Responses of energy partitioning and surface resistance to drought in a poplar plantation in northern China
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Abstract

Poplar (Populus sp.) plantations have been used broadly for combating desertification, urban greening, and paper and wood production in northern China. However, given the high water use by the species and the regional dry climate, the sustainability of these plantations needs to be evaluated. Currently, the understanding of the acclimation of the species to the semiarid environment is limited, impeding assessments of their long-term success and impact on the environment. In this study we examine the variability of bulk resistance parameters and energy partitioning over a four-year period encompassing both dry and wet conditions in a poplar (Populus euramericana CV. “74/76”) plantation located in northern China. The partitioning of available energy to latent heat (LE) decreased from 0.62 to 0.53 under meteorological drought. A concomitant increase in sensible heat (H) resulted in the increase of a Bowen ratio from 0.83 to 1.57. Partial correlation analysis indicated that surface resistance ($R_s$) normalized by leaf area index (LAI) (i.e., $R_s$ : LAI) increased by 50% and became the dominant factor controlling the Bowen ratio. Furthermore, $R_s$ was the major factor controlling LE during the growing season, even in wet years, as indicated by the decoupling coefficient ($\Omega$ =0.45 and 0.39 in wet and dry years, respectively) and the LE/LE$_{eq}$ ratio ranging from 0.81 and 0.68 in wet and dry years, respectively. In general, the dry climate dominated the poplar plantation ecosystem regardless of soil water availability suggesting that fast-growing and water use-intensive species like poplar plantations are poorly suited for the water limited region. The required irrigation for sustaining these forests also presents a threat to the adjacent ecosystems because of their role in reducing ground water table, and may compromise long-term sustainability and livelihoods in the region.
1 Introduction

Poplar (Populus sp.) plantations are the most dominant broadleaf forest ecosystems throughout northern and central China, due to their rapid growth rates, high productivity and wide adaptability (Gielen and Ceulemans, 2001; Wilske et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2011). Since the late-1970s, with the implementation of the “Three-North Shelterbelt Program” (1978), the “Combating Desertification Project” (1991) and the “Grain for Grain Program” (1999) (Wilske et al., 2009), poplar plantations have been playing a vital role in timber production, bioenergy, urban greening, desertification control, and carbon sequestration (Martín-García et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2013). By 2007, China had the largest poplar plantation area in the world (i.e., more than 7.0 million ha, Fang, 2008). However, indiscriminate use of the same species beyond its native range and habitats may result in unanticipated consequences. For example, the use of poplars in water limited regions may increase the risk of environmental degradation, soil moisture deficit, hydrologic and vegetation changes (Gao et al., 2014).

Poplars require large quantities of water throughout the growing season, and may experience water limitation even on the mesic sites (Kim et al., 2008; Stanturf and Oosten, 2014). For example, poplar plantations may even cause the transformation of wetlands into dry land due to the water-pumping effect on groundwater (Li et al., 2014; Migliavacca et al., 2009). Thus, poplar plantations, which have higher productivity but also higher water use (Zhou et al., 2013) than other forests, clearly require large quantities of irrigation in water limited areas such as northern China.

However, over the past 50 years, northern China has experienced the decline of the water table, land degradation, large increases in surface air temperature and severe droughts (Ding et al., 2007; Qiu et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2014), while the wide-spread use of irrigation has been cited as one of possible causes for these impacts. Therefore, studying the drought response of poplars under water shortage is essential for effective management of water resource over this region and avoiding the use of water-intensive species in ecological restoration and reforestation efforts if the environmental resources are not sufficient. Whereas, most of previous and current studies are only concentrated on the water balance of forest ecosystem other than the interactions between forest ecosystem and environment, it is clear that exploring the energy partitioning and ecosystem response to drought is central important for understanding forest water and carbon cycling processes (Guo et al., 2010; Jamiyansharav et
al., 2011; Sun et al., 2010; Takagi et al., 2009; Wu et al., 2007), and thus understanding the adaption and long term sustainability of plantation establish in water limited regions.

The goal of the current study was to examine how forest water and energy balances vary under different climatic conditions and how to best manage the plantation forests to maximize ecological benefits in water limited region. Therefore, we evaluated drought responses in energy partitioning in a ten-year-old poplar (Populus euramericana CV. “74/76”) plantation on sandy soil in northern China. We hypothesized that drought would trigger significant changes in the surface resistance and energy partitioning in the water-demanding poplar species. Specifically, the objectives of this study were to: (1) quantify the seasonal and inter-annual variability of energy partitioning and bulk resistance parameters; (2) partition the control of energy partitioning to biological and climatological components; and (3) evaluate the long-term sustainability of poplar plantations in a water limiting region in northern China.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1. Study site

The study was carried out in a managed poplar (Populus euramericana CV. “74/76”) plantation at the Daxing Forest Farm, which is located in the southern suburbs of Beijing, China (116°15′07″E, 39°31′50″N, 30 m a.s.l.). The trees were planted in 1998 with 3 m x 2 m spacing, dead or low-vigor trees were replaced with new saplings in 2001 and 2003. The stand characteristics over the four years of study are provided in Table 1. At the end of 2009, the average height of the trees were 16.2±1.6 m, and the diameter at breast height (DBH) was 14.1±1.6cm. The average leaf area index (LAI) of the stand increased over time. During the growing season, shrubs as the understory layer were low at density due to manual removal. Perennial herbs included Chenopodium glaucum Linn., Medicago sativa L., Melilotus officinalis (L.) Lam., Salsola collina Pall., and Tribulus terrestris L.

The local climate is classified as sub-humid warm temperate zone, with a mean (1990–2009) annual temperature of 11.6°C, and maximum and minimum temperature are 40.6 °C and -27.4 °C, respectively. The annual precipitation ranges from 262 mm to 1058 mm (1952-2000), with an average of 556 mm, of which 60%-70% falls from July to September (Daxing Weather Station, 116°19′ 56″ E, 39°43′ 24″ N). The annual frost-free period lasts 209 days, and the total sunshine-hour reaches 2772 h per year with 15.5 MJ m⁻² d⁻¹ of incoming solar radiation.
The average wind speed is 2.6 m s\(^{-1}\) and it mostly comes from southeast (during growing season) and northwest (during non-growing season).

The study area is on the alluvial plain of the Yongding River, and is flat with an average slope of $< 5^\circ$. The upper two meter of the soil is mostly composed of well drained fluvial sand with bulk density of 1.43~1.47 g·cm\(^{-3}\) and a pH of 8.25~8.39. The soil porosity is about 40% and capillary porosity is 32%. The groundwater table has an annual average of 16.5 m below the ground in the past nine years (2001 to 2009), and has declined at an average rate of 0.6 m per year. The maximum pan evaporation occurs from May through June, exceeding precipitation for the same period. Severe drought during the beginning of the growing season (from April to June) in northern of China is common. The amount of flood irrigation was applied by pumping groundwater and back calculated based on the records of the water meters from three wells on a weekly basis from 2006 through 2009. Other management practices included tilling, weeding since the establishment of the plantations.

2.2. Eddy covariance system

The micrometeorological and eddy flux measurements were conducted at a 32m tower in the center of the study site, which was established in June of 2005. The foot-print of the eddy flux covariance system, was about 1 km x 1 km in size. The observation site has a sufficiently wide fetch of at least 300 m in all directions. Fluxes of CO\(_2\), water, sensible heat and latent heat were calculated based on the eddy-covariance (EC) principles. The sensors included a CO\(_2\)/H\(_2\)O infrared analyzer (Li-7500; LI-COR, Inc., Lincoln, NE, USA) and a three-dimensional sonic anemometer (CSAT-3; Campbell Scientific, Inc., CSI, UT, USA). The CO\(_2\)/H\(_2\)O sensor head was installed towards a predominant wind direction (southeast) with a slightly vertical angle ($< 20$ degree) and downwind of the sonic anemometer in the predominant wind direction; the analyzer was calibrated every year. The EC sensors were mounted initially at a height of 16 m in 2006. This was increased to about 18 m before the start of the growing season in 2007, and again to 20 m in February 2009 to ensure that the sensors remained well above the tree canopy.

Net radiation was measured with net radiometers (Q7.1, REBS, Seattle, WA, USA) and (CNR-1; Kipp and Zonen, Delft, Netherlands) at 26 m above the ground. Photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) was measured by a PAR quantum sensor (LI-190SB; LI-COR, Inc.) mounted at 20 m. The atmospheric pressure was measured by a barometric pressure sensor (CS105, CSI) at 21 m height. Air temperatures and humidity were measured with temperature
and relative humidity probe (HMP45C; Vaisala, Helsinki, Finland) at 5, 10, 15 and 20 m.
Precipitation was measured with a tipping bucket rain gauge (TE525-L; Texas Electronics, USA)
at 22.5m. Soil heat flux was determined with three soil heat transducers (HFT3, CSI), and soil
temperatures were measured with three thermocouples (TCAV107; CSI) located at depths of 5,
10 and 20 cm below the soil surface. Soil water content was measured with TDR sensors
(CS616; CSI) buried at 20 and 50cm.

With the exception of the rain gauge, all microclimatic data were recorded with a data-
logger (CR23X; CSI) at 30 min intervals and the fluctuations in wind speed, sonic temperature
and CO₂ and H₂O concentrations were sampled at 10 Hz, and recorded by a CR5000 data-
logger (CSI).

2.3. Data processing and QA/QC
The raw 10 Hz data were processed with an EC Processor, version 2.3 (Noormets et al., 2010).
The program is designed for reprocessing EC flux data and can calculate half-hour mean eddy
covariance fluxes of carbon, water and energy. The wind coordinates were rotated using the
planar fit method (Paw U et al., 2000; Wilczak et al., 2001). Fluxes were corrected for additional
sensor heating (Burba et al., 2008) and fluctuations in air density (Webb et al., 1980). The data
quality controls included: screening of 30-min mean eddy covariance fluxes based on
instrument quality flag, integral turbulence characteristics (Foken and Wichura, 1996), flux
stationarity, atmospheric stability, and adequate turbulent mixing (Goulden et al., 1996). The
threshold of friction velocity (μₜ) below which flux loss occurred was determined from the
seasonal binned relationship between nighttime turbulent flux of CO₂ and friction velocity (μₜ)
(Schmid et al., 2003). The threshold was consistent across different seasons, but differed
slightly between years: 0.18 m s⁻¹ (2006), 0.12 m s⁻¹ (2007), 0.14 m s⁻¹ (2008) and 0.13 m s⁻¹
(2009). In this study, the MDV (mean diurnal variation) method (Falge et al., 2001) was used
to fill the data gaps, the linear relationship between LE or H and net radiation (Rn) was used to
gap-fill each flux when short period (< 2h) flux data were missing. A ±7 day moving average
was used to fill each flux gaps for period between 2 h and 7 days. Gaps longer than 7 days were
not filled.

Four year study period was classified into “wet” and “dry” year distinctively. The dry year
referred to the meteorological drought when yearly precipitation less than 75% of the 20-year
average according to the National Standard of People’s Republic of China (GB/T 20481-2006)
(China, 2006). Years 2007 and 2008 were classified as ‘wet’ while 2006 and 2009 were ‘dry’ year, respectively. We focused on the growing season when the driving forces (e.g., solar radiation, and temperature) for energy and water fluxes and the physiological response of vegetation were usually strong. In this study, the strongest forcing days occurred approximately between day 100 (mid-April) and day 300 (late October). The daytime was defined as the period between the sunrise and sunset with PAR > 4 μmolm$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$. The regulations of surface exchange are often different during nocturnal periods (Mahrt, 1999), with heat fluxes at night typically weaker and markedly less station than those during the daytime (Wilson et al., 2002b). The midday was defined as the period from 10:00 a.m. to 15:00 p.m. at local standard time, when the interaction between vegetation and environment was usually the strongest.

2.4. Biophysical characteristics

The availability of relative extractable water (REW) content was calculated to analyze the ecosystem response on drought stress. According to Granier et al. (2007), soil water stress was assumed to occur when the REW dropped below the threshold of 0.4. Daily REW is calculated as,

$$\text{REW} = \frac{\text{VWC} - \text{VWC}_{\text{min}}}{\text{VWC}_{\text{max}} - \text{VWC}_{\text{min}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $\text{VWC}_{\text{min}}$ and $\text{VWC}_{\text{max}}$ are the minimum and maximum soil volumetric water content across the four years, respectively.

The Bowen ratio ($\beta$) reflects the influence of microclimate and the hydrological cycle on the energy partitioning and water use of the ecosystem (Perez et al., 2008). The midday $\beta$ is calculated as Eq. (2),

$$\beta = \frac{H}{\text{LE}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

Based on the daytime half-hourly and daytime totals of turbulent energy fluxes, the energy balance ratio ($E_{BR}$) is calculated as Eq. (3),

$$E_{BR} = \frac{\sum (H + \text{LE})}{\sum (R_n - G - S)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $S$ is the latent and sensible heat storage in the air-column below the EC system and is calculated as in Eq. (4) (Dou et al., 2006),
\[ S = \int_0^{hc} \rho c_p \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \, dz + \int_0^{hc} \rho c_p \frac{\partial e}{\partial t} \, dz \] (4)

where \( hc \) is the height of eddy flux system measurement (32 m), \( T \) is air temperature in the air-column below \( hc \), and \( e \) is water vapor pressure.

During midday periods (from 10:00 to 15:00 LST), the Penman-Monteith approximation was inverted to calculate the surface resistance \((R_s)\) in Eq. (5) (Kumagai et al., 2004).

\[ R_s = \frac{\rho c_p (\delta e/LE)}{\gamma} + \left( \frac{\Delta}{\gamma} \beta - 1 \right) R_a \] (5)

where \( R_s \) is the surface resistance to water vapor transport (s m\(^{-1}\)), representing four components: bulk stomatal resistance of the canopy, bulk boundary layer resistance of the vegetation, bulk ground resistance, and bulk boundary layer resistance of the ground (Admiral et al., 2006; Cho et al., 2012; Perez et al., 2008; Wilson et al., 2002b).

\( R_i \) is the climatological resistance (s m\(^{-1}\)) indicating the atmospheric demand (Wilson et al., 2002b) and is calculated as,

\[ R_i = \frac{\rho c_p \delta e}{\gamma A} \] (6)

where \( A \) is the available energy \((R_n - G)\); \( \rho \) is air density (kg m\(^{-3}\)), \( c_p \) is the specific heat of the air (1005 J kg\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)); \( \delta e \) is the atmospheric vapor pressure deficit (Pa); \( LE \) is latent heat flux; \( \Delta \) is the change of saturation vapor pressure with temperature (Pa K\(^{-1}\)); \( \gamma \) is the psychrometric constant (\( \approx 67 \) Pa K\(^{-1}\)); \( \beta \) is the Bowen ratio.

\( R_a \) is the aerodynamic resistance of the air layer between the canopy and the flux measurement height (s m\(^{-1}\)), which reflects the aerodynamic properties of turbulent transport in the near surface boundary layer (Holwerda et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2007). \( R_a \) is calculated following Hossen et al. (2011) and Migliavacca et al. (2009).

\[ R_a = r_{a,m} + r_b = \frac{\mu}{\mu^2} + 6.2\mu_*^{-2/3} \] (7)

where \( r_{a,m} \) is the aerodynamic resistance for momentum transfer, and \( r_b \) is the quasi-laminar boundary-layer resistance, \( \mu \) is the wind speed, and \( \mu_* \) is the friction velocity.

The decoupling coefficient (\( \Omega \)) explains the degree of coupling between the atmosphere and the vegetation, and describes the relative control of evapotranspiration by surface resistance...
and net radiation (Pereira, 2004). The \( \Omega \) value ranges from 0 to 1, with values approaching zero indicating that \( LE \) is highly sensitive to surface resistance and ambient humidity deficit. The \( \Omega \) value approaching to 1 indicates that \( LE \) or evapotranspiration is mostly controlled by net radiation (Jarvis and McNaughton, 1986).

\[
\Omega = \frac{\Delta + \gamma}{\Delta + \gamma(1 + \frac{R_s}{R_a})} \tag{8}
\]

The equilibrium evaporation (\( LE_{eq} \)) is the climatologically determined evaporation (atmospheric demand) over an extensive wet surface and is dependent only on \( R_n \) and temperature. It is calculated as,

\[
LE_{eq} = \frac{\Delta(R_n - G)}{\Delta + \gamma} \tag{9}
\]

The ratio \( LE/LE_{eq} \), which is also known as the Priestley–Taylor \( \alpha \), reflects the control of evaporation by atmospheric and physiological factors. \( LE/LE_{eq} \) characterizes the surface dryness of ecosystem. It, therefore, indicates whether soil water supply for evapotranspiration of an ecosystem is under limitation or not. An \( LE/LE_{eq} \) of < 1 represents an ecosystem under water stress, and, therefore, experiences reductions in evapotranspiration; whereas \( LE/LE_{eq} \) of > 1.26 indicates an ecosystems of unrestricted water supply and only available energy limits evaporation (Arain et al., 2003). The \( LE/LE_{eq} \) is dependent of leaf area index (LAI), soil water content, meteorological conditions (e.g., wind speed, solar radiation, VPD, air stratification stability, convection, advection surface resistance), vegetation types, and altitude (Guo et al., 2008).

### 2.5. Statistical analysis

Repeated measurement ANOVA (SPSS) was used for quantifying the changes of all biophysical variables, energy fluxes, and bulk parameters among years. The \( t \) test was used to compare the differences of biophysical variables among different studies. The partial correlation analysis was used to distinguish the impacts of each of the three resistance parameters (\( R_s, R_i \) and \( R_a \)) on the Bowen ratios. All analyses were accessed at \( \alpha = 0.05 \).
3 Results

3.1 Environmental conditions

The annual precipitation rates in the four study years differed from the long-term average (556 mm yr$^{-1}$) (1990-2009). Precipitation was 74 mm below this long term mean in 2006 and 159 mm in 2009. Whereas rainfall exceeded the 20-year mean by over 100 mm in 2007 and 2008. Generally, over 90% precipitation of each year occurred in April–October, but with different timing and magnitude among the years. The study site was irrigated during the dry years of 2006 and 2009 to mitigate drought conditions (Fig. 1). Seasonal drought stress (REW < 0.4) occurred during periods in the late growing season of 2006 and 2009, the spring of 2007 and 2009, but not at all in 2008 (Fig. 2a–d). In 2006, precipitation of growing season reached 467 mm, of which 51% had occurred by July. The amount of irrigation was 35 mm in April, 21 mm in May and 30 mm in September. The two seasonal drought periods separately were #1_06 (from DOY 164 to 192) and #2_06 (from DOY 231 to 300). The total rainfall in 2007 and 2008 was similar, but more evenly distributed throughout the year in 2008. In 2007, drought stress occurred during DOY 110-143 (#1_07) and 151-200 (#2_07). A single rain event in late May (57 mm), and a few large precipitation events (> 25 mm d$^{-1}$) in July were recorded. The amount of rainfall in 2009 was smallest among the four years, during which 195 mm of irrigation was applied from March to September. There were several short and scattered droughts across the growing season of 2009 (Fig. 2d). Despite the higher-than normal rainfall in the two wet years, there was no flooding or overland runoff.

The growing season $T_a$ in 2008 was significantly lower than that in 2007 and 2009 ($p < 0.05$, Fig. 2 e-h). The years differed in the spring warm-up and the timing of peak temperature (by up to 35.9 °C). The maximum air temperature occurred in June in 2006 and 2009, and July in 2007 and 2008. The warmest month was June for 2006 (27.1 ± 2.4 °C).

The daytime average VPD of the four growing seasons (Fig. 2 e-h) was 1.3 ± 0.7 kPa. The mean VPD in wet years (i.e., 2007 and 2008) was 1.2 ± 0.7 kPa, which was significantly lower (F=6.093, $p < 0.01$) than that in dry years (i.e., 2006 and 2009, 1.3 ± 0.8 kPa). The VPD of the growing seasons in 2008 (i.e., 1.1 ± 0.5 kPa) was lower than those in the other years ($p < 0.05$). Higher $T_a$ and lower precipitation in May 2007 led to higher VPD compared with the same period in 2006 and 2008 ($p < 0.001$). Furthermore, the VPD was the highest in June 2009 (i.e., 2.3 ± 1.1 kPa, $p < 0.05$) and the lowest in 2008 (i.e., 1.0 ± 0.5 kPa, $p < 0.01$).
3.2 Seasonal changes in energy partitioning and β

The energy partitioning trends of daytime total net radiation ($R_n$) into latent, sensible heat fluxes (LE and $H$), soil heat fluxes ($G$) and heat storage of canopy ($S$) for the year 2006-2009 were presented in Fig.3. Among these years, $R_n$ varied with solar radiation ($R > 0.95, \alpha =0.01$ level), reached the maximum in July, and gradually decreased until the late October (in dry years) or November (in wet years). During growing season, there were no significant difference in average daytime total $R_n$ between wet and dry years. The average of daytime total $G$ during the growing season displayed great seasonal and annual differences among these years ($p < 0.05$), with a lower value in wet years than that of the dry years ($p < 0.001$). Additionally, $G$ only accounted for a small proportion of $R_n$, which ranged from 2.1% in 2007 to 4.9% in 2006. Moreover, the average value of daytime total $S$ among four growing seasons were 0.46 MJ m$^{-2}$, 0.49 MJ m$^{-2}$, 0.51 MJ m$^{-2}$, 0.54 MJ m$^{-2}$, respectively. $S/R_n$ varied between 6.0% in 2007 and 6.8% in 2009 and showed no differences between the wet and dry years.

LE was the dominant turbulent flux with changes of $R_n$, and started to rapidly increase in mid-April and reached a maximum in July for all 3 years (i.e., in 2006, 2008 and 2009), except but August for 2007. The peak value of daytime total LE was 16.61 MJm$^{-2}$, 17.01 MJ m$^{-2}$, 19.72 MJ m$^{-2}$ and 16.27MJ m$^{-2}$, in 2006 to 2009 respectively. $H$ became the main consumer of the growing season $R_n$ in October for dry years and in November for the wet years. Among the four years, LE/($R_n$-$G$) was significantly higher in 2008 (64.8%) than those in 2006 (57.1%), 2007 (60.3%) and 2009 (50.4%) ($p < 0.05$). LE/($R_n$-$G$) was much lower in 2009 than those in other 3 years ($p < 0.01$). Partitioning of $R_n$ into LE and $H$ differed significantly between the wet and dry years ($F =17.599, p < 0.001$) (Table 3). The average daytime total LE in wet years was greater (6.77 MJm$^{-2}$) than that of dry years (5.72 MJm$^{-2}$, $p < 0.01$). The dominant turbulent energy flux during the early growing season was sensible heat flux ($H$) with or without drought stress, except in 2006 when the irrigation were applied (Table 3). Then LE was the dominant driver of energy partitioning during the middle and late growing season under drought stress.

The seasonal variation of the midday Bowen ratio ($β$) displayed rapid and significant trend across the growing season, especially at the beginning (April-June) and end (September-October) of the growing season (Fig. 4). The Bowen ratios during the middle of growing seasons were all smaller than 1, and approximately lasted from DOY 180-250 in the dry year and from DOY 180-290 in the wet years. The average midday $β$ of dry year was greater (1.57) than that of the wet year (0.83; $F=19.176, p < 0.001$). The Bowen ratio showed differences in
response to drought stress across the four growing seasons (Table 3), and had much higher values (> 1) during the drought periods in 2007 and 2009, but not in 2006. The Bowen ratio was smaller than 1 during drought-stressed periods in 2008.

3.3 Biophysical controls of energy partitioning

The $R_s$ varied widely at the beginning and the end of growing season, but changed steadily within a low range during the middle of growing season by comparison. Moreover, these lower $R_s$ in the dry year lasted a shorter period (DOY 190-250) than in the wet year (Fig. 5a). Overall, the seasonal average of surface resistance ($R_s$) normalized by leaf area index (LAI) (i.e., $R_s$:LAI) in 2008 (54.1 s m$^{-1}$ leaf area) was lowest among four years (i.e., $p < 0.05$). The $R_s$:LAI in the dry year (106.8 s m$^{-1}$ leaf area) was 50% higher than in the wet year (71.2 s m$^{-1}$ leaf area) ($p < 0.001$). The $R_s$:LAI in the seasonal drought-stressed periods of 2006, 2007 and 2009 were greatly higher than those in unstressed periods ($p < 0.001$). In addition, a significantly negative relationship was found between the $R_s$ and LAI during the wet years (Fig. 6).

The average midday $R_a$ peaked in June, and decreased in July/August before reaching a second peak in October (Fig. 5b). The seasonal average $R_a$ during growing season ranged from 68.3 s m$^{-1}$ to 77.9 s m$^{-1}$, with a mean value of 74.4 s m$^{-1}$, and showed no difference among the four growing seasons ($p > 0.05$). Figure 5c presents the seasonal and annual variations of midday $R_a$. The average $R_a$ for the four growing seasons was 23.2±8.5 s m$^{-1}$, ranging from 10.6 to 43.5 s m$^{-1}$, 9.7 to 52.5 s m$^{-1}$, 6.5 to 43.1 s m$^{-1}$, 9.7 to 74.5 s m$^{-1}$, from 2006 to 2009, respectively. $R_a$ in 2007 was significantly higher than that of the dry years ($p < 0.01$), while $R_a$ in 2008 was smaller than that in dry years ($p < 0.001$). However, there were no significant differences between dry and wet years $R_a$ ($p > 0.05$).

The seasonal changes of LE/LE$_{eq}$ value varied between 0.4 and 1.0 during most of the growing seasons (Fig. 5d). The average LE/LE$_{eq}$ of the four years were 0.76, 0.73, 0.89, and 0.63, respectively. The mean LE/LE$_{eq}$ of the dry years (0.68) was lower than that of wet years (0.81; $p < 0.001$). Specifically, the value of LE/LE$_{eq}$ in drought periods of 2007 and 2009 were much smaller. A significantly exponential relationship existed between the LE/LE$_{eq}$ and $R_s$ during the growing season (Fig. 7).

The decoupling coefficient ($\Omega$) across the growing season peaked in mid-July in 2008 and in early August in the other years (Fig. 5e). The mean $\Omega$ for the four years was 0.41, 0.46, 0.43 and 0.39 (Table 3), respectively, and was significantly higher in wet year (0.45) than that in dry years (0.41).
year ($F=9.460$, $p < 0.01$). Compared to the value during unstressed periods, the decoupling coefficient during the seasonal drought periods (#1_06, #2_06; #1_07, #2_07 and #1_09, #2_09, #3_09) was much lower values.

4 Discussion

4.1 Energy partitioning and Bowen ratio

The energy balance ratio ($E_{BR}$) is a way of evaluating scalar flux estimates from EC techniques (Chen et al., 2009). In this study, the closure of the energy budget was 0.88 based on daytime 30-minute fluxes, and > 0.96 based on daytime totals (Table 2). The annual mean $E_{BR}$ at our site was similar to the values of eight ChinaFlux sites, which averaged 0.83 and ranged from 0.58 to 1.00 (Li et al., 2005). The energy budget is also consistent with the 50 site-year of flux data from 22 in FLUXNET sites, which had energy closure of 0.34-1.69 (Mean = 0.84, Wilson et al., 2002a). A recent analysis of 173 FLUXNET sites also found an average closure of 0.84 (Stoy et al., 2013), although the authors also detected consistent differences among the biomes, and based on metrics of landscape heterogeneity. In addition to the known reasons for decreasing energy balance closure (Hernandez-Ramirez et al., 2010; Li et al., 2005; Nakai et al., 2006; Stoy et al., 2013), management operations at our site (e.g., irrigation, tilling and partial felling) may also affect the energy balance. Although the causes of surface energy balance closure continues to be debated (Stoy et al., 2013) and will not be conclusively answered in the current study, the results reported here are similar to other FLUXNET sites.

The surface energy partitioning depends on water potential gradient and surface resistance (Arain et al., 2003; Baldocchi et al., 2000; Chen et al., 2009). To the extent that canopy development (Guo et al., 2010), rainfall dynamics and irrigation (Ozdogan et al., 2010) affect these properties, they could directly lead to a change in soil moisture and the evaporation component of LE, therefore impact energy partitioning and $\beta$ (Chen et al., 2009; Ozdogan et al., 2010). However, the impact of precipitation on the Bowen ratio may vary by even at any site (Tang et al., 2014). In our study, a detectable response of LE/(Rn-G) and Bowen ratio to drought stress and non-stress periods were observed in response to soil water supply (Table 3) with a 50 mm threshold on average (Fig 8). The variability of energy partitioning during the growing season was highly sensitive to water availability from precipitation and irrigation. On an annual scale, the Bowen ratio appeared linearly related to the total growing season precipitation.
(R²=0.89, p < 0.05). Thus, the Bowen ratio is very responsive to the site water supply, similar finding was reported in Grünwald and Bernhofer (2007) in a temperate spruce forest.

By contrast, β varied from 0.18 to 0.71, with a mean of 0.35 ± 0.15 during the most part of the growing season in 2008 and non-stressed periods in other 3 years, which was close to 0.42 for deciduous forests (Wilson et al., 2002b) and 0.55 in a temperate Douglas-fir (Humphreys et al., 2003), similar to the variations in a ponderosa pine forest in the western United States (Goldstein et al., 2000) and a deciduous broadleaved forest in the southern United States (Wilson and Baldocchi, 2000). Seasonal drought stress had a discernible impact on the Bowen ratio of this poplar plantation. However, compared to the reported β values such as, 0.74 in a temperate mixed forest (Wu et al., 2007), 0.81 in a boreal Scots pine forest (Launiainen, 2010), 0.89 in a loblolly pine plantation (Sun et al., 2010), the average β in wet years were close to the above values. β was higher in seasonal drought periods and dry years than most temperate coniferous forests (Mean = 1.07, (Wilson et al., 2002b), which typically had a higher β values. The high β value in this study reflects the semi-arid conditions, and suggests a low tree water supply which might be resulted from the combination of low rainfall, low water holding capacity of the sandy soil, and high plant and atmospheric water demand. It has been suggested that the large-scale establishment of poplar plantation in sandy semi-arid regions of northern China could have an adverse impact on the region’s groundwater reserves (Li et al., 2014; Petzold et al., 2011). Our findings corroborate the hypothesis that drought would trigger significant changes in energy partitioning of water-demanding poplar species in a water-stressed region.

4.2 Biophysical control on Bowen ratio

The Bowen ratio is dependent of the interactions of climatic and biological factors (Perez et al., 2008; Wilson and Baldocchi, 2000). Ri quantifies the climatic control on energy partitioning and tends to decrease the Bowen ratio. A higher Ri implies a warm and dry climate in continental regions (Raupach, 2000; Wilson et al., 2002b). Rs reflects the physiological control on surface energy exchange of an ecosystem (Costa et al., 2010; Launiainen, 2010; Zhou et al., 2010), and generally increases the Bowen ratio. Wilson et al. (2002b) reported that Rs was the dominant factor in controlling the variability of the Bowen ratio of forests in temperate regions. A linear relation was also found between the Bowen ratio and Rs normalized by aerodynamic (Ra) and climatological resistance (Ri) parameters (Cho et al., 2012).
In this study, similar to $R_s$, varied seasonally with plant phenology, and showed similar seasonal characteristics to other deciduous forests during the course of the growing season (Cabral et al., 2010; Kutsch et al., 2008; Li et al., 2012). As reported by Tchebakova et al. (2002), $R_s$ in seasonal drought stressed periods was much higher than that in non-stressed periods. The drought stress during the canopy development in 2007 led to lower leaf area and higher canopy resistance (e.g. Noormets et al., 2008), which may explain significant difference in $R_s$ between wet year 2007 and 2008 (Fig.9). Compared with the $R_s$ in other researches, the $R_s$:LAI in dry years of this poplar plantation was close to that of Euphrates Poplar (Populus euphratica Oliv.) (130.2 s m$^{-1}$ leaf area) and smaller than that of Gansu Poplar (Populus gansuensis Wang et Yang) (189.4 s m$^{-1}$ leaf area) in northwest China (Chen et al., 2004). In wet years it was similar to that of poplar (58.6 s m$^{-1}$ leaf area) in Iceland (Wilson et al., 2002b), and boreal aspen during the full-leaf period (51.8 s m$^{-1}$ leaf area) in Canada (Blanken et al., 1997).

$R_s$ is primarily driven by solar radiation, moisture availability and VPD (Fernández et al., 2009; Li et al., 2012), and modulated by leaf area and stomatal resistance, which in turn changes as a function of the above factors (Wilson and Baldocchi, 2000). The strong correlation between $R_s$ and LAI in wet years (Fig.6) suggested that $R_s$ in dry years was also influenced by other physiological and non-physiological (e.g., soil evaporation, canopy structure and turbulence) factors (Wilson et al., 2002b). The mean $R_s$ in this study area was higher than mean $R_t$ across site-year for forests in Wilson et al. (2002b) ($t$=5.91, df=741, $p < 0.001$), but ~ 50% lower than the value reported by Li et al. (2009) in a vineyard in Gansu Province in China ($t$= -29.87, df=741, $p < 0.001$), likely due to the warm-dry climate of the northern region in China.

On the seasonal scale, the Bowen ratio and $R_s$ of this poplar plantation were correlated, and consistent with Wilson et al. (2002b) and Li et al. (2009), but differed in wet and dry years. The Bowen ratio and $R_s$ were linearly related in wet years ($R^2$=0.98, $p < 0.001$), and correlated exponentially in dry years ($R^2$=0.93, $p < 0.001$, Fig.10), during which the sensitivity of the Bowen ratio on $R_s$ increased with the growing $R_o$. The partial correlation analysis indicated that $R_s$ and $R_o$, respectively, had strong positive and negative effects on $\beta$ in both wet and dry years (Table 4), which could not be detected through correlation analysis (e.g., the impact of $R_s$ and $R_o$ on $\beta$). Furthermore, both controlling roles of $R_s$ and $R_o$ on the Bowen ratio in dry years seemed greater than that in wet years. Finally, $R_o$ had a significant negative impact on the Bowen ratio in wet years, but not in dry years.
The average LE/LE\textsubscript{eq} in the growing season was 0.74 at our site, which is similar to deciduous forests (0.72) (Wilson et al., 2002b), but smaller than at a temperate broad-leaved forest (0.82) (Komatsu, 2005). The average Ω value of 0.42 ± 0.22 (0.39-0.46) was close to the other forests (0.26-0.4, Wilson and Baldocchi, 2000; 0.25-0.43, Motzer et al., 2005). Similar to Baldocchi (1994), LE/LE\textsubscript{eq} declined with increasing Rs during the growing season (Fig. 7), which is equivalent to the logarithmic relationship between LE/LE\textsubscript{eq} and G\textsubscript{s} (surface conductance) reported by other studies (Chen et al., 2009; Hossen et al., 2011; Zhu et al., 2014). The asymptotic value of LE/LE\textsubscript{eq} in dry years (0.89) and wet years (0.96) were both lower than the 1.1-1.4 range reported by Monteith (1995), indicating that our study site was characterized by drier surface conditions than average for the deciduous forest biome during both dry and wet years. The low LE/LE\textsubscript{eq} values under dry surface conditions of the ecosystem in this study may also be related to the high porosity of sandy soil and a low ground water table (Zhao et al., 2013). Overall, as indicated by the lower Ω values and the significant correlation coefficients between LE/LE\textsubscript{eq} and Rs, the Rs was the major factor controlling the LE during growing season, which was consistent with the relations between Rs and the Bowen ratio. In addition, LE was more coupled to the atmosphere during the dry years and seasonal drought periods across growing season, which were reported in other studies (Bagayoko et al., 2007; Bracho et al., 2008; Zha et al., 2013).

### 4.3 Implication for poplar plantation establishment

To our knowledge, there is no and it is hard to develop a metrics for the sustainability of forest plantation, even though there are a couple of studies defining the sustainability of forest plantation by site and plantation productivity for commercial purpose only (e.g. Richardson et al., 1999; Watt et al., 2005) other than in a broader sense of the plantation and environment interactions that were our focus in the current paper. Our previous study indicated that annual water use of the plantation was even higher than the annual precipitation (Zhang et al., 2014) and thus the irrigation was applied in dry years by pumping groundwater (Table 1). Such water abstraction for irrigating plantation and agriculture crops have led to the dramatic water table decline in the last 30 years (Zhang et al., 2014). Energy partitioning to latent and sensible heat and surface resistance was dramatically responsive to climatological drought, and as indicated by low LE/LE\textsubscript{eq} (< 1) and low values of decoupling coefficient (Ω) (Zhu et al., 2014), the dry surface dominated the poplar plantation no matter in wet or dry years, which led to the shortage of water use in poplar plantation. In other words, the poplar plantation would consume much
water which comes from precipitation or groundwater to maintain its ecological services, while
the required irrigation for sustaining these forests may present a threat to the adjacent
ecosystems because of their role in reducing ground water table, and may compromise long-
term sustainability and livelihoods in the region. Therefore, from the viewpoint of hydrologic
balance as well as interactions with atmosphere, growing poplar trees in a water-stressed region
is not sustainable.

5 Conclusions

The seasonal drought stress affected the dynamics of individual turbulent energy fluxes and the
surface resistances in the poplar plantation during growing seasons. Partitioning of available
energy into latent (LE) and sensible heat (H) flux responded to meteorological drought and
correspondingly displayed higher β in dry years (1.57) than that in wet years (0.83). Similar to
the response of the Bowen ratio on drought conditions, the LAI normalized surface resistance
(Rs:LAI) in dry years was 33% higher than that in wet years. Accordingly, the contrasting
impact of Rs and Ri on the Bowen ratio were stronger in dry years than in wet years, while the
effect of Ra was stronger in wet years, Rs was the major factor in controlling energy partitioning
during the growing season, as indicated by the relatively low decoupling coefficient (Ω) values.
Furthermore, the overall low LE/LEeq (< 1) of poplar plantations indicated that dry climate
dominated in this water limited region, which suggested that the fast-growing and water-
intensive species like the poplar plantation are poorly adapted for the water limited regions.
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Table 1. The stand characteristics of four years from 2006 to 2009, including the minimum, maximum and mean temperature (T), the annual precipitation (P), evapotranspiration (ET), irrigation (I), canopy height (H), breast height diameter (DBH), leaf area index (LAI). The error estimates are standard deviation (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tmin (°C)</th>
<th>Tmax (°C)</th>
<th>Tmean (°C)</th>
<th>P (mm)</th>
<th>ET (mm)</th>
<th>I (mm)</th>
<th>H (m)</th>
<th>DBH (cm)</th>
<th>LAI (m²m⁻²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>12.5±0.73</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11.5±1.1</td>
<td>10.8±1.5</td>
<td>1.6±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>13.0±0.55</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.0±1.3</td>
<td>12.2±1.8</td>
<td>2.1±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>13.3±0.54</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.8±1.2</td>
<td>13.8±1.8</td>
<td>2.2±0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>12.5±0.60</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>16.2±1.6</td>
<td>14.5±1.6</td>
<td>2.9±0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Energy balance closure statistic using half-hourly and daytime totals during growing season from 2006 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>daytime</th>
<th>Daytime sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>17.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daytime was defined as the period between the sunrise and sunset with PAR > 4 umol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$;

The unit of Intercept for Half-hourly value and Daytime sum value were W • m$^{-2}$ and MJ • m$^{-2}$, respectively.
Table 3. The value of the soil water supply (WS), energy partitioning ratios and biophysical variables in the different periods of the growing season during 2006-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Periods(DOY)</th>
<th>WS (mm)</th>
<th>LE/(Rn-G)(%/%)</th>
<th>H/(Rn-G)(%/%)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Rs (s m⁻¹)</th>
<th>Ri (s m⁻¹)</th>
<th>Ra (s m⁻¹)</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Ω</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>100-163</td>
<td>76.2±56</td>
<td>50.5(23.4)</td>
<td>45.9(19.7)</td>
<td>3.48(6.37)</td>
<td>418.7(528.7)</td>
<td>87.8(30.2)</td>
<td>20.0(6.3)</td>
<td>0.64(0.35)</td>
<td>0.25(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164-192d</td>
<td>127.8</td>
<td>68.0(13.3)</td>
<td>33.2(11.1)</td>
<td>0.66(0.35)</td>
<td>184.0(94.7)</td>
<td>94.9(45.2)</td>
<td>23.8(5.1)</td>
<td>0.79(0.19)</td>
<td>0.42(0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>193-230</td>
<td>219.6</td>
<td>77.7(11.9)</td>
<td>13.8(6.7)</td>
<td>0.19(0.13)</td>
<td>50.4(29.9)</td>
<td>51.5(16.4)</td>
<td>27.8(8.6)</td>
<td>1.01(0.24)</td>
<td>0.70(0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>231-300d</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51.9(12.7)</td>
<td>31.7(11.6)</td>
<td>0.94(0.52)</td>
<td>178.5(68.8)</td>
<td>77.4(27.5)</td>
<td>25.6(6.8)</td>
<td>0.69(0.23)</td>
<td>0.36(0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>100-143d</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>35.2(6.4)</td>
<td>57.8(8.3)</td>
<td>2.37(0.66)</td>
<td>426.9(148.8)</td>
<td>96.1(29.4)</td>
<td>18.1(5.4)</td>
<td>0.41(0.13)</td>
<td>0.16(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151-200d</td>
<td>146.8</td>
<td>49.5(18.2)</td>
<td>37.0(17.7)</td>
<td>1.41(1.06)</td>
<td>314.1(225.6)</td>
<td>91.7(42.8)</td>
<td>25.3(7.1)</td>
<td>0.58(0.23)</td>
<td>0.35(0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200-300</td>
<td>396.8</td>
<td>66.0(16.3)</td>
<td>15.5(8.5)</td>
<td>0.35(0.32)</td>
<td>74.1(27.3)</td>
<td>61.1(22.7)</td>
<td>30.4(9.2)</td>
<td>0.87(0.20)</td>
<td>0.60(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>100-117</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>16.3(14.1)</td>
<td>71.8(9.7)</td>
<td>1.86(1.12)</td>
<td>206.9(102.0)</td>
<td>60.7(22.9)</td>
<td>13.6(4.1)</td>
<td>0.59(0.35)</td>
<td>0.21(0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118-155d</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>58.8(12.3)</td>
<td>39.5(10.7)</td>
<td>0.71(0.36)</td>
<td>130.8(48.6)</td>
<td>81.1(32.3)</td>
<td>14.7(4.2)</td>
<td>0.81(0.23)</td>
<td>0.31(0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156-188</td>
<td>212.7</td>
<td>68.1(14.6)</td>
<td>33.3(10.7)</td>
<td>0.35(0.23)</td>
<td>70.2(33.4)</td>
<td>56.1(20.6)</td>
<td>19.3(5.9)</td>
<td>0.94(0.23)</td>
<td>0.53(0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>189-212d</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73.5(12.7)</td>
<td>20.4(7.5)</td>
<td>0.18(0.15)</td>
<td>59.3(27.1)</td>
<td>67.4(41.1)</td>
<td>27.8(6.8)</td>
<td>1.07(0.25)</td>
<td>0.68(0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>213-239</td>
<td>173.4</td>
<td>74.8(11.9)</td>
<td>11.8(6.2)</td>
<td>0.24(0.16)</td>
<td>61.5(23.7)</td>
<td>55.8(14.3)</td>
<td>19.3(5.2)</td>
<td>0.92(0.14)</td>
<td>0.57(0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240-251d</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>60.4(12.6)</td>
<td>23.4(9.9)</td>
<td>0.42(0.22)</td>
<td>88.7(34.6)</td>
<td>60.4(15.3)</td>
<td>18.0(4.1)</td>
<td>0.87(0.21)</td>
<td>0.46(0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>252-300</td>
<td>116.2</td>
<td>47.2(5.7)</td>
<td>39.2(3.6)</td>
<td>0.41(0.22)</td>
<td>72.1(17.8)</td>
<td>57.3(28.9)</td>
<td>18.4(4.4)</td>
<td>0.85(0.23)</td>
<td>0.48(0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>100-158d</td>
<td>37.6±52</td>
<td>36.0(16.5)</td>
<td>48.8(13.4)</td>
<td>1.90(0.83)</td>
<td>298.9(150.8)</td>
<td>84.2(39.3)</td>
<td>18.2(3.8)</td>
<td>0.43(0.19)</td>
<td>0.21(0.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WS: soil water supply of period (sum of precipitation and irrigation); $\beta$: Bowen ratio; $R_s$, the surface resistance; $R_i$, the climatological resistance; $R_a$, the aerodynamic resistance; $\alpha$, the Priestley-Taylor coefficient; $\Omega$, the decoupling coefficient;

d indicate the drought stressed periods.

The value in table represents Mean (SD), the superscript uppercase letters (A, B, C) and lowercase letters (a, b, c) respectively indicate the significance at the 0.01 level and the 0.05 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165-186 $^d$</td>
<td>187-235</td>
<td>236-300 $^d$</td>
<td>466+86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>265+32</td>
<td>20.4+20</td>
<td>59.1(18.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.8(15.6)</td>
<td>65.9(12.8)</td>
<td>50.4(20.5)</td>
<td>31.8(16.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.1(14.8)</td>
<td>12.4(6.7)</td>
<td>33.1(18.4)</td>
<td>1.60(3.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.32(0.78)</td>
<td>0.28(0.18)</td>
<td>1.28(1.31)</td>
<td>31.8(16.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>360.5(139.8)</td>
<td>61.2(30.9)</td>
<td>208.3(194.3)</td>
<td>231.4(338.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137.4(43.8)</td>
<td>53.0(22.8)</td>
<td>72.3(26.5)</td>
<td>77.9(33.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.2(5.9)</td>
<td>27.4(6.6)</td>
<td>26.9(10.7)</td>
<td>24.0(7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.53(0.28)</td>
<td>0.82(0.18)</td>
<td>0.64(0.28)</td>
<td>0.76(0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.24(0.10)</td>
<td>0.66(0.13)</td>
<td>0.39(0.21)</td>
<td>0.41(0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 Growing season</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>400+195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.6(19.5)</td>
<td>56.6(19.5)</td>
<td>48.5(21.9)</td>
<td>52.6(22.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.7(19.6)</td>
<td>28.7(19.6)</td>
<td>34.6(18.5)</td>
<td>33.0(18.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.93(0.98)</td>
<td>0.93(0.98)</td>
<td>1.54(2.19)</td>
<td>1.57(3.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>192.2(190.7)</td>
<td>192.2(190.7)</td>
<td>248.9(273.3)</td>
<td>240.3(306.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.4(34.0)</td>
<td>75.4(34.0)</td>
<td>77.1(39.1)</td>
<td>77.5(36.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.9(9.3)</td>
<td>26.9(9.3)</td>
<td>23.8(8.5)</td>
<td>23.9(8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.73(0.44)</td>
<td>0.73(0.44)</td>
<td>0.63(0.38)</td>
<td>0.68(0.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.46(0.22)</td>
<td>0.46(0.22)</td>
<td>0.39(0.24)</td>
<td>0.40(0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2006,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007 Growing season</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>400+195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.1(15.2)</td>
<td>66.1(15.2)</td>
<td>48.5(21.9)</td>
<td>52.6(22.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.1(13.4)</td>
<td>22.1(13.4)</td>
<td>34.6(18.5)</td>
<td>33.0(18.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.73(1.04)</td>
<td>0.73(1.04)</td>
<td>1.54(2.19)</td>
<td>1.57(3.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118.1(115.3)</td>
<td>118.1(115.3)</td>
<td>248.9(273.3)</td>
<td>240.3(306.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.3(44.9)</td>
<td>68.3(44.9)</td>
<td>77.1(39.1)</td>
<td>77.5(36.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.5(6.3)</td>
<td>18.5(6.3)</td>
<td>23.8(8.5)</td>
<td>23.9(8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89(0.59)</td>
<td>0.89(0.59)</td>
<td>0.63(0.38)</td>
<td>0.68(0.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.43(0.19)</td>
<td>0.43(0.19)</td>
<td>0.39(0.24)</td>
<td>0.40(0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wet years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2007,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008 Growing season</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>400+195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.5(18.1)</td>
<td>61.5(18.1)</td>
<td>48.5(21.9)</td>
<td>52.6(22.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.1(17.0)</td>
<td>25.1(17.0)</td>
<td>34.6(18.5)</td>
<td>33.0(18.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.83(1.01)</td>
<td>0.83(1.01)</td>
<td>1.54(2.19)</td>
<td>1.57(3.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153.1(159.7)</td>
<td>153.1(159.7)</td>
<td>248.9(273.3)</td>
<td>240.3(306.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.6(40.3)</td>
<td>71.6(40.3)</td>
<td>77.1(39.1)</td>
<td>77.5(36.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.5(8.9)</td>
<td>22.5(8.9)</td>
<td>23.8(8.5)</td>
<td>23.9(8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.81(0.29)</td>
<td>0.81(0.29)</td>
<td>0.63(0.38)</td>
<td>0.68(0.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.45(0.20)</td>
<td>0.45(0.20)</td>
<td>0.39(0.24)</td>
<td>0.40(0.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. The correlation analysis between the Bowen ratio ($\beta$) and $R_s$, $R_i$ and $R_a$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partial correlation analysis*</th>
<th>Correlation analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SOCC$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$ &amp; $R_s$</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry year</td>
<td>$\beta$ &amp; $R_i$</td>
<td>-0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$ &amp; $R_a$</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$ &amp; $R_i$</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wet year</td>
<td>$\beta$ &amp; $R_i$</td>
<td>-0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$ &amp; $R_a$</td>
<td>-0.217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Partial correlation analysis was proceeded between Bowen ratio and each of three resistance parameters ($R_s$, $R_i$ and $R_a$) with the other two as controlling variables.

$SOCC$: The abbreviation of Second-order correlation coefficient.
Figure 1. The cumulative precipitation (P) and periodic irrigation during 2006-2009, irrigation in 2006 and 2009 were separately represented by the solid and dotted brace, respectively.
Figure 2. The seasonal variation of environmental conditions during 2006-2009, a-d: the relative extractable water (REW) (drought periods longer than 20 days are shaded), daily sum of precipitation (P); e-h: daytime mean air temperature ($T_a$), daytime mean air vapor deficit (VPD).
Figure 3. Seasonal patterns of daytime energy components (5-day running average) during the growing season from 2006 to 2009, including net radiation ($R_n$), latent heat (LE), sensible heat ($H$) and soil heat flux ($G$) and heat storage term ($S$).
Figure 4. Seasonal and inter-annual variability of the midday mean Bowen ratio ($\beta$) (5-day running average) across the growing season, with detailed $\beta$ during DOY 185-255 representing in small pane; Midday means the time course from 10:00 a.m. to 15:00 p.m. at local standard time.
Figure 5. Seasonal dynamics of the midday mean surface resistance ($R_s$), climatological resistance ($R_i$), aerodynamic resistance ($R_a$), LE/LE\textsubscript{eq} and decoupling coefficient ($\Omega$) (5-day running average) across the growing season from 2006 to 2009. Midday means the time course from 10:00 a.m. to 15:00 p.m. LST.
Figure 6. The relationship between leaf area index (LAI) and surface resistance ($R_s$) during growing season of the wet and dry year.
Figure 7. The relationships between surface resistance ($R_s$) and LE/LE$_{eq}$ (Priestley-Taylor coefficient) during growing season of the wet (a) and dry (b) year.
Figure 8. The response of Bowen ratio and $\text{LE}/(R_n - G)$ on Water Supply (WS) (including precipitation (P) and irrigation (I) during individual period) of the different periods across four growing seasons.
Figure 9. Seasonal variations of monthly average LAI and $R_s$ during the growing season in wet year 2007 and 2008.
Figure 10. Response of monthly average Bowen ratio ($\beta$) on surface resistance ($R_s$) in the wet and dry year.

\[ \beta = 0.0105 \times R_s - 0.4887 \]
\[ R^2 = 0.9877, \ P < 0.001 \]

\[ \beta = 0.2643e^{0.0054R_s} \]
\[ R^2 = 0.9329, \ P < 0.001 \]