Effect of Soil Moisture on Diurnal Convection and Precipitation in Large-Eddy Simulations
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ABSTRACT

A determination of the sign and magnitude of the soil moisture–precipitation feedback relies either on observations, where synoptic variability is difficult to isolate, or on model simulations, which suffer from biases mainly related to poorly resolved convection. In this study, a large-eddy simulation model with a resolution of 250 m is coupled to a land surface model and several idealized experiments mimicking the full diurnal cycle of convection are performed, starting from different spatially homogeneous soil moisture conditions. The goal is to determine under which conditions drier soils may produce more precipitation than wetter ones. The methodology of previous conceptual studies that have quantified the likelihood of convection to be triggered over wet or dry soils is followed but includes the production of precipitation. Although convection can be triggered earlier over dry soils than over wet soils under certain atmospheric conditions, total precipitation is found to always decrease over dry soils. By splitting the total precipitation into its magnitude and duration component, it is found that the magnitude strongly correlates with surface latent heat flux, hence implying a wet soil advantage. Because of this strong scaling, changes in precipitation duration caused by differences in convection triggering are not able to overcompensate for the lack of evaporation over dry soils. These results are further validated using two additional atmospheric soundings and a series of perturbed experiments that consider cloud radiative effects, as well as the effect of large-scale forcing, winds, and plants on the soil moisture–precipitation coupling.

1. Introduction

The evolution of the atmosphere is partly written in the land surface. Over some regions of the globe and by changing the soil moisture, it is possible to modify the future atmospheric state on time scales ranging from the diurnal cycle to the seasonal scale. For instance, Fischer et al. (2007) used model simulations of the anomalously hot summer of 2003 to show that, by simply decreasing soil moisture by 25% in spring, summer temperature anomalies can increase by more than 2°C. In this particular case, reduced soil moisture availability limits the surface latent heat flux which, as a compensation, leads to a larger surface sensible heat flux and hence warmer air temperatures. Although the coupling between air temperature and soil moisture is straightforward (Miralles et al. 2012, 2014), the coupling between precipitation and soil moisture has been debated many times. A wetter soil promotes larger surface latent heat fluxes in a soil moisture–limited regime (Budyko 1974), thus increasing the moisture contribution to the atmosphere. From an atmospheric moisture balance perspective, this increase in the amount of water vapor increases the potential amount of precipitation. The precipitation eventually falls on the ground and replenishes the soil moisture reservoir, closing the feedback loop. This is the main idea behind the mechanism of precipitation recycling (Trenberth 1999). It implies a positive soil moisture–precipitation feedback. Precipitation recycling is nevertheless thought not to play a big role on the regional scale. Van der Ent et al. (2010), for instance, reported a recycling ratio of less than 10% for horizontal scales of 500 km, which agrees with the
estimate obtained by Schär et al. (1999) based on a one-month model simulation over Europe. The major source of water vapor for precipitation is indeed constituted by the advection of moisture into a region rather than direct local evapotranspiration.

Instead of locally increasing water vapor, soil moisture can modify the efficiency at which water vapor is converted into precipitation. By exploring this scenario with the aid of a simple 1D model, Findell and Eltahir (2003a) showed that, over a homogeneous surface, the resulting coupling over a diurnal cycle strongly depends on the early morning atmospheric state. Larger values of sensible heat flux, as the ones found over dry soils, produce a deeper planetary boundary layer (PBL) that can more easily reach the level of free convection (LFC). On the other hand, larger values of latent heat flux, as the ones found over wet soils, lead to a moistening of the PBL and thus to a lowering of the lifting condensation level (LCL), making it easier to trigger convection. Different combinations of low-level instability and moisture amount favor one or the other mechanism, resulting either in a dry soil advantage (more precipitation over dry soils) or in a wet soil advantage (more precipitation over wet soils). In Findell and Eltahir (2003a) these two scenarios are differentiated using the convective triggering potential (CTP) index, which considers convective instability between 900 and 700 hPa, and the HI_{low} humidity index, which corresponds to the sum of the dewpoint depressions at 950 and 850 hPa. A third mechanism by which soil moisture can impact precipitation is through the generation of thermally induced mesoscale circulations (Pielke 2001; Taylor et al. 2011), which is not considered in this study as the focus is on initially homogeneous surface conditions and short time scales.

Given the importance of the soil moisture–precipitation feedback in regulating the global and continental hydrological cycle, many studies have tried to estimate its more likely sign and magnitude using either observations (e.g., Miralles et al. 2014; Ford et al. 2015), coarse-resolution models with parameterized convection (e.g., Schär et al. 1999; Wang et al. 2007), convection-permitting models with explicit convection (e.g., Hohenegger et al. 2009; Schlemmer et al. 2012), or conceptual models (e.g., Findell and Eltahir 2003a; Tawfik et al. 2015; Gentile et al. 2013). The main problem regarding observational studies is that the effect of synoptic variability is difficult to filter out. In contrast, model studies rely on their parameterizations. Hohenegger et al. (2009), using model simulations of an entire summer season over the Alps, showed that the sign of the soil moisture–precipitation feedback strongly depends on the design of the model. In particular, the parameterization of convection is the model feature that greatly affects the sign of the feedback. The parameterization of convection can even reverse its sign depending on the use or not as well as on the design of such a parameterization. Even convection-permitting simulations are not exempt of biases because of a grid spacing that is still too coarse to properly resolve convection. This typically leads to a too late triggering of convection (e.g., Hohenegger et al. 2008), which might bias the resulting soil moisture–precipitation feedback. Finally, it should be noted that studies often use metrics to diagnose the soil moisture–precipitation feedback that were designed to assess the potential for triggering of convection over a certain surface state, without actually considering the amount of precipitation. Some examples of such metrics are the already described CTP–HI_{low} framework of Findell and Eltahir (2003a) and the heated-condensation framework of Tawfik et al. (2015), where the buoyant condensation level and buoyant mixing temperature are used to quantify the preconditioning of the atmospheric state to moist convection.

The present work aims at estimating the sign and magnitude of the soil moisture–precipitation coupling in an idealized setup of an initially horizontally homogeneous atmosphere and homogeneous soil moisture conditions. The focus is on one diurnal cycle of convection with its associated precipitation. The first goal is to quantify the likelihood of precipitation on soils that are either wetter or drier than normal. Here we neglect any effects that would arise due to the presence of heterogeneous soil moisture conditions, which, in the absence of winds, lead to more precipitation over spatially drier soil patches (Taylor et al. 2012). The second goal is to evaluate whether large-scale effects, cloud–surface interactions, or the presence of winds or plants can modify the sign and magnitude of the coupling.

To address these goals, idealized experiments are performed with the aid of a state-of-the-art, high-resolution large-eddy simulation (LES) model starting from different initial soil moisture values. The LES model is fully coupled to a land surface model as well as to radiation. This setup allows for an explicit representation of convection and of land surface interactions on scales of O(100) m. Within this setup, the methodology proposed by Findell and Eltahir (2003a) is revisited. Instead of focusing only on the dependence of the triggering of convection on soil moisture, attention is set on the entire diurnal cycle of convection and its precipitation.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the modeling framework and the experiment setup. In section 3 the results of the experiments using the same initial atmospheric conditions as in Findell and Eltahir (2003a) are discussed and a simple expression is derived to assess the likelihood of observing more precipitation over drier soils. In section 4 the role of clouds, large-scale forcing, winds, and plants on the
soil moisture–precipitation coupling is investigated. Conclusions are given in section 5.

2. Method

a. The modeling framework

The Icosahedral Nonhydrostatic (ICON) model is a new-generation unified modeling system for numerical weather prediction (NWP) and climate studies that allows for an explicit representation of nonhydrostatic processes and can be applied across a wide range of scales. It has been developed as a collaboration between the Max Planck Institute for Meteorology and the German Weather Service [Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD)], where it is currently used to produce global operational forecasts. To maximize the model performance and to remove the singularity at the poles, ICON employs an unstructured icosahedral grid where all the common mathematical operators are expressed in terms of components either normal or perpendicular to the triangle edges (Wan et al. 2013).

The nonhydrostatic dynamical core has been validated by means of several idealized cases including a flow over orography and a baroclinic development, as well as through NWP skill scores [see Zängl et al. (2015) for details]. In the context of the High Definition Clouds and Precipitation for Advancing Climate Prediction [HD(CP)2] project, a large-eddy version of the ICON model (ICON-LEM) has been developed. ICON-LEM uses the same dynamical core as ICON and shares many of its parameterizations, except for the representation of turbulence, cloud cover, convection, and gravity waves. A comprehensive description of the model can be found in Dipankar et al. (2015). Below, we only recall some of its aspects that are more relevant for our study.

ICON-LEM solves the Favre-filtered (Hinze 1975) equations of motion for the prognostic variables: horizontal velocity component normal to the triangle edges \( v_n \), horizontal velocity component tangential to the triangle edges \( v_t \), vertical wind component perpendicular to the triangle edges \( w \), density \( \rho \), virtual potential temperature \( \theta_v \), and the specific masses of tracers. In the momentum equations, the turbulence parameterization terms are computed as the divergence of the subgrid-scale stress tensor following the approach of Lilly (1962), who revisited the classical Smagorinsky scheme. The contributions of subgrid slow physics (e.g., radiation) and fast physics (e.g., cloud microphysics) are expressed through a flux–gradient relationship in the thermodynamic and tracer equations. The governing equations are integrated in time using a two-time-level predictor–corrector scheme, except for the terms corresponding to the vertical sound-wave propagation, which are integrated implicitly. The tracers are integrated using a flux-form semi-Lagrangian scheme for its better conservation properties.

At the typical resolution of \( O(100) \) m adopted in ICON-LEM, deep convection is thought to be explicitly resolved (Bryan et al. 2003; Petch et al. 2002), while cloud fraction is diagnosed through a simple all-or-nothing scheme (Sommeria and Deardorff 1977). The microphysical cloud processes are parameterized using a one-moment scheme that distinguishes between cloud water, rain, cloud ice, graupel, hail, and snow (see Doms et al. (2011) for a comprehensive description). The choice of this particular scheme is due to the fact that it has been extensively validated and used for many years in the operational setup of the Consortium for Small-Scale Modeling (COSMO)-DE model, which provides short-range forecasts over Germany at a resolution of 2.8 km. Furthermore, the aforementioned microphysical scheme produced the best agreement with other LES studies that investigated typical features of the convective diurnal cycle over midlatitude regions (e.g., Schlemmer et al. 2012). Subgrid-scale orographic effects and nonorographic gravity wave drag parameterizations are disabled in ICON-LEM. Radiation is parameterized with the aid of the Rapid Radiative Transfer Model (RRTM) scheme (see Clough et al. (2005) for a general review).

The coupling between soil and atmosphere is realized through surface fluxes of moisture, heat, and momentum. They are parameterized using a simple drag-law formulation (Dipankar et al. 2015; Doms et al. 2011). The surface latent heat flux entails contribution from bare soil evaporation, plant transpiration, and evaporation from the interception layer. These contributions are computed by the land surface model TERRA-Multi-Layer (TERRA-ML; Schrodin and Heise 2002). TERRA-ML also predicts the evolution of soil moisture and soil temperature at various soil layers. The water reservoir of every soil layer can be modified by gravitational and capillary flux, water extraction by plants, and runoff, while the balance of the first soil layer also accounts for bare soil evaporation, percolation, and precipitation. An interception layer at the surface is coupled to the underlying soil layers. The bare soil evaporation scheme employs the Biosphere–Atmosphere Transfer Scheme (BATS) formulation (Dickinson 1984). Surface evaporation can thus vary between the value of potential evaporation, which depends on surface temperature, and a limiting factor that corresponds to the maximum moisture flux through the surface that the soil can sustain. While more details about the formulation can be found in Doms et al. (2011), the drawbacks of using this particular scheme will be presented in section 3a. The
vertical soil water transport between different layers is parameterized using the Richards equation (Richards 1931). At the lower boundary, defined as the lowermost two soil layers, only downward gravitational transport is considered. Runoff from any soil layer occurs if the total water content of the layer exceeds the field capacity and if the divergence of the fluxes associated with soil water transport are negative. The temperature of the soil layers is predicted using a simple heat diffusion equation (Doms et al. 2011). The lower boundary condition for temperature is provided by a climatological temperature, constant in time, while at the upper boundary the forcing due to surface net radiation (sum of surface longwave and shortwave radiative fluxes), sensible heat flux, latent heat flux, and ground heat flux determines the temperature evolution.

The ICON-LEM modeling framework has been validated for the idealized cases of a dry convective boundary layer and of a cloud-topped boundary layer in Dipankar et al. (2015). The simulations revealed similar results to the ones obtained with two other large-eddy models (LEMs), the University of California, Los Angeles, Large-Eddy Simulation (UCLA-LES) model and the Parallelized Large-Eddy Simulation Model (PALM; Maronga et al. 2015). Furthermore, in the context of the HD(CP)2 project, the modeling framework employing both ICON-LEM and TERRA-ML has been validated using a semi-idealized approach (Heinze et al. 2017a) and by performing real-case simulations (Heinze et al. 2017b). In the latter case, the ICON-LEM simulations compare well to simulations performed with the COSMO model, with ICON-LEM in particular producing more realistic mesoscale variability.

b. Experimental design

1) BASIC CONFIGURATION

To study the response of the diurnal cycle of convection and precipitation to soil moisture, different experiments have been set up using an idealized coupled configuration of ICON-LEM and TERRA-ML. The two early morning soundings (1200 UTC/0600 LST) proposed by Findell and Eltahir (2003a), taken on 3 July and 23 July 1999 in Lincoln, Illinois (United States), are used to initialize the atmosphere, as we want to repeat their analysis but including precipitation. The profiles are illustrated in Fig. 1. Since the effect of winds is not considered in the basic configuration, the (zonal $u$, meridional $v$, and vertical $w$) velocity components are set to 0 over the whole atmospheric column at the beginning of the simulation. The 3 July sounding should represent a wet soil advantage and thus favor convection over wetter soils, whereas the sounding taken on 23 July should favor convection over drier soils, as briefly explained in the introduction and in Findell and Eltahir (2003a). The two cases are referred to in the following as WA for wet soil advantage and DA for dry soil advantage. For each atmospheric profile, the simulations start at 0600 LST and end at 2400 LST. At the initial time, a random perturbation is added in the three lowermost atmospheric levels on the prognostic variables $\theta_e$ and $w$ with an amplitude of 0.2 K and 0.05 m s$^{-1}$, respectively, to break the perfectly homogeneous initial state. To avoid that differences in the insolation between the two cases may affect the coupling, the radiation code is always initialized with the date of the WA sounding and coordinates of Lincoln, Illinois (40.15°N, 89.37°W). Thus, the solar zenith angle depends only on the time of the day and not on the position on the domain.

The horizontal domain comprises 400 $\times$ 400 points on a doubly periodic domain with a resolution of 250 m, which should explicitly resolve deep moist convection (Bryan et al. 2003; Petch et al. 2002), giving a total size of approximately 100 $\times$ 100 km$^2$. This should be large enough to allow organization of convection (Tompkins 2001). It should be recalled that, on an icosahedral grid, the resolution can be formulated with different metrics: throughout this work we will always refer to the distance between triangle edges. Rotation is not considered in the model since the Coriolis term $f \sin \phi$ is set to 0. In the vertical, 150 levels are adopted: the spacing varies from 10 m in the lowermost layer to approximately 400 m at the model top situated by 21 km. In the uppermost 20 atmospheric levels, a sponge layer (Klemp et al. 2008) prevents upward-propagating gravity waves from being reflected.

As in the operational setup of ICON, the soil column is discretized into eight soil layers. In this configuration the soil layers have the following depths: 0.01, 0.02, 0.06, 0.18, 0.54, 1.62, 4.86, and 14.58 m. The soil temperature of the climatological layer amounts to 281 K, whereas the soil type is set to loam. This corresponds to the most common soil type used in ICON over midlatitude areas (e.g., Germany). Table 1 summarizes the parameters used by TERRA-ML in our configuration.

To obtain a spread of surface fluxes large enough to see a significant atmospheric response, soil moisture is varied starting from the saturation value and decreasing down to a condition of a dry soil but still over the wilting point. The soil moisture values considered are 100%, 80%, 70%, 60%, 50%, and 40% of the saturation value, respectively. For the sake of simplicity, they are set homogeneous over the whole soil column.

The soil temperature profile is prescribed by linearly interpolating the near-surface temperature from the lowermost atmospheric level to the climatological value...
of 281 K. Given the consideration of a single diurnal cycle, the values of soil moisture and temperature in deeper soil layers should not appreciably affect the surface latent heat fluxes. As a comparison, Findell and Eltahir (2003a) also used a vertically constant soil moisture, but their values were 100% and 20% with respect to saturation.

2) PERTURBED EXPERIMENTS

A series of additional experiments (see Table 2) are performed to test specific controls on the soil moisture–precipitation coupling. To save computing time and given the observed quasi-monotonic response of precipitation to soil moisture in DA and WA, only soil moisture values of 100%, 70%, and 40% of the saturation value are considered. For most of these experiments the DA sounding was used exclusively in order to see whether drier soils could produce more precipitation than wetter soils.

First, it should be noted that, given the HIlow threshold of 10°C proposed by Findell and Eltahir (2003a) to distinguish between the wet and dry soil advantage, the WA sounding, with a computed HIlow of 10.9°C, may not be viewed as the best sounding. For this reason, and in

FIG. 1. Atmospheric profiles measured at Lincoln, Illinois. Temperature (°C) is represented by the black line and dewpoint temperature (°C) by the blue line. The red dashed line highlights the area where the surface parcel is positively buoyant with respect to the environment. The plot title contains the value of CTP and HIlow computed following Findell and Eltahir (2003a). Text insets indicate values of pressure and temperature at the LCL, vertically integrated water vapor content (Pwat), and CAPE.
In order to have a larger data sample, two additional early morning soundings are selected from the same period as used in Findell and Eltahir (2003a). The two retained dates are 6 July and 10 June 1999 and the respective profiles are shown in Fig. 1. For these atmospheric states the following values of $CTP-HI_{low}$ are obtained: (38 J kg$^{-1}$, 7°C) and (223 J kg$^{-1}$, 15°C), respectively. Considering the thresholds proposed by Findell and Eltahir (2003a), these cases better fall into the different hypothesized regions of the coupling behavior, with 6 July falling into the wet soil advantage and 10 June in the dry soil advantage. The two simulations are called WA2 and DA2, respectively.

Second, the impact of clouds on the coupling is explored. By inspecting the surface radiative balance in model simulations, Schär et al. (1999) found that the reduction of incoming shortwave radiation due to cloud shading is overcompensated by an increase in longwave radiation. This consequently supports higher surface fluxes over wet soils in cloudier conditions than over dry soils in sunnier conditions. The latter response further emphasizes a positive soil moisture–precipitation feedback. However, from observations, a decrease of the net radiation by cloud radiative effect is generally expected. To quantify the potential amplification or dampening of the response of precipitation to an initial change in soil moisture by cloud radiative effects (CREs), simulations are performed starting from the DA sounding and using a modified version of ICON-LEM, where liquid and ice clouds are set transparent to the radiation both in the shortwave and longwave. These simulations are called DA_transp. Making cloud transparent to radiation has been successfully used in several studies (see, e.g., Stevens et al. 2012; Fermepin and Bony 2014) to isolate the impacts of CREs on the dynamic of convection.

Third, the impact of large-scale forcing is considered. The presence of subsidence favors the development of an inversion layer at the top of the boundary layer that could eventually suppress deep convection formation. In this regime, only a strong enough sensible heat flux that can break through the inversion may promote the development of deep convection, thus possibly leading to more precipitation over drier soils. The effect of large-scale forcing is mimicked by prescribing a large-scale velocity $w_{LS}$ that acts on the tendency equations of momentum, temperature, and moisture (Randall and Cripe 1999). The subsidence velocity $w_{0}^{S}$ in the perturbed

### Table 1. Parameters used in the land surface model TERRA-ML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil type</th>
<th>Loam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume of voids/pore volume</td>
<td>0.455 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field capacity</td>
<td>0.340 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilting point</td>
<td>0.110 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air dryness point</td>
<td>0.035 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat capacity</td>
<td>$1.42 \times 10^{3}$ J m$^{-3}$ K$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface roughness length</td>
<td>0.1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albedo</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwave surface emissivity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases with plants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land-cover class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic of cropland (50%–70%) and vegetation (20%–50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf area index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomatal resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 s m$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface roughness length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Experiment descriptions. In the text, the following notation is adopted to refer to a specific experiment: SOUNDING_CASE_MOISTURE, for example, WA_100 represents the simulation run with the wet soil advantage sounding (3 Jul 1999) and a fully saturated soil, while DA_wind_40 refers to the simulation run with the dry soil advantage sounding (23 Jul 1999) considering the presence of winds with a soil moisture of 40% of the saturation value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of simulations</th>
<th>Soil moisture</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic configuration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>3 Jul 1999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%, 80%, 70%, 60%, 50%,</td>
<td>Wet soil advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and 40% saturation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>23 Jul 1999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%, 80%, 70%, 60%, 50%,</td>
<td>Dry soil advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and 40% saturation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perturbed experiments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA_transp</td>
<td>23 Jul 1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%, 70%, and 40% saturation</td>
<td>Transparent clouds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA_subs</td>
<td>23 Jul 1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%, 70%, and 40% saturation</td>
<td>Induced subsidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA_asce</td>
<td>23 Jul 1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%, 70%, and 40% saturation</td>
<td>Induced ascent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA_wind</td>
<td>23 Jul 1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%, 70%, and 40% saturation</td>
<td>Nonzero winds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA_plants</td>
<td>23 Jul 1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%, 70%, and 40% saturation</td>
<td>With plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA_plants</td>
<td>3 Jul 1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%, 70%, and 40% saturation</td>
<td>With plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA2</td>
<td>6 Jul 1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%, 70%, and 40% saturation</td>
<td>Additional wet soil advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA2_plants</td>
<td>6 Jul 1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%, 70%, and 40% saturation</td>
<td>With plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA2</td>
<td>10 Jun 1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%, 70%, and 40% saturation</td>
<td>Additional dry soil advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA2_plants</td>
<td>10 Jun 1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%, 70%, and 40% saturation</td>
<td>With plants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
experiments DA_sub is specified following the Rain in Cumulus over the Ocean (RICO) setup for different heights of the atmospheric column $z$ (VanZanten et al. 2011):

$$w_{LS} = \begin{cases} 
  w_0^s z & \text{for } z < 1 \text{ km} \\
  w_0^s & \text{for } 1 < z < 3 \text{ km} \\
  w_0^s(4 - z) & \text{for } 3 < z < 4 \text{ km} \\
  0 & \text{for } z > 4 \text{ km} 
\end{cases} \quad (1)$$

with $w_0^s = -0.005 \text{ m s}^{-1}$. This choice produces a constant subsidence velocity $w_{LS} = w_0^s$ between 1 and 3 km that linearly decreases to 0 outside of this layer. Moreover, an additional set of simulations with a forced ascent, called DA_asce, is carried out where $w_{LS}$ is simply set equal to a constant value of 0.005 m s$^{-1}$ over the whole atmospheric column. Forced ascent can be thought as representing an additional buoyancy source for the parcel, associated, for example, to frontal induced lift. The reason behind not using a vertically constant subsidence velocity in DA_sub is because early test simulations showed that convection was strongly suppressed in such simulations, making a reliable estimation of the coupling practically impossible.

Fourth, the impact of winds on the soil moisture–precipitation coupling is investigated in a set of simulations called DA_wind. A follow-up study by Findell and Eltahir (2003b) on their original work already indicated that winds strongly influence the coupling. Strong low-level wind shear can suppress the convective potential, making it harder to rain regardless of the surface state, while veering winds with small low-level shears may provide more buoyancy and enhance convection. Moreover, wind shear can promote the organization of convection through interaction with cold pools (Rotunno et al. 1988; Schlemmer and Hohenegger 2014). Organized convection may be less dependent on surface fluxes as the convective evolution becomes dictated by the cold pools’ evolution. In the case DA_wind, the simulations are initialized with the wind field measured by the balloon sounding. Note that winds are only prescribed in the initial condition and freely evolve during the day in every atmospheric level.

Finally, the dependency of the results on the specification of the land surface is investigated by fully covering the soil with plants in simulations WA_plants, DA_plants, WA2_plants, and DA2_plants. The land-cover class is set to a mosaic of cropland (50%–70%) and vegetation (20%–50%) with a maximum leaf area index of 3, minimum stomatal resistance of 160 s m$^{-1}$, and a root depth of 0.5 m (these parameters are taken from the COSMO model). Surface roughness length is increased from 0.1 to 0.25 m. Within this setup, the only contribution to surface latent heat flux comes from the transpiration term, given that bare soil is fully covered by plant leaves. For the exact formulations of the different parameterizations adopted with plants (e.g., canopy resistance), the reader is referred to Doms et al. (2011).

3. Influence on convection and precipitation in the basic configuration

a. Surface energy balance

Changes in soil moisture directly affect the partitioning of the incoming solar radiation into latent and sensible surface heat fluxes, as expected. Figure 2 highlights the decrease of surface latent heat fluxes from a maximum of about 0.8 mm h$^{-1}$ in the wettest soil case (DA_100) to a nearly constant null value in the case with the driest soil (DA_40). Conversely, the surface sensible heat flux is inversely related to soil moisture, and its diurnal maximum increases from an initial value of
about 0.2 mm h\(^{-1}\) (DA_100) to a final value of almost 0.6 mm h\(^{-1}\) (DA_40). As a consequence, most of the incoming solar radiation in the DA_40 case is used to heat up the surface, which reaches a maximum temperature of 52°C, and to heat up the air above the surface, which reaches a maximum temperature of 37°C. Instead, in DA_100 the surface reaches a maximum temperature of about 37°C and the lowermost atmospheric layer heats up to 31°C in the early afternoon. Comparison of Figs. 2a and 2b also clearly highlights the effect of soil moisture that begins to limit the evaporation when starting from drier initial soil moisture conditions. Up to 1100 LST, DA_100 and DA_70 exhibit similar fluxes, but afterward the latent heat flux levels out in DA_70 and slightly decreases until the end of the day. The different temporal evolutions of net surface radiation visible in Fig. 2 during the afternoon hours reflect the different evolution of convection among the cases. In particular, the reduction of net surface radiation is due to cloud shading that changes accordingly to the different evolution of convective clouds.

Bowen ratio values averaged between 1200 and 1500 LST vary from 0.23 in the saturated case to 0.63 in the DA_70 case, 3.08 in the DA_60 case, and 118.36 in the driest case. We thus observe that the employed bare soil evaporation scheme produces near-null values when soil moisture approaches the wilting point. The almost complete shutdown of the latent heat flux in the DA_40 case may appear exaggerated but is observed over a semiarid region (e.g., Couvreux et al. 2012), which should be comparable to our bare soil setup. The reason for this behavior is that the bare soil evaporation scheme adopted in TERRA-ML, which is still used at the time of writing in the operational version of ICON, was adapted from the former generation of two layers soil models. As stated by Schulz et al. (2016), this scheme systematically overestimates (underestimates) evaporation under wet (dry) conditions, giving a wider variation of surface fluxes compared to observed ones. This is not of concern for this study as the important quantity determining the precipitation response is the latent heat flux, not the soil moisture, as will be shown in section 3c. Moreover, a larger variation in surface fluxes allows for a larger and hence more robust precipitation response.

b. Convection and precipitation

Figure 3 shows the evolution of the diurnal cycle of convection in both WA and DA cases, for two different values of the soil moisture as an example. All the simulations show a reasonable evolution of convection over time: clouds first appear in the late morning/early afternoon and dissipate in the late afternoon or even during the evening. After the growth of the first clouds in the late morning, rain is produced in less than 1 h, followed by a further vertical extension of the cloud tops that reach their maximum extent a few hours later: at this time ice is produced at the top and lasts until the late evening. The mean cloud thickness reaches lower values over drier soils, as found in Schlemmer et al. (2012), because of the higher LCL due to the decreased latent heat flux, while the cloud top remains unchanged. It can also be noticed that strong precipitation, as in the case of DA_100, leads to a collapse of the PBL around 1500 LST. The simulated small magnitude of the precipitation rate (insets in Fig. 3) reflects the limited spatial extension of the precipitating area, which covers at best 10%–15% of the domain. The values are on the order of magnitude of other LES studies that have investigated processes leading to the development of convection over midlatitude regions (e.g., Schlemmer et al. 2012).

More importantly, Fig. 3 reveals variations of convective precipitation as a function of soil moisture. Both the precipitation rates and the timing of convection respond to the changing soil moisture and hence surface fluxes. To better organize the results obtained for the cases presented in Table 2, domain-averaged accumulated precipitation and time of convection triggering are computed and shown in Fig. 4. The triggering of convection (LST) is defined by the first time instant when domain-averaged cloud cover exceeds 0.1. Convection is triggered 2 h earlier over the driest soil in the DA case, whereas being lagged in the WA case (Fig. 4a). The earlier triggering over dry soils in DA in contrast to WA can also be recognized in the precipitation rate time series of Fig. 3. These findings are in agreement with the results obtained by Findell and Eltahir (2003a) with their 1D model. The earlier triggering over dry soils in DA is due to the fact that the growth of the boundary layer through induced surface sensible heat fluxes is more efficient than moistening to trigger convection. In the WA case, in contrast, the lowering of LFC, due to surface moistening through latent heat fluxes, is the energetically most efficient mechanism, giving an earlier triggering over wet soils. However, in terms of precipitation, both cases show a decrease over dry soils. From Fig. 4b it can also be noted that above a degree of saturation of 80% and below a degree of saturation of 50%, the accumulated precipitation does not exhibit any dependency on soil moisture, most likely because of similar latent heat flux and triggering. This hypothesis will be explored in section 3c.

It should be noted that the relatively small amounts of precipitation do not allow the soil to recover from the losses caused by evaporation. In the DA_100 case, at the end of the simulated diurnal cycle, the uppermost layer
of soil moisture reaches about 65% of its initial value, while in the DA_70 case it reaches almost 90%. This results from the fact that in DA_100 the saturated soil instantaneously produces runoff that brings the soil moisture to the field capacity, a model constraint, while in the other case soil moisture is lost only because of evaporation. Interestingly enough, in the DA_40 case the absence of evaporation allows a slight increase of soil moisture of about 1% of its initial value due to the recorded precipitation. Thus, in our simulations, wetter soils generally become drier while drier soils maintain their moisture reservoir, and the change in soil moisture over one day does not reflect the precipitation changes across the simulations. To avoid confusion between the soil moisture and the precipitation response, we will not refer to a negative soil moisture–precipitation coupling in the following but rather to a dry soil advantage when more precipitation is observed to fall over initially drier soils.

We further analyze the properties of the convective diurnal cycle through the computation of convective available potential energy (CAPE) and of cloud water and rain distribution. Figure 5 shows the time series of domain-averaged CAPE for both the WA and DA cases. It can be inferred that, regardless of the initial sounding, the energy available to feed convection decreases with soil moisture. This large, more than 1000 J kg$^{-1}$ difference at 1300 LST between 100% and 40% saturation is linked to different profiles of temperature and relative humidity in the first 1.5 km of the atmosphere due to the different Bowen ratios of the two simulations. In particular, both warming and drying of the PBL, as found over dry soils, lead to lower CAPE. This is consistent with the obtained decrease of precipitation rate (insets of Fig. 3) over drier soils, regardless of the initial sounding used. However, none of the simulations fully deplete their CAPE reservoir, which makes this simple explanation questionable. The decrease of CAPE over drier soils is consistent with what was already found by Barthlott and Kalthoff (2011) in more realistic simulations over southwestern Germany.

Figure 5 further reveals that in the DA case CAPE exhibits a very strong peak in the early afternoon and is rapidly depleted. Over soils with a soil moisture above 60% of the saturation value, however, large latent heat fluxes provide enough energy to rebuild a second peak.
of CAPE in the late afternoon. This allows for a second development of convection. The presence of two convective events over wet soils that merge to one over dry soils is also clearly visible in Figs. 3b and 3d.

As an alternative to CAPE, Fig. 6 shows the full time and spatial average (indicated by angle brackets) of cloud water mixing ratio \(q_c\) and rain mixing ratio \(q_r\) as functions of soil moisture. Note that snow and cloud ice are not considered, given that they appear to be only minor components. The behavior of \(q_c\) is consistent with the behavior of the precipitation rate and shows a decrease toward drier soils irrespective of the initial atmospheric state. In contrast, the response of \(q_r\) depends on the initial sounding and does show an unexpected increase over dry soils in the DA case.

An increase in \(q_c\) may be caused either by a larger value of produced \(q_c\) or by the presence of longer-lived clouds. Larger values of produced \(q_c\) over drier soils seem unlikely, given the presence of a drier and warmer PBL regardless of the initial sounding. Longer-lived clouds may be created because of less evaporation of \(q_c\) or less conversion of \(q_c\) into \(q_r\). Less evaporation of \(q_c\) over dry soils again seems unlikely, given the presence of a drier PBL. Hence, the only mechanism responsible for an increase of \(q_c\) over dry soils in the DA case must be linked to the efficiency in converting \(q_c\) into \(q_r\). This appears as a reasonable hypothesis given what follows. The diurnal evolution simulated in the DA case over wet soil consists of two distinct convective events that progressively merge to one event over drier soils. The first event among the two shows larger precipitation rates and thicker clouds (see Fig. 3b). The lagged triggering of convection over wet soils in DA, due to reduced sensible heat flux, causes an accumulation of energy that is released abruptly when clouds are formed (Fig. 5) and
leads to a fast production of $q_c$. These local positive anomalies of cloud water are quickly converted into $q_r$, thus depleting the reservoir. This is mainly related to the fact that autoconversion processes and collection mechanisms in the microphysics depend nonlinearly on the amount of $q_c$ [see Eqs. 5.107–5.112 in section 5.6 of Doms et al. (2011)]. Over dry soils the convection is less explosive so that the critical threshold is unlikely to be reached, and thus $q_c$ is only partially depleted. When examining the values attained by $q_c$ in DA_40, it appears that this variable has a larger mean but a lower spatial absolute maximum. On the other hand, DA_100 contains the highest value of $q_c$, although having a lower mean. In this regard, the WA case is equivalent to DA over dry soils: the slow growth of clouds does not produce high peaks of cloud water mixing ratio for any of the initial soil moisture, and $q_c$ follows the moisture input from the surface.

c. Under which conditions may drier soils receive more precipitation?

The results outlined in the previous section seem to suggest that, in terms of total accumulated precipitation, there is no dry soil advantage. If the soil moisture is reduced, the surface latent heat flux decreases and thus the moisture flux from the surface to the atmosphere is limited. The atmosphere is not able to compensate for this lack of moisture contribution by becoming more efficient at converting water vapor into precipitation, the prerequisite to obtain more precipitation over drier soils. However, the previous section also showed that convection can indeed be triggered earlier over dry soils, which, under certain circumstances, may be able to overcompensate for the lack of moisture input.

To explore the feasibility of this scenario, the surface rain accumulated in time and spatially averaged $R$ needs to be estimated a priori. Note that the terms rain and precipitation are used interchangeably as surface precipitation is always in liquid form. Moreover, the specification “domain averaged” is dropped given that every quantity is always averaged over the full domain area. Variable $R$ (mm) is computed as

$$R = \sum_{i=1}^{N} RR_i \times \Delta t = \sum_{i=1}^{N} RR_i \times \Delta t + \sum_{i=1}^{N_0} 0 \times \Delta t = \sum_{i=1}^{N_0} RR_i \times \Delta t,$$

that is, by summing the product of the instantaneous rain rate $RR_i$ predicted by the model at the time step $i$ (mm h$^{-1}$) and the output time step $\Delta t$ (h) over the entire simulation. The output time step is chosen small enough (30 s with a model time step of 2 s) to consider $RR_i$ an instantaneous value. The total number of time steps $N$ can be split into the number of rainy ($RR_i > 0$ mm h$^{-1}$) events $N_1$ and the number of time steps with no rain $N_0$. By introducing a mean over rainy events $RR = (1/N_1) \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} RR_i$, Eq. (2) can be rewritten as

$$R = \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} RR_i \times \Delta t = \bar{RR} \times \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \Delta t \simeq \bar{RR}(t_1 - t_0),$$

where now $t_0$ and $t_1$ indicate the time (LST) when precipitation begins and ends, respectively. It should be noted that the only used approximation, that is, $N_1 \times \Delta t \simeq (t_1 - t_0)$, holds for a typical precipitation intensity–time distribution over one diurnal cycle with no long temporal gap between precipitation events, which is indeed the case in the examples displayed in Fig. 3.

Finally, by assuming that $(t_1 - t_0)$ is approximately equal to the period when deep convective clouds are present on the domain, one can infer that $R$ is related to three main parameters: the time when convection is triggered, which strongly depends on the atmospheric profile and exhibits either a wet or dry soil advantage in agreement with Findell and Eltahir (2003a); the time when convection dissipates; and finally, the mean rainfall rate.

In Fig. 7a the duration of precipitation $(t_1 - t_0)$ is computed for all the WA and DA simulations directly using the value of $N_1$ from the simulation output. The duration shows an interesting V-shaped distribution in the DA case, with a central minimum by a soil saturation of 70%, whereas such a central minimum is absent in the WA case. While convection is triggered earlier over
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drier soils than over wetter ones in DA, clouds dissipate later on wetter soils (see Fig. 3). This gives a total response with a central minimum. Concerning the variation of $g_{RR}$ with soil moisture, it can be claimed that, based on the results of the previous section, $g_{RR}$ scales with $g_{LH}$, that is, the latent heat flux averaged over the precipitation duration. This is confirmed by Fig. 7b, which shows the values of $g_{RR}$ and $g_{LH}$ computed using data from both WA and DA simulations. The two cases even exhibit a similar slope, but different offsets. The slope of this line may be interpreted as a precipitation efficiency that, given the absence of large-scale moisture advection, is equivalent to the recycling ratio. It again suggests that, at least to a first order, the two soundings are not associated with fundamentally different convective dynamics once convection is triggered. There is nevertheless a larger scatter among the points in the DA case than in the WA case as also revealed by smaller Pearson chi-squared $\chi^2$ values.

As a sanity check, Fig. 7c uses the linear fit of Fig. 7b to estimate $g_{RR}$ and, combined with the diagnosed value of $t_1 - t_0$, to compute $R$. The resulting accumulated precipitation should be compared to the one diagnosed from the simulations in Fig. 4b. The relative errors of the different simulations range from about 2% to 20% for the WA case and from 1% to 15% for the DA case. The relative error averaged over all the simulations is about 10%. Although not perfect, the values predicted by this simple approximation resemble the simulated ones, and in particular the decrease of precipitation over dry soils is captured fairly well. We stress that our aim is not to predict the accumulated precipitation with the smallest possible error but rather to reproduce the overall observed behavior.

The advantage of Eq. (3) and of its parameterization is indeed that it splits the contribution of the total accumulated precipitation into two distinct terms, one favoring a wet soil advantage and one favoring either a dry or a wet soil advantage. Thus, it is possible to infer which precipitation duration would be needed to offset the decrease in $g_{RR}$ due to changes in latent heat flux. For instance, Fig. 7b predicts that a decrease in latent heat flux from approximately 0.3 mm h$^{-1}$ over wet soils to almost 0 mm h$^{-1}$ over dry soils is accompanied by a half of the rain rate. This means that, in order to have more rain over dry soils, the duration term in Eq. (2) needs to balance a factor of at least 2. In other words, more than 16 h of continuous precipitation are needed to offset the lack of surface latent heat fluxes. This is unlikely to occur over one diurnal cycle.

These considerations are generalized in Fig. 8. There, the values of the slope and of the offset obtained in the
linear regressions in Fig. 7b for the WA case are used to compute an estimated value of RR, which is then used to obtain R. To do so we consider a wide variation of surface latent heat flux values (the x axis of Fig. 8) and precipitation durations less than 24h (the y axis of Fig. 8). The result is a discrete function \( R(LH, t_1 - t_0) \), which is shown by the color-filled contour lines. The results of the WA case are represented by dots using the values of \( (LH, t_1 - t_0, R) \) obtained in every simulation. They reveal a good agreement with the theoretical estimates.

To compensate for a change in latent heat flux, one has to move along the isoline of accumulated precipitation in Fig. 8. Given the curvature of the isolines, only small changes in latent heat flux may be accommodated by changes in the duration, making the occurrence of more precipitation over drier soils unlikely. Moreover, the potential earlier triggering of convection over dry soils under certain atmospheric conditions, as in the DA case, is usually compensated by an equal shift of \( t_1 \), annihilating the triggering advantage. Hence, it may be concluded that the only possibility to obtain more precipitation over drier soils consists in not triggering convection over wet soils, which, for the tested situations, never happened.

Although this scenario is unlikely to occur, according to the values used to construct Fig. 8, some environmental conditions could lead to a weakening of the coupling. In fact, the curvature of the isolines in Fig. 8 depends on the slope and on the offset derived from the RR–LH relationship. This is evident if rewriting Eq. (3) as

\[
R = mLH(t_1 - t_0) + q(t_1 - t_0),
\]

where \( m \) and \( q \) are the slope and offset of the linear fit associated with the RR–LH relationship, respectively. While the slope may be interpreted as the atmospheric efficiency in converting water vapor to rain, the offset may be interpreted as the overall availability of precipitable water, which depends both on the atmospheric state and on external forcing. Given that changes in \( m \) are weighted by the values of \( LH \ll 1 \), one can imagine that changes of the same magnitude in \( q \) are more likely to affect \( R \). Increasing \( m \) while keeping \( q \) constant causes a steepening of the contour lines for small values of \( LH \), making it even more unlikely to get more rain over drier soils. On the other hand, if \( q \) becomes large enough, the isolines become flatter even for small values of \( LH \) and the sensitivity of precipitation to latent heat flux is dampened. To get more rain over drier soil, \( q \) should be large enough so that the \( m \) term becomes negligible, and \( t_1 - t_0 \) should be zero only over wet soils. Another possibility would be to have a negative value of \( m \). Since this does not seem to happen in the simulations presented up to now, we further investigate how environmental conditions and external forcing could concur to a dry soil advantage in the next section.

4. Sensitivity experiments

a. Additional cases

An inspection of the temporal evolution of cloud water and precipitation (not shown), similar to the one presented in Fig. 3, reveals a noticeable resemblance between the WA–WA2 and DA–DA2 cases, respectively. In particular, the simulations initialized with the DA2 atmospheric profile exhibit again two distinctive convective events over wet soils, merging into one single long-lived convective event over dry soils below a soil moisture saturation of 60%. The computation of \( \langle q_c \rangle \) and \( \langle q_r \rangle \) for the DA2 case also confirms the presence of an increase of \( \langle q_c \rangle \) and of a decrease of \( \langle q_r \rangle \) over dry soils, as observed in DA. In DA2 convection is triggered earlier over dry soils, as in DA, whereas in WA2 convective clouds appear first over wet soils, as in WA. As a consequence, the duration of precipitation for the DA2 case shows again a central minimum, whereas in WA2 a monotonic decrease is observed (not shown). The total accumulated precipitation nevertheless again decreases over dry soils irrespective of the initial sounding, and the RR–LH linear relationship exhibits a comparable slope as in the DA and WA cases (Fig. 9). Because of the large spread observed in the DA2 case, the \( \chi^2 \) value is smaller, while in the WA2 case it reflects the one obtained in WA. The only difference worth noting consists of the larger amount of accumulated precipitation observed in the DA2 case, which reflects the larger offset of the line in Fig. 9b, due to enhanced instability. The DA2 case is an example of a weaker coupling of soil moisture and precipitation due to a larger offset in the LH–RR relationship (see the final part of section 3c). Nevertheless, the larger offset cannot reverse the relationship and lead to more precipitation over drier soils.

b. Transparent clouds

Making clouds transparent does not change the overall wet soil advantage (Fig. 10a), but the increase in the total accumulated precipitation with soil moisture is larger than in the DA case where CREs are included. This difference is linked to a larger sensitivity of the mean rain rate RR to the mean latent heat flux LH (see Fig. 10b). To explain this larger sensitivity, one can note that the surface energy balance is modified in DA_transp by the lack of CREs. The reduction of the net surface radiation seen in Fig. 2 between 1300
and 1600 LST in the DA_100 case, for instance, is absent when clouds are set transparent to radiation. The resulting increase of incoming shortwave radiation at the surface, on the order of 200 W m\(^{-2}\) in DA_transp compared to DA, is able to offset the opposing increase of surface outgoing longwave radiative flux of about 30 W m\(^{-2}\). This surplus of radiative energy in DA_transp causes a slight increase of surface latent heat flux over wet soils because the simulation lies in an energy-limited regime because of the abundance of soil moisture, and a slight increase of surface sensible heat fluxes over dry soils, as the simulation belongs here to the soil moisture–limited regime. The magnitude of the soil moisture–precipitation coupling is enhanced. Hence, clouds act to dampen the soil moisture–precipitation coupling but cannot reverse its sign. These findings contrast with the results of Schär et al. (1999), where the presence of clouds further amplified the feedback due to the longwave CRE being stronger than the shortwave one. One reason for this discrepancy could be related to the fact that convective cloud features, including their interaction with radiation, are parameterized in the regional climate model (RCM) employed by Schär et al. (1999). Another reason could
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**FIG. 9.** (a) Total domain-averaged accumulated precipitation and (b) scatterplot of RR vs LH for simulations with different soil moisture and the DA, DA2, WA, and WA2 cases. The equations give the regression lines (slope and offset) together with the \(\chi^2\).
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**FIG. 10.** As in Fig. 9, but for the experiments DA_subs, DA_asc, DA_wind, and DA_transp. The DA case is also included for the sake of comparison.
be a distinct distribution of low and high clouds between the two studies.

c. Large-scale forcing

Figure 10a highlights a decrease of total accumulated precipitation over dry soils in DA_subs and DA_asce, thus confirming the presence of a wet soil advantage in both cases. However, with subsidence the convection is so heavily suppressed that the difference between the wettest soil and the driest soil in terms of precipitation is small. This is the result of two main factors. First, there is a smaller slope in the relationship between RR and LH (Fig. 10b), which is reasonable as convection is more strongly forced and less dependent upon the surface state. Second, the convection remains triggered earlier over dry soils as sensible heating is more efficient to break the inversion. Regarding DA_asce, even though the RR–LH relationship exhibits a similar slope as in DA_subs, the duration term shows a different behavior, with a triggering time almost constant regardless of the soil moisture value. Introducing ascent forces the air to rise and to reach its LFC without having to rely too heavily on moistening or heating of the PBL through surface fluxes. The offset of the RR–LH relationship is also modified in both the DA_subs and DA_asce cases compared to DA and reflects the additional source of buoyancy (more precipitation, larger offset when compared to DA) and the suppression of convection (less precipitation, smaller offset when compared to DA). These various differences are nevertheless not sufficient to alter the coupling sign. In both cases the points in Fig. 10b show no considerable spread, which is reflected in values of $\chi^2$ higher than 0.9.

d. Winds

The inclusion of winds leads to a different evolution of the atmospheric state over time. Figure 11 shows a comparison of the vertically integrated cloud water and rain mixing ratios, and of the virtual potential temperature perturbation in the lowermost atmospheric level, for the DA and DA_wind simulations. The DA case does not show an appreciable degree of organization since only scattered convection is simulated, probably because of the absence of wind shear and of the homogeneous surface state (Chen and Avissar 1994). In contrast, the DA_wind simulation shows stronger and larger cold pools, as well as bigger clouds that tend to be organized along lines. Given that the strength of the cold pools is larger in DA_wind than in DA, one can argue that this case is indeed more organized, also considering the importance of cold pools on convective organization (Tompkins 2001). Although only qualitative, the differences between DA and DA_wind observed in Fig. 11 are reminiscent of the differences obtained in Schlemmer and Hohenegger (2014) between simulations with and without wind shear (see their Fig. 5).

Despite these differences in the spatial organization of convection, the coupling sign is not altered in this set of simulations. The DA_wind case still shows a decrease of total accumulated precipitation with soil moisture (see Fig. 10). The presence of larger winds increases the surface latent heat flux for a given value of soil moisture, as expected because of the drag-law formulation, but decreases the precipitation rate for a given latent heat flux. This decrease in precipitation rate may be related to CAPE, which is always smaller when compared to the DA
The presence of winds already at the beginning of the simulation induces more mixing and prevents an efficient buildup of instability, which would lead to an abrupt release of energy and ensuing higher precipitation rates (as already observed in section 3b). This results in a weaker dependency of RR on LH and, given similar changes in duration with soil moisture as in DA, leads to a weaker variation of total accumulated precipitation across the experiments. The weakening of the soil moisture–precipitation coupling in the presence of winds is consistent with Findell and Eltahir (2003b) and with the idea that stronger cold pools in DA wind more strongly determine the precipitation rate evolution, making DA wind less dependent on the surface state.

5. Conclusions

In the present study, a state-of-the-art, high-resolution LEM is fully coupled to a land surface model to investigate the coupling between soil moisture and precipitation in an idealized setup. We use homogeneous initial soil moisture conditions and focus on the precipitation response to increase/decrease of the initial soil moisture. The soil moisture values considered are 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, and 100% of the saturation value. To pursue this goal, the experimental framework proposed by Findell and Eltahir (2003a) is revisited by using the same atmospheric soundings as initial condition but allowing a full interaction of the atmosphere with the land surface over a complete diurnal cycle. These two soundings were recognized as representative of a wet soil advantage (more precipitation over wet soils) and of a dry soil advantage (more precipitation over dry soils), even though precipitation was not explicitly simulated in Findell and Eltahir (2003a). Furthermore, by using a grid resolution of 250 m, we aim at explicitly resolving moist convection.

The modeling framework is able to reproduce the expected sensitivity of the surface fluxes to soil moisture...
and to simulate the typical convective evolution over one diurnal cycle. The triggering of convection happens earlier over dry soils than over wet soils for the dry soil advantage case and vice versa for the wet soil advantage case. This stands in agreement with the results of Findell and Eltahir (2003a) and confirms that certain atmospheric conditions may be preconditioned to different mechanisms of convection triggering. The cloud water content also shows a similar behavior with larger values over dry soil in the dry soil advantage case but larger values over wet soils in the wet soil advantage case. However, the precipitation is found to always decrease with decreasing soil moisture, irrespective of the initial sounding. This indicates the presence of a wet soil advantage. These different sensitivities of cloud water and precipitation to soil moisture can be explained by the way convective instability is exploited depending on the atmospheric state.

To understand these results and to infer under which conditions drier soils may receive more precipitation than wetter ones, we propose a simple model based on a linear fit to disentangle the effects of the surface on the precipitation amounts. The total domain-averaged accumulated precipitation is split into two main contributions: the value of precipitation rate averaged over the time when precipitation is occurring, and the duration of precipitation. While the latter depends upon the time of triggering and can exhibit a dry soil advantage, the precipitation rate is found to closely follow the values of the surface latent heat flux and thus always exhibits a wet soil advantage. The relationship between precipitation rate and surface latent heat flux is linear and, surprisingly enough, the slope of this linear relationship does not change appreciably with different atmospheric states. Using this simple linear relationship and combining it with a range of duration indicates that in our idealized setup a larger amount of precipitation is unlikely to be observed over drier soils. The relationship predicts that half of the latent heat flux, as obtained over soils with a 40% soil moisture saturation, must be offset by a doubling of precipitation duration. This is unlikely to occur over one diurnal cycle. One would expect a time scale of at least one week for the antecedent precipitation to directly influence the surface fluxes, as obtained by Duerinck et al. (2016).
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