Improved estimation of gross primary production of paddy rice cropland with changing model parameters over phenological transitions
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ABSTRACT

Paddy rice is one of the main grain crops in the world. Accurate estimations of the gross primary production (GPP) of paddy rice are essential for assessing rice grain production and monitoring the carbon cycle in paddy fields with the aim of providing ideal conditions for crops throughout the growing season. Several studies have demonstrated the advantages of combining the eddy covariance technique with remotely sensed data to model GPP at CO\textsubscript{2} eddy flux tower sites. As paddy rice continuously changes during its growth and development, and important growth events frequently occur, it is critical to observe the growing conditions at various stages of the process. To better understand the variations in GPP at different growth stages, two key parameters that drive the vegetation photosynthesis model (VPM) are analyzed and estimated at various phenological phases. Specifically, general piecewise logistic functions are used to extract phenological transitions from data at four paddy rice flux tower sites. The maximum light-use efficiency (LUE) and optimum temperature are estimated from these phenological transitions, and these indicators are used to drive the VPM to simulate GPP over multiple years at the four sites. The simulation results show that GPP based on our phenological transition-based VPM (GPP\textsubscript{PVPM}) agrees reasonably well with the variations of GPP estimated from CO\textsubscript{2} flux data (GPP\textsubscript{EC}) (R\textsuperscript{2} > 0.9). In addition, a comparison indicates that GPP\textsubscript{PVPM} tracks the seasonal dynamics of GPP\textsubscript{EC} better than GPP\textsubscript{EC} estimated from the original VPM. Furthermore, GPP based on the improved maximum LUE is lower than GPP\textsubscript{PVPM} at most flux sites and GPP based on the improved optimum temperature is higher than GPP\textsubscript{EC}. These comparisons imply that the maximum LUE and optimum temperature estimated in the phenological transitions of paddy rice are beneficial to enhance the accuracy of GPP estimation. The improved estimation of GPP provides phenological insights into the temporal dynamics of vegetation photosynthesis in paddy fields.

1. Introduction

Paddy rice fields are among the major global agricultural ecosystems, and were estimated to cover approximately 167 million hectares worldwide in 2017 (FAOSTAT, 2017). The majority of the world’s paddy fields are in Asia, accounting for approximately 87% of the globally harvested rice area and 90% of global rice production (FAOSTAT, 2017). Irrigated rice fields are also one of the major sources of methane (CH\textsubscript{4}), as the inherent anaerobic soil conditions are conducive to methane production (Neue, 1993). Although several in-situ studies have reported that paddy rice fields enable high levels of carbon sequestration and act as net sinks for carbon dioxide (CO\textsubscript{2}) (Bhattacharyya et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2013; Pan et al., 2004), predictions of the carbon fluxes in paddy rice fields suffer from considerable uncertainties (Xin et al., 2017).
exchange of CO₂ between agricultural ecosystems and the atmosphere plays an important role in the carbon cycle. The amount of CO₂ fixed from radiant energy absorbed by the paddy rice field is strongly related to the physiological and phenological activities of croplands (Hanan et al., 2002). Therefore, the measurement of CO₂ fluxes in paddy rice fields is crucial in clarifying the physiological responses of crops to environmental conditions. Furthermore, a better understanding of this process will be beneficial for the prediction of grain production under climate change conditions.

The gross primary production (GPP) of paddy rice reflects the CO₂ flux fixed by crops through the process of photosynthesis, and is the main variable determining crop yield. The eddy covariance (EC) technique is one of the best micrometeorological methods for measuring the net exchange of CO₂ between the atmosphere and the surface of various ecosystems. The observed net ecosystem exchange (NEE) data can be partitioned into GPP and ecosystem respiration (denoted as Rₑ) (Sal-dueche et al., 2001). These NEE data and the derived GPP and Rₑ data from flux sites have been widely used to support the development of GPP simulation models for satellite remote sensing and climate data at regional and global scales (Running et al., 1999; Stockli et al., 2008; Williams et al., 2009). EC flux measurements from global flux networks provide valuable information for calibrating and validating the parameterization of these models in an attempt to improve the GPP estimation capability, facilitating numerous studies of carbon fluxes over paddy rice ecosystems (Alberto et al., 2009; Baldocchi et al., 2001; Choi et al., 2018; Hwang et al., 2020; Knox et al., 2015; Saito et al., 2005; Xin et al., 2017).

Light-use efficiency (LUE) models have significant potential to address the spatial and temporal dynamics of GPP, because they take advantage of extensive satellite observations (Yuan et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2017). These satellite-based models assume that the GPP of a terrestrial ecosystem is directly related to the absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (APAR) through LUE (Monteith, 1972, 1977), and have been developed to estimate the GPP of terrestrial ecosystems through vegetation indices (VIs) derived from remotely sensed optical images and meteorological data (Barton and North, 2001; Brogaard et al., 2005; Machwitz et al., 2015; Nichol et al., 2000; Potter et al., 1993; Yuan et al., 2007). The GPP estimated from these models is the product of APAR and the LUE (denoted as ε₀), i.e., GPP = APAR × ε₀. Earlier studies using LUE models employed the fraction of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) absorbed by the vegetation canopy (FPARcanopy) to estimate APARcanopy = PAR × FPAR, where FPARcanopy was approximated using VIs (Potter et al., 1993; Zhao et al., 2005). For example, the MOD17 product employs MODIS AF PAR, which is a canopy-level FPAR comprised of both photosynthetic and non-photosynthetic components (Cheng et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2014). As the fraction of PAR absorbed by chlorophyll (FPARchl) contributes to vegetation photosynthesis, it is more reasonable to use FPARchl to estimate GPP = PAR × FPARchl × ε₀ (Sims et al., 2006; Wu et al., 2010; Xiao et al., 2004b; Zhang et al., 2009, 2006). The vegetation photosynthesis model (VPM) was the first LUE-based model to use FPARchl to estimate GPP (Xiao et al., 2004a).

Previous research has shown the comprehensive ability of VPM to estimate GPP over a variety of CO₂ flux sites (Wu et al., 2018), including forests (Xiao et al., 2004a, 2004b, 2005a; Xiao et al., 2005b), savanna (Jin et al., 2013), grassland (Wang et al., 2010; Yang et al., 2019), and cropland (Ma et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2010). Recently, VPM has been successfully applied to the estimation of GPP in paddy rice fields (Xin et al., 2017).

In VPM, the actual LUE (ε₀) may be less than its theoretical maximum because of environmental stresses such as extreme temperatures, water shortages, or flooding. Therefore, ε₀ is determined by the maximum LUE (ε₀) and a water stress factor (εₛ), as well as a temperature stress factor (εₚₒₜ₉), i.e., ε₀ = εₛ × εₚₒₜ₉ × Wₛ. In most research on paddy rice GPP estimation using VPM, the ecosystem-level ε₀ can be obtained from analysis of the NEE of CO₂ and the incident PAR (µmol/m²/s) at CO₂ eddy flux sites, either by using the hyperbolic light response function (Alberto et al., 2009; Inoue et al., 2008; Lindner et al., 2016; Saito et al., 2005; Yang et al., 2018) or by taking a suitable value from the literature (Xin et al., 2017; Yan et al., 2009). The ε₀ estimates given by the former approach are based on analyses of half-hourly NEE and incident PAR data, either by dividing the entire growing season into several growth periods (Saito et al., 2005) or by considering the entire growing season at the flux sites (Alberto et al., 2009). Some photosynthesis research has demonstrated that, within C₃ species, annual herbaceous plants (e.g., paddy rice) display weaker temperature homeostasis of photosynthesis than perennial herbaceous plants (e.g., wheat) (Yamori et al., 2014). More importantly, the growth and development of paddy rice plants involve continuous change, which means that important growth events occur frequently. Therefore, the overall daily or healthy growth stages of the plant are crucial. To better understand the development of paddy rice and properly manage the rice crop, it is essential to separate the entire growing season of paddy rice into individual growing seasons according to physiological and phenological characteristics for ε₀ estimation. Moreover, the effect of temperature stress (εₚₒₜ₉) is an uncertain factor in LUE models due to the relationship between temperature and photosynthesis. Few scholars have focused on the temperature stress factors. In VPM, εₚₒₜ₉ is determined by two temperature factors, εₚₒₑₜ and εₚₒₑₑₜ. The basic hypothesis behind εₚₒₑₜ and εₚₒₑₑₜ is that vegetation growth acclimatizes to the optimum temperature (Tₒₑₑₜ), which is defined as the mean temperature of the month when the normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) reaches its maximum (Field et al., 1995; Potter et al., 1993), or the average temperature of the growth season (Yan et al., 2009). However, this definition may not be comprehensive for the following reasons: (1) in cropland ecosystems, the growing seasons of crops span several physiological stages, and the use of a uniform average temperature in the growing season, either site-specific or on a regional scale, needs to be improved; (2) due to extreme weather events or natural disasters, the maximum NDVI or enhanced vegetation index (EVI) values in some areas may not occur in July or August, as typically expected; and (3) abnormal maximum NDVI or EVI values may occur for other reasons. Recent work has shown that improvements in phenology-based research on optimum temperatures significantly enhances forest net primary production (NPP) estimations using the Carnegie–Ames–Stanford Approach (CASA) model (Pei et al., 2018). However, this approach has not yet been applied to estimations of the GPP of crop ecosystems.

To overcome uncertainties in the determination of the maximum LUE (ε₀) of paddy rice fields and the limitations of the definition of optimum temperature in the LUE model, this research first attempts to understand and estimate the model parameters (ε₀ and optimum temperature) at various phenological phases, and then generates improved GPP estimations by running VPM with parameters that are appropriate for the individual phenological phases. The results of this work are expected to make a significant contribution in terms of improving the accuracy of GPP estimation and promoting our long-term monitoring capabilities in rice agriculture, which feeds more than 50% of the global population.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study sites

For this study, we selected four paddy rice flux sites, namely, the Mase paddy rice site in Japan, the Haenam paddy rice site in South Korea, the Twitchell Island paddy rice site in California, USA, and the Jingzhou paddy rice site in China (Table 1). For detailed descriptions of the four sites, see the AmeriFlux (http://ameriflux.lbl.gov/sites/siteinfo/fo/US-Twi) and AsiaFlux (http://asiaflux.net/) websites, or the report by Su et al. (2013). The flux footprint of the four sites has been analyzed by Su et al. (2013) and Xin et al. (2017).
The availability ratio of 30-min NEE for each 8-day period in the growing season of paddy rice in the four sites.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lat (°)</th>
<th>Long (°)</th>
<th>Elevation (m)</th>
<th>Temp (°C)</th>
<th>Prec (mm)</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>Rejection rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mase</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>36.05</td>
<td>140.03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>2003–2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haenam</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>34.55</td>
<td>126.57</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitchell Island</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>38.11</td>
<td>-121.65</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jingzhou</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>112.12</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>2010, 2013, 2018</td>
<td>50%, 56%, 32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

The availability ratio of 30-min NEE for each 8-day period in the growing season of paddy rice in the four sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
malfunction, atmospheric conditions inappropriate for EC measurements, rainfall, or human disturbances. To eliminate these errors, the EC data were subjected to quality control procedures, as described by Saito et al. (2005). The GPP and \( R_e \) were also estimated in the same way as Saito et al. (2005). Daily carbon flux data, PAR data, and air temperature data were averaged over an 8-day period, consistent with MODIS 8-day composites. Daily and 8-day data from 2003–2005 within the plant growing season were used in this study.

### 2.2.4. HFK flux site

The CO\(_2\) flux at HFK was measured by an open-path EC sensor. Detailed information about the flux measurements, data processing, quality control, and gap-filling has previously been reported (Hong et al., 2009; Kwon et al., 2010). The data processing method, whereby NEE was separated into GPP and \( R_e \), was the same as for the MSE flux site. The HFK site has no quantum sensor with which to directly measure the photosynthetic photon flux density (PPFD or PAR), so PAR was estimated to be 45% of the solar radiation (Meek et al., 1984) and the units of PAR were converted from \( \text{W} \times \text{m}^{-2} \) to \( \text{mol} \times \text{m}^{-2} \times \text{s}^{-1} \) (Aber et al., 1996; Dye, 2004). The daily GPP, NEE, and climate data in 2008 were averaged over an 8-day period according to the MODIS 8-day composite images. Daily and 8-day data from the paddy rice growing season in 2008 were used in this study.

### 2.2.5. Processing of the flux data

EC systems directly measure NEE rather than GPP. Thus, the NEE of CO\(_2\) between the atmosphere and paddy rice fields was separated into GPP and \( R_e \). To partition NEE into GPP and \( R_e \), a conventional method that estimates the nighttime \( R_e \) (i.e., NEE in nighttime hours) as an exponential function of air temperature (\( T_a \)) was adopted. This function was applied to the daytime to estimate the daytime half-hourly \( R_e \) (Falge et al., 2001). The simple exponential function is:

\[
R_e = A \times e^{B \times T_a}
\]

where A and B are estimated model coefficients and \( T_a \) is the air temperature; B is related to a temperature coefficient, \( Q_{10} \), as \( B = \ln(Q_{10})/10 \), and A denotes the value of \( R_e \) at 0 °C. Another commonly used method was employed to gap-fill the GPP values corresponding to the time points at which invalid NEE data had been removed (Falge et al., 2001). NEE is generally expressed as a rectangular hyperbolic function (the Michaelis–Menten light response equation) of incident PAR or incident PPFD (\( Q_o \)), which can be expressed as follows:

\[
NEE = \frac{\alpha \times Q_o \times \text{GEE}_{\text{max}}}{\alpha \times Q_o + \text{GEE}_{\text{max}} - R_e}
\]

where \( \text{GEE}_{\text{max}} \) (GPP at saturating light) and \( \alpha \) (initial slope of the function or ecosystem quantum yield) are empirical constants that can be determined from a regression analysis of the NEE and incident PPFD. The daily NEE, \( R_e \), and meteorological variables were estimated by summing the averaged half-hourly or hourly rate over 24 h. The GPP was estimated as the sum of the NEE and \( R_e \). The relationship among GPP, NEE and \( R_e \) can be expressed as:

\[
\text{GPP} = -\text{NEE} + R_e
\]

The 8-day GPP mean value was calculated from the daily data. If more than two days of daily data within a given 8-day period were unavailable, the 8-day value was indicated as missing. In this study, the paddy rice growing period was divided into four phenological transitions, and the GPP of the respective transitions was estimated from the equations stated above.

### 2.3. MODIS data

The MODIS sensor on NASA’s Terra satellite was launched in December 1999. Among the 36 spectral bands of MODIS, seven are mainly designed for studying vegetation and land surface: blue (459–479 nm), green (545–565 nm), red (620–670 nm), near-infrared (841–875 nm, 1230–1250 nm), and shortwave infrared (1628–1652 nm, 2105–2155 nm). The MODIS sensor has a spatial resolution of 250 m in the red and near-infrared bands, and 500 m in blue, green, and shortwave infrared bands. In our study, the 8-day land surface reflectance (MOD09A1, 500-m spatial resolution) datasets from NASA’s Earthdata Search were employed.

Based on the geolocation information (latitude and longitude) of the paddy rice flux sites, the site-specific time series of land surface reflectance and quality flags in the study period were extracted from one MODIS pixel centered on the flux tower. Poor-quality observations were gap-filled using a three-step procedure (Jin et al., 2013). EVI and the land surface water index (LSWI) were calculated using 8-day synthesized surface reflectance data from four spectral bands (blue, red, near-infrared (841–875 nm), and shortwave infrared (1628–1652 nm)). EVI (Huete et al., 2002, 1997) and LSWI (Xiao et al., 2004a) were calculated as follows:

\[
\text{EVI} = G \times \frac{\rho_{\text{near}} - \rho_{\text{red}}}{\rho_{\text{near}} + (C_1 \times \rho_{\text{red}} - C_2 \times \rho_{\text{blue}}) + L}
\]
\[ LSWI = \frac{P_{tmax} - P_{tmin}}{P_{tmax} + P_{tmin}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5)

### 2.4. Vegetation photosynthesis model

Based on the concept that a vegetation canopy is composed of chlorophyll (chl) and non-photosynthetic vegetation (NPV) that includes materials at both the canopy-level (e.g., stem, branch, senescent leaves) and leaf-level (e.g., cell walls, vein, and other pigments), VPM was developed to estimate the GPP over the photosynthetically active period of vegetation as the product of the PAR absorbed by chlorophyll (APARchl = FPARchl × PAR) and LUE (Xiao et al., 2004a). Thus, VPM can be described as:

\[ GPP = \varepsilon_g \times FPAR_{chl} \times PAR \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where \( \varepsilon_g \) is the LUE for GPP (\( \mu \text{mol CO}_2/\mu \text{mol PPFD} \)) and PAR is in units of \( \mu \text{mol PPFD} \). Within the photosynthetically active period of vegetation, FPARchl is estimated as a linear function of EVI and a coefficient \( \alpha \); in this study, \( \alpha \) is set to 1.0 (Xiao et al., 2004a, 2004b; Zhang et al., 2016).

\[ FPAR_{chl} = \alpha \times EVI \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)

The LUE value (\( \varepsilon_g \)) is affected by temperature and water, and can be expressed as:

\[ \varepsilon_g = \varepsilon_0 \times T_{scalar} \times W_{scalar} \]  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where \( \varepsilon_0 \) is the apparent quantum yield or maximum LUE (\( \mu \text{mol CO}_2/\mu \text{mol PPFD}, \) or \( g \text{ C/\mu mol PPFD} \)). In view of its variation with environmental conditions, \( \varepsilon_0 \) was estimated from four major phenological transitions of paddy rice instead of being assigned a constant value (see detailed description in Section 2.5). \( T_{scalar} \) and \( W_{scalar} \) are scalars for the effects of temperature and water on the LUE of vegetation, respectively. Using the equation developed for the terrestrial ecosystem model, the effect of temperature on photosynthesis (\( T_{scalar} \)) was estimated at each time step as:

\[ T_{scalar} = \left( \frac{(T - T_{min}) \times (T - T_{max})}{(T - T_{min}) \times (T - T_{max}) - (T - T_{opt})} \right)^{\frac{1}{d}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

where \( T_{min}, T_{max}, T_{opt} \) denote the minimum, maximum, and optimal temperature for photosynthetic activity, respectively. In this study, \( T_{min} \) and \( T_{max} \) were set to 0 °C (cold damage to plants) and 48 °C (heat damage to plants), respectively, at all sites (Xin et al., 2017). \( T_{opt} \) was set to the average temperature in each of the four major phenological transitions (see detailed description in Section 2.5). If the air temperature fell below \( T_{min} \), \( T_{scalar} \) was set to zero.

The effect of water on plant photosynthesis (\( W_{scalar} \)) was estimated from satellite-derived LSWI as:

\[ W_{scalar} = \frac{1 + LSWI}{1 + LSWI_{max}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (10)

where \( LSWI_{max} \) is the maximum LSWI during the growing season of paddy rice for each pixel based on an analysis of seasonal LSWI dynamics derived from MODIS data. The maximum LSWI value within the paddy rice growing season was used as an approximation of \( LSWI_{max} \).

### 2.5. Identification of phenological transitions of paddy rice

Paddy rice is grown in warm and waterlogged soil. The paddy fields are flooded throughout the growing season, providing ideal conditions for crops that release large amounts of CO₂. Four major phenological transitions (PTs) were derived from the annual MODIS EVI time series data: PT1, from the returning green stage after seedling establishment to tillering; PT2, from tillering to the panicle initiation stage; PT3, from the panicle initiation stage to heading; and finally PT4, from heading to harvest. Before the PTs were extracted, the EVI time series data from the four flux sites were chronologically combined and the quality of the EVI observations in each pixel was examined for contamination by cloud and snow. The very few poor-quality EVI observations were removed and the gaps were filled using a simple gap-filling method (Xiao et al., 2003). The Savitzky–Golay filter was then used to smooth the EVI observations so as to preserve peak moments among the data and reduce the biased low values caused by atmospheric effects (Chen et al., 2004; Savitzky and Golay, 1964). The two major parameters of this filter, namely the half-width of the smoothing window (\( m \)) and an integer specifying the degree of the smoothing polynomial (\( d \)), were empirically set to 4 and 2, respectively. Piecewise logistic functions were used to identify the PTs of paddy rice through inflection point estimates within the VI time series from the four flux sites (Zhang et al., 2003). The model can be expressed as follows:

\[ y(t) = \frac{c}{1 + e^{a(t - d)}} + d \]  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where \( t \) is measured in days; \( y(t) \) is the EVI value at time \( t \); \( d \) is the initial background EVI value, which is generally the minimum EVI value in the time series; \( c + d \) is the maximum EVI value; \( a \) and \( b \) are fitting parameters. The rate of change of the curvature of the fitted logistic model was used to identify the PT dates, as these often coincide with the time when the rate of change of the curvature of the logistic function achieves a local minimum or maximum (Zhang et al., 2003). The rate of change in curvature can be calculated as:

\[ K' = b^2 \cfrac{3z(1 - z)(1 + z^2)[2(1 + z)^2 + b^2c^2z]}{[(1 + z)^4 + (bcz)^2]^2} - \frac{(1 + z^2)(1 + 2z - 5z^2)}{[(1 + z)^4 + (bcz)^2]^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (12)

where \( z = e^{a(t - d)} \) and \( a, b, t \) are the same as in Eq. (11). We define the metrics \( E, T, \) and \( HD \) as the dates at which the intercept of the fitting curve and the rate of change of the curvature of the fitting curve reach their first maximum, first minimum, and second maximum in the first half of the year. Similarly, the metrics \( H_e \) and \( H_a \) are defined as the dates at which the intercept of the fitting curve and the rate of change of the curvature of the logistic function achieve their first and second minima of the second half of the year. Thus, the length of the four major PTs can be calculated from the gaps between these metrics, with PT1 = \( E_s - T \), PT2 = \( HD - T \), PT3 = \( H_e - HD \), and PT4 = \( H_a - H_e \).

### 2.6. Simulation of VPM

Based on the four major PTs of paddy rice, the maximum LUE was estimated using the Michaelis–Menten light response equation. The optimum temperatures were given by the 8-day mean temperatures of each PT. If the start date of each PT was located in the first half of one 8-day period, the 8-day mean temperature was used to estimate the optimum temperature in that PT. If the end date of each PT was located in the second half of one 8-day period, the 8-day mean temperature was used in the estimation of optimum temperature in that PT. Thus, the GPP was simulated in all four PTs based on the improved maximum LUE and optimum temperatures. This improved VPM is named phenology-based VPM (PVPM). Finally, the proposed PVPM was applied to the four paddy rice flux sites to estimate the GPP, with all other parameters the same as for conventional VPM.

The PTs derived from the MODIS EVI data at the four paddy rice flux sites were evaluated alongside other relevant research results. The GPP estimated from PVPM were compared with estimations from conventional VPM and MOD17A2H data as well as GPP derived from data at the flux sites. The determination coefficient (\( R^2 \)) and root mean square error (RMSE) were calculated to assess the accuracy of each approach.
3. Results

3.1. Seasonal dynamics of climate, vegetation indices, and GPP

Fig. 1 compares the air temperature and PAR across the four sites over several years. The seasonal dynamics of PAR at the four sites are similar, with comparatively high values in the summer. The seasonal dynamics of air temperature at the four sites are also similar, with the highest values observed in mid-summer.

A comparison of GPP within the growing season among the four sites is shown in Fig. 2. At MSE, GPP increases after the paddy rice is transplanted in early May, reaches its peak in late July/early August (>10 g C m\(^{-2}\) day\(^{-1}\)), and drops sharply by early September. At HFK, paddy rice GPP starts to increase rapidly in mid-June, reaches its peak in mid-August (>10 g C m\(^{-2}\) day\(^{-1}\)), and declines quickly from mid-September into October. At TWT, GPP starts to increase from late May to mid-June (about one month later in 2012), reaches its peak value of nearly 15 g C m\(^{-2}\) day\(^{-1}\) in August (September in 2012), and decreases until it is harvested in late October (mid-November in 2012). At JZ, the farmers transplant rice from late May to early June and harvest it in mid-September. The 8-day maximum GPP among these four sites (covering nine site-years) varies from 5–20 g C m\(^{-2}\) day\(^{-1}\) (Fig. 2).

Fig. 3 compares two VIs (EVI and LSWI) at the four sites. At MSE, EVI starts to gradually increase in May, and LSWI increases steeply in late April. Both VIs start to drop steeply in September. At HFK, EVI and LSWI increase steadily until mid-June and decrease quickly in September. At TWT, both EVI and LSWI rise gradually in June and start to decline in August (2011) or September (2012). At JZ, following the harvest of oilseed rape in late May, the field is flooded and rice plants are transplanted. EVI rises rapidly in mid-June, corresponding to the rapid rise in GPP (Fig. 4). By early or mid-September, EVI and LSWI reach ~0.2 and ~0.1, respectively, corresponding to the harvest season of paddy rice.

3.2. Key PTs of paddy rice

The rates of change in the curvature of the fitted logistic models derived from flux tower EVI-based data are shown in Fig. 4. The EVI dynamics at the four flux sites are similar, with the highest value in mid-summer and the lowest value at the beginning of the growing season or after the harvest.

The day of the year (DOY) at the beginning and at the end of the four PTs are summarized in Table 3. The length of the plant growing season (LOS) is somewhat different at the four sites. At MSE, the LOS varies from 109–125 days, with an average LOS of 117 days from 2003–2005. At HFK, the LOS is 115 in 2008, almost the same as the average LOS at MSE. The LOS at TWT is greater than 135 days in both 2011 and 2012. At JZ, the LOS is less than 100 days in 2010, 2013, and 2018, and the variations among the LOS are very small. In terms of the start date of PT1 (SDPT), MSE has a similar date in 2003 and 2004 (DOYs of 142 and 143), whereas the SDPT in 2005 is about one week later. The SDPT at HFK is 168, later than that of MSE. At TWT, the SDPT in 2012 is nearly one month later than that in 2011. At JZ, the SDPT is similar in 2010, 2013, and 2018 (DOYs of 158, 155, and 152, respectively). At MSE, TWT, and JZ, the SDPT is relatively close (except TWT in 2012). With regard to the end date of PT4 (EDPT), MSE and JZ exhibit small variations, whereas HFK and TWT are similar in 2011 (Table 3).

To validate the PTs of paddy rice across the four sites, as much information as possible was collected from the literature. At MSE in 2003 and 2004, rice seedlings were transplanted in early May and harvested in mid-September (Inoue et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2017). Usually, rice seedlings will turn (or return) green ~7–35 days (depending on rice variety, meteorology of site location, and local environmental factors) after planting or transplanting (Saichuk et al., 2009). From this perspective, an SDPT in late May and an EDPT in mid-September are reasonable. According to previous research, rice planting and harvesting

![Fig. 1. Seasonal dynamics of PAR and air temperature (T\(_a\)) from flux measurements at the four CO\(_2\) eddy flux sites. (a) MSE, Japan, 2003–2005; (b) HFK, South Korea, 2008; (c) TWT, California, USA, 2011–2012; (d) JZ, China, 2010, 2013, and 2018.](image-url)
Fig. 2. Temporal dynamics of GPP (GPP$_{EC}$) estimated from flux measurements at the four CO$_2$ eddy flux sites within growing seasons. (a) MSE, 2003–2005; (b) HFK, 2008; (c) TWT, 2011–2012; (d) JZ, 2010, 2013, 2018.

Fig. 3. Seasonal dynamics of two MODIS-derived VIs (EVI and LSWI) at the four CO$_2$ eddy flux sites. (a) MSE, 2003–2005; (b) HFK, 2008; (c) TWT, 2011–2012; (d) JZ, 2010, 2013, 2018.
planting time lag in 2012 and the SDPT in early June were detected in our research. Previous studies at JZ show that the transplanting date is usually in early June and the turning-green date lags by around one week, with the harvest time typically in early/mid-September (Su et al., 2010). This agrees well with our SDPT in early June and harvest date in mid-September.

3.3. Estimation of maximum LUE ($\epsilon_0$) and optimum temperature during PTs

Based on the four PTs extracted from the MODIS EVI data, the maximum LUE and optimum temperature were estimated using the CO$_2$ flux data and climate data from the four flux sites. In a previous study of GPP estimations for paddy rice, the maximum LUE ($\epsilon_0$) was set to 0.05 mol CO$_2$/mol PPFD (0.6 g C/mol PPFD) (Xin et al., 2017). However, this quantity varies considerably during the four PTs over the four flux sites (Table 4). At MSE from 2003–2005, the maximum $\epsilon_0$ appears in PT2 and varies from 0.058–0.065, while the minimum appears in PT1 or PT4 and varies from 0 to 0.4. At HFK, the maximum $\epsilon_0$ is 0.047 in PT4, while the minimum $\epsilon_0$ is 0.036 in PT1. At TWT in 2011 and 2012, the maximum $\epsilon_0$ changes from 0.038 to 0.04 and appears in PT3, while the minimum $\epsilon_0$ is 0.02 in PT1. At JZ in 2010, the maximum $\epsilon_0$ is 0.05 in PT2 and the minimum $\epsilon_0$ is 0.03 in PT3 and PT4. For the other years at this site (2013 and 2018), the maximum $\epsilon_0$ is 0.045 in PT4 and the minimum $\epsilon_0$ is 0.03 in PT2 (2013) and PT1 (2018).

In a previous study on GPP estimations for paddy rice, the relationship between the daily mean air temperature and the GPP from flux data was investigated as a means of defining the optimum temperature ($T_{\text{opt}}$) (Xin et al., 2017). Table 5 presents the improved optimum temperatures estimated from the PTs at the four flux sites ($T_{\text{opt}}$). At MSE from 2003–2005, $T_{\text{opt}}$ varies from 19.91–27.06 °C. At HFK, the maximum $T_{\text{opt}}$ is 27.98 °C in PT3, while the minimum $T_{\text{opt}}$ is 23.24 °C in PT1. At TWT, $T_{\text{opt}}$ ranges from 16.66–20.83 °C. The maximum $T_{\text{opt}}$ occurs in PT2 of 2011, whereas the minimum occurs in PT4 of 2012. At JZ, $T_{\text{opt}}$ varies from 25.28–30.51 °C. Over the three years considered in this study, the maximum $T_{\text{opt}}$ values occur in PT3, whereas the minimum values occur in PT1. Generally, there are substantial differences between the optimum temperatures in each PT ($T_{\text{opt}}$) and the optimum temperature over the growing season ($T_{\text{opt}}$) at all four flux sites.

3.4. Temporal dynamics of GPP as predicted by PVPM within growing seasons

The temporal dynamics of GPP predicted by PVPM (GPP$_{\text{PVPM}}$) are plotted against the temporal dynamics of GPP$_{\text{EC}}$ derived from the individual flux sites (nine site-years) in Fig. 5. At MSE, GPP$_{\text{PVPM}}$ accurately tracks both the seasonal dynamics and inter-annual variation of GPP$_{\text{EC}}$ from 2003–2005, except for some slight overestimation of the GPP$_{\text{EC}}$ peak period in 2005. At HFK, GPP$_{\text{PVPM}}$ rises sharply in July, reaches a peak in August, and drops rapidly in late September, which clearly tracks the temporal dynamics of GPP$_{\text{EC}}$. At TWT, GPP$_{\text{PVPM}}$ agrees well with GPP$_{\text{EC}}$ in 2011 in terms of the seasonal maximum. The 8-day maximum GPP$_{\text{PVPM}}$ value is slightly higher than GPP$_{\text{EC}}$ in 2012 (Fig. 5). At JZ, GPP$_{\text{PVPM}}$ tracks both the seasonal dynamics and inter-annual variation of GPP$_{\text{EC}}$ well in 2010, 2013, and 2018. There are some slight differences at the heading stage of paddy rice in 2018. Overall, the temporal dynamics of GPP$_{\text{PVPM}}$ and GPP$_{\text{EC}}$ are in good agreement at all four sites.

Scatterplots of GPP$_{\text{PVPM}}$ and GPP$_{\text{EC}}$ over the paddy rice growing seasons exhibit strong linear correlations at all four paddy rice sites (Fig. 6). The correlation between GPP$_{\text{PVPM}}$ and GPP$_{\text{EC}}$ was also compared with that between GPP$_{\text{PVPM}}$ and GPP$_{\text{EC}}$ based on the same temporal data (see detailed discussion in Section 4.2). The coefficient of determination is greater than 0.9 at all four flux sites. HFK has the highest R$^2$ of 0.95, while TWT has the largest RMSE of 1.22 g C m$^{-2}$ day$^{-1}$. 

Fig. 6. Rate of change in curvature (red dot lines) of the fitted logistic models derived from EVI-based data over flux sites (green dots are 8-day EVI, black solid lines are fitted logistic models).
4.1. Performance of GPP

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>PT1(DOY)</th>
<th>PT2(DOY)</th>
<th>PT3(DOY)</th>
<th>PT4(DOY)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 4

Comparison of maximum LUE used in PVPM and VPM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VPM-based ε 0 (mol CO2/mol PPFD)</th>
<th>PVPM-based ε 0 (mol CO2/mol PPFD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PT1(PVPM)</td>
<td>PT2(PVPM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mase</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haenam</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twichell Island</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jingzhou</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Comparison of optimum temperature between PVPM and VPM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>T*0 (%)</th>
<th>T*0 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PT1(PVPM)</td>
<td>PT2(PVPM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mase</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>23.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>24.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haenam</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>23.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twichell Island</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>18.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jingzhou</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>20.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>28.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>26.28</td>
<td>27.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Discussion

4.1. Performance of GPP

The relationship between GPP and daily mean air temperature (T_a) through the entire growing season has been described in previous research on paddy rice GPP estimation (Alberto et al., 2009; Saito et al., 2005; Xin et al., 2017). Generally, GPP increases with T_a until it becomes saturated at a certain temperature. As PVPM is based on the phenology of paddy rice, the relationship between GPP and T_a during the PTs is investigated through the correlation between these parameters in PT1, PT2, PT3, and PT4. The results are shown in Fig. 7. In PT1, GPP gradually increases as temperature rises, except at TWT in 2012, where GPP first decreases with increasing temperature before increasing as temperature rises further. At MSE, HFK, and JZ, the variation in GPP ranges from 0–5 g C m^{-2} day^{-1} during PT1. The variation in GPP at TWT has a broader range of 0–10 g C m^{-2} day^{-1}. At MSE in PT2 and PT3, GPP increases as T_a rises, and appears to saturate (or plateau) at ~25°C. This behavior is different from that reported in previous studies, which suggested a plateau at ~20°C (Xin et al., 2017). At JZ in PT2 and PT3, GPP increases as T_a rises, plateauing at ~29°C.

At HFK in PT2, GPP climbs as T_a increases, and reaches a peak at ~29°C. However, there is no significant trend in PT3 at this site. This may be because only a single year of flux data was used in this research. At TWT in PT2 and PT3, GPP first increases as the temperature rises, before reaching a peak and decreasing as T_a increases further. In PT4, the relationship between GPP and T_a is broadly consistent at all four flux sites, with GPP increasing as T_a rises.

Fig. 8 illustrates the relationship between the 8-day EVI and the corresponding GPP in the four PTs across three sites (HFK is neglected in this analysis because the 8-day GPP data only covered a single year). Simple quadratic polynomial regression analyses show that GPP is strongly correlated with EVI during all four PTs at TWT. This conclusion is slightly inconsistent with previous results, which indicated that GPP vs. GPP is significantly lower than GPP vs. GPP from the MOD17A2H product underestimates GPP by ~6 g C m^{-2} day^{-1} at the same site and within the same year are shown in Fig. 6. Based on fixed values of GPP and the optimum temperature, the GPP in Xin’s study was employed to simulate the GPP of rice paddy plants at sites in Japan, South Korea, and the USA. At JZ, fixed parameters were set to estimate GPP (Xin et al., 2017). At all four sites, the correlation between GPP and GPP is stronger than that between GPP and GPP, and the RMSE of GPP is lower than that of GPP vs. GPP.

The estimation of GPP from PVPM is more accurate than the GPP determined from directly flux the sites (Fig. 5). Additionally, comparisons of GPP vs. GPP and GPP vs. GPP at the same site and within the same year are shown in Fig. 6. Based on fixed values of GPP and the optimum temperature, the GPP in Xin’s study was employed to simulate the GPP of rice paddy plants at sites in Japan, South Korea, and the USA. At JZ, fixed parameters were set to estimate GPP (Xin et al., 2017). At all four sites, the correlation between GPP vs. GPP and GPP vs. GPP is stronger than that between GPP vs. GPP and GPP vs. GPP.

MOD17A2H is a widely used global GPP data product, and has been applied in many studies of forests, grasslands, and crops (Fu et al., 2017; Tagesson et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2017). Recently, it has been suggested that GPP from the MOD17A2H product underestimates GPP (GPP) and GPP vs. GPP at the same site and within the same year are shown in Fig. 6. Based on fixed values of GPP and the optimum temperature, the GPP in Xin’s study was employed to simulate the GPP of rice paddy plants at sites in Japan, South Korea, and the USA. At JZ, fixed parameters were set to estimate GPP (Xin et al., 2017). At all four sites, the correlation between GPP vs. GPP and GPP vs. GPP is stronger than that between GPP vs. GPP and GPP vs. GPP.
Fig. 5. Temporal dynamics of predicted and estimated GPP ($\text{GPP}_{\text{PVPM}}$ and $\text{GPP}_{\text{EC}}$) at the four CO$_2$ eddy flux sites. (a) MSE, 2003–2005; (b) HFK, 2008; (c) TWT, 2011–2012; (d) JZ, 2010, 2013, and 2018.

Fig. 6. Comparison of measured GPP and predicted GPP ($\text{GPP}_{\text{PVPM}}$, $\text{GPP}_{\text{PVPM}}$, and $\text{GPP}_{\text{EC}}$) during growing seasons at the four rice paddy CO$_2$ eddy flux sites. (a) MSE, 2003–2005; (b) HFK, 2008; (c) TWT, 2011–2012; (d) JZ, 2010, 2013, 2018.
in the peak of the growing season at TWT in 2011–2012 and at JZ in 2010, 2013, and 2018. The substantial underestimation in \( GPP_{MO} \), relative to \( GPP_{EC} \), \( GPP_{VPM} \), and \( GPP_{PVPM} \), can be attributed to the climate data and the maximum LUE parameter used by Xin et al. (2017). The moderate overestimation in \( GPP_{VPM} \), relative to \( GPP_{EC} \) and \( GPP_{PVPM} \), may be the result of the value of \( \epsilon_0 \) used in the model. The maximum LUE is an essential parameter in LUE models, but suffers from significant uncertainty among different models and biome types. In the MOD17A2H data product, the moderate resolution imaging spectroradiometer photosynthesis (MODIS-PSN) model uses 0.22 g C/mol PPFD (1.004 g C/MJ) as its \( \epsilon_0 \) parameter for croplands (see the Daily GPP and Annual NPP (MOD17A2/A3) Products NASA Earth Observing System MODIS Land Algorithm). In a previous GPP estimation study, \( \epsilon_0 \) was set to 0.6 g C/mol PPFD (0.05 mol CO\(_2\)/mol PPFD) for VPM simulations of paddy rice (Xin et al., 2017). Compared with the \( \epsilon_0 \) value used in the MOD17A2H data product and the VPM estimation of paddy rice, the value of \( \epsilon_0 \) estimated from the four PTs in PVPM may be more appropriate, as this allows GPP\(_{PVPM}\) to capture seasonal variations in GPP\(_{EC}\) among the four paddy rice sites.

### 4.3. Comparison between GPP\(_{EC}\), GPP\(_{PVPM}\), GPP\(_{PVPM,LUE}\), and GPP\(_{PVPM,Topt}\)

The optimum temperature (\( T_{opt} \)) is another key parameter in the LUE
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model that often varies among models and biome types. A review paper highlighted the temperature acclimation and adaptation of photosynthesis for C3 and C4 plants (Yamori et al., 2014). Recently, a study on NPP revealed that, for forest GPP estimation from the CASA model, the optimum temperature defined in the peak of the growing season was more appropriate than that determined by the mean temperature of the month in which NDVI reaches its maximum (Pei et al., 2018). From this viewpoint, T_{popt} was averaged over the four PTs defined in this study. Xin et al. (2017) used values of 20 °C, 25 °C, and 18 °C as their T_{opt} parameters for paddy rice in VPM. To evaluate the performance of the improved optimum temperature and maximum LUE, the GPP values estimated from the improved T_{opt} (GPP_{VPM, T_{popt}}), from the improved maximum LUE (GPP_{VPM, LUE}), and from combining the improved T_{opt} and maximum LUE (GPP_{VPM}) were compared with GPP_{EC}. Fig. 10 shows the results. There is a substantial overestimation in GPP_{VPM, T_{popt}} compared with GPP_{VPM} and GPP_{EC} during the peak growing season at HFK, TWT, and JZ. This demonstrates the degree of uncertainty in GPP estimates of paddy rice when using only the 8-day mean temperature as the optimum temperature in the PTs. Nevertheless, using PTs to estimate the optimum temperature is reasonable, and satellite-based VIs make it possible to delineate accurate PTs (Wang and Wu, 2019; Wu et al., 2017; Yamori et al., 2014). Additional research should compare the T_{popt} values derived from various methods. GPP_{VPM, LUE} is slightly lower than GPP_{EC} at TWT in 2012 and slightly higher than GPP_{EC} in the peak

![Fig. 8. Relationships between 8-day EVI and GPP_{EC} during the four PTs of the crop growing season. The top, middle, and bottom panels show the relationships at MSE (2003–2005), TWT (2011–2012), and JZ (2010, 2013, 2018), respectively.](image1)

![Fig. 9. Comparison of predicted and measured GPP (GPP_{VPM}, GPP_{PVPM}, GPP_{MOD17A2H} and GPP_{EC}) during growing seasons at the four CO_{2} eddy flux sites. (a)MSE, 2003–2005; (b)HFK, 2008; (c)TWT, 2011–2012; (d) JZ, 2010, 2013, 2018.](image2)
growing season at HFK and JZ in 2018. A comparison of GPP\textsubscript{PVPM\_LUE} and GPP\textsubscript{EC} implies that the maximum LUE estimation in the PTs is helpful in approaching the observed GPP. Generally, with regard to the improved maximum LUE and optimum temperature, GPP\textsubscript{PVPM} tracks GPP\textsubscript{EC} more accurately than GPP\textsubscript{PVPM\_LUE} and GPP\textsubscript{PVPM\_T_{popt}} at the four paddy rice sites. This comparison suggests that both the maximum LUE and T\textsubscript{popt} estimated using the PTs of paddy rice could be of great value for GPP estimation.

4.4. Sources of error and uncertainty in GPP estimation from PVPM in paddy rice cropland

The results of this research demonstrate that the temporal dynamics of GPP\textsubscript{PVPM} agree well with those of GPP\textsubscript{EC} (Figs. 5 and 6), with some acceptable overestimation in the peak of the growing season at MSE (in 2005) and JZ (in 2018). PTs were introduced into the GPP estimation of paddy rice. Many methods of deriving land surface phenology indicators from remotely sensed data or CO$_2$ EC measurements have been developed, but there is no wholly appropriate method for extracting temporal information on paddy rice. Recently, a rule-based algorithm called PhenoRice was developed for the automatic extraction of phenology information on rice crops (Boschetti et al., 2017). Because the test sites used to develop PhenoRice (Italy, India, and Philippines) are totally different from the sites considered in this study, there could be many uncertainties in terms of diverse genetics, environmental conditions, and management techniques. Thus, a traditional and comprehensive method of deriving vegetation phenology (Zhang et al., 2003) was employed, and the good agreement between the PTs of paddy rice and phenology information derived from the literature demonstrates the rationality of the method applied in this study. As the benefits and limitations of the method have already been discussed (Verbesselt et al., 2010; White et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2004), additional work should focus on using more paddy rice flux sites and data from additional years to provide a more comprehensive comparison of different phenology extraction methods.

Maximum LUE is one of the main parameters in the PVPM. Two previous in-situ studies estimated the maximum LUE in predicting rice yields in the Philippines, Italy, and the USA, and found that this parameter varied in the range 0.08–0.20 mol CO$_2$/mol PPFD (Campbell et al., 2001; Kiniry et al., 2001). In another case of rice GPP estimation, the maximum LUE was set to ~0.1 mol CO$_2$/mol PPFD in the derivation of an LUE model (Chen et al., 2011). In a recent study of GPP estimation in paddy rice fields, 0.05 mol CO$_2$/mol PPFD was applied at four sites in Asia and the USA (Xin et al., 2017). Table 4 demonstrates that there is some discrepancy between the maximum LUE over a complete growing season and during the PTs, which is consistent with expert knowledge that the maximum LUE varies among the same ecosystem type over different regions (Xiao et al., 2011; Xue et al., 2016). The good agreement between GPP\textsubscript{PVPM} and GPP\textsubscript{EC} in our study implies that the maximum LUE estimated in the PTs reduces the uncertainty of this parameter and provides a substantial improvement in GPP estimations for paddy rice cropland. Another potential source of error is the uncertainty of climate datasets such as PAR (Cai et al., 2014; Cheng et al., 2014; He et al., 2014) and temperature. Remotely sensed data are rarely used in studies on the optimum temperature of paddy rice in GPP estimation. Although the improved optimum temperature has a limited impact in our study, the trends in optimum temperature in the PTs of paddy rice crops conform to the rhythms of rice growth, and could be used to promote growth in future research. The third main potential source of error concerns the estimation of site-based GPP\textsubscript{EC}. In this study, different methods were used to calculate GPP\textsubscript{EC} at four sites, which may have introduced extra uncertainty into the comparison between GPP\textsubscript{PVPM} and GPP\textsubscript{EC}. Other sources of error, such as the uncertainty of EVI time series data derived from MODIS imagery and mismatches in the spatial relationship between the footprint of a CO$_2$ flux tower and a MODIS pixel, were discussed by Xin et al. (2017).
5. Conclusions

The integration of PTs derived from time series of MODIS images and CO₂ flux measurements from eddy flux sites at four paddy rice sites has been used to obtain accurate GPP estimations. The GPP_EC data from the flux sites exhibit various trends with respect to daily mean air temperature during the PTs, rather than the single trends generalized from the entire growing season. The observed CO₂ flux data also present diverse tendencies with respect to the EVI time series from MODIS during the PTs, in contrast to the single trends inferred from the full growing season. For this reason, the estimation of driving parameters in LUE models according to the land surface phenology is an effective way of improving GPP estimation.

Taking into account the uncertainty of the maximum LUE and optimum temperature in VPM, these parameters were estimated from the four major PTs corresponding to the physiological features of paddy rice. This is the first case study to use a phenology-based strategy to optimize the maximum LUE and optimum temperature in the GPP estimation of paddy rice croplands. The results indicate that estimating the maximum LUE and optimum temperature in PTs is more appropriate, in terms of capturing the temporal dynamics and inter-annual variations of GPP at paddy rice sites, than attempting to improve either the maximum LUE or optimum temperature. To complement and improve the global flux network, further assessment of the phenology-based LUE model at other paddy rice sites with comparative CO₂ flux measurements would be of great value in determining universal parameter values across various regions. The extrapolation of site-scale flux measurements to the regional or national scale should be achievable in the near future using the presented methodology.
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