

# Evapotranspiration regulates leaf temperature and respiration in dryland vegetation

Christopher L. Kibler<sup>a,\*</sup>, Anna T. Trugman<sup>a,b</sup>, Dar A. Roberts<sup>a,b</sup>, Christopher J. Still<sup>c</sup>, Russell L. Scott<sup>d</sup>, Kelly K. Caylor<sup>a,b,e</sup>, John C. Stella<sup>f</sup>, Michael Bliss Singer<sup>b,g,h</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Geography, University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

<sup>b</sup> Earth Research Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

<sup>c</sup> Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA

<sup>d</sup> Southwest Watershed Research Center, USDA Agricultural Research Service, Tuscon, AZ, USA

<sup>e</sup> Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

<sup>f</sup> Department of Sustainable Resources Management, State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry, Syracuse, NY, USA

<sup>g</sup> School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, United Kingdom

<sup>h</sup> Water Research Institute, Cardiff University, Cardiff, United Kingdom

## ARTICLE INFO

Dataset link: [Manuscript code and data \(Original data\)](#)

### Keywords:

Carbon cycling  
Ecophysiology  
Eddy covariance  
Evaporative cooling  
Thermal remote sensing  
Thermoregulation

## ABSTRACT

Evapotranspiration regulates energy flux partitioning at the leaf surface, which in turn regulates leaf temperature. However, the mechanistic relationship between evapotranspiration and leaf temperature remains poorly constrained. In this study, we present a novel mechanistic model to predict leaf temperature as a linearized function of the evaporative fraction. The model is validated using measurements from infrared radiometers mounted on two flux towers in Arizona, USA, which measure canopies of *Prosopis velutina* with contrasting water availability. Both the observations and model predictions reveal that leaf temperature equilibrates with air temperature when latent heat flux consumes all of the energy incident on the leaf surface. Leaf temperature exceeds air temperature when there is a net input of energy into the leaf tissue. The flux tower observations revealed that evaporative cooling reduced canopy leaf temperature by ca. 1–5 °C, depending on water availability. Evaporative cooling also enhanced net carbon uptake by reducing leaf respiration by ca. 15% in the middle of the growing season. The regulation of leaf temperature by evapotranspiration and the resulting impact on net carbon uptake represents an important link between plant water and carbon cycles that has received little attention in literature. The model presented here provides a mechanistic framework to quantify leaf evaporative cooling and examine its impacts on plant physiological function.

## 1. Introduction

Leaves serve as a critical nexus between water, energy, and carbon fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems, and leaf temperature ( $T_L$ ) plays an important role in regulating the rates of mass and energy fluxes at the leaf surface (Still et al., 2021; Vinod et al., 2022).  $T_L$  directly influences several physical processes that drive mass and energy exchange, including leaf-to-air vapor pressure deficit (VPD; Grossiord et al., 2020), thermal conductance and emittance (Jones, 2014), net photosynthetic assimilation (Medlyn et al., 2002), and leaf respiration ( $R_L$ ; Heskell et al., 2016). High values of  $T_L$  can also cause thermal stress and damage to leaf biochemical systems, which may permanently inhibit leaf physiologic function (O'Sullivan et al., 2017).  $T_L$  is thus a critical variable that regulates several aspects of terrestrial ecosystem function,

and it is important to constrain the drivers of  $T_L$  to better predict the sensitivity of terrestrial ecosystems to anthropogenic climate change.

Generally speaking,  $T_L$  is regulated by environmental conditions and energy fluxes at the leaf surface. Empirical observations have demonstrated that  $T_L$  is often close to air temperature ( $T_a$ ), but the mechanistic relationship between  $T_L$  and  $T_a$  remains poorly constrained. Some studies have argued that leaves exhibit limited homeothermy, whereby the slope of the relationship between  $T_L$  and  $T_a$  is less than 1 (Michaletz et al., 2015, 2016; Blonder and Michaletz, 2018; Cook et al., 2021). Other studies have argued that leaves exhibit megathermy, whereby the slope of the relationship between  $T_L$  and  $T_a$  is greater than 1 (Salisbury and Spomer, 1964; Pau et al., 2018; Still et al., 2019b, 2022). Observations where  $T_L \cong T_a$  (i.e., poikilothermy) have also been reported (Drake et al., 2020; Miller et al., 2021; Uni et al.,

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [kibler@ucsb.edu](mailto:kibler@ucsb.edu) (C.L. Kibler).

2022). The terminology for leaf thermal regimes follows the convention described by Cavaleri (2020). In practice,  $T_L$  observations are often normalized by  $T_a$  (i.e.,  $T_L - T_a$ ) to control for environmental variability and analyze other drivers of  $T_L$ .

Surface energy flux partitioning between latent ( $\lambda E$ ) and sensible ( $H$ ) heat flux also plays an important role in regulating  $T_L$ . Surface energy balance must be preserved at the leaf scale, so leaf-level  $\lambda E$  consumes energy that would otherwise increase  $T_L$ . Surface energy flux partitioning can be quantified using the evaporative fraction ( $f_E$ ), which measures the proportion of available energy ( $Q_a$ ) that is consumed by  $\lambda E$ :

$$f_E = \frac{\lambda E}{Q_a} \quad (1)$$

Thus, there is a direct physical relationship between  $f_E$  and  $T_L$ , which results in evaporative cooling of the leaf surface.

Evaporative cooling has important functional implications for plant carbon cycling and leaf physiologic function, particularly in hot and dry ecosystems (Hultine et al., 2020; Uni et al., 2022). Photosynthetic assimilation of carbon is highly dependent on  $T_L$  at the leaf scale (Medlyn et al., 2002). Maintaining lower  $T_L$  also reduces  $R_L$  (Heskel et al., 2016; Mathias and Trugman, 2022) and can prevent thermal damage to leaves (O'Sullivan et al., 2017). Indeed, several recent studies have speculated that plants may decouple photosynthesis and transpiration during extreme heat waves to maintain high levels of  $\lambda E$ , which keeps  $T_L$  below critical thresholds that would result in damage to the leaf tissue (Drake et al., 2018; Krich et al., 2022; cf. De Kauwe et al., 2019). Likewise, water availability for evaporative cooling may limit the distributions of some plant species in dryland ecosystems when they cannot maintain physiologic function at ambient temperatures (Hultine et al., 2020). Improving mechanistic models of  $T_L$  will enhance our understanding of the feedbacks between water, energy, and carbon fluxes at the leaf surface and improve our ability to predict shifts in ecosystem function under anthropogenic climate change. It will also improve our ability to map ecosystem water fluxes at broad spatial scales using thermal remote sensing data (Mallick et al., 2022).

Many models predict  $T_L$  or  $T_L - T_a$  by combining energy balance theory with the Penman-Monteith equation (e.g., Monteith and Unsworth, 2013). However, implementing these models requires empirical assumptions about stomatal conductance, which is difficult to constrain. Here, we present an alternate modeling framework that predicts  $T_L$  as a linearized function of  $f_E$ . Our mechanistic model requires fewer surface parameters than previous formulations, which improves our ability to isolate and examine the environmental variables that drive  $T_L$ . The simplified model also yields fundamental insights into the relationship between  $T_L$  and  $T_a$  under varying environmental conditions, and the resulting impacts on plant physiologic function.

The paper is organized as follows. First, we present the new model. Then, we validate the model predictions using  $T_L$  measurements from infrared radiometers mounted on two flux towers in Arizona, USA, which measure stands of *Prosopis velutina* with contrasting water availability. We also examine the environmental variables that are most important for predicting  $T_L$  in the observational data set. Finally, we force the model with flux tower measurements to estimate the change in  $R_L$  that is attributable to evaporative cooling of the leaf surface, which may reveal an important link between evaporative cooling and net carbon uptake. In doing so, we address the following research questions:

1. How sensitive is  $T_L$  to changes in surface energy flux partitioning between  $\lambda E$  and  $H$ ?
2. Which environmental variables directly regulate  $T_L$ ? Which of those variables is most important for regulating  $T_L$  in dryland ecosystems?
3. How much is  $R_L$  reduced by evaporative cooling of the leaf surface?

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Leaf temperature model

Steady-state surface energy balance can be modeled as the difference between  $Q_a$ ,  $H$ , and  $\lambda E$ :

$$Q_a - H - \lambda E = 0 \quad (2)$$

When modeling the energy balance of individual leaves, the  $Q_a$  term is equivalent to leaf-level net radiation ( $R_n$ ), which is the sum of downwelling ( $\downarrow$ ) and upwelling ( $\uparrow$ ) shortwave ( $SW$ ) and longwave ( $LW$ ) radiation fluxes:

$$R_n = SW\downarrow - SW\uparrow + LW\downarrow - LW\uparrow \quad (3)$$

The  $LW\uparrow$  term can be calculated as a function of  $T_L$  measured in K:

$$LW\uparrow = k\varepsilon_L\sigma T_L^4 \quad (4)$$

where  $\varepsilon_L$  is leaf emissivity ( $\varepsilon_L = 0.98$ ),  $\sigma$  is the Stefan–Boltzmann constant ( $5.67 \times 10^{-8} \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-4}$ ), and  $k$  is a coefficient that indicates whether it is a one-sided ( $k = 1$ ) or two-sided ( $k = 2$ ) leaf model. The  $H$  term in Eq. (2) can be calculated as:

$$H = k \frac{\rho c_p (T_L - T_a)}{r_H} \quad (5)$$

where  $\rho$  is air density,  $c_p$  is the specific heat of air, and  $r_H$  is the aerodynamic resistance to  $H$ . We combined Eqs. (1), (2), and (5) and rearranged to produce a novel linearized equation for  $T_L - T_a$ :

$$\begin{aligned} T_L - T_a &= \frac{Q_a r_H}{k \rho c_p} (1 - f_E) \\ &= \frac{Q_a r_H}{k \rho c_p} - \frac{Q_a r_H}{k \rho c_p} f_E \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The expanded version of Eq. (6) contains two additive terms: a radiative heating term that is proportional to  $Q_a$  and an evaporative cooling term that is proportional to  $f_E$ . Importantly, Eq. (6) reveals that  $T_L - T_a$  is a linear function of  $f_E$  and that the slope and intercept are functions of  $Q_a$  and  $r_H$ . Because the slope and intercept negate each other (i.e., slope = intercept  $\times -1$ ),  $T_L - T_a = 0 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$  when  $f_E = 1$ , which reveals that  $T_L$  converges at  $T_a$  when  $\lambda E$  consumes all of the energy incident on the leaf surface. It follows that:

$$T_L = T_a + \frac{Q_a r_H}{k \rho c_p} - \frac{Q_a r_H}{k \rho c_p} f_E \quad (7)$$

Eq. (7) provides a framework to examine the competing roles of  $T_a$ , radiative heating, and evaporative cooling in regulating  $T_L$ . It also provides a framework to examine the resulting impacts on plant physiologic function.

It is worth noting that  $T_L$  appears on both sides of Eq. (7) because  $T_L$  regulates  $R_n$  and thus  $Q_a$  (i.e., Eq. (4)). If  $R_n$  is not measured directly, Eq. (7) can be solved numerically, as is discussed below in Section 2.3.7. Alternatively, the  $R_n$  term can be approximated using isothermal net radiation ( $R_{n,i}$ ) following Jones (2014):

$$R_{n,i} = SW\downarrow - SW\uparrow + \varepsilon_L LW\downarrow - k\varepsilon_L\sigma T_a^4 \quad (8)$$

We used direct measurements of  $R_n$  throughout our analysis, except as noted in Section 2.3.7.

### 2.2. Leaf temperature sensitivity analysis

We modeled the sensitivity of  $T_L - T_a$  to environmental drivers by forcing Eq. (6) with simulated values of  $Q_a$  (250, 500, and  $750 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ ),  $r_H$  (1, 10, 20, 30, and  $40 \text{ sm}^{-1}$ ), and  $f_E$  (0-1). The  $\rho$  term was held constant at  $1.006 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ , and the  $c_p$  term was held constant at  $1010 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ kg}^{-1}$ , which are representative values for the study area. A one-sided model ( $k = 1$ ) was used to facilitate intercomparison with subsequent analyses.

### 2.3. Flux tower observations

We compared the modeled sensitivities from Eq. (6) to measurements from two eddy covariance flux towers in Arizona, USA, where  $T_L$  was measured by infrared radiometers mounted on the towers. The infrared radiometers measured the average temperature of many leaves on the outside of the *P. velutina* canopies, so we use the term  $T_c$  to describe the radiometer measurements of “canopy-scale leaf temperature” following (Still et al., 2021). However, we generally assume that  $T_c \cong T_L$ , and we use  $T_c$  and  $T_L$  interchangeably. The flux tower data set contains 17 site-years of growing season measurements under varying environmental conditions. We also used the flux tower data to analyze the environmental drivers of  $T_c$  and to quantify the impact of  $T_c$  on  $R_L$ .

The  $T_c$  measurements by the infrared radiometers represent leaves on the outside of a single *P. velutina* canopy, while the eddy covariance measurements represent the average fluxes within the fetch of the sensors (ca. 50–200 m). We acknowledge the scale mismatch between the canopy-scale  $T_c$  measurements and the fetch-scale flux measurements, but we contend that novel insights can still be gleaned from the measurements using a “big leaf” assumption, whereby the entire fetch is assumed to behave like a single leaf in order to link leaf-scale theoretical models with canopy-scale measurements (e.g., Sellers et al., 1992; Amthor, 1994). In this context, Eq. (7) can be used to predict the average surface temperature of an entire canopy or stand. Canopy-scale processes are arguably more important than leaf-scale processes for understanding terrestrial ecosystem function, but they are also more difficult to constrain (Bonan, 2016). The temperature and fluxes of individual leaves can be measured using *in situ* sensors, but they may not be representative of the canopy as a whole (Miller et al., 2021; Vinod et al., 2022). We believe that the big leaf assumption is a reasonable approach to glean insights into the theoretical drivers of canopy-scale processes. To connect the leaf-scale theoretical model with the canopy-scale measurements, we included a ground heat flux ( $G$ ) term when calculating  $Q_a$ , such that:

$$Q_a = R_n - G \quad (9)$$

Eq. (9) helps control for the loss of available energy through the bottom of the canopy. We also used a one-sided model ( $k = 1$ ) for all analyses.

#### 2.3.1. Study sites

We analyzed data from two flux towers located in stands of *P. velutina* in southeastern Arizona, USA. Southeastern Arizona has a semi-arid climate with monsoonal precipitation that is delivered in brief, spatially restricted storms that dominate total annual rainfall and runoff (Thomas and Pool, 2006; Singer and Michaelides, 2017). The summer growing season encompasses both the driest and wettest parts of the year. The first part of the growing season is very dry, but ecosystems receive intense precipitation after the onset of the monsoon around early July. The monsoonal precipitation and accompanying humidity typically decrease after August, but generally remain above pre-monsoon levels through the end of the growing season (Higgins et al., 1997). The two stands that we analyzed have contrasting physiographic positions resulting in differences in plant water availability, particularly during the dry months before the onset of the monsoon. The differences in water availability create ideal conditions for a natural experiment to quantify the sensitivity of  $T_c$  to  $\lambda E$  and environmental conditions, while holding regional climatic variables relatively constant.

The first flux tower is in a riparian woodland approximately 16 km northeast of Sierra Vista, Arizona (31.6637° N, 110.1777° W). The riparian woodland is located on an old alluvial terrace above the San Pedro River, where the depth to groundwater is approximately 10 m (Sabathier et al., 2021). The flux tower is located ca. 225 m from the river channel, and the alluvial terrace is ca. 10 m above the river channel, so we assume that evaporation from the river channel does not affect the  $\lambda E$  measurements. The mean summer air temperature is

25 °C and the mean annual precipitation is 319 mm (PRISM Climate Group, 2021; Huntington et al., 2017). The woodland is dominated by a canopy of *P. velutina* (canopy cover ~70%) with a mean height of 7 m and a maximum height of 10 m. Leaf emergence for the deciduous *P. velutina* trees typically occurs in April, and plant hydraulic function increases in late May. The understory is dominated by the perennial grass *Sporobolus wrightii* but annual forbs and herbs are common during the summer monsoon season (Scott et al., 2004). Rooting depths of *P. velutina* can exceed 10 m (Stromberg, 2013), and the pre-monsoon fluxes reveal that overstory vegetation accesses groundwater. Because groundwater provides a stable source of water that is somewhat decoupled from the local precipitation regime, evapotranspiration ( $ET$ ) consistently exceeds precipitation on an annual basis (Missik et al., 2021; Scott et al., 2021). Groundwater is an important water source for maintaining vegetation structure and function in many dryland riparian plant communities (Kibler et al., 2021). The understory vegetation has a maximum rooting depth of 2–3 m, so it does not have access to groundwater and is dependent on water inputs from local precipitation (Scott et al., 2004).

The second flux tower is in an upland savanna at the Santa Rita Experimental Range, approximately 45 km south of Tucson, Arizona (31.8214° N, 110.8661° W). The site is a semi-desert grassland that has been encroached by *P. velutina*. The mean summer air temperature is 26 °C and the mean annual precipitation is 368 mm (PRISM Climate Group, 2021; Huntington et al., 2017). Scott et al. (2009) reported that the *P. velutina* canopy ranges in height from 0.25 to 6 m (mean height 2.5 m) and covers ~35% of the ground area. Leaf emergence for *P. velutina* typically occurs in April (Seyednasrollah et al., 2019). The *P. velutina* plants at the upland savanna likely had lower leaf area index and smaller average leaf size than those at the riparian woodland (Stromberg et al., 1993). Perennial grasses, forbs, and shrubs cover ~22% of the ground area (Scott et al., 2009). Depth to groundwater exceeds 100 m, so the overstory and understory vegetation do not have access to groundwater and are dependent on water inputs from local precipitation.

Both flux towers contain an array of eddy covariance, meteorological, and soil sensors, along with infrared radiometers (IRT-P, Apogee Instruments, Logan, UT) pointed 45° off-nadir at the *P. velutina* canopies. This study primarily relied on flux measurements of  $\lambda E$ ,  $H$ ,  $R_n$ ,  $G$ ,  $SW\downarrow$ ,  $SW\uparrow$ , and  $LW\downarrow$ ; meteorological measurements of  $T_a$ , wind speed ( $u$ ), and relative humidity (RH); measurements of soil temperature ( $T_s$ ) and soil water content (SWC); and  $T_c$  measurements from the infrared radiometers. In the riparian woodland,  $\lambda E$  and  $H$  were measured at 14 m.  $G$  was quantified for the surface using soil heat flux plate measurements at 5 cm depth along with the change in heat storage from 0–5 cm depth. Canopy-level  $T_a$ ,  $u$ , and RH were measured at 8 m.  $T_s$  was measured at 5 cm depth and SWC was measured at 22.5 cm depth. The infrared radiometer was mounted at 10 m. A four-component net radiometer measured individual  $SW\downarrow$ ,  $SW\uparrow$ ,  $LW\uparrow$ , and  $LW\downarrow$  fluxes from 2001–2003, but it was replaced by a two-channel SW and LW net radiometer from 2004–2006. The four-channel radiometer was mounted at 14 m, and the sensors for the two-channel radiometer were mounted at 10 m and 14 m. In the upland savanna,  $\lambda E$  and  $H$  were measured at 7.8 m;  $SW\downarrow$ ,  $SW\uparrow$ ,  $LW\uparrow$ , and  $LW\downarrow$  were measured at 7.1 m; and  $G$  was quantified for the surface. Canopy-level  $T_a$  and RH were measured at 2 m. Canopy-level  $u$  was measured at 3.5 m.  $T_s$  was measured at 5 cm depth and SWC was measured at 20 cm depth. The infrared radiometer was mounted at 7 m. Atmospheric transmittance and emittance were assumed to have a negligible impact on the radiometer measurements over the short distances (ca. 5 m) between the radiometers and the canopies (Aubrecht et al., 2016). We also assumed that the differences in  $T_a$  between the meteorological sensors and the canopies were negligible, given that the  $T_a$  sensors were at approximately the same heights as the measured leaves. All flux tower data were acquired from Ameriflux (sites US-CMW and US-SRM, respectively). See Scott (2021a,b) and Scott et al.

(2004, 2009) for additional details about the collection and processing of the flux tower data.

Several criteria were used to filter the half-hourly flux tower measurements:

- growing season observations between May and September
- daytime observations between 8:00 and 16:00 local time
- removed days with any measured precipitation and the day after any measured precipitation
- observations with friction velocity ( $u_*$ ) > 0.2

We also removed years that did not have complete records of growing season measurements and years where there were apparent shifts in the infrared radiometer view angle due to a loose mounting bracket, as evidenced by sudden changes in the relationship between  $T_c$  and  $T_s$  at 5 cm depth. Based on these criteria, two site-years of data were removed for the riparian woodland (2007 and 2008), and four site-years of data were removed for the upland savanna (2014, 2015, 2020, and 2021). The resulting data set contained six site-years of data for the riparian woodland (2001–2006) and eleven site-years of data for the upland savanna (2007–2019, excluding 2014 and 2015). The  $R_L$  analysis relied on individual measurements of  $SW\downarrow$ ,  $SW\uparrow$ , and  $LW\downarrow$  fluxes, which were only available from 2001–2003 at the riparian woodland. They were available for all years at the upland savanna. The flux tower measurements were used to force Eq. (7) and analyze the sensitivity of  $T_c$  to  $\lambda E$  and environmental conditions. All of the other terms in Eq. (7) can be directly derived from the flux tower measurements, except for  $r_H$ .

### 2.3.2. Resistance to sensible heat flux

Following Young et al. (2021), the canopy-scale  $r_H$  is the sum of the resistance to momentum transfer ( $r_{am}$ ) and the excess resistance ( $r_{bh}$ ):

$$r_H = r_{am} + r_{bh} \quad (10)$$

The  $r_{am}$  term can be estimated as a function of  $u$  and the friction velocity ( $u_*$ ):

$$r_{am} = \frac{u}{u_*^2} \quad (11)$$

The  $r_{bh}$  term is a function of the roughness lengths for momentum ( $z_{0m}$ ) and heat ( $z_{0h}$ ) as well as stability functions for momentum ( $\psi_m$ ) and heat ( $\psi_h$ ) exchange:

$$r_{bh} = \frac{1}{\kappa u_*} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{z_{0m}}{z_{0h}} \right) - \psi_h + \psi_m \right] \quad (12)$$

where  $\kappa$  is the Von Kármán constant ( $\kappa = 0.41$ ). Eq. (8) can be simplified to ignore the stability functions, which have a negligible impact on the predicted values of  $r_{bh}$  at a canopy scale (Young et al., 2021):

$$r_{bh} = \frac{1}{\kappa u_*} \ln \left( \frac{z_{0m}}{z_{0h}} \right) \quad (13)$$

The  $z_{0m}$  and  $z_{0h}$  terms are often represented by the parameter  $kB^{-1}$  such that:

$$kB^{-1} = \ln \left( \frac{z_{0m}}{z_{0h}} \right) \quad (14)$$

$$r_{bh} = \frac{1}{\kappa u_*} kB^{-1} \quad (15)$$

At an ecosystem scale, the parameter  $kB^{-1}$  varies as a function of land cover, leaf area, vegetation structure, and environmental conditions (Yang and Friedl, 2003). Various empirical formulations for  $kB^{-1}$  have been developed. We estimated  $kB^{-1}$  as an empirical function of  $u_*$  following (Thom, 1972), which yielded the most parsimonious predictions of  $r_H$  out of 12 formulas described by Verhoef et al. (1997) and Hong et al. (2012). The comparison of the formulas is described in the Supplementary Materials.

$$kB^{-1} = 1.35\kappa(100u_*)^{1/3} \quad (16)$$

### 2.3.3. Model validation

The flux tower measurements were used to validate the model described in Eq. (7). We compared the  $T_c$  measurements from the infrared radiometers to  $T_c$  predictions that were generated by forcing Eq. (7) with concurrent flux tower measurements. The MAE,  $R^2$ , slope, and bias were used to quantify the model performance at each site.

### 2.3.4. Energy balance closure

The model presented in Eq. (7) assumes energy balance closure. However, energy balance closure is rarely achieved in eddy covariance measurements due to systematic sensor errors, differences in the spatial footprints of individual sensors, advective fluxes, and a variety of other factors (Stoy et al., 2013; Mauder et al., 2020). The energy balance closure ratio ( $C$ ) can be calculated as:

$$C = \frac{\lambda E + H}{Q_a} \quad (17)$$

We calculated  $C$  for the half-hourly flux measurements using Eq. (17).

We quantified the sensitivity of the  $T_c$  predictions to  $C$  by forcing closure in the flux measurements and then comparing the  $T_c$  predictions from the forced and unforced values. While forcing energy balance closure is often not recommended for eddy covariance analyses (e.g., Scott, 2010), comparing the different  $T_c$  predictions enabled us to quantify the model error that might be attributable to the lack of energy balance closure. Energy balance closure was forced by assuming that the  $\lambda E$  and  $H$  were measured correctly and adjusting the value of  $Q_a$ . Energy balance closure can also be forced by assuming that  $Q_a$  was measured correctly and adjusting the values of  $\lambda E$  and  $H$  (Twine et al., 2000; Knauer et al., 2018). However, the  $H$  term is not explicitly represented in Eq. (7). Energy balance closure was forced by setting  $Q_a$  equal to the sum of the turbulent fluxes:

$$Q_{a,f} = \lambda E + H \quad (18)$$

where the subscript  $f$  denotes that the value was adjusted to force energy balance closure. Eq. (7) was forced with  $Q_{a,f}$  to generate a new set of  $T_c$  predictions. All other model forcings remained unchanged. We compared the two sets of  $T_c$  predictions to estimate the model error that might be attributable to the lack of energy balance closure.

### 2.3.5. T/ET partitioning

The model presented in Eq. (7) also assumes that all  $\lambda E$  is attributable to leaf transpiration ( $T$ ). However, eddy covariance measurements are collected at a stand scale, and soil evaporation ( $E$ ) may also contribute to the  $\lambda E$  signal. The ratio of  $T/ET$  can be used to quantify the extent to which the  $\lambda E$  signal is attributable to  $T$ . Several methods have been proposed to partition  $T$  and  $E$  in eddy covariance measurements (Stoy et al., 2019). We reanalyzed data from Scott et al. (2021) and Nelson et al. (2020a,b), who partitioned data for the riparian woodland and upland savanna, respectively, using the method proposed by Nelson et al. (2018). We used their daily estimates of  $T$  and  $ET$  to calculate  $T/ET$  for the two sites. The  $T/ET$  analysis included all days where there was at least one half-hourly measurement in the filtered eddy covariance data set and an estimate of  $T/ET$  from the published data sets. The resulting data set covered years 2005–2006 for the riparian woodland and 2007–2013 for the upland savanna.

### 2.3.6. Analysis of flux tower measurements

We conducted several analyses to identify the mechanistic basis for the model behavior using the flux tower measurements. We compared the distributions of the  $T_c - T_a$  and  $f_E$  measurements and calculated the seasonal and diurnal climatology of  $T_c - T_a$  at each site. We also produced seasonal and diurnal climatologies for the individual drivers of  $T_c$ , including  $T_a$ ,  $f_E$ ,  $r_H$ , and  $Q_a$ . Spearman rank correlation was used to quantify the sensitivity of  $T_c$  and  $T_c - T_a$  to the individual drivers. The data were grouped by month to assess seasonal changes in the variables that drive  $T_c$  and  $T_c - T_a$ . Spearman rank correlation was also used to



quantify the sensitivity of  $f_E$ ,  $r_H$ , and  $Q_a$  to environmental variables measured by the flux towers, which may have an indirect effect on  $T_c$  and  $T_c - T_a$ . The environmental variables include SW↓, VPD,  $u$ , and soil water content (SWC). VPD was calculated using the flux tower measurements of  $T_a$  and RH following Allen et al. (1998).

### 2.3.7. Leaf respiration model

We also analyzed the sensitivity of daytime leaf respiration ( $R_L$ ) to changes in  $T_c$  caused by  $\lambda E$  variability. Leaf respiration is a complex biochemical process that varies as a function of leaf mass per area, leaf nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations, photosynthetic carboxylation capacity,  $T_L$ , and other variables (Atkin et al., 2015). Leaf respiration is also inhibited by sunlight during the daytime (Kok, 1948; Heskell et al., 2013). In practice,  $R_L$  is often estimated as an empirical function of  $T_L$  (Mathias and Trugman, 2022). We estimated leaf dark respiration ( $R_{L,dark}$ ) following Heskell et al. (2016):

$$R_{L,dark}(T_L) = R_{L,dark}(T_{ref}) * e^{0.1012(T_L - T_{ref}) - 0.0005(T_L^2 - T_{ref}^2)} \quad (19)$$

where  $T_{ref}$  is the reference temperature and  $R_{L,dark}$  is measured in units of  $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ . The  $R_{L,dark}(T_{ref})$  parameter was set to  $1.7 \mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$  based on a measurement of *Prosopis glandulosa* by Reich et al. (1998) at a  $T_{ref}$  of  $25^\circ\text{C}$ . Leaf light respiration ( $R_{L,light}$ ) was modeled as a function of  $R_{L,dark}$  following Way et al. (2015) and Mathias and Trugman (2022):

$$R_{L,light}(T_L) = R_{L,dark}(T_L) * (0.0039 * T_L + 0.6219) \quad (20)$$

Eq. (20) helps control for the light inhibition of  $R_L$ , which is not represented in the  $R_{L,dark}$  estimates (Way et al., 2015).

We estimated  $R_{L,light}$  using two temperature forcings:  $T_c$  and modeled canopy temperature with no evaporative cooling ( $T_{c,ne}$ ). We modeled  $T_c$  by forcing Eq. (7) with flux tower measurements. The  $r_H$  term was calculated using Eqs. (10)–(16). We used modeled rather than measured  $T_c$  values to control for any effect of changing sensor calibrations over the multi-annual time series. We modeled  $T_{c,ne}$  by setting  $\lambda E$  to 0 in Eq. (7). We also calculated  $Q_a$  as a function of its component fluxes (Eqs. (3)–(4)) to account for the effect of  $T_c$  on  $LW\uparrow$ . When all terms in Eq. (7) are directly measured, the feedback between  $T_c$  and  $LW\uparrow$  is implicitly encoded in the flux measurements. However, when combining measured and forced flux values (i.e., by setting  $\lambda E$  to 0), the feedback must be explicitly specified in the analytical formulation. The  $LW\downarrow$  term must also be multiplied by  $\epsilon_L$ . The equation for  $T_{c,ne}$  can be written as:

$$T_{c,ne} = T_a + \frac{(SW\downarrow - SW\uparrow + \epsilon_L LW\downarrow - \epsilon_L \sigma T_{c,ne}^4 - G)r_H}{\rho c_p} \quad (21)$$

Eq. (21) estimates the temperature of a non-transpiring canopy. The terms of the equation were forced with flux tower measurements. To make Eq. (21) analytically tractable, we rewrote the equation in the form of a quartic function and solved for  $T_{c,ne}$  using a numerical solver (NumPy v1.23.3; Harris et al., 2020). Physically unreasonable values where modeled  $T_{c,ne}$  was less than modeled  $T_c$  were likely due to the lack of energy balance closure and were removed from the analysis.

The difference between the estimates of  $R_{L,light}$  using  $T_c$  and  $T_{c,ne}$  revealed the marginal change in  $R_{L,light}$  that is attributable to  $T_c$  variability caused by  $\lambda E$  (i.e.,  $\partial R_{L,light} / \partial T_c(\lambda E)$ ). This framework enabled us to estimate the decrease in daytime  $R_L$  caused by evaporative cooling of the leaf surface ( $\Delta R_L$ ).

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Leaf temperature model

The mechanistic model of  $T_L$  presented in Eq. (7) reveals that there are three drivers of  $T_L$ : (1)  $T_a$ , (2) a radiative heating term that is proportional to  $Q_a$ , and (3) an evaporative cooling term that is proportional to  $f_E$ . The model predicts that  $T_L$  converges to  $T_a$  when

$\lambda E$  consumes all of the energy incident on the leaf surface, regardless of environmental conditions (Fig. 1). When  $f_E < 1$ ,  $T_L - T_a$  also varies as a function of  $Q_a$  and  $r_H$ . Importantly, the model predicts that  $T_L - T_a \geq 0^\circ\text{C}$  under all conditions, although there are environmental conditions when  $T_L - T_a$  approaches  $0^\circ\text{C}$  even though  $f_E < 1$ . Specifically, the model predicts that  $T_L - T_a = 0^\circ\text{C}$  when  $Q_a = 0 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  or when  $r_H = 0 \text{ sm}^{-1}$ , regardless of the value of  $f_E$ . The first condition often happens around dawn and dusk, while the second condition is unrealistic in real-world settings (Young et al., 2021).

### 3.2. Model validation


The model of  $T_L$  presented in Eq. (7) was validated by forcing Eq. (7) with flux tower measurements and comparing the  $T_L$  predictions to concurrent  $T_c$  measurements from infrared radiometers mounted on the flux towers. The  $T_c$  measurements represented the average temperature of many leaves on the outside of a *P. velutina* canopy, and we generally assumed that  $T_c \cong T_L$ . The model yielded strong fits at both study sites (Fig. 2). The predictions for the riparian woodland exhibited a stronger fit (MAE =  $2.67^\circ\text{C}$ ). The predictions for the upland savanna exhibited a slightly weaker fit (MAE =  $3.42^\circ\text{C}$ ), but the range of observed  $T_c$  values was also larger. The model tended to slightly overestimate  $T_c$  at both sites (mean bias =  $2.53^\circ\text{C}$  and  $1.55^\circ\text{C}$ , respectively).

### 3.3. Energy balance closure


We also assessed the impact of energy balance closure on the  $T_c$  predictions. The median energy balance closure ratio ( $C$ ) in the riparian woodland was 0.86 with an interquartile range of [0.75, 0.98]. The median  $C$  in the upland savanna was 0.83 with an interquartile range of [0.75, 0.92] (Supplementary Figure 4). Forcing energy balance closure by adjusting the  $Q_a$  value reduced the  $T_c$  predictions by  $1.06^\circ\text{C}$  in the riparian woodland and  $1.64^\circ\text{C}$  in the upland savanna. The MAE between the two sets of  $T_c$  predictions was  $1.38^\circ\text{C}$  in the riparian woodland and  $1.8^\circ\text{C}$  in the upland savanna. The  $T_c$  predictions based on  $Q_{a,f}$  were more parsimonious than the predictions based on the unforced values when compared to the infrared radiometer measurements at both sites. The  $R^2$  values were 0.89 and 0.7 for the riparian woodland and upland savanna, respectively. The analysis suggests that the overestimation of  $T_c$  seen in Fig. 2 is due, in part, to the lack of energy balance closure in the flux data. This is supported by comparing the model prediction error to the  $C$  values. In the riparian woodland, the average model prediction error was near  $0^\circ\text{C}$  when  $C \approx 1$ . When  $C$  decreased below 1, the model prediction error increased monotonically. In the upland savanna, the model prediction error also increased as  $C$  decreased below 1, although the upland savanna exhibited a less clear trend (Supplementary Figure 5).

### 3.4. T/ET partitioning


The analysis of  $T/ET$  values indicated that the  $\lambda E$  signal was dominated by  $T$  and not  $E$  at both sites (Fig. 3). In the riparian woodland, the median daily  $T/ET$  value ranged from 0.87 to 0.92 for each month. In the upland savanna, the median daily  $T/ET$  value ranged from 0.72 to 0.8 for each month. The upland savanna exhibited more variability in  $T/ET$  values, suggesting that  $E$  may have contributed more error to the model predictions at that site. The  $T/ET$  values were relatively consistent throughout the growing season and did not exhibit any apparent seasonal trend at either site.



**Fig. 1.** Predicted values of  $T_L - T_a$  from Eq. (6) calculated using different values of available energy ( $Q_a$ ), evaporation fraction ( $f_E$ ), and resistance to sensible heat flux ( $r_H$ ). Air density ( $\rho$ ) was held constant at  $1.006 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ . The specific heat of air ( $c_p$ ) was held constant at  $1010 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ kg}^{-1}$ .



**Fig. 2.** Model predicted  $T_c$  compared to  $T_c$  measurements from the infrared radiometers for the riparian woodland (a) and upland savanna (b). The predicted  $T_c$  values were calculated by forcing Eq. (7) with flux tower measurements. The blue lines are the 1:1 line. The mean absolute error (MAE) is also indicated. White areas in the plots indicate that there were 0 observations in that portion of the feature space. The color scale saturates when there are more than 100 half-hourly observations in a given portion of the feature space.




**Fig. 3.** Boxplots of daily  $T/ET$  values in the riparian woodland (a) and upland savanna (b) for each month of the growing season. Outliers are not shown. Source: Data are reanalyzed from Scott et al. (2021) and Nelson et al. (2020a,b).

### 3.5. Flux tower observations


We also analyzed the flux tower observations to characterize the mechanistic basis for the model behavior. In the riparian woodland,  $T_c - T_a$  remained close to  $0 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$  for the entire time series, although  $T_c - T_a$  varied both seasonally and diurnally. The mean  $T_c - T_a$  value across the entire data set was  $1.57 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$  (Fig. 4).  $T_c - T_a$  values near  $0 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$  indicate that there was a substantial degree of evaporative cooling in the riparian woodland. Otherwise,  $T_c$  would substantially exceed  $T_a$  because of energy inputs from solar radiation. The largest  $T_c - T_a$  values tended to occur in May when the trees were leafing out and plant hydraulic function was still increasing. The values decreased substantially starting

in June (Fig. 5). In May, the average peak value was  $4.27 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ , and by June the average peak value decreased to  $2.44 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ , with lower peaks occurring in subsequent months. The daily maximum values tended to occur around 11:30 local time.


The upland savanna exhibited similar trends. The mean  $T_c - T_a$  value across the entire data set was  $6.46 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$  (Fig. 4). The largest values tended to occur in the dry months of May and June and decreased substantially starting in July when the summer rainy season began (Fig. 5). In June, the average peak value was  $10.59 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ . By August, the average peak value decreased to  $5.72 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ . Unlike the riparian woodland, the daily maximum values tended to occur around 13:00 local time.



**Fig. 4.** Energy flux measurements from the riparian woodland (a,c) and upland savanna (b,d) differ in that the riparian woodland has a higher evaporative fraction ( $f_E$ ) compared to the upland savanna. However, in both systems leaf temperature ( $T_c$ ) converges to air temperature ( $T_a$ ) when  $f_E$  approaches 1. The plots in the top row (a,b) compare  $T_a$  and  $T_c$  measurements. The blue lines are the 1:1 line. The plots in the bottom row (c,d) show the relationship between  $T_c - T_a$  and  $f_E$ . White areas in the plots indicate that there were 0 observations in that portion of the feature space. The color scale saturates when there are more than 75 half-hourly observations in a given portion of the feature space. Some outliers are outside of the plotted range.



**Fig. 5.** Diurnal and seasonal climatology of  $T_c - T_a$  (a,b) and  $T_a$  (c,d) in the riparian woodland (a,c) and upland savanna (b,d). The colored lines represent the mean values for each time of day, grouped by month of the growing season. A comparable figure for  $f_E$ ,  $r_H$ , and  $Q_a$  is located in the Supplementary Materials.



**Fig. 6.** Seasonal climatology of evaporative fraction ( $f_E$ ), resistance to sensible heat flux ( $r_H$ ), and available energy ( $Q_a$ ) in the riparian woodland (a–c) and upland savanna (d–f). The colored bars represent the median values for each month of the growing season. The black vertical bars represent the interquartile range. The  $Q_a$  values are limited to observations from 12:00 local time.

The sensitivity of  $T_c - T_a$  to  $f_E$  from the flux tower measurements was consistent with the sensitivity predicted by Eq. (6). At both sites,  $T_c - T_a$  converged to 0 °C as  $f_E$  approached 1 (Fig. 4), which is consistent with the model predictions shown in Fig. 1. When  $f_E < 1$ , the range and distribution of measured  $T_c - T_a$  values was also similar to the modeled values. The  $T_c - T_a$  values ranged from  $-1.24$  °C (1<sup>st</sup> percentile) to  $7.61$  °C (99th percentile) in the riparian woodland and  $-0.25$  °C (1<sup>st</sup> percentile) to  $16.44$  °C (99th percentile) in the upland savanna. The maximum values at both sites occurred when  $f_E$  approached 0, consistent with the model predictions. The  $f_E$  values for the upland savanna (mean  $f_E = 0.15$ ) were on average lower than the  $f_E$  values for the riparian woodland (mean  $f_E = 0.46$ ), which provides a mechanistic explanation for why  $T_c - T_a$  was generally greater at the upland savanna than the riparian woodland.

The flux tower measurements exhibited a non-linear relationship between  $f_E$  and  $T_c - T_a$ , especially at the riparian woodland. The model in Eq. (6) predicts a linear relationship between  $f_E$  and  $T_c - T_a$  when all other variables are held constant. The apparent non-linear relationship between  $f_E$  and  $T_c - T_a$  is likely due to covariance between  $f_E$ ,  $r_H$ , and  $Q_a$  on seasonal and diurnal time scales. The model validation accounted for the changing values of  $f_E$ ,  $r_H$ , and  $Q_a$ , and it demonstrated strong model performance at both sites (Fig. 2).

### 3.5.1. Drivers of leaf temperature

Seasonal climatologies of  $f_E$ ,  $r_H$ , and  $Q_a$  revealed seasonal changes in the environmental variables that drive  $T_c - T_a$ . The  $f_E$  exhibited the most pronounced seasonal trends and generally tracked the onset of the monsoon. In the riparian woodland, median  $f_E$  increased from 0.2 in May to 0.57 in August. In the upland savanna, median  $f_E$  remained low in May and June (0.08 and 0.07, respectively) and increased to 0.32 in August. At both sites,  $r_H$  exhibited a much less pronounced seasonal trend. Monthly median  $r_H$  values ranged from 12.1 to 14.6  $\text{sm}^{-1}$  in the riparian woodland and 20.4 to 24.6  $\text{sm}^{-1}$  in the upland savanna. Likewise, median monthly  $Q_a$  (measured at 12:00 local time) exhibited little seasonal trend and ranged from 604 to 652  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in the riparian woodland and 501 to 528  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in the upland savanna. The greater values of  $Q_a$  in the riparian woodland are likely due to the greater canopy cover with lower albedo as well as smaller  $G$  flux. The median albedos were 9.3% and 15.2% in the riparian woodland and upland savanna, respectively. The median  $G$  fluxes were 59  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  and 119  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ , respectively.

**Table 1**

Spearman rank correlations between observed  $Q_a$ ,  $r_H$ , and  $f_E$  and environmental variables measured by the flux towers, including shortwave insolation (SW↓), vapor pressure deficit (VPD), wind speed ( $u$ ), and soil water content (SWC) for the riparian woodland and upland savanna.

	Riparian woodland				Upland savanna			
	SW↓	VPD	$u$	SWC	SW↓	VPD	$u$	SWC
$f_E$	-0.39	-0.15	-0.36	0.02	-0.36	-0.34	-0.40	0.76
$r_H$	-0.15	-0.21	-0.73	0.12	-0.08	-0.02	-0.66	0.04
$Q_a$	0.86	0.27	0.15	-0.02	0.91	0.20	0.27	0.07

The  $r_H$  term can also be calculated directly from temperature measurements by inverting Eq. (5) (Verhoef et al., 1997). The inversion method yielded a different seasonal trend, indicating that  $r_H$  decreased throughout the growing season. However, the values of  $r_H$  were generally similar using both methods (Supplementary Figure 7).

Spearman rank correlation was used to quantify the sensitivity of observed  $T_c$  to the individual variables that drive  $T_c$ , including  $T_a$ ,  $Q_a$ ,  $r_H$ , and  $f_E$ . As expected,  $T_a$  was highly correlated with  $T_c$  in all months at both sites ( $r_s \geq 0.75$ ; Supplementary Figure 8). We controlled for  $T_a$  by repeating the analysis with  $T_c - T_a$  values. There were coherent seasonal trends in the correlations between  $T_c - T_a$  and  $Q_a$ ,  $r_H$ , and  $f_E$  at both sites (Fig. 7). In the riparian woodland,  $T_c - T_a$  was highly correlated with  $f_E$  early in the growing season ( $r_s = -0.79$  in May), but the sensitivity to  $f_E$  decreased as monsoonal moisture accumulated in the ecosystem ( $r_s = -0.14$  in September). The sensitivity to  $Q_a$  peaked in the middle of the summer ( $r_s = 0.71$  in July) and was lower at the beginning and end of the growing season. The sensitivity to modeled  $r_H$  was negligible in all months ( $r_s \leq 0.1$ ). In the upland savanna,  $T_c - T_a$  was more sensitive to  $Q_a$  in May and June ( $r_s = 0.56$  and  $0.58$ , respectively) and more sensitive to  $f_E$  after the onset of the monsoon in July. The sensitivity to  $f_E$  peaked in July ( $r_s = -0.68$ ) and decreased at the end of the growing season. The sensitivity to modeled  $r_H$  was weak in all months ( $-0.15 \leq r_s \leq 0.09$ ).

Spearman rank correlation was also used to quantify the sensitivity of observed  $Q_a$ ,  $r_H$ , and  $f_E$  to environmental variables measured by the flux towers, including SW↓, VPD,  $u$ , and SWC. The  $f_E$  term was negatively correlated with SW↓ and VPD at both sites (Table 1). The  $f_E$  term was also negatively correlated with  $u$ , potentially because  $u$  often peaks late in the afternoon when VPD is highest. The  $f_E$  term was negligibly correlated with SWC in the riparian woodland ( $r_s = 0.02$ ) but strongly correlated with SWC in the upland savanna ( $r_s = 0.76$ ), likely






Fig. 7. Spearman rank correlations between  $T_c - T_a$  and evaporative fraction ( $f_E$ ), resistance to sensible heat flux ( $r_H$ ), and available energy ( $Q_a$ ) at the riparian woodland (a–e) and upland savanna (f–j). The colored bars represent the correlations for each month of the growing season.




Fig. 8. Diurnal and seasonal climatology of modeled  $T_{c,ne} - T_c$ , which indicates the change in  $T_c$  due to evaporative cooling of the leaf surface. The colored lines represent the mean values for each time of day, grouped by month of the growing season, for the riparian woodland (a) and upland savanna (b).

due to contrasting groundwater availability at the two sites (Mayes et al., 2020; Sabathier et al., 2021). The  $u$  term was the dominant driver of  $r_H$  at both sites ( $r_s = -0.73$  and  $-0.66$ , respectively), which was expected given that  $u$  is encoded in the  $r_H$  calculations.  $SW\downarrow$  was the dominant driver of  $Q_a$  ( $r_s = 0.86$  and  $0.91$ , respectively). The analysis of the environmental variables also explains the negative correlations between  $T_c - T_a$  and  $r_H$  at both sites (Fig. 7), which were contrary to expectations. The negative correlations likely emerge from the fact that  $u$  has negative correlations with both  $f_E$  and  $r_H$  (Table 1), yet  $f_E$  and  $r_H$  have opposing effects on  $T_c - T_a$ . Thus, the effect of  $u$  on  $f_E$  and  $T_c - T_a$  is likely large enough to confound the relationship between  $r_H$  and  $T_c - T_a$ .

### 3.6. Evaporative cooling

The modeled values of  $T_c$  and  $T_{c,ne}$  revealed the change in  $T_c$  that can be attributed to evaporative cooling of the canopy. The  $T_{c,ne} - T_c$  values were generally greater in the riparian woodland than the upland savanna (Fig. 8). At both sites, seasonal variability in  $T_{c,ne} - T_c$  tracked the seasonal trends of  $f_E$ . The smallest values of  $T_{c,ne} - T_c$  occurred in May at the riparian woodland and in May and June at the upland savanna. The largest values of  $T_{c,ne} - T_c$  (i.e., the most evaporative cooling) occurred in August at both sites. In the riparian woodland, the maximum daily climatological  $T_{c,ne} - T_c$  was  $1.45^\circ\text{C}$  in May and  $4.81^\circ\text{C}$  in August. In the upland savanna, the maximum daily climatological  $T_{c,ne} - T_c$  was  $1.14^\circ\text{C}$  in May and  $3.35^\circ\text{C}$  in August. The dip in  $T_{c,ne} - T_c$  values in the middle of the morning is likely a measurement or modeling artifact, potentially caused by shading of the flux tower sensors.

### 3.7. Impact of evaporative cooling on leaf respiration

Leaf light respiration ( $R_{L,light}$ ) was predicted using modeled values of  $T_c$  and  $T_{c,ne}$ . The difference between the two predictions ( $\Delta R_L$ ) indicates the change in  $R_{L,light}$  that is attributable to evaporative cooling of the canopy. In the riparian woodland,  $\Delta R_L$  exhibited consistent seasonal patterns each year, with the lowest values occurring during the pre-monsoon period in May and the largest values occurring in August (Fig. 9). In May, evaporative cooling decreased  $R_{L,light}$  by 5%–11%. In August, evaporative cooling decreased  $R_{L,light}$  by 21%–24%. In the upland savanna,  $\Delta R_L$  varied much more sporadically, likely due to the dependence of the ecosystem on water inputs from precipitation. The smallest values of  $\Delta R_L$  typically occurred in May and June of each year, and the largest values typically occurred in August. In May, evaporative cooling decreased  $R_{L,light}$  by 4%–11%. In August, evaporative cooling decreased  $R_{L,light}$  by 7%–28%. The largest value of  $\Delta R_L$  occurred in July 2008, when evaporative cooling decreased  $R_{L,light}$  by 31%. It is important to note the difference in sample size at the two study sites (3 years for the riparian woodland vs. 11 years for the upland savanna) due to the limited measurements of  $SW\downarrow$ ,  $SW\uparrow$ , and  $LW\downarrow$  in the riparian woodland, which may account for some of the contrasting variability.

## 4. Discussion

We have presented a novel model to predict leaf temperature ( $T_L$ ) as a linearized function of the evaporative fraction ( $f_E$ ). The model predictions and empirical observations presented here demonstrate




Fig. 9. Monthly mean decrease in daytime leaf respiration ( $\Delta R_L$ ) that is attributable to evaporative cooling for the riparian woodland (a) and upland savanna (b). The black vertical bars indicate the range of monthly mean  $\Delta R_L$  values for individual years. There are 3 years of data for the riparian woodland and 11 years of data for the upland savanna.

that evapotranspiration reduces  $T_L$  by consuming energy that would otherwise be partitioned into sensible heat flux. The model predicts that  $T_L - T_a$  varies as a linear function of  $f_E$  when all other variables are held constant. The model also predicts that  $T_L = T_a$  when  $f_E = 1$ . When  $f_E < 1$ ,  $T_L$  theoretically varies as a function of  $Q_a$  and  $r_H$ . The theoretical predictions from the energy balance model were tested using canopy-scale measurements of leaf temperature ( $T_c$ ) from two flux towers with contrasting water availability. At both sites,  $T_c$  converged to  $T_a$  when  $f_E$  approached 1. The mechanistic model presented in Eq. (7) exhibited strong model fit at both sites. Our findings are also consistent with a multi-site synthesis reported by Panwar et al. (2020), who demonstrated that the difference between surface temperature and air temperature was negatively correlated with  $f_E$  across a variety of ecosystems.

#### 4.1. Environmental controls on $T_c$

The flux tower observations suggest that water availability plays an important role in regulating  $f_E$  and its impact on  $T_c$ . The riparian woodland has consistent access to shallow groundwater (depth to groundwater  $\approx 10$  m), which provides a persistent source of water that is decoupled from the local precipitation regime on short time scales. The upland savanna does not have access to groundwater (depth to groundwater  $> 100$  m) and is thus reliant on water inputs from monsoonal precipitation during the growing season. As a result,  $f_E$  was decoupled from near-surface SWC in the riparian woodland ( $r_s = 0.02$ ) but strongly coupled to SWC in the upland savanna ( $r_s = 0.76$ ). The enhanced water availability in the riparian woodland resulted in an earlier increase in  $f_E$  in the late spring and higher values of  $f_E$  throughout the growing season compared to the upland savanna (Fig. 6).

The differences in  $f_E$  at the two sites resulted in different magnitudes of evaporative cooling throughout the growing season. In the riparian woodland,  $T_c - T_a < 2$  °C for much of the growing season, while in the upland savanna  $T_c$  consistently exceeded  $T_a$  by as much as 10 °C (Fig. 5). The seasonal patterns of  $T_c - T_a$  matched the seasonal patterns in  $f_E$  at both sites. That being said, the strength of the correlation between  $T_c - T_a$  and  $f_E$  in the riparian woodland decreased throughout the growing season, suggesting that  $Q_a$ , and not water availability, was the primary driver of riparian  $T_c$  by the end of the growing season (Fig. 7). In the upland savanna,  $T_c - T_a$  was most strongly correlated with  $f_E$  in the middle of the growing season during peak monsoonal precipitation and less strongly correlated with  $f_E$  during the drier periods at the beginning and end of the growing season.

At low values of  $f_E$ ,  $T_c - T_a$  is largely regulated by non-evaporative cooling processes (Muller et al., 2021, 2023). The efficiency of non-evaporative cooling is determined by the resistance to sensible heat flux ( $r_H$ ). At a leaf scale,  $r_H$  is a function of leaf size, leaf structure, and

the wind speed across the leaf surface (Balding and Cunningham, 1976; Jones, 2014; Leigh et al., 2017). At a canopy scale,  $r_H$  is also a function of vegetation cover and vegetation structure, which drive turbulent mixing (Yang and Friedl, 2003; Rigden et al., 2018). The upland savanna experienced a larger range of  $T_c - T_a$  values at low values of  $f_E$  because there was a larger range of  $r_H$  values under those conditions. In the riparian woodland,  $f_E$  and  $r_H$  covaried more strongly, resulting in a smaller range of  $T_c - T_a$  values at low values of  $f_E$ . Interestingly, the upland savanna experienced higher wind speeds and likely had smaller leaves (Stromberg et al., 1993), which are typically associated with more efficient heat transfer, but the riparian woodland had lower modeled values of  $r_H$ . This suggests that turbulent mixing at a canopy scale played an important role in regulating  $r_H$ , which is consistent with previous analyses of  $r_H$  across different vegetation types (Rigden et al., 2018; Young et al., 2021).

#### 4.2. Limited homeothermy

The mechanistic relationship between  $T_L$  and  $T_a$  has received considerable attention in literature (Cavaleri, 2020, and references therein), with various studies arguing that plants exhibit either limited homeothermy ( $T_L < T_a$  at high values of  $T_a$ ), poikilothermy ( $T_L \cong T_a$ ), or megathermy ( $T_L > T_a$  at high values of  $T_a$ ). We found that the riparian woodland generally exhibited poikilothermy. The slope of the relationship between  $T_c$  and  $T_a$  was close to 1 ( $\beta = 0.92$ ) and there were few observations where  $T_c < T_a$ , even at high values of  $T_a$ . The upland savanna exhibited megathermy; the slope of the relationship between  $T_c$  and  $T_a$  was greater than 1 ( $\beta = 1.17$ ) and  $T_c$  consistently exceeded  $T_a$ . Neither site in this study exhibited a clear signal of limited homeothermy. Moreover, the mechanistic model of  $T_L$  always predicts that  $T_L \geq T_a$  when  $Q_a \geq 0$  W m<sup>-2</sup> and  $f_E \leq 1$ . Even if stomatal conductance is not limiting, there is by definition not enough  $Q_a$  in the system to increase  $\lambda E$  to levels that result in  $T_L < T_a$  under normal conditions. It follows from Eq. (6) that  $T_L < T_a$  can only occur if  $f_E > 1$ . Previous studies have demonstrated that  $f_E > 1$  only occurs briefly around sunrise and sunset when  $H$  is negative and  $\lambda E$  is positive, a time of day when the magnitudes of energy fluxes are small. The value of  $f_E$  is somewhat constant during daylight hours and typically substantially less than 1 (Crago, 1996; Gentine et al., 2007, 2011). Conditions where  $f_E > 1$  can also occur as a result of the ‘‘oasis effect’’ whereby the advection of dry air over well-watered vegetation creates a land-atmosphere feedback that causes  $\lambda E$  to exceed  $Q_a$  (Baldocchi et al., 2016). The oasis effect is most commonly associated with rice paddies and wetlands in semi-arid climates, but it is not clear how often the effect actually occurs (Baldocchi et al., 2016).

Despite the lack of theoretical or empirical support for limited homeothermy in the data examined here, observations where  $T_L < T_a$  are commonly reported in literature. Some researchers have suggested

that observations of limited homeothermy are due to systematic errors from certain types of *in situ* sensors (Still et al., 2019b). However, observations where  $T_L < T_a$  have also been reported in studies that measure  $T_L$  using infrared radiometers (e.g., Idso et al., 1981; Jackson et al., 1981; Kar and Kumar, 2007; Ballester et al., 2013; Blonder et al., 2020). Thus, there is an apparent paradox whereby observations of  $T_L < T_a$  seem highly unlikely given fundamental energy balance constraints (Eq. (6)), but are nonetheless common. Blonder and Michaletz (2018) demonstrated from energy balance theory that limited homeothermy can only occur when stomatal conductance is high and  $r_H$  is low. Other research has examined non-steady state  $T_L$  dynamics, which are not explored here (e.g., Leigh et al., 2017). The relationship between  $f_E$  and  $T_L$  established by this study represents another novel constraint on leaf thermoregulation via limited homeothermy. Further theoretical and empirical research is needed to constrain the conditions that result in observations where  $T_L < T_a$ , especially given the substantial disagreement over how frequently leaf thermoregulation actually occurs in nature (e.g., Blonder et al., 2020; Still et al., 2022).

#### 4.3. Plant carbon balance

Constraining the mechanistic relationship between  $T_L$  and  $T_a$  is of critical importance for modeling ecosystem responses to anthropogenic climate change. Leaf energy balance and  $T_L$  serve as fundamental constraints on the selection and adaptation of plant traits (Michaletz et al., 2015, 2016), which are generally assumed to maximize net carbon uptake while controlling for the risk of plant hydraulic failure (Wolf et al., 2016; Sperry et al., 2017; Mencuccini et al., 2019). Previous trait-based research has focused on the role of stomatal conductance in maximizing photosynthetic assimilation via biochemical fixation of carbon (Cowan and Farquhar, 1977; Medlyn et al., 2011). Here we demonstrate that stomatal conductance also alters net carbon uptake via the impact of evaporative cooling on  $R_L$ . In both the riparian woodland and upland savanna, evaporative cooling of the leaf surface often reduced  $R_L$  by ca. 15% in the middle of the growing season. Reduced  $T_L$  from evaporative cooling would also be expected to keep  $T_L$  closer to the photosynthetic optimum in hot environments, maximizing photosynthetic assimilation (Roden and Pearcy, 1993; Medlyn et al., 2002). For example, Uni et al. (2022) demonstrated that a reduction in  $T_L$  from 40 °C to 35 °C would increase photosynthetic assimilation by 42%. Their study analyzed *Acacia tortilis*, a species that is structurally and functionally similar to *P. velutina*. The regulation of  $T_L$  by stomatal conductance represents an important linkage between plant water and carbon cycles that has received little attention in literature (but see Michaletz et al., 2015, 2016) and may alter predictions of optimal plant traits and behavior. All other factors held constant, the data examined here suggest that high levels of  $\lambda E$  will enhance net carbon uptake by reducing  $R_L$ , which may marginally favor high risk-high reward hydraulic strategies in dryland vegetation (e.g., Hultine et al., 2020; Williams et al., 2022).

#### 4.4. Thermal remote sensing

Eq. (7) also provides a physical basis to interpret thermal remote sensing measurements (Mallick et al., 2022). Tower-mounted infrared radiometers are a reliable proxy for airborne and satellite thermal sensors, which can measure surface temperature over broad spatial scales. Thermal remote sensing is widely used to monitor agricultural productivity (Jones et al., 2009; Maes and Steppe, 2012) and manage water resources (Anderson et al., 2012). Our study joins other recent efforts to unify plant traits and thermal measurements, which will likely yield novel insights into ecosystem processes at leaf to global scales (Still et al., 2019a, 2021; Farella et al., 2022).

## 5. Conclusion

The mechanistic relationships between water, energy, and carbon fluxes at the leaf surface are of considerable importance for predicting the responses of terrestrial ecosystems to anthropogenic climate change. The model presented here constrains the mechanistic relationship between  $T_L$  and  $T_a$  and provides a framework to quantify evaporative cooling of the leaf surface. Importantly, the model reveals that  $T_L - T_a$  varies as a linear function of  $f_E$  and that  $T_L - T_a = 0$  °C when  $f_E = 1$ . The model predictions were validated using measurements of canopy-scale leaf temperature ( $T_c$ ) from two flux towers. Seasonal variability in measured  $T_c$  was primarily driven by  $f_E$ , although  $Q_a$  also played an important role in regulating  $T_c$  in well-watered conditions. Neither the model predictions nor the empirical observations provided evidence for regimes where  $T_L$  is substantially less than  $T_a$ . Future work is needed to understand the conditions that result in empirical observations of  $T_L < T_a$  in croplands. Our analysis also reveals that evaporative cooling of the leaf surface has important functional implications for plant carbon cycling. Evaporative cooling substantially reduced  $R_L$  at both study sites. The impact of evaporative cooling on  $R_L$  may affect predictions of optimal plant traits and behavior under future climate scenarios.

### Declaration of competing interest

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 paper.

### Data availability

Code and data to replicate the analyses are available online.

[Manuscript code and data \(Original data\)](#) (Github)

### Acknowledgments

The authors thank Jean Allen and Bryn Morgan for their assistance with this study. The research was supported by grants from NASA, United States (80NSSC21K1639), the U.S. National Science Foundation (BCS-1660490, EAR-1700555, EAR-1700517, DEB-2003205, and IOS-2216855), and the U.S. Department of Defense's Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (RC18-1006). Funding for the AmeriFlux data portal was provided by the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science.

### Appendix A. Symbols

Symbol	Description	Unit
$C$	energy balance closure ratio	—
$c_p$	specific heat capacity of air	J K <sup>-1</sup> kg <sup>-1</sup>
$\lambda E$	latent heat flux	W m <sup>-2</sup>
$f_E$	evaporative fraction	—
$G$	ground heat flux	W m <sup>-2</sup>
$H$	sensible heat flux	W m <sup>-2</sup>
$k$	one or two-sided leaf model	—
$kB^{-1}$	empirical parameter	—
LW↓	longwave downwelling radiation	W m <sup>-2</sup>
LW↑	longwave upwelling radiation	W m <sup>-2</sup>
$Q_a$	available energy	W m <sup>-2</sup>
$Q_{a,f}$	available energy (forced closure)	W m <sup>-2</sup>
RH	relative humidity	%
$R_L$	leaf respiration	μ mol CO <sub>2</sub> m <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>
$R_n$	net radiation	W m <sup>-2</sup>

Symbol	Description	Unit
$r_{am}$	resistance to momentum transfer	$\text{m s}^{-1}$
$r_{bh}$	excess resistance	$\text{m s}^{-1}$
$r_H$	resistance to sensible heat flux	$\text{s m}^{-1}$
$r_s$	Spearman rank correlation coefficient	—
SW↓	shortwave downwelling radiation	$\text{W m}^{-2}$
SW↑	shortwave upwelling radiation	$\text{W m}^{-2}$
SWC	soil water content	%
$T_a$	air temperature	$^{\circ}\text{C}$
$T_c$	canopy-scale leaf temperature ( $T_c \cong T_L$ )	$^{\circ}\text{C}$
$T_{c,ne}$	canopy-scale leaf temperature when $\lambda E = 0$	$^{\circ}\text{C}$
$T_L$	leaf temperature	$^{\circ}\text{C/K}$
$T_{ref}$	reference leaf temperature	K
$T_s$	soil temperature	$^{\circ}\text{C}$
$u$	wind speed	$\text{m s}^{-1}$
$u_*$	friction velocity	$\text{m s}^{-1}$
VPD	vapor pressure deficit	kPa
$z_{0h}$	roughness length for heat	m
$z_{0m}$	roughness length for momentum	m
$\epsilon_L$	leaf emissivity	—
$\kappa$	Von Kármán constant	—
$\rho$	density of air	$\text{kg m}^{-3}$
$\sigma$	Stefan–Boltzmann constant	$\text{W m}^{-2}\text{ K}^{-4}$
$\psi_h$	stability function for heat	—
$\psi_m$	stability function for momentum	—

## Appendix B. Supplementary data

Supplementary material related to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2023.109560>.

## References

- Allen, R.G., Pereira, L.S., Raes, D., Smith, M., 1998. Crop Evapotranspiration: Guidelines for Computing Crop Water Requirements. Drainage Paper 56, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.
- Amthor, J.S., 1994. Scaling CO<sub>2</sub>-photosynthesis relationships from the leaf to the canopy. *Photosynth. Res.* 39 (3), 321–350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00014590>, URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF00014590>.
- Anderson, M.C., Allen, R.G., Morse, A., Kustas, W.P., 2012. Use of Landsat thermal imagery in monitoring evapotranspiration and managing water resources. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 122, 50–65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2011.08.025>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0034425712000326>.
- Atkin, O.K., Bloomfield, K.J., Reich, P.B., Tjoelker, M.G., Asner, G.P., Bonal, D., Bönisch, G., Bradford, M.G., Cernusak, L.A., Cosio, E.G., Creek, D., Crous, K.Y., Domingues, T.F., Dukes, J.S., Egerton, J.J.G., Evans, J.R., Farquhar, G.D., Fyllas, N.M., Gauthier, P.P.G., Gloor, E., Gimeno, T.E., Griffin, K.L., Guerrieri, R., Heskell, M.A., Huntingford, C., Ishida, F.Y., Kattge, J., Lambers, H., Liddell, M.J., Lloyd, J., Lusk, C.H., Martin, R.E., Maksimov, A.P., Maximov, T.C., Malhi, Y., Medlyn, B.E., Meir, P., Mercado, L.M., Mirotchnick, N., Ng, D., Niinemets, Ü., O'Sullivan, O.S., Phillips, O.L., Poorter, L., Poot, P., Prentice, I.C., Salinas, N., Rowland, L.M., Ryan, M.G., Sitch, S., Slot, M., Smith, N.G., Turnbull, M.H., VanderWel, M.C., Valladares, F., Veneklaas, E.J., Weerasinghe, L.K., Wirth, C., Wright, I.J., Wythers, K.R., Xiang, J., Xiang, S., Zaragoza-Castells, J., 2015. Global variability in leaf respiration in relation to climate, plant functional types and leaf traits. *New Phytol.* 206 (2), 614–636. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nph.13253>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nph.13253>.
- Aubrecht, D.M., Helliher, B.R., Goulden, M.L., Roberts, D.A., Still, C.J., Richardson, A.D., 2016. Continuous, long-term, high-frequency thermal imaging of vegetation: Uncertainties and recommended best practices. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 228–229, 315–326. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.07.017>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192316303434>.
- Balding, F.R., Cunningham, G.L., 1976. A comparison of heat transfer characteristics of simple and pinnate leaf models. *Botanical Gazette* 137 (1), 65–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/336843>, URL: <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/336843>.
- Baldocchi, D., Knox, S., Dronova, I., Verfaillie, J., Oikawa, P., Sturtevant, C., Matthes, J.H., Detto, M., 2016. The impact of expanding flooded land area on the annual evaporation of rice. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 223, 181–193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.04.001>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192316302155>.
- Ballester, C., Jiménez-Bello, M., Castel, J., Intrigliolo, D., 2013. Usefulness of thermography for plant water stress detection in citrus and persimmon trees. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 168, 120–129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2012.08.005>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192312002572>.
- Blonder, B., Escobar, S., Kapás, R.E., Michaletz, S.T., 2020. Low predictability of energy balance traits and leaf temperature metrics in desert, montane and alpine plant communities. In: Perez Carmona, C. (Ed.), *Funct. Ecol.* 34 (9), 1882–1897. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13643>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1365-2435.13643>.
- Blonder, B., Michaletz, S.T., 2018. A model for leaf temperature decoupling from air temperature. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 262, 354–360. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2018.07.012>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192318302338>.
- Bonan, G.B., 2016. *Ecological Climatology: Concepts and Applications*, third ed. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA.
- Cavaleri, M.A., 2020. Cold-blooded forests in a warming world. *New Phytol.* 228 (5), 1455–1457. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nph.16916>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nph.16916>.
- Cook, A.M., Berry, N., Milner, K.V., Leigh, A., 2021. Water availability influences thermal safety margins for leaves. *Funct. Ecol.* 35 (10), 2179–2189. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13868>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1365-2435.13868>.
- Cowan, I.R., Farquhar, G.D., 1977. Stomatal function in relation to leaf metabolism and environment: Stomatal function in the regulation of gas exchange. p. 19.
- Crago, R.D., 1996. Conservation and variability of the evaporative fraction during the daytime. *J. Hydrol.* 180 (1–4), 173–194. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694\(95\)02903-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(95)02903-6), URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0022169495029036>.
- De Kauwe, M.G., Medlyn, B.E., Pitman, A.J., Drake, J.E., Ukkola, A., Griebel, A., Pendall, E., Prober, S., Roderick, M., 2019. Examining the evidence for decoupling between photosynthesis and transpiration during heat extremes. *Biogeosciences* 16 (4), 903–916. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5194/bg-16-903-2019>, URL: <https://bg.copernicus.org/articles/16/903/2019/>.
- Drake, J.E., Harwood, R., Va, A., Reich, P.B., Barton, C.V.M., Tjoelker, M.G., 2020. No evidence of homeostatic regulation of leaf temperature in Eucalyptus parramattensis trees: Integration of CO<sub>2</sub> flux and oxygen isotope methodologies. *New Phytol.* 1511–1523. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nph.16733>.
- Drake, J.E., Tjoelker, M.G., Vårhammar, A., Medlyn, B.E., Reich, P.B., Leigh, A., Pfautsch, S., Blackman, C.J., López, R., Aspinwall, M.J., Crous, K.Y., Duursma, R.A., Kumarathunge, D., De Kauwe, M.G., Jiang, M., Nicotra, A.B., Tissue, D.T., Choat, B., Atkin, O.K., Barton, C.V.M., 2018. Trees tolerate an extreme heatwave via sustained transpirational cooling and increased leaf thermal tolerance. *Global Change Biol.* 24 (6), 2390–2402. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14037>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/gcb.14037>.
- Farella, M.M., Fisher, J.B., Jiao, W., Key, K.B., Barnes, M.L., 2022. Thermal remote sensing for plant ecology from leaf to globe. *J. Ecology* 1365–2745.13957. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13957>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1365-2745.13957>.
- Gentine, P., Entekhabi, D., Chehbouni, A., Boulet, G., Duchemin, B., 2007. Analysis of evaporative fraction diurnal behaviour. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 143 (1–2), 13–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2006.11.002>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S016819230600339X>.
- Gentine, P., Entekhabi, D., Polcher, J., 2011. The diurnal behavior of evaporative fraction in the soil–vegetation–atmospheric boundary layer continuum. *J. Hydrometeorol.* 12 (6), 1530–1546. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/2011JHM1261.1>, URL: <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/2011JHM1261.1>.
- Grossiord, C., Buckley, T.N., Cernusak, L.A., Novick, K.A., Poulter, B., Siegwolf, R.T.W., Sperry, J.S., McDowell, N.G., 2020. Plant responses to rising vapor pressure deficit. *New Phytol.* 226 (6), 1550–1566. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nph.16485>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nph.16485>.
- Harris, C.R., Millman, K.J., van der Walt, S.J., Gommers, R., Virtanen, P., Cournapeau, D., Wieser, E., Taylor, J., Berg, S., Smith, N.J., Kern, R., Picus, M., Hoyer, S., van Kerkwijk, M.H., Brett, M., Haldane, A., del Río, J.F., Wiebe, M., Peterson, P., Gérard-Marchant, P., Sheppard, K., Reddy, T., Weckesser, W., Abbasi, H., Gohlke, C., Oliphant, T.E., 2020. Array programming with NumPy. *Nature* 585 (7825), 357–362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2>, URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2649-2>.
- Heskell, M.A., Atkin, O.K., Turnbull, M.H., Griffin, K.L., 2013. Bringing the Kok effect to light: A review on the integration of daytime respiration and net ecosystem exchange. *Ecosphere* 4 (8), art98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/ES13-00120.1>, URL: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/ES13-00120.1>.
- Heskell, M.A., O'Sullivan, O.S., Reich, P.B., Tjoelker, M.G., Weerasinghe, L.K., Penillard, A., Egerton, J.J.G., Creek, D., Bloomfield, K.J., Xiang, J., Sinca, F., Stangl, Z.R., Martinez-de la Torre, A., Griffin, K.L., Huntingford, C., Hurry, V., Meir, P., Turnbull, M.H., Atkin, O.K., 2016. Convergence in the temperature response of leaf respiration across biomes and plant functional types. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 113 (14), 3832–3837. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1520282113>, URL: <https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1520282113>.
- Higgins, R.W., Yao, Y., Wang, X.L., 1997. Influence of the north American monsoon system on the U.S. summer precipitation regime. *J. Clim.* 10 (10), 2600–2622. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(1997\)010<2600:IOTNAM>2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1997)010<2600:IOTNAM>2.0.CO;2).



- Hong, J., Kim, J., Byun, Y.H., 2012. Uncertainty in carbon exchange modelling in a forest canopy due to kb-1 parametrizations on carbon exchange modelling. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* 138 (664), 699–706. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/qj.944>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/qj.944>.
- Hultine, K.R., Froend, R., Blasini, D., Bush, S.E., Karlinski, M., Koepke, D.F., 2020. Hydraulic traits that buffer deep-rooted plants from changes in hydrology and climate. *Hydrol. Process.* 34 (2), 209–222. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hyp.13587>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hyp.13587>.
- Huntington, J.L., Hegewisch, K.C., Daudert, B., Morton, C.G., Abatzoglou, J.T., McEvoy, D.J., Erickson, T., 2017. Climate engine: Cloud computing and visualization of climate and remote sensing data for advanced natural resource monitoring and process understanding. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* 98 (11), 2397–2410. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00324.1>, URL: <https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00324.1>.
- Idso, S., Jackson, R., Pinter, P., Reginato, R., Hatfield, J., 1981. Normalizing the stress-degree-day parameter for environmental variability. *Agric. Meteorol.* 24, 45–55. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0002-1571\(81\)90032-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0002-1571(81)90032-7), URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0002157181900327>.
- Jackson, R.D., Idso, S.B., Reginato, R.A., Pinter, P.J., 1981. Canopy temperature as a crop water stress indicator. *Water Resour. Res.* 17 (4), 1133–1138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/WR017i004p01133>, URL: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/WR017i004p01133>.
- Jones, H.G., 2014. *Plants and Microclimate: A Quantitative Approach to Environmental Plant Physiology*, third ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge ; New York.
- Jones, H.G., Serraj, R., Loveys, B.R., Xiong, L., Wheaton, A., Price, A.H., 2009. Thermal infrared imaging of crop canopies for the remote diagnosis and quantification of plant responses to water stress in the field. *Funct. Plant Biol.* 36 (11), 978. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/FP09123>, URL: <http://www.publish.csiro.au/?paper=FP09123>.
- Kar, G., Kumar, A., 2007. Surface energy fluxes and crop water stress index in groundnut under irrigated ecosystem. *Agric. Forest Meteorol.* 146 (1–2), 94–106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2007.05.008>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S016819230700144X>.
- Kibler, C.L., Schmidt, E.C., Roberts, D.A., Stella, J.C., Kui, L., Lambert, A.M., Singer, M.B., 2021. A brown wave of riparian woodland mortality following groundwater declines during the 2012–2019 California drought. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 16 (8), 084030. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac1377>, URL: <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ac1377>.
- Knauer, J., Zaehle, S., Medlyn, B.E., Reichstein, M., Williams, C.A., Migliavacca, M., De Kauwe, M.G., Werner, C., Keitel, C., Kolari, P., Limousin, J.-M., Linderson, M.-L., 2018. Towards physiologically meaningful water-use efficiency estimates from eddy covariance data. *Global Change Biol.* 24 (2), 694–710. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13893>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/gcb.13893>.
- Kok, B., 1948. A critical consideration of the quantum yield of *Chlorella*-Photosynthesis. *Enzymologia* 13, 1–56.
- Krich, C., Mahecha, M.D., Migliavacca, M., De Kauwe, M.G., Griebel, A., Runge, J., Miralles, D.G., 2022. Decoupling between ecosystem photosynthesis and transpiration: A last resort against overheating. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 17 (4), 044013. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac583e>, URL: <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ac583e>.
- Leigh, A., Sevanto, S., Close, J., Nicotra, A., 2017. The influence of leaf size and shape on leaf thermal dynamics: Does theory hold up under natural conditions? *Plant Cell Environ.* 40 (2), 237–248. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/pce.12857>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/pce.12857>.
- Maes, W.H., Steppe, K., 2012. Estimating evapotranspiration and drought stress with ground-based thermal remote sensing in agriculture: A review. *J. Exp. Bot.* 63 (13), 4671–4712. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jxb/ers165>, URL: <https://academic.oup.com/jxb/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/jxb/ers165>.
- Mallick, K., Baldocchi, D., Jarvis, A., Hu, T., Trebs, I., Sulis, M., Bhattarai, N., Bossung, C., Eid, Y., Cleverly, J., Beringer, J., Woodgate, W., Silberstein, R., Hinko-Najera, N., Meyer, W.S., Ghent, D., Szantoi, Z., Boulet, G., Kustas, W.P., 2022. Insights into the aerodynamic versus radiometric surface temperature debate in thermal-based evaporation modeling. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 49 (15), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2021GL097568>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2021GL097568>.
- Mathias, J.M., Trugman, A.T., 2022. Climate change impacts plant carbon balance, increasing mean future carbon use efficiency but decreasing total forest extent at dry range edges. In: Liu, L. (Ed.), *Ecol. Lett.* 25 (2), 498–508. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ele.13945>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ele.13945>.
- Mauder, M., Foken, T., Cuxart, J., 2020. Surface-energy-balance closure over land: A review. *Bound.-Lay. Meteorol.* 177 (2–3), 395–426. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10546-020-00529-6>, URL: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10546-020-00529-6>.
- Mayes, M., Caylor, K.K., Singer, M.B., Stella, J.C., Roberts, D., Nagler, P., 2020. Climate sensitivity of water use by riparian woodlands at landscape scales. *Hydrol. Process.* 34 (25), 4884–4903. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hyp.13942>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hyp.13942>.
- Medlyn, B.E., Dreyer, E., Ellsworth, D., Forstreuter, M., Harley, P.C., Kirschbaum, M.U.F., Le Roux, X., Montpied, P., Strassmeyer, J., Walcroft, A., Wang, K., Loustau, D., 2002. Temperature response of parameters of a biochemically based model of photosynthesis. II. A review of experimental data: Temperature response of photosynthetic parameters - Review. *Plant Cell Environ.* 25 (9), 1167–1179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3040.2002.00891.x>, URL: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1046/j.1365-3040.2002.00891.x>.
- Medlyn, B.E., Duursma, R.A., Eamus, D., Ellsworth, D.S., Prentice, I.C., Barton, C.V.M., Crous, K.Y., De Angelis, P., Freeman, M., Wingate, L., 2011. Reconciling the optimal and empirical approaches to modelling stomatal conductance. *Global Change Biol.* 17 (6), 2134–2144. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02375.x>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02375.x>.
- Mencuccini, M., Manzoni, S., Christoffersen, B., 2019. Modelling water fluxes in plants: From tissues to biosphere. *New Phytol.* 222 (3), 1207–1222. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nph.15681>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nph.15681>.
- Michaletz, S.T., Weiser, M.D., McDowell, N.G., Zhou, J., Kaspari, M., Helliker, B.R., Enquist, B.J., 2016. The energetic and carbon economic origins of leaf thermoregulation. *Nature Plants* 2 (9), 16129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nplants.2016.129>, URL: <http://www.nature.com/articles/nplants2016129>.
- Michaletz, S.T., Weiser, M.D., Zhou, J., Kaspari, M., Helliker, B.R., Enquist, B.J., 2015. Plant thermoregulation: Energetics, trait–environment interactions, and carbon economics. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 30 (12), 714–724. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.09.006>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0169534715002396>.
- Miller, B.D., Carter, K.R., Reed, S.C., Wood, T.E., Cavaleri, M.A., 2021. Only sun-lit leaves of the uppermost canopy exceed both air temperature and photosynthetic thermal optima in a wet tropical forest. *Agric. Forest Meteorol.* 301–302, 108347. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2021.108347>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192321000307>.
- Missik, J.E.C., Liu, H., Gao, Z., Huang, M., Chen, X., Arntzen, E., McFarland, D.P., Verbeke, B., 2021. Groundwater regulates interannual variations in evapotranspiration in a Riparian semiarid ecosystem. *J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos.* 126 (7), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2020JD033078>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2020JD033078>.
- Monteith, J.L., Unsworth, M.H., 2013. *Principles of Environmental Physics: Plants, Animals, and the Atmosphere*, fourth ed. Elsevier/Academic Press, Boston, OCLC, ocn858967864.
- Muller, J.D., Rotenberg, E., Tatarinov, F., Oz, I., Yakir, D., 2021. Evidence for efficient nonevaporative leaf-to-air heat dissipation in a pine forest under drought conditions. *New Phytol.* 232 (6), 2254–2266. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nph.17742>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nph.17742>.
- Muller, J.D., Rotenberg, E., Tatarinov, F., Oz, I., Yakir, D., 2023. Detailed in situ leaf energy budget permits the assessment of leaf aerodynamic resistance as a key to enhance non-evaporative cooling under drought. *Plant Cell Environ.* pce.14571. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/pce.14571>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/pce.14571>.
- Nelson, J.A., Carvalhais, N., Cuntz, M., Delpierre, N., Knauer, J., Ogée, J., Migliavacca, M., Reichstein, M., Jung, M., 2018. Coupling water and carbon fluxes to constrain estimates of transpiration: The TEA algorithm. *J. Geophys. Res.: Biogeosci.* 123 (12), 3617–3632. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2018JG004727>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018JG004727>.
- Nelson, J.A., Perez-Priego, O., Sha, Z., 2020a. Ecosystem Transpiration from FLUXNET. Zenodo, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.3978408>, URL: <https://zenodo.org/record/3978408>, Version Number: v1.0 Type: dataset.
- Nelson, J.A., Pérez-Priego, O., Zhou, S., Poyatos, R., Zhang, Y., Blanken, P.D., Gimeno, T.E., Wohlfahrt, G., Desai, A.R., Gioli, B., Limousin, J.-M., Bonal, D., Paul-Limoges, E., Scott, R.L., Varlagin, A., Fuchs, K., Montagnani, L., Wolf, S., Delpierre, N., Berveiller, D., Gharun, M., Beletti Marchesini, L., Gianelle, D., Šigut, L., Mammarella, I., Siebicke, L., Andrew Black, T., Knohl, A., Hörtnagl, L., Magliulo, V., Besnard, S., Weber, U., Carvalhais, N., Migliavacca, M., Reichstein, M., Jung, M., 2020b. Ecosystem transpiration and evaporation: Insights from three water flux partitioning methods across FLUXNET sites. *Global Change Biol.* 26 (12), 6916–6930. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15314>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/gcb.15314>.
- O'Sullivan, O.S., Heskel, M.A., Reich, P.B., Tjoelker, M.G., Weerasinghe, L.K., Penillard, A., Zhu, L., Egerton, J.J.G., Bloomfield, K.J., Creek, D., Bahar, N.H.A., Griffin, K.L., Hurry, V., Meir, P., Turnbull, M.H., Atkin, O.K., 2017. Thermal limits of leaf metabolism across biomes. *Global Change Biol.* 23 (1), 209–223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13477>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/gcb.13477>.
- Panwar, A., Renner, M., Kleidon, A., 2020. Imprints of evaporative conditions and vegetation type in diurnal temperature variations. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* 24 (10), 4923–4942. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-4923-2020>, URL: <https://hess.copernicus.org/articles/24/4923/2020/>.
- Pau, S., Detto, M., Kim, Y., Still, C.J., 2018. Tropical forest temperature thresholds for gross primary productivity. *Ecosphere* 9 (7), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2311>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ecs2.2311>.
- PRISM Climate Group, 2021. Monthly Climate Data. Oregon State University, URL: <https://prism.oregonstate.edu>.
- Reich, P.B., Walters, M.B., Ellsworth, D.S., Vose, J.M., Volin, J.C., Gresham, C., Bowman, W.D., 1998. Relationships of leaf dark respiration to leaf nitrogen, specific leaf area and leaf life-span: A test across biomes and functional groups. *Oecologia* 114 (4), 471–482. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s004420050471>, URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s004420050471>.

- Rigden, A., Li, D., Salvucci, G., 2018. Dependence of thermal roughness length on friction velocity across land cover types: A synthesis analysis using AmeriFlux data. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 249, 512–519. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2017.06.003>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192317302022>.
- Roden, J.S., Pearcy, R.W., 1993. The effect of flutter on the temperature of poplar leaves and its implications for carbon gain. *Plant Cell Environ.* 16 (5), 571–577. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.1993.tb00905.x>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-3040.1993.tb00905.x>.
- Sabathier, R., Singer, M.B., Stella, J.C., Roberts, D.A., Caylor, K.K., 2021. Vegetation responses to climatic and geologic controls on water availability in southeastern Arizona. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 16 (6), 064029. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abfe8c>, URL: <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/abfe8c>.
- Salisbury, F.B., Spomer, G.G., 1964. Leaf temperatures of alpine plants in the field. *Planta* 60 (5), 497–505. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01894807>, URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF01894807>.
- Scott, R.L., 2010. Using watershed water balance to evaluate the accuracy of eddy covariance evaporation measurements for three semiarid ecosystems. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 150 (2), 219–225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2009.11.002>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192309002512>.
- Scott, R.L., 2021a. AmeriFlux BASE US-CMW Charleston Mesquite woodland, ver. 1-5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17190/AMF/1660339>.
- Scott, R.L., 2021b. AmeriFlux BASE US-SRM Santa Rita Mesquite, Ver. 22-5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17190/AMF/1246104>.
- Scott, R.L., Edwards, E.A., Shuttleworth, W., Huxman, T.E., Watts, C., Goodrich, D.C., 2004. Interannual and seasonal variation in fluxes of water and carbon dioxide from a riparian woodland ecosystem. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 122 (1–2), 65–84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2003.09.001>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192303002211>.
- Scott, R.L., Jenerette, G.D., Potts, D.L., Huxman, T.E., 2009. Effects of seasonal drought on net carbon dioxide exchange from a woody-plant-encroached semiarid grassland. *J. Geophys. Res.* 114 (G4), G04004. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2008JG000900>, URL: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2008JG000900>.
- Scott, R.L., Knowles, J.F., Nelson, J.A., Gentine, P., Li, X., Barron-Gafford, G., Bryant, R., Biederman, J.A., 2021. Water availability impacts on evapotranspiration partitioning. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 297, 108251. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2020.108251>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192320303531>.
- Sellers, P., Berry, J., Collatz, G., Field, C., Hall, F., 1992. Canopy reflectance, photosynthesis, and transpiration. III. A reanalysis using improved leaf models and a new canopy integration scheme. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 42 (3), 187–216. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0034-4257\(92\)90102-P](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0034-4257(92)90102-P), URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S003442579290102P>.
- Seyednasrollah, B., Young, A.M., Hufkens, K., Milliman, T., Friedl, M.A., Frolking, S., Richardson, A.D., 2019. Tracking vegetation phenology across diverse biomes using Version 2.0 of the PhenoCam Dataset. *Sci. Data* 6 (1), 222. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41597-019-0229-9>, URL: <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41597-019-0229-9>.
- Singer, M.B., Michaelides, K., 2017. Deciphering the expression of climate change within the Lower Colorado River basin by stochastic simulation of convective rainfall. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 12 (10), 104011. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa8e50>, URL: <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/aa8e50>.
- Sperry, J.S., Venturas, M.D., Anderegg, W.R.L., Mencuccini, M., Mackay, D.S., Wang, Y., Love, D.M., 2017. Predicting stomatal responses to the environment from the optimization of photosynthetic gain and hydraulic cost: A stomatal optimization model. *Plant Cell Environ.* 40 (6), 816–830. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/pce.12852>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/pce.12852>.
- Still, C.J., Page, G., Rastogi, B., Griffith, D.M., Aubrecht, D.M., Kim, Y., Burns, S.P., Hanson, C.V., Kwon, H., Hawkins, L., Meinzer, F.C., Sevanto, S., Roberts, D., Goulden, M., Pau, S., Detto, M., Helliker, B., Richardson, A.D., 2022. No evidence of canopy-scale leaf thermoregulation to cool leaves below air temperature across a range of forest ecosystems. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 119 (38), e2205682119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2205682119>, URL: <https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.2205682119>.
- Still, C., Powell, R., Aubrecht, D., Kim, Y., Helliker, B., Roberts, D., Richardson, A.D., Goulden, M., 2019a. Thermal imaging in plant and ecosystem ecology: Applications and challenges. *Ecosphere* 10 (6), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2768>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ecs2.2768>.
- Still, C.J., Rastogi, B., Page, G.F.M., Griffith, D.M., Sibley, A., Schulze, M., Hawkins, L., Pau, S., Detto, M., Helliker, B.R., 2021. Imaging canopy temperature: Shedding (thermal) light on ecosystem processes. *New Phytol.* 230 (5), 1746–1753. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nph.17321>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nph.17321>.
- Still, C.J., Sibley, A., Page, G., Meinzer, F.C., Sevanto, S., 2019b. When a cuvette is not a canopy: A caution about measuring leaf temperature during gas exchange measurements. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 279, 107737. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2019.107737>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192319303533>.
- Stoy, P.C., El-Madany, T.S., Fisher, J.B., Gentine, P., Gerken, T., Good, S.P., Klosterhalfen, A., Liu, S., Miralles, D.G., Perez-Priego, O., Rigden, A.J., Skaggs, T.H., Wohlfahrt, G., Anderson, R.G., Coenders-Gerrits, A.M.J., Jung, M., Maes, W.H., Mammarella, I., Mauder, M., Migliavacca, M., Nelson, J.A., Poyatos, R., Reichstein, M., Scott, R.L., Wolf, S., 2019. Reviews and syntheses: Turning the challenges of partitioning ecosystem evaporation and transpiration into opportunities. *Biogeosciences* 16 (19), 3747–3775. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5194/bg-16-3747-2019>, URL: <https://bg.copernicus.org/articles/16/3747/2019/>.
- Stoy, P.C., Mauder, M., Foken, T., Marcolla, B., Boegh, E., Ibrom, A., Arain, M.A., Arneth, A., Aurela, M., Bernhofer, C., Cescatti, A., Dellwik, E., Duce, P., Gianelle, D., van Gorsel, E., Kiely, G., Knohl, A., Margolis, H., McCaughey, H., Merbold, L., Montagnani, L., Papale, D., Reichstein, M., Saunders, M., Serrano-Ortiz, P., Sotocornola, M., Spano, D., Vaccari, F., Varlagin, A., 2013. A data-driven analysis of energy balance closure across FLUXNET research sites: The role of landscape scale heterogeneity. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 171–172, 137–152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2012.11.004>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192312003413>.
- Stromberg, J., 2013. Root patterns and hydrogeomorphic niches of riparian plants in the American Southwest. *J. Arid Environ.* 94, 1–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2013.02.004>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S014196313000220>.
- Stromberg, J.C., Wilkins, S.D., Tress, J.A., 1993. Vegetation-hydrology models: Implications for management of *Prosopis Velutina* (Velvet Mesquite) riparian ecosystems. *Ecol. Appl.* 3 (2), 307–314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1941833>, URL: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.2307/1941833>.
- Thom, A.S., 1972. Momentum, mass and heat exchange of vegetation. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* 98 (415), 124–134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/qj.49709841510>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/qj.49709841510>.
- Thomas, B.E., Pool, D.R., 2006. Trends in Streamflow of the San Pedro River, Southeastern Arizona, and Regional Trends in Precipitation and Streamflow in Southeastern Arizona and Southwestern New Mexico. *Professional Paper 1712*, U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia.
- Twine, T., Kustas, W., Norman, J., Cook, D., Houser, P., Meyers, T., Prueger, J., Starks, P., Wesely, M., 2000. Correcting eddy-covariance flux underestimates over a grassland. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 103 (3), 279–300. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1923\(00\)00123-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1923(00)00123-4), URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192300001234>.
- Uni, D., Sheffer, E., Winters, G., Lima, A.C., Fox, H., Klein, T., 2022. Peak photosynthesis at summer midday in Acacia trees growing in a hyper-arid habitat. *Trees* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00468-022-02344-7>, URL: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00468-022-02344-7>.
- Verhoef, A., De Bruin, H., Van Den Hurk, B., 1997. Some practical notes on the parameter kB-1 for sparse vegetation. *J. Appl. Meteorol.* 36 (5), 560–572, URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26182252>.
- Vinod, N., Slot, M., McGregor, I.R., Ordway, E.M., Smith, M.N., Taylor, T.C., Sack, L., Buckley, T.N., Anderson-Teixeira, K.J., 2022. Thermal sensitivity across forest vertical profiles: Patterns, mechanisms, and ecological implications. *New Phytol.* 18539. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nph.18539>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nph.18539>.
- Way, D.A., Holly, C., Bruhn, D., Ball, M.C., Atkin, O.K., 2015. Diurnal and seasonal variation in light and dark respiration in field-grown *Eucalyptus pauciflora*. In: Tissue, D. (Ed.), *Tree Physiol.* 35 (8), 840–849. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpv065>, URL: <https://academic.oup.com/treephys/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/treephys/tpv065>.
- Williams, J., Stella, J.C., Voelker, S.L., Lambert, A.M., Pelletier, L.M., Drake, J.E., Friedman, J.M., Roberts, D.A., Singer, M.B., 2022. Local groundwater decline exacerbates response of dryland riparian woodlands to climatic drought. *Global Change Biol.* 28 (22), 6771–6788. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16376>, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/gcb.16376>.
- Wolf, A., Anderegg, W.R.L., Pacala, S.W., 2016. Optimal stomatal behavior with competition for water and risk of hydraulic impairment. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 113 (46), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1615144113>, URL: <https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1615144113>.
- Yang, R., Friedl, M.A., 2003. Determination of roughness lengths for heat and momentum over boreal forests. *Bound.-Lay. Meteorol.* 107 (3), 581–603. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1022880530523>, URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1023/A:1022880530523>.
- Young, A.M., Friedl, M.A., Seyednasrollah, B., Beamesderfer, E., Carrillo, C.M., Li, X., Moon, M., Arain, M.A., Baldocchi, D.D., Blanken, P.D., Bohrer, G., Burns, S.P., Chu, H., Desai, A.R., Griffis, T.J., Hollinger, D.Y., Litvak, M.E., Novick, K., Scott, R.L., Suyker, A.E., Verfaillie, J., Wood, J.D., Richardson, A.D., 2021. Seasonality in aerodynamic resistance across a range of North American ecosystems. *Agricult. Forest Meteorol.* 310, 108613. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2021.108613>, URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168192321002999>.