CloudRoots-Amazon22:

Integrating clouds with photosynthesis by crossing scales
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ABSTRACT: How are rainforest photosynthesis and turbulent fluxes influenced by clouds? To what extent are clouds affected by local processes driven by rainforest energy, water and carbon fluxes? These interrelated questions were the main drivers of the intensive field experiment CloudRoots-Amazon22 which took place at the ATTO/Campina supersites in the Amazon rainforest during the dry season, in August 2022. CloudRoots-Amazon22 collected observational data to derive cause-effect relationships between processes occurring at the leaf-level up to canopy scales in relation to the diurnal evolution of the clear-to-cloudy transition. First, we studied the impact of cloud and canopy radiation perturbations on the sub-diurnal variability of stomatal conductance. Stoma opening is larger in the morning, modulated by the cloud optical thickness. Second, we combined 1 Hz-frequency measurements of the stable isotopologues of carbon dioxide and water vapor with measurements of turbulence to determine carbon dioxide and water vapor sources and sinks within the canopy. Using scintillometer observations, we inferred 1-minute sensible heat flux that responded within minutes to the cloud passages. Third, collocated profiles of state variables and greenhouse gases enabled us to determine the role of clouds in vertical transport. We then inferred, using canopy and upper-atmospheric observations and a parameterization, the cloud cover and cloud mass flux to establish causality between canopy and cloud processes. This shows the need of comprehensive observational set to improve weather and climate model representations. Our findings contribute to advance our knowledge of the coupling between cloudy boundary layers and primary carbon productivity of the Amazon rainforest.
CAPSULE: Leaf-canopy-clouds observations taken in the Amazon are interconnected to study sub-hourly causality on how radiation, turbulence and moist convection interact with the rainforest heat, moisture and carbon exchanges.

1. Introduction

In the Amazon basin, clouds and the canopy mediate the exchange of energy, water and carbon dioxide between the rainforest and the atmosphere. The processes underlying these fluxes are connected in complex ways that are not well-understood. Yet, they are key to understand the basin’s response to stress and its resilience under current effects of deforestation, regional warming and enhancement of CO₂ levels (Costa and Foley 2000). Regulated by vegetation processes, rainfall patterns over large portions of the basin are currently disrupted due to an increased water vapor deficit (Barkhordarian et al. 2019), lengthening of the dry season (Fu et al. 2013), and the replacement of forest with pasture or crops (Spracklen et al. 2012). More specific to the carbon cycle, biomass observations indicate a declining trend of carbon dioxide (CO₂) assimilation by the Amazon forest due to its low resilience to climate extremes such as drought (Brienen et al. 2015; Hubau et al. 2020). Due to the coupling between energy, water and carbon canopy fluxes, a decrease in CO₂ uptake leads to a decline in evaporation, and an increase of the sensible heat flux (Biudes et al. 2015; Longo et al. 2020). These shifts in canopy fluxes alter the transport of moisture into the cloud layer influencing key processes associated to rain formation (Sikma and Vila-Guerau de Arellano 2019). In turn, these shifts are strongly modulated by synoptic and mesoscale weather patterns (Machado 2000). Looking into our near future climate, these local-to-regional atmospheric scales of motions are influenced by the current enhancement of atmospheric warming and of CO₂ concentrations (Sikma et al. 2019).

Every molecule of water and CO₂ that is exchanged, passes through tiny openings in the soil and the stomata of leaves (Roberts et al. 1990). This process regulates the partition of available radiative energy in sensible and latent heat fluxes above the canopy, that in turn governs the intensity and nature of turbulence (Moene and van Dam 2014). Turbulent thermals organize the transport of heat, moisture and carbon inside the canopy (Patton et al. 2016) and through the atmospheric boundary layer (ABL). This leads to the formation and intensification of cumulus clouds (Martin et al. 1988; Ouwersloot et al. 2013). In all, cumulus clouds formed by this chain of processes are
rooted in the biosphere, giving our project its name - CloudRoots - which echoes and extends the early interaction studies between cumulus clouds and the sub-cloud layer in the marine trade-wind region (LeMone and Pennel 1976). By extending the “roots” we aim not only to study how the canopy influences clouds, but also how clouds modify the canopy fluxes.

Photosynthesis regulates the canopy turbulent exchange and it is governed by the diurnally varying solar radiation through a broken cloud field (Pedruzo-Bagazgoitia et al. 2017; Kivalov and Fitzjarrald 2018; Durand et al. 2021) and the turbulence in and above the canopy (Patton et al. 2016). Even though these individual biophysical processes governing the exchange between the vegetation and cloudy boundary layer are identified and previously investigated, current understanding and representation of the interaction between rainforest fluxes and cloudy atmospheres is limited due to the barriers between disciplines (Vilà-Guerau de Arellano et al. 2023). To overcome these we need to interconnect biophysical processes across spatiotemporal scales, from regional weather patterns to local and vertical transport and exchanges processes, as shown in Figures 1a and 1b), respectively. To advance our understanding, here, we focus on processes occurring at the scales of leaves to canopies to clouds, and temporal variability from the time it takes for a cloud shadow to pass (seconds to minutes), to the diurnal cycle (Fig. 1b). These spatiotemporal scales are coarsely represented and resolved in contemporary weather and climate models, casting doubt on the fluxes (magnitude and diurnal variability) they predict, as discussed by Bonan et al. (2021) and Friedlingstein et al. (2022),

The CloudRoots-Amazon22 field experiment was conceived to quantify which processes, ranging from stomatal conductance to clouds, are essential to understand and represent the partition of available radiation into the canopy fluxes of energy, water and carbon and their coupling to clouds. To this end, our research strategy is to take collocated and comprehensive measurements designed to quantify the bi-directional responses between canopy fluxes and clouds across the diurnal cycle. Specifically, we seek answers to the following questions:

1. To what extent are rainforest photosynthesis and turbulent fluxes of energy, water and CO₂ are influenced by the presence of shallow cumulus clouds?

2. To what extent are clouds affected by small-scale variability (seconds to hours) in rainforest energy, water and carbon fluxes?
Fig. 1. Left: Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) scene from August 16, 2022 characterized by shallow-to-deep convection at the ATTO-Campina supersites. The average wind speed ranges from 4 to 6 m s$^{-1}$, and wind direction was predominately northeast. The CloudRoots-Amazon22 area including the ATTO and Campina site are indicated by the yellow cross. The insight figure shows the distance between the ATTO and Campina supersites and the location of the laser- and long-path scintillometer. Right: Impression of a precipitating cloud that shades the surface above the supersites of ATTO and Campina. Map scale is shown at the top right of both figures.

Previous field campaigns paved the way to CloudRoots-Amazon22. Most notably, we highlight the Amazon Boundary Layer Experiment (ABLE-2A). This field study paved the way of our field campaign by relating local-to-regional motion scales, integrating the physics (Fitzjarrald et al. 1988) and chemistry (Harriss et al. 1990) of the rainforest and connected to the atmospheric boundary layer. Other influential and related field studies are: the comprehensive CHUVA program on cloud processes and their relation to tropical weather forecasting (Machado et al. 2014), the link between urban Manaus and pristine conditions on atmospheric chemistry during the GoAmazon2014/5 campaign (Martin et al. 2017), and, recently, the CAFE-Brazil campaign (December 2022 to February 2023) on new cloud particle formation and the impact of deep convection. Our research design was also strongly inspired by the pioneering compendium written by Garstang and Fitzjarrald (1999), the comprehensive research on the Amazon as a physical, biology and chemistry system within the program Large-Scale Biosphere-Atmosphere Experiment in the Amazon (LBA) (Avissar et al. 2002), and a review on the topic by Gentine et al. (2019).

Here we provide an overview of the observations from the Cloud Roots-Amazon22 campaign, placing special emphasis on the unique aspect of CloudRoots-Amazon22 with respect to the
previous field campaigns: to integrate observations and simulating efforts (Patton et al. 2016; Pedruzo-Bagazgoitia et al. 2023) to study simultaneously ecophysiological processes and canopy fluxes as part of the energy-, carbon- and water cycles that interacts with clouds. First, we show new observations on the sub-diurnal asymmetry of the stomatal conductance (10 to 100 μm) connected to disruptions of the radiative and turbulent fluxes in relation to vegetation responses and clouds (seconds). Second, we analyse the turbulent (seconds) and sub-diurnal vertical evolution (minutes) of stable isotopologues of carbon dioxide and water vapor in and above the canopy, and discuss our preliminary results in relation to the emerging challenge to quantify the individual contributions of soil and vegetation to evaporation and the net ecosystem exchange disrupted by the presence of clouds. Third, we relate observations on the diurnal development of shallow and deep convection to the thermodynamic structure and the carbon dioxide profiles up to the mid-troposphere (~5 kilometers). Finally, the causal relationships between canopy fluxes and cloud properties are investigated by a conceptual atmospheric model coupled to the diurnal rainforest conditions. By so doing, we plan to identify relevant and potentially missing processes and aim to evaluate and design new representations of biophysical processes in weather and climate models.

2. Connecting and collocating leaf-to-cloud observations as a continuum

a. Continuous observations at ATTO and Campina supersites

CloudRoots-Amazon22 was conducted from August 8 to 21, 2022, at and around the measurement sites of ATTO (latitude -2.1458, longitude -59.0055) and Campina (latitude -2.1819, longitude -59.0217). These locations are situated approximately 150 km north of the city of Manaus and approximately 1000 km inland from the Atlantic Ocean. As described by Andreae et al. (2015), both sites are located at Uatumã Sustainable Development Reserve (USDR) in the central Amazon. This region is characterized by different ecosystems: terra firme forests on ancient river terraces, campinas (savanna on white-sand soils) and campinaranas (white-sand forest). Focusing on the terra firme rainforest, the canopy height ranges between 35 to 45 above ground level. In our study we take 40 m as the average reference canopy height. Fig. 1a shows the location of the towers and the area in which the radiosondes and boundary-layer flights (vertical profiles and horizontal rasters) took place. Our observational strategy aimed to extend and complete the comprehensive measurements taken routinely at the ATTO and Campina supersites. In short, there are three tall
towers at the ATTO facility: ATTO tower (323 m), Triangle tower (81 m) and INSTANT tower (80 m) (Andreae et al. 2015) that continuously measure key profiles of atmospheric state variables (wind, temperature, and specific humidity) and their turbulent fluxes. Shortwave and longwave radiation is measured at 75 m and light interception profiles of photosynthetic active radiation (PAR) are gathered across and above the canopy (INSTANT tower). Turbulent fluxes are measured using on site eddy covariance (EC) techniques that calculate the fluxes at the 30-minute time scale.

Regarding greenhouse gases and chemical species, atmospheric composition is routinely measured to constrain the carbon exchange based on measurements of CO₂ (including fluxes), CH₄ and the stable isotopologues of water vapor and CO₂ (see Appendix A1). The observational data set of atmospheric chemistry (Nölscher et al. 2016) is completed by measurements of chemically reactive species at three heights (80, 150 and 320 meters) (Pfannerstill et al. 2021). In addition, the most representative most representatives biogenic volatile organic compounds (BVOC) are measured, isoprene, the sum of methyl vinyl ketone plus methacrolein and isoprene hydroxyhydroperoxide. The diurnal evolution of measured BVOCs at three heights are presented in Appendix A2. Finally, remote sensing observations at the Campina supersite (Machado et al. 2021), 5 km SE from the ATTO tower (Fig. 1a), enabled us to fully characterize the cloud properties such as cloud base, cloud top, liquid water content, vertical velocities, and precipitation over the entire campaign.

b. Leaf and canopy observations specific to CloudRoots-Amazon22

The CloudRoots-Amazon22 campaign added dedicated measurements that provide a full description of the sub-hourly and diurnal variability of the energy, water, and carbon exchange processes and perturbations affected by the presence of clouds and the canopy rainforest (Table 1). On-site observations of canopy light profiles (400-700 nm) were complemented with vertical profiles gathered by a fast radiation-broad band (10 Hz) spectrometer. This spectrometer measures 18 light spectra in 18 wavebands ranging from 400 to 950 nm with a 20 nm full width half maximum bandwidth (Heusinkveld et al. 2023).

To trace the influence of sub-diurnal dynamics of inside-canopy gradients in light, temperature, humidity and CO₂, we measured leaf-level stomatal conductance and photosynthesis across three canopy layers for two consecutive days. Leaf-level gas exchange was measured with the LI-6400XT portable photosynthesis system (LI-COR, Lincoln, NE, USA) with chamber settings
closely matching ambient temperature, light and humidity while keeping sample CO₂ constant at 400 ppm. For our measurements, small branches were excised from their respective locations in the canopy and transported quickly (within one minute) to the leaf chamber. We randomly selected sunlit and shaded leaves at the canopy top (between 20 and 26 m), the upper-mid canopy (between 13 and 19 m) and the understory (from ground to 5 m), respectively. Here the aim was to quantify on how the stomata open and close during the day and at different in canopy heights. This enable us to connect stomatal conductance behaviour to radiation, including cloud disturbances (enhancement and shading with respect to the clear sky values) and in canopy perturbations, and micrometeorological conditions. These measurements were done in two days under different cloud conditions: 11 August is characterized by shallow cumulus whereas the 12 August is characterized by shallow-to-deep convection transition.

To determine turbulent fluxes at a temporal resolution of minutes (van Kesteren et al. 2013), our campaign incorporated a double-beam laser scintillometer (DBLS, short-path ≈ 100 m that was located at a height of 59 m between INSTANT and TRIANGLE towers). The scintillometer minute scale fluxes enable us to determine the response of turbulent fluxes to radiation fluctuations imposed by clouds (van Kesteren et al. 2013; Vilà-Guerau de Arellano et al. 2020). In addition, Fig. 1a shows the long-path scintillometer flux measurements (long-path ≈ 500 m) and located between INSTANT and ATTO towers at a height of 56.8 m. These line-path measurements allow us to to infer the sensible heat flux with a larger footprint than the EC flux observations under the assumption of canopy spatial homogeneity to be able to apply Monin-Obukhov Similarity Theory (MOST) to infer fluxes from the observed scintillations. The larger footprint of the long-path scintillometer make it more suitable for intercomparison with fluxes obtained from model simulations. As shown in Table 1 and described in more detailed in Appendix A1, we furthermore measured the H₂O and CO₂ stable isofluxes at a high-frequency rate (10 Hz) (Moonen et al. 2023) with the purpose of determining the contribution of soil evaporation/efflux and plant transpiration/assimilation to the canopy evaporation and NEE.

c. Upper-atmospheric observations specific CloudRoots-Amazon22

To quantify changes in the state variables between the canopy, the sub-cloud and cloud layers, and the free troposphere, we launched balloon soundings with high temporal frequency (every
three hours) over the course of the campaign. On August 18, we extended these measurements by additional aircraft measurements of vertical profiles (up to 5000 m) and horizontal spatial distribution of atmospheric composition (H$_2$O, CO$_2$, CO, CH$_4$) observations during the morning (09-11 LT) and afternoon transition (13-15 LT), respectively. The horizontal raster were flown around the ATTO facility at constant height, including flights above the river Uatumã. Both in the morning and afternoon flights, we selected three representative heights in the sub-cloud layer, cloud layer, and free troposphere and measured at a constant height long, horizontal paths ($\approx$20 km).

These upper-atmospheric observations combined with the Campina cloud radar enabled us to group the date by similar situations of shallow cumulus days (6, ShCu) and distinguish them from the shallow-to-deep convective days (4, ShDeep) (see Table 2). August 14 was characterized by the passage of a squall line at around 11 LT (local time or Amazon time). Here, we were inspired by previous studies in the Amazon basin (Czikowsky and Fitzjarrald 2009) and using similar criteria as applied by Henkes et al. (2021). By creating these ensembles, we attempt to propose archetypal cloudy boundary layers coupled to specific rainforest conditions.

3. Leaf-level processes: Height and sub-diurnal variability

The transfer of shortwave and longwave radiation throughout the atmosphere is a crucial process for the land-atmosphere system as it represents the energy input into the ecosystem (Baldocchi and Amthor 2001). Although routine measurements of the upward and downward/short- and longwave radiation components are regularly carried out to determine the radiative budget, and therefore the net available radiation energy (Moene and van Dam 2014), new observational techniques are required to quantify its complex behavior in space and time and unravel any missing features. As an illustration of the complex vertical and temporal variability in the radiative transfer, Figure 2 shows the evolution of global horizontal irradiance measured at three representative heights in and above the canopy and compared to the clear-sky calculation for the same day. These observations were selected because they show the simultaneous impact of the passage of shallow (Fig. 2a) and shallow-to-deep clouds (Fig. 2b), characterized by different values of cloud optical thickness (see Appendix A3), and the disturbances due to the penetration in the canopy. The high-frequency observations enable us to quantify the high variability across a range of scales (from seconds to
On August 18, we extended these measurements by additional aircraft measurements of vertical profiles (up to 5000 m) and horizontal spatial distribution of atmospheric composition (H2O, CO2, CO, CH4) observations during the morning (09-11 LT) and afternoon transition (13-15 LT), respectively. The horizontal raster were flown around the ATTO facility at constant height, including flights above the river Uatumã. Both in the morning and afternoon flights, we selected three representative heights in the sub-cloud layer, cloud layer, and free troposphere and measured at a constant height long, horizontal paths (≈20 km).

These upper-atmospheric observations combined with the Campina cloud radar enabled us to group the dates by similar situations of shallow cumulus days (6, ShCu) and distinguish them from the shallow-to-deep convective days (4, ShDeep) (see Table 2). August 14 was characterized by the passage of a squall line at around 11 LT (local time or Amazon time). Here, we were inspired by previous studies in the Amazon basin (Czikowsky and Fitzjarrald 2009) and using similar criteria as applied by Henkes et al. (2021). By creating these ensembles, we attempt to propose archetypal cloudy boundary layers coupled to specific rainforest conditions.

### Table 1. Variables measured during the CloudRoots-Amazon22 campaign in addition to the routine standard measurements collected at the super sites ATTO and Campina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Spatial Scale</th>
<th>Temporal Scale</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stomatal conductance</td>
<td>Leaf</td>
<td>Sub-diurnal</td>
<td>Discrete measurements</td>
<td>Diurnal asymmetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom (2 m), Middle (25 to 30 m), Top Canopy (30 to 40 m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Photosynthesis</td>
<td>Leaf</td>
<td>Sub-diurnal</td>
<td>Discrete measurements</td>
<td>Sub-diurnal asymmetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom, Middle, Top Canopy</td>
<td>Height dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Soil/Leaf water isotopic composition</td>
<td>Soil/Leaf</td>
<td>Sub-diurnal</td>
<td>Discrete measurements</td>
<td>Plant distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Soil efflux H2O and CO2</td>
<td>Canopy</td>
<td>Hourly-Diurnal</td>
<td>Ground surface</td>
<td>Contribution soil efflux to NEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Spectral irradiance 400 to 950 nm</td>
<td>Canopy</td>
<td>Subsecond to Weekly</td>
<td>0.5, 5.77, 15.0, 22.68, 26.84, 62.91 m</td>
<td>Time cloud and canopy light fluctuations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 m (Campina) 2.5 m (Campsite)</td>
<td>Spatial cloud and canopy light fluctuations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63 m (INSTANT) 322 m (ATTO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sensible heat flux</td>
<td>Canopy</td>
<td>Minute-Hourly</td>
<td>56 m</td>
<td>1-minute turbulent fluxes (laser scintillometer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sensible heat flux</td>
<td>Canopy (hectometer)</td>
<td>Hourly-Diurnal</td>
<td>56 m</td>
<td>Hectometer line-averaged fluxes (scintillometer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Isotopologues CO2 H2O</td>
<td>Canopy</td>
<td>Minute-Hourly</td>
<td>56 m</td>
<td>1-minute turbulent fluxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Profiling state variables (sounding)</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Hourly-Diurnal</td>
<td>0 to ~14000 m</td>
<td>State variable vertical variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Profiling and horizontal raster (aircraft)</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Instantaneous</td>
<td>0 to ~6000 m</td>
<td>Greenhouse gases spatial variation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Classification of the cloud convective regimes observed during CloudRoots-Amazon22. Two regimes were classified: shallow cumulus (ShCu) and shallow-to-deep convection (ShDeep). The classifications were based on a criteria proposed by Henkes et al. (2021) and modified by de Feiter (2023). In the description the time is approximated and denoted in LT, which can be converted to UTC by adding 4 hours: LT+4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 2022</th>
<th>Convective Regime</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (10) Increased cloud cover (12) First cloud dissipated (14) All clouds dissipated (16:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (09:30) Increased cloud cover (11) First clouds dissipated (12:30) All clouds dissipated (16:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (08:30) Increased cloud cover (10) First cloud dissipated (12:30) Deep convection far (16:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ShDeep</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (09) Increased cloud cover (10) First cloud dissipated (12:30) Deep convection (12:30-16:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ShDeep</td>
<td>Clouds high altitude (08) Dissipation high level clouds (10) New clouds form (10:30) Deep convection (14:10-15:50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ShDeep</td>
<td>High level clouds present (09) First deep convection (09:50) Passage squall line (11) Shallow and deep convective development (12:30-16:30) Dissipating clouds (17:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (10:45) Increased cloud formation (12) Clouds dissipated (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ShDeep</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (10) Increased cloud cover (12) First clouds dissipated (13) Downburst deep convection (14-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (10) Increased cloud cover (12:30) First clouds dissipated (15) Clouds disappear (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (10) Increased cloud cover (11) First clouds dissipated (15) Clouds disappear (17:30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Classification of the cloud convective regimes observed during CloudRoots-Amazon22. Two regimes were classified: shallow cumulus (ShCu) and shallow-to-deep convection (ShDeep). The classifications were based on criteria proposed by Henkes et al. (2021) and modified by de Feiter (2023). In the description the time is approximated and denoted in LT, which can be converted to UTC by adding 4 hours: LT+4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Convective Regime</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-08</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (10) Increased cloud cover (12) First cloud dissipated (14) All clouds dissipated (16:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-09</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (09:30) Increased cloud cover (11) First clouds dissipated (12:30) All clouds dissipated (16:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-09</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (08:30) Increased cloud cover (10) First cloud dissipated (12:30) Deep convection far (16:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-09</td>
<td>ShDeep</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (09) Increased cloud cover (10) First cloud dissipated (12:30) Deep convection (12:30-16:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-09</td>
<td>ShDeep</td>
<td>Clouds high altitude (08) Dissipation high level clouds (10) New clouds form (10:30) Deep convection (14:10-15:50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-09</td>
<td>ShDeep</td>
<td>High level clouds present (09) First deep convection (09:50) Passage squall line (11) Shallow and deep convective development (12:30-16:30) Dissipating clouds (17:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-09</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (10:45) Increased cloud formation (12) Clouds dissipated (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-09</td>
<td>ShDeep</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (10) Increased cloud cover (12) First clouds dissipated (13) Downburst deep convection (14-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-09</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (10) Increased cloud cover (12:30) First clouds dissipated (15) Clouds disappear (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-09</td>
<td>ShCu</td>
<td>Onset shallow cumuli (10) Increased cloud cover (11) First clouds dissipated (15) Clouds disappear (17:30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

hours) created by clouds. This is characterized by a significant enhancement of global horizontal irradiance (more than 20%) with respect to the clear values by absorption and scattering (Mol et al. 2023), but also the more expected decrease of global irradiance due to cloud shading. The time-lag between the radiation perturbation and the reaction of the canopy exchange flux is in the order minutes (Vilà-Guerau de Arellano et al. 2020). In addition, and as quantified by Kivalov and Fitzjarrald (2019) using observations taken in the Amazon and Harvard temperate forests, these step changes in light can create transient maximum values in the evaporation and net ecosystem exchanges with characteristic time scales of minutes. The strong decrease of the irradiance when penetrating the dense canopy reveals how the complex interplay between disturbances of clouds, plant density distribution, and leaf orientation are key drivers of spatial and temporal variability in ecosystem photosynthesis and transpiration (Parker et al. 2019).

The sub-diurnal variability of leaf-level stomatal conductance across the three canopy layers on August 11 and 12 is shown in Figure 3. Both days show an asymmetric pattern over the course of the day with highest conductance observations before 13 LT. Similar diurnal behaviour was measured in a primary rain forest by Roberts et al. (1990). Under high radiation conditions, and at the canopy top the decrease on stomatal conductance is due to the high values of temperature and water vapor deficit. The canopy-height dependence is clearly observed on August 11 before midday with a linear pattern (intervals 06:00-07:30 and 08:30-11:00) or more logarithmic (11:15-12:45), with values that roughly increase by factor two between the bottom and middle and the middle and top. This dependency changes owing to the appearance of clouds in the afternoon which leads to similar values in the middle and bottom levels due to the simultaneous decrease of direct irradiance and the increased penetration of diffuse radiation (not measured during CloudRoots-Amazon22). This change in the partitioning of direct versus diffuse might be also dependent on the irradiance wavelength (Durand et al. 2021). As shown in Fig. 2, the lower averaged values of the global irradiance during the afternoon August 12, lead to lower leaf conductivity at the top of the canopy due to the presence of clouds. Appendix A3 shows the cloud depth observed by a cloud radar at the Campina site during both days. During August 11, the cloud depth was always below 1 km whereas during August 12, cloud depths above 1 km were observed during the intervals 11:15 to 12:45 LT, and 16:30 to 18:00. These radiation and stomatal conductance observations need to be
Fig. 2. High frequency global horizontal irradiance measurements (1 Hz) taken at the 80-meter INSTANT tower at three different levels: above canopy (62.9 m), in the middle of canopy (15.1 m) and bottom (0.5 m) during (a) August 11 (shallow cumulus) and (b) August 12 (shallow-to-deep convection) August. The average values over the following 1.5 h time intervals are marked by dots (LT): 06:00-07:30, 08:30-10:00, 11:15-12:45, 14:00-15:30, 16:30-18:00. Bars indicate the averaging period (90 minutes). To be consistent, these periods are the same used for the measurements of the stomatal conductance (shown in Fig. 3). Cloud depth of both days is shown at Fig. A2.

combined with temperature and water vapour deficit profiles as well as stable isotopologues of CO$_2$ and H$_2$O to determine the variation of soil and photosynthesis rate within the canopy.

4. Canopy-level processes: carbon and water fluxes at the forest and atmosphere interface

To upscale measurements from leaf to canopy level, it is important to discriminate the individual contributions of soil, and plant leaves and relate them to the canopy architecture. Environmental variables such as the transfer of radiation and the effects of vertical and horizontal turbulent transport also need to be taken into account. Measurements of the stable isotopologues of CO$_2$ and H$_2$O enable us to quantify the contributions of photosynthetic assimilation and respiratory components to NEE (Bowling et al. 2001) and of plant transpiration and soil evaporation to net
Fig. 3. Sub-diurnal variability of the leaf stomatal conductance at different heights of the canopy collected during August 11 and 12. Leaf samples (total 158 samples) were taken under sunlit (63 samples) and shaded (95) conditions at three heights: bottom (47), middle (50) and top (61). Leaf samples were taken from random trees. Canopy height is 40 meters. Top samples were collected between 27 and 30 meters. Medium samples were collected between 18 and 22 meters. Bottom samples were collected at around 2 meters. Observations were done using LI6400XT instrument.

We have measured the gradients and fluxes of CO₂, H₂O, and their abundant and scarce isotopologues. Figure 4 shows the diurnal variability of CO₂ and H₂O and their isotopic compositions, δ¹³C-CO₂ and δ¹⁸O-H₂O, for a diurnally aggregated period of two or four days (August 17-18 or 15-18). Note these isotopic compositions reflect the ratio of measured scarce (heavy-element bearing molecules) to abundant (light-element bearing molecules) isotopologue mixing ratios, e.g. $^{13}$C$^{16}$O₂ / $^{12}$C$^{16}$O₂, relative to the ratio of the heavy to light isotope in the reference standard. A positive δ value means that the sample contains more of the heavy isotope than the reference stan-
standard; a negative $\delta$ value means that the sample contains less of the heavy isotope than the reference standard. Plant and soil exchange with the atmosphere is characterized by different relationships between abundant and scarce isotopologues, which can be used to identified the sources and sinks of CO$_2$ and H$_2$O in and above the canopy.

The depicted days were selected as an example of shallow to deep convection (15 and 16) and two consecutive shallow convection days (Table 2). The diurnal variability showed a shift in stability from the nocturnal, thermodynamically stable and characterized by gradients, to the diurnal (unstable) conditions at 09 LT (13 UTC). From this time and until 20 LT, the four stable isotopologues show very similar patterns, i.e., the time series of all heights collapse to a single evolution, which indicates that they are well-mixed profiles above the canopy. This pattern is also followed by the 79 m discrete flask observations. This shows that turbulence, above the canopy, is efficiently mixing and able to partially penetrate, mix, and transport air from the different heights of the canopy (from 24 m and higher) into the ABL. Here it is important to mention that the diurnal variability is controlled by canopy processes, but also by non-local processes such as entertainment of air masses from the residual layer into the free troposphere as shown by previous studies on CO$_2$ (Vilà-Guerau de Arellano et al. 2004; Patton et al. 2016) and stable isotopologues (Welp et al. 2012). The analysis of changes in the isotopologue composition variability measured during the campaign can therefore enable us to disentangle the contribution of local and regional sources of evaporation and the net ecosystem exchange in the Amazon basin, as indicated by Griffis et al. (2016).

The exception is the lower measurement height at 4 m, for both continuous and flask measurements. As shown, at this level close to the ground, all the four components are decoupled from the evolution of the compounds measured at the other heights. This decoupling is driven by the more thermodynamically stratified mixing conditions in the middle of the canopy (not shown). In addition there is a shift from CO$_2$ photosynthesis assimilation in the canopy top to the soil CO$_2$ respiration dominant conditions. Therefore, soil CO$_2$ efflux and soil evaporation are larger contributors, as also shown by the high CO$_2$ concentrations, and depleted $\delta^{13}$CO$_2$ values, indicating a source value of 28.3‰. Our objective here is to assess if these stable isotopologues measurements can help to quantify more accurately the flux partitioning between overstory and understory (Misson et al. 2007). For tropical rainforest, sources originated at the understory ET contribute
23.6% to the net ET (Jiménez-Rodríguez et al. 2020). To our knowledge, no previous study has identified the understory contribution to gross primary production, autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration, and net evaporation in the Amazon rainforest. Within CloudRoots-Arazon22, these high-precision measurements of CO₂ and H₂O, and their isotopic composition, characterized by distinct sub-diurnal patterns for all components and heights, as shown in Fig. 4, will permit the use of Keeling plot techniques on different temporal and spatial scales. This analysis will provide a detailed and in-depth partitioning of NEE and ET (soil versus plants) and its dependence on environmental variables (Bowling et al. 2001; Pataki et al. 2003; Knohl and Buchmann 2005; Zhang et al. 2006).

b. Ejection and sweeping motions of stable isotopologues above the canopy

High-frequency observations of CO₂ and H₂O complete the on-site gradient measurements of the isotopologues of CO₂ and H₂O. They enable us to study the role of turbulent dynamics (gust penetration into the canopy) of CO₂ and H₂O exchange (Fitzjarrald et al. 1988). The quadrant plot in Figure 5 depicts the sweeping penetrative motions of air from the boundary layer into the canopy (Q3 quadrants with downdrafts quantified by w’ < 0, shown at the 2 lower panels) and upwards ejections of air masses (quadrants Q1 and Q2 characterized by w’ > 0, shown at the 2 upper panels) originating from within the canopy. All these high-frequency measurements were taken at 56 m, this height is approximately 16 m above the canopy and we consider it a representative level of the processes occurring at the interface between the canopy and the atmosphere i.e. the roughness sub-layer.

This plot shows 18,000 observations of the perturbations in CO₂’ and H₂O’ molar fractions and δ₁⁸O-CO₂ measured at 10Hz over a 30-minute time window from 12:00 to 12:30 LT (August 18). These perturbations are calculated using a Reynolds decomposition using φ’ = φ - ̄φ, where φ is the generic measurement and ̄φ its average during the 30-minute interval. The two main modes of exchange during this midday period are observed between the lower left quadrant Q3 in Fig. 5 (downdraft motions entering the canopy) and the upper-right quadrant Q1 (updraft motions from the canopy into the atmosphere). Here we follow the quadrant analysis criteria as suggested by Shaw et al. (1983). Downward moving air (inward transport) in Q3 (72% motions characterized by w’ < 0), contain air parcels characterized by high CO₂ concentrations (positive fluctuation with
Fig. 4. Diurnal cycles of CO₂, δ¹³C-CO₂, H₂O and δ¹⁸O-H₂O. Upper panel: Averaged CO₂ mixing ratio measured at the INSTANT tower by the Picarro G2401. Simultaneously measured tall tower CO₂ molar fractions (measured by the FTIR Spectronus analyzer) are shown in grey. Second panel: Averaged δ C¹³CO₂ values measured at the tall tower by the FTIR Spectronus analyzer. H₂O concentrations (third panel) and δ¹⁸O-H₂O (fourth panel) values as measured at the INSTANT tower by the Picarro L2140-i, and by the L2130-i at the ATTO tower (56m). The shown observations of CO₂ and δ C¹³CO₂ (two upper panels) were taken on August 15-18 and the observations H₂O and δ¹⁸O-H₂O were taken on August 17-18. To complete the data set, flask measurements of CO₂ and δ¹³C-CO₂ taken on August 15 are included. Details on the instrumentation can be found in Appendix A1.

These air parcels likely originate from the convective boundary layer dynamics. They are characterized by an ABL signal respect to the 30-minute average period) and by low in H₂O concentrations. These air parcels likely originate from the convective boundary layer dynamics. They are characterized by an ABL signal
indicating the transport, by subsiding motions, of air masses rich in CO₂ and dry air originated and entrained from the free tropospheric air (Welp et al. 2012; Griffis et al. 2016). We interpreted values around 41.3‰ as air masses characterized by background isotopic composition of δ₁⁸O-CO₂ in the local ABL. In contrast, air parcels in Q1 were ejected from the canopy (68% characterized by w’ < 0). Canopy outward transport motions are characterized by reduced levels of CO₂ and increased H₂O reflecting active vegetation processes with high rates of photosynthesis and transpiration occurring at around midday (Fig. 3). Strongly enriched δ₁⁸O-CO₂ signals (> 41.6 ‰) confirm leaf contact, since CO₂ oxygen isotopes exchange rapidly with isotopically enriched leaf water in the presence of carbonic anhydrase (CA) (Yakir et al. 1994; Adnew et al. 2020). The Q2 quadrant provides intriguing evidence of air parcels predominantly influenced by the most dominant soil signal. We find that ejection motions of air parcels are less frequent with increasing CO₂ and H₂O contents as was also reported by Thomas et al. (2008). We associate their upward transport with energetic canopy-scale eddies that are able to penetrate almost unperturbed into the canopy down to the understory transporting air with high levels of H₂O and CO₂ back to sensor height (56 m) above the canopy.

c. One-minute turbulent fluxes in relation to cloud radiation perturbations

Using the data of CloudRoots-Amazon22, we plan to calculate isofluxes (Griffis 2013) using two different observational techniques: the eddy covariance (Wehr et al. 2013) and the DBLS scintillometer (van Kesteren et al. 2013). As a preparatory example, Figure 6 shows how the sensible heat flux (H) varies due to the photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) fluctuations. Magnitude and duration of the fluctuations depend on cloud passage and the thickness of the cloud. The high-frequency fluctuations in global horizontal irradiance, proportional to PAR (Fig. 2), drive fluctuations in the canopy turbulent fluxes at comparable timescales (Kivalov and Fitzjarrald 2019; Vilà-Guerau de Arellano et al. 2023), as highlighted by the one-minute observations of the DBLS technique (van Kesteren et al. 2013). These collocated radiation-H fluctuations are with some time lag with respect to PAR which indicates that radiation is not the only driver, but also other processes regulating the exchange (stomatal conductance, turbulence) play a role in controlling the sensible heat flux. As shown in the figure 6, this variability is not registered (filtered out) in the standard 30-minute average eddy covariance observations. These advanced measurements of canopy turbulent
Fig. 5. Quadrant plot of high-frequency perturbations in CO₂ and H₂O, coloured with 10Hz δ¹⁸O-CO₂ measurements from an Aerodyne TILDAS-CS. The 30-minute time interval started at 12:00 LT on August 18 2022, and was measured at 57 m on the ATTO tower. Canopy height is 40 m. Quadrants are defined in term of positive and negative fluctuations of vertical velocity w': Q1 is the outward transport from the canopy into atmosphere, Q2 correspond to ejections from the understory and Q3 to the inward transport from the atmosphere into the canopy. The percentages correspond to the fluctuation vertical velocity per quadrant. Details on the instrumentation can be found in Appendix A1.

Fluxes will enable us to study how the vegetation responds to these rapid variable cloud radiation perturbations of varying intensity. Note that the scintillometer technique, unlike eddy-covariances, does not rely on integration over all eddy scales that contribute to the turbulent transport. Rather, it determines turbulence variables, structure parameters of temperature, and dissipation rate of the turbulent kinetic energy on eddy scales that lie in the inertial range of the refractive index spectrum, which are linked to fluxes using MOST. The disadvantage of the technique is that it is more indirect because it relies on inertial range behavior of the observed eddies and the assumption that MOST holds. Both assumptions will require to be further investigated.
Fig. 6. Collocated observations of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) (black) and sensible heat flux (H) taken during the August, 2022. The red dots connected with the line shows the standard 30-minute average by eddy covariance and dark red line shows the one-minute averages determined using the displaced-beam laser scintillometer. The cumulative values (the four hour u=interval from 10 to 14 LT) of H for eddy covariance and scintillometer are equal so as to better highlight the dynamic differences. This day is categorized as a shallow cumulus day (Table 2).

5. Cloud-level processes

a. Clear-to-cloudy profiles: diurnal evolution

Ejection and sweeping motions at the forest atmosphere interface regulate the exchange of energy, water and carbon dioxide. These motions are also influenced by ABL-scale structures that can lead to changes in the turbulent fluxes at the top of the canopy (Patton et al. 2016). Therefore, to connect these canopy fluxes to the vertical distribution of the ABL state variables, we measured the morning and afternoon profiles of potential temperature ($\theta$), specific humidity ($q$), and carbon dioxide (CO$_2$). Figure 7 shows the observed profiles collected during the afternoon of August 18 (period 14 to 18 LT) characterized by shallow cumulus. The figure combines observations from the two tall towers, the sounding (potential temperature and specific humidity), and aircraft vertical profiles (H$_2$O and CO$_2$) (Table 1). In the bottom panels we show the first 500 m, which are dominated by large gradients which even change sign in and above the canopy, i.e. potential temperature and carbon dioxide. The observations show the large differences in profiles in and above the canopy with respect to magnitude and gradients. The large differences in values are the largest for CO$_2$: 431 ppm at the lowest level, 414 ppm near the canopy top, and 419 ppm...
within the well-mixed ABL. These data can contribute to the current debate on the impact of canopy on the inertial and roughness layer at the Amazon rainforest (Dias-Júnior et al. 2019). They also provide observational evidence to evaluate the effects of the canopy turbulence on the mean flux profiles (Harman 2012), i.e. modifications of MOST, which require to be implemented in numerical weather and global climate models (Bonan et al. 2021).

In the upper panels, which display the altitude from the top of the forest up to 5000 m, we find that the three variables very closely follow a three-layer structure determined by a sub-cloud layer (that is well-mixed for the three conserved variables below 1500 m), a cloud layer (that is conditionally unstable from 1500 to 3000 m), and the free troposphere (that is thermodynamic stably stratified > 3000 m). This three-layer structure is already present in the morning profiles (09-11 LT) of the three variables (see Appendix A4 and Fig. A1), but now with an ABL depth at 1000 m. These soundings indicate that the diurnal growth of the ABL (sub-cloud layer) is between 0.03 m s\(^{-1}\) (108 m hour\(^{-1}\)) and 0.05 m s\(^{-1}\) (180 m hour\(^{-1}\)) (see Fig. A4). The transport in the sub-cloud layer is mainly driven by turbulence depending on the partitioning between sensible and latent heat fluxes at the canopy top. At the cloud base, the transport from the sub-cloud layer into the cloud layer, namely the mass flux \(M\) or ventilation, is driven by two processes: at the canopy level by the partition of the turbulent fluxes, which is partly controlled by plants (Sikma and Vilà-Guerau de Arellano 2019), and, at the cloud scale, by the thermodynamic conditions at the ABL and cloud, more specifically the dynamic conditions at their interface, and the role of the temperature and specific humidity lapse rates (van Stratum et al. 2014). It has been shown numerically that this mass flux is important for the transport of atmospheric compounds such as isoprene between the sub-cloud and cloud layers (Ouwersloot et al. 2013). Mass flux is modified under conditions of enhanced CO\(_2\) levels and warming (Sikma et al. 2019).

\(\text{b. Cloud characteristics: cloud core and mass flux}\)

As a representative example of the advantages to gather collocated and comprehensive observations to study cause-effect relationship between canopy and cloud processes, Figure 8 shows the observed and modeled calculations of the area fraction cloud core \(a_{cc}\) and the mass flux \(M\). Both variables are calculated for the aggregated days characterized by shallow (ShCu) and deep (ShDeep) convection, respectively. \(a_{cc}\) is defined as the region at cloud base in which the air
within the well-mixed ABL. These data can contribute to the current debate on the impact of canopy on the inertial and roughness layer at the Amazon rainforest (Dias-Júnior et al. 2019). They also provide observational evidence to evaluate the effects of the canopy turbulence on the mean flux profiles (Harman 2012), i.e. modifications of MOST, which require to be implemented in numerical weather and global climate models (Bonan et al. 2021).

In the upper panels, which display the altitude from the top of the forest up to 5000 m, we find that the three variables very closely follow a three-layer structure determined by a sub-cloud layer (that is well-mixed for the three conserved variables below 1500 m), a cloud layer (that is conditionally unstable from 1500 to 3000 m), and the free troposphere (that is thermodynamic stably stratified >3000 m). This three-layer structure is already present in the morning profiles (09-11 LT) of the three variables (see Appendix A4 and Fig. A1), but now with an ABL depth at 1000 m. These soundings indicate that the diurnal growth of the ABL (sub-cloud layer) is between 0.03 m s$^{-1}$ (108 m hour$^{-1}$) and 0.05 m s$^{-1}$ (180 m hour$^{-1}$) (see Fig. A4). The transport in the sub-cloud layer is mainly driven by turbulence depending on the partitioning between sensible and latent heat fluxes at the canopy top. At the cloud base, the transport from the sub-cloud layer into the cloud layer, namely the mass flux ($M$) or ventilation, is driven by two processes: at the canopy level by the partition of the turbulent fluxes, which is partly controlled by plants (Sikma and Vila-Guerau de Arellano 2019), and, at the cloud scale, by the thermodynamic conditions at the ABL and cloud, more specifically the dynamic conditions at their interface, and the role of the temperature and specific humidity lapse rates (van Stratum et al. 2014). It has been shown numerically that this mass flux is important for the transport of atmospheric compounds such as isoprene between the sub-cloud and cloud layers (Ouwersloot et al. 2013). Mass flux is modified under conditions of enhanced CO$_2$ levels and warming (Sikma et al. 2019).

b. Cloud characteristics: cloud core and mass flux

As a representative example of the advantages to gather collocated and comprehensive observations to study cause-effect relationship between canopy and cloud processes, Figure 8 shows the observed and modeled calculations of the area fraction cloud core $a_{cc}$ and the mass flux ($M$). Both variables are calculated for the aggregated days characterized by shallow (ShCu) and deep (ShDeep) convection, respectively. $a_{cc}$ is defined as the region at cloud base in which the air...
PARCLES are positively buoyant, and therefore move upwards with a velocity. Note that $a_{cc}$ is related to the cloud cover, but it has smaller values. We calculate $a_{cc}$ and $M$ based on a parameterization derived and presented by Neggers et al. (2006) and van Stratum et al. (2014). It was further revised and improved with a suite of large-eddy simulations numerical experiments on marine and land shallow cumulus by van Stratum et al. (2014) and Sikma and Ouwersloot (2015). The formulae used to calculate these two cloud properties as well as the intermediate variables are explained and their results are shown in Appendix A5. In Fig. 8, the parameterization (Eq. A4) is calculated using two different input variables: tower/sounding observations (OBS) and model calculations (CLASS) using a land-atmosphere model that include cloud cover and mass flux representations (van Stratum et al. 2014). The numerical experiments reproduce the aggregated of the ShCu and ShDeep observational situations, using initial and boundary conditions constrained by the observations.

Within the CloudRoots-Amazon22 objectives, the analysis of these two variables is a key element to show the causality of canopy-cloud processes. In short, air parcels move upwards with a convective velocity that depends on the heat and moisture flux at the canopy top, i.e. buoyancy (see Fig. A4a) regulated by the canopy condition. The area fraction of the cloud core (Eq. A4 in Appendix A5), is proportional to the atmospheric boundary layer growth and the differences in moisture content between the free troposphere and the mixed-layer values, represented by the jump of the specific humidity at the cloud base. This parameterization is inversely proportional to the transition layer ($\Delta z$). It therefore separates the regimes of cloud moist convection (quantified by $LCL$) from those of dry convection and mechanical mixing below (quantified by $h$) (Augstein et al. 1974; Albrecht et al. 1979). As such this representation integrates processes driven by the canopy fluxes to ABL dynamic processes.

As shown in Fig. 8, there is a satisfactory agreement between the $a_{cc}$ and $M$ inferred from the observations and from the calculations using CLASS. The outlier is the value for ShDeep at 15 LT which indicates that under deep convective conditions the assumptions included to derive equation A4 are probably not longer valid. At 12 LT, and for ShDeep, the higher values $a_{cc}$ and $M$ indicates the more favourable conditions to initiate deep convection. However, we need to be cautious about our analysis since the differences in the intermediate variables are minimal and subtle as shown in Fig. A4. Here we take as a representative example of the variability in the calculation of $\Delta z$ (Fig.
parcels are positively buoyant, and therefore move upwards with a velocity. Note that $a_{cc}$ is related to the cloud cover, but it has smaller values. We calculate $a_{cc}$ and $M$ based on a parameterization derived and presented by Neggers et al. (2006) and van Stratum et al. (2014). It was further revised and improved with a suite of large-eddy simulations numerical experiments on marine and land shallow cumulus by van Stratum et al. (2014) and Sikma and Ouwersloot (2015). The formulae used to calculate these two cloud properties as well as the intermediate variables are explained and their results are shown in Appendix A5. In Fig. 8, the parameterization (Eq. A4) is calculated using two different input variables: tower/sounding observations (OBS) and model calculations (CLASS) using a land-atmosphere model that include cloud cover and mass flux representations (van Stratum et al. 2014). The numerical experiments reproduce the aggregated of the ShCu and ShDeep observational situations, using initial and boundary conditions constrained by the observations.

Within the CloudRoots-Amazon22 objectives, the analysis of these two variables is a key element to show the causality of canopy-cloud processes. In short, air parcels move upwards with a convective velocity that depends on the heat and moisture flux at the canopy top, i.e. buoyancy (see Fig. A4a) regulated by the canopy conditions. The area fraction of the cloud core (Eq. A4 in Appendix A5), is proportional to the atmospheric boundary layer growth and the differences in moisture content between the free troposphere and the mixed-layer values, represented by the jump of the specific humidity at the cloud base. This parameterization is inversely proportional to the transition layer ($\Delta z$). It therefore separates the regimes of cloud moist convection (quantified by $L_L$) from those of dry convection and mechanical mixing below (quantified by $h$) (Augstein et al. 1974; Albrecht et al. 1979). As such this representation integrates processes driven by the canopy fluxes to ABL dynamic processes.

As shown in Fig. 8, there is a satisfactory agreement between the $a_{cc}$ and $M$ inferred from the observations and from the calculations using CLASS. The outlier is the value for ShDeep at 15 LT which indicates that under deep convective conditions the assumptions included to derive equation A4 are probably not longer valid. At 12 LT, and for ShDeep, the higher values $a_{cc}$ and $M$ indicates the more favourable conditions to initiate deep convection. However, we need to be cautious about our analysis since the differences in the intermediate variables are minimal and subtle as shown in Fig. A4. Here we take as a representative example of the variability in the calculation of $\Delta z$ (Fig. 8). We interpret $\Delta z < 0$ as a local condition that favours the formation and intensification of cloud: air parcels release at the canopy top have more favourable conditions to reach condensation. We calculate $L_L$ from the soundings as the height where and air parcel has reached the relative humidity 100%. $h$ is calculated as the maximum of the potential temperature gradient in between 300 and 2000 m following the definition by Sullivan et al. (1998). For the key hours of the potential intensification and transition of convection all the values are ranging between -100 m and 100 m indicating the high variability of the calculations, both in observations and conceptual modelling.

6. Future perspectives

How are surface and atmospheric processes coupled to control moist, shallow and deep convection (Gentine et al. 2013) and what is the influence of local processes on cloudy boundary layer dynamics (Vilà-Guerau de Arellano et al. 2023)? Recent studies have described key processes related to
these questions: the role of vertical wind shear (Drueke et al. 2021; Cecchini et al. 2022), the role of fog (Anber et al. 2015) and low level jets (Henkes et al. 2021) during the morning transition, and the impact of weather on aerosol distribution (Machado et al. 2021) in the Amazon region. The latter aspect is discussed by Gentine et al. (2019) who stressed the need to integrate regional and large-scale changes in ocean to land flow and the inland distance of penetration influencing local coupling, \textit{i.e.} moisture recycling and changes on aerosol properties (Zemp et al. 2014).

Our modelling strategy, constrained and evaluated by the campaign data, aims to contribute to this debate by explicitly resolving radiation transfer, turbulent eddies and cloud dynamics using large-eddy Simulations (LESs) (Heus et al. 2010; Ouwersloot et al. 2017). Here, the strategy is twofold: coupled to dynamic representations of explicit canopy vegetation responses to ABL and cloud evolution (Patton et al. 2016; Pedruzo-Bagazgoitia et al. 2023), including the radiation effects of cloud shading (Lohou and Patton 2014; Horn et al. 2015) and the three-dimensional effects of radiation at the surface (Veerman et al. 2020). Key in our approach is to integrate a complete data set of isotopologues and isofluxes to advance in the determination of the sink and sources of carbon and water (Lee et al. 2012). Here we follow the recommendations of Bonan et al. (2021) to make use of multi-layer canopy models coupled to atmospheric processes to advance our understanding of the forest-atmosphere interactions. These detailed LES experiments are supported by the conceptual coupled forest-atmosphere model CLASS (Vilà-Guerau de Arellano et al. 2015) in which clouds (van Stratum et al. 2014; Cecchini et al. 2022), the land surface (van Heerwaarden and Teuling 2014), the carbon cycle (Vilà-Guerau de Arellano et al. 2012) that includes the diurnal variability of CO$_2$ and H$_2$O stable isotopolgues (Vilà-Guerau de Arellano et al. 2019) are simultaneously solved.

As shown in Figures 8 and A4, numerical experiments using a conceptual model such as CLASS, supported by observations and LES numerical experiments, can be viewed as a surrogate of a typical weather or climate grid cell. In this particular case, CLASS model results compared to observations enable us to determine key aspects of the mass flux parameterizations (Neggers et al. 2006; van Stratum et al. 2014) or to determine the level of coupling between local processes and non-local processes such as entertainment, subsidence and advection (Mangan et al. 2023; Aguirre-Correa et al. 2023). An improved assessment and representation of these processes could therefore contribute to reduce analyze uncertainties of coupled canopy-cloud processes such as the
estimation of atmospheric boundary layer height in global model such as ERA5 (Dias-Júnior et al. 2022). In our modelling approach, the contribution of regional processes to the diurnal variability, for instance by long-range transport of moisture and carbon dioxide from remote sources, on canopy fluxes and clouds are simultaneously solved as part of a continuum using the ECMWF-IFS to provide model boundary conditions (Boussetta et al. 2013). This regional perspective will enable us to determine and distinguish the origin of air masses in which moisture is recycled (Trenberth 1999; Rösner et al. 2018) and quantify potential effects on atmospheric moisture recycling through vegetation (Staal et al. 2018). With respect to CO₂, and in combination with atmospheric transport models (Botía et al. 2022), it will enable us to improve the quantification of the contribution of upwind air masses on the local diurnal CO₂ cycle.

7. Summary

The CloudRoots-Amazon 2022 campaign generated a comprehensive, high-frequency, two-week data set that simultaneously probes (micro)meteorology, including cloud properties, and soil/plant dynamics relating to atmospheric composition in and above the pristine rainforest. Collocated surface and upper atmospheric observations were taken around the supersites of ATTO and Campina in August 2022 (Southern Hemisphere Amazon dry season). These data provide unique constraints for modeling important uncertainties regarding evaporation/precipitation and sources/sinks of CO₂ in the Amazon basin, connecting local processes to large-scale circulations at the diurnal scale. Our main findings are:

1. Our leaf-to-canopy observations confirmed that there is an asymmetry in the stomatal conductance and subsequent fluxes of water, carbon and energy, with more favourable conditions in the morning compared to the afternoon. This asymmetry is strongly regulated by light fluctuations (order seconds to minutes) driven by clouds and in-canopy penetration.

2. Slow/fast and accurate measurements of CO₂ and H₂O stable isotopologues combined with high-frequency turbulence measurements enable us to determine CO₂ and H₂O sources and sinks at the over- and understory. The analysis shows that thermal stratification in and above the canopy controls mixing and transport. In intermittent situations, turbulence is able to penetrate to the bottom of the canopy shown by different signals of δ¹⁸O-CO₂. Quadrant
analysis show how sweeping and ejection motions transport CO$_2$-rich/poor and dry/moist air masses between the boundary layer and the canopy.

3. One-minute turbulent fluxes inferred by scintillometer observations show large fluctuations relate to the radiation and transport perturbations related to the passage of clouds.

4. We find similar and consistent vertical structure of potential temperature, specific humidity and carbon dioxide strongly characterized by a well-mixed sub-cloud layer and a cloud layer. This pattern occurs in shallow cumulus cases, but also in days in which the transition shallow-to-deep occurs. In both cases, we calculate two metrics that connect canopy to cloud processes: the area fraction of the cloud core and the mass flux that vents sub-cloud properties to the cloud layer. Our observations, supported by results using a conceptual modelling results, show that these cycles are characterized by a strong sub-diurnal variability, with favorable conditions for formation of boundary-layer clouds in the afternoon.

The data collected during the CloudRoots-Amazon22 campaign will provide novel opportunities to connect processes at leaf, canopy and cloud levels. Placing CloudRoots-Amazon22 in a broader framework, this field campaign complements and adds a comprehensive observational perspective to the coupling between evaporation and clouds (Findell et al. 2011; Taylor et al. 2011) by adding the active role played by plants. Our approach also introduces a well-resolved local perspective on top-down regional-global studies in which vegetation responses are investigated in the context of clouds (Doutriaux-Boucher et al. 2009; Pietschnig et al. 2021; Park et al. 2021).
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APPENDIX

A1. Isotopologue measurements

CloudRoots-Amazon22 campaign bolstered seven distinct setups all measuring unique aspects of the CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}O isotopic budget. Tables A1 and A2 provide a detailed overview of these various setups, which are categorized into continuous profile measurements (PF), high-frequency (HF) observations to calculate isofluxes and discrete flask (DF) measurements. Continuous profile measurements were carried out by the Max Planck Institute Biogeoscience team at several sampling heights in and above canopy by using multiple inlet lines that sample sequentially through custom-made inlet manifolds. The analysers used for this purpose are placed in air-conditioned labs at the base of the towers. The high frequency analysers were placed in air-conditioned enclosures on the 54 m platform of the ATTO tall tower. They were used to infer isoflux measurements by combing them either with eddy-covariance or the laser scintillometer. The short inlet line in combination with heated, smooth, inlet tubing, high gas flow rates, and adequate post processing minimized the effects of inlet line attenuation or lag (Moonen et al. 2023). Finally, leaf, air, and soil samples were collected during two days (14 and 15 2022) (Fig. 4) for isotopic analysis at MPI Jena and IMAU. The sampling was done in eight specific time windows (Local Times: 05:00-05:26, 06:01-06:21, 08:02-08:23, 09:02-09:26, 11:03-11:21, 13:01-13:27, 15:01-15:27, 20:02-20:55) and at 6 heights.

The vertical air sample profiles provide the backbone of the CO\textsubscript{2} isotopic composition measurements as they are highly accurate. Water isotopic compositions of leaf and soil samples should reveal the isotopic source compositions of evaporation and the net ecosystem exchange, i.e. soil versus plant. $\delta^2$H-H\textsubscript{2}O and $\delta^{18}$O-H\textsubscript{2}O and CH\textsubscript{4} were measured on a Thermo Delta\textsuperscript{PLUS}+XL IRMS coupled to a high-temperature conversion reactor (HTC) via a ConFlo III. Two in-house water standards which were tied to VSMOW-SLAP (Gehre et al. 2004). Leaf and soil (0-10, 10-20, 40-50, 80-90 cm) waters are obtained by cryogenic vacuum extraction.

LS-H\textsubscript{2}O PFs isotope measurement values were cross-checked against the calibrated LS-H\textsubscript{2}O HF’s ones because LS-H\textsubscript{2}O PFs calibration system was unfortunately not functional during the field campaign.
CloudRoots-Amazon22 campaign bolstered seven distinct setups all measuring unique aspects of the CO$_2$ and H$_2$O isotopic budget. Tables A1 and A2 provide a detailed overview of these various setups, which are categorized into continuous profile measurements (PF), high-frequency (HF) observations to calculate isofluxes and discrete flask (DF) measurements. Continuous profile measurements were carried out by the Max Planck Institute Biogeoscience team at several sampling heights in and above canopy by using multiple inlet lines that sample sequentially through custom-made inlet manifolds. The analysers used for this purpose are placed in air-conditioned labs at the base of the towers. The high frequency analysers were placed in air-conditioned enclosures on the 54 m platform of the ATTO tall tower. They were used to infer isoflux measurements by combing them either with eddy-covariance or the laser scintillometer. The short inlet line in combination with heated, smooth, inlet tubing, high gas flow rates, and adequate post processing minimized the effects of inlet line attenuation or lag (Moonen et al. 2023). Finally, leaf, air, and soil samples were collected during two days (14 and 15 2022) (Fig. 4) for isotopic analysis at MPI Jena and IMAU. The sampling was done in eight specific time windows (Local Times: 05:00-05:26, 06:01-06:21, 08:02-08:23, 09:02-09:26, 11:03-11:21, 13:01-13:27, 15:01-15:27, 20:02-20:55) and at 6 heights. The vertical air sample profiles provide the backbone of the CO$_2$ isotopic composition measurements as they are highly accurate. Water isotopic compositions of leaf and soil samples should reveal the isotopic source compositions of evaporation and the net ecosystem exchange, i.e. soil versus plant.

$\delta^{2}H$-H$_2$O and $\delta^{18}O$-H$_2$O and CH$_4$ were measured on a Thermo Delta $\text{P}$+XL IRMS coupled to a high-temperature conversion reactor (HTC) via a ConFlo III. Two in-house water standards which were tied to VSMOW-SLAP (Gehre et al. 2004). Leaf and soil (0-10, 10-20, 40-50, 80-90 cm) waters are obtained by cryogenic vacuum extraction.

Table A1. CO$_2$ isotope instrument specifications. PF, HF and DF stands for continuous profiles, high-frequency and discrete flask measurements, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LS-CO2 PF</th>
<th>LS-CO2 HF</th>
<th>FTIR PF</th>
<th>Air samples DF (MPI &amp; IMAU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Picarro</td>
<td>Aerodyne</td>
<td>ACOEM</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>G2401</td>
<td>TILDAS-CS</td>
<td>Spectronus</td>
<td>MAT252 IRMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>CO$_2$ (CO, H$_2$O, CH$_4$)</td>
<td>CO$_2$, $\delta^{13}$C, $\delta^{18}$O</td>
<td>CO$_2$, $\delta^{13}$C (CH$_4$, CO, N$_2$O)</td>
<td>CO$_2$, $\delta^{13}$C, $\delta^{18}$O, $\delta^{17}$O (etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling frequency</td>
<td>Profile in 15 min</td>
<td>10 Hz</td>
<td>Profile in 1 hour</td>
<td>Profile in 2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Described in</td>
<td>Winderlich et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Moonen et al. (2023)</td>
<td>van Asperen et al. (2023)</td>
<td>Adnew et al. (2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>INSTANT</td>
<td>ATTO</td>
<td>ATTO</td>
<td>ATTO &amp; INSTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet height(s) [m]</td>
<td>4, 24, 79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4, 42, 81, 150, 273, 321</td>
<td>4, 24, 38, 60, 80, 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration approach</td>
<td>Flowthrough gaseous standard</td>
<td>Trapping gaseous standards</td>
<td>Flowthrough gaseous standard</td>
<td>Reference standard (gas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration types</td>
<td>Span</td>
<td>Span, mole-frac dependence</td>
<td>Span</td>
<td>Offset from standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2. H$_2$O isotope instrument specifications. PF, HF and DF stands for continuous profiles, high-frequency and discrete flask measurements, respectively. ¹ LS-H$_2$O PF’s isotope measurement values were cross-checked against the calibrated LS-H$_2$O HF’s ones because LS-H$_2$O PF’s calibration system was unfortunately not functional during the field campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>LS-H$_2$O PF</th>
<th>LS-H$_2$O HF</th>
<th>Leaf/Soil Samples DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Picarro</td>
<td>Picarro</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>L-2140i</td>
<td>L-2130i (HF)</td>
<td>Delta$^{PLUS}$+XL IRMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>H$_2$O, δD, δ$^{18}$O, δ$^{17}$O</td>
<td>H$_2$O, δD, δ$^{18}$O</td>
<td>δD, δ$^{18}$O (N, P, gs, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling frequency</td>
<td>Profile in 24 minutes</td>
<td>4 Hz</td>
<td>178 samples in 2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>INSTANT</td>
<td>ATTO</td>
<td>INSTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet height(s) [m]</td>
<td>4, 24, 38, 79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-85, -45, -15, -5, 2, 19, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration approach</td>
<td>Vaporizing liquid standards ¹</td>
<td>Vaporizing liquid standards</td>
<td>HTC reactor, liquid standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration types</td>
<td>Span, mole-frac dependence</td>
<td>Span, mole-frac dependence</td>
<td>Span</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. H$_2$O isotope instrument specifications. PF, HF and DF stands for continuous profiles, high-frequency and discrete flask measurements, respectively. LS-H$_2$O PF's isotope measurement values were cross-checked against the calibrated LS-H$_2$O HF's ones because LS-H$_2$O PF's calibration system was unfortunately not functional during the field campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Picarro</th>
<th>Thermo Fisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>L-2140i</td>
<td>L-2130i (HF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delta $^{13}$C +XL IRMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>H$_2$O, $\delta^{18}$O</td>
<td>$\delta^{18}$O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\delta^{18}$O (N, P, gs, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling frequency</td>
<td>Profile in 24 minutes</td>
<td>4 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>INSTANT</td>
<td>ATTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet height(s) [m]</td>
<td>4, 24, 38, 79</td>
<td>56 -85, -45, -15, -5, 2, 19, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration approach</td>
<td>Vaporizing liquid standards</td>
<td>HTC reactor, liquid standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration types</td>
<td>Span, mole-frac dependence</td>
<td>Span, mole-frac dependence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A2. Profile evolution of biogenic volatile organic compounds

Figure A1 shows the evolution of isoprene, the sum of methyl vinyl ketone (MVK) plus methacrolein (MACR) and isoprene hydroxyhydroperoxide (ISOPOOH), and the sum of monoterpenes measured in the consecutive days August 15 17, at three heights in the ATTO tower: 80, 150 and 320 m. All species are detected by a PTR-ToF-MS (Ionicon Analytik, Innsbruck, Austria) using 3/8"OD insulated Teflon lines to connect to the respective sampling height. The five compounds follow a clear diurnal variability governed by the diurnal emission variability in BVOCs, oxidative chemistry, and the boundary-layer dynamic evolution (Karl et al. 2009; Vilà-Guerau de Arellano et al. 2012). From the figure, we find that measurements at 150 and 320 m are more representative of the atmospheric boundary layer during the day. This can be seen by their collapse in one single line due to the well-mixed convective conditions as shown in Fig. 7, whereas the 80 m observations are still within the roughness sub-layer (Harman 2012).
Fig. A1. Diurnal cycles of isoprene, the sum of methyl vinyl ketone (MVK) plus methacrolein (MACR) and isoprene hydroxyhydroperoxide (ISOPOOH), and the sum of monoterpenes. Upper figure: 1-hour averaged isoprene mixing ratio. Second figure: Averaged of the aggregated of MVK, MACR, and ISOPOOH mixing ratio. Bottom: Sum of monoterpenes mixing ratios. All observations were taken at at the ATTO tower for the period August 15 17, 2022 are averaged over this period. Error bars show the standard deviation.
A3. Evolution of cloud depths

Figure A2 shows the observed cloud depth/thickness organized in five temporal periods (similar to Fig. 3) during the 11 and 12 August 2022. The observations were taken with Doppler Cloud Radar MIRA. Vertical profiles of reflectivity every 5 seconds were taken. The retrieval algorithm analyzes the vertical profiles and consider the first real value (a hit in the cloud radar signal either a cloud or a rain droplet) to be the cloud base. Subsequently, it analyzes all the cloud/rain values in a column until it finds a value with no cloud/rain value. This is considered to be the cloud top. The code considers every continuous cluster of data to be a cloud, that means that if the code detects a droplet at a given height z at time t, if in t+1 it identifies a droplet at height z, z+1 or z-1, the code will consider these data to be components of the same cloud. Finally, the cloud thickness of a certain cloud is calculated according to maximum height of the cloud top minus height of the cloud base.
Fig. A2. Cloud thickness observed with the Doppler Cloud Radar MIRA during August 11 (upper panel) and August 12 (bottom panel). The observations are clustered using the same periods as the ones of the observations of the stomatal conductance (Fig. 3). Based on the number of hits in the radar signal, probability distribution functions are calculated for each interval.
A4. Morning profiles of potential temperature, specific humidity and carbon dioxide

Figure A3 shows the observed profiles collected during the morning flight (during the period 09 to 11 LT). The figure combines observations from the two tall towers, the sounding (potential temperature and specific humidity), and aircraft profiling (H₂O and CO₂) (Table 1). The ABL depth is at 1000 m, and the three-layer structure as described in Fig. 7 sub-cloud layer (well mixed), cloudy boundary layer, and free troposphere layer is already well defined.
Fig. A3. Vertical profiles of potential temperature (left), specific humidity (middle), and carbon dioxide (right) measured August 18, 2022 during the morning: potential temperature 15 LT (11 UTC), specific humidity 10 LT (14 UTC) and carbon dioxide 10 LT (14 UTC). The height h is in m above sea level and the boundary layer $z_i$ is marked by the dashed line. The figure includes the following observations: INSTANT and ATTO tall towers (all variables), aircraft profiles and mean/standard deviation horizontal rasters (specific moisture and carbon dioxide) and radio soundings (potential temperature and specific humidity). The atmospheric boundary layer height is indicated by $z_i$. 
A5. Representations of area fraction cloud core and mass flux

To support Fig. 8 we present all the formulae and the intermediate variables in the calculation of the area fraction cloud core and mass flux. The formulation of the area fraction of the cloud core ($a_{cc}$, dimensionless units) and the mass flux ($M$, units velocity) at cloud base are presented below. We define $a_{cc}$ as as the region of the upward vertical motions which are positive buoyantly within the cloud. The mass flux at cloud base is defined as the upward velocity within $a_{cc}$ which transports mass from the sub-cloud layer into the cloud layer. Following Betts (1973), the kinematic mass flux is defined by the area fraction of cloud cores $a_{cc}$ multiplied by the difference between the cloud core vertical velocity ($w_{cc}$) and the domain-averaged vertical velocity at cloud base ($\bar{w}_{cb}$):

$$M = a_{cc} (w_{cc} - \bar{w}_{cb}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (A1)

Here we will assume that $\bar{w}_{cb}$ is much smaller than $w_{cc}$, and therefore we neglect it in equation A1. Our objective to parameterize equation A1 is twofold: to calculate cloud characteristics by means of variables that were observed during CloudRoots-Amazon22, and to determine by means of a conceptual land-atmosphere model which uses similar representations of area fraction cloud core and mass flux as weather and climate models, its level of representativeness. Therefore it is useful to determine the relationships between surface processes, and the dynamics of the boundary layer and cloud base as presented and discussed in Fig. 8.

Based on the original parameterizations proposed by Cuijpers and Bechtold (1995) and Neggers et al. (2004); and revised in an extensive study of marine and land shallow cumulus clouds by Sikma and Ouwersloot (2015) using systematic large-eddy experiments, we scale the cloud core vertical velocity or convective transport as a function of the convective velocity $w_*$

$$w_{cc} = 0.91 w_*,$$  \hspace{1cm} (A2)

where 0.91 is a constant estimated from a suite of numerical experiments of shallow cumulus carried out using large-eddy simulations (Sikma and Ouwersloot 2015), and $w_*$ is the convective velocity scale of the most energetic turbulent eddies defined as

$$w_* = \left( \frac{g}{\theta_o} \right) \left( \frac{w'\theta'_z}{v z_i} \right)^{1/3}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A3)
Here $g$ is the acceleration of gravity, $\theta_o$ is a characteristic reference potential temperature, $w'\theta'_v$ is the buoyancy flux at the canopy top (surface) and $z_i$ is the boundary layer height.

We subsequently parameterize the area fraction of the cloud core using the expression:

$$ a_{cc} = 0.292 Q_2^{-2}, \quad (A4) $$

where 0.292 was also estimated by Sikma and Ouwersloot (2015), and $Q_2$ is defined as

$$ Q_2 = \frac{q_t - q_s}{\sigma_q}. \quad (A5) $$

The specific humidity $q_t$ and $q_s$ are, respectively, the total and saturation specific humidity, and $\sigma_q$ (units $kg_{water}^2 kg_{atmosphere}^{-2}$) is the spatial standard deviation of the specific humidity defined at cloud base. The $\sigma_q$-parameterisation at cloud base is based on the variance equation of specific humidity at cloud base (Neggers et al. 2006; van Stratum et al. 2014). The simplified parameterizations reads:

$$ \sigma_q^2 = -\left(\delta q'/\delta q\right)_e \left(\Delta q/\Delta z\right) \left(z_i/w_*\right), \quad (A6) $$

where $\left(\delta q'/\delta q\right)_e$ is the entertainment flux of specific humidity at cloud base, $\Delta q$ is the discontinuity (jump) between the free troposphere and the mixed-layer values assuming an infinitesimal discontinuity, i.e. zero-order model (Tennekes and Driedonks 1981). $\Delta z$ is the transitional layer calculated as the difference between the lifting condensation level and the boundary layer height (Augstein et al. 1974; Albrecht et al. 1979). If we parameterize $\left(\delta q'/\delta q\right)_e$ using a zero-order model:

$$ \left(\delta q'/\delta q\right)_e = -w_e \Delta q = -\left(\frac{dz_i}{dt}\right) \Delta q. \quad (A7) $$

Here, we define the entertainment velocity $w_e$ equal to the boundary later growth $\left(\frac{\delta h}{dt}\right)$ where we assume that there are not subsidence motions. We finally obtain the final expression for $\sigma_q$ that reads

$$ \sigma_q^2 = \left(\frac{dz_i}{dt}\right) \left(\Delta q^2/\Delta z\right) \left(z_i/w_*\right). \quad (A8) $$
Fig. A4 shows all the variables used in the calculation of the area fraction cloud cover and mass flux for the shallow cumulus and shallow-to-deep aggregate cases. The calculations are based on two different inputs: observations and model calculations using the rainforest-atmosphere model CLASS. In general, and in spite of the oversimplification of the processes the agreement is very satisfactory. The travelling time of the parcel (Fig. A4a) from the canopy top to the ABL height show representative values ranging from 8 to 20 minutes. There is also a very good agreement between the observation calculations and the model in the calculation of the entrainment velocity (Fig. A4b), except for the time 15 LT in which normally deep convection is the dominated process. The transitional layer (Fig. A4c) that represent the layer between moist driven turbulence (quantified by the lifting condensation level LCL and dry driven turbulence (quantified by the ABL height show that probability of forming clouds increase during the course of the day (12 LT values are closer to zero than 09 LT), and also the deep convective case show (15 LT blue) is the only one with negative values in the calculation of the observations. Due to the overall simplifications in inferring $\Delta_q$ (Fig. A4d) and $q_t - q_s$ (Fig. A4e) there is more scatter in the comparison between the model and observations, and much larger variability on the model calculations of $q_t - q_s$. However, there is an offset compensation since the final calculation of $\sigma_q^2$ at cloud base shows a satisfactory alignment between observations and model calculations.
Fig. A4. Sequence of all the variables used to calculate the area fraction of the cloud core and the mass flux in Fig. 8 (Eqs. A1-A8) at cloud base. Results are presented for the aggregated of the shallow cumulus (ShCu) and shallow-to-deep convection (ShDeep). The variables are calculated using the observations (x-axis) or the rainforest-atmosphere coupled model (y-axis). The variables are: (a) time of a parcel to move upwards from the canopy top to the atmospheric boundary layer height calculated from the atmospheric boundary layer height and the convective velocity, (b) entrainment velocity, (c) transition layer defined as lifting condensation level minus the atmospheric boundary layer height, (d) infinitesimal discontinuity (jump) at the ABL, (d) difference between total and saturation specific humidity, and (f) variance of the specific humidity.
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