

---

## Using Scintillometry to Estimate Sensible Heat Fluxes over Water: First Insights

M. N. Bouin<sup>a,\*</sup>, D. Legain<sup>b</sup>, O. Traullé<sup>b</sup>, S. Belamari<sup>b</sup>, G. Caniaux<sup>b</sup>, A. Fiandrino<sup>c</sup>, F. Lagarde<sup>c</sup>,  
J. Barrié<sup>b</sup>, E. Moulin<sup>b</sup> and G. Bouhours<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Centre de Météo Marine, CNRM, Météo France, 13 rue du Chatellier, CS12804, 29228 Brest Cedex 2, France

<sup>b</sup> CNRM-GAME, URA 1357, Météo France CNRS, 42 Avenue Coriolis, 31057 Toulouse Cedex, France

<sup>c</sup> Laboratoire Environnement Ressources Languedoc Roussillon, Ifremer, Bd Jean Monnet, BP 171, 34203 Sète Cedex, France

\*: Corresponding author : Marie-Noëlle Bouin, email address : [marie-noelle.bouin@meteo.fr](mailto:marie-noelle.bouin@meteo.fr)

---

### Abstract:

An extra large aperture scintillometer (XLAS) was used over several months across the Thau Lagoon (South of France) to retrieve one-wavelength scintillation and, thence, sensible heat flux. We present the experiment with the XLAS, an eddy-covariance station and meteorological stations measuring on or near the Thau Lagoon. Changes implemented to adapt the scintillometry processing schemes to the above water conditions are presented together with a full error budget, including sensitivity tests to the relevant parameters of the scintillometer processing scheme. The XLAS error budget amounts to 16% (systematic part)  $\pm$ 50% (random part). Sensible heat fluxes obtained using the XLAS under unstable atmospheric conditions are then compared to eddy-covariance estimates used as a reference. The scintillometry technique proved to perform satisfactorily in such a watery environment. Some discrepancies observed between the XLAS and eddy-covariance measurements were investigated according to the lagoon fraction of the source area, to discriminate whether they were related to deviations from the Monin–Obukhov similarity theory or to different atmospheric conditions at the respective instrument locations. Local atmospheric conditions agreed well with the Monin–Obukhov similarity theory, especially measurements with source areas largely composed of the lagoon surface. Retaining only the measurements with almost only the lagoon surface in the source area improved the agreement between the XLAS and eddy-covariance measurements. The remaining discrepancies are interpreted as being due to significant location differences between the two instruments, resulting in different atmospheric conditions, and to size differences in the source areas.

**Keywords:** Air–sea fluxes ; Eddy covariance ; Footprint ; Monin–Obukhov similarity theory ; Scintillometry ; Sensible heat flux

# 1 **1 Introduction**

2 Accurate estimates of turbulent fluxes at sea (or over water bodies) are crucial for  
3 various applications in the atmospheric and oceanographic sciences, and in  
4 weather forecasting. They are required, for instance, to improve mesoscale  
5 atmospheric circulation models, to better constrain the upper level ocean heat  
6 budget, and to improve knowledge and so flux parametrization in Numerical  
7 Weather Prediction models. Their precise measurements usually rely on short-  
8 term, difficult-to-set-up, labour-intensive, very costly sea campaigns. The most  
9 reliable technique to retrieve turbulent fluxes over water, in particular at sea, is so  
10 far considered to be eddy covariance (EC). Wind, temperature and humidity  
11 fluctuations are measured using high frequency, fast response sensors on a fixed  
12 or moving platform (e.g. on a shipborne mast during scientific cruises, as in Weill  
13 et al. (2003)). The momentum, and sensible and latent heat fluxes are then  
14 retrieved using the full spectrum (eddy covariance method) or the inertial part  
15 only (inertial dissipation method). The EC method has proved to be the most  
16 accurate method independently of the atmospheric or surface (roughness)  
17 conditions but it is complicated to set up properly and flow distortion corrections  
18 need to be applied (Yelland et al. 1998; Bourras et al. 2009).

19 We present, here, the potential contribution of scintillometry as a new measuring  
20 technique for assessing turbulent heat fluxes at sea.

21 Scintillometry has been used increasingly over the recent decades to retrieve  
22 sensible heat fluxes (one-wavelength system) or both sensible and latent heat  
23 fluxes (dual-wavelength system). It was first shown to perform reliably in  
24 comparison with eddy covariance measurements over homogeneous terrain  
25 (Andreas 1988a; De Bruin et al. 1995; Lagouarde et al. 2006; Zeweldi et al.  
26 2010). More recently, it has also been validated against eddy covariance over  
27 heterogeneous landscapes (Meijninger et al. 2002; Beyrich et al. 2002; Ezzahar et  
28 al. 2009). It has proved to be especially useful for deriving aggregated fluxes over  
29 heterogeneous parcels where EC estimates only give access to local information  
30 (Ezzahar and Chehbouni 2009). Large Aperture Scintillometers (LAS) in  
31 particular are less prone than others to saturation, which occurs under highly  
32 turbulent conditions. They can operate over path lengths of several kilometres and  
33 provide sensible heat fluxes aggregated over large areas comparable to one or

1 several pixels of a satellite image or numerical weather model output. A review of  
2 the capabilities and recent uses of scintillometry can be found in Moene et al.  
3 (2009).  
4 In this study, we use data collected during the 2009 Thau Lagoon Experiment to  
5 investigate whether the LAS technique can be used reliably over lakes or sea to  
6 retrieve sensible heat flux ( $H$ ) values. The scintillometry technique has, to our  
7 knowledge, been used only once to estimate sensible heat fluxes over sea or lakes  
8 (McJannet et al. 2011). This paper presents the results of one of the first attempts  
9 to extend its domain of use and compares scintillometry sensible heat flux  
10 estimates with those obtained by eddy covariance.  
11 The paper is organized as follows. In the next part, we present the EC analysis and  
12 quality check, the scintillometer processing scheme and its adaptation to the air-  
13 sea flux assessment. Part 3 presents the Thau Lagoon (South of France)  
14 experiment and the instruments. The results of some sensitivity tests used to  
15 derive an error budget are presented in part 4. Part 5 validates the sensible heat  
16 fluxes by comparing them to the eddy covariance fluxes. Using a detailed  
17 footprint and wind sector analysis, restrictions are identified on the use of  
18 scintillometry in such an environment.

## 19 **2 Theory**

20 In this section, the adaptation of the Large Aperture Scintillometry processing  
21 scheme to air-sea flux estimation is described. For each step of the processing, the  
22 changes made in connection with the experimental conditions are reported, some  
23 of them in connection with the results of the sensitivity tests (part 4). The  
24 instrument used in this study was an Extra Large Aperture Scintillometer (XLAS)  
25 manufactured by Kipp & Zonen (K&Z). Some of the steps described below are  
26 specific to this instrument but all the adaptations reported may be generalized to  
27 any scintillometry measurements performed over water. When necessary,  
28 additional input parameters were provided by in situ measurements at the  
29 Marseillan station (see Section 3, Table 1, and Fig. 4 and 5 for a full description  
30 of the experiment).

## 1 **2.1 From Raw Measurements to $C_n^2$**

### 2 *2.1.1 Measurement Errors*

3 Electromagnetic radiation emitted by the XLAS transmitter is scattered by the  
4 atmospheric turbulence, and the resulting variations in the signal intensity are  
5 recorded by the receiver. These signal intensity fluctuations (scintillation) can  
6 then be related to the structure parameter of the refractive index of the air  $C_n^2$   
7 averaged over the path. (In the following, the  $C_n^2$  notation refers to this path-  
8 averaged value.) In their LAS scintillometer intercomparison study, Kleissl et al.  
9 (2008; 2009) pointed out some discrepancies (up to 20%) among measurements  
10 performed using several K&Z LAS instruments as well as among measurements  
11 performed using K&Z instruments and scintillometers from other manufacturers  
12 (e.g. Scintec). These inaccuracies, which are attributed to electronic or optical  
13 problems in the K&Z LAS, directly affect the measurement of the structure  
14 parameter of the air refractive index,  $C_n^2$ . In a recent study, Van Kesteren and  
15 Hartogensis (2011) observed two systematic errors affecting the  $C_n^2$  measurements  
16 from K&Z LAS. The first one (called high  $C_n^2$  error) may have been due to a poor  
17 focal alignment of the receiver detector and the transmitter diode.

18 The second one (called low  $C_n^2$  error) corresponded to the bias detected by Kleissl  
19 et al. (2009) and affects  $U_{C_n^2}$  (output signal of the XLAS), from which  $C_n^2$  itself is  
20 usually calculated. Two different relations may be used to derive  $C_n^2$  from the  
21 various outputs of the LAS (or XLAS). A first assessment of the presence of this  
22 low  $C_n^2$  error in the XLAS signal may thus be obtained by comparing these two  
23 relations.

24 The first one is based on the demodulated signal ( $I$ , corresponding to the signal  
25 strength or intensity averaged over the optical path) and relates the air refractive  
26 index  $C_n^2$  to the mean variance of the logarithmic intensity  $\sigma_{\ln(I)}^2$  (Wang et al.,  
27 1978):

$$28 \quad C_n^2 = 1.12 \sigma_{\ln(I)}^2 D^{7/3} L^{-3} \quad (1)$$

29 where  $D$  is the aperture diameter and  $L$  the path length, and:

$$30 \quad \sigma_{\ln(I)}^2 = \ln \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma_I^2}{I^2} \right) \quad (2)$$

1 where  $\sigma_I^2$  is the signal intensity variance.  
 2 The second relation is specific to the K&Z XLAS instrument and uses the high  
 3 frequency raw output signal multiplied by  $10^{15}$  (whose mean value is hereafter  
 4 referred to as  $PU_{C_n^2}$ ), namely ( Kipp & Zonen 2007):

$$5 \quad C_n^2 = PU_{C_n^2} 10^{-15} \quad (3)$$

6 We checked the correspondence between the values of  $C_n^2$  obtained using Eq. 1  
 7 and Eq. 3, using a log-log comparison. The agreement was excellent, with  
 8 correlation coefficients over 0.99 and an RMS (relative value) of 6%. We thus  
 9 conclude that the K&Z XLAS is probably not subject to this low  $C_n^2$  systematic  
 10 error. Equation 1 is used in the following because it is more direct and thus  
 11 inherently safer.

### 12 *2.1.2 Saturation*

13 One advantage of the XLAS over the laser (mm) scintillometer is that it is less  
 14 subject to saturation. Saturation occurs in strong scintillation: as the variance of  
 15 the logarithmic intensity  $\sigma_{\ln(I)}^2$  becomes saturated, the relation between  $C_n^2$  and  
 16 this variance (Eq. 1) is no longer valid. Saturation of LAS measurements has been  
 17 intensively studied (e.g. Wang et al. 1978; Hill and Clifford 1981; Ochs and Hill  
 18 1982; Frehlich and Ochs 1990). For a review of saturation effects on the XLAS,  
 19 see Kohsiek et al. (2006). With the parameters corresponding to the scintillometer  
 20 used in this experiment, the most restrictive criterion for non-saturation  
 21 corresponds to the results of Frehlich and Ochs (1990) with:

$$22 \quad C_n^2 < 0.057 D^{5/3} L^{-8/3} \lambda^{1/3} \quad (4)$$

23 where  $\lambda$  is the scintillometer optical wavelength. Removing data according to this  
 24 criterion led to rejection of  $\approx 1\%$  of the raw data.

## 25 **2.2 From $C_n^2$ to $C_T^2$**

### 26 *2.2.1 T-q Correlation*

27 The relationship between the structure parameter of the air refractive index  $C_n^2$  and  
 28 the structure parameters of the pressure  $P$ , air temperature  $T$  and specific humidity

1  $q$  has been extensively described (e.g. Moene 2003; Moene et al. 2004). Below is  
 2 a brief summary to present the changes made in the XLAS processing scheme.  
 3 Except for rare cases where the temperature and humidity fluctuations are very  
 4 low, the effects of the pressure fluctuations may be safely neglected, and the  
 5 relationship between  $C_n^2$  and  $C_T^2$  depends on  $T$  and  $q$  only (Wesely 1976):

$$6 \quad C_n^2 \approx \frac{A_T^2}{T^2} C_T^2 \left( 1 + 2 \frac{A_q}{q} \frac{T}{A_T} R_{Tq} \frac{c_p}{L_v} \beta^{-1} + \frac{A_q^2}{q^2} \frac{T^2}{A_T^2} \left( \frac{c_p}{L_v} \right)^2 \beta^{-2} \right) \quad (5)$$

7 where  $A_T$  and  $A_q$  are coefficients related to the temperature and humidity  
 8 fluctuations for the XLAS wavelength,  $R_{Tq}$  is the correlation coefficient between  
 9 the temperature and humidity fluctuations,  $c_p$  is the specific heat capacity of air at  
 10 constant pressure,  $L_v$  the specific latent heat of vaporization, and  $\beta$  the Bowen  
 11 ratio. In Eq. 5 and the following,  $T$  and  $q$  refer to the mean values of temperature  
 12 and specific humidity over the measurement averaging interval. When using  
 13 scintillometry to derive heat fluxes over land surfaces, it is usually assumed that  
 14  $R_{Tq}$  is equal to +/- 1, depending on the sign of  $\beta$  (e.g. Ludi et al. 2005). For typical  
 15 atmospheric conditions, this leads to:

$$16 \quad C_T^2 \approx \left( \frac{T^2}{0.78 \cdot 10^{-6}} \right)^2 C_n^2 \left( 1 + \frac{0.03}{\beta} \right)^{-2} \quad (6)$$

17 In the case of the Thau Lagoon experiment, the correlation coefficient  $R_{Tq}$  was  
 18 closer to zero. An analysis of the EC measurements showed that its mean absolute  
 19 value was  $0.046 \pm 0.066$ . We then followed Odhiambo et al. (2009) in using a  
 20 mean value of this correlation coefficient close to zero in Eq. 5. A new  
 21 relationship between  $C_n^2$  and  $C_T^2$  is then:

$$22 \quad C_T^2 \approx \left( \frac{T^2}{0.78 \cdot 10^{-6}} \right)^2 C_n^2 \left( 1 + \left( \frac{0.03}{\beta} \right)^2 \right)^{-1} \quad (7)$$

23 This equation 7 is used in the following.

### 24 2.2.2 Bowen Ratio

25 In contrast with land surface measurements, Bowen ratios over water are usually  
 26 very low (less than 0.5). The value of this Bowen ratio  $\beta$  in Eq. 7 should be known  
 27 as precisely as possible. The best option here would probably be to use the Bowen

1 ratio derived from the EC measurements, but one of the aims of this study was to  
 2 assess the quality of the XLAS sensible heat fluxes over water using the EC  
 3 measurements as a reference. It was thus desirable to obtain results as independent  
 4 as possible of the EC technique. Bowen ratio values were obtained using the  
 5 gradient method together with atmospheric parameters from the Marseillan  
 6 station:

$$7 \quad \beta = \frac{c_p T_s - T}{L_v e_s - e} \quad (8)$$

8  $T_s$  being the water surface temperature,  $e_s$  the saturation vapour pressure and  $e$  the  
 9 partial pressure of water vapour. Figure 1 presents a comparison (histograms) of  
 10 the gradient and EC-derived Bowen ratios over the experimental period. The  
 11 mean difference (EC-derived minus gradient) is  $0.174 \pm 1.218$ , and the correlation  
 12 coefficient is 0.70. While the agreement is good for low Bowen ratio values (less  
 13 than 0.25), the gradient method fails to reproduce Bowen ratios between 0.5 and  
 14 1.2 as derived from eddy covariance measurements.

15 In the following, Bowen ratios computed using the gradient method on the  
 16 Marseillan measurements are used.

## 17 **2.3 From $C_T^2$ to Sensible Heat Flux**

### 18 *2.3.1 Effect of Humidity*

19 To obtain sensible heat flux from the temperature structure parameter, it is  
 20 necessary to use the surface layer similarity relationship for  $C_T^2$ , which is part of  
 21 Monin-Obukhov Similarity Theory (MOST).

$$22 \quad \frac{C_T^2 z^{2/3}}{T_*^2} = \varphi_T \left( \frac{z}{L_{MO}} \right) \quad (9)$$

23 where  $z$  is the measurement height,  $T_*$  the scale parameter for temperature,  $L_{MO}$   
 24 the Obukhov length, and  $\varphi_T$  a universal function of  $z/L_{MO}$ , and the additional  
 25 relationships for  $L_{MO}$  and  $T_*$ :

$$26 \quad T_* = \frac{H}{u_* \rho c_p} \quad (10)$$

$$27 \quad L_{MO} = \frac{u_*^2 T_v}{g T_v^* k} \quad (11)$$

1 with  $u_*$  the friction velocity,  $\rho$  the air density,  $T_v$  the virtual temperature of air,  $g$   
 2 the gravitational attraction mean value,  $T_{v^*}$  the scale parameter for temperature  
 3 including the buoyancy flux, and  $k$  the von Karman constant (taken equal to 0.4).  
 4 The virtual temperature and scale parameter for temperature including humidity  
 5 may be expressed as:

$$6 \quad T_v = T(1 + 0.61q) \quad (12)$$

$$7 \quad T_{v^*} = T_*(1 + 0.61 T_v \frac{c_p}{L_v} \beta^{-1}) \quad (13)$$

8 These expressions for  $T_v$  and  $T_{v^*}$  are used in Eq. 11 to express  $L_{MO}$  as a function of  
 9  $u_*$ ,  $T$ , and  $T_*$  only. The Bowen ratio used in Eq. 13 was deduced from the  
 10 Marseillan atmospheric parameters using the gradient method as in section 2.2.4.

### 11 2.3.2 Stratification

12 Stratification (unstable or stable) specification within the scintillometry  
 13 processing must be established from independent information, for instance  
 14 atmospheric/hydrological measurements. As this study was a first approach to  
 15 evaluate whether scintillometry was capable of retrieving sensible heat fluxes over  
 16 water, we restricted ourselves to data corresponding to unstable cases.

17 There are several possible criteria for selecting unstable stratification situations.  
 18 All of them used measurements made at the Marseillan station (Figure 2 and 3),  
 19 which is not exactly collocated with the XLAS path. An assumption of the  
 20 unstable data selection was that the stratification was the same in Marseillan and  
 21 along the scintillometer path.

22 Unstable stratification may be defined using the virtual temperature difference  
 23 between the surface and the measurement height ( $T_v^s - T_v$ ), the Obukhov length  
 24 computed using a bulk algorithm (see section 3.5) ( $L_{MO}^{bulk}$ ), or the Obukhov length  
 25 obtained using the eddy covariance method ( $L_{MO}^{EC}$ ). The first two criteria ( $T_v^s - T_v$   
 26  $> 0.5$  °C and  $z/L_{MO}^{bulk} < -0.05$ ) were used together to select data corresponding to  
 27 unstable stratification. To ensure the consistency of the XLAS processing with the  
 28 eddy covariance measurements, the data were filtered according to the EC-derived  
 29 Obukhov length criterion ( $z/L_{MO}^{EC} < -0.05$ ); this led to the rejection of a further 4%  
 30 of the data. Finally, only unstable atmospheric situations (independently of night-  
 31 or day-time period) are retained in the following. This represents more than 80%  
 32 of the entire Thau Lagoon dataset.



### 1 2.3.3 Roughness Length

2 Equations 9 and 11 were combined in an iterative way to solve for  $T_*$ ,  $u_*$  and  $L_{MO}$ .  
3 As an additional assumption was needed to determine these 3 parameters from 2  
4 equations,  $u_*$  was estimated from the roughness length  $z_0$  and the wind speed  
5 using the following relationship:

$$6 \quad u_* = \frac{k U_{10}}{\ln(z/z_0) - \Psi_m(z/L_{MO}) + \Psi_m(z_0/L_{MO})} \quad (14)$$

7 where  $\Psi_m$  is the universal similarity function for momentum, and  $U_{10}$  the mean  
8 horizontal wind velocity at 10 m. As a first guess, a simplified relationship was  
9 used for  $u_*$  with a roughness length  $z_0 = 10^{-4}$  m:

$$10 \quad u_* = \frac{k U_{10}}{\ln(z/z_0)} \quad (15)$$

11 Unlike the case for land surfaces, this roughness length may change very quickly  
12 over a lake or sea as it depends on the sea state and thus on the wind. The  
13 scintillometry solving algorithm was adapted to adjust this  $z_0$  iteratively using the  
14 relationship of Smith (1988):

$$15 \quad z_0 = 0.011 \frac{u_*^2}{g} + 0.11 \frac{\nu}{u_*} \quad (16)$$

16 where  $\nu$  is the kinematic viscosity of water.

### 17 2.3.4 Similarity and Stability Functions

18 Several universal functions  $\varphi_T$  (Eq. 9) have been used by different authors (e.g.  
19 Andreas 1988b; Hill et al. 1992; Thiermann and Grassl 1992; De Bruin et al.  
20 1993; Edson and Fairall 1998). In the following, the function of Edson and Fairall  
21 (1998) was used, viz.:

$$22 \quad \varphi_T \left( \frac{z}{L_{MO}} \right) = c_{T_1} \left( 1 - c_{T_2} \frac{z}{L_{MO}} \right)^{-2/3} \quad (17)$$

23 with  $C_{T_1} = 5.92$  and  $C_{T_2} = 8$ .

24 The universal stability function for momentum under unstable conditions  $\Psi_m$  (Eq.  
25 14) was defined using the Businger-Dyer expression (Paulson 1970):

$$\Psi_m\left(\frac{z}{L_{MO}}\right) = 2 \ln\left(\frac{1+x}{2}\right) + \ln\left(\frac{1+x^2}{2}\right) - 2 \arctan(x) + \frac{\pi}{2} \quad (18)$$

with:

$$x = \left(1 - 16 \frac{z}{L_{MO}}\right)^{1/4} \quad (19)$$

## 3 Field experiment

### 3.1 The Thau Lagoon

The Thau Lagoon lies between 43°20'N and 43°28'N, and between 3°32'E and 3°42'E, along the French north-west Mediterranean coast. Its maximum length (north-east – south-west) is about 19 km, its width is less than 4.5 km and its mean depth is 4 m (see Fig. 3 for bathymetry information). The lagoon deepens to 10 m in the north-east and a maximum of 32 m is reached at the Fosse de la Vise (north-east). The salinity is generally slightly less than in the nearby sea and varies seasonally between 31 and 39 depending on the evaporation and precipitation rates, and on sea salinity variations (due to the nearby river runoff for instance).

The lagoon is connected to the sea through several passes or channels (in Sète, see Figure 2). Most of the water exchanges with the sea are due to tidal currents, with average daily values between  $0.7 \times 10^6$  and  $3.8 \times 10^6$  m<sup>3</sup>. Sea tides have a weak influence on the lagoon water level (less than 100 mm between peak and minimum). The surface current on the Thau Lagoon itself is considered as very weak, and can be safely neglected in the following.

### 3.2 Scintillometry

#### 3.2.1 Instruments

We used an Extra Large Aperture Scintillometer manufactured by Kipp & Zonen with technical characteristics close to those described by Kohsiek et al. (2002): the signal wavelength is 880 nm, the effective aperture 0.32 m and the focal length 0.61 m. Such instruments can operate over path lengths ranging between 1000 and 8000 m, with a minimum height above ground of 3 m. The XLAS was set up over a path of 4850 m between Loupian Saint-Félix near the small town of

1 Mèze and the IUT de Chimie in Sète (on the narrow tongue or ‘lido’ located  
2 between the Thau Lagoon and the sea - Figure 2). Measurements of the signal  
3 intensity were performed every second, then averaged over 10-min periods. The  
4 instrument operated continuously for nearly 8 months, from 15 January to 9  
5 September 2009. Except for very basic maintenance (checking the transmitter-  
6 receiver alignment and cleaning the windows of the transmitter and receiver every  
7 month) it worked reliably unattended. The data were automatically downloaded,  
8 stored in situ, and transmitted in real time during the whole experiment.

### 9 *3.2.2 Scintillometer Effective Height*

10 The transmitter height above water was 14 m and the receiver height 12 m. As the  
11 optical path lay entirely over water (Fig. 2 and 3a), the beam height variation was  
12 small and almost entirely due to this height difference, resulting in an effective  
13 height of 13 m. As already pointed out by several studies, scintillometry results  
14 are especially sensitive to the effective height (e.g. Hartogensis et al. 2003). A  
15 correction was made for the Earth's curvature effect on the 4850-m-long path  
16 (reaching 0.4 m). The final effective height  $z$  used in the data analysis was thus  
17 12.6 m. Note that, in contrast most studies using scintillometry over cultivated  
18 areas, forest patches or cities, the displacement height  $z_d$  which is directly related  
19 to the roughness length, was negligible over water. The classical  $z - z_d$  height  
20 difference used in scintillometry processing reduces to the effective height  $z$  here.

## 21 **3.3 Eddy Covariance Measurements**

22 Eddy covariance measurements were performed continuously from May to  
23 November 2009 at the Marseillan site (see Fig. 2 and 3b, and Table 1 for the  
24 complete list of instruments). The experimental platform where the high  
25 frequency instruments were set up is deeply anchored (metal poles several metres  
26 long) in the lagoon bottom and may be considered stable at the measurement  
27 frequency. The water depth at the platform position is  $4.2 \pm 0.3$  m.

### 28 *3.3.1 Data Processing*

29 The eddy covariance raw data were processed using the turbulence software  
30 package TK2 (Mauder and Foken 2004), which has been compared with several  
31 other turbulent flux packages (Mauder et al. 2008) and was shown to perform

1 accurately. Several corrections were applied during the processing, in an iterative  
2 way because of their interdependence (Mauder and Foken 2006). They concerned  
3 the conversion of fluctuations of the sonic temperature into fluctuations of  
4 temperature according to Schotanus et al. (1983), the correction for density  
5 fluctuations (temperature and humidity term, depending on the sensors used)  
6 according to Webb et al. (1980), and the correction of spectral loss according to  
7 Moore (1986), using the spectra models of Højstrup (1981) and Kaimal et al.  
8 (1972) for unstable conditions. The time delay of the gas analyzer with respect to  
9 the sonic anemometer was determined by calculating and maximizing cross  
10 correlations. The cross-wind correction of the sonic temperature (Liu et al. 2001)  
11 was not applied because it was already accounted for in the anemometer software.  
12 The wind sensor orientation was corrected using the planar fit method on a period  
13 of 10 days excluding observations with wind speed above  $10 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  (Wilczak et al.  
14 2001).

### 15 3.3.2 Quality Control

16 Several quality tests are implemented in the TK2 software. The steady state test  
17 (Foken and Wichura 1996) compares the statistical parameters determined for the  
18 averaging period of 30 minutes and for 6 intervals of 5 minutes within these 30  
19 minutes. For the sensible heat flux determination, the average of the covariance of  
20 the measured vertical wind  $w$  and the sonic temperature  $T_{sn}$  ( $\overline{w'T_{sn}'}$ ) determined  
21 over the six 5-min interval is compared with the covariance of the same  
22 parameters for the whole 30-min interval. The time series of the measurements is  
23 considered to be steady state if the relative difference between the two  
24 covariances is lower than 30%. The Integral Turbulence Characteristics test (ITC;  
25 Kaimal and Finnigan 1994) checks the development of turbulent conditions  
26 through the similarity characteristics of the atmospheric turbulence. The modelled  
27 and measured values of the standard deviation of a given parameter normalized by  
28 the corresponding scale parameter are compared. For the sensible heat flux  
29 determination, the ratio  $\sigma_T/T_*$  modelled using the functions of Foken et al. (1991)  
30 is compared to the measured values of  $\sigma_T/T_*$ , where  $\sigma_T$  is the standard deviation  
31 of the temperature. This ITC test is not applied under neutral conditions, when the  
32 absolute value of the sensible heat flux is lower than  $10 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , because  $\sigma_T/T_*$  is  
33 not well defined in that case.

1 We then used the overall flag system of Foken et al. (2004) as implemented in the  
2 TK2 software. This scheme for sensible heat flux determination is based on the  
3 results of the steady state test for  $H$  and on the results of the ITC test for the  $\sigma_T/T_*$   
4 and the  $\sigma_w/u_*$  time series, where  $\sigma_w$  is the standard deviation of the vertical wind.  
5 If the results of these two ITC tests disagree, the larger deviation is used for the  
6 overall flag. As recommended by Mauder and Foken (2004), only the data with  
7 overall flags of 1, 2, or 3 are kept for the analysis. The maximum deviations for  
8 the two tests corresponding to the overall flags are given with the percentage of  
9 our data for each flag in Table 2. More than 57% of the data are flagged 1 or 2,  
10 corresponding to very good steady state conditions and good turbulence  
11 conditions.

### 12 **3.3 Additional Measurements**

13 In addition to the EC station, three stations operated on and around the Thau  
14 Lagoon during the experiment to measure atmospheric parameters: air  
15 temperature, humidity, wind speed and direction were recorded at the Marseillan,  
16 Crique, and Sète stations (Fig. 2), the latter also including pressure measurements.  
17 This third station (Sète hereafter) was nearly collocated with the XLAS receiver  
18 but, as it was located closer to the lagoon shore, the wind conditions were very  
19 different from those observed at the Marseillan and Crique stations. The pressure  
20 data measured in Sète are used in the following as representative of the other  
21 locations.

22 Water surface temperature was recorded at the Marseillan and Crique stations,  
23 using 0.2-m-deep shielded thermometers ( $T_s$  hereafter) and infra-red radiometers  
24 ( $T_s^{IR}$  hereafter). The skin surface temperature provided by these infra-red  
25 radiometers gave some hints on the surface temperature homogeneity over the  
26 lagoon. Over the measurement time period, the mean difference between these  
27 skin surface temperatures was  $0.03 \pm 0.64$  °C, showing that, at the surface, the  
28 lagoon evolves rather uniformly. The difference between water temperatures ( $T_s$  -  
29  $T_s^{IR}$ ) in Marseillan (in Crique, respectively) reached  $-1.3 \pm 0.75$  °C ( $-3.8 \pm 1.1$  °C,  
30 resp.). Since  $T_s^{IR}$  is more prone to calibration errors and biases (Kohsiek et al.  
31 2007),  $T_s$  is used as the surface temperature in the following.

32 Below, we consider data from 14 May to 7 September 2009 corresponding to the  
33 common period between the XLAS, EC and other meteorological station

1 measurements. The scintillometry measurements were averaged over 30-min  
 2 periods to be consistent with the other measurements.

### 3 **3.4 Mean Atmospheric Conditions**

4 Figure 4 gives a wind rose, a histogram of the wind speed, and a histogram of the  
 5 surface temperature difference at the Marseillan station for the data actually used  
 6 in this study.

7 The mean wind conditions were mostly moderate, with wind speeds up to  $13 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ .  
 8 <sup>1</sup>. The wind direction was mainly west-north-west to north-north-west, then east to  
 9 south, corresponding to wind blowing from inland (Tramontane) and from the sea  
 10 over the narrow strip of land respectively. Around 75% of the observations  
 11 corresponded to wind blowing along the XLAS path, in the ‘continental’ (north-  
 12 westerly wind) and ‘lido’ (south-easterly wind) sectors in Figure 4a. Wind  
 13 directions perpendicular to the XLAS path (wind blowing from the Thau Lagoon,  
 14 either from the south-west or from the north-east, ‘lagoon’ sector in Fig 6a) still  
 15 made up more than 25% of the data.

### 16 **3.5 Bulk Computation**

17 The principle of a bulk algorithm is to estimate the flux corresponding to the  
 18 variable  $x$  (e.g. wind, heat or humidity) as  $F_x = C_x U (\delta_s - \delta_z)$ ,  $C_x$  being a transfer  
 19 coefficient, and  $\delta_s$  and  $\delta_z$  the corresponding parameter measured at the surface  
 20 and at the height  $z$ . Using these relationships in combination with, for instance  
 21  $\tau = \rho u_*^2$  for the momentum flux  $\tau$  or  $H = \rho c_p u_* T_*$  (equivalent to Eq. 10) for the  
 22 sensible heat flux allows to write  $u_* = C_D^{1/2} U$  and  $u_* T_* = C_H U (T_s - T)$ ,  $C_D$  being  
 23 the transfer coefficient for the momentum flux and  $C_H$  the transfer coefficient for  
 24 the sensible heat flux. These transfer coefficients can be evaluated from the  
 25 roughness length and the Obukhov length using the formulae:

$$26 \quad C_D = k^2 \left( \ln \frac{z}{z_0} - \Psi_m \left( \frac{z}{L_{MO}} \right) \right)^{-2} \quad (20)$$

27 and :

$$28 \quad C_H = k^2 \left( \ln \frac{z}{z_0} - \Psi_m \left( \frac{z}{L_{MO}} \right) \right)^{-1} \left( \ln \frac{z}{z_T} - \Psi_T \left( \frac{z}{L_{MO}} \right) \right)^{-1} \quad (21)$$

29 It is assumed here that the air temperature and the wind are measured at the same  
 30 height  $z$ . The roughness length and the Obukhov length are related to the friction

1 velocity and to the scale parameter for temperature as shown by Eq. 16, and a  
2 conjunction of Eq. 11 and 13. Similar relationships allow to express  $z_T$  and the  
3 universal function for temperature  $\Psi_T$  from the same group of parameters. This  
4 set of Eq. 11, 16, 20 and 21 together with the bulk relationships  $u_* = C_D^{1/2}U$  and  
5  $u_*T_* = C_H U(T_s - T)$  is used iteratively to solve for  $u_*$ ,  $T_*$ ,  $z_0$  and  $L_{MO}$ , and thus to  
6 obtain estimates of the momentum and sensible heat fluxes from measurements of  
7 the mean wind, the air temperature and the surface water temperature.  
8 In section 2.3.2 and here below, a bulk algorithm (COARE 3.0, Fairall et al.  
9 2003) is used to estimate the Obukhov length, the roughness length or the sensible  
10 heat flux.

### 11 **3.6 Data Representativeness**

12 For logistical reasons, the high-rate flux measurements and mean meteorological  
13 parameters (Marseillan-EC station) were performed several kilometres south-  
14 westward of the XLAS path (Fig. 2). In this part, we investigate whether the  
15 measurements performed with XLAS are theoretically comparable to those  
16 recorded at the (Marseillan-EC) reference station; namely, whether the respective  
17 footprints cover each other or not.

18 A footprint analysis using the model of Schmid (1994) was performed for the  
19 sensible heat flux along the scintillometer path, and for the temperature and wind  
20 fields (Marseillan-EC station). Both footprints were computed using the FSAM  
21 software (Schmid 1994), based on the analytical solution of the 2-D advection-  
22 diffusion equation for non-neutral stratification.

23 The along-XLAS-path footprint integration was then computed by combining the  
24 flux footprint itself with the weighting function of the XLAS as provided in the  
25 XLAS manual (Meijninger et al. 2002; Kipp & Zonen 2007). The Obukhov and  
26 roughness lengths were computed using the bulk algorithm COARE 3.0 together  
27 with atmospheric parameters observed at the Marseillan-EC station.

28 Typical footprints corresponding to wind blowing across (respectively along) the  
29 XLAS path are shown Figure 5a (resp. 5b). These examples are based on  
30 observed unstable stratification conditions corresponding to 15 July 2009  
31 (respectively 15 May 2009), with an Obukhov length of -8 m (-126 m), a  
32 roughness length of  $3.0 \times 10^{-5}$  m ( $1.8 \times 10^{-4}$  m), and a wind speed of  $3.2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$   
33 ( $10.1 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ). These situations are thus typical of very unstable, moderately windy

1 lagoon conditions (slightly unstable, windy conditions resp.). Note that roughness  
2 length was consistently an order of magnitude higher on 15 May 2009 compared  
3 to the 15 July 2009 conditions.

4 These footprints correspond approximately to the maximum size of the XLAS  
5 integrated source area observed during this experiment, and show clearly that 1)  
6 the measurement footprints of the EC station and of the XLAS do not cover each  
7 other, whatever the atmospheric conditions for unstable stratification; 2) the  
8 respective sizes of these footprints or source areas are very different.

9 To further refine this, the same footprint analysis method was used to process the  
10 source area accounting for 90% of the signal for every averaging interval of the  
11 XLAS processing. The mean surface was  $1.6 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$  (maximum value  $4.4 \times 10^6$   
12  $\text{m}^2$ ) for the XLAS,  $2.3 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$  (maximum value  $3.7 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$ ) for the EC station.

13 The actual fraction of lagoon (respectively land) surface was computed for each  
14 XLAS measurement to check whether these XLAS measurements are  
15 representative of the air-water interface or could have been influenced by land  
16 surface conditions. The fraction of land surface in the XLAS footprints ranged  
17 from 10 to 22%. Measurements with land surface less than 15% were considered  
18 representative of the lagoon surface. They represented 98% of the measurements  
19 made in the 'lagoon' sector (Fig. 4a), but only 39% of the measurements made in  
20 the 'continental' sector and 91% of the measurements made in the 'lido' sector.

21 EC- and XLAS-derived sensible heat fluxes corresponded neither to the same  
22 location nor to the same footprint size. XLAS measurements made with wind  
23 blowing in the 'continental' sector (Fig. 4a) were partly representative of land  
24 surface, while the EC station measurements are always representative of the  
25 lagoon surface. These differences should be kept in mind when analyzing the  
26 results.

## 27 **4 Sensitivity Analysis and Error Budget**

28 Several tests of sensitivity to input parameters are described below and  
29 summarized in Table 3. They correspond to various steps of the processing as  
30 described in part 2. All of them were performed on a 20-day dataset (9 to 28 June  
31 2009, hereafter referred to as 'the 20-day test period') representative of the mean  
32 atmospheric conditions and of their variability. Finally, a detailed error budget is  
33 presented.



#### 1 **4.1 From Raw Measurements to $C_n^2$**

2 As stated in section 2.1.1, Eq. 1 was used to derive the  $C_n^2$  values from the  
3 intensity fluctuations measured by the XLAS. A sensitivity test was performed on  
4 the test period of 20 days to assess whether using Eq. 3 rather than Eq. 1 to obtain  
5 the  $C_n^2$  values changed the final results (sensible heat fluxes). The mean  
6 difference (Eq. 3 – Eq. 1) on  $H$  is  $0.81 \pm 1.62 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , corresponding to a mean  
7 relative difference (mean absolute value of the difference divided by the absolute  
8 value of  $H$ ) of  $5.0 \pm 10.8\%$  (Table 2). Here and in the following, all the figures  
9 given with a ‘ $\pm$ ’ sign are standard deviations; i.e. RMS with respect to mean  
10 values.

11 Note that a full error assessment of the  $C_n^2$  signal measured by the XLAS should  
12 include a comparison of the raw signal ( $C_n^2$ ) between at least two collocated  
13 scintillometers. This was not done in this study.

#### 14 **4.2 From $C_n^2$ to $C_T^2$**

15 The relationship between the structure parameter of the air refractive index and  
16 the structure parameter of the temperature is given Eq. 5. It can be simplified to  
17 Eq. 6 or to Eq. 7 depending on the mean value of the correlation coefficient  
18 between the temperature and humidity fluctuations  $R_{Tq}$ . To assess the effect of  
19 taking this correlation  $R_{Tq}$  equal to zero in the final results (sensible heat flux  
20 estimates), we performed a sensitivity test on the 20-day test period. The sensible  
21 heat fluxes were processed using Eq. 7 (reference solution), the full relationship  
22 between  $C_n^2$  and  $C_T^2$  derived from Eq. 5 with  $R_{Tq}$  estimated using eddy covariance  
23 (full solution), and the classical relationship Eq. 6 (classical solution). The mean  
24 difference (full minus reference solutions) was  $0.17 \pm 0.48 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , corresponding  
25 to a mean relative difference of  $1.0 \pm 1.8\%$ , while the mean difference (classical  
26 minus reference solution) was  $-3.35 \pm 2.54 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , corresponding to a mean  
27 relative difference of  $21.0 \pm 8.8\%$ .

28 This relationship between  $C_n^2$  and  $C_T^2$  is very sensitive to the value of the Bowen  
29 ratio used. As stated in section 2.2.2, the Bowen ratios obtained from a  
30 computation using the gradient method were used to obtain final results as  
31 independent as possible from EC-derived fluxes. However, the discrepancies  
32 between the two Bowen ratio datasets are significant (see section 2.2.2, Fig. 1). To

1 assess the uncertainties due to the use of gradient Bowen ratios rather than EC-  
2 derived ones in this Eq. 7 (and this one only), we compared the sensible heat  
3 fluxes obtained using the two datasets over the test period of 20 days (Table 3).  
4 The mean difference (EC-derived minus gradient) is  $-0.15 \pm 3.69 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , with a  
5 correlation coefficient of 0.97 and a mean relative difference of  $11.0 \pm 22.2\%$ . We  
6 also assessed the sensitivity of the sensible heat fluxes to a change of + 0.2 on the  
7 Bowen ratios, over the same period. The mean difference was  $-1.28 \pm 6.47 \text{ W m}^{-2}$   
8 with a correlation coefficient of 0.91 and a mean relative difference of  $13.1 \pm$   
9  $48.3\%$ .

#### 10 **4.3 From $C_T^2$ to Sensible Heat Flux**

11 The effect of using the air temperature rather than the virtual air temperature in  
12 the XLAS processing (use of Eq.12) was assessed on the test dataset and proved  
13 not to be significant. The mean difference (air temperature minus virtual air  
14 temperature) was  $0.10 \pm 0.07 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , with a perfect correlation, corresponding to a  
15 mean relative difference of  $0.6 \pm 0.2\%$ . The effect of neglecting the buoyancy flux  
16 effect in the temperature scale (Eq. 13) was estimated on the same dataset, and  
17 shown to be significant. The mean difference (without humidity minus with  
18 humidity) was  $3.13 \pm 2.19 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , with a correlation coefficient  $R = 0.99$  and a  
19 mean relative difference of  $29.0 \pm 31.0\%$ .

20 In addition to being part of Eq. 7 relating the structure parameter of the air  
21 refractive index and the structure parameter of temperature, the Bowen ratio is  
22 part of this Eq. 13. To assess the impact of using gradient Bowen ratios rather  
23 than EC-derived ones in this Eq. 13 (and this one only), we compared the sensible  
24 heat fluxes obtained using the two datasets over the test period of 20 days (Table  
25 3). The mean difference (EC-derived minus gradient) is  $-0.08 \pm 1.75 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , with  
26 a correlation coefficient of 0.99 and a mean relative difference of  $4.0 \pm 15.9\%$ .  
27 We also assessed the sensitivity of the sensible heat fluxes to a change of + 0.2 on  
28 the Bowen ratios, over the same period. The mean difference is negligible ( $0.01 \pm$   
29  $0.36 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  with a perfect correlation and a mean relative difference of  $1.5 \pm$   
30  $2.2\%$ ).

31 We then assessed the impact of using various Bowen ratio sources in the whole  
32 processing (Eq.7 and Eq. 13). The mean difference obtained when using EC-  
33 derived Bowen ratios rather than gradient ones is  $-0.38 \pm 3.53 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , with a

1 correlation coefficient of 0.97 and a mean relative difference of  $11.2 \pm 22.7\%$  (see  
 2 Fig. 6, Table 3). A change of + 0.2 on the Bowen ratios resulted in a mean  
 3 difference of  $-1.67 \pm 4.41 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  with a correlation coefficient of 0.94 and a mean  
 4 relative difference of  $13.8 \pm 48.7\%$ ). Doubling (respectively halving) these Bowen  
 5 ratios as shown Fig. 6 resulted in a mean difference of  $0.93 \pm 1.44 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  ( $1.09 \pm$   
 6  $1.52 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ ), with a perfect correlation and a mean relative difference of  $8.0 \pm$   
 7  $16.3\%$  ( $10.9 \pm 15.1\%$ ). These tests show the very high sensitivity of the XLAS  
 8 processing results to the input Bowen ratio. The main influence of the Bowen  
 9 ratio comes from the (modified) relationship between  $C_n^2$  and  $C_T^2$  (Eq. 7).  
 10 A further step would be to adjust the Bowen ratio during the processing, as  
 11 suggested by McJannet et al. (2011).  
 12 A sensitivity test was performed on the 20-day test period to assess the impact of  
 13  $z_0$  a priori values on the sensible heat flux estimates (Table 3). Using a priori  
 14 values of  $10^{-3} \text{ m}$  (respectively  $10^{-5} \text{ m}$ ) rather than  $10^{-4} \text{ m}$  for  $z_0$  resulted in  
 15 negligible differences in the sensible heat flux (less than  $1.0 \pm 5.9\%$  mean relative  
 16 difference). We also compared (on the same test period) the roughness lengths  
 17 obtained in the XLAS processing with the bulk derived roughness lengths  
 18 (obtained using COARE 3.0). The mean difference (bulk minus XLAS-derived  $z_0$ )  
 19 was  $-1.24 \times 10^{-6} \pm 7.87 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}$ , with a correlation coefficient above 0.99 and a  
 20 mean relative difference of  $5.5 \pm 13.3\%$ . We therefore conclude that computing  $z_0$   
 21 iteratively using Eq. 16 gives good results with respect to the bulk analysis.  
 22 To assess whether adjusting the roughness length iteratively (Eq. 16) had a  
 23 significant effect on the results or not, the scintillometry processing was  
 24 performed on the 20-day dataset with fixed  $z_0$  inputs: using a mean fixed value for  
 25  $z_0$  (the same value for every XLAS measurement, taken as the average of the  $z_0$   
 26 values computed from bulk) resulted in an  $H$  mean difference of  $-0.19 \pm 1.34 \text{ W}$   
 27  $\text{m}^{-2}$  (fixed minus adjusted value; mean relative difference of 3.0%). Using  
 28 individual fixed  $z_0$  values for every XLAS measurement (computed from bulk)  
 29 resulted in a very low mean difference of  $0.02 \pm 0.60 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  (relative mean  
 30 difference of 1.0%). Individual fixed  $z_0$  values obtained from the EC analysis  
 31 resulted in a change of  $-0.34 \pm 1.46 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  (relative mean difference of 2.9%).  
 32 Adjusting  $z_0$  during the XLAS processing caused no significant changes in the  
 33 final results.

1 The impact of using different universal functions  $\varphi_T$  (section 2.3.4) for unstable  
2 situations on the XLAS sensible heat flux estimates was assessed on the 20-day  
3 test period. The function of Edson and Fairall (1998) was tested against those of  
4 Andreas (1988b), Hill et al. (1992), Thiermann and Grassl (1992) and De Bruin  
5 et al. (1993). The global results of this comparison are presented in Table 3 and  
6 Figure 7. Mean relative differences with respect to the function of Edson and  
7 Fairall (1998) reach as much as  $18.3 \pm 5.2\%$ . The differences between the heat  
8 fluxes computed using these functions roughly showed a proportionality  
9 relationship, some functions (Andreas 1988b; De Bruin et al. 1993)  
10 overestimating the results, while others (Hill et al. 1992; Thiermann and Grassl  
11 1992) underestimated them.

12 Sensitivity tests were performed to assess the impact of using another momentum  
13 stability function (Beljaars and Holtslag 1991) than the Businger-Dyer expression  
14 (Eq. 18 and 19) on the sensible heat flux estimates. On the test dataset, the mean  
15 difference was  $0 \pm 0.37 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , corresponding to a mean relative difference of  $1.1$   
16  $\pm 2.0\%$ .

#### 17 **4.4 Error Budget**

18 The results of these various sensitivity tests are summarized in Table 3. The main  
19 possible error source appears to be due to using the scale parameter for  
20 temperature  $T^*$  rather than the scale parameter including the buoyancy flux  $T_v^*$ ,  
21 with a mean relative difference of 29%. The second possible error source is  
22 related to the use of the classical relationship between the refractive index  
23 structure parameter  $C_n^2$  and the temperature structure parameter  $C_T^2$  (Eq. 6) rather  
24 than the relationship adapted to the conditions over water (Eq.7), with a mean  
25 relative difference of 21% in the final result  $H$ . These two errors are specific to the  
26 use of scintillometry above water and appear as both systematic biases (mean  
27 difference above  $3 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  in absolute value) and random errors, as shown by the  
28 high standard deviations (above  $2 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ ). The origin of these two main  
29 uncertainties in the final results clearly shows that adapting the XLAS processing  
30 scheme to take into account: 1) the humidity effect in the scale parameter for  
31 temperature and 2) a correlation between the temperature and humidity  
32 fluctuations closer to zero than to  $\pm 1$  was mandatory to ensure a good precision  
33 in the final results. Computing the roughness length  $z_0$  iteratively at every step of

1 the processing, however, resulted in no change (1% of mean relative difference) in  
2 the final results, provided the bulk roughness length is used as a fixed input. Even  
3 using a fixed mean value (mean bulk value) for  $z_0$  resulted in only 3% mean  
4 relative difference in the final results. It should be noted that this experiment on a  
5 lagoon corresponds to very smooth surface state (roughness lengths less than  $10^{-3}$   
6 m).

7 Other significant uncertainties are not specific to an experiment over a lake. They  
8 may result from the choice of the universal function  $\varphi_T$ . In particular, using the  
9 universal function of De Bruin et al. (1993) rather than the Edson and Fairall  
10 (1998) one changes the results by 18% (mean relative difference). Once again,  
11 this error is the sum of a systematic bias (more than  $3 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ ) and random errors  
12 (standard deviation of  $2.66 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ ). The Edson and Fairall (1998) function  $\varphi_T$ ,  
13 which was used in the processing, gave values for the final sensible heat flux  
14 intermediate between other universal functions (see Fig. 3). Significant  
15 uncertainties (up to 14% of mean relative difference) resulted from the choice of  
16 the sources of the Bowen ratio used as an input to the XLAS processing (Eq. 7).  
17 This dependency was exacerbated by the low values of this Bowen ratio over  
18 water, as the Bowen ratio appears in the denominator in Eq. 7 and Eq. 13. This  
19 uncertainty resulted more from random errors than systematic biases, as shown by  
20 the high standard deviations (between  $1.52$  and  $4.41 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ ) and the moderate  
21 mean differences. The final processing used the Bowen ratio values from a  
22 gradient method computation. This is probably not the best possible choice, since  
23 these computed values proved to be significantly different from the EC-derived  
24 Bowen ratios (Figure 1), but it was desirable to obtain results fully independent of  
25 the EC observations here.

26 Finally the total mean relative error may be estimated as the sum of the  
27 uncertainties for which no clear choice or correction could be made, namely the  
28 input Bowen ratio (mean relative difference of  $14 \pm 49\%$ ), the universal function  
29  $\varphi_T$  (excluding De Bruin et al.'s (1993) function, mean relative difference of  $5 \pm$   
30  $5\%$ ), and the formula for computing the refractive index structure parameter  $C_n^2$   
31 from raw data (mean relative difference of  $5 \pm 11\%$ ). If these three error sources  
32 are considered as independent, the resulting final systematic error (sum of the  
33 variances) is close to 16% for the XLAS processing, and the random error (sum of

1 the RMS of the variances) is 50%, largely due to the uncertainties on the Bowen  
2 ratios.

### 3 **5 Validation of Fluxes**

4 As the XLAS processing was performed using input variables computed solely  
5 from meteorological measurements made independently of the EC observations,  
6 XLAS and EC outputs may be regarded as independent results. In the following,  
7 we compare XLAS-derived sensible heat fluxes to those obtained using the EC  
8 measurements.

9 Figure 8 shows a general comparison between the XLAS and EC sensible heat  
10 flux, with a colour code corresponding to the wind direction. The regression  
11 between the XLAS and EC estimates gives  $H_{XLAS} = 0.93 H_{EC} + 0.96$  [ $\text{W m}^{-2}$ ],  
12 meaning that the XLAS values are slightly underestimated relative to the EC ones.  
13 The correlation coefficient  $R$  is 0.832, the mean difference  $-0.62 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , and the  
14 RMS  $9.53 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ . The agreement is thus good but, as the sensible heat flux values  
15 over the Thau Lagoon are generally low ( $19.7 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  and  $22.8 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  for the  
16 XLAS estimates mean and median values respectively), the RMS of the difference  
17 represents 73% of the flux value. The colour code used to represent the fluxes  
18 (Fig. 8) clearly shows some systematic effects related to the wind direction. High  
19 sensible heat flux values (above  $40 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ ) correspond to the ‘continental’ wind  
20 sector (or wind blowing from inland, in yellow). They do not show any systematic  
21 bias in the XLAS estimates with respect to EC-derived fluxes. Fluxes  
22 corresponding to the ‘lido’ wind sector (wind blowing from the Mediterranean  
23 Sea, in cyan) show an underestimation of the XLAS estimates with respect to the  
24 EC estimates. Fluxes in red (north-east part of the ‘lagoon’ wind sector) indicate a  
25 slight overestimation of the XLAS estimates with respect to the EC ones.

26 Differences between XLAS and EC estimates may result either from instrument  
27 specificities (location or footprint differences as pointed out in section 3.5), from  
28 theoretical concerns (deviation from MOST), or from internal uncertainties of the  
29 two techniques. In the following, we first investigate whether the observed  
30 discrepancies may be explained by deviations from MOST, then we focus on  
31 discrepancies that may be related to either location or footprint differences.

## 1 **5.1 Deviations from MOST**

2 MOST is the theory underlying both the XLAS processing and bulk computation.  
3 It is based on several hypotheses concerning the atmospheric surface layer, viz.:  
4 [1] steady state conditions; [2] sufficiently developed turbulence; [3] horizontal  
5 homogeneity of the air flow; [4] turbulent fluxes varying little with height.

6 If one or more of the above assumptions are not fulfilled, then MOST conditions  
7 are not met: the XLAS processing scheme and bulk computation rely on non-  
8 verified conditions and the sensible heat fluxes estimated using either the XLAS  
9 or the bulk algorithm may be biased or affected by random errors when compared  
10 to EC measurements.

11 Two of these assumptions – steady state conditions and fully developed  
12 turbulence ([1] and [2]) – are also used within the EC processing scheme, and  
13 their validity is verified through the quality control of the TK2 software. As  
14 recommended by Mauder and Foken (2004), only the data with overall flags of 1,  
15 2, or 3 were kept for the analysis. This first selection should thus guarantee that  
16 assumptions [1] and [2] are met for the dataset on which the present study relies.

17 Assumption [3], corresponding to horizontally homogeneous conditions within  
18 the measurement footprints is probably not always met, especially for wind  
19 directions in the ‘continental’ and ‘lido’ sectors. The geographical situation of the  
20 lagoon enclosed between small hills and a ‘lido’ is favourable to air mass  
21 advection from inland that may result in non-homogeneous conditions within the  
22 XLAS footprint. This non-homogeneity may affect the measured parameter  
23 (structure parameter for refractive index  $C_n^2$ ) or the physical value of the sensible  
24 heat flux. As a result, MOST is not fulfilled, the XLAS processing scheme relies  
25 on non-verified conditions, and the sensible heat fluxes estimated using the XLAS  
26 may be biased or affected by random errors.

27 The failure of assumption [4] (turbulent fluxes almost constant with height within  
28 the atmospheric surface layer) may correspond, for instance, to the formation of  
29 an internal boundary layer due to the roughness change between the land surface  
30 and the lagoon surface, or to the formation of a wave boundary layer due to the  
31 surface state of the lagoon. Measurements of significant wave heights during the  
32 experiment gave a mean value of 0.020 m, with a maximum value of 0.271 m,  
33 showing that there is almost no wave field at the lagoon surface. We have,

1 however, no further measurements providing information on a possible internal  
2 boundary layer.

3 In the following, we attempt to quantify the level of agreement of the atmospheric  
4 conditions with MOST requirements, using the EC measurements as a reference  
5 dataset. As bulk computations rely on MOST, and as the 'slow' parameter  
6 measurements needed are exactly collocated with the EC measurements (both  
7 recorded at the EC-Marseillan station), we chose to quantify the deviations from  
8 MOST by comparing the bulk estimates and EC measurements. The results of this  
9 comparison are representative of MOST fulfilment at Marseillan, but probably not  
10 within the XLAS source area as: i) the location is not the same, and conditions  
11 could therefore be different; ii) the respective sizes of the footprint areas for the  
12 XLAS and EC estimates are very different.

13 A global comparison between the EC sensible heat fluxes and that computed  
14 using the COARE 3.0 software is provided in Figure 9a. The correlation  
15 coefficient ( $R = 0.850$ ) and the  $RMS = 9.18 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  are slightly better than those  
16 obtained between XLAS and EC measurements. The regression between bulk  
17 estimates and EC values is  $H_{bulk} = 0.98 H_{EC} - 0.06 [\text{W m}^{-2}]$ , showing that the bulk  
18 fluxes slightly underestimate the EC values. There is no mean bias. The general  
19 agreement is then very good but with some scatter close to the level obtained  
20 when comparing the two measurement datasets. It is therefore difficult to  
21 conclude on the general fulfilment of MOST at the Marseillan station using the  
22 EC estimates. The colour patterns that were observed in the XLAS-EC flux  
23 comparison (Fig. 8) are still present, and even more clear, in Figure 9a,  
24 confirming that they correspond to systematic effects.

25 These systematic deviations between the bulk fluxes and EC measurements may  
26 come either from atmospheric physical effects (non-homogeneity) leading to  
27 discrepancies between the actual conditions and that corresponding to MOST, or  
28 from inaccuracies in the EC estimates. To check the latter hypothesis, the same  
29 comparison between EC results and bulk computation was made using only the  
30 highest quality EC measurements (flag = 1, see Table 2). The very same patterns  
31 were observed with striking clarity (Figure 9b), indicating that these deviations  
32 are more probably due to the atmospheric conditions than to the quality of the EC  
33 measurements. As such a quality flag is supposed to correspond to both steady  
34 state conditions and well developed turbulence, these discrepancies between



1 observations and theory should be related either to horizontal non-homogeneities  
2 (assumption [3]) or to variations of the turbulent fluxes with height (assumption  
3 [4]). In the following, we use the footprint analysis of the XLAS measurements to  
4 select – in the EC and bulk flux datasets - the observations corresponding to the  
5 most homogeneous conditions, that is to say atmospheric conditions that best  
6 fulfil at least three of the underlying MOST assumptions.

7 Using the results of the previous XLAS footprint analysis, we now consider only  
8 the data in which at least 85% of the area corresponds to lagoon surface and with  
9 wind direction in the ‘lagoon’ sector, which represent 21% of the total number of  
10 measurements. A comparison between the EC-derived and bulk computed fluxes  
11 obtained using this reduced dataset (Figure 10) shows a very good correlation ( $R$   
12  $= 0.912$ ), higher than that obtained for the full dataset ( $R = 0.850$ ), and a reduced  
13 RMS of  $6.06 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  (RMS  $= 9.18 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  previously). The linear regression now  
14 reads  $H_{bulk} = 1.01 H_{EC} + 1.67$ , and there is a positive bias between the two datasets  
15 of  $1.85 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  ( $H_{bulk} - H_{EC}$ ). No clear patterns in connection with the wind sector  
16 (north-eastward vs. south-westward) are visible in Fig. 10. Focusing on  
17 homogeneous conditions by selecting the data representative of the lagoon surface  
18 thus significantly reduces the deviations from MOST, as shown by the improved  
19 agreement between the EC fluxes and bulk estimates.

## 20 **5.2 Footprint and Location Differences**

21 As no representative measurements were performed near the middle of the XLAS  
22 path, no direct comparison of the XLAS estimates with the bulk computation was  
23 possible. We focus here on the comparison between XLAS estimates (MOST-  
24 dependent, not collocated) and EC measurements. We used the same methodology  
25 as previously on the whole dataset to check whether selecting only the  
26 measurements corresponding to the theoretically most homogeneous conditions  
27 improved the agreement between the XLAS- and EC-derived fluxes (Figure 11).  
28 The agreement between XLAS- and EC-derived fluxes was better than when all  
29 the measurements were considered. Keeping only the data with more than 85% of  
30 the footprint on the lagoon surface and wind direction in the lagoon sector indeed  
31 reduced the dispersion between the XLAS and the EC estimates. As previously,  
32 no systematic effect connected with the wind direction (north-eastward vs. south-  
33 westward) was observed. The best linear regression between the XLAS and eddy

1 covariance estimates was  $H_{XLAS} = 0.96 H_{EC} + 3.29$  [ $\text{W m}^{-2}$ ], with a large mean bias  
2 of  $2.65 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  and an RMS of  $8.68 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ . The systematic part of the  
3 discrepancies was higher ( $2.65 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  for the selection vs.  $-0.62 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  for the full  
4 dataset) but with a significantly reduced random part ( $8.68 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  for the selection  
5 vs.  $9.53 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  for the full dataset). The correlation between the two datasets was  
6 quite good ( $R = 0.807$ ) but lower than what was obtained when considering the  
7 whole dataset.

8 Interpreting the systematic discrepancy of  $2.65 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  is not straightforward.  
9 However, part of it is probably due to the disagreement noted previously between  
10 the actual conditions (illustrated by the EC-derived fluxes) and MOST  
11 requirements (on which the derivation of the sensible heat flux from XLAS  
12 measurements relies). In particular, even when the measurements were selected to  
13 be representative of the lagoon surface, non-homogeneity in the atmospheric  
14 conditions could occur in connection with the advection of cold or warm air from  
15 inland or mild air from the Mediterranean. Another part of the discrepancy is  
16 probably due to observing and/or processing errors of the XLAS itself (estimated  
17 to be 16%, section 4.4), and of the eddy covariance method.

18 The last part of this disagreement may be explained by the difference of location  
19 of the two instruments. As shown by the bathymetry map (Fig. 5), the XLAS  
20 source area includes zones of various depth, ranging 2 m close to the shores to 10  
21 m near the middle of the lagoon. The water depth in the EC source area is much  
22 more uniform and close to 4 m. This may result in different thermal behaviour of  
23 the lagoon at the two locations, and then in discrepancy in the sensible heat flux.

24 The discrepancy due to horizontal remoteness may be reinforced (or partly  
25 compensated) by the measurement height difference (6 m for the EC station, 12.6  
26 m for the XLAS): Mahrt et al. (1998) indeed noted a heat flux difference of up to  
27 50% between the 3-m and 10-m level measurements during RASEX, in case of  
28 cold air advection.

## 29 **6 Conclusion**

30 For the first time, an Extra Large Aperture Scintillometer (XLAS) performed  
31 reliably over water for a long period of time.

32 We expose here how the algorithms classically used over land surfaces to derive  
33 sensible heat fluxes from scintillation measurements can be adapted to obtain air-

1 sea or air-lake fluxes. The main adaptations of the processing schemes concern (i)  
2 the use of a scale parameter for temperature including a humidity correction  
3 (rather than a temperature scale parameter without humidity), and (ii) the use of a  
4 correlation coefficient between temperature and humidity fluctuations close to  
5 zero as in Odhiambo et al. (2009). Not accounting for these effects (typical of the  
6 lagoon environment) may result in 20 to 30% systematic errors in the sensible  
7 heat flux estimates. In contrast, using a fixed mean value for the roughness length,  
8 rather than adjusting this value during the processing (as we did), results in minor  
9 changes in the results (3% or less). A full error budget of the XLAS processing,  
10 including several sensitivity tests, showed that the final results are mainly  
11 dependent on the choice of the Bowen ratio used as a fixed input in the  
12 processing. A further improvement of the method (beyond the scope of this study)  
13 would be to test the iterative Bowen ratio adjustment suggested recently by  
14 McJannet et al. (2011). Another processing parameter impacting the final results  
15 is the universal similarity function  $\varphi_T$ . The function of Edson and Fairall (1998)  
16 used here gave intermediate results among the different universal functions  
17 reported in the literature. Finally, the systematic error level due to XLAS  
18 processing uncertainties amounts 16%, with a random error of  $\approx 50\%$ .

19 The comparison of the results with nearby EC fluxes is incomplete due to lack of  
20 real collocation, as logistical constraints prevailed in the choice of instrument  
21 location. Nevertheless, the general agreement between the two estimated sensible  
22 heat fluxes during the whole experiment (117 days) is rather good, and  
23 comparable to what could be obtained over heterogeneous land surfaces or on the  
24 open sea from other instruments: the regression equation for the whole dataset is  
25  $H_{XLAS} = 0.93 H_{EC} + 0.96$  [ $\text{W m}^{-2}$ ], with a correlation coefficient of 0.832 and an  
26 RMS of  $9.53 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ . The agreement between the EC-derived and XLAS fluxes is  
27 only slightly lower than that obtained between EC measurements and bulk fluxes  
28 computed using collocated atmospheric/hydrological mean parameters (RMS =  
29  $9.18 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ ). LAS can thus be considered as a valuable technique for assessing  
30 sensible heat fluxes at sea with an accuracy better than  $10 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ .

31 As shown by the comparison of the collocated EC-derived and bulk computed  
32 fluxes, some of the discrepancies between XLAS and EC fluxes are due to  
33 deviations from MOST. If only the data representative of the lagoon surface are  
34 used, the discrepancies between the EC-derived and bulk computed fluxes fall

1 from 9.18 to 6.06 W m<sup>-2</sup> (RMS) with a bias of 1.85 W m<sup>-2</sup>. Using the same  
2 selected dataset, the agreement between the XLAS fluxes and the EC-derived  
3 fluxes improves, the RMS being reduced to 8.68 W m<sup>-2</sup>. Keeping only the  
4 measurements representative of more homogeneous conditions thus proves to  
5 provide better results.

6 The remaining discrepancies between the XLAS and EC sensible heat fluxes are  
7 difficult to interpret. They may be related to the difference in the instrument  
8 locations (several kilometres), the difference between the measurement heights (a  
9 few metres), and to the respective sizes of the source areas, which differ by  
10 several orders of magnitude: the XLAS footprint, in particular, is large enough to  
11 include various surface conditions. This is similar to horizontal effects that can  
12 affect lakes as pointed out by Elo (2007) and proved to be difficult to take into  
13 account for modelling studies.

14 These first results need to be confirmed with perfectly collocated XLAS and EC  
15 measurements, as our comparison clearly suffers from the distinct measurement  
16 locations, the impact of which is amplified by the footprint differences. In  
17 addition, an interesting perspective of this study could be to perform the same  
18 kind of comparisons in an open sea environment, including strong winds and  
19 various sea states (especially swell).

#### 20 Acknowledgements

21 The authors are grateful to the Ifremer Sète technical team, to A. Manteghetti, IUT de Chimie,  
22 Université de Montpellier 2, to O. Filippi, Pépinières Filippi Loupian, and to M. Cazanova for  
23 their support during the field experiment and for their authorization to set up the instrumentation.  
24 Thanks to G. Pellecuer and C. Dupressoir, Météo France, for their contribution to meteorological  
25 measurements. We thank R. Verney, Ifremer, for providing spectral wave measurements. We are  
26 grateful to P. Le Moigne, CNRM, for providing the Thau Lagoon bathymetry data. Most of the  
27 graphics were made using the GMT package of Wessel and Smith (1998). We thank H.P. Schmid,  
28 Indiana University, for providing the FSAM/SAM software. The Thau Lagoon and surroundings  
29 map was downloaded from the © Google Maps service, part of information are provided by  
30 GéoRoute © 2008 IGN France and/or © 2008 IGN France.

31

## 1 **References**

- 2 Andreas EL (1988a) Two-wavelength method of measuring path-averaged turbulent surface heat  
3 fluxes. *J Atmos Ocean Technol* 6: 280-292
- 4 Andreas EL (1988b) Estimating  $C_n^2$  over snow and sea ice from meteorological data. *J Opt Soc*  
5 *Amer* 5:481-495
- 6 Beljaars ACM, Holtslag AAM (1991) Flux parameterization over land surfaces for atmospheric  
7 models. *J Appl Meteorol* 30:327-341
- 8 Beyrich F, De Bruin HAR, Meijninger WML, Schipper JW, Lohse H (2002) Results from one  
9 year continuous operation of a large aperture scintillometer over a heterogeneous land surface.  
10 *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 105:85-97
- 11 Bourras D, Weill A, Caniaux G, Eymard L, Boulès B, Letourneur S, Legain D, Key E, Baudin F,  
12 Piguet B, Traullé O, Bouhours G, Sinardet B, Barrié J, Vinson J, Boutet F, Berthod C, Cléménçon  
13 A (2009) Turbulent air-sea fluxes in the Gulf of Guinea during the AMMA experiment. *J Geophys*  
14 *Res* 114, C04014 doi:10.1029/2008JC004951
- 15 De Bruin HAR, Kohsiek W, van den Hurk BJJM (1993) Verification of some methods to  
16 determine the fluxes of momentum, sensible heat, and water vapour using standard deviation and  
17 structure parameter of scalar meteorological quantities. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 63:231-257
- 18 De Bruin HAR, van den Hurk BJJM, Kohsiek W (1995) The scintillation method tested over a dry  
19 vineyard area. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 76:25-40
- 20 Edson JB, Fairall CW (1998) Similarity relationships in the marine atmospheric surface layer for  
21 terms in the TKE and scalar variance budgets. *J Atmos Sci* 55:2311-2328
- 22 Elo PAR (2007) The energy balance and vertical thermal structure of two small boreal lakes in  
23 summer. *Boreal Env Res* 12:585-600
- 24 Ezzahar J, Chehbouni A (2009) The use of scintillometry for validating aggregation schemes over  
25 heterogeneous grids. *Agric Forest Meteorol* 149:2098-2109 doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2009.09.004
- 26 Ezzahar J, Chehbouni A, Hoedjes J, Ramier D, Boulain N, Boubkraoui S, Cappelaere B, Descroix  
27 L, Mougnot B, Timouk F (2009) Combining scintillometer measurements and an aggregation  
28 scheme to estimate area-averaged latent heat flux during the AMMA experiment. *J Hydrol*  
29 375:217-226 doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.01.010
- 30 Fairall CW, Bradley EF, Hare JE, Grachev AA, Edson JB (2003) Bulk parameterization of air-sea  
31 fluxes: updates and verification for the COARE algorithm. *J Clim* 16:571-591
- 32 Foken T, Skeib G, Richter SH (1991) Dependence of the integral turbulence characteristics on the  
33 stability of stratification and their use for Doppler-Sodar measurements. *Z Meteorol* 41:311-315
- 34 Foken T, Wichura B (1996) Tools for quality assessment of surface-based flux measurements.  
35 *Agric Forest Meteorol* 78:83-105
- 36 Foken T, Goeckede M, Mauder M, Mahrt L, Amiro BD, Lunger JW (2004) Post-field data quality  
37 control. In: Lee X et al. (eds) *Handbook of Micrometeorology: a guide for surface flux*  
38 *measurement and analysis*. Kluwer Dordrecht 181-208
- 39 Frehlich RG, Ochs GR (1990) Effects of saturation on the optical scintillometer. *Appl Optics*  
40 29:548-553

1 Hartogensis OK, Watts CJ, Rodriguez J-C, De Bruin HAR (2003) Derivation of an effective  
2 height for scintillometers: La Poza experiment in Northwest Mexico. *J Hydrol* 4:915-928  
3 Hill RJ, Clifford SF (1981) Theory of saturation of optical scintillation by strong turbulence for  
4 arbitrary refractive-index spectra. *J Opt Soc Am* 71:675-686  
5 Hill RJ, Ochs GR, Wilson JJ (1992) Measuring surface-layer fluxes of heat and momentum using  
6 optical scintillation. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 58:391-408  
7 Højstrup J (1981) A simple model for the adjustment of velocity spectra in unstable conditions  
8 downstream of an abrupt change in roughness and heat flux. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 21:341-  
9 356  
10 Kaimal JC, Wyngaard JC, Izumi Y, Coté OR (1972) Spectral characteristics of surface layer  
11 turbulence. *Quat J Meteorol Soc* 9:563-589  
12 Kaimal JC, Finnigan JJ (1994) Atmospheric boundary layer flows: their structure and  
13 measurement. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 289 pp  
14 Kipp & Zonen (2007) LAS & X-LAS, (Extra) Large Aperture Scintillometer Instruction Manual.  
15 Kleissl J, Gomez J, Hong S-H, Hendrickx JMH, Rahn T, Defoor WL (2008) Large Aperture  
16 Scintillometer intercomparison study. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 128:133-150  
17 doi:10.1007/s10546-008-9274-1  
18 Kleissl J, Watts CJ, Rodriguez JC, Naif S, Vivoni ER (2009) Scintillometer intercomparison study  
19 - continued. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 130:437-443 doi:10.1007/s10546-009-9352-z  
20 Kohsiek W, Meijninger WML, Moene AF, Heusinkveld BG, Hartogensis OK, Hillen WCAM, De  
21 Bruin HAR (2002) An Extra Large Aperture Scintillometer for long range applications. *Boundary-*  
22 *Layer Meteorol* 105:119-127  
23 Kohsiek W, Meijninger WML, De Bruin HAR, Beyrich F (2006) Saturation of the Large Aperture  
24 Scintillometer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 121:111-126 doi:10.1007/s10546-005-9031-7  
25 Kohsiek W, Liebethal C, Foken T, Vogt R, Oncley SP, Bernhofer C, De Bruin HAR (2007) The  
26 energy balance experiment EBEX-2000. Part III: Behaviour and quality of radiation  
27 measurements. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 123:55-75  
28 Lagouarde JP, Irvine M, Bonnefond J-M, Grimmond CSB, Long N, Oke TR, Salmond JA, Offerle  
29 B (2006) Monitoring the sensible heat flux over urban areas using Large Aperture Scintillometry:  
30 case study of Marseille City during the Escompte experiment. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 118:449-  
31 476 doi:10.1007/s10546-005-9001-0  
32 Liu H, Peters G, Foken T (2001) New equations for sonic temperature variance and buoyancy heat  
33 flux with an omnidirectional sonic anemometer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 100:459-468  
34 Ludi A, Beyrich F, Matzler C (2005) Determination of the turbulent temperature-humidity  
35 correlation from scintillometric measurements. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 117:525-550  
36 doi:10.1007/s10546-005-1751-1  
37 Mahrt L, Vickers D, Edson J, Sun J, Højstrup J, Hare J, Wilczak JM (1998) Heat flux in the  
38 coastal zone. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 86:421-446  
39 Mauder M, Foken T (2004) Documentation and instruction manual of the eddy covariance  
40 software package TK2. Arbeitsergeb, Univ Bayreuth, Abt Mikrometeorol, ISSN 1614-8916. 26-  
41 42

1 Mauder M, Foken T (2006) Impact of post-field data processing on eddy covariance flux estimates  
2 and energy balance closure. *Z Meteorol* 15:597-609

3 Mauder M, Foken T, Clement R, Elbers J, Eugster W, Gruenwald T, Heusinkveld B, Kolle O  
4 (2008) Quality control of CarboEurope flux data – Part 2: Inter-comparison of eddy-covariance  
5 software. *Biogeosci* 5:451-462

6 McJannet DL, Cook FJ, McGloin RP, McGowan HA, Burn S (2011) Estimation of evaporation  
7 and sensible heat flux from open water using a large-aperture scintillometer. *Water Resour Res* 47:  
8 W05545 doi:10.1029/2010WR010155

9 Meijninger WML, Hartogensis OK, Kohsiek W, Hoedjes JCB, Zuurbier RM, De Bruin HAR  
10 (2002) Determination of area-averaged sensible heat flux with a Large Aperture Scintillometer  
11 over a heterogeneous surface - Flevoland field experiment. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 105:37-62

12 Moene AF (2003) Effects of water vapour on the structure parameter of the refractive index for  
13 near-infrared radiation. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 107:635-653

14 Moene AF, Meijninger WML, Hartogensis OK, Kohsiek W, De Bruin HAR (2004) A review of  
15 the relationships describing the signal of a Large Aperture Scintillometer. Internal Report 2004/2,  
16 Meteorology and Air Quality Group, Wageningen University. <http://www.met.wau.nl>. Accessed  
17 13 February 2011

18 Moene AF, Beyrich F, Hartogensis OK (2009) Developments in scintillometry. *Bull Am Meteorol*  
19 *Soc* doi:10.1175/2008BAMS2672.1

20 Moore CJ (1986) Frequency response corrections for eddy correlation systems. *Boundary-Layer*  
21 *Meteorol* 37:17-35

22 Ochs GR, Hill RJ (1990) A study of factors influencing the calibration of optical  $C_n^2$  meters,  
23 NOAA Technical Memorandum ERL WPL-106

24 Odhiambo GO, Savage MJ (2009) Sensible heat flux by Surface Layer Scintillometry and Eddy  
25 Covariance over a mixed grassland community as affected by Bowen ratio and MOST  
26 formulations for unstable conditions. *J Hydromet* 10:479-492 doi:10.1175/2008JHM1008.1

27 Paulson CA (1970) The mathematical representation of wind speed and temperature profiles in the  
28 unstable boundary layer. *J Appl Meteorol* 9:857-861

29 Schmid HP (1994) Source areas for scalars and scalar fluxes. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 67:293-  
30 318

31 Schotanus P, Nieuwstadt FTM, De Bruin HAR (1983) Temperature measurement with a sonic  
32 anemometer and its application to heat and moisture fluctuations. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol*  
33 26:81-93

34 Smith SD (1988) Coefficients for sea surface wind stress, heat flux, and wind profiles as a function  
35 of wind speed and temperature. *J Geophys Res* 93(C12):15467-15472

36 Sun J, Vandemark D, Mahrt L, Vickers D, Crawford T, Vogel C (2001) Momentum transfer over  
37 the coastal zone. *J Geophys Res* 106(D12):12437- 12448

38 Thiermann V, Grassl H (1992) The measurements of turbulent surface-layer fluxes by use of  
39 bichromatic scintillation. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 58:367-389

1 Van Kesteren B, Hartogensis OK (2011) Analysis of the systematic errors found in the Kipp &  
2 Zonen large-aperture scintillometer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 138:493-509 doi:10.1007/s10546-  
3 010-9564-2

4 Wang T, Ochs GR, Clifford SF (1978) A saturation-resistant optical scintillometer to measure  $C_n^2$ .  
5 *J Opt Soc Am* 68:334-338

6 Webb EK, Pearman GI, Leuning R (1980) Correction of the flux measurements for density effects  
7 due to heat and water vapour transfer. *Quat J Roy Meteorol Soc* 106:85-100

8 Weill A, Eymard L, Caniaux G, Hauser D, Planton S, Dupuis H, Brut A, Guerin C, Nacass P,  
9 Butet A, Cloché S, Pedreros R, Durand P, Bourras D, Giordani H, Lachaud G, Bouhours G (2003)  
10 Toward a better determination of turbulent air-sea fluxes from several experiments. *J Clim* 16:600-  
11 618

12 Wesely ML (1976) The combined effect of temperature and humidity fluctuations on refractive  
13 index. *J Appl Meteorol* 15:43-49

14 Wessel P, Smith WHF (1998) New, improved version of the Generic Mapping Tools Released.  
15 *EOS Trans AGU* 79:579

16 Wilczak JM, Oncley SP, Stage SA (2001) Sonic anemometer tilt correction algorithms. *Boundary-*  
17 *Layer Meteorol* 99:127-150

18 Yelland MJ, Moat BI, Taylor PK, Pascal RW, Hutchings J, Cornell VC (1998) Wind stress  
19 measurements from the open-ocean corrected for airflow distortion by the ship. *J Phys Oceanog*  
20 28:1511-1526

21 Zeweldi DA, Gebremichael M, Wang J, Sammis T, Kleissl J, Miller D (2010) Intercomparison of  
22 sensible heat flux from Large Aperture Scintillometer and Eddy Covariance methods: field  
23 experiment over a homogeneous semi-arid region. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* doi:10.1007/s10546-  
24 009-9460-9

25



1 Figure 1: Histograms of the Bowen ratios computed using the gradient method (solid grey) and  
2 derived from the eddy covariance measurements (open black).

3 Figure 2: Map of the Thau Lagoon (copyright Google Maps) with the XLAS transmitter and  
4 receiver locations, the EC Marseillan station (yellow dot) and Marseillan, Sète, and Crique  
5 Meteorological Stations (MS, red dots).

6 Figure 3: (a) XLAS transmitter; the black arrow indicates the XLAS receiver approximate  
7 location; (b) EC measurement mast with a sonic anemometer and an Infrared Gas Analyzer. Note  
8 the EC-collocated meteorological station providing ‘slow’ atmospheric parameter measurements.

9 Figure 4: Mean meteorological and hydrological conditions as derived from Marseillan station  
10 measurements. (a) Wind rose showing the different wind sectors in Marseillan (see text). The  
11 black arrow indicates the XLAS path orientation; (b) Histogram (number of observations) of the  
12 10-m wind velocity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ); (c) Histogram (number of observations) of the air temperature minus  
13 lagoon temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ).

14 Figure 5: Footprints computed for XLAS and EC measurements, (a) for wind blowing across the  
15 XLAS path, either from south-west (solid lines) or from north-east (dashed lines); (b) for wind  
16 blowing along the XLAS path, either from north-west (solid lines) or from south-east (dashed  
17 lines). The different contours correspond to 50% (green), 70% (blue), 80% (red), and 90% (black)  
18 source area, the grey scale indicates the depth (m).

19 Figure 6: Outcomes of tests (performed over a 20-day period) of the XLAS processing sensitivity  
20 to Bowen ratio input values: resulting sensible heat flux values ( $H$ , vertical axis) obtained when  
21 the original Bowen ratio is multiplied by a factor 2 (red circles) or replaced by that derived from  
22 the eddy covariance method (black crosses) with respect to the sensible heat fluxes obtained with  
23 the original Bowen ratio (horizontal axis).

24 Figure 7: Results of tests of the XLAS processing sensitivity to the universal function  $\varphi_T$ , with  
25 respect to the Edson and Fairall (1998) universal function (E & F 1998): Andreas (1988b) (A  
26 1988, black crosses), De Bruin et al. (1993) (DB 1993, red circles), Hill et al. (1992) (H 1992, blue  
27 diamonds), and Thiermann and Grassl (1992) (T & G 1992, green triangles).


28 Figure 8: Comparison of the sensible heat flux assessed using the XLAS (y-axis) and the EC  
29 station (x-axis), in  $\text{W m}^{-2}$ . The colour code corresponds to the wind direction, yellow to the  
30 ‘continental’ sector, cyan to the ‘lido’ sector, and red and green to the ‘lagoon’ sector. The black  
31 arrow on the scale indicates the XLAS path orientation. The dash-dotted line indicates the best  
32 regression line, and the dotted lines the RMS limits.

33 Figure 9: Comparison of the sensible heat flux computed using the COARE 3.0 bulk algorithm and  
34 atmospheric parameters measured in Marseillan (y-axis) and that derived from the EC station (x-  
35 axis), in  $\text{W m}^{-2}$ , (a) whole dataset; (b) data with EC quality flag = 1 only. Colour code: same as  
36 Figure 8. The black arrow on the scale indicates the XLAS path orientation. The dash-dotted line  
37 indicates the best regression line, and the dotted lines the RMS limits.

- 1 Figure 10: Same as Figure 9a, but for data with at least 85% of the source area on the lagoon
- 2 surface and wind direction in the 'lagoon' sector (north-east and south-west).
- 3 Figure 11: Same as Figure 8, but for data with at least 85% of the source area on the lagoon
- 4 surface and wind direction in the 'lagoon' sector (north-east and south-west).
- 5

1

2



3

4

5

6

Figure 1




1  
2  
3  
4

Figure 2

1

2



3

4

5

Figure 3a

6




7

8

Figure 3b

9

1




2

3


4

Figure 4a



1  
2  
3


Figure 4b



1  
2  
3


Figure 4c





1  
2  
3


Figure 5a



1

2


Figure 5b



1

2

Figure 6




1

2

3

Figure 7





1

2

3

Figure 8




1

2

3


Figure 9

1  
2  
3



4  
5  
6  
7

Figure 10



1  
2  
3

Figure 11



	Manufacturer Type	Sampling frequency (Hz)	Height/depth/ orientation (m, °)	Site	Precision
3D sonic anemometer/thermometer	Gill <sup>a</sup> Horizontal HS50	25	6 m 240°	M	Wind < 1% RMS sound speed < 0.5%
Infra-red hygrometer and CO <sub>2</sub> analyzer	LiCor <sup>b</sup>	20	6 330°	M	H <sub>2</sub> O 3%
Wind speed and direction	Young <sup>c</sup>	2	6	M,C,S	0.3 m s <sup>-1</sup> / 3°
Barometer	Vaisala <sup>d</sup> PTB220 class A	0.1	4	S	0.2 hPa
Air thermometer	Atexis <sup>e</sup> 1000 Ohm platinum wire class A	0.1	4	M, C, S	0.2°C
Hygrometer	Vaisala <sup>d</sup> HMP45D	0.1	4	M, C, S	3%
Net radiometer	Kipp & Zonen <sup>e</sup> CNR1	0.1	4	M, C	10% daily average
Water thermometer	Atexis <sup>f</sup> 1000 Ohm platinum wire class A	0.1	-0.2	M, C, S	0.2°C

1 <sup>a</sup> Lymington, U.K.; <sup>b</sup> Atlanta, Nebraska, U.S.A.; <sup>c</sup> Traverse City, Michigan, U.S.A.; <sup>d</sup> Helsinki,  
2 Finland; <sup>e</sup> Fontenay Trésigny, France; <sup>f</sup> Delft, The Netherlands

3

4 Table 1: Instruments and parameters recorded during the Thau Lagoon experiment. The  
5 sites refer to Figure 2: Marseillan (M), Crique (C) or Sète (S).

6

7

8

Steady state deviation (%)	Integral turbulence characteristics deviation (%)	Final flag	Percentage of data (%)
0-15	0-30	<b>1</b>	51
16-30	0-30	<b>2</b>	6.5
1-30	31-75	<b>3</b>	42.5

1  
2  
3  
4

Table 2: TK2 overall flag system, after Foken et al. (2004), and percentage of data for each flag.

1

Parameter		$H$ mean difference ( $\text{W m}^{-2}$ )	$H$ mean relative difference (%)
$C_n^2$	Eq.3/Eq.1	$0.81 \pm 1.62$	$5.0 \pm 10.8$
$R_{Tq}$	Full/ref	$0.17 \pm 0.48$	$1.0 \pm 1.8$
	Ref/classical	<b><math>-3.35 \pm 2.54</math></b>	$21.0 \pm 8.8$
Bowen ratio	EC/gradient in Eq. 7	$-0.15 \pm 3.69$	$11.0 \pm 22.2$
	+0.2 in Eq. 7	<b><math>-1.28 \pm 6.47</math></b>	$13.1 \pm 48.3$
	EC/gradient in Eq. 13	$-0.08 \pm 1.75$	$4.0 \pm 15.9$
	+0.2 in Eq. 13	$0.01 \pm 0.36$	$1.5 \pm 2.2$
	EC/gradient	$-0.38 \pm 3.53$	$11.2 \pm 22.7$
	+0.2	<b><math>-1.67 \pm 4.41</math></b>	$13.8 \pm 48.7$
	$\times 2$	$0.93 \pm 1.44$	$8.0 \pm 16.3$
Humidity	$T_v/T$	$0.10 \pm 0.07$	$0.6 \pm 0.2$
	$T_v^*/T^*$	<b><math>3.13 \pm 2.19</math></b>	$29.0 \pm 31.0$
$z_0$ a priori	$10^{-5} \text{ m}/10^{-4} \text{ m}$	-	$1.0 \pm 5.9$
	$10^{-3} \text{ m}/10^{-4} \text{ m}$	-	$1.0 \pm 5.9$
$z_0$	fixed mean value/adjusted	$-0.19 \pm 1.34$	$3.0 \pm 4.2$
	fixed bulk/adjusted	$0.02 \pm 0.60$	$1.0 \pm 3.9$
	fixed EC/adjusted	$-0.34 \pm 1.46$	$2.9 \pm 9.9$
$\varphi_T^a$	Andreas 1988b	$0.72 \pm 0.96$	$4.0 \pm 3.2$
	De Bruin et al. 1993	<b><math>3.17 \pm 2.66</math></b>	$18.3 \pm 5.2$
	Hill et al. 1992	$0.16 \pm 1.14$	$4.9 \pm 4.7$
	Thiermann and Grassl 1992	$-0.91 \pm 1.17$	$4.8 \pm 3.2$
$\psi_m^b$	Beljaars and Holtslag 1991	$0.00 \pm 0.37$	$1.1 \pm 2.0$

2 <sup>a</sup> with respect to the Edson and Fairall (1998) function; <sup>b</sup> with respect to the Businger-Dyer  
3 (Paulson 1970) expression

4 Table 3: XLAS processing, list of sensitivity tests performed. See explanation in text. Bold figures  
5 correspond to the most significant absolute effects, grey boxes correspond to the most significant  
6 relative effects (more than 10% mean relative difference). Mean relative differences correspond to  
7 absolute values of difference divided by  $H$  absolute value.

8