

A dynamical systems framework for crop models: Toward optimal fertilization and irrigation strategies under climatic variability

*Original*

A dynamical systems framework for crop models: Toward optimal fertilization and irrigation strategies under climatic variability / Norman, Pelaka; Revelli, Roberto; Amilcare, Porporato. - In: ECOLOGICAL MODELLING. - ISSN 0304-3800. - STAMPA. - 365:(2017), pp. 80-92. [10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2017.10.003]

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11583/2686438 since: 2019-03-27T20:27:53Z

*Publisher:*

Elsevier

*Published*

DOI:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2017.10.003

*Terms of use:*

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

*Publisher copyright*

Elsevier postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

© 2017. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. The final authenticated version is available online at:  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2017.10.003>

(Article begins on next page)

# A dynamical systems framework for crop models: toward optimal fertilization and irrigation strategies under climatic variability

Norman Pelak<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Roberto Revelli<sup>a,c</sup>, Amilcare Porporato<sup>b,a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Duke University, 121 Hudson Hall,  
Box 90287, Durham, NC 27708, United States*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Princeton University, E-208  
E-Quad, Princeton, NJ 08544, United States*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Hydraulics, Transport, and Civil Infrastructures, Politecnico di Torino,  
Turin, Italy*

---

## Abstract

Crop models are widely used for the modeling and prediction of crop yields, as decision support tools, and to develop research questions. Though typically constructed as a set of dynamical equations, crop models are not often analyzed from a specifically dynamical systems point of view, despite its potential to elucidate the roles of feedbacks and internal and external forcings on system stability and the optimization of control protocols (e.g., irrigation and fertilization). Here we develop a minimal dynamical system, based in part on the widely known AquaCrop model, consisting of a set of ordinary differential equations (ODE's) describing the evolution of canopy cover, soil moisture, and soil nitrogen. These state variables are coupled through canopy growth and senescence, the evapotranspiration and percolation of soil moisture, and the uptake and leaching of soil nitrogen. The system is driven by random hydroclimatic forcing. Important crop model responses, such as biomass and yield, are calculated, and optimal yield and profitability under differing climate scenarios, irrigation strategies, and fertilization strategies are examined within the developed framework. [The results highlight the need to maintain the system at or](#)

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email addresses:* [norman.pelak@duke.edu](mailto:norman.pelak@duke.edu) (Norman Pelak), [roberto.revelli@polito.it](mailto:roberto.revelli@polito.it) (Roberto Revelli), [aporpora@princeton.edu](mailto:aporpora@princeton.edu) (Amilcare Porporato)

above resource limitation thresholds to achieve optimality and the role of system variability in determining management strategies.

*Keywords:* Crop model, agroecosystems, nitrogen, fertilization, dynamical systems

---

## 1. Introduction

As tools to forecast or backcast crop yields, improve management strategies, and better understand the physical processes underlying crop production, crop models are important tools from both a research and an engineering view-  
5 point (Wallach et al., 2006; Steduto et al., 2009). The model outputs, structure, parameterization, and data assimilation are all active areas of crop modeling research. Because different users have different goals, several types of crop models have been proposed, which can be categorized in a number of ways. One of the most basic distinctions is between dynamic crop models, which are comprised of  
10 a set of differential equations, which are then integrated in time to simulate the crop responses of interest at each time point (often daily), and crop response models, which, though they may be built on dynamic models, relate crop responses directly to inputs (Thornley and Johnson, 1990; Wallach et al., 2006). Most crop models have as their main state variables above-ground biomass, leaf  
15 area index (LAI), harvestable yield, and water and nitrogen balances, though the choice and precise number of state variables varies (Wallach et al., 2006). Virtually all crop models are process-based, but necessarily involve empirical components, and are of varying levels of complexity, depending on the particular goals of the model and on the availability of input data. Some are specific  
20 to certain crops or groups of crops, such as CERES (Ritchie et al., 1998) and AZODYN (Jeuffroy and Recous, 1999), while others are more generic, such as CROPGRO (Boote et al., 1998), CROPSYST (Stöckle et al., 2003), STICS (Brisson et al., 2003), and some focus on particular regions (e.g., INFOCROP (Aggarwal et al., 2006) for tropical regions). Also in the category of generic  
25 models, but with a more parsimonious framework, is AquaCrop (Steduto et al.,

2009). Despite the abundance of crop models which have dynamical systems at their core, they are not often analyzed as dynamical systems *per se*—that is, using the wide array of tools and methods provided by dynamical systems theory to understand the mathematical behavior and properties of the models (Strogatz, 2014). There are a number of potential reasons for this, such as the difficulty of applying these methods to complex models and the aims of modelers, which may be focused toward other goals.

Although they tend to be considerably more complex and serve different purposes, crop models share many features and describe many of the same processes as do minimal ecohydrological models. The use of such models, which are typically formulated as dynamical systems, has provided many insights into soil moisture dynamics, plant-water interactions, and nutrient cycling (Rodríguez-Iturbe et al., 1999; Porporato et al., 2002, 2003; Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato, 2004). Some features of this type of ecohydrological model, such as the parsimonious representation of processes and stochastic and dynamic coupling between state variables, are well-suited to study the feedbacks, nonlinearities, and effect of random hydroclimatic forcing on agroecosystems (Porporato et al., 2015). Indeed, the underlying assumptions of many dynamic ecohydrological models are better met in agroecosystems than in the natural ecosystems where they are normally applied. Such assumptions include homogenous soil depth and plant spacing, as well as good drainage, which describe well an agricultural field with tillage, uniform crop spacing, and tile drains.

Various studies have used a dynamical systems framework to examine grass ecosystems (Thornley and Verberne, 1989; Tilman and Wedin, 1991), grass growth modulated by competition with legumes (Thornley et al., 1995) and grazing (Johnson and Parsons, 1985), forest ecosystems (Thornley and Cannel, 1992), forest ecosystems under harvest (Parolari and Porporato, 2016), soil salinity and sodicity (Mau and Porporato, 2015), and the cycles themselves, including feedbacks and nonlinearities (Porporato et al., 2003; Manzoni et al., 2004; Manzoni and Porporato, 2007). Studying crop models with dynamical systems theory allows for the more ready exploration of many interesting aspects

of crop systems, including their stability with respect to parameter change, the  
feedbacks between water, carbon, and nutrient cycling, the optimal conditions  
for growth, and the impact of external inputs such as changes in climate patterns  
60 and management choices (i.e. fertilization and irrigation).

With the goal of taking advantage of the tools of dynamical systems theory,  
in this work we develop a dynamic crop model which captures the main crop  
fluxes and responses of interest without being overly complex. The model has  
three main variables which interact dynamically: the canopy cover, the relative  
65 soil moisture, and the soil nitrogen. The differential equations which account for  
these components are coupled via the crop growth, nitrogen uptake and leaching,  
and evapotranspiration terms. Biomass and yield, which are not considered to  
interact dynamically with the other state variables but rather are determined by  
them, are also included as derived variables of agroecologic interest. The model  
70 is used to examine the crop response to water and nutrient availability and  
varying climatic conditions in order to examine questions of optimal fertilization  
and irrigation and reduction of nutrient leaching.

Several aspects of the model are derived from AquaCrop (Steduto et al.,  
2009; Raes et al., 2009; Hsiao et al., 2009), which is the existing generic crop  
75 model that, in addition to its parsimony, can perhaps most easily be viewed as  
a dynamical system. It is also physically based, validated for a variety of crops,  
and widely known. AquaCrop itself is largely based on earlier FAO publications,  
in particular through its use of crop coefficients (Allen et al., 1998) and in  
the relation between crop water uptake and yield (Doorenbos and Kassam,  
80 1998). The most notable similarities between the model developed here and  
AquaCrop are that canopy cover is used rather than the more typical LAI, that  
evapotranspiration is represented by crop coefficients, and in the dependence of  
the partitioning of transpiration and evaporation on the canopy cover. Some key  
differences involve the soil moisture balance (the model developed here makes  
85 use of a single vertically averaged soil moisture value rather than a soil column  
consisting of multiple layers, and it uses the same soil moisture stress thresholds  
throughout) and the nitrogen balance (a balance of total mineral nitrogen in

the soil is used here rather than the empirical fertility coefficient employed in AquaCrop).

90 Here a different viewpoint and set of tools is emphasized for studying dynamic crop models, and we also aim to place crop models in a dynamical systems context and to discuss the application of the associated methods to crop models. We hope that this contribution will be of interest to both the crop modeling community and to researchers in the area of theoretical ecohydrology as a means  
95 to explore the response of agroecosystems to uncertain climatic conditions and optimal management strategies.

## 2. Model components

In this section a dynamical system is constructed which describes the interaction of three main components: canopy cover  $C(t)$ , relative soil moisture  
100  $S(t)$ , and total nitrogen content in the soil  $N(t)$ . We also consider two related variables, namely the crop biomass  $B(t)$  and the crop yield  $Y(t)$  (hereafter we drop the  $t$ -dependence of the state variables). The model is interpreted at the daily timescale (no diurnal dynamics are considered) and applied over the course of a single growing season. It can be forced by random rainfall inputs  
105 (Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato, 2004), and is assumed to apply to an agricultural field which is homogenous in terms of soil composition, climatic forcing, and management.

### 2.1. Canopy cover dynamics

We define the canopy cover to be the fraction of ground covered by a crop. The benefit of using this alternative to the LAI, which was also employed by AquaCrop (Steduto et al., 2009), is that it combines multiple attributes of the crop canopy into a single, easily measured or estimated variable. The rate of change in canopy cover is modeled as a balance between the increase due to canopy growth and the decrease due to ~~resource~~-metabolic limitations and senescence, so that

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = G(C, S, N, t) - M(C, t), \quad (1)$$

where  $G$  is the canopy growth rate, and  $M$  is a term which combines the effects of ~~resource~~-metabolic limitation and senescence. The growth rate is assumed to be proportional to the rate of nitrogen uptake,  $U$  (discussed further in Section 2.3), giving

$$G(C, S, N, t) = r_G \cdot U(C, S, N, t), \quad (2)$$

where  $r_G$  is the canopy cover increase per amount of nitrogen taken up (the value for this and other crop growth parameters can be found in Table 2.4). The combined ~~resource~~-metabolic limitation and mortality/senescence term is

$$M(C, t) = \left( r_M + \gamma(t - t_{sen}) \cdot \Theta(t - t_{sen}) \right) \cdot C^2, \quad (3)$$

where the first term,  $r_M$ , is a constant ~~resource~~-metabolic limitation term, and the next term is a time-dependent mortality and senescence term. For the latter, a linear function is used which increases with a slope of  $\gamma$  after the senescence onset time,  $t_{sen}$ , at which point the Heaviside step function,  $\Theta$ , causes the senescence term to begin to affect the equation. This form recalls somewhat the Gompertz-Makeham law (Makeham, 1860), which includes an age-independent mortality term and an age-dependent mortality term, although here the constant term is conceptualized as a ~~resource~~-metabolic limitation term and the time-dependent term as a senescence term. For unstressed conditions (sufficiently high  $S$  and  $N$ ) prior to  $t_{sen}$ , Equation (1) is the logistic growth equation (Murray, 2002), and it includes the approximately exponential growth of  $C$  in the initial growth stage, the slowing of growth as a limit is reached, and the negligible growth rate near the carrying capacity. This compares well with the data for canopy cover presented by Hsiao et al. (2009) (see Section 3.1).

## 2.2. Soil moisture balance equation

Soil moisture is modeled as a balance between gains from rainfall and irrigation and losses to evapotranspiration and leakage (Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato, 2004; Vico and Porporato, 2010)

$$\phi Z \frac{dS}{dt} = R(t) + I(S, t) - T(S, C, t) - E(S, C, t) - L(S), \quad (4)$$

where  $S$  is the vertically averaged relative soil moisture,  $\phi$  is porosity, and  $Z$  is  
 125 a soil depth with homogenous characteristics (Table 2.4 contains values for the  
 soil parameters).  $\phi Z$  is defined as the active soil depth (Laio et al., 2001b), the  
 volume per surface area available for water storage. In agricultural soils, tilling  
 tends to rearrange soil profiles so that the top layer of soil is relatively uniform  
 in composition and depth. We assume that the root growth (which we do not  
 130 explicitly model) is constricted to  $Z$ , and that hydraulic redistribution over  
 this depth allows water to easily move to areas of lower soil moisture, making  
 the vertically-averaged soil moisture a good description of the amount of water  
 available for evapotranspiration (Guswa et al., 2002).

$R$  is the rainfall rate. For the purposes of a probabilistic analysis, here it is  
 135 modeled as a marked Poisson process with mean event frequency  $\lambda$  and expo-  
 nentially distributed rainfall events depths  $\alpha$  (Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato,  
 2004). This stochastic components allows for the model to include the effect of  
 unpredictable external forcing via rainfall, which is especially important in arid  
 and semi-arid ecosystems, and for rain-fed agriculture.

140 In the case of irrigated agriculture, a term  $I$  gives the irrigation rate, which  
 may be a function of  $S$  and/or  $t$  depending on the irrigation strategy employed  
 (e.g., stress avoidance or microirrigation) (Vico and Porporato, 2010, 2011a,b).

The transpiration rate  $T$  is assumed to be proportional to  $C$  and is given by

$$T(S, C, t) = K_s(S) \cdot C \cdot K_{cb} \cdot ET_0(t), \quad (5)$$

where  $K_s(S)$  is a water stress coefficient,  $K_{cb}$  is a basal crop coefficient (essen-  
 tially the midseason basal crop coefficient of Allen et al. (1998)), and  $ET_0$  is the  
 reference evapotranspiration, which is calculated using the Penman-Monteith  
 equation for a reference crop (normally grass, but occasionally alfalfa) (Allen  
 et al., 1998). As no diurnal variation is considered,  $ET_0$  is a mean daily rate  
 and thus the model should be interpreted at the daily timescale. The water



stress coefficient is given by

$$K_s(S) = \begin{cases} 0 & S \leq S_w, \\ \frac{S-S_w}{S^*-S_w} & S_w < S \leq S^*, \\ 1 & S^* < S, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $S_w$  is the wilting point and  $S^*$  is the point of incipient stomatal closure.  $K_s(S)$  therefore captures the plant stomatal response to soil moisture conditions.

145 As mentioned previously, the plant is assumed to be able to easily compensate for areas of low soil moisture in the soil column by drawing more water from areas of high soil moisture, making  $S$  a good indicator of the amount of water available to the plant. However, this assumption is weakened if the plant cannot do so because of high root resistance or spatial heterogeneities in the soil properties  
 150 (Guswa et al., 2002).

The evaporation rate  $E$  is assumed to be proportional to  $(1 - C)$  and is given by

$$E(S, C, t) = K_r(S) \cdot (1 - C) \cdot K_{ec} \cdot ET_0(t), \quad (7)$$

where  $K_r(S)$  reduces evaporation according to soil moisture and  $K_{ec}$  is a baseline evaporation coefficient. A similar dependence of evaporation on  $1 - C$  was used by Steduto et al. (2009). The evaporation reduction coefficient is given by

$$K_r(S) = \begin{cases} 0 & S \leq S_h, \\ \frac{S-S_h}{1-S_h} & S \geq S_h, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where  $S_h$  is the hygroscopic point, below which no soil moisture losses occur. A diagram of  $K_s$  and  $K_r$  as a function of  $S$  is shown in the upper panel of Figure 1, and the increase of evapotranspiration as a whole with increasing  $S$  can be seen from top to bottom in the lower panel of Figure 1. Evaporation draws primarily  
 155 from a thin top layer of soil, drawing from lower soil layers only when potential gradients drive water from lower soil depths upward. This is often modeled using the two stage method for soil evaporation (Ritchie, 1972; Brutsaert and Chen, 1995). The dependence of  $E$  on the average soil moisture value over a

depth  $Z$  simplifies the actual relationship, but it does capture the high rates of  
160 evaporation at saturation ( $S = 1$ ) and the trend toward a rate of zero evapora-  
tion as  $S$  approaches  $S_h$ . The form that is used for  $K_s$  is essentially equivalent  
to the expression for transpiration used in Laio et al. (2001b), while the form  
for  $K_r$  is quite different from that used for evaporation in the same paper. Laio  
et al. (2001b) considered evaporation and transpiration separately, with the for-  
165 mer being very small due to the presence of the plant canopy. However, as we  
are interested in the crop canopy as it develops throughout the growing season  
(from left to right in the lower panel of Figure 1), the maximum values for  $T$   
and  $E$  must be of somewhat similar magnitude to capture the dominance of  $E$   
shortly after planting and that of  $T$  later in the growing season (this is reflected  
170 in the fact that  $K_{cb}$  and  $K_{ce}$  are indeed nearly the same) (Kelliher et al., 1995).

The combined percolation and runoff rate is denoted as  $Q$ , and as we are  
considering well-drained agricultural fields, subsurface percolation is assumed  
to dominate compared to overland runoff and to be equal to the hydraulic  
conductivity, i.e.,

$$Q(S) = k(S) = k_{sat} \cdot S^d, \quad (9)$$

where  $k$  is the hydraulic conductivity,  $k_{sat}$  is the saturated hydraulic con-  
ductivity, and  $d$  is an empirically based parameter (Brooks and Corey, 1964;  
Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato, 2004).

### 2.2.1. Calculation of $S_w$ and $S^*$

175 Using data for silty loam (a common agricultural soil) and methods from  
Clapp and Hornberger (1978) and Laio et al. (2001a), the wilting point  $S_w$  of  
was calculated as the soil moisture level corresponding to a matric potential of  
-1.5 MPa. Corn begins to suffer water stress when approximately 50% of the  
total available water (which is the water content at field capacity minus that at  
180 the wilting point) is depleted (Rhoads and Yonts, 2000). Therefore, we calculate  
the point of incipient stomatal closure  $S^*$  as  $S^* = (S_w + S_{fc})/2$ . For silty loam,  
 $S_w = 0.35$ ,  $S^* = 0.47$ , and  $S_{fc} = 0.59$ .




Figure 1: Top: the water stress coefficient (dashed line) and the evaporation reduction coefficient (solid line) as a function of soil moisture  $S$ . Bottom: evapotranspiration [m/d] as a function of  $S$  and  $C$ , with values of  $ET_0$  and the soil moisture thresholds as in Table 2.4.

### 2.3. Soil nitrogen content

While AquaCrop (Steduto et al., 2009) makes use of an empirical measure of soil fertility that allows the model to be used even if detailed soil nitrogen data are not available, most crop models consider a nitrogen balance (Ritchie et al., 1998; Jeuffroy and Recous, 1999; Boote et al., 1998; Stöckle et al., 2003; Brisson et al., 2003; Aggarwal et al., 2006) due to its key role in the growth and development of crops. In order to better examine crop growth and yield under optimal fertilization and irrigation strategies, a soil nitrogen balance is also included here. The evolution of total mineral nitrogen in the soil is given by the balance between deposition and fertilization as inputs and leaching and plant uptake as outputs (Porporato et al., 2003)

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = D(t) + F(N, t) - L(S, N) - U(S, N, C, t), \quad (10)$$

where  $N$  is nitrogen content per unit area of soil,  $D$  is the rate of natural nitrogen addition to the soil, and  $F$  is the fertilization rate. For all figures in this paper, the average annual rate of nitrogen deposition for a heavily agricultural region has been used as a constant deposition rate  $D$  (National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NRSP-3), 2017). Unless otherwise noted, the fertilization rate  $F$  is considered to be the maximum potential uptake of nitrogen  $F_t$  divided by the length of the growing season,  $t_{GS}$ . The total mineral nitrogen content in the soil, rather than the individual nitrate and ammonium components, is used because plants are able to take up both forms, making the separation of the two unnecessary in the case of this model, which aims for a general picture of nitrogen fluxes.

The leaching term  $L$  is proportional to the percolation from the hydrologic balance,  $Q$ , and the nitrogen concentration as

$$L(S, N) = \frac{aN}{S\phi Z} Q(S), \quad (11)$$

where  $a$  is the fraction of  $N$  which is dissolved in the soil moisture ( $a \approx 1$  for nitrate, while  $a \leq 1$  for ammonium). The nitrogen concentration in the soil moisture is given by the quantity  $\frac{aN}{S\phi Z}$ , which is denoted by  $\eta$ .

Plant uptake of nitrogen,  $U$ , is given by

$$U(S, N, C, t) = f(\eta) \cdot T(S, C, t), \quad (12)$$

in which  $f(\eta)$  is a function which limits the nitrogen uptake above a certain critical concentration  $\eta_c$ , with the form

$$f(\eta) = \begin{cases} \frac{aN}{S\phi Z} & \frac{aN}{S\phi Z} < \eta_c, \\ \eta_c & \frac{aN}{S\phi Z} \geq \eta_c. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

The physical reasoning for this limitation is that beyond a certain point, taking up more nitrogen is not useful for the plant to increase its growth rate, and extremely high nitrogen concentrations in plant tissue are toxic to the plant. The above limitation is meant to account in a parsimonious way for the plant's ability to exclude nitrogen from transpired water (i.e. active uptake (Porporato et al., 2003)). It is worth noting that a reduction in  $S$  can either increase or decrease the  $N$  uptake. As long as  $S > S^*$ , a reduction in  $S$  increases the concentration  $\eta$ , thereby increasing  $N$  uptake if initially  $\eta < \eta_c$ . However, if  $S$  drops below  $S^*$ , transpiration decreases and therefore so does  $N$  uptake.

#### 2.4. Crop biomass and yield

While the dynamics of the model are contained in the equations for  $C$ ,  $S$ , and  $N$ , other variables which depend on one of the three main variables are also of interest. Specifically, we consider the crop biomass  $B$  and crop yield  $Y$ .

The accumulation of plant biomass is modeled ~~by multiplying the normalized water use efficiency using the normalized daily water productivity~~  $W^*$  (e.g., Steudt et al. (2009)), which is typically multiplied by the ratio of nitrogen uptake to reference evapotranspiration times transpiration to reference evaporation to model biomass accumulation. However, in place of transpiration we use the nitrogen uptake divided by the nitrogen uptake threshold  $\eta_c$ , giving

$$\frac{dB}{dt} = W^* \frac{U(S, N, C, t)}{\eta_c ET_0(t)} = \frac{W^*}{\eta_c} K_s(S) K_{cb} f(\eta) C. \quad (14)$$

The use of  $\frac{U}{\eta_c}$  rather than  $T$  allows us to extend the concept of ~~water use efficiency-productivity~~ to also consider the effects of nitrogen limitation. When

$\eta \geq \eta_c$ , one recovers the biomass growth equation used by Steduto et al. (2009) and others, which considered transpiration rather than nitrogen uptake for  
215 biomass accumulation.

The biomass and yield are related through a harvest index,  $h$ , which is the fraction of the biomass which makes up the yield. The harvest index is often modeled as an increasing function in time which is modulated by various stresses (Steduto et al., 2009; Raes et al., 2009). Here we instead utilize a reference value for  $h$  and assume that stress limitations are sufficiently accounted for elsewhere in the crop growth equations, recognizing that this limits the validity of the crop yield calculations to the end of the growing season. The yield is then

$$Y = h \cdot B. \tag{15}$$

*Model parameters*

Parameter	Value	Units	Name/Description	Source
$r_G$	560	$\text{m}^2/\text{kg } N$	Canopy growth per unit $N$ uptake	Calculated using data from Hsiao et al. (2009)
$r_M$	0.2	1/d	Canopy decline due to metabolic limitation	Calculated using data from Hsiao et al. (2009)
$\gamma$	0.005	1/d <sup>2</sup>	Slope of increase of senescence after $t_{sen}$	Calculated using data from Hsiao et al. (2009)
$K_{cb}$	1.03	-	Max. $T/ET_0$	Allen et al. (1998); Hsiao et al. (2009)
$K_{ce}$	1.1	-	Max. $E/ET_0$	Hsiao et al. (2009)
$t_{sen}$	110	d	Days until onset of senescence	Mean of values in Table 2 of Hsiao et al. (2009)
$t_{GS}$	140	d	Length of growing season	Mean of values in Table 2 of Hsiao et al. (2009)
$W^*$	$3.37 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$\text{kg } B/\text{m}^2/\text{d}$	Normalized daily water productivity	Hsiao et al. (2009)
$h$	0.5	$\text{kg } Y/\text{kg } B$	Maximum harvest index	Hsiao et al. (2009)
$\eta_c$	0.054	$\text{kg } N/\text{m}^3 \text{ water}$	Maximum $N$ concentration taken up	Derived from model parameters
$D$	$5.5 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$\text{kg}/\text{m}^2/\text{d}$	$N$ deposition rate	National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NRSP-3) (2017)
$F_t$	0.0286	$\text{kg } N/\text{m}^2$	Maximum $N$ uptake	Bender et al. (2013)
$p_Y$	0.12	\$/kg	Corn price per kg of yield	Lamm et al. (2007)
$p_F$	0.639	\$/kg	Fertilizer unit price $N$	Lamm et al. (2007)
$p_I$	0.0148	\$/m <sup>3</sup>	Irrigation water unit price	Vico and Porporato (2011b)
$p_L$	0	\$/kg	Cost of leached $N$	Set to 0 in current simulations
$p_{fix}$	0.109	\$/m <sup>2</sup>	Fixed costs	Lamm et al. (2007); Vico and Porporato (2011b)

*Climate and soil parameters*

Parameter	Value	Units	Name/Description	Source
$\alpha$	1.5	cm	Mean rainfall depth	Sample values
$\lambda$	0.3	1/d	Mean rainfall frequency	Sample values
$ET_0$	$5 \times 10^{-3}$	m/d	Reference evapotranspiration	Approximated from Hsiao et al. (2009)
$S_h$	0.14	-	Hygroscopic point	Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato (2004)
$S_w$	0.17	-	Wilting point	Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato (2004)
$S^*$	0.35	-	Point of incipient stomatal closure	Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato (2004)
$S_{fc}$	0.59	-	Field capacity	Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato (2004)
$k_{sat}$	0.33	m/d	Saturated hydraulic conductivity	Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato (2004)
$d$	13	-	Leakage parameter	Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato (2004)
$a$	1	-	Fraction of $N$ dissolved	Porporato et al. (2003)
$\phi$	0.43	-	Soil porosity	Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato (2004)
$Z$	1.0 m	$d$	Soil depth	Irmak and Rudnick (2014)

220

15



### 3. Reduced versions of the model

The complete model is defined by the balance equations for  $C$ ,  $S$ , and  $N$  (Equations (1), (4), and (10)) and their component fluxes, with Equations (14) and (15) defining additional variables. Two reduced versions of the model will now be examined. The first, in which  $S$  and  $N$  are held constant, is compared to canopy cover data to estimate parameters for Equation (1). The second, in which only  $S$  is held constant (and there is therefore no stochastic forcing), is analyzed as a typical deterministic dynamical system in order to demonstrate some of the insights which can be gained from this approach.

#### 3.1. Canopy growth equation and its parameterization

We begin by examining the simplest version of the model, in which  $S$  and  $N$  are fixed (at  $S \geq S^*$  and with  $N$  such that  $\eta \geq \eta_c$ ) but  $C$  is allowed to vary. In these conditions (and also with  $ET_0$  constant, to maintain analytical tractability), Equation (1) reduces to

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = r_G K_{cb} ET_0 \eta_c \cdot C - \left( r_M + \gamma(t - t_{sen}) \cdot \Theta(t - t_{sen}) \right) \cdot C^2, \quad (16)$$

which is simply the logistic model if  $t < t_{sen}$ , in which case this equation can be solved analytically as

$$C(t) = \frac{r_G K_{cb} ET_0 \eta_c C_0 e^{r_G K_{cb} ET_0 \eta_c t}}{r_G K_{cb} ET_0 \eta_c + C_0 r_M (e^{r_G K_{cb} ET_0 \eta_c t} - 1)}, \quad (17)$$

which is the logistic equation (Murray, 2002).

In order to parameterize Equation (16), it was necessary to use data from a growing season in which the crop did not experience water or nitrogen stress. Values for  $r_G$ ,  $r_M$ , and  $\gamma$  have therefore been obtained by minimizing the RMSE of the model compared to the data from Hsiao et al. (2009) for fully irrigated and fertilized conditions. The data come from 6 seasons of experiments spread over 22 years in Davis, CA. The first three years used slightly different maize cultivars, while the last three used the same cultivars, but in order to include more data they have been assumed to be similar enough to consider together.




Figure 2: Growth of canopy cover in the  $C$ -only model, using the parameterization as described in the text (black line). Data are from 6 years of maize experiments in Davis, CA (Hsiao et al., 2009) (open circles).

240 An approximate mean reference evapotranspiration rate  $ET_0$  and the value for  $K_{cb}$  were also taken from Hsiao et al. (2009). These experiments did not report soil  $N$  or uptake rates, and so  $\eta_c$  has been estimated by averaging the cumulative  $N$  uptake for maize found in Bender et al. (2013) across the growing season. While it would be preferable to use a more complete single dataset for the model

245 parameterization, the emphasis here is not on predicting crop growth but on reproducing the general crop behavior. Figure 2 shows the model vs. the data against which it was parameterized, demonstrating a good fit particularly prior to the time of senescence,  $t_{sen}$ . The value for  $t_{sen}$  is cultivar-specific and for this figure was taken as the average  $t_{sen}$  over the 6 years of experiments. The

250 value of this parameter and all others discussed in this section can be found in Table 2.4.

### 3.2. $N$ and $C$ system

An interesting 2-D dynamical system is obtained when  $C$  and  $N$  are free to vary in time, but  $S$  is kept constant, which approximates the conditions in an

255 agricultural field with a microirrigation system and constant fertilization and  
deposition rate,  $F + D = F_0$ . The top panel of Figure 3 shows the evolution  
of the two state variables  $N$  and  $C$  in time, while the bottom panel is a phase  
space diagram which shows sample trajectories in the  $C$ - $N$  phase space. It is  
easy to see the development of the state variables for different initial conditions,  
260 and the effects of parameter changes on the vector field, which determines the  
direction the system moves for a given condition, can also be examined using  
this type of diagram. In the bottom of Figure 3, the  $\eta_c$  threshold of Equation  
(13) can be seen as the solid gray line which separates the two parts of the  
solution—on the left side,  $\eta < \eta_c$ , and on the right,  $\eta > \eta_c$ . Optimization will  
265 be further discussed in a later section, but for now we point out that in order  
to maximize crop growth, the system should be kept on the right side of this  
threshold, as the trajectories of the vector field here point to higher values of  $C$   
and thereby greater rates of crop growth.

Different solutions exist above and below  $\eta_c$  because when  $\eta \geq \eta_c$ , sufficient  
270 nitrogen is available for crop growth, and Equation (1) is decoupled from  $N$ .  
An analytic expression for  $C(t)$  can be obtained (when  $t < t_{sen}$ ) due to this  
decoupling, which is shown in Equation (17). An exact expression can also be  
found for  $N(t)$ , but as it is rather involved it is not included here. When  $\eta < \eta_c$ ,  
the crop experiences nitrogen stress and Equation (1) is again coupled to  $N$ .  
275 Analytical expressions for  $C(t)$  and  $N(t)$  are unavailable in this case.

### 3.2.1. Fixed points and stability, $\eta \geq \eta_c$

For the simpler case of  $\eta \geq \eta_c$  and  $t < t_{sen}$ , the first fixed point is given by

$$C_1^* = 0, \quad (18)$$

$$N_1^* = \frac{F_0 \cdot S\phi Z}{a \cdot k_{sat} S^a}, \quad (19)$$

while the expressions for the second are

$$C_2^* = \frac{r_G K_{cb} E T_0 \eta_c}{r_M} \frac{r_G}{r_M} K_{cb} E T_0 \eta_c, \quad (20)$$




Figure 3: Top: timeseries of canopy cover and soil nitrogen for the  $C$ - $N$  model, for two differing initial conditions of  $N$  (solid lines represent  $C$ ; dashed lines represent  $N$ ). Bottom:  $C$ - $N$  vector plot and phase portrait, for two initial conditions. The black dot represents the stable fixed point  $(N_2, C_2)$ , and the solid gray line is the  $\eta_c$  threshold. Note that in this figure, the combined fertilization and deposition rate has been reduced slightly in order to better show the impact of varying the initial conditions, and the simulation has only been performed until  $t_{sen}$  because after this point in time the trajectories no longer converge towards the same fixed point.

$$N_2^* = \frac{S\phi Z (F_0 \cdot r_M - ET_0^2 \eta_c^2 K_{cb}^2 r_G)}{a \cdot r_M k_{sat} S^d} \frac{S\phi Z \left( F_0 - \frac{r_M}{r_G} C_2^{*2} \right)}{a \cdot k_{sat} S^d} = \frac{S\phi Z \left( F_0 - \frac{r_G}{r_M} K_{cb}^2 ET_0^2 \eta_c^2 \right)}{a \cdot k_{sat} S^d}. \quad (21)$$

Recalling Equation (1) with  $\frac{dC}{dt} = 0$ , we note that the steady-state uptake of nitrogen is given by  $\frac{r_M}{r_G} (C_2^{*2}) = \frac{r_G}{r_M} K_{cb}^2 ET_0^2 \eta_c^2$ , a quantity which can also be seen inside the parentheses in Equation (20). The first fixed point is an unstable node and the second is a stable node (a third exists, but it is always negative and thus not physical). The eigenvalues of the first fixed point are

$$\lambda_{1a} = -\frac{a \cdot k_{sat} S^d}{S\phi Z}, \quad (22)$$

$$\lambda_{1b} = ET_0 \eta_c K_{cb} r_G, \quad (23)$$

while those of the second fixed point are

$$\lambda_{2a} = -\frac{a \cdot k_{sat} S^d}{S\phi Z}, \quad (24)$$

$$\lambda_{2b} = -ET_0 \eta_c K_{cb} r_G. \quad (25)$$

The first fixed point is always an unstable node, and in the second is always a stable node. This is unsurprising, as the standard logistic equation, which is contained within the system dynamics when  $\eta \geq \eta_c$ , likewise has one stable and one unstable node as its fixed points.

280

### 3.2.2. Fixed points and stability, $\eta < \eta_c$

If the system were allowed to develop to steady state ( $t \rightarrow \infty$ ), the explicitly time-dependent part of the mortality  $M(C, t)$  term would ultimately drive the canopy cover to a value of zero, and the soil nitrogen content would approach a value determined by the balance between the fertilization/deposition and leaching terms. The fixed points are obtained assuming no senescence term (e.g., if a perennial crop rather than an annual one were considered). In this condition, there are two fixed points. The first has the same expressions as Equations (18) and (19), while the second is

$$C_2^* = \frac{-k_{sat} S^d + \sqrt{(k_{sat} S^d)^2 + \frac{4F_0 \cdot ET_0^2 K_{cb}^2 r_G}{r_M}}}{2ET_0 K_{cb}}, \quad (26)$$

$$N_2^* = \frac{-r_M Z \phi k_{sat} S^{d+1} + S \phi Z \sqrt{(r_M k_{sat} S^d)^2 + 4F_0 \cdot ET_0^2 K_{cb}^2 r_G}}{2aET_0^2 K_{cb}^2 r_G}. \quad (27)$$

The stability can more easily be seen when it is put in terms of the fertilization and deposition term, the critical value of which is derived from the expression for the eigenvalues and is given by

$$F_c = 2aS^{2d}k_{sat}^2 r_M (aETK_{cb} - SZ\phi r_M) \cdot (a^2ET^2K_{cb}^2 + 4aETSZ\phi K_{cb}r_M - S^2Z^2\phi^2r_M^2) \div ETK_{cb}r_G (a^2ET^2K_{cb}^2 - 6aETSZ\phi K_{cb}r_M + S^2Z^2\phi^2r_M^2)^2, \quad (28)$$

so that the fixed point is a spiral when  $F_0 < F_c$  and a node when  $F_0 > F_c$ , pointing to the possibility of damped oscillations. Oscillations related to nitrogen cycling were also observed by Thornley et al. (1995) (oscillations of LAI and soil nitrogen in a model of grass-legume dynamics), Tilman and Wedin (1991) (oscillations and possible chaos in interannual dynamics of a perennial grass), Manzioni and Porporato (2007) (shifts in stability in a model of substrate carbon and nitrogen dynamics), and Parolari and Porporato (2016) (stability shifts in a model of forest carbon and nitrogen cycles under harvesting). The interpretation of such oscillations is not entirely clear, as ~~is is~~ it is possible that they are merely artifacts of simplified models or the results of overfitting the available data, but their presence in such models is intriguing and deserves further attention.

#### 4. Soil moisture dynamics and hydrologic forcing

The addition of the soil moisture dynamics greatly increases the model complexity, especially when the rainfall stochastic forcing is considered. This forcing adds considerable interest to the dynamics of the model, as it allows us to consider the effect of varying rainfall parameters as well as to examine the model in a probabilistic sense. While it is possible to obtain some analytic results regarding soil moisture probability distributions for statistically steady states under stochastic rainfall forcing (see for example Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato (2004)), the complexity of the crop growth function and nitrogen balance

employed here make it necessary to proceed numerically (though see Schaffer et al. (2015) for a special case in which analytical results were obtained for  
305 stochastically driven soil moisture and plant biomass).

#### 4.1. Soil moisture dry-down

Many important agroecosystems have some form of the Mediterranean climate, in which the rainfall occurs out of phase with the growing season. In this case, the soil moisture dynamics occur as a deterministic dry-down, with  
310 the exception of whatever small amounts of precipitation may occur during the growing season. Therefore, all other factors being equal, the crop yield of rain-fed (i.e., non-irrigated) agriculture in this type of climate depends greatly on the initial condition of soil moisture that is available at the beginning of the growing season. Of course, this initial supply may also be supplemented by  
315 irrigation, which is similar to the case considered in Section 3.2.

#### 4.2. Stochastic forcing

Figures 4 and 5 show the development of the three main state variables and their associated fluxes over the course of a growing season, with  $t = 0$  taken as the start of the growing season. Note that in these and the preceding figures,  
320 a constant rate of nitrogen fertilization/deposition was imposed. As compared to the deterministic scenarios discussed in Section 3, the variables in the full model show much greater variability, due to the direct dependence of the fluxes on the stochastically driven soil moisture balance. Figure 6 shows the main dynamic variables in the three-dimensional phase space. Observing this sample  
325 time series, excursions below the soil moisture threshold  $S^*$  (the dotted lines that are perpendicular to the  $S$  axis) and below the  $\eta_c$  threshold (the diagonal line on the  $S$ - $N$  plane) can be seen to coincide with reductions in  $C$ . The case of water stress depends on  $S$  only, while the latter case of nitrogen stress involves the interaction of  $S$  and  $N$  because of their joint effect on the  $f(\eta)$  limitation  
330 function.




Figure 4: Time series of (a) canopy cover  $C$ , (b) soil moisture  $S$  and rainfall  $R$ , (c) soil nitrogen  $N$ , (d) crop biomass and yield over a growing season.






Figure 5: Time series of (a) transpiration  $T$ , evaporation  $E$ , and evapotranspiration  $ET$ , (b) nitrogen uptake  $U$  and limitation function  $f(\eta)$ , (c) leakage  $Q$ , and (d) nitrogen leaching  $L$ .




Figure 6: A sample trajectory shown in the 3-dimensional phase space of  $C$ ,  $S$ , and  $N$  (black line), and projections onto the three planes (gray lines). Dashed lines denote the dynamics which occur after  $t_{sen}$ , and the dotted lines the  $S^*$  threshold ( $S$ - $C$  and  $S$ - $N$  planes) and the  $\eta_c$  threshold ( $S$ - $N$  plane).

#### 4.3. Impact of rainfall regimes on rain-fed agriculture

The timing and amount of rainfall exerts a strong control on crop growth in rain-fed agriculture. We first examine the effect of different rainfall regimes when associated parameters (mean event depth  $\alpha$  and mean frequency  $\lambda$ ) are constant throughout a growing season, which is a reasonable approximation for growing season conditions in many regions of the world. Despite the fact that the parameters are constant in time, there remains a strong intra-seasonal time dependence, primarily due to the growth of canopy cover,  $C$ . This is due to both its growth in time and more explicitly through the time-dependence of the  $M(C, t)$  term.

This pattern in time can be seen not only in Figures 4 and 5 but also in Figure 7, which shows the ensemble average over many simulations of canopy cover (top left), soil nitrogen (top right), soil moisture (bottom left), and nitrogen leaching (bottom right). In each simulation, the mean rainfall rate was kept constant but  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$  were changed, to demonstrate the interaction of rainfall event frequency and event size. Simulations with larger, less frequent events are characterized




Figure 7: A comparison of the mean (a) canopy cover, (b) soil nitrogen, (c), soil moisture, and (d) leaching across different precipitation regimes for  $\lambda = 0.1 \text{ d}^{-1}$  (light gray),  $\lambda = 0.3 \text{ d}^{-1}$  (gray),  $\lambda = 0.5 \text{ d}^{-1}$  (black), with  $\alpha$  altered to keep a constant mean rainfall rate of 4.5 mm/d for all figures. [A typical fertilization treatment for corn has been applied, resulting in the observed jump in  \$N\$ .](#)

by reduced canopy cover, and higher rates of nitrogen leaching. However, there are also slightly higher levels of soil nitrogen which remain, as the reduced soil moisture and canopy cover led to a low nitrogen uptake and thus higher soil moisture levels. [The system shown in Figure 7 undergoes a typical fertilization schedule for corn, in which some fraction  \$\xi\$  of the total fertilization  \$F\_t\$  is applied at the beginning of the growing season, and the remainder is applied after a period  \$\tau\$ , resulting in the jump which can be observed in  \$N\$  in Figure 7b. Here,  \$\xi = 0.3\$  and  \$\tau = 40\$  d \(see Section 5.1 and Figure 10 for a discussion of the optimization of  \$\xi\$  and  \$\tau\$ \).](#)

## 5. Optimal strategies

Crop models represent an important tool to study the impact of different management strategies aimed at maximizing yield, minimizing water and fertilizer use, reducing the leaching of fertilizers, and optimizing the timing of irrigation and fertilization treatments under hydroclimatic variability (Wallach et al., 2006). Toward this goal we develop a first-order objective function, which considers the profit from the sale of produce, costs of fertilizer and irrigation, ‘environmental cost’ of nitrogen leaching, and fixed costs,

$$P_{net} = p_Y \cdot Y(t_{GS}) - p_F \cdot F_{tot} - p_I \cdot I_{tot} - p_L \cdot L_{tot} - p_{fix}, \quad (29)$$

where  $p_Y$  [\$/kg Y] is the unit sale price of the crop yield at the end of the growing season,  $Y(t_{GS})$ .  $p_F$  [\$/kg N] and  $p_I$  [\$/m<sup>3</sup>] are the unit prices of fertilizer and irrigation water, respectively, while the cumulative fertilization and irrigation are given by  $F_{tot} = \int_0^{t_{GS}} F(N, t) dt$  and  $I_{tot} = \int_0^{t_{GS}} I(S, t) dt$ . The unit ‘environmental cost’ of leached nitrogen is given by  $p_L$  [\$/kg N], here conceptualized as the cost necessary to mitigate these losses or to pay associated fines, while the cumulative nitrogen leaching is given by  $L_{tot} = \int_0^{t_{GS}} L(S, N) dt$ . Finally,  $p_{fix}$  [\$/m<sup>2</sup>] is a fixed cost representing distribution and energy costs, here estimated following Vico and Porporato (2011b). Estimated values for these parameters can be found in Table 2.4. This objective function should be thought of as a means to quantify the relative financial impact and importance of various components of the crop system, rather than as a way to obtain firm predictions about the profitability of various management strategies.

Figure 8 shows several key crop responses under idealized, non-stochastic conditions. The responses of crop yield  $Y$  and the objective function  $P_{net}$  to different mean soil moisture and soil nitrogen conditions are illustrated in Figures 8a and 8b. Figures 8c and 8d show the cumulative amounts of irrigation and fertilization, respectively, that would be needed to keep the  $S$  and  $N$  at the designated mean values. The horizontal lines mark the  $S^*$  threshold, below which point the transpiration begins to decrease, and the diagonal line marks




Figure 8: Response to the necessary rates of irrigation and fertilization to keep  $S$  and  $N$  at the designated constant values of (a) crop yield, (b) profit, (c) cumulative fertilization [kg/m<sup>2</sup>], (d) cumulative irrigation [m], (e) Nitrogen use efficiency (NUE), the cumulative nitrogen uptake as a fraction of total fertilization, and (f) irrigation efficiency (IE), the cumulative transpiration as a fraction of the total irrigation. The horizontal dashed line represents the  $S^*$  threshold, while the diagonal dashed line is the  $\eta_c$  limit. All figures are for deterministic conditions (i.e., no stochastic forcing in the rainfall).

the  $\eta_c$  concentration threshold. Nitrogen Use Efficiency (NUE) is the ratio of the amount of nitrogen which is taken up by the crop to the amount which is applied, and is an important metric by which to judge fertilization strategies.

380 Similarly, we can define the Irrigation Efficiency (IE) as the ratio of the irrigation water applied to the amount which is transpired by the crop. These two values are shown in Figures 8e and 8f, respectively, as a function of the mean soil moisture and mean soil nitrogen. Each of the panels in Figure 8 sheds light on a different consideration for the optimal use of water and nitrogen resources.

385 However, the common thread between them is that in each case, the ‘best’ scenario from the ~~point of view of a stakeholder, whether it be maximizing yield, profit, NUE, or IE,~~ perspective of using water and nitrogen resources in the most efficient manner (i.e. maximizing IE and NUE to produce the highest possible yield and profit), occurs at the intersection of the  $S_w$ - $S^*$  and  $\eta_c$  lines.

390 At this point neither water nor nitrogen is limiting, and no extra irrigation or fertilization beyond what is needed to keep the system at these  $S$  and  $N$  values is used. However, with the addition of the random rainfall in the next section, additional concerns such as the robustness of the optimal strategies under stochastic forcing must also be considered.

### 395 5.1. Optimization under stochastic rainfall conditions

Random hydroclimatic forcing adds uncertainty to the expected value of the objective function. This is illustrated in Figure 9, which shows the ~~empirical~~ numerical probability distribution functions of yield and profit for varying fertilization rates. Note that as the fertilization rate increases, both the mean

400 of the yield and its variance increase. The mean increases because the higher fertilization rates lead to less likelihood that the crop will experience a shortage of nitrogen, while the variance increases because the field of possible yields expands—the extra nitrogen raises the maximum possible yield, while a low-rainfall growing season could still occur, so lower yields are still possible. The

405 probability distributions in Figure 9 highlight the fact that under stochastic rainfall conditions, the question of optimization must be examined from a probabilistic

point of view. Unlike in the previous section, optimal strategies for a system undergoing stochastic forcing must attempt to maximize profit while also being robust to adverse conditions, such as drought or flood years. This necessarily involves tradeoffs between maximizing yield and profit on the one hand and mitigating risk on the other. For example, we point out that in the bottom of Figure 9, the theoretical maximum (which refers to the value which would be obtained if the crop experienced no water stress and took up as much  $N$  as possible) for profit (dashed line) occurs at a much lower fertilization rate than the maximum of the actual profit under stochastic rainfall conditions (black line), demonstrating in a simple way the necessity of accounting for the possibility of adverse conditions. A detailed analysis of such concerns is beyond the scope of this work, though we point out that many studies have examined the related concept of resilience in ecological and social systems (see for example Walker et al. (2004)).

In order to examine the impact of stochastic forcing on optimal fertilization, we first suppose that the total fertilization over the course of a growing season  $F_t$  (the value of which can be found in Table 2.4) is to be divided into two treatments, which corresponds to a typical fertilization schedule for corn (e.g., Brady et al. (1996)). The placement of the fertilizer applications in time is varied by changing the fraction of  $F_t$  which is applied in each application and the amount of time between the two applications. In order to focus on optimal fertilization timing and amounts under stochastic conditions, we do not consider the other potential degrees of freedom in the fertilization scheduling, such as varying the total amount of fertilizer used or using more than two applications. The effect of varying  $\xi$  and  $\tau$  (the fraction of  $F_t$  in the first application and the time between the first and second applications, respectively) on crop yield can be seen in Figure 10, which shows the yield response to varying  $\xi$  and  $\tau$  for three different soil depths. Larger soil depths lead to less variation in  $S$  and thus less percolation and leaching, thereby increasing the fraction of  $\xi - \tau$  space in which higher yields can occur. The exact location of the peak yield is a result of the balance which maximizes the uptake of nitrogen and minimizes the loss due to




Figure 9: Yield (top) and profit (bottom) as a function of the constant fertilization rate. The dashed line represents a theoretical maximum while the solid line is the mean of many simulations. The inset plots show the [numerical probability density histograms-functions](#) at each point.



leaching.

## 6. Conclusion

440 We have presented a dynamical system for crop evolution, based on the AquaCrop model (Steduto et al., 2009) and minimal models for soil moisture and nitrogen cycling used in ecohydrology (Rodríguez-Iturbe and Porporato, 2004). It includes canopy cover, soil moisture, and soil nitrogen as its main state variables and tracks fluxes of water and nitrogen from evapotranspiration, nitrogen uptake, and leaching. This parsimonious model, with its reduced  
445 number of parameters, may be useful for evaluating the impact of different fertilization and irrigation strategies as well as different precipitation and climate regimes on crop yield, expected profit, and other outputs of interest. A simple objective function was used to compare optimal strategies of fertilization and  
450 irrigation.

The results highlight the importance of considering, from a quantitative and theoretical point of view, the optimization of these agricultural inputs, and also provide a direct connection with climate parameters. Hydroclimatic forcing is a major driver of variability in agricultural systems, which has implications not  
455 only for crop yield and profitability but also for environmental impact. The model developed here is capable of characterizing the variability in the model outputs and provides a link to the random processes which drive this variability.

Agroecosystems cover a large portion of the Earth's surface and provide essentially all of the global food supply. It is thus crucial to have a more complete  
460 understanding of the fluxes of water and nutrients in such systems, and their dependence on potentially changing hydroclimatic inputs and human activities. To this regard, the model presented here may be useful to explore scenarios and generate hypotheses. The framework can be extended in a number of directions. In order to emphasize the dynamical systems point of view, the model  
465 presented here necessarily included certain simplifications. However, including more detailed plant and soil models and performing a comparison with more




Figure 10: Crop yield as a function of  $\xi$ , the fraction of the total fertilization amount which is applied at the beginning of the growing season, and  $\tau$ , the time between the first and second fertilizer applications, for three soil depths:  $Z=33$  cm (top),  $Z=67$  cm (middle), and  $Z=100$  cm (bottom). In this figure, microirrigation was used to prevent the soil moisture from dropping below  $S^*$ , and therefore the crop can experience only nitrogen stress, not water stress.

complete crop models would provide firmer ground from which to make predic-  
tions. Moreover, the model could easily account for periodic seasonal variations  
in temperature, radiation, or rainfall, which alter the water and nutrient cy-  
cles and therefore the optimal fertilization and irrigation strategies. Finally,  
470 the nature of agroecosystems is that they are heavily intertwined with human  
activities (e.g., Sivapalan et al. (2012); Porporato et al. (2015); Assouline et al.  
(2015), suggesting the need to couple models for ecological systems and land-  
scape evolution with social and behavioral models (e.g., harvesting in Parolari  
475 and Porporato (2016) and Pelak et al. (2016)). We hope that these consider-  
ations will be accounted for in future contributions, providing a quantitative  
framework for the sustainable use of soil and water resources while ensuring  
food security.

### Acknowledgments

480 We acknowledge the financial support from National Science Foundation  
(DGE-1068871, NSF-EAR-0838301, NSF-EAR-1331846, and NSF-EAR-1316258)  
and Duke Wireless Intelligent Sensor Networks (WISeNet) Integrative Graduate  
Education and Research Training (IGERT) program, by the US Department of  
Defense through the NDSEG Fellowship program, and the European Union's  
485 Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-  
Curie grant agreement "ECO.G.U.S. (701914).

### References

- Aggarwal, P.K., Kalra, N., Chander, S., Pathak, H., 2006. InfoCrop: a dynamic  
simulation model for the assessment of crop yields, losses due to pests, and  
490 environmental impact of agro-ecosystems in tropical environments. I. Model  
description. *Agricultural systems* 89, 1–25.
- Allen, R.G., Pereira, L.S., Raes, D., Smith, M., et al., 1998. *FAO Irrigation and  
Drainage Paper 56: Crop evapotranspiration (Guidelines for computing crop  
water requirements).*

- 495 Assouline, S., Russo, D., Silber, A., Or, D., 2015. Balancing water scarcity and  
quality for sustainable irrigated agriculture. *Water Resources Research* 51,  
3419–3436.
- Bender, R.R., Haegerle, J.W., Ruffo, M.L., Below, F.E., 2013. Nutrient uptake,  
partitioning, and remobilization in modern, transgenic insect-protected maize  
500 hybrids. *Agronomy Journal* 105, 161–170.
- Boote, K.J., Jones, J.W., Hoogenboom, G., 1998. Simulation of crop growth:  
CROPGRO model. Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Brady, N.C., Weil, R.R., et al., 1996. The nature and properties of soils. Ed.  
11, Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- 505 Brisson, N., Gary, C., Justes, E., Roche, R., Mary, B., Ripoche, D., Zimmer,  
D., Sierra, J., Bertuzzi, P., Burger, P., et al., 2003. An overview of the crop  
model STICS. *European Journal of Agronomy* 18, 309–332.
- Brooks, R., Corey, T., 1964. Hydraulic properties of porous media, in: *Hydrology  
Papers*, Colorado State University.
- 510 Brutsaert, W., Chen, D., 1995. Desorption and the two stages of drying of  
natural tallgrass prairie. *Water Resources Research* 31, 1305–1313.
- Clapp, R.B., Hornberger, G.M., 1978. Empirical equations for some soil hy-  
draulic properties. *Water Resources Research* 14, 601–604.
- Doorenbos, J., Kassam, A., 1998. *FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper 33: Yield  
515 response to water*.
- Guswa, A.J., Celia, M., Rodriguez-Iturbe, I., 2002. Models of soil moisture  
dynamics in ecohydrology: A comparative study. *Water Resources Research*  
38.
- Hsiao, T.C., Heng, L., Steduto, P., Rojas-Lara, B., Raes, D., Fereres, E., 2009.  
520 AquaCrop—The FAO crop model to simulate yield response to water: III.  
Parameterization and testing for maize. *Agronomy Journal* 101, 448–459.

- Irmak, S., Rudnick, D.R., 2014. Corn soil-water extraction and effective rooting depth in a silt loam soil. Technical Report. University of Nebraska-Lincoln Extension, Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources.
- 525 Jeuffroy, M.H., Recous, S., 1999. Azodyn: a simple model simulating the date of nitrogen deficiency for decision support in wheat fertilization. *European journal of Agronomy* 10, 129–144.
- Johnson, I., Parsons, A., 1985. A theoretical analysis of grass growth under grazing. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 112, 345–367.
- 530 Kelliher, F., Leuning, R., Raupach, M., Schulze, E.D., 1995. Maximum conductances for evaporation from global vegetation types. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 73, 1–16.
- Laio, F., Porporato, A., Fernandez-Illescas, C., Rodriguez-Iturbe, I., 2001a. Plants in water-controlled ecosystems: active role in hydrologic processes and response to water stress: IV. Discussion of real cases. *Advances in Water Resources* 24, 745–762.
- 535 Laio, F., Porporato, A., Ridolfi, L., Rodriguez-Iturbe, I., 2001b. Plants in water-controlled ecosystems: active role in hydrologic processes and response to water stress: II. Probabilistic soil moisture dynamics. *Advances in Water Resources* 24, 707–723.
- 540 Lamm, F., Stone, L., O'Brien, D., 2007. Crop production and economics in Northwest Kansas as related to irrigation capacity. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture* 23, 737–745.
- Makeham, W.M., 1860. On the law of mortality and construction of annuity tables. *The Assurance Magazine and Journal of the Institute of Actuaries* 8, 301–310.
- 545 Manzoni, S., Porporato, A., 2007. A theoretical analysis of nonlinearities and feedbacks in soil carbon and nitrogen cycles. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 39, 1542–1556.

- 550 Manzoni, S., Porporato, A., D’Odorico, P., Laio, F., Rodriguez-Iturbe, I., 2004. Soil nutrient cycles as a nonlinear dynamical system. *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics* 11, 589–598.
- Mau, Y., Porporato, A., 2015. A dynamical system approach to soil salinity and sodicity. *Advances in Water Resources* 83, 68–76.
- 555 Murray, J.D., 2002. *Mathematical biology: An Introduction*. 3rd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NRSP-3), 2017. NADP Program Office, Illinois State Water Survey, University of Illinois, Champaign, IL 61820.
- 560 Parolari, A.J., Porporato, A., 2016. Forest soil carbon and nitrogen cycles under biomass harvest: stability, transient response, and feedback. *Ecological Modelling* 329, 64–76.
- Pelak, N.F., Parolari, A.J., Porporato, A., 2016. Bistable plant–soil dynamics and biogenic controls on the soil production function. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 41, 1011–1017.
- 565 Porporato, A., D’Odorico, P., Laio, F., Rodriguez-Iturbe, I., 2003. Hydrologic controls on soil carbon and nitrogen cycles. I. Modeling scheme. *Advances in Water Resources* 26, 45–58.
- Porporato, A., D’Odorico, P., Laio, F., Ridolfi, L., Rodriguez-Iturbe, I., 2002. 570 Ecohydrology of water-controlled ecosystems. *Advances in Water Resources* 25, 1335–1348.
- Porporato, A., Feng, X., Manzoni, S., Mau, Y., Parolari, A.J., Vico, G., 2015. Ecohydrological modeling in agroecosystems: Examples and challenges. *Water Resources Research* 51, 5081–5099.
- 575 Raes, D., Steduto, P., Hsiao, T.C., Fereres, E., 2009. AquaCrop–The FAO crop model to simulate yield response to water: II. Main algorithms and software description. *Agronomy Journal* 101, 438–447.

- Rhoads, F., Yonts, C., 2000. Irrigation Scheduling for Corn—Why and How. National Corn Handbook. Water Management (Irrigation). US Department of Agriculture (USDA) .  
580
- Ritchie, J., Singh, U., Godwin, D., Bowen, W., 1998. Cereal growth, development, and yield, in: Understanding options for agricultural production. Springer, pp. 79–98.
- Ritchie, J.T., 1972. Model for predicting evaporation from a row crop with incomplete cover. Water Resources Research 8, 1204–1213.  
585
- Rodríguez-Iturbe, I., Porporato, A., 2004. Ecohydrology of water-controlled ecosystems: soil moisture and plant dynamics. Cambridge University Press.
- Rodriguez-Iturbe, I., Porporato, A., Ridolfi, L., Isham, V., Coxi, D., 1999. Probabilistic modelling of water balance at a point: the role of climate, soil and vegetation, in: Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical,  
590 Physical and Engineering Sciences, The Royal Society. pp. 3789–3805.
- Schaffer, B.E., Nordbotten, J.M., Rodriguez-Iturbe, I., 2015. Plant biomass and soil moisture dynamics: Analytical results, in: Proceedings of the Royal Society A, The Royal Society. p. 20150179.
- 595 Sivapalan, M., Savenije, H.H., Blöschl, G., 2012. Socio-hydrology: A new science of people and water. Hydrological Processes 26, 1270–1276.
- Steduto, P., Hsiao, T.C., Raes, D., Fereres, E., 2009. AquaCrop—The FAO crop model to simulate yield response to water: I. Concepts and underlying principles. Agronomy Journal 101, 426–437.
- 600 Stöckle, C.O., Donatelli, M., Nelson, R., 2003. Cropsyst, a cropping systems simulation model. European Journal of Agronomy 18, 289–307.
- Strogatz, S.H., 2014. Nonlinear dynamics and chaos: with applications to physics, biology, chemistry, and engineering. Westview Press.

- 605 Thornley, J., Bergelson, J., Parsons, A., 1995. Complex dynamics in a carbon-nitrogen model of a grass-legume pasture. *Annals of Botany* 75, 79–94.
- Thornley, J., Cannell, M., 1992. Nitrogen relations in a forest plantation–soil organic matter ecosystem model. *Annals of Botany* 70, 137–151.
- Thornley, J., Verberne, E., 1989. A model of nitrogen flows in grassland. *Plant, Cell & Environment* 12, 863–886.
- 610 Thornley, J.H., Johnson, I.R., 1990. A mathematical approach to plant and crop physiology. The Blackburn Press.
- Tilman, D., Wedin, D., 1991. Oscillations and chaos in the dynamics of a perennial grass. *Nature* 353, 653.
- Vico, G., Porporato, A., 2010. Traditional and microirrigation with stochastic soil moisture. *Water Resources Research* 46.
- 615 Vico, G., Porporato, A., 2011a. From rainfed agriculture to stress-avoidance irrigation: I. A generalized irrigation scheme with stochastic soil moisture. *Advances in Water Resources* 34, 263–271.
- Vico, G., Porporato, A., 2011b. From rainfed agriculture to stress-avoidance irrigation: II. Sustainability, crop yield, and profitability. *Advances in Water Resources* 34, 272–281.
- 620 Walker, B., Holling, C.S., Carpenter, S., Kinzig, A., 2004. Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems. *Ecology and society* 9.
- 625 Wallach, D., Makowski, D., Jones, J.W., 2006. Working with dynamic crop models: Evaluating, analyzing, parameterizing, and applications. Elsevier.