



Long-term irrigation water use datasets from multiple Earth Observation-based methods in major irrigated regions

Pierre Laluet¹, Jacopo Dari^{2,3}, Louise Busschaert⁴, Zdenko Heyvaert⁴, Gabrielle De Lannoy⁴, Pia Langhans¹, Sara Modanesi³, Christian Massari³, Luca Brocca³, Carla Saltalippi², Renato Morbidelli², Clément Albergel⁵, and Wouter Dorigo¹

¹Department of Geodesy and Geoinformation, TU Wien, Vienna, Austria

²Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Perugia, Perugia, Italy

³Research Institute for Geo-Hydrological Protection, National Research Council, Perugia, Italy

⁴Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

⁵European Space Agency Climate Office, ECSAT, Didcot, UK

Correspondence: Pierre Laluet (pierre.laluet@geo.tuwien.ac.at)

Abstract. Irrigation water use (IWU) is the largest direct human intervention in the terrestrial water cycle, yet it remains poorly characterized at the spatial and temporal scales required for climate research. We present a long-term archive of monthly IWU estimates at 0.25° spatial resolution for four major irrigated regions — the contiguous United States (CONUS), India, the Murray–Darling Basin in Australia, and the Ebro Basin in Spain — spanning up to two decades depending on input data availability. The datasets are derived using three distinct approaches: (i) a Soil Moisture (SM)–based Delta method that infers irrigation from discrepancies between satellite and model SM and evapotranspiration, (ii) an SM–based inversion of the soil water balance constrained by satellite SM, and (iii) a model–observation integration scheme combining a land surface model with satellite-based irrigated-area maps. Across regions, these approaches yield up to six SM-based Delta products, five SM-based Inversion products, and one Model–observation integration product. Validation against available irrigation records shows that several method–input combinations reproduce the order of magnitude of annual state-level irrigation volumes in the CONUS, with typical errors for the best-performing datasets of about 4–5 km³ yr^{−1} in root mean square deviation and 1–2 km³ yr^{−1} in bias. In the Murray–Darling and Ebro basins, the products capture the main features of the seasonal irrigation cycle, with variations in spatial patterns, magnitude, and timing across methods. In India, where no observational records are available, the datasets reproduce the expected agricultural seasons while exhibiting a wider inter-method spread. This coordinated dataset collection, produced with multiple Earth Observation-based approaches and harmonized inputs across regions, provides long-term, spatially explicit IWU estimates and a basis for better quantifying and representing irrigation in large-scale hydrological and climate studies. The complete archive of datasets is freely available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14988197> (Laluet et al., 2025b).



20 1 Introduction

Irrigation is widely considered the largest direct human intervention in the terrestrial water cycle, accounting for about 45–90% of global freshwater withdrawals (Puy et al., 2025). Beyond its direct pressure on water resources and its role in sustaining agricultural productivity, irrigation strongly influences land–atmosphere fluxes, the surface energy balance, and regional climate patterns by altering evapotranspiration, surface albedo, and soil moisture regimes. These modifications, in turn, can affect temperature and precipitation, with potential implications for larger-scale circulation patterns (e.g., Thiery et al., 2017, 2020; Seneviratne and Hauser, 2020; McDermid et al., 2023; Lunel et al., 2024).

With global demand for irrigation projected to rise due to population growth, dietary shifts, and climate change, quantifying when, where, and how much water is used for irrigation is essential for managing water resources and for advancing climate research. In particular, long-term, spatially consistent records of irrigation water use (IWU) are indispensable not only for capturing present-day irrigation dynamics but also for assessing historical trends and their sustainability, as well as for quantifying the long-term impacts of irrigation on local and regional climate. Such records enable irrigation hotspots to be more accurately represented in climate and land surface models.

Despite its importance, IWU remains one of the least well-quantified components of the water cycle (Dorigo et al., 2021). While national statistics and survey-based databases such as FAO’s AQUASTAT (FAO, 2025) provide a useful baseline, they are affected by large uncertainties, due to limitations in country-reported irrigation statistics (Ajaz et al., 2019) and inconsistencies between national reports and AQUASTAT estimates (Puy et al., 2021). Global hydrological and land surface models increasingly include irrigation modules (e.g., Wada et al., 2014; Arboleda-Obando et al., 2024), but model-based IWU estimates remain highly uncertain, as they depend on assumptions that often deviate from actual practices, such as irrigation triggering rules (Olivera-Guerra et al., 2023), or on poorly constrained parameters, for instance those related to irrigation efficiency (Puy et al., 2022).

Earth Observation (EO) has opened new opportunities for detecting and monitoring irrigation from space (Massari et al., 2021). Various satellite observations capture irrigation-related signals, including vegetation properties (e.g., Ambika et al., 2016; Deines et al., 2019; Dari et al., 2024), land surface temperature (e.g., Corbari et al., 2025; Jalilvand et al., 2026), soil moisture (e.g., Modanesi et al., 2022; Dari et al., 2023; Zappa et al., 2024; Lallet et al., 2024), and evapotranspiration (e.g., Zhang and Long, 2021; Kragh et al., 2023; Zipper et al., 2024). These approaches have shown promising results from field to basin scales, and several have been extended to continental or global domains (e.g., Zaussinger et al., 2019; Zohaib and Choi, 2020; Zhang and Long, 2021). However, long-term large-scale IWU datasets remain scarce, and existing EO-based products rely on heterogeneous input datasets and retrieval strategies, which limits their comparability, generalisation, and use in cross-regional analysis or climate-oriented applications.

Against this background, this study provides a coordinated assessment of multiple EO-based IWU retrieval techniques within a unified framework. We present a harmonised archive of IWU datasets for four major irrigated regions — the contiguous United States (CONUS), India, the Murray-Darling Basin (Australia), and the Ebro Basin (Spain) — delivering monthly estimates at 0.25° resolution over up to two decades, depending on data availability.



The archive is generated using three complementary approaches. The Soil Moisture (SM)–based Delta approach (e.g.,
55 Zaussinger et al., 2019; Zappa et al., 2021, 2024) quantifies IWU by contrasting satellite-based soil moisture and evapotran-
spiration datasets (which implicitly include irrigation) with model estimates that exclude irrigation. The SM–based Inversion
approach (e.g., Dari et al., 2020, 2025b) estimates irrigation through the inversion of a soil water balance, constrained mainly
by satellite soil moisture observations. Finally, the Model–observation integration approach uses the Noah–MP land surface
model (Niu et al., 2011) equipped with an irrigation scheme (Ozdogan et al., 2010), and scales the simulated irrigation amounts
60 using EO-derived irrigated area fractions within each grid cell.

Together, these datasets provide the first coordinated collection of EO-based IWU estimates with harmonised inputs and
consistent processing across several major irrigated regions worldwide. They are intended as a foundation for building a climate
data record of IWU and for improving the representation of irrigation in hydrological and climate studies. The remainder of
this paper describes the study regions (Sect. 2.1), the methods used to generate the IWU archive (Sect. 2.2), the input datasets
65 (Sect. 2.3), evaluates the results against available observations and across methods (Sect. 3), and discusses limitations and
perspectives (Sect. 4).

2 Material and methods

2.1 Study regions

Figure 1 presents the four regions studied here, together with a map of area equipped for irrigation (GMIA version 5; Siebert
70 et al. 2013), originally at 5 arc-minute (~ 10 km) resolution and resampled to 0.25° using an area-weighted aggregation.

The CONUS spans a strong climatic gradient, from humid subtropical and temperate conditions in the east to semiarid and
desert climates in the west. Irrigation is concentrated in western and central hotspots: the California Valley (mostly orchards and
vineyards), Snake River Plain (mainly potatoes, sugar beets, and alfalfa), Great Plains (mostly maize, wheat, and soybeans), and
the Mississippi Floodplain (mainly rice, soybeans, and cotton). Water sources include both groundwater from major aquifers,
75 such as the High Plains (Ogallala) and Central Valley systems (Scanlon et al., 2012), and surface water conveyed through
canal networks. Irrigation is primarily applied through sprinkler or gravity methods, with an increasing use of drip systems in
high-value crop regions, such as California (USDA NASS, 2019; Evett et al., 2020).

The Ebro Basin in Spain has a semi-arid Mediterranean climate, with irrigation concentrated mainly in the central and eastern
parts of the basin, supporting mostly winter cereals, maize, orchards, olives, and vineyards. Water comes from snowmelt-fed
80 reservoirs in the Pyrenees distributed through canals, with both modern pressurized and traditional surface irrigation systems
(Paolini et al., 2023).

The Murray–Darling Basin in southeastern Australia spans hot semiarid regions in the north and cooler semiarid zones in
the south. Irrigation is primarily located along the southern rivers, especially the Murray and Murrumbidgee, supporting crops
such as cotton, rice, vineyards, and fruit orchards. Water is sourced from both surface reservoirs and groundwater aquifers
85 (Bretreger et al., 2020).



India hosts the world's most intensively irrigated regions, dominated by the Indo-Gangetic Plain in the north, where irrigation supports year-round multi-cropping systems (Kharif, Rabi, and Zaid seasons) with major crops including rice, wheat, and sugarcane. Groundwater is the primary source of irrigation water across much of the country and has supported a marked expansion of irrigated areas over recent decades, particularly in northern India, even as groundwater resources have become increasingly depleted (Asoka et al., 2018; Mehta et al., 2024).

2.2 Overview of algorithms

2.2.1 SM-based Delta

The SM-based Delta approach estimates IWU by contrasting EO-derived and model-simulated soil water balance dynamics, with the latter excluding irrigation (e.g., Zaussinger et al., 2019; Zappa et al., 2021). The underlying assumption is that, in irrigated areas, discrepancies between EO- and model-based estimates primarily reflect the influence of irrigation, which affects both SM and ET.

To ensure comparability between EO- and model-derived SM, satellite SM time series are first rescaled to the distribution of the model simulations using a mean–standard deviation adjustment. We further assume that EO-based and model-simulated ET agree under non-irrigated conditions, such that any departures in irrigated areas can be attributed to irrigation. The EO SM and ET datasets used in this approach are described in Sect. 2.3.

The soil water balance equation for EO-based soil moisture (SM_{EO}) can be written as:

$$Z \cdot \frac{dSM_{EO}}{dt} = P(t) + I(t) - ET_{EO}(t) - P(t) - \Delta S_{rest}, \quad (1)$$

and for model-simulated soil moisture (SM_{model}) as:

$$Z \cdot \frac{dSM_{model}}{dt} = P(t) - ET_{model}(t) - P(t) - \Delta S_{rest}, \quad (2)$$

where P [mm] is precipitation, I [mm] is irrigation, ET [mm] is evapotranspiration, R [mm] is runoff, and ΔS_{rest} [$m^3 m^{-3}$] represents other storage changes below the surface layer (e.g., drainage). Z [mm] is the soil depth used to convert volumetric soil moisture into water storage, fixed at 50 mm following Zaussinger et al. (2019).

Subtracting Eq. (2) from Eq. (1) expresses the EO–model discrepancies in terms of irrigation, under the assumption that differences in precipitation, runoff, and other storage terms are either negligible or do not systematically differ between the two formulations. The resulting IWU estimate is:

$$I(t) = \left(Z \cdot \frac{dSM_{EO}}{dt} - Z \cdot \frac{dSM_{model}}{dt} \right) + \max[0, ET_{EO}(t) - ET_{model}(t)]. \quad (3)$$

To reduce spurious irrigation signals due to noise in the satellite SM data, IWU is only considered between two consecutive time steps when the relative increase in soil moisture exceeds a predefined threshold of 0.12, as determined from the sensitivity analysis in Zaussinger et al. (2019). The EO SM and ET datasets used in this approach are described in Sect. 2.3.




Figure 1. Study regions considered in this work, for which IWU archives are available. Color shading indicates the percentage of area equipped for irrigation (GMIA v5; Siebert et al. 2013). Black outlines show the study domains: contiguous United States, with four main irrigated subregions (California Valley, Great Plains, Mississippi Floodplain, Snake River Plain); India; Ebro Basin (Spain); and Murray–Darling Basin (Australia).



115 2.2.2 SM-based Inversion

The SM-based Inversion approach estimates IWU by inverting the soil water balance equation, following a formulation conceptually similar to the SM2RAIN method (Brocca et al., 2014) originally developed to retrieve precipitation from soil moisture. In this framework, temporal variations in soil moisture $SM(t)$ are used to infer the total water input (precipitation plus irrigation), and the known precipitation component is subsequently removed.

120 The general form of the soil water balance is:

$$nZ \frac{dSM(t)}{dt} = I(t) + P(t) - G(t) - SR(t) - ET(t), \quad (4)$$

where n [-] is the soil porosity, Z [mm] the effective soil depth, SM [-] the volumetric soil moisture, I and P [mm] the irrigation and precipitation inputs (with precipitation taken from the ERA5 forecast fields; Hersbach et al. 2020), G [mm] the drainage, SR [mm] the surface runoff, and ET [mm] the actual evapotranspiration.

125 Defining the total water input as $W_{in}(t) = I(t) + P(t)$, Eq. 4 can be rearranged as:

$$W_{in}(t) = nZ \frac{dSM(t)}{dt} + G(t) + SR(t) + ET(t), \quad (5)$$

from which irrigation is retrieved as

$$I(t) = W_{in}(t) - P(t). \quad (6)$$

Following Dari et al. (2024), the drainage term is represented as $G(t) = a SM(t)^b$, where a and b are parameters related to soil hydraulic properties. Actual evapotranspiration is expressed as $ET(t) = F SM(t) PET(t)$, where PET [mm] is potential evapotranspiration and F [-] is a scaling parameter modulating the sensitivity of ET to SM. The parameters a , b , F , and nZ are calibrated jointly during rainfall-free periods. Surface runoff is assumed to be negligible.

Negative irrigation estimates are set to zero, and spurious low values are filtered out using a precipitation-based threshold, following Jalilvand et al. (2019) and Dari et al. (2023).

135 2.2.3 Model-observation integration

The Model-observation integration approach estimates IWU using simulations from the Noah-MP land surface model (v4.0.1; Niu et al. 2011) implemented within NASA's Land Information System (LIS; Kumar et al., 2006, 2008). Irrigation is simulated following the sprinkler scheme of Ozdogan et al. (2010), in which irrigation is applied during the growing season whenever root-zone moisture availability (MA) falls below a prescribed threshold. Here, a threshold of 0.45 is used, following Modanesi et al. (2022); sensitivity tests confirmed that this value yields the most realistic irrigation behaviour (not shown). The start and end of the growing season are derived from a monthly climatological greenness dataset (Gutman and Ignatov, 1998), with irrigation allowed only when greenness exceeds 40% of its annual range (Ozdogan et al., 2010).

The model is forced with ERA5 forecast fields, which do not assimilate land-surface observations and therefore avoid introducing irrigation-related signals. Soil texture is taken from the Harmonized World Soil Database (FAO, 2023), and soil hydraulic properties follow Cosby et al. (1984) with adaptations from Chen and Dudhia (2001).



Root-zone moisture availability MA is computed as:

$$MA = \frac{\theta - \theta_{WP}}{\theta_{FC} - \theta_{WP}}, \quad (7)$$

where θ is the simulated volumetric soil moisture, and θ_{WP} and θ_{FC} are the water contents at wilting point and field capacity, respectively. When MA drops below the threshold of 0.45, irrigation is applied to restore the root zone to field capacity.

150 Noah-MP is run over all land pixels using a homogeneous cropland land-cover type to ensure that the irrigation scheme is active everywhere. A satellite-based irrigated-area map is then used to constrain the spatial distribution of irrigation, retaining simulated irrigation only over irrigated pixels and scaling it by the irrigated fraction within each 0.25° grid cell. For this study, we use the ensemble mean of 24 Noah-MP simulations driven by perturbed meteorological forcings (radiation and precipitation, as in Modanesi et al., 2022).

155 2.3 Main input data

Table 1 summarizes the main input datasets, together with the methods in which they are employed.

2.3.1 Soil moisture datasets

We use seven surface SM datasets, including both satellite-based and model-based products. The satellite products, which are expected to contain irrigation signals (e.g., Lawston et al., 2017; Crow et al., 2025), comprise three long-term records from the
 160 ESA Climate Change Initiative (CCI) Soil Moisture version 08.1 data collection (Dorigo et al., 2017, 2023). These datasets provide volumetric SM [$\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$] for the upper 0–5 cm soil layer at a daily time step and 0.25° spatial resolution. They include (i) the ACTIVE dataset, merging scatterometer observations from ERS-1, ERS-2, and ASCAT (MetOp-A/B/C); (ii) the PASSIVE dataset, combining microwave radiometer measurements from multiple missions and sensors (SMMR, SSM/I, TMI, AMSR-E, WindSat, AMSR2, SMOS, SMAP, FengYun, and GPM); and (iii) the COMBINED dataset, which integrates all
 165 active and passive retrievals into a single harmonized product. We also include three additional satellite datasets: Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS; Kerr et al. 2016), Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP; Entekhabi et al. 2010), and Advanced Scatterometer (ASCAT; Wagner et al. 2013). Finally, ERA5-Land (Muñoz-Sabater et al., 2021) is used as a model-based reference dataset, providing volumetric SM for the upper 0–5 cm at hourly resolution and 0.1° spatial resolution. ERA5-Land does not assimilate land-surface observations (e.g., SM or land surface temperature) and does not include any explicit
 170 representation of irrigation. However, it is forced by ERA5 atmospheric fields, which may carry an indirect imprint of irrigation introduced through atmospheric data assimilation. In practice, our analyses (not shown) indicate that ERA5-Land exhibits no detectable irrigation signal in the study regions and can therefore be used as a non-irrigated reference.

2.3.2 Evapotranspiration datasets

We use four ET datasets. Two of them are observation-based products that integrate satellite information and therefore contain
 175 irrigation signals (e.g., Lalluet et al., 2025a): (i) SSEBop v5 (Senay, 2018), based on MODIS land surface temperature and vegetation data; and (ii) FLUXCOM (Remote Sensing version) (Jung et al., 2019), obtained by machine-learning upscaling



of eddy-covariance fluxes using satellite-derived predictors. The remaining two datasets are model-based products that do not explicitly represent irrigation: Noah-MP ET (forced with ERA5 forecast meteorology) and ERA5-Land ET. Noah-MP ET is available for 2010–2024 for the CONUS and Murray–Darling Basin domains, while ERA5-Land ET is used for the remaining regions and periods. In addition, we use potential evapotranspiration from the GLEAM v3.7b dataset (Martens et al., 2017) in the SM-based Inversion approach; GLEAM v3.7b potential evapotranspiration is computed using the Priestley–Taylor equation and meteorological forcing.

2.3.3 Irrigated area maps

To constrain irrigation estimates in the Model–observation integration approach, we use the Landsat-derived Global Rainfed and Irrigated-Cropland product at 30 m resolution (LGRIP30; Teluguntla et al., 2023) for the nominal year 2015. LGRIP30 provides spatially detailed irrigated and rainfed cropland fractions based on Landsat surface reflectance time series and machine-learning classification. In addition, the Global Map of Irrigated Areas v5 (GMIA v5; Siebert et al. 2013) is used in the SM-based Delta and SM-based Inversion approaches as a spatial mask to restrict the analysis to regions equipped for irrigation. GMIA v5, provided at 0.0833° resolution, compiles subnational agricultural statistics, census information, and international reports on irrigated areas for the period 2000–2008.

Table 1. Summary of soil moisture (SM), evapotranspiration (ET), and irrigated-area datasets used as main inputs, including temporal coverage, original resolution, and version information. Dataset names link to their respective data repositories.

Type	Dataset	Version	Period used	Original resolution	Method(s)
SM	ESA CCI Active	v08.1	2003–2022	0.25°	Delta, Inversion
SM	ESA CCI Passive	v08.1	2003–2022	0.25°	Delta, Inversion
SM	ESA CCI Combined	v08.1	2003–2022	0.25°	Delta, Inversion
SM	SMOS	v700 (L2)	2010–2022	25 km EASE-Grid 2.0	Inversion
SM	SMAP	v8 (L2)	2015–2022	36 km EASE-Grid 2.0	Inversion
SM	ASCAT	H119	2007–2022	12.5 km	Inversion
SM	ERA5-Land	2024 CDS release	2003–2022	0.1°	Delta
ET	SSEBop	v5	2003–2022	1 km	Delta
ET	FLUXCOM	Remote sensing	2003–2020	0.0833°	Delta
ET	Noah-MP (LIS)	v4.0.1	2010–2022	0.25°	Delta
ET	ERA5-Land	2024 CDS release	2003–2022	0.1°	Delta
PET	GLEAM	v3.7b	2003–2022	0.25°	Inversion
Irrigation map	Landsat (LGRIP30)	v1.0 (2023)	–	30 m	Model–obs integration
Irrigation map	GMIA	v5	–	0.0833°	Delta, Inversion



2.3.4 Spatial and temporal processing

All input datasets were regridded to the 0.25° regular latitude–longitude grid used in the ESA CCI SM products. SMOS and SMAP were resampled using nearest–neighbour interpolation to preserve their native retrieval characteristics. All other datasets (ASCAT, ERA5–Land SM and ET, FLUXCOM, SSEBop, Noah–MP ET, and GMIA v5) were aggregated to the 0.25° grid using spatial averaging. The LGRIP30 irrigated area map, which provides a binary classification of irrigated versus rainfed cropland at 30 m resolution, was similarly aggregated by computing the fraction of irrigated pixels within each 0.25° grid cell.

A spatial mask was applied to the SM–based Delta and SM–based Inversion IWU outputs, retaining only pixels with at least 5% of land equipped for irrigation according to the GMIA v5 dataset, in order to avoid spurious irrigation signals in non-irrigated areas. For the Model–observation integration approach, irrigation amounts are already restricted and scaled to the irrigated fraction within each grid cell using the LGRIP30 irrigated area map.

A temporal mask was applied to the SM–based Delta and SM–based Inversion estimates to restrict the analysis to active irrigation periods: April–September for CONUS and the Ebro Basin, September–March for the Murray–Darling Basin, and November–June for India. In India, irrigation also occurs during the monsoon months (July to October), but these months were excluded to ensure consistency across methods, as the SM–based Inversion approach uses this period for parameter calibration. For the Model–observation integration approach, a temporal mask was applied only in the Murray–Darling Basin, where the climatological greenness threshold from Gutman and Ignatov (1998) is outdated and cannot be used to define irrigation timing. Finally, all 0.25° IWU estimates were temporally aggregated to monthly values.

2.4 *In situ* and survey-based reference datasets

Table 2 summarizes the reference datasets used for validation, including their spatial coverage, period of record, and data source. For CONUS, we used annual state-level irrigation volumes from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey (FRIS) for 2013 and 2018. The survey, compiled by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), is based on representative farm and ranch samples, which are then expanded to state totals using statistical weights. Reported applied water (acre-feet) was converted to km^3 using each state’s area.

For the Ebro Basin, we used daily canal-delivery volumes from the Automatic Hydrological Information System (SAIH) monitoring network for the years 2007 to 2020, covering four major irrigation districts in the eastern basin: Urgell, Al-gerri–Balaguer, North Catalan and Aragonese, and South Catalan and Aragonese (Fig. 6c). Reported pumped volumes were corrected for conveyance and application losses using district-specific factors from Dari et al. (2020), yielding actual IWU. The corrected values were expressed in millimeters over each district and then combined into a single basin-wide monthly time series by area-weighted averaging, yielding one representative IWU time series for the four districts. This aggregation was necessary because the individual districts are smaller than the 0.25° grid cells of the IWU datasets.

For the Murray–Darling Basin, we used daily irrigation volumes reported by the Australian Irrigation Infrastructure Operators (IIOs) for four districts in southern New South Wales: Murrumbidgee, Murray Wakool, Murray Mulwala, and Coleambally



(Fig. 8c; Bretreger et al. 2020). Reported volumes (liters) were converted to millimeters by dividing by each district's irrigated area, and the daily data were subsequently aggregated to monthly values.

225 For India, no *in situ* or survey-based irrigation records were available for the study period. Consequently, no direct validation could be performed; analyses for this region are therefore limited to inter-dataset comparisons and to the examination of spatial and temporal IWU patterns.

Table 2. *In situ* and survey-based reference datasets used for validation, including area, period of record, and data source for each region and irrigation district.

Region / District	Area [km ²]	Period	Source
CONUS			
State-level	–	2013, 2018	USDA FRIS
Ebro Basin			
Urgell	887.6	2007–2020	SAIH Ebro
Algerri–Balaguer	70.8	2007–2020	SAIH Ebro
North Catalan Aragonese	657.0	2007–2020	SAIH Ebro
South Catalan Aragonese	504.5	2007–2020	SAIH Ebro
Aggregated (4 districts)	2119.9	2007–2020	SAIH Ebro
Murray–Darling Basin			
Coleambally	977.0	2009–2019	IIOs
Murrumbidgee	2789.3	2014–2019	IIOs
Murray Mulwala	3092.6	2010–2019	IIOs
Murray Wakool	1455.2	2010–2019	IIOs

2.5 Overview of generated datasets

230 Table 3 provides an overview of the IWU archive generated in this study. Each dataset corresponds to a specific combination of methods and input datasets, and its availability depends on both the region and the temporal coverage of the input data. A check mark indicates that a dataset is included in the archive for a given region, while a dash indicates that it is not. Periods refer to the effective time span covered by each dataset.

For the SM-based Delta method, only FLUXCOM-based estimates were retained for India, as SSEBop yielded unrealistically high ET values compared to ERA5 precipitation, consistent with Kragh et al. (2023).

235 For the Model–observation integration approach, IWU estimates were produced only for CONUS and the Murray–Darling Basin. These two regions were selected for the first implementation of the regional-scale ensemble Noah–MP irrigation simulations because they provide the most comprehensive *in situ* reference data for evaluation among the four study regions, whereas observational records are more limited in the Ebro Basin and unavailable for India.



Table 3. Datasets generated in this study: method, dataset, time coverage, and regional availability. A check mark (✓) indicates availability; a dash (—) indicates that the dataset is not available.

Method	Dataset	Data availability	CONUS	Ebro	Murray–Darling	India
SM–based Delta	CCI Combined & FLUXCOM	2003–2020	✓	✓	✓	✓
	CCI Passive & FLUXCOM	2003–2020	✓	✓	✓	✓
	CCI Active & FLUXCOM	2003–2020	✓	✓	✓	✓
	CCI Combined & SSEBop	2003–2022	✓	✓	✓	—
	CCI Passive & SSEBop	2003–2022	✓	✓	✓	—
	CCI Active & SSEBop	2003–2022	✓	✓	✓	—
SM–based Inversion	CCI Combined	2003–2022	✓	✓	✓	✓
	CCI Passive	2003–2022	✓	✓	✓	✓
	ASCAT	2003–2022	✓	✓	✓	✓
	SMOS	2010–2022	✓	✓	✓	✓
	SMAP	2015–2022	✓	✓	✓	✓
Model–obs. integration	Landsat-based irrigation map	2010–2022	✓	—	✓	—

3 Technical validation

240 3.1 Contiguous United States (CONUS)

3.1.1 Summary of performance

Figure 2 presents a heatmap of the time-averaged spatial root mean square deviation (RMSD), bias, and Pearson correlation coefficient (R) computed between observed and estimated state-level irrigation volumes from FRIS and the corresponding IWU estimates. Each metric is derived from the comparison of state-level values (one point per state, as illustrated in Fig. 3b), and then averaged over the two FRIS reference years (2013 and 2018). Results for the two years evaluated separately are provided in the Supplementary Material (Table S1). To ensure consistency with the FRIS-reported units ($\text{km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ per state), IWU estimates originally expressed in millimeters were converted to cubic kilometers by multiplying by each state’s area.

For SM–based Delta datasets, those relying on ET from SSEBop show the weakest agreement with the reference data, with mean RMSD of $9.6\text{--}10.1 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and biases of $5.6\text{--}6.3 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$. In contrast, SM–based Delta datasets using FLUXCOM ET perform better, with mean RMSD ranging from $5.4\text{--}6.1 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, biases of $2.6\text{--}3.5 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, and higher correlations.

For the SM–based Inversion approach, the CCI Passive dataset shows the closest agreement with the reference data, combining a low mean RMSD ($4.2 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$) and bias ($0.7 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$) with the highest correlation ($R = 0.66$) among all SM–based Inversion products. The CCI Combined dataset also performs reasonably well (RMSD = $5.8 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, bias = $1.1 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, $R = 0.29$), whereas datasets based on ASCAT, SMOS, and SMAP show weaker performance, with generally higher RMSD values ($5.4\text{--}6.7 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$) and substantially lower correlations ($R = 0.22\text{--}0.39$).




Figure 2. Performance metrics for CONUS: spatial RMSD, bias, and Pearson correlation (R) between state-level FRIS observations (km^3/year) and aggregated IWU estimates for each method-input combination, averaged over the 2013 and 2018 years. The best-performing dataset for each approach is highlighted in bold.

For the Model–observation integration approach, the Landsat-derived irrigation map dataset performs within the same range as the better SM–based datasets, with a mean RMSD of $3.9 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, a mean bias of $1.1 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, and a mean correlation of $R = 0.79$.

Overall, the best-performing SM–based datasets are CCI Passive & FLUXCOM for the SM–based Delta approach and CCI Passive for the SM–based Inversion approach. Together with the Landsat-based dataset from the Model–observation integration approach, these three products were retained for further analysis in this region.

3.1.2 Spatial patterns and state-level agreement

Figure 3a shows mean annual IWU over CONUS (2010–2020) for the three selected datasets. The major irrigation regions identified in Fig. 1 (California Valley, Snake River Plain, Great Plains, and Mississippi Floodplain) emerge, particularly in the Model–observation integration dataset. Figure 3b presents state-level scatterplots comparing estimated and observed IWU volumes for 2013 (blue) and 2018 (orange), highlighting year-specific relationships and associated performance metrics.

The three IWU datasets exhibit distinct spatial patterns. The SM–based Inversion (CCI Passive) dataset shows a relatively uniform distribution, with most pixels ranging between 50 and 150 mm yr^{-1} . In contrast, the SM–based Delta (CCI Passive & FLUXCOM) dataset displays a west–east gradient, with many western areas exceeding 150 mm yr^{-1} (locally $>350 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$), while the Mississippi Floodplain generally remains below 150 mm yr^{-1} , with the notable exception of Florida, where locally higher values are observed. The Model–observation integration dataset shows the strongest spatial heterogeneity, highlighting distinct irrigation hotspots: parts of the California Valley exceed 500 mm yr^{-1} , while the Mississippi Floodplain typically exhibits values between 150 and 200 mm yr^{-1} .




Figure 3. (a) Spatial distribution of mean annual IWU (2010–2020) over CONUS derived from the three approaches: SM-based Inversion (CCI Passive), SM-based Delta (CCI Passive & FLUXCOM), and Model–observation integration (Landsat-based irrigation map). (b) State-level scatterplots comparing estimated IWU volumes (km³) from each dataset with observed FRIS irrigation volumes for 2013 and 2018.



3.1.3 Time series and seasonal cycles

275 Figure 4 shows monthly IWU estimates from SM-based Inversion (CCI Passive, blue line), SM-based Delta (CCI Passive & FLUXCOM, green line), and Model-observation integration (Landsat-based map, red line) for the Great Plains, California Valley, Snake River Plain, and Mississippi Floodplain over 2010–2020. These four major irrigated regions, defined as in Figure 1 (top-left panel), span a strong climatic gradient, from the arid western domains (California Valley, Snake River Plain) to the more humid Great Plains and Mississippi Floodplain. Values are spatially averaged by region, and mean seasonal cycles are also displayed.

280 are also displayed.




Figure 4. Monthly IWU (2010–2020) estimated by the three approaches over four major irrigated regions in the CONUS: Great Plains, Central Valley, Snake River Plain, and Mississippi Floodplain. SM-based Delta (CCI Passive & FLUXCOM, in green), SM-based Inversion (CCI Passive, in blue), and Model-observation integration (Landsat-based map, in red) estimates are spatially averaged by region. Mean seasonal cycles are shown in the right panels.



Both the SM-based Delta and Model-observation integration datasets reproduce the July–August irrigation peak and show similar interannual variability, especially in the Great Plains. By contrast, the SM-based Inversion (CCI Passive) dataset yields lower summer IWU volumes and displays a different seasonal cycle. The SM-based estimates always start in April and end in October by design, whereas model-based irrigation sometimes starts earlier (in the Great Plains and California Valley) and continues slightly later in the year, which may reflect the absence of explicit harvest timing in the model (De Lannoy et al., 2024).

3.2 Ebro Basin

3.2.1 Summary of performance

Figure 5 presents a heatmap of RMSD, bias, and Pearson correlation (R) between observed monthly IWU and the generated IWU datasets at the aggregated district level in the eastern Ebro Basin over 2007-2020. Metrics were computed only for the irrigation season (April-October), and only pixels with at least 25% of their surface area within the irrigation districts were retained.

Among the six SM-based Delta datasets, performance is relatively consistent, with all products underestimating irrigation volumes (mean bias of about $-20 \text{ mm month}^{-1}$). The best agreement is obtained for the SM-based Delta (CCI Passive & FLUXCOM) and SM-based Delta (CCI Combined & SSEBop) configurations, with correlations of $R = 0.63$ and $R = 0.60$, RMSD of 29.0 and $27.3 \text{ mm month}^{-1}$, and biases of -17.1 and $-17.2 \text{ mm month}^{-1}$, respectively.

For the SM-based Inversion datasets, the CCI Passive dataset performs best, with R of 0.63 , RMSD of $30.0 \text{ mm month}^{-1}$, and bias of $-23.0 \text{ mm month}^{-1}$, yielding results comparable to the best SM-based Delta products. Other SM-based Inversion datasets show weaker agreement, with lower correlations and larger negative biases.

Overall, the best-performing datasets are CCI Passive & FLUXCOM for the SM-based Delta approach and CCI Passive for the SM-based Inversion approach. These two datasets are therefore retained for further analysis in this region.

3.2.2 Time series, seasonal cycles, and spatial patterns

Figure 6a shows monthly *in situ* IWU observations (grey shading) together with estimates from SM-based Delta (CCI Passive & FLUXCOM, green line) and SM-based Inversion (CCI Passive, blue line), averaged over the merged irrigation districts for 2007-2020. Both datasets capture the timing of the irrigation season, with a marked peak in June-August, but they consistently underestimate irrigation volumes. They exhibit stronger interannual variability compared to *in situ* observations but show similar year-to-year fluctuations among themselves, suggesting that both methods respond similarly to interannual forcing in this region despite their different formulations.

Figure 6b shows maps of mean annual IWU over 2003-2020 for the two datasets. The SM-based Delta (CCI Passive & FLUXCOM) dataset indicates higher IWU in the eastern basin, broadly consistent with the distribution of irrigated areas in GMIA v5 (see Fig. 1). The SM-based Inversion (CCI Passive) dataset also exhibits a heterogeneous pattern, with localized




Figure 5. Performance metrics in the Ebro Basin: RMSD, bias, and Pearson correlation (R) between observed monthly IWU at the aggregated district level and estimates from each method-inputs combination (2007–2020). The best-performing dataset for each approach is highlighted in bold.

hotspots of high IWU, including the Ebro Delta in the south-east, a region of intensive irrigation. The location and extent of the irrigation districts with available in-situ observations are shown in Fig. 6c.

3.3 Murray–Darling Basin

3.3.1 Summary of performance

Figure 7 presents a heatmap of RMSD, bias, and Pearson correlation (R) between monthly observed IWU and the corresponding estimates from each method–input combination. Metrics are computed over the irrigation season (September–March) and averaged across the four irrigation districts of the Murray–Darling Basin, with values reported as mean $\pm$ standard deviation across districts. Evaluation periods vary by dataset according to data availability, and only pixels whose centroids fall within district boundaries were included. District-level metrics are provided in the Supplementary Material (Tables S2–S3).

For all datasets, performance varies considerably across the four irrigation districts, as indicated by the large standard deviations. Among the SM–based Delta products, those using SSEBop ET generally outperform those using FLUXCOM ET. The CCI Combined & SSEBop dataset, in particular, shows the most balanced performance across the three metrics, with the lowest RMSD (13.5 ± 1.9 mm/month), a moderate bias (3.8 ± 2.7 mm/month), and relatively higher correlations ($R = 0.29 \pm 0.20$). For SM–based Inversion, CCI Combined, CCI Passive, and SMAP datasets perform best. SMAP shows the lowest mean RMSD (12.5 ± 2.6 mm/month) and lower bias (5.6 ± 2.6 mm/month), but is limited to the post-2015 period. CCI Passive reaches the highest mean correlation ($R = 0.38 \pm 0.16$), while CCI Combined provides a more balanced trade-off between RMSD and bias. The Model-observation integration dataset achieves the highest mean correlation overall ($R = 0.47 \pm 0.11$), but with large bias and substantial variability between districts.




Figure 6. (a) Monthly IWU time series (2007–2020; left) and mean seasonal cycle (right) averaged over the Ebro irrigation districts, compared with *in situ* observations (grey shading). (b) Spatial distribution of mean annual IWU (2003–2020) from SM-based Delta (CCI Passive & FLUXCOM; left) and SM-based Inversion (CCI Passive; right). (c) Location and extent of the four irrigation districts (Urgell, Algerri–Balaguer, Catalan and Aragonese North, and Catalan and Aragonese South), merged into a single unit for this study.

330 No single method–input combination performs best across all districts, as reflected by the large standard deviations. However, some datasets show comparatively better and more consistent results across the three metrics and the four districts. For the following analysis, we therefore retain one representative dataset from each approach: SM-based Delta (CCI Combined & SSEBop), SM-based Inversion (CCI Combined), and Model–observation integration (Landsat-based map).

3.3.2 Time series, seasonal cycles, and spatial patterns

335 Figure 8a shows monthly IWU time series and mean seasonal cycles for the four Murray–Darling irrigation districts (districts shown in panel c), with *in situ* IWU in shaded grey and estimates from the three selected datasets SM-based Delta (CCI Combined & SSEBop), SM-based Inversion (CCI Combined), and Model–observation integration (Landsat-based map) in color. All datasets exhibit substantial interannual variability, but their temporal fluctuations show limited agreement with the observed records.




Figure 7. Heatmap of district-averaged performance metrics for the Murray–Darling Basin. Values represent mean monthly RMSD, bias, and Pearson correlation (R), with “ $\pm$ ” indicating inter-district standard deviation.

340 The Model-observation integration dataset tends to overestimate IWU, except in the Murrumbidgee district, where values are closer to the observations than in other regions. The SM–based Delta (CCI Combined & SSEBop) and SM–based Inversion (CCI Combined) datasets exhibit IWU magnitudes generally closer to the observations than the Model-observation integration dataset, though both substantially overestimate in the Murray Wakool district. When averaged over all years, the mean seasonal cycle shows that only the Model-observation integration dataset reproduces the distinct January peak also seen in the *in situ* records.

Figure 8b shows maps of mean annual IWU (2010–2020) for the three selected datasets. SM–based Delta (CCI Combined & SSEBop) yields values mostly between 100 and 250 mm yr^{−1}, with higher values in the northwest of the basin. SM–based Inversion (CCI Combined) also ranges between 100 and 250 mm yr^{−1} but is more spatially uniform, with slightly higher values in the northern part. In contrast, the Model-observation integration dataset shows marked spatial heterogeneity, with the highest values (locally exceeding 500 mm yr^{−1}) concentrated in the southern basin.

3.4 India (Ganges Plain)

3.4.1 Mean IWU estimates across datasets

Table 4 summarises monthly mean IWU over the Ganges Plain (aggregation domain shown in Fig. 9c) for three SM–based Delta and six SM–based Inversion datasets. Values are reported separately for two cropping seasons, Rabi (November–March) and Zaid (April–June), while the Kharif season (July–October) is excluded due to temporal masking. The “Annual” column corresponds to the mean over the combined November–June period. Reported values represent the mean over the full temporal coverage of each dataset, which varies depending on data availability (see the “Period” column in Table 4).




Figure 8. (a) Monthly IWU time series (left) and mean seasonal cycles (right) for four irrigation districts in the Murray-Darling Basin, with *in situ* observations (grey) and estimates from the three selected datasets: SM-based Delta (CCI Combined & SSEBop, in green), SM-based Inversion (CCI Combined, in blue), and Model-observation integration (Landsat-based map, in red). (b) Spatial distribution of mean annual IWU (2010–2020) from the three selected datasets. (c) Location and extent of the four irrigation districts.



Table 4. Mean monthly IWU ($\pm$ standard deviation) (in mm) over the Gangetic Plain for SM-based Delta and SM-based Inversion datasets. Values are reported separately for the Rabi (Nov–Mar) and Zaid (Apr–Jun) seasons, and for the combined November–June period ("Annual" column). The Kharif season (Jul–Oct) is excluded due to temporal masking. The rightmost column indicates the period over which the mean IWU values were computed for each dataset.

Dataset	Rabi (Nov–Mar)	Zaid (Apr–Jun)	Annual (Nov–Jun)	Period
SM-based Delta				
CCI Combined & FLUXCOM	29.0 $\pm$ 13.1	30.3 $\pm$ 8.3	29.5 $\pm$ 11.5	2003–2020
CCI Passive & FLUXCOM	29.8 $\pm$ 13.9	36.0 $\pm$ 8.5	32.2 $\pm$ 12.5	2003–2020
CCI Active & FLUXCOM	20.5 $\pm$ 13.9	19.5 $\pm$ 9.2	20.1 $\pm$ 12.3	2003–2020
SM-based Inversion				
CCI Combined	38.1 $\pm$ 15.3	39.5 $\pm$ 10.1	38.6 $\pm$ 13.6	2003–2022
CCI Passive	72.3 $\pm$ 26.3	52.7 $\pm$ 12.1	64.9 $\pm$ 24.0	2003–2022
ASCAT	86.4 $\pm$ 37.7	75.6 $\pm$ 19.6	82.3 $\pm$ 32.5	2007–2022
SMOS	67.0 $\pm$ 14.9	42.1 $\pm$ 9.4	57.7 $\pm$ 17.8	2010–2022
SMAP	89.5 $\pm$ 25.6	44.5 $\pm$ 11.2	71.8 $\pm$ 30.5	2015–2022

SM-based Delta datasets yield annual mean IWU values between 20 and 32 mm month^{−1}, with relatively small differences between the Rabi and Zaid seasons. The associated standard deviations (8 to 14 mm month^{−1}) indicate marked month-to-month and interannual variability, generally higher during Rabi than during Zaid. SM-based Inversion datasets exhibit a much wider range of annual IWU, from about 39 mm month^{−1} (CCI Combined) to more than 80 mm month^{−1} (ASCAT), together with higher variability. Within this group, the CCI Combined product is the closest in magnitude and variability to the SM-based Delta datasets, whereas the other products (CCI Passive, ASCAT, SMOS, SMAP) systematically yield larger totals.

For the following analyses, we focus on SM-based Delta (CCI Combined & FLUXCOM) and SM-based Inversion (CCI Combined), as they provide the most consistent estimates across methods and align reasonably well with the magnitudes reported by Kragh et al. (2023). Since no direct validation data are available, this does not imply that these datasets are necessarily closer to real IWU, but they offer a pragmatic choice to ensure comparability between approaches.

3.4.2 Temporal dynamics and spatial distribution

Figure 9a shows monthly IWU time series (2003–2020) from the two selected datasets averaged over the Gangetic Plain, with the monsoon months (July–October) excluded. Both datasets generally reproduce a dominant Rabi season (November–March) and a smaller Zaid peak (April–June). The main difference lies in the timing and magnitude of the Rabi maximum: SM-based Inversion (CCI Combined) produces sharper and higher peaks in November–December, whereas SM-based Delta (CCI Combined & FLUXCOM) yields smoother dynamics, generally peaking in March.

Because the monsoon period (Kharif; July–October) is masked, both datasets likely miss an irrigation peak typically associated with this cropping phase. This is supported by FAO crop calendars (FAO, 2010), which indicate widespread irrigation for rice, maize, and other water-demanding crops during the monsoon months. For the Rabi season, the simulated magni-




Figure 9. (a) Monthly IWU time series (left) and mean seasonal cycle (right) over the Ganges Plain derived from SM-based Inversion (CCI Combined, in blue) and SM-based Delta (CCI Combined & FLUXCOM, in green), with monsoon months (July–October) masked. (b) Spatial distribution of monthly mean IWU (2003–2020) over India for both approaches (computed over Nov–June). (c) Extent of the Ganges Plain used for aggregation.

tudes ($10\text{--}50\text{ mm month}^{-1}$, with a March maximum) are consistent with previous findings by Kragh et al. (2023), particularly matching the SM-based Delta (CCI Combined & FLUXCOM) dataset pattern.

Spatially, both datasets (Fig. 9b) identify the Gangetic Plain as an important irrigation hotspot. In this area, SM-based Delta (CCI Combined & FLUXCOM) shows values mostly between 20 and 50 mm month^{-1} , with higher levels ($40\text{--}60\text{ mm month}^{-1}$) in the northwestern part of the plain, near the Indus Basin. SM-based Inversion (CCI Combined) presents a more uniform distribution across the plain, with elevated values in the eastern part (around $40\text{--}60\text{ mm month}^{-1}$).



4 Limitations and perspectives

4.1 SM-based approaches: methodological considerations

385 The SM-based Delta and SM-based Inversion approaches rely on SM and ET datasets that provide indirect signatures of
 irrigation and remain affected by retrieval uncertainties. Satellite SM is sensitive only to the near-surface layer, so irrigation
 signals may be weak depending on infiltration rates, timing relative to satellite overpasses, or irrigation method. In addition,
 SM retrievals tend to saturate in wet or frequently irrigated conditions. ET products are likewise influenced by methodological
 assumptions and uncertainties in their inputs, such as land surface temperature, vegetation parameters, and meteorological
 390 forcing.

Differences in IWU estimates obtained when using alternative SM or ET datasets reflect this sensitivity and are consistent
 with the spread reported among ET products in irrigated regions (e.g., Lalluet et al., 2025a) and among SM retrievals (e.g.,
 Escorihuela and Quintana-Seguí, 2016; García-García* and Stradiotti* et al., 2026). At the 0.25° resolution considered here,
 irrigation signals in SM and ET datasets can also be diluted in regions where irrigated areas are small or highly fragmented
 395 (e.g., Zappa et al., 2022; Dari et al., 2023), which further limits detectability.

Although these limitations are partly intrinsic to the EO datasets, methodological refinements may help characterise their
 impact. In particular, current SM-based IWU products do not include formal uncertainty estimates; future developments could
 incorporate ensemble or Monte Carlo perturbations of key inputs (e.g., SM, ET, precipitation, irrigated-area masks) to quantify
 the robustness of the retrieved irrigation signal.

400 4.2 Model-observation integration: methodological considerations

The Model-observation integration dataset inherits several structural assumptions from the underlying land surface model.
 These include the parameterisation of soil hydraulic properties, the formulation of irrigation-triggering thresholds, and the use
 of a generic vegetation representation, all of which influence the magnitude and spatial distribution of simulated irrigation.
 Such assumptions may contribute to regional overestimation, as observed in parts of the Murray-Darling Basin.

405 Potential improvements include the introduction of crop-specific parameterisations and the optimisation of irrigation-related
 parameters (De Lannoy et al., 2024), as well as the sequential assimilation of satellite observations to better constrain SM
 and irrigation dynamics (e.g., De Lannoy et al., 2024). At the 0.25° spatial resolution, irrigation is applied uniformly over
 the model grid cell, which cannot fully represent sub-grid variability in irrigation practices and may influence the simulated
 irrigation amounts (Modanesi et al., 2025). In addition, the scaling of simulated irrigation by the irrigated-area fraction depends
 410 on the accuracy of the underlying irrigated-area map (here LGRIP30), which directly affects the spatial pattern of the resulting
 IWU estimates.

Current uncertainty estimates are solely based on perturbations of the meteorological forcing. Developing ensembles that
 also vary irrigated-area maps and key land-surface parameters would provide a more comprehensive characterisation of struc-
 tural uncertainty in this approach.



415 4.3 Data availability and validation constraints

The evaluation of the IWU datasets is restricted to regions and periods where irrigation records are available (CONUS and selected districts within the Ebro and Murray–Darling Basins). Outside these domains, data quality can only be assessed indirectly, for example, through consistency with irrigated-area maps or crop calendars. The reference datasets themselves also contain uncertainties: survey-based annual estimates (e.g., FRIS) may be affected by reporting or sampling limitations, and
420 district-level time series in the Ebro and Murray–Darling Basins may be influenced by measurement uncertainties or changes in monitoring practices. Expanding and improving the availability of observational irrigation data would greatly support future validation and benchmarking efforts.

4.4 Recommendations for users

Given the methodological and data-related considerations outlined above, the IWU datasets should be interpreted with care,
425 especially in regions where uncertainties cannot be directly evaluated due to the lack of validation data. Users are encouraged to assess spatial and temporal patterns in conjunction with ancillary information, such as irrigated-area maps, meteorological conditions, and crop calendars.

Beyond these interpretation guidelines, the datasets are primarily designed for large-scale analyses, intercomparison exercises (e.g., Dari et al., 2025a), and model benchmarking. Combining them with complementary observations or model outputs
430 can further support robust interpretation and help mitigate uncertainties associated with individual datasets.

5 Conclusions

This study presents a coordinated archive of long-term IWU datasets for four major irrigated regions worldwide, produced at 0.25° spatial resolution and a monthly time step. The archive combines three distinct approaches — SM-based Delta, SM-based Inversion, and Model-observation integration — implemented with multiple soil moisture, evapotranspiration, and irrigated-
435 area datasets. The number of available products varies by region depending on input data availability, with up to six SM-based Delta products, five SM-based Inversion products, and one Model-observation integration product. Beyond dataset generation, the study provides a first multi-regional assessment of the consistency and behaviour of these IWU retrieval approaches over extended time periods.

Validation against in situ irrigation records in the CONUS, Ebro, and Murray–Darling Basins shows that several datasets
440 reproduce the main features of the seasonal irrigation cycle and the broad spatial patterns of irrigation. However, notable differences remain in both magnitude and timing across methods and relative to the reference data. The Model–observation integration approach tends to emphasise irrigation hotspots inherited from the irrigated-area maps, whereas the SM–based approaches produce smoother spatial patterns, reflecting the coarser resolution and retrieval sensitivities of soil moisture and evapotranspiration products. Interannual variability is only partly captured, primarily due to methodological limitations; the



445 limited availability of multi-year ground-based irrigation records further constrains our ability to evaluate this aspect of the datasets.

These datasets represent an initial step toward a harmonised, long-term IWU record built on satellite observations and model-data integration. Future developments should prioritise expanding and diversifying validation datasets, improving the spatial resolution of the IWU estimates, and refining methodological elements such as irrigation-triggering rules and uncertainty characterisation. Such advances would enhance the usefulness of IWU products for hydrological research and climate modelling. 450 Ultimately, this coordinated archive lays the groundwork for future efforts to better quantify irrigation water use and to improve the representation of irrigation-climate interactions in large-scale Earth system analyses.

6 Data availability

All irrigation water use datasets described in this paper are openly available on Zenodo: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14988197> (Laluet et al., 2025b). 455

In situ reference data are available from the following sources: – Ebro basin irrigation districts: Automatic Hydrologic Information System of the Ebro River Basin (SAIH Ebro), available at <http://www.saihebro.com/saihebro/index.php?url=/datos/canales>. – CONUS: Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey (FRIS), produced by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), available at [https://www.nass.usda.gov/Surveys/Guide_to_](https://www.nass.usda.gov/Surveys/Guide_to_NASS_Surveys/Farm_and_Ranch_Irrigation/index.php) 460 [NASS_Surveys/Farm_and_Ranch_Irrigation/index.php](https://www.nass.usda.gov/Surveys/Guide_to_NASS_Surveys/Farm_and_Ranch_Irrigation/index.php).

7 Code availability

No dedicated code repository is available. Data processing and analysis steps are described in Sects. 2 and 3.

Author contributions. All authors contributed to the study design. Data processing and analyses were performed by P. Laluet, P. Langhans, J. Dari, L. Busschaert, Z. Heyvaert, S. Modanesi, and C. Massari. P. Laluet wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to 465 the interpretation of the results and to the revision and editing of the manuscript.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Acknowledgements. This work was carried out with support from the European Space Agency under the Climate Change Initiative – Anthropogenic Water Use (CCI-AWU) precursor project (contract number 4000142449/23/I-NB). We gratefully acknowledge the providers of the input datasets and irrigation reference data used in this study.



470 References

- Ajaz, A., Karimi, P., Cai, X., De Fraiture, C., and Akhter, M. S.: Statistical Data Collection Methodologies of Irrigated Areas and Their Limitations: A Review, *Irrigation and Drainage*, 68, 702–713, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ird.2365>, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/ird.2365>, 2019.
- Ambika, A. K., Wardlow, B., and Mishra, V.: Remotely sensed high resolution irrigated area mapping in India for 2000 to 2015, *Scientific Data*, 3, 160 118, <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.118>, publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 2016.
- Arboleda-Obando, P. F., Ducharne, A., Yin, Z., and Ciais, P.: Validation of a new global irrigation scheme in the land surface model ORCHIDEE v2.2, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 17, 2141–2164, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-17-2141-2024>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2024.
- Asoka, A., Wada, Y., Fishman, R., and Mishra, V.: Strong linkage between precipitation intensity and monsoon season groundwater recharge in India, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 45, 5536–5544, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL078466>, 2018.
- Bretreger, D., Yeo, I.-Y., Hancock, G., Willgoose, G., et al.: Monitoring irrigation using Landsat observations and climate data over regional scales in the Murray–Darling Basin, *Journal of Hydrology*, 590, 125 356, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125356>, 2020.
- Brocca, L., Ciabatta, L., Massari, C., Moramarco, T., Hahn, S., Hasenauer, S., Kidd, R., Dorigo, W., Wagner, W., and Levizzani, V.: Soil as a natural rain gauge: Estimating global rainfall from satellite soil moisture data, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119, 5128–5141, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD021489>, [eprint: https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/2014JD021489](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/2014JD021489), 2014.
- Chen, F. and Dudhia, J.: Coupling an Advanced Land Surface–Hydrology Model with the Penn State–NCAR MM5 Modeling System. Part I: Model Implementation and Sensitivity, *Monthly Weather Review*, 129, 569–585, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(2001\)129<0569:CAALSH>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2001)129<0569:CAALSH>2.0.CO;2), publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Monthly Weather Review, 2001.
- Corbari, C., Paciolla, N., Sheffield, J., Labbassi, K., Dos Santos Araujo, D. C., Berendsen, S., and Szantoi, Z.: Estimates of Irrigation Water Volume by Assimilation of Satellite Land Surface Temperature or Soil Moisture Into a Water-Energy Balance Model in Morocco, *Water Resources Research*, 61, e2024WR038 926, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024WR038926>, [eprint: https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2024WR038926](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2024WR038926), 2025.
- Cosby, B. J., Hornberger, G. M., Clapp, R. B., and Ginn, T. R.: A Statistical Exploration of the Relationships of Soil Moisture Characteristics to the Physical Properties of Soils, *Water Resources Research*, 20, 682–690, <https://doi.org/10.1029/WR020i006p00682>, [eprint: https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/WR020i006p00682](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/WR020i006p00682), 1984.
- Crow, W. T., Anderson, M. C., Volk, J. M., and Colliander, A.: Value of microwave soil moisture and thermal-infrared evapotranspiration retrievals for the mapping of irrigation coverage, *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, 143, 104 773, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2025.104773>, 2025.
- Dari, J., Brocca, L., Quintana-Seguí, P., Escorihuela, M. J., Stefan, V., and Morbidelli, R.: Exploiting High-Resolution Remote Sensing Soil Moisture to Estimate Irrigation Water Amounts over a Mediterranean Region, *Remote Sensing*, 12, 2593, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12162593>, number: 16 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute, 2020.
- Dari, J., Brocca, L., Modanesi, S., Massari, C., Tarpanelli, A., Barbetta, S., Quast, R., Vreugdenhil, M., Freeman, V., Barella-Ortiz, A., Quintana-Seguí, P., Bretreger, D., and Volden, E.: Regional data sets of high-resolution (1 and 6 km) irrigation estimates from space, *Earth System Science Data*, 15, 1555–1575, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-15-1555-2023>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2023.



- 505 Dari, J., Morbidelli, R., Quintana-Seguí, P., and Brocca, L.: The Temporal-Stability-Based Irrigation MAPPING (TSIMAP) Method: A Virtuous Trade-Off between Accuracy, Flexibility, and Facility for End-Users, *Water*, 16, 644, <https://doi.org/10.3390/w16050644>, publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute, 2024.
- Dari, J., Brocca, L., Laluet, P., Morbidelli, R., Saltalippi, C., Modanesi, S., Dorigo, W. A., and Albergel, C.: Satellite-based estimates of irrigation water use versus modeling reconstructions: how much do they differ?, *ESS Open Archive*,
 510 <https://doi.org/10.22541/essoar.176218923.33215210/v1>, 2025a.
- Dari, J., Presti, S. L., and Brocca, L.: Irrigation monitoring from satellite at hyper-high resolution: Paving the way for remote-sensing-based agricultural water management support services, *Agricultural Water Management*, 317, 109 627, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378377425003415>, publisher: Elsevier, 2025b.
- De Lannoy, G. J. M., Bechtold, M., Busschaert, L., Heyvaert, Z., Modanesi, S., Dunmire, D., Lievens, H., Getirana, A., and Mas-
 515 sari, C.: Contributions of Irrigation Modeling, Soil Moisture and Snow Data Assimilation to High-Resolution Water Budget Estimates Over the Po Basin: Progress Towards Digital Replicas, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 16, e2024MS004 433, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024MS004433>, _eprint: <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2024MS004433>, 2024.
- Deines, J. M., Kendall, A. D., Crowley, M. A., Rapp, J., Cardille, J. A., and Hyndman, D. W.: Mapping three decades of annual irrigation across the US High Plains Aquifer using Landsat and Google Earth Engine, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 233, 111 400,
 520 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2019.111400>, 2019.
- Dorigo, W., Wagner, W., Albergel, C., Albrecht, F., Balsamo, G., Brocca, L., Chung, D., Ertl, M., Forkel, M., Gruber, A., Haas, E., Hamer, P. D., Hirschi, M., Ikonen, J., de Jeu, R., Kidd, R., Lahoz, W., Liu, Y. Y., Miralles, D., Mistelbauer, T., Nicolai-Shaw, N., Parinussa, R., Pratola, C., Reimer, C., van der Schalie, R., Seneviratne, S. I., Smolander, T., and Lecomte, P.: ESA CCI Soil Moisture for improved Earth system understanding: State-of-the art and future directions, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 203, 185–215,
 525 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.07.001>, 2017.
- Dorigo, W., Dietrich, S., Aires, F., Brocca, L., Carter, S., Cretaux, J.-F., Dunkerley, D., Enomoto, H., Forsberg, R., Güntner, A., Hegglin, M. I., Hollmann, R., Hurst, D. F., Johannessen, J. A., Kummerow, C., Lee, T., Luoju, K., Looser, U., Miralles, D. G., Pellet, V., Recknagel, T., Vargas, C. R., Schneider, U., Schoeneich, P., Schröder, M., Tapper, N., Vuglinsky, V., Wagner, W., Yu, L., Zappa, L., Zemp, M., and Aich, V.: Closing the Water Cycle from Observations across Scales: Where Do We Stand?, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological*
 530 *Society*, 102, E1897–E1935, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-19-0316.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2021.
- Dorigo, W., Preimesberger, W., Hahn, S., Van der Schalie, R., De Jeu, R., Kidd, R., Rodriguez-Fernandez, N., Hirschi, M., Stradiotti, P., Frederikse, T., Gruber, A., and Madelon, R.: ESA Soil Moisture Climate Change Initiative (Soil_Moisture_cci): Version 08.1 data collection, <http://catalogue.ceda.ac.uk/uuid/ff890589c21f4033803aa550f52c980c>, accessed: 20 Oct 2025, 2023.
- 535 Entekhabi, D., Njoku, E. G., O'Neill, P. E., Kellogg, K. H., Crow, W. T., Edelstein, W. N., Entin, J. K., Goodman, S. D., Jackson, T. J., Johnson, J., Kimball, J., Piepmeier, J. R., Koster, R. D., Martin, N., McDonald, K. C., Moghaddam, M., Moran, S., Reichle, R., Shi, J. C., Spencer, M. W., Thurman, S. W., Tsang, L., and Van Zyl, J.: The Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP) Mission, *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 98, 704–716, <https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2010.2043918>, 2010.
- Escorihuela, M. J. and Quintana-Seguí, P.: Comparison of remote sensing and simulated soil moisture datasets in Mediterranean landscapes,
 540 *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 180, 99–114, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.02.046>, 2016.
- Evett, S. R., Colaizzi, P. D., Lamm, F. R., O'Shaughnessy, S. A., Heeren, D. M., Trout, T. J., Kranz, W. L., and Lin, X.: Past, Present, and Future of Irrigation on the U.S. Great Plains, *Transactions of the ASABE*, 63, 703–729, <https://doi.org/10.13031/trans.13620>, 2020.



- FAO: Crop Calendar, <https://cropcalendar.apps.fao.org/>, accessed: 2025-08-20, 2010.
- FAO: Harmonized World Soil Database version 2.0, FAO ; International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) ;, <https://openknowledge.fao.org/handle/20.500.14283/cc3823en>, 2023.
- 545 FAO: AQUASTAT – FAO’s Global Information System on Water and Agriculture, <https://www.fao.org/aquastat>, latest data release: March 2025; accessed on 2025-08-21, 2025.
- García-García, A., Stradiotti, A., Delogu, F., Jonas, M., Tzounis, G. I. G., Raja, P., Rakovec, V. A., Beck, H. E., Dorigo, W., Pôças, C., and Martens, B.: Intercomparison of Earth Observation products for hyper-resolution hydrological modelling over Europe, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 333, 115 131, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2025.115131>, 2026.
- 550 Gutman, G. and Ignatov, A.: The derivation of the green vegetation fraction from NOAA/AVHRR data for use in numerical weather prediction models, *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 19, 1533–1543, <https://doi.org/10.1080/014311698215333>, publisher: Taylor & Francis _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/014311698215333>, 1998.
- Hersbach, H., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Hirahara, S., Horányi, A., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Nicolas, J., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Schepers, D., Sim-
 555 mons, A., Soci, C., Abdalla, S., Abellan, X., Balsamo, G., Bechtold, P., Biavati, G., Bidlot, J., Bonavita, M., De Chiara, G., Dahlgren, P., Dee, D., Diamantakis, M., Dragani, R., Flemming, J., Forbes, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A., Haimberger, L., Healy, S., Hogan, R. J., Hólm, E., Janisková, M., Keeley, S., Laloyaux, P., Lopez, P., Lupu, C., Radnoti, G., de Rosnay, P., Rozum, I., Vamborg, F., Vil-
 laume, S., and Thépaut, J.-N.: The ERA5 global reanalysis, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 146, 1999–2049, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803>, _eprint: <https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/qj.3803>, 2020.
- 560 Jalilvand, E., Tajrishy, M., Ghazi Zadeh Hashemi, S. A., and Brocca, L.: Quantification of irrigation water using remote sensing of soil moisture in a semi-arid region, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 231, 111 226, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2019.111226>, 2019.
- Jalilvand, E., Kumar, S. V., Truong, C., Haacker, E., and Mahanama, S.: Characterization of irrigation timing using thermal satellite obser-
 vations, a data-driven approach, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 333, 115 153, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2025.115153>, 2026.
- Jung, M., Koirala, S., Weber, U., Ichii, K., Gans, F., Camps-Valls, G., Papale, D., Schwalm, C., Tramontana, G., and Reichstein, M.: The
 565 FLUXCOM ensemble of global land-atmosphere energy fluxes, *Scientific Data*, 6, 74, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-019-0076-8>, pub-
 lisher: Nature Publishing Group, 2019.
- Kerr, Y. H., Al-Yaari, A., Rodriguez-Fernandez, N., Parrens, M., Molero, B., Leroux, D., Bircher, S., Mahmoodi, A., Mialon, A., Richaume,
 P., Delwart, S., Al Bitar, A., Pellarin, T., Bindlish, R., Jackson, T. J., Rüdiger, C., Waldteufel, P., Mecklenburg, S., and Wigneron, J. P.:
 Overview of SMOS performance in terms of global soil moisture monitoring after six years in operation, *Remote Sensing of Environment*,
 570 180, 40–63, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.02.042>, 2016.
- Kragh, S. J., Fensholt, R., Stisen, S., and Koch, J.: The precision of satellite-based net irrigation quantification in the Indus and Ganges
 basins, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 27, 2463–2478, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-27-2463-2023>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH,
 2023.
- Kumar, S. V., Peters-Lidard, C. D., Tian, Y., Houser, P. R., Geiger, J., Olden, S., Lighty, L., Eastman, J. L., Doty, B., Dirmeyer, P., Adams,
 575 J., Mitchell, K., Wood, E. F., and Sheffield, J.: Land information system: An interoperable framework for high resolution land surface
 modeling, *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 21, 1402–1415, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2005.07.004>, 2006.
- Kumar, S. V., Reichle, R. H., Peters-Lidard, C. D., Koster, R. D., Zhan, X., Crow, W. T., Eylander, J. B., and Houser, P. R.: A land surface data
 assimilation framework using the land information system: Description and applications, *Advances in Water Resources*, 31, 1419–1432,
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2008.01.013>, 2008.



- 580 Laluet, P., Olivera-Guerra, L. E., Altés, V., Paolini, G., Ouadi, N., Rivalland, V., Jarlan, L., Villar, J. M., and Merlin, O.: Retrieving the irrigation actually applied at district scale: Assimilating high-resolution Sentinel-1-derived soil moisture data into a FAO-56-based model, *Agricultural Water Management*, 293, 108 704, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2024.108704>, 2024.
- Laluet, P., Corbari, C., Baez-Villanueva, O., Walther, S., Zhang, Y., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Senay, G. B., Albergel, C., and Dorigo, W.: Assessing the suitability of global evapotranspiration products over irrigated areas, *EGUsphere*, pp. 1–29, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5716>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2025a.
- 585 Laluet, P., Dari, J., Busschaert, L., Heyvaert, Z., Brocca, L., Massari, C., Modanesi, S., Dorigo, W., Langhans, P., De Lannoy, G., Bechtold, M., Saltalippi, C., Morbidelli, R., Rulli, M. C., Chiarelli, D. D., and Galli, N.: Regional datasets of long-term and coarse resolution irrigation estimates from space [dataset], <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14988197>, 2025b.
- Lawston, P. M., Santanello Jr, J. A., and Kumar, S. V.: Irrigation Signals Detected From SMAP Soil Moisture Retrievals, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44, 11,860–11,867, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL075733>, _eprint: <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/2017GL075733>, 2017.
- 590 Lunel, T., Boone, A. A., and Le Moigne, P.: Irrigation strongly influences near-surface conditions and induces breeze circulation: Observational and model-based evidence, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 150, 2798–2819, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.4736>, _eprint: <https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/qj.4736>, 2024.
- 595 Martens, B., Miralles, D. G., Lievens, H., van der Schalie, R., de Jeu, R. A. M., Fernández-Prieto, D., Beck, H. E., Dorigo, W. A., and Verhoest, N. E. C.: GLEAM v3: satellite-based land evaporation and root-zone soil moisture, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10, 1903–1925, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-1903-2017>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2017.
- Massari, C., Modanesi, S., Dari, J., Gruber, A., De Lannoy, G. J. M., Girotto, M., Quintana-Seguí, P., Le Page, M., Jarlan, L., Zribi, M., Ouadi, N., Vreugdenhil, M., Zappa, L., Dorigo, W., Wagner, W., Brombacher, J., Pelgrum, H., Jaquot, P., Freeman, V., Volden, E.,
- 600 Fernández Prieto, D., Tarpanelli, A., Barbetta, S., and Brocca, L.: A Review of Irrigation Information Retrievals from Space and Their Utility for Users, *Remote Sensing*, 13, 4112, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13204112>, publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute, 2021.
- McDermid, S., Nocco, M., Lawston-Parker, P., Keune, J., Pokhrel, Y., Jain, M., Jägermeyr, J., Brocca, L., Massari, C., Jones, A. D., Vahmani, P., Thiery, W., Yao, Y., Bell, A., Chen, L., Dorigo, W., Hanasaki, N., Jasechko, S., Lo, M.-H., Mahmood, R., Mishra, V., Mueller, N. D.,
- 605 Niyogi, D., Rabin, S. S., Sloat, L., Wada, Y., Zappa, L., Chen, F., Cook, B. I., Kim, H., Lombardozzi, D., Polcher, J., Ryu, D., Santanello, J., Satoh, Y., Seneviratne, S., Singh, D., and Yokohata, T.: Irrigation in the Earth system, *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 4, 435–453, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-023-00438-5>, publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 2023.
- Mehta, P., Siebert, S., Kummu, M., Deng, Q., Ali, T., Marston, L., Xie, W., and Davis, K. F.: Half of twenty-first century global irrigation expansion has been in water-stressed regions, *Nature Water*, 2, 254–261, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44221-024-00206-9>, 2024.
- 610 Modanesi, S., Massari, C., Bechtold, M., Lievens, H., Tarpanelli, A., Brocca, L., Zappa, L., and De Lannoy, G. J. M.: Challenges and benefits of quantifying irrigation through the assimilation of Sentinel-1 backscatter observations into Noah-MP, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 26, 4685–4706, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-26-4685-2022>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2022.
- Modanesi, S., Busschaert, L., Lannoy, G. D., Santis, D. D., Natali, M., Dari, J., Quintana-Seguí, P., Castelli, M., Grasso, F. M., and Massari, C.: Accounting for scaling effects on irrigation optimization within a land surface model using satellite observations: impacts on water
- 615 and carbon cycle dynamics, *ESS Open Archive*, <https://doi.org/10.22541/essoar.174721778.84342159/v1>, 2025.
- Muñoz-Sabater, J., Dutra, E., Agustí-Panareda, A., Albergel, C., Arduini, G., Balsamo, G., Boussetta, S., Choulga, M., Harrigan, S., Hersbach, H., Martens, B., Miralles, D. G., Piles, M., Rodríguez-Fernández, N. J., Zsoter, E., Buontempo, C., and Thépaut, J.-N.: ERA5-Land:



- a state-of-the-art global reanalysis dataset for land applications, *Earth System Science Data*, 13, 4349–4383, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-4349-2021>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2021.
- 620 Niu, G.-Y., Yang, Z.-L., Mitchell, K. E., Chen, F., Ek, M. B., Barlage, M., Kumar, A., Manning, K., Niyogi, D., Rosero, E., Tewari, M., and Xia, Y.: The community Noah land surface model with multiparameterization options (Noah-MP): 1. Model description and evaluation with local-scale measurements, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 116, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JD015139>, _eprint: <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2010JD015139>, 2011.
- 625 Olivera-Guerra, L.-E., Laluet, P., Altés, V., Ollivier, C., Pageot, Y., Paolini, G., Chavanon, E., Rivalland, V., Boulet, G., Villar, J.-M., and Merlin, O.: Modeling actual water use under different irrigation regimes at district scale: Application to the FAO-56 dual crop coefficient method, *Agricultural Water Management*, 278, 108 119, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2022.108119>, 2023.
- Ozdogan, M., Rodell, M., Beaudoin, H. K., and Toll, D. L.: Simulating the Effects of Irrigation over the United States in a Land Surface Model Based on Satellite-Derived Agricultural Data, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 11, 171–184, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JHM1116.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Journal of Hydrometeorology, 2010.
- 630 Paolini, G., Escorihuela, M. J., Merlin, O., Laluet, P., Bellvert, J., and Pellarin, T.: Estimating multi-scale irrigation amounts using multi-resolution soil moisture data: A data-driven approach using PrISM, *Agricultural Water Management*, 290, 108 594, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2023.108594>, 2023.
- Puy, A., Borgonovo, E., Lo Piano, S., Levin, S. A., and Saltelli, A.: Irrigated areas drive irrigation water withdrawals, *Nature Communications*, 12, 4525, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-24508-8>, publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 2021.
- 635 Puy, A., Lankford, B., Meier, J., van der Kooij, S., and Saltelli, A.: Large variations in global irrigation withdrawals caused by uncertain irrigation efficiencies, *Environmental Research Letters*, 17, 044 014, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac5768>, publisher: IOP Publishing, 2022.
- Puy, A., Linga, S. N., Wei, N., Flinders, S., Callow, B., Allen, G., Cross, B., Aguiló-Rivera, C., and Lankford, B.: Widely cited global irrigation statistics lack empirical support, *PNAS Nexus*, 4, pgaf323, <https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgaf323>, open Access, Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), 2025.
- 640 Scanlon, B. R., Faunt, C. C., Longuevergne, L., Reedy, R. C., Alley, W. M., McGuire, V. L., and McMahon, P. B.: Groundwater depletion and sustainability of irrigation in the U.S. High Plains and Central Valley, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109, 9320–9325, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1200311109>, 2012.
- Senay, G.: Satellite Psychrometric Formulation of the Operational Simplified Surface Energy Balance (SSEBop) Model for Quantifying and Mapping Evapotranspiration, *Applied Engineering in Agriculture*, 34, 555–566, <https://doi.org/10.13031/aea.12614>, 2018.
- 645 Seneviratne, S. I. and Hauser, M.: Regional Climate Sensitivity of Climate Extremes in CMIP6 Versus CMIP5 Multimodel Ensembles, *Earth's Future*, 8, e2019EF001 474, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EF001474>, _eprint: <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2019EF001474>, 2020.
- Siebert, S., Henrich, V., Frenken, K., and Burke, J.: Update of the digital global map of irrigation areas to version 5., <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.2660.6728>, 2013.
- 650 Teluguntla, P., Thenkabail, P., Oliphant, A., Gumma, M., Aneece, I., Foley, D., and McCormick, R.: Landsat-derived Global Rainfed and Irrigated-Cropland Product @ 30-m (LGRIP30) of the World (GFSADLGRIP30WORLD), The Land Processes Distributed Active Archive Center (LP DAAC) of NASA and USGS, <https://doi.org/10.5067/Community/LGRIP/LGRIP30.001>, iP-148728, 2023.



- Thiery, W., Davin, E. L., Lawrence, D. M., Hirsch, A. L., Hauser, M., and Seneviratne, S. I.: Present-day irrigation mitigates
 655 heat extremes, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122, 1403–1422, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD025740>, _eprint:
<https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/2016JD025740>, 2017.
- Thiery, W., Visser, A. J., Fischer, E. M., Hauser, M., Hirsch, A. L., Lawrence, D. M., Lejeune, Q., Davin, E. L., and Seneviratne, S. I.:
 Warming of hot extremes alleviated by expanding irrigation, *Nature Communications*, 11, 290, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-14075-4>, 2020.
- 660 USDA NASS: 2018 Irrigation and Water Management Survey, Tech. rep., U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics
 Service, https://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/AgCensus/2017/Online_Resources/Farm_and_Ranch_Irrigation_Survey/, 2019.
- Wada, Y., Wisser, D., and Bierkens, M. F. P.: Global modeling of withdrawal, allocation and consumptive use of surface water and ground-
 water resources, *Earth System Dynamics*, 5, 15–40, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-5-15-2014>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2014.
- Wagner, W., Hahn, S., Kidd, R., Melzer, T., Bartalis, Z., Hasenauer, S., Figa-Saldaña, J., de Rosnay, P., Jann, A., Schneider, S., Komma,
 665 J., Kubu, G., Brugger, K., Aubrecht, C., Züger, J., Gangkofner, U., Kienberger, S., Brocca, L., Wang, Y., Blöschl, G., Eitzinger, J., and
 Steinnocher, K.: The ASCAT Soil Moisture Product: A Review of its Specifications, Validation Results, and Emerging Applications, *Me-
 teorologische Zeitschrift*, pp. 5–33, <https://doi.org/10.1127/0941-2948/2013/0399>, publisher: Schweizerbart'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung,
 2013.
- Zappa, L., Schlaffer, S., Bauer-Marschallinger, B., Nendel, C., Zimmerman, B., and Dorigo, W.: Detection and Quantification of Irriga-
 670 tion Water Amounts at 500 m Using Sentinel-1 Surface Soil Moisture, *Remote Sensing*, 13, 1727, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13091727>,
 publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute, 2021.
- Zappa, L., Schlaffer, S., Brocca, L., Vreugdenhil, M., Nendel, C., and Dorigo, W.: How accurately can we retrieve irrigation timing and
 water amounts from (satellite) soil moisture?, *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, 113, 102979,
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2022.102979>, 2022.
- 675 Zappa, L., Dari, J., Modanesi, S., Quast, R., Brocca, L., De Lannoy, G., Massari, C., Quintana-Seguí, P., Barella-Ortiz, A., and Dorigo, W.:
 Benefits and pitfalls of irrigation timing and water amounts derived from satellite soil moisture, *Agricultural Water Management*, 295,
 108773, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2024.108773>, 2024.
- Zaussinger, F., Dorigo, W., Gruber, A., Tarpanelli, A., Filippucci, P., and Brocca, L.: Estimating irrigation water use over the con-
 tiguous United States by combining satellite and reanalysis soil moisture data, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 23, 897–923,
 680 <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-23-897-2019>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2019.
- Zhang, C. and Long, D.: Estimating Spatially Explicit Irrigation Water Use Based on Remotely Sensed Evapotranspiration and Mod-
 eled Root Zone Soil Moisture, *Water Resources Research*, 57, e2021WR031382, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021WR031382>, _eprint:
<https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2021WR031382>, 2021.
- Zipper, S., Kastens, J., Foster, T., Wilson, B. B., Melton, F., Grinstead, A., Deines, J. M., Butler, J. J., and Marston, L. T.: Estimating irrigation
 685 water use from remotely sensed evapotranspiration data: Accuracy and uncertainties at field, water right, and regional scales, *Agricultural
 Water Management*, 303, 109036, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2024.109036>, 2024.
- Zohaib, M. and Choi, M.: Satellite-based global-scale irrigation water use and its contemporary trends, *Science of The Total Environment*,
 714, 136719, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.136719>, 2020.