# Retrieval of Atmospheric and Surface Parameters From AIRS/AMSU/HSB Data in the Presence of Clouds

Joel Susskind, Christopher D. Barnet, and John M. Blaisdell

Abstract-New state-of-the-art methodology is described to analyze the Atmospheric Infrared Sounder/Advanced Microwave Sounding Unit/Humidity Sounder for Brazil (AIRS/AMSU/HSB) data in the presence of multiple cloud formations. The methodology forms the basis for the AIRS Science Team algorithm, which will be used to analyze AIRS/AMSU/HSB data on the Earth Observing System Aqua platform. The cloud-clearing methodology requires no knowledge of the spectral properties of the clouds. The basic retrieval methodology is general and extracts the maximum information from the radiances, consistent with the channel noise covariance matrix. The retrieval methodology minimizes the dependence of the solution on the first-guess field and the first-guess error characteristics. Results are shown for AIRS Science Team simulation studies with multiple cloud formations. These simulation studies imply that clear column radiances can be reconstructed under partial cloud cover with an accuracy comparable to single spot channel noise in the temperature and water vapor sounding regions; temperature soundings can be produced under partial cloud cover with RMS errors on the order of, or better than, 1 °K in 1-km-thick layers from the surface to 700 mb, 1-km layers from 700-300 mb, 3-km layers from 300-30 mb, and 5-km layers from 30-1 mb; and moisture profiles can be obtained with an accuracy better than 20% absolute errors in 1-km layers from the surface to nearly 200 mb.

*Index Terms*—Infrared measurements, inverse problems, iterative methods, linear approximation, matrices, microwave measurements, moisture measurements, remote sensing, satellites, temperature measurement.

# I. INTRODUCTION

T HE ATMOSPHERIC Infrared Sounder (AIRS) is a high spectral resolution ( $\nu/\Delta\nu \approx 1200$ ) infrared sounder, with 2378 channels covering the spectral domain 650–2675 cm<sup>-1</sup>, which was launched on the Earth Observing System (EOS) Aqua platform on May 4, 2002, accompanied by the Advanced Microwave Sounding Unit A (AMSU-A) and the Humidity Sounder for Brazil (HSB), the HSB being similar to AMSU-B. The AIRS footprint is 13 km at nadir, as is the HSB footprint, with a 3 × 3 array of AIRS and HSB footprints falling into a single AMSU-A footprint. Spectral and radiometric charac-

Manuscript received May 1, 2002; revised October 14, 2002.

J. M. Blaisdell is with the Science Applications International Corporation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771 USA.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TGRS.2002.808236

teristics of the AIRS instrument are given in [18]. The results shown in this paper are based on simulated data. A preliminary assessment of AIRS data shows excellent spectral and radiometric performance. It takes many months to stabilize the AIRS instrument after launch and then to properly characterize the channel spectral response functions in space. Retrievals using actual AIRS data will not be produced operationally until one year after launch.

Susskind et al. [23], described the first version of the methodology used by the AIRS Science team to analyze AIRS/AMSU/HSB data in the presence of clouds to determine surface skin temperature, surface spectral emissivity and bidirectional reflectance, atmospheric temperature-moisture-ozone profile, and the heights and amounts of different layers of clouds in the fields of view (FOVs). Two important characteristics of the basic retrieval methodology are that no assumptions are needed about the spectral properties of the clouds and no assumptions are needed about the intrinsic accuracy of the first guess field used to start the iterative process. This paper describes further theoretical improvements in the retrieval and cloud-clearing methodology incorporated in the current version of the AIRS Science team algorithm, which will be used to analyze AIRS/AMSU/HSB data on the EOS Aqua platform. The following sections will describe the basic methodology used to estimate cloud-cleared AIRS radiances, which are subsequently used to retrieve surface and atmospheric geophysical parameters other than cloud parameters as well as to derive the effects of clouds on the channel noise covariance matrix; describe the inversion methodology, which makes strong use of the channel noise covariance matrix and is applicable to solving for all the geophysical parameters including cloud parameters; and show sample results from AIRS Science Team simulations.

### II. CLOUD-CLEARING METHODOLOGY

Clouds have a significant effect on observed infrared radiances, and can have smaller but non negligible effects on microwave observations as well. Therefore, an accurate treatment of the effects of clouds on the observed AIRS radiances is critical to obtaining accurate soundings. There are three basic approaches for treating cloud effects on the infrared (IR) observations: look for clear spots and therefore avoid the problem; attempt to solve for the radiative effects of clouds directly in the inversion process; and attempt to infer what the radiances in the clear portions of the scene would be, called clear column

J. Susskind is with National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771 USA.

C. D. Barnet is with the Joint Center for Earth Systems Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771 USA.

radiances, from observations in a number of adjacent FOVs. An example of the first approach is given in [6]. Eyre [7], [9] has used the second approach in simulation by assuming an unknown homogeneous amount of black clouds at an unknown pressure, and attempted it with real TOVS data as well [8]. Our approach, like that used in [24], is of the third type and is an extension of that used in [3], [4], and [21]. The advantage of this approach is that it does not have the clear-sky sampling bias of the first approach, nor does it require the ability to accurately model the spectral emissive, reflective, and transmissive properties of the clouds, and their dependence on the vertical microphysics and geometry, as required by the second approach. The key assumption made in the third approach is that while there may be many types of clouds in the different FOVs, the radiative properties of a given type of cloud are identical in all FOVs, which differ only in the relative amounts of these cloud types. Fields of view containing clouds with the same optical properties but at different heights, or clouds at the same height but with different optical properties, can be considered as having multiple cloud types. The other key assumption of this approach is that the FOVs have the same characteristics in the clear portions of their scenes, with unknown temperatures, humidities, etc. that we are trying to solve for. We have used analogous assumptions in analyzing 23 years of TOVS data on board the NOAA operational satellites [24] and shown that retrieval accuracy does not degrade appreciably with increasing cloud cover [2]. Analogous assumptions are made by NOAA/NESDIS in production of their clear column radiances used in generation of operational HIRS2/MSU retrievals [17].

Using these assumptions, Chahine [4] has shown that in the case of K - 1 cloud formations, observations in K FOVs are needed to obtain channel *i* clear column radiances  $\hat{R}_i$  according to

$$\hat{R}_{i} = R_{i,1} + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \eta_{k} \left( R_{i,1} - R_{i,K+1-k} \right)$$
(1)

where  $R_{i,k}$  is the channel *i* observation in FOV *k*. We have found it is advantageous (as suggested by L. McMillin) to extrapolate the radiances in the *K* FOVs according to a similar equation of the form

$$\hat{R}_i = R_{i, AVG} + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \eta_k (R_{i, AVG} - R_{i, k})$$
 (2)

where  $R_{i, AVG}$  is the average radiance of all FOVs. Optimal values of  $\eta_k$  will give true values of  $\hat{R}_i$  up to instrumental noise effects.

Cloud formations should be distinguished from cloud types. For example, if three FOVs are considered, and two cloud types exist, with cloud top pressures at 300 mb and 700 mb, and the respective cloud fractions as seen from above are (10%, 20%), (20%, 40%), and (30%, 60%) in each FOV, then only a single cloud formation exists with cloud fractions of 30%, 60%, and 90% in each FOV, respectively. If instead, the third FOV had cloud fractions of 30% and 65%, then 5% of a second cloud formation exists in the third FOV only. The above discussion applies only to cases in which the upper cloud type is opaque,

and a portion of the scene, as observed from above, corresponds to cloud type 1, cloud type 2, or the surface. If the upper cloud type is semitransparent, then a portion of the scene can correspond to cloud type 1 overlaying the surface, cloud type 1 overlaying cloud type 2, cloud type 2, and the surface. In such a case, three cloud formations will exist in general even if the relative amounts of each cloud type are as initially stated above.

The methodology we use to determine  $\eta_k$  is general for handling up to K - 1 cloud formations. The simulations done by the AIRS Science Team, and shown in this paper, used essentially two cloud formations of gray clouds with differing amounts of clouds at two discrete levels in each of the nine AIRS footprints within an AMSU-A footprint. The cloud spectral emissivities and cloud top pressures were allowed to vary slightly between FOVs, however. Surface skin properties also had some variability between FOVs. This allows for multiple degrees of freedom within the 3 × 3 array of AIRS spots in a single AMSU-A footprint.

Susskind et al. [23] used the nine AIRS spots within an AMSU-A footprint to construct three FOVs used to determine two values of  $\eta$  to be used in (1). Field of view 1 was comprised of the average of the observations in the three warmest spots in an 8- $\mu$ m window channel, and FOV 3 was the average of three coldest spots. We now use all radiances in all spots separately and determine nine values of  $\eta$ . Given  $\eta_k$ , clear column radiances for all channels can be obtained from (2). As in [23], we determine the values  $\eta$  and from observations in a selected set of I(=76) cloud-filtering channels that are primarily in between lines in the 15- $\mu$ m CO<sub>2</sub> band and in the 4.2- $\mu$ m CO<sub>2</sub> bandhead region, with some additional channels in the window regions. If, for each channel *i*, one substitutes an estimate of  $R_{i, \text{CLR}}$  for  $R_i$  in (2), this gives I equations for K unknowns. The unconstrained weighted least square solution to this multilinear problem is given by

$$\eta_{K\times 1} = \left[\Delta R' N^{-1} \Delta R\right]_{K\times K}^{-1} \Delta R' N^{-1} \Delta R_{\text{CLR}}$$
(3)

where  $\Delta R$  is a  $I \times K$  matrix with  $\Delta R_{i,k} = R_{AVG} - R_{i,k}$ ;  $\Delta R_{CLR}$  is an  $I \times 1$  matrix given by  $\Delta R_{i,CLR} = R_{i,CLR} - R_{i,AVG}$ ; and N is an  $I \times I$  channel noise covariance matrix.

The nine radiances  $R_{i,k}$  are observed at three different zenith angles. Having observations at different zenith angles will cause additional contributions to  $\Delta R$  that are not due to differences in cloud cover. To remove these, we adjust all observed channel radiances to what they would have been if taken at the central zenith angle of the  $3 \times 3$  array of AIRS spots according to Goldberg *et al.* [11]. From now on,  $\Delta R$  refers to adjusted observed radiances.

The key to the accurate determination of  $\eta$  is obtaining the best estimates of  $\Delta R_{i, \text{CLR}}$ , along with an accurate treatment of the noise covariance matrix N. As in [23], we assume the noise in channel i used to determine  $\eta$  is dominated by errors in  $\Delta R_{i, \text{CLR}}$ . The values of  $\Delta R_{i, \text{CLR}}$  that we use to determine  $\eta$  (and  $\hat{R}_i$ ) are iterative and are computed based on the current best estimate of all relevant surface and atmospheric properties. For optimal results, it is important for the estimated geophysical parameters to be unbiased over large regions of the atmosphere. For example, if the estimated temperature profile were uniformly too warm, values of  $\Delta R_{i, \text{CLR}}$  would all be too high and incorrect values of  $\eta_k$  would be obtained which would reconstruct too high values of  $\hat{R}_i$ . To avoid this, we make sure that the profile used to estimate  $R_{i, \text{CLR}}$  is consistent with observations in all AMSU-A and HSB channels, thus insuring an unbiased temperature and moisture profile over coarse layers in the atmosphere. It would be a mistake to use an analysis or a forecast field directly to compute  $R_{i, \text{CLR}}$  because this field, while potentially accurate, could be biased in the vertical.

The iterative methodology to determine clear column radiances consists of four passes to determine  $\eta^n$  (n = 1, 2, 3, 4), using four sets of conditions, described later, to estimate  $R_{i, \text{CLR}}^n$ , in which  $R_{i, \text{CLR}}^n$  and hence  $\eta^n$ , become increasingly more accurate for each iteration. Each set of conditions has its own  $N^n$ , reflecting expected errors in  $R_{i, \text{CLR}}^n - R_{i, 1}$ . The diagonal term of the noise covariance matrix is modeled according to

$$N_{ii}^{n} = NE\Delta N_{i}^{2} + \left[\frac{\partial R_{i}}{\partial T_{s}}\delta T_{s}^{n}\right]^{2} + \left[\frac{\partial R_{i}}{\partial \varepsilon_{\nu_{i}}}\delta \varepsilon_{\nu_{i}}^{n}\right]^{2} \\ + \left[\frac{\partial R_{i}}{\partial \rho_{\nu_{i}}}\delta \rho_{\nu_{i}}^{n}\right]^{2} + \left[\frac{\partial R_{i}}{\partial T(P)}\delta T(P)^{n}\right]^{2} \\ + \left[\frac{\partial R_{i}}{\frac{\partial q(P)}{q}}\frac{\delta q(P)^{n}}{q}\right]^{2}$$
(4a)

and the off-diagonal term is given by

$$N_{ij}^{n} = \frac{\partial R_{i}}{\partial T_{s}} \frac{\partial R_{j}}{\partial T_{s}} (\delta T_{s}^{n})^{2} + \frac{\partial R_{i}}{\partial \varepsilon_{\nu_{i}}} \frac{\partial R_{j}}{\partial \varepsilon_{\nu_{j}}} \left(\delta \varepsilon_{\nu_{i}}^{n} \delta \varepsilon_{\nu_{j}}^{n}\right) + \cdots$$
(4b)

where  $NE\Delta N_i$  is the channel *i* instrumental noise and the remaining terms are contributions to errors in the computed value  $R_{i,\text{ CLB}}$  resulting from errors in estimated surface skin temperature, surface spectral emissivity, surface spectral bidirectional reflectance of solar radiation, and temperature and moisture profile, respectively. The partial derivatives are determined empirically by computing the radiance using the current estimate of each parameter and recomputing it after a small change in that parameter. In [23], the uncertainties, such as  $\delta T_s^n$ , are specified so as to be indicative of the expected errors for that parameter in pass n. We now predict these errors on a profile by profile basis for each pass by propagation of expected sources of error through the retrieval process in a manner to be described later. A principal source of retrieval error arises from errors in the reconstructed clear column radiances. These errors propagate into degraded estimates of all the variables shown in (4).

# Selection of Optimal Fields of View

The effects of instrumental noise on the clear column radiances will in general be amplified from single spot noise values because the clear column radiances are expressed as a linear combination of the observations in different FOVs. If there were no other sources of error, the diagonal term of the clear column radiance noise covariance matrix in a given pass in (2) would be

$$\left[\delta \hat{R} \cdot \delta \hat{R}'\right]_{ii} = NE\Delta N_i^2 \cdot A(\eta_k)^2 \tag{5}$$

where  $A(\eta_k)$  is the noise amplification factor, given by

$$A(\eta_k) = \left[\sum_{k=1}^{9} \left(\frac{1}{9} \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{k'=1}^{9} \eta_{k'}\right) - \eta_k\right)^2\right]^{1/2}.$$
 (6)

 $A(\eta_k)$  is approximately equal to  $[\sum \eta_k^2]^{1/2}$  because the first term, containing the factor 1/9, is small. It is desirable to find an accurate expression for clear column radiance that minimizes  $A(\eta_k)$ . We can minimize  $A(\eta_k)$  by expressing (2) in terms of radiances in an optimal set of FOVs, given by linear combinations of the original set. The optimal  $A(\eta_k)$  can be found by transforming the original contrast fields, to a new set  $\Delta R_k^T$  according to

$$\Delta R_{i,k}^T \equiv \sum_{k'} U_{k,k'} \cdot \Delta R_{i,k'} \tag{7}$$

where U is the unitary transformation that diagonalizes  $\Delta R' \cdot N^{-1} \cdot \Delta R$ 

$$\left[U' \cdot \left(\Delta R' \cdot N^{-1} \cdot \Delta R\right) \cdot U\right]_{k,k'} = \lambda_k \cdot \delta_{k,k'}.$$
 (8)

This is equivalent to having selected

$$R_{k}^{T} = R_{\text{AVG}} - \sum_{k'} U_{k, \, k'} \left( R_{\text{AVG}} - R_{k'} \right).$$
(9)

One eigenvalue  $\lambda_k$  is always zero because only eight linearly independent values of  $\Delta R_{i,k}$  exist. In transformed space

$$\hat{R}_i = R_{i, \text{AVG}} + \sum_{k=1}^{K_{\text{max}}} \zeta_k \cdot \Delta R_{i, k}^T$$
(10)

and the solution for  $\zeta_k$  is given by

$$\zeta_k = \lambda_k^{-1} \cdot \left( \Delta R^{T'} \cdot N^{-1} \cdot \Delta R_{\rm CLR} \right) \tag{11}$$

where  $\Delta R_{i,k}^{T'}$  is the transpose of  $\Delta R_{i,k}^{T}$ .

It is apparent that large eigenvalues  $\lambda_k$  imply low values of  $\zeta_k$ while small eigenvalues imply large (and undesirable) values of  $\zeta_k$ . The eigenvalues themselves indicate the degrees of freedom in the radiances in the different FOVs corresponding to the different number of cloud formations. Typical cloud formation eigenvalues are the order of 1000. We discard all eigenvalues less than 25 and set  $K_{\text{max}}$  accordingly, with the constraint that  $K_{\text{max}}$  is never greater than four. We also do not include any eigenfunction whose eigenvalue is less than the uncertainty in  $\zeta_k$ , given later in (13). Discarding low eigenvalues reduces the noise amplification factor by suppressing noise in the solution of  $\eta_k = \sum_{k'=1}^{K_{\text{max}}} U_{k,k'} \cdot \zeta_{k'}$ , resulting in lower values of  $\eta$ .

Under certain pathological conditions, one or more cloud formations may not result in significant eigenvalues of  $\Delta R' N^{-1} \Delta R$  and cannot be solved for, resulting in a poor solution. The most obvious example of this is a single cloud formation with a constant cloud fraction in each FOV. Here,  $\Delta R$  is comprised of noise only. The most common examples of this are all FOVs are clear, which is a benign case, or all FOVs are overcast, which is a case which must be otherwise identified and rejected. Likewise, with two cloud formations, if the lower cloud deck is overcast, a proper reconstruction of the clear column radiances cannot be obtained. In this case, if the cloud fraction of the upper cloud in FOV k is  $\alpha_{1k}$ , then the lower cloud fraction as seen from above,  $\alpha_{2k}$ , is  $1 - \alpha_{1k}$ . In general, if  $\alpha_{2k} = A + B\alpha_{1k}$  for all k, then cloud formation 2 will have a zero eigenvalue of  $\Delta R' N^{-1} \Delta R$  up to noise effects. The benign case occurs when A = 0, corresponding to a truly single cloud formation.

# Contribution of Clouds to the Retrieval Channel Noise Covariance Matrix M

The basic retrieval methodology described in the next section requires a channel noise covariance matrix M representing channel correlated errors in the terms  $(\hat{R}_i - R_i^m)$  and  $(\hat{R}_j - R_j^m)$ where  $R_i^m$  is the radiance computed for channel i based on the mth iterative solution. The channel noise covariance matrix is the sum of two parts, resulting from noise in the reconstructed clear column radiances  $\delta \hat{R}_i$  with noise covariance  $\hat{M}$ , and noise in the computed radiances  $\delta R_i^m$  due to uncertainty in the parameters assumed known, with noise covariance  $\hat{M}$ .

 $M_{ij} = [\delta R \delta R']_{ij}$  is the expected noise covariance matrix for the channel clear column radiances. The noise in  $\hat{R}_i$  obtained from (2) has two parts, arising from instrumental noise  $NE\Delta N_i$ , and from cloud-clearing errors coming from errors in  $\zeta_k$ . Errors in  $\zeta_k$  will cause channel correlated clear column radiance errors. Clear column radiances for those channels affected by clouds will have this additional error due to errors in  $\zeta$ . For the AIRS instrument, the channel noise is spectrally uncorrelated, giving the final result

$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta \hat{R} \delta \hat{R}' \end{bmatrix}_{ii} = NE\Delta N_i^2 A(\eta_k)^2 + \begin{bmatrix} \Delta R^T \delta \zeta \, \delta \zeta' \Delta R^{T'} \end{bmatrix}_{ii}$$
(12a)

and

$$\left[\delta\hat{R}\delta\hat{R}'\right]_{ij} = \left[\Delta R^T \delta\zeta\,\delta\zeta'\Delta R^{T'}\right]_{ij} \tag{12b}$$

where  $\delta \zeta \, \delta \zeta'$  is the error covariance of  $\zeta$ . If *N*, as defined in (4), is indeed representative of the noise in the determination of  $\eta$ , then it can be shown [see (38)] that

$$\left[\delta\zeta\,\delta\zeta'\right]_{kk'} = \left[\Delta R^{T'}N^{-1}\Delta R^{T}\right]^{-1} = \lambda_k^{-1}\delta_{kk'}.\tag{13}$$

In the special case for which we determine that channel *i* does not "see" the clouds (i.e., stratospheric sounding channels or tropospheric sounding channels peaking significantly above the highest cloud top), the clear column radiance is best described as the average radiance in all FOVs. For these channels, the scene appears to be clear and we can define effective values of  $\eta^{\text{CLR}}$ for "clear" channels as  $\eta_k^{\text{CLR}} = 0$  for all *k*. For these channels [see (6)]

$$A\left(\eta_k^{\text{CLR}}\right) = \frac{1}{3} \tag{14}$$

which is a noise reducer. For "clear" channel i, one can write

$$\hat{M}_{ij} = \frac{1}{9} N E \Delta N_i^2 \,\delta_{ij} \tag{15}$$

where j is any other channel and  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Kronecker delta function.

For a channel to be determined not to see clouds, it must be included in a list showing a 95% probability of not seeing a cloud, which is precomputed as a function of cloud top pressure and zenith angle. In addition, the standard deviation of the radiances in the  $3 \times 3$  array of AIRS spots must be less than twice the channel noise.

For channels which see clouds, the clear column noise covariance can now be expressed as

$$\hat{M}_{ij} = NE\Delta N_i NE\Delta N_j A(\eta_k)^2 \delta_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^{K_{\text{max}}} \left( \Delta R_{ik}^T \Delta R_{jk}^T \lambda_k^{-1} \right).$$
(16)

Errors in clear column radiances can be larger than predicted by (16), however, because  $\lambda_k^{-1}$  is just an estimate of  $(\delta \zeta \, \delta \zeta')_{kk'}$ . Moreover, (16) does not take into account contributions to the noise covariance matrix arising from higher components of  $\zeta$  not solved for  $(k > K_{\text{max}})$  as well as fitting errors due to a poor first guess. Another estimate of the error in the  $\zeta$  parameters can be computed using weighted radiance residuals in the channels used in the cloud-clearing retrieval  $R_{i, \text{CLR}} - \hat{R}_i$ . If we take  $R_{i, \text{CLR}} - \hat{R}_i$  as the uncertainty of  $\Delta R_{i, \text{CLR}}$ , then using (11), we estimate the uncertainty in  $\zeta_k$  according to

$$\left[\delta\hat{\zeta}\,\delta\hat{\zeta}'\right]_{kk} = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_k}\right)^2 \sum_i \left(\Delta R_{k,\,i}^T \,N_{ii}^{-1}\right)^2 \left(R_{i,\,\text{CLR}} - \hat{R}_i\right)^2 \tag{17}$$

which we evaluate for all significant functions k with  $\lambda_k > 10^{-3}$ . This includes eigenfunctions with  $\lambda_k < 25$  and therefore not included in the solution for  $\hat{R}_i$ . For values of  $k \leq K_{\text{max}}$ , we take

$$\left[\delta\zeta\,\delta\zeta'\right]_{kk} = \mathrm{MAX}\left[\lambda_k^{-1}, \left[\delta\hat{\zeta}\,\delta\hat{\zeta}'\right]_{kk}\right] \tag{18}$$

and for values of k between  $K_{\rm max}$  and  $K_{\rm sig}$  (significant eigenvalues  $\lambda_k>10^{-3}$ ) we set

$$\left[\delta\zeta\,\delta\zeta'\right]_{kk} = \left[\delta\hat{\zeta}\,\delta\hat{\zeta}'\right]_{kk} \tag{19}$$

and write

$$\hat{M}_{ij} = NE\Delta N_i NE\Delta N_j A(\eta_k)^2 \delta_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^{K_{sig}} \Delta R_{ik}^T \Delta R_{jk}^T [\delta \zeta \, \delta \zeta']_{kk} \,. \tag{20}$$

One can think of (20) in terms of a different effective noise amplification factor  $A_{i, \text{eff}}$  for each channel i

$$\hat{M}_{ii} = NE\Delta N_i^2 A_{i,\,\text{eff}}^2 \tag{21}$$

where

$$A_{i, \text{eff}} = \left[ A(\eta_k)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{k_{\text{sig}}} \frac{\Delta R_{i,k}^{T^2} \left[ \delta \zeta \delta \zeta' \right]_{kk}}{NE \Delta N_i^2} \right]^{1/2}.$$
 (22)

The channel effective noise amplification factor is largest for channels which see the surface and have potentially large values of the scene contrast  $\Delta R_{i,k}$ . We find it convenient to define an effective noise amplification factor relevant to the surface channel retrieval step as the RMS value of  $A_{i, \text{eff}}$  over all NSURF IR channels used in the surface retrieval step

$$A_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{\text{NSURF}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{\text{NSURF}} A_{i, \text{eff}^2} \right]^{1/2}.$$
 (23)

Very large values of  $A_{\text{eff}}$  can arise when  $\delta\zeta\delta\zeta'$  is large ( $A_{\text{eff}}$  is sometimes 100 or more) and indicate a large uncertainty in the determination of the clear column radiances. These large uncertainties are sometimes caused by hidden, or nearly hidden cloud formations, and often correlate with poor solutions.

#### III. BASIC RETRIEVAL METHODOLOGY

The basic retrieval methodology is the same as that of [23] and is reviewed below. After a startup procedure to determine the clear column radiances, we use AIRS/AMSU/HSB data to retrieve the following:

- a) surface skin temperature, surface spectral emissivity, and surface bidirectional reflectance of solar radiation;
- b) atmospheric temperature profile;
- c) atmospheric moisture profile;
- d) atmospheric ozone profile;
- e) cloud properties.

These steps are done sequentially, solving only for the variables to be determined in each step and using previously determined variables as fixed but with an appropriate uncertainty attached to them which is accounted for in the channel noise covariance matrix M. The objective in each step is to find solutions which best match the observations for a select set of channels, bearing in mind the channel noise estimates. The "observations" in Steps a)-d) are the clear column radiances as determined from (10) and (11), with values of  $\zeta^{\text{CLR}}$  used for appropriate channels. The cloud parameters determined from Step e) are found so as to be most consistent with the actual observed radiances and the clear-sky geophysical parameters determined from Steps a)-d). Steps a)-d) are ordered so as to allow for selection of channels in each step which are primarily sensitive to variables to be determined in that step or determined in a previous step, and relatively insensitive to other parameters. Separation of the problem in this manner also allows for the problem in each step to be made as linear as possible. Steps a)-e) are all solved for in a completely analogous manner, linearizing the problem about initial guess parameters and iterating the solution until convergence is reached. In general, these linear equations are ill conditioned and require some form of stabilization, which is commonly based on an estimate of the accuracy of the a priori information obtained in the first guess or background field [19], [12]. The methodology we have developed, described in the next section, relies exclusively on the signal to noise of the observations to indicate the degree to which the information contained in the radiances should be believed, and does not involve use of an estimate of the accuracy of the background field.

### Iterative Least Squares Solution to the Nonlinear Problem

The solution to each of the five steps described above is done in the form

$$X^{m} = X^{m-1} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} F_{\ell} \Delta A_{\ell}^{m} = X^{0} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} F_{\ell} A_{\ell}^{m}$$
(24)

where  $X^m$  is the  $m {\rm th}$  iterative state,  $F_\ell$  is a set of L functions, and

$$A_{\ell}^m = A_{\ell}^{m-1} + \Delta A_{\ell}^m. \tag{25}$$

 $\Delta A_{\ell}^{m}$  is determined each iteration so as to minimize the residuals  $\Delta \Theta^{m}$ , weighted inversely with respect to expected noise levels, for the channels used to determine  $A_{\ell}$ . The residual for channel I is defined as

$$\Delta \Theta_i^m = \left(\hat{R}_i - R_i^m\right) \left(\frac{dB_i}{dT}\right)_{\Theta_i^m}^{-1} \tag{26}$$

where  $\hat{R}_i$  is the reconstructed clear column radiance,  $R_i^m$  is the radiance computed from the *m*th iterative parameters, and  $\Theta_i^m$  is the brightness temperature corresponding to  $R_i^m$ . The *m*th iterative residual for channel *i* is attributed to errors in the coefficients  $\delta A^m$  and to the noise effects

$$\Delta \Theta_i^m = \sum_{\ell} S_{i\ell} \,\delta A_{\ell}^m + \tilde{\Theta}_i \tag{27}$$

where  $S_{i\ell}$  is an element of the sensitivity matrix, or Jacobian, given by

$$S_{i\ell}^{m} = \frac{\partial R_{i}^{m}}{\partial A_{\ell}} \left(\frac{dB_{i}}{dT}\right)_{\Theta_{i}^{m}}^{-1}$$
(28)

and the noise factor  $\tilde{\Theta}_i$  for a given case has two parts: errors in observed clear column radiance  $\delta \hat{\Theta}_i$  that are affected by instrumental noise and cloud-clearing errors, and computational noise  $\delta \Theta_i^c$ .

In the simulations done thus far, we have assumed perfect knowledge of physics, i.e., if we know all of the variables exactly, we can compute exact noise-free radiances. Nevertheless, the transmittances depend on the variables to be solved for. Therefore, computational noise exists. Computational noise, arising from errors such as a low (high) estimate of atmospheric water vapor, will produce noise that is spectrally correlated. Instrumental noise is spectrally uncorrelated but cloud-cleared radiance errors are correlated. Each retrieval step in pass n uses an appropriate noise covariance matrix

$$M_{ij} = \left(\hat{M}_{ij}^n + \tilde{M}_{ij}\right) \left(\frac{dB_i}{dT}\right)_{\Theta_i}^{-1} \left(\frac{dB_j}{dT}\right)_{\Theta_j}^{-1}$$
(29)

where  $\hat{M}$  was defined in (20).

The matrix M in (29) represents channel correlated uncertainties in the computed radiances  $R_i^m$  and  $R_j^m$  based primarily on uncertainties in the parameters being held fixed in a given retrieval step. For example, when we are solving for temperature profile, we are holding fixed surface parameters, moisture profile, and ozone profile. We currently write

$$\tilde{M}_{ii} = 0.1^2 \left(\frac{\partial B_i}{\partial T}\right)_{\Theta_i}^2 + \left(\frac{\partial R_i}{\partial T_s} \delta T_s\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial R_i}{\partial \varepsilon_{\nu_i}} \delta \varepsilon_{\nu_i}\right)^2 \\ + \left(\frac{\partial R_i}{\partial \rho_{\nu_i}} \delta \rho_{\nu_i}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial R_i}{\frac{\partial q(P)}{q}} \frac{\delta q(P)}{q}\right)^2 \\ + \left(\frac{\partial R_i}{\frac{\partial O_3(P)}{O_3}} \frac{\delta O_3(P)}{O_3}\right)^2$$
(30a)

and

$$\tilde{M}_{ij} = \left[ \left( \frac{\partial R_i}{\partial T_s} \right) \left( \frac{\partial R_j}{\partial T_s} \right) \delta T_s^2 + \cdots \right].$$
(30b)

The terms in (30a) and (30b) do not depend to first order on the variables being solved for or the iterative state m. The term  $0.1^2$  included in (30a) is taken to represent additional uncertainties in computed brightness temperatures based on the imperfect knowledge of the variables being solved for, as well as potential spectroscopic errors. The methodology used to predict and propagate errors such as  $\delta T_s$  for use in the computation of  $\tilde{M}$ will be discussed later. These terms are analogous to the terms in (4), but uncertainty in  $O_3$  profile was not included in (4) as it did not prove to have a significant effect on the solution and the calculation is computationally expensive. In analyzing real data, we modify computed radiances to account for errors in the physics in a manner to be described elsewhere. Additional terms in the channel noise covariance matrix can account for residual uncertainties in the computed radiances.

# Application of a Constraint H

The standard constrained solution [12] to this problem is given by

$$\Delta A^{m} = \left[ S^{m'} M^{-1} S^{m} + H^{m} \right]^{-1} S^{m'} M^{-1} \Delta \Theta^{m}$$
$$= D^{m} \Delta \Theta^{m}$$
(31)

where  $H^m$  is a stabilization matrix. Without stabilization,  $S\Delta A$ would minimize the weighted residuals  $\Delta \Theta' M^{-1} \Delta \Theta$ , but the matrix elements of D might be large. This is undesirable as it amplifies errors in  $\Delta \Theta^m$  in determining  $\Delta A^m$ . The key to optimization of the solution lies in accurate treatment of the terms  $\Delta\Theta$ , S and M; a judicious choice of the functions F and channels i; and optimal treatment of the constraint matrix H. Hanel et al. [12] and Rodgers [19] have reviewed several methods of constraining the ill-conditioned inverse problem. In the minimum variance approach [19], H is taken to be the inverse of the a priori error covariance. If the statistics of both the measurement and *a priori* are Gaussian, the maximum likelihood solution is obtained. If the *a priori* covariance is taken to be  $H = \gamma I$ , the maximum entropy solution is obtained. Other forms of H include the first or second derivative formulations [25] that force a smoothness constraint on the solution. The solution can also be constrained by the relaxation method [5] and by the Backus and Gilbert [1] method.

The minimum variance and maximum likelihood solutions are often considered to be "optimal." However, if the *a priori*  error covariance is not known or estimated incorrectly, the solution will be suboptimal. If the *a priori* errors are underestimated, the solution could be overconstrained. This could potentially create biases in the retrievals. The biases may mask small trends in the retrieved data that one may be trying to extract. The approach described here attempts to keep the effects of instrument noise at a tolerable level without assumptions regarding the *a priori* data error covariance.

Our objective is to determine a constraint matrix that affects only the pieces of information not well determined by the radiances. This involves use of an optimal set of functions G, related to F by a unitary transformation

$$G = FU \tag{32}$$

in terms of which we could write

$$X^{m} = X^{m-1} + G\Delta B^{m} = X^{m-1} + FU\Delta B^{m}$$
$$= X^{m-1} + F\Delta A^{m}.$$
 (33)

In terms of the functions G, (31) becomes

$$\Delta B^{m} = U' \Delta A^{m} = \left( U^{m'} S^{m'} M^{-1} S^{m} U^{m} + H^{m} \right)^{-1} \cdot U^{m'} S^{m'} M^{-1} \left( \Delta \Theta^{m} - \delta \Theta^{m-1} \right).$$
(34)

A new term  $\delta \Theta^{m-1}$  has been included in (34) which is a background correction term that is zero in the first iteration and will be discussed in detail later. The optimal transformation matrix  $U^m$  is chosen so that  $U^{m'}S^{m'}M^{-1}S^mU^m$  is diagonal with eigenvalues  $\lambda_{\ell}$ . The inverse of each eigenvalue is the variance of eigenmode  $G_{\ell}$ . The unconstrained solution, with both  $H_{ij} = 0$ and with no background correction ( $\delta \Theta^n = 0$ ), is given by

$$\Delta B_{\ell}^{m}(0) = (\lambda_{\ell}^{m})^{-1} \left( U^{m'} S^{m'} M^{-1} \right)_{\ell} \Delta \Theta^{m}$$
$$= (\lambda_{\ell}^{m})^{-1} d_{\ell}^{m} \Delta \Theta^{m}$$
(35)

where  $d_{\ell}^m$  is the  $\ell$ th row of  $U^{m'}S^{m'}M^{-1}$ . Low values of  $\lambda_{\ell}$ , indicating ill-conditioned variables  $G_{\ell}$ , would lead to large coefficients of  $\Delta\Theta^n$  in the determination of  $\Delta B_{\ell}^m$  if the solution for the coefficients of these functions were unconstrained. We therefore only constrain the solution of those functions  $G_{\ell}$  with low eigenvalues and set  $H_{\ell\ell'}^m = \Delta \lambda_{\ell}^m \delta_{\ell\ell'}$ . The constrained solution is now given by

$$\Delta B_{\ell}^{m}\left(\Delta\lambda_{\ell}^{m}\right) = \frac{\lambda_{\ell}^{m}}{\lambda_{\ell}^{m} + \Delta\lambda_{\ell}^{m}} \,\Delta B_{\ell}^{m}(0) = \Phi_{\ell}^{m} \,\Delta B_{\ell}^{m}(0) \tag{36}$$

where  $\Phi$  is a damping factor equal to unity if no constraint is applied and zero if  $\Delta \lambda_{\ell}$  is infinite. If  $\Phi_{\ell} = 1$ , all the information about  $G_{\ell}$  obtained from the radiances is believed. Otherwise only  $\Phi_{\ell}$  of the information in the radiances is believed, and  $(1 - \Phi_{\ell})$  of the *a priori* information is believed.

The objective of damping a mode is to reduce propagation of noise  $\delta \tilde{B}_{\ell}(\Delta \lambda_{\ell})$ , which is given by

$$\delta \tilde{B}_{\ell}^{m} \left( \Delta \lambda_{\ell}^{m} \right) = \left( \lambda_{\ell}^{m} + \Delta \lambda_{\ell}^{m} \right)^{-1} \left( U^{m'} S^{m'} M^{-1} \right)_{\ell} \delta \tilde{\Theta}^{m}$$
(37)

where  $\delta \tilde{\Theta}^m$  is the noise in  $\Delta \Theta_i$ . A statistical estimate of  $\delta \tilde{B}_{\ell}^m$  over an ensemble of profiles is given by

$$\delta \overline{B}_{\ell}(\Delta_{\lambda}) = \left[\delta \tilde{B}^{m} \, \delta \tilde{B}^{\prime m}\right]_{\ell\ell}^{1/2}$$

$$= (\lambda_{\ell}^{m} + \Delta \lambda_{\ell}^{m})^{-1}$$

$$\cdot \left[U^{m'} S^{m'} M^{-1} \delta \tilde{\Theta} \delta \tilde{\Theta}^{\prime} M^{-1} S^{m} U^{m}\right]_{\ell\ell}^{1/2}$$

$$= \frac{(\lambda_{\ell}^{m})^{1/2}}{\lambda_{\ell}^{m} + \Delta \lambda_{\ell}^{m}} = \Phi_{\ell} \cdot (\lambda_{\ell}^{m})^{-1/2}$$
(38)

to the extent that M accurately represents  $\delta \Theta \delta \Theta'$ , the noise covariance of  $\Delta \Theta$ . We assign a noise propagation threshold  $\Delta B_{\max}$  for each type of retrieval (surface properties, temperature profile, etc.) and set  $\Delta \lambda_{\ell} = 0$  if  $\delta \overline{B}_{\ell}(0) \leq \Delta B_{\max}$ . Otherwise, we obtain  $\Delta \lambda_{\ell}$  such that  $\delta \overline{B}_{\ell}(\Delta \lambda_{\ell}) = \Delta B_{\max}$ .

# Formulation of the Background Term

The need for an iterative process arises because the radiative transfer equation is not linear. In every iteration, we recompute  $\Theta_i^m$ , as well as  $S^m$ ,  $U^m$  and  $\lambda^m$ . If the solutions were completely linear, and we applied no damping, then

$$\Delta \Theta^{m+1}(0) \equiv \hat{\Theta} - \Theta^{m+1}(0) \cong \Delta \Theta^m - S^m U^m \Delta B^m(0)$$
(39)

and  $\Delta B^{m+1}(0)$  would be determined to be zero because  $\Delta B^m(0)$  would have already minimized the residuals  $\Delta \Theta^m$ .

The residual  $\Delta \Theta^{m+1}$  is not zero however, both because  $\Theta^{m+1}(0)$  is not given exactly by  $\Theta^m + S^m U^m \Delta B^m(0)$  as a result of nonlinearity, and because  $\Delta B_\ell^m \neq \Delta B_\ell^m(0)$ . As a result of applying  $\Delta B_\ell^m$  rather than  $\Delta B_\ell^m(0)$ , we obtain

$$\Delta \Theta^{m+1} \approx \Delta \Theta^{m+1}(0) + S^m U^m \left[ \Delta B^m(0) - \Delta B^m \right]$$
$$= \Delta \Theta^{m+1}(0) + \delta \Theta^m. \tag{40}$$

In (40),  $\Delta \Theta_{\ell}^{m+1}(0)$  represents the portion of  $\Delta \Theta^{m+1}$  that is due to effects of nonlinearity on the solution, while  $\delta \Theta^m$  represents the residual portion of  $\Delta \Theta^{m+1}$  due to the effects of damping in iteration m. The second term is zero for undamped modes and increases in significance with increased damping. This term is also zero for all modes in the first iteration. We only want to include the effects of nonlinearity on  $\Delta \Theta^m$  in the iterative procedure used in the determination of  $\Delta B^m$ . Therefore, the background term to be used in (34) is given by

$$\delta \Theta^{m-1} = S^{m-1} U^{m-1} \left[ \Delta B^{m-1} \left( 0 \right) - \Delta B^{m-1} \right]$$
(41)

and we solve for  $\Delta B^m_{\ell}$  according to

$$\Delta B_{\ell}^{m} = (\lambda_{\ell}^{m} + \Delta \lambda_{\ell}^{m})^{-1} U^{m'} S^{m'} M^{-1} \left[ \Delta \Theta^{m} - \delta \Theta^{m-1} \right]$$
$$= \Phi^{m} \Delta B_{\ell}^{m}(0) - (\lambda_{\ell}^{m} + \Delta \lambda_{\ell}^{m})^{-1}$$
$$\cdot \left[ U^{m'} S^{m'} M^{-1} S^{m-1} U^{m-1} (\Delta B_{\ell}^{m-1}(0) - \Delta B_{\ell}^{m-1}) \right]$$
(42)

where  $\Delta B_{\ell}^{m-1}$  is the value of  $\Delta B_{\ell}$  which was applied in iteration m-1. Inclusion of the background term in (42) insures second order convergence along the lines discussed in [19] with regard to treatment of the *a priori* term.

# Convergence Criteria

In solving (42), we are attempting to find solutions to the radiative transfer equations that minimize weighted residuals of observed and computed brightness temperatures, corrected for the background term. To test convergence of the solution, one should monitor the weighted residual

$$R = \left[ \left( \Delta \Theta - \delta \Theta \right)' V' V \left( \Delta \Theta - \delta \Theta \right) \right]^{1/2}$$
(43)

where the weight matrix V accounts for noise effects on the channel residuals, as well as the relative information content of the channels with regard to the variables being solved for. For example, if a channel (or linear combination of channels) carries little information content in terms of signal to noise, it should be given little weight in the estimation of the residual in (43). An appropriate choice of V, expressing the information content of the channels, would therefore be  $V = (\lambda_{\ell} + \Delta \lambda_{\ell})^{-1}$  (U'S'M<sup>-1</sup>), in which case we obtain

$$R = [\Delta B' \,\Delta B]^{1/2}.\tag{44}$$

As shown in (44), a reasonable way to determine if the solution has converged, in terms of weighted residuals of observed minus computed brightness temperatures, is to see if the solution has converged in terms of the iterative changes in the solution itself. Initially, we set  $\Delta B_i = 0$  if  $\Phi_\ell^1 < 0.05$ , that is, coefficients of very heavily damped components with little information content are not believed at all in any iteration. The solution is said to have converged when the root sum square (RSS) value of  $\Delta B_{\ell}^m$ is less than 10% of the RSS value of  $\delta \overline{B}^{m}$  for all components not set equal to zero. The iterative procedure is also terminated if the RSS value of  $\Delta B_{\ell}^m$  is not less than 75% of that of  $\Delta B_{\ell}^{m-1}$ for the nonzero components. This indicates the solution is not converging rapidly enough and may be responding primarily to unmodeled noise. The iterative procedure, which typically converges by three iterations, is carried out analogously for all retrieval steps.

# Variables and Functions for Retrieval Steps

As shown in (24), all steps involve expression of the basic variables X in terms of a set of functions F. In the temperature profile retrieval step, the temperature perturbation functions F(P) are 24 trapezoids piecewise linear in log of pressure, spanning the pressure range 0.016 mb to the surface, with a perturbation of 0.5 K between pressures  $P_{\ell}$  and  $P_{\ell-1}$ , and 0° at  $P_{\ell+1}$  and  $P_{\ell-2}$ . In the top and bottom functions, the top or bottom portion of the trapezoid is missing. The Jacobian  $S_{i\ell}^m$  is obtained numerically by computing the channel *i* brightness temperature for the *m*th iterative temperature profile  $T^m(P)$  and subtracting it from the brightness temperature computed with everything else fixed but perturbing  $T^m(P)$  by one unit of  $F_{\ell}(P)$ . With regard to water vapor and ozone profiles, we express solutions in the form

$$q^{m+1}(P) = q^m(P) \left[ 1 + \sum A_\ell F_\ell(P) \right]$$
(45)

with the functions (L = 11 for water vapor and L = 8 forozone) and methodology for computation of the Jacobian being completely analogous to those for temperature profile. In the case of surface variables, the functions are a discrete value of surface skin temperature, as well as nine triangle functions in the frequency domain dealing with perturbations of surface emissivity and three with surface bidirectional reflectance of solar radiation. The total precipitable water also can be adjusted by using (45) with a single function which is constant as a function of height. The window channels are sensitive to boundary layer water vapor but not higher level water vapor. Adjustment of total precipitable water is used in an intermediate retrieval step, done before the water vapor retrieval step using AIRS channels, and improves total low-level water vapor at the expense of upper level water vapor. Table I shows the pressure levels used in the temperature profile, moisture profile, and ozone profile retrieval steps. These pressure levels are a subset of the 100 levels used by Strow et al. [22] in the AIRS radiative transfer calculation.

# Selection of Channels

While AIRS has 2378 channels, it is neither necessary nor optimal to use all the channels in the retrieval process as the information content of these channels is highly redundant. Therefore, computational time can be lowered by limiting the number of channels used without an appreciable effect on the results. In a given step, it is preferable to use channels which are primarily sensitive to the variables being solved for, while relatively insensitive to variables not yet solved for. We also find it desirable to use channels with sharp localized weighting functions. The channels selected are optimized to be applicable for all conditions. Kaplan et al. [14] show that channels with sharpest weighting functions lie either in between absorption lines or on the band head of the 4.3- $\mu$ m CO<sub>2</sub> band between 2378 cm<sup>-1</sup> and 2390 cm<sup>-1</sup>. The first set of channels have sharp weighting functions because of a rapid increase of absorption coefficient with increasing pressure, while the second benefit from a rapid increase of absorption coefficient with increasing temperature in the troposphere. Such channels form the basic set used for temperature sounding. Channels in between water vapor absorption lines also produce very sharp weighting functions which are preferable for water vapor sounding and also useful for temperature sounding if the water vapor distribution is known accurately. Channels between absorption features are by definition less opaque than nearby channels situated on absorption features, and may not have sufficient opacity to be sensitive to either temperature or constituents at high enough levels in the atmosphere. For temperature profile, we select channels in the CO<sub>2</sub> Q branch at 667 cm<sup>-1</sup>, which do not have sharp weighting functions but are sensitive to temperature variations up to 1 mb. We do not select channels in the most opaque portion of the 4.3- $\mu$ m CO<sub>2</sub> band because these channels are sensitive to effects of nonlocal thermodynamic equilibrium. For water vapor, we selected a few channels on the peaks of some of the strongest absorption features in the 6.7- $\mu$ m water vapor band to increase the sensitivity to stratospheric and upper tropospheric water vapor.

 TABLE I

 TRAPEZOID FUNCTION ENDPOINTS (mb)

Temperature	Moisture	Ozone
Retrieval	Retrieval	Retrieval
0.016	0.016	0.016
0.714	170.1	20.92
1.297	272.9	51.53
2.701	314.1	71.54
4.077	343.6	103.0
8.165	407.5	142.4
16.43	496.6	300.0
23.45	617.5	surface
39.26	706.6	
56.13	852.8	
71.54	surface	
96.11		
125.6		
160.5		
212.0		
272.9		
343.6		
424.5		
596.3		
661.2		
753.6		
878.6		
surface		

Window channels are highly redundant with each other and have been selected generally on and off closely lying weak absorption features in the spectral regions from 755  $cm^{-1}$ –980  $cm^{-1}$ , 1070  $cm^{-1}$ -1240  $cm^{-1}$ , 2180  $cm^{-1}$ -2192  $cm^{-1}$ , and 2390 cm<sup>-1</sup> to 2665 cm<sup>-1</sup>. Cloud-filtering channels are generally a subset of the temperature sounding channels which are sensitive to the troposphere. Our sounding methodology involves two temperature profile retrieval steps, one (temp 1) before the water vapor retrieval step, and the other (temp 2) subsequent to it. In temp 2, we include a number of channels in the water vapor absorption band which produce sharp temperature weighting functions. These channels are treated as "noisy" in the channel noise covariance matrix to the extent that the predicted uncertainty in water vapor distribution produces an appropriate uncertainty in their computed brightness temperatures. The location of all channels used are shown in Fig. 1. We use 53 channels in the surface temperature retrieval, 147 channels in the first temperature profile retrieval, an additional seven channels in the second temperature profile retrieval, 66 channels in the water vapor profile retrieval, and 23 channels in the ozone profile retrieval. Some channels are used for more than one purpose. Channels also exist which can be used for retrievals of profiles of CH<sub>4</sub>, CO, and CO<sub>2</sub>. These will be described in a future publication.

Table II shows the eigenvalues and damping factors for the second pass temperature profile retrieval, the water vapor retrieval, and the ozone profile retrieval for a typical case. Coefficients of eight temperature profile functions are undamped, and those of two more functions are only slightly damped, giving about nine pieces of information about the temperature profile being contained in the radiances. Roughly 4 1/2 pieces of information about water vapor are contained in the radiances, and roughly 1 1/2 pieces of information are contained about the ozone profile in this case.



Fig. 1. AIRS spectrum showing channels used in different retrieval steps. Temperature sounding channels are red, ozone are green, water vapor are blue, and surface channels are orange.

TABLE II Sample Eigenvalues and Damping Factors (  $\Phi > 0.05$  )

Temperat	ure Profile	Water Va	por Profil	le Ozone	Profile	
$\Delta B_{max}$	= 0.75	$\Delta B_{max} = 1.0$		$\Delta B_{max}$	$\Delta B_{max} = 0.75$	
λ	Φ	λ	Φ	λ	Φ	
94.40	1.0	69.78	1.0	41.59	1.0	
65.06	1.0	10.31	1.0	0.745	0.419	
36.81	1.0	2.44	1.0	0.403	0.278	
26.55	1.0	1.26	1.0	0.139	0.079	
12.19	1.0	0.68	0.668			
6.96	1.0	0.27	0.270			
3.84	1.0	0.09	0.095			
1.84	1.0	0.07	0.069			
1.21	0.685					
0.80	0.447					
0.50	0.281					
0.35	0.196					
0.29	0.161					
0.20	0.114					
0.11	0.006					

# Cloud Parameter Retrievals

In performing cloud parameter retrievals, all other variables are assumed known within their estimated errors, allowing us to compute  $R_{i, \text{CLR}}$ . The channels used are the subset of cloudclearing channels that are not sensitive to solar radiation reflected off the clouds. The cloud parameter retrieval algorithm is analogous to that of the other steps but slightly different. At this time, the cloud retrieval algorithm has been tested only for the case of assumed cloud spectral properties in order to determine cloud fractions and cloud top pressures for up to two layers of clouds. The method is easily generalizable to include cloud spectral emissivity by inclusion of an appropriate set of spectral emissivity functions as done in the surface parameter retrievals. With known spectral properties, cloud radiances  $R_i(P_c)$  can be calculated based on the surface skin temperature and atmospheric temperature-moisture-ozone profile, which have been retrieved from the clear column radiances and are "known," as a function of unknown cloud top pressure  $P_c$ . For two cloud layers (the method works for any number of cloud layers) we can write

$$R_{ik} = (1 - \alpha_{1k} - \alpha_{2k})R_{i, \text{CLR}} + \alpha_{1k}R_i(P_{c1}) + \alpha_{2k}R_i(P_{c2})$$
(46)

where  $R_{ik}$  is the radiance computed for channel *i* in FOV *k* covered by (as seen from above)  $\alpha_{1k}$  fractional coverage of a cloud

at  $P_{c1}$  and  $\alpha_{2k}$  of a cloud at  $P_{c2}$ . In the above equation, we have assumed two types of clouds in each of the FOVs k = 1, 9, with different cloud fractions in each FOV. All clouds were assumed to have a constant spectral emissivity of 0.9. In order to determine the variables  $P_{c1}$ ,  $P_{c2}$ ,  $\alpha_{11}$ ,  $\alpha_{12}$  ..., we use observations in the nine FOVs for the subset of channels used to determine  $\eta$  which are unaffected by solar radiation. The noise covariance matrix N used to retrieve cloud parameters is identical to that used in (4) to determine  $\eta$ , but for the appropriate subset of channels.

Given the *m*th guess cloud parameters  $\alpha_{1k}^m$ ,  $\alpha_{2k}^m$ ,  $P_{c1}^m$ , and  $P_{c2}^m$ , we define

$$Y_{ik}^{m} = R_{i,k} - R_{ik}^{m} = (R_{i,k} - R_{i,\text{CLR}}) + \sum_{j=1,2}^{m} \alpha_{jk}^{m} \left( R_{i,\text{CLR}} - R_{i}(P_{cj}^{m}) \right)$$
(47)

and obtain the iterative equation

$$Y_{ik}^{m+1} - Y_{ik}^{m}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1,2} \left[ \left( R_{i, \text{CLR}} - R_{i}(P_{cj}^{m}) \right) \right] \Delta \alpha_{jk}^{m}$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1,2} \left[ \alpha_{jk}^{m} \left( \frac{-\partial R_{i}(P_{cj})}{\partial P_{cj}} \right) \right] \Delta P_{cj}^{m}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1,2} \left[ S_{ik, \Delta \alpha_{jk}}^{m} \right] \Delta \alpha_{jk}^{m} + \sum_{j=1,2} \left[ S_{ik, \Delta P_{cj}}^{m} \right] \Delta P_{cj}^{m} \quad (48)$$

where the terms in the square brackets are the appropriate Jacobians, which are computed empirically as are all other Jacobians. It should be noted that if  $\alpha_{jk}$  (for all k) and/or  $\partial R_i / \partial P_{cj}$ (for all i) are small for a given  $P_{cj}$ , that cloud top pressure will be contained primarily in a heavily damped mode and not be changed significantly from the initial guess.

#### Error Propagation and Channel Noise Covariance Matrix

Equations (4) and (30) contain terms such as  $\delta T(P)$ , indicative of expected errors in state parameters used in a given pass and step. These errors are case dependent and can be estimated by propagating expected errors through the retrieval system. In any iteration, the estimate of a parameter, such as  $T(P)^m$ , is given by

$$T(P)_{j}^{m} = T(P)_{j}^{0} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} F_{j\ell}A_{\ell}^{m} = T(P)_{j}^{0} + (FUB^{m})_{j,1}$$
(49)

where j is a discrete pressure level. There are three contributions to the expected error  $\delta T(P)_j^m$ . The first contribution comes from the null space error, arising from the error of the first guess in the space outside that of the L functions used to expand the solution. The second component arises from errors in the coefficients  $B^m$ . The last contribution arises from the damping of the solution in which  $(1 - \Phi)$  of the first guess (or previous iteration) is believed for each eigenfunction

$$G = FU$$
.

Equations (4) and (30) contain the square of the expected error in state parameter  $X_j^m$ ,  $\delta X_j^{m^2}$ , which can be expressed in terms of errors in the expansion coefficients A according to

$$\delta X_j^{m^2} = \delta X_j^{N^2} + \sum_k F_{jk}^2 \delta A_k^{m^2}$$
(50)

where  $\delta X_j^N$  is the null space error and  $\delta A^m$  is the error in the coefficients  $A^m$  used to represent  $X^m$ . Errors in A arise both from errors in the B coefficients and errors in the damped portion of the m-1 iterative guess. In every step in the retrieval process, we begin with parameters  $X^0$  having an uncertainty  $\delta X_j^0$ . The uncertainty of the microwave product first guess is specified based on expected errors, as is the null space error. Given  $\delta X^0$ ,  $\delta A^0$  can be solved for according to

$$\delta A_k^0 = \left[ (F'^2 F^2)^{-1} F'^2 \left( \delta X^0 - \delta X^N \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}$$
$$= \left[ \left( F'^2 F^2 \right)^{-1} F'^2 \left( \delta \tilde{X}^0 \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}.$$
 (51)

In a given iteration, we can express  $\delta A_k^m$  according to

$$\delta A_k^m = \left[ \sum_{\ell} \left( U_{k\ell} \cdot \frac{\Phi_\ell^m}{\sqrt{\lambda_\ell^n}} \right)^2 + \sum_{\ell} \left( U_{k\ell} (1 - \Phi_\ell^m) \sum_j U_{j\ell} \delta A_j^{m-1} \right)^2 + \delta A_k^{N^2} \right]^{1/2}$$
(52)

where  $\Phi_{\ell}^m/\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}^m}$  represents the predicted error in  $B_{\ell}^m$  due to noise propagation, and the second term represents the portions of the errors  $\delta B_{\ell}^{m-1}$  of the previous iterative profile which are believed in the current iteration. Given  $\delta A_k^m$  from (52) for the final iterative step, we compute the square of the corresponding profile error to be used in (4) and (30) according to (50). This term is carried to the next retrieval step and used in (51) to give  $\delta A_k^0$  which is in turn used in (52) to generate the uncertainty in parameter X for use in subsequent steps.

For moisture and ozone profile, the form of the expansion is slightly different [see (45)] and we write

$$\left(\frac{\delta q^m(P)}{q}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{\delta q^N(P)}{q}\right)^2 + \sum_k F_k^2(P) \,\delta \,A_k^{m^2}.$$
 (53)

Surface spectral emissivity and bidirectional reflectance are analogous to temperature profile, as is skin temperature, in which case F is a number. The liquid water profile comes from the microwave product and is not iterated. We assume an error estimate of 20% of the liquid water profile. In addition, if the total liquid water is less than 0.01 g/cm<sup>2</sup>, we consider the possibility that liquid water may have been missed due to an error in the water vapor microwave solution. For these low liquid water solutions, an alternative error estimate of (2 \* RH - 1) \* 0.05 \* q, where RH is the relative humidity and

q is the layer water vapor in milligrams per cubic centimeter, is considered and used if it is larger than 20% of the liquid water. The null space temperature error is taken as 0.1 K in the lower and upper atmosphere, increasing to 0.2 K near the tropopause. The null space error in percent is taken as 5% for water vapor and 10% for ozone respectively.

Equation (52) is case dependent through the parameters  $\Phi_{\ell}$ and  $\lambda_{\ell}$ , which depend both on the *S* matrix and more significantly on the *M* matrix. *M* contains contributions from clouds,  $\hat{M}$ , and parameter uncertainty  $\tilde{M}$ . The uncertainties determined from (50), (52), and (53) in turn are used in the computation of  $\tilde{M}$  [(30)] and *N* [(4)].

Equations (50) and (53) give the magnitude of the estimated error in each parameter but contain no information about sign. If we assume all  $\partial X(P)$  are of the same sign, we would overestimate the effect of the uncertainty of that parameter on the computed radiances. Bearing this in mind, when the derivatives in (4) and (30) are computed numerically, we write

$$\frac{\partial R}{\partial X(P)} \,\partial X(P) = R(X(P) + \Delta X(P)) - R(X(P)) \tag{54}$$

where  $\Delta X(P)$  is constructed by multiplying  $\partial X(P)$  by a sine wave with a full period of six temperature profile functions in the case of uncertainty of temperature profile to be used in the humidity and ozone profile retrievals, and six humidity profile functions in the case of water vapor uncertainty to be used in the temperature and ozone profile retrievals. In the case of ozone profile, with only seven functions, we simply multiply the predicted uncertainty by 0.5. We have also found that in constructing the noise covariance terms in (4), it is advantageous to set  $\Delta X = 0.5 \,\delta(X)$  for all profile terms. For surface parameters we take  $\Delta X = \partial X$ , as for the liquid water profile.

# Steps in the Processing System

The processing system used in this paper is comprised of a number of sequential steps listed below. All steps start from the conditions found in the previous step, with appropriate computed uncertainty estimates  $\delta X^0$  unless otherwise noted.

- Step 1) Use as a starting point the microwave product which agrees with the AMSU-A, HSB radiances [20]. We follow this by a temperature profile retrieval using AMSU-A radiances as well as AIRS radiances for channels that never see clouds, followed by a water vapor retrieval using HSB channels and some AMSU-A window channels. As part of the temperature profile retrieval, we also update the surface skin temperature and microwave spectral emissivity.
- Step 2) Determine an initial  $\zeta^1$  from (11) using the atmospheric and surface parameters obtained in Step 1). We also perform a cloud parameter retrieval to help determine which IR channels are not affected by clouds.  $\hat{R}_i^1$  is obtained using  $\zeta^1$  in (10).
- Step 3) Determine the first guess IR surface parameters and temperature–moisture–ozone profile using  $\hat{R}_i^1$ based on a regression step using most AIRS channels [11]. Under some difficult cloud conditions, this first guess is modified in a manner described later.

- Step 4) Produce an improved temperature profile and microwave spectral emissivity starting from the surface and atmospheric parameters determined in step 3) using the AMSU-A channel radiances and AIRS channel radiances which do not see clouds. The surface skin temperature is not updated as it is estimated better from AIRS radiances than can be determined from AMSU radiances. This is followed by an improved water vapor profile using HSB radiances.
- Step 5) Determine  $\zeta^2$  taking advantage of the refined parameters. Also determine cloud parameters to decide which channels do not see clouds so as to average radiances in these channels when producing  $\hat{R}_i^2 \cdot \hat{R}_i^2$  is considerably more accurate than  $\hat{R}_i^1$  because the surface and atmospheric parameters obtained from the AIRS regression step are more accurate than those from the microwave first product, especially the infra-red surface spectral properties which are not determined from the microwave retrieval.
- Step 6) Perform a surface parameter retrieval using AIRS surface sounding channels shown in Fig. 1, and AMSU-A and HSB window channels. This produces a new skin temperature, IR and microwave spectral emissivity, and IR spectral bidirectional inflectance. It also includes adjustment of the entire water vapor profile by a single trapezoidal function which is constant in the troposphere and lower stratosphere.
- Step 7) Determine  $\zeta^3$  taking advantages of the refined surface parameters, and produce  $\hat{R}_i^3$  and new estimates of cloud parameters.
- Step 8) Use  $\hat{R}_i^3$  to sequentially determine surface parameters, temperature profile, humidity profile, and ozone profile. These are called the first pass retrieved products.
- Step 9) Update temperature profile. See Step 8).
- Step 10) Update humidity profile. See Step 8).
- Step 11) Update ozone profile. See Step 8).
- Step 12) Update the temperature profile, using only AMSU-A radiances and AIRS channel radiances insensitive to clouds. This profile is also used in the rejection criteria and is referred to as the test microwave only retrieval.
- Step 13) Using the first pass retrieved products and updated temperature profile, determine  $\zeta^4$ , final cloud parameters, and the final clear column radiances  $\hat{R}_i^4$ , which is a product of the system.
- Step 14) Repeat Steps 8) and 9) using  $\hat{R}_i^4$  to obtain the final product surface parameters and temperature profile. The initial guess used in the second pass surface parameter and temperature profile retrievals is identical to that of the first pass but all other parameters are updated, such as the clear column radiances, moisture profile, etc. The noise covariance matrix is also updated to account for better estimates of the other parameters. In addition, chan-

nels in the water vapor band which are highly sensitive to lower tropospheric water vapor are included in the final temperature profile step (but not the first pass) because an accurate moisture profile has now been retrieved. The moisture profile and ozone profile retrieval steps are not repeated, as no appreciable improvement in parameters resulted from further retrieval steps.

- Step 15) Test solution for acceptance. If rejected, return to the AMSU/HSB retrieval starting from the initial guess, including AIRS channels insensitive to clouds, as the "final microwave only" product. Cloud parameters for rejected cases are based on this solution and were determined in Step 2).
- Step 16) Determine (outgoing longwave radiation) OLR and clear-sky OLR using the appropriate solution for either accepted or rejected cases.

#### Adjustment of the First Guess

The first guess temperature profile  $T^0(P)$  used in Step 4) is usually the result of the AIRS regression done in Step 3),  $T^{\mathrm{reg}}(P)$ . Under most conditions, this is considerably more accurate than the microwave product  $T^M(P)$  used in Step 1). However, under some difficult cloud conditions, a very poor regression can be obtained. In general, the regression temperature profile will degrade below 300 mb with increasing values of the effective noise amplification factor, and can be considerably poorer than the microwave retrieval, especially near the surface. The problem is compounded, in cases of large effective noise amplification factor, because temperature sounding channels sensing the lower troposphere will be treated as noisy due to a large contribution of the second term in the noise covariance matrix [see (20)]. Consequently, eigenfunctions having high vertical resolution in the lower troposphere will be heavily damped and the poor vertical structure in the lower troposphere of the regression guess will be heavily believed. To help alleviate this problem, we construct a first guess temperature profile which is a linear combination of the  $T^{\text{reg}}(P)$  and  $T^{M}(P)$ below 300 mb

$$T^{0}(P) = T^{\text{reg}}(P) + A(P) \left( T^{M}(P) - T^{\text{reg}}(P) \right)$$
(55)

where  $A(P_s) = 0$  if  $A_{\text{eff}} \leq 2.5$  and  $A(P_s) = 1$  if  $A_{\text{eff}} \geq 6.5$ , with values of  $A(P_s)$  linearly interpolated between zero and one for intermediate values of  $A_{\text{eff}}$ . In addition, A(P) = 1 for  $P \leq 300$  mb, and A(P) is linearly interpolated in  $\ln P$  for intermediate pressure values between 300 mb and the surface pressure  $P_s$ .

# Computation of OLR

OLR is computed from the AIRS products in a manner analogous to that used to compute OLR from TOVS [15], [16]

$$F = (1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2)F_{\text{CLR}} + \alpha_1 F_{\text{CLD}}(P_{c_1}) + \alpha_2 F_{\text{CLD}}(P_{c_2})$$
(56)

where  $F_{\rm CLR}$ , the clear-sky OLR, is the sum of contributions from 14 spectral bands each with effective surface emissivity  $\varepsilon_i$ 

 $F_{\rm CLR}$ 

$$=\pi \sum_{i=1}^{14} \left[ \varepsilon_i B_{\nu_i}(T_s) \tau_i(P_s) + \int_{\ell n P_s}^{\ell n \overline{P}} B_{\nu_i}(\tau) \frac{d\tau_i}{d\ell n P} d\ell n P \right]$$
$$=\pi \sum_i F_{i, \text{CLR}}$$
(57)

and the band transmittances  $\tau_i(P)$  are computed at effective zenith angles  $\theta_i$ . The small term related to downwelling thermal radiation reflected off the surface and transmitted to space is neglected.  $F_{\text{CLD}}(P_c)$  is computed in an analogous way, in terms of the cloud spectral emissivity  $\varepsilon_i(P_c)$ , and assuming a cloud transmissivity of  $(1 - \varepsilon_i(P_c))$ 

$$F_{\text{CLD}}(P_c) = \pi \sum_{i=1}^{14} \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_i(P_c) B_{\nu_i}(T(P_c)) \tau_i(P_c) \\ + \int_{\ell n P_c}^{\ell n \overline{P}} B_{\nu_i}(\tau) \frac{d\tau_i}{d\ell n P} d\ell n P \\ + (1 - \varepsilon_i) F_{i, \text{ CLR}} \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (58)

The band transmittances  $\tau_i(P)$  are parameterized as a function of temperature, moisture, and ozone profile [16]. The spectral cloud emissivity was assumed to have a constant value of 0.9, to be consistent with what was done in the cloud parameter retrieval.

# Rejection Criteria

A number of tests are done to assess the quality of the retrieval. If any of the tests fail, the full IR-microwave retrieval is rejected. In such a case, the retrieval based on use of microwave and stratospheric AIRS channels Step 1) is reported, and appropriately flagged as such. Results shown later in the paper do not include these rejected retrievals. The major cause of rejection is difficulty in dealing with the effects of clouds on the AIRS radiances. The tests are described below.

1) Assessment of Cloud Clearing Fit: Equations (11) and (10) give the solution for the vector  $\zeta$  and the resultant clear column radiances  $\hat{R}_i$ . If a successful solution is produced, the ensemble  $\hat{R}_i$  for the cloud-clearing channels *i* should match the incoming estimates of clear column radiances  $\hat{R}_{i, \text{CLR}}$  to a reasonable degree. A poor match is indicative of either a particularly poor first guess or problems in handling the effects of clouds on the radiances. We compute the weighted residual of the clear column radiances used in the computation of  $\zeta$  in brightness temperature units

$$\Delta F = \left(\frac{\sum_{i} \left(\hat{R}_{i} - R_{i, \text{CLR}}\right)^{2} N_{ii}^{-1}}{\sum_{i} N_{ii}^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial B_{i}}{\partial T}\right)_{\hat{R}_{i}}^{2}}\right)^{1/2}$$
(59)

and reject the solution if  $\Delta F$  computed when generating  $\zeta^1$  is greater than 1.75 K. Equation (59) is equivalent to taking



Fig. 2. Number of cases as a function of cloud fraction (black), percentage of successful cases (mauve), and percentage of cases called essentially clear (blue).

Land **Ocean** Essentially Essentially Latitude <u>A11</u> Accepted Clear <u>All</u> Accepted Clear  $80 - 90^{\circ}N$  $70 - 80^{\circ}N$  $60 - 70^{\circ}N$  $50 - 60^{\circ}N$  $40 - 50^{\circ}N$  $30 - 40^{\circ}N$  $20 - 30^{\circ}N$  $10 - 20^{\circ}N$ 0 - 10°N  $0 - 10^{\circ} S$  $10 - 20^{\circ}$ S 20 - 30•S  $30 - 40^{\circ}S$  $40 - 50^{\circ}S$ 50 - 60°S 60 – 70°S 70 - 80°S 80 - 90°S 1159(47.5%) 131(5.4%) 3445(72.3%) 300(6.3%) TOTAL

TABLE III NUMBER OF CASES AS A FUNCTION OF LATITUDE

the residual of clear column brightness temperatures weighted by the channel noise covariance in brightness temperature units.

2) Difficult Cloud Cases: Cases with extensive cloud cover and low contrast are particularly difficult. The solution is rejected if the sum of the final retrieved cloud fractions for all cloud layers is greater than 80% or the total cloud fraction is greater than 50%, and the total cloud below 500 mb is greater than 10% and the noise amplification factor is greater than two, or the noise amplification factor is greater than three, or the effective noise amplification factor is greater than eight. We also reject cases if the total cloud liquid water determined by the microwave product is greater than 0.03 gm/cm<sup>2</sup>. 3) Large Residuals in Second Pass Retrievals: The general iterative solution is terminated when either the residual  $R^n$  [(44)] is less than 10% of the RSS of the predicted noise for each mode  $\Delta \overline{B}_{\ell}$ , [(38)] or  $R^n$  is more than 75% of  $R^{n-1}$ . Slow convergence may indicate a poor solution. We reject the solution if the converged value of R is greater than the RSS of  $\delta \overline{B}_{\ell}$  in either the surface parameter retrieval or the temperature profile retrieval in the second pass. Poor convergence generally indicates problems with the clear column radiances  $\hat{R}_{4}^{i}$ .

4) Inconsistency of Test "Microwave Only" and Combined IR/Microwave Retrievals: Under some conditions, the clear column radiances  $\hat{R}_i^4$  can be poor but all convergence tests are passed. Nevertheless, the test microwave only retrieval will



Fig. 3. (Top) Mean value of cloud correction needed, cloud correction made, and errors of cloud-cleared brightness temperature for essentially clear cases. (Bottom) RMS values of cloud correction needed, cloud correction made, and cloud-cleared brightness temperature errors for essentially clear sport. Single spot noise is also shown.

produce low-level temperatures which differ significantly from those of the second pass retrieval. This generally indicates poor clear column radiances. The solution is rejected if the RMS differences between the temperature in the lowest 3 km of the test microwave only retrieval differs from that of the second pass retrieval by more than 1.25 K.



Fig. 4. (Top) Mean values of cloud correction needed, cloud correction made, and errors of cloud-cleared brightness temperatures for all accepted cases. (Bottom) RMS values of cloud correction needed, cloud correction made, and cloud-cleared brightness temperature errors for all cases. Single spot noise is also shown.

# **IV. SIMULATION STUDY**

The simulation study is based on radiances computed from conditions derived from a global simulation using a version of the operational general circulation model (GCM) from NOAA NCEP for December 15, 2000 [13]. Details of the methodology to simulate the surface and atmospheric conditions for each AIRS footprint are given in [10].

The test set is the first scan line of every granule (6-min period) for December 15, 2000. The dependent dataset, on which the regression coefficients are based, is taken as cloud-free radiances computed from the whole day December 10, 2000. A first guess of all the geophysical parameters (including surface pressure) taken from an 18-hour GCM forecast is available for use in the retrieval. We used only the forecast surface pressure as it is felt that use of a model forecast first guess temperature–moisture profile is unnecessary to analyze AIRS/AMSU data because of the high information content of the radiances.

The AIRS orbital dataset has the following salient features within a given scene made up of nine FOVs:

- variable surface topography and surface pressure  $P_s$ ;
- daytime and nighttime conditions;
- temperature T(P), moisture q(P), ozone  $O_3(P)$ , and other trace constituents from the surface to 0.005 mb;
- cloud liquid water profiles  $\ell(P)$  (only affects microwave);
- multiple-level cloud conditions within a FOV, with spectrally varying cloud emissivity,  $\varepsilon_{cld}(v)$ , and reflectivity,  $\rho_{cld}(v)$ , consistent with atmospheric conditions. The cloud top pressure, emissivity, and reflectivity are spatially varying as well;
- variable surface skin temperature  $T_s$ , spectral surface emissivity  $\varepsilon(v)$ , and spectral surface bidirectional reflectance  $\rho(v)$ ;
- variable land fraction, with coastlines, islands, lakes, etc.;
- orbital simulation with simulated scan lines with variable viewing angle and solar zenith angle.

#### V. RESULTS

There were a total of 7200 cases in the simulation. In 74 cases, the microwave retrieval step failed, and no retrieval was attempted. Of the remainder, 4604 cases were accepted. Fig. 2 shows the number of cases, and percent accepted, as a function of fractional cloud cover, in 0.5% bins. We also show statistics for cases we classify as "essentially clear" based on the observed radiances. This "essentially clear" flag can be of use to the data assimilation community, in which it is common to assimilate observed channel radiances under clear conditions. The data assimilation community avoids cloud contaminated radiances out of fear that noise due to handling effects of clouds on the radiances may degrade the resultant analyzed fields. Two potential problems with this approach are that only a small number of cases are completely clear, thus limiting the utility of the sounding data in improvement of forecast skill, and scenes with small amounts of cloud cover may be mistakenly classified as clear. Our "essentially clear" flag is designed to include cases of very small amounts of cloudiness to increase the yield of cases to be assimilated as compared to only 100% clear situations.

A case is a candidate to be called essentially clear if the largest eigenvalue of  $\Delta R' N^{-1} \Delta R$  is less than 125 for ocean cases and 225 for land cases. This indicates a small amount of variability in the radiances in the 3 × 3 array of AIRS spots. A larger value of radiance variability is allowed for land cases to be called clear because surface variability is larger over land than ocean. We also define a cloud correction value  $\Delta BT$  as the average



Fig. 5. RMS temperature profile errors.

difference of the reconstructed clear column brightness temperature  $\hat{\Theta}_i$  and the nine spot average brightness temperature,  $\overline{\Theta}_i$ , for all channels in the window regions between 800 cm<sup>-1</sup> and 900 cm<sup>-1</sup>. For the scene to be declared "essentially clear,"  $\Delta BT$  must be less than or equal to 0.1 K. In addition, the retrieval must be accepted. 431 cases were called essentially clear. Fig. 2 includes the number of cases called "essentially clear" as a function of actual cloud cover. The average cloudiness of all cases was 37.14%, the average cloudiness of all accepted cases was 31.31%, and the average cloudiness of all cases called essentially clear was 0.94%. The percentage of cases accepted drops slowly with increasing cloud cover until about 50%, and then drops off more rapidly after that. Roughly 40% of those accepted cases with cloud cover less than 0.5% were identified as "essentially clear."

Table III gives the distribution of the 7200 cases as a function of latitude, with separate statistics for ocean and land. On this particular day, most of the essentially clear cases occurred in the tropics and southern (summer) hemisphere, with a substantial percentage (27.3%) occurring poleward of  $70^{\circ}$ S. The percentage of cases accepted over land (47.5%) is considerably lower than that over ocean (72.3%). A high percentage of retrievals were rejected in large areas of very cold snow covered land in Canada and Siberia.



Fig. 6. (Top) Mean temperature errors as a function of cloud cover for accepted retrievals. (Bottom) RMS temperature errors as a function of cloud cover for accepted retrievals.

Fig. 3 shows statistics for the clear column brightness temperatures for the 431 essentially clear cases, with biases shown in the upper and RMS values shown in the lower part of the figure. The top panel shows the difference between the noise-free brightness temperatures computed from the truth for a given scene and the average of the observed brightness temperatures in the  $3 \times 3$ array of AIRS spots in the scene. This is the correction *needed* to make the observed brightness temperatures match the true values. The second panel shows the difference between the reconstructed brightness temperatures and the average observed values. This is the correction *made* in the cloud clearing. The third panel shows the difference between the reconstructed clear column brightness temperature and that computed from the truth. This is the *error* in the reconstructed clear column brightness temperature. Also shown in the third panel of the RMS statistics is the single spot channel noise.

In the mean sense, "essentially clear" spots needed an average cloud correction of roughly 0.1 K in the  $800 \text{-cm}^{-1}$ -1150-cm<sup>-1</sup>

region, and essentially none was made on the average. This resulted in a small cold bias in this window region in the reconstructed clear column brightness temperatures. In the RMS sense, corrections of up to 0.25 K were needed in the longwave window for these cases (some of this is due to channel noise) and corrections of about 0.1 K were made. For the most part, the RMS values of the reconstructed brightness temperatures were comparable to, or smaller than, the single spot channel noise. Lower values can arise if either the channel is considered not to see clouds (the noise amplification factor is 1/3) or the scene is considered clear or contains very small values of  $\eta$ , resulting in noise amplification factors less than one, provided accurate values of  $\eta$  are obtained. Radiances for "essentially clear" cases are definitely suitable for data assimilation purposes.

Fig. 4 shows analogous statistics for the 4604 accepted cases for all cloud conditions. On the average, cloud corrections of almost 12 K were needed in the longwave window region, and the correction made was slightly smaller than needed, with about a 0.5-K negative bias in reconstructed clear column brightness temperatures at the worst frequencies.

In the RMS sense, reconstructed clear column brightness temperatures were still comparable to channel noise throughout most of the temperature profile sounding regions  $(650 \text{ cm}^{-1}-750 \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ and } 2200 \text{ cm}^{-1}-2400 \text{ cm}^{-1})$ , but larger than the noise elsewhere in the spectrum. RMS errors in the water vapor sounding region are still very small and radiances in these channels, as well as those in the temperature sounding region, should be suitable for data assimilation. We encourage researchers in the field of data assimilation to test the use of radiances for all accepted cases. This would substantially increase the number of cases which can be used and should further improve forecast skill compared to use of radiances in just clear or essentially clear cases.

Fig. 5 shows RMS temperature errors for the 4604 accepted cases, as well as for the 431 essentially clear cases. Errors are shown for layer mean temperatures in roughly 1-km layers from the surface to 300 mb, 3-km layers from 300-30 mb, and 5-km layers from 30–1 mb. Results are shown for both the regression guess and the final physical retrieval. Errors of the surface skin temperature are indicated in the figure, as well as average RMS temperature profile errors over the layers 700 mb to the surface and 100 mb to the surface. The physical retrieval improves considerably over the regression based retrieval in both clear and cloudy cases with the largest improvement near the surface. In cloudy cases, part of this improvement is due to use of more accurate clear column radiances as the final physical retrieval uses  $\eta^4$  while the regression uses  $\eta^1$ . In addition, the regression coefficients are based on radiances for clear cases, in which channel noise is uncorrelated and lower than for cloud-cleared radiances. These are not factors in clear cases however, which still show significant improvement in RMS errors of the physical retrieval compared to regression near the surface. Retrievals under the multi layer cloud cover used in this simulation (average cloudiness of the accepted cases is 31%) degrade over those in clear situations beneath 150 mb, but are still of high accuracy. Average tropospheric RMS errors are 0.82 K, and average lower tropospheric errors are 0.92 K, both exceeding or essentially meeting the 1-K RMS error requirement for AIRS. The RMS



Fig. 7. RMS humidity profile percentage errors.

error in the lowest 1 km (1.06 K) slightly exceeds 1 K, however. Skin temperature errors are 0.25 K for clear cases and 0.59 K for all cases. These include land cases and are affected by uncertainties in surface spectral emissivity.

Fig. 6 shows mean and RMS errors of retrieved surface skin temperature and temperatures in 1-km tropospheric layers up to 344 mb for accepted retrievals as a function of actual cloud cover. Also shown is the mean and RMS clear column brightness temperature error for the 937.8-cm<sup>-1</sup> window channel. Mean and RMS errors for most temperatures are not very sensitive to cloud fraction. Negative biases are found, which increase slowly with increasing cloud cover, for the longwave window channel radiance, the surface skin temperature, and the temperature in the lowest kilometers of the atmosphere. RMS errors of all parameters increase slowly with increasing cloud cover, especially for the lowest kilometers of the atmosphere.

Fig. 7 shows RMS percent errors of the water vapor retrievals, weighted by water vapor amount in the layer, for integrated column water vapor in roughly 1-km layers from the surface to 200 mb. The RMS percent errors of total precipitable water are also indicated in the figure. Clouds do not degrade the retrieval profile accuracy appreciably. Part of this result may be due to sampling differences between clear and cloudy areas.

Clouds degrade the total precipitable water accuracy by 2.5%, but the 3.8% error of total precipitable water for all cases is still



Fig. 8. Ozone profile retrieval errors.

extremely good. The 1-km layer precipitable water errors in the troposphere are generally better than 20% in the cloudy cases in layers up to about 235 mb. Clear cases RMS percentage errors are worse than all case errors in the mid-upper troposphere. However, the actual RMS errors are larger in the cloudy cases; which are considerably moister in the mid-upper troposphere than are the clear cases.

Fig. 8 shows weighted percent errors in the ozone profile retrievals in roughly 4-km layers from 260–2.15 mb and in one coarse layer from 260 mb to the surface. Also shown is the percentage error in total ozone, which is 2.4% for clear cases and 2.6% for cloudy cases. The RMS profile errors are better than 8% in all layers in both clear and cloudy cases. The physical retrieval improves tropospheric ozone retrievals considerably over what is obtained by regression.

The accuracy of cloud parameters cannot be compared in a straightforward manner because of the existence of two cloud layers in some (most) scenes. The retrieved cloud fractions are effective, both because of errors in retrieved cloud top pressure and assumed cloud spectral emissivity. In the retrieval process, cloud spectral emissivity was always assumed to be 0.9 while the true cloud spectral emissivity varied a few percent from that.

TABLE IV RETRIEVED CLOUD FRACTION AND OLR ERRORS

	Accepted Cases	Rejected Cases
Number	4604	2522
Average Cloud Cove	r 31.31%	47.12%
Bias	1.98%	-1.17%
RMS Error	6.33%	11.75%
Average OLR	221.8 W/m <sup>2</sup>	196.2 W/m <sup>2</sup>
Bias	-1.28 W/m <sup>2</sup>	0.38 W/m <sup>2</sup>
RMS Error	2.94 W/m <sup>2</sup>	5.20 W/m <sup>2</sup>
Average CLR OLR	253.0 W/m <sup>2</sup>	238.8 W/m <sup>2</sup>
Bias	-1.60 W/m <sup>2</sup>	-1.81 W/m <sup>2</sup>
RMS Error	2.57 W/m <sup>2</sup>	6.76 W/m <sup>2</sup>

Two straightforward parameters to compare are total cloud fraction  $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ , and OLR. The OLR validates the cloud parameters, as well as all other parameters, in a radiative sense. Clear-sky OLR ( $F_{\rm CLR}$ ) is also useful to validate all parameters with the exception of clouds. Accuracies should be better for accepted cases than for rejected cases, because cloud products and all other parameters for rejected cases are based on the AMSU retrievals which are less accurate.

Table IV shows statistics for retrieved cloud cover, OLR and clear-sky OLR for accepted and rejected cases. The errors for rejected retrievals are poorer than for accepted retrievals, but all products should be useful for climate studies.

The OLR product is complementary to OLR measured more directly from CERES, also on the Aqua platform, in that the AIRS derived product will explain variations of OLR and clear-sky OLR in space and time in terms of variations of surface and atmospheric parameters, including cloud cover and height.

# REFERENCES

- G. Backus and E. Gilbert, "Uniqueness in the inversion of inaccurate gross earth data," *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London*, vol. A266, pp. 123–192, 1970.
- [2] M. T. Chahine and J. Susskind, "Fundamentals of the GLA physical retrieval method," in *Report on the Joint ECMWF/EUMETSAT Workshop* on the Use of Satellite in Operational Weather Prediction: 1989–1993, A. Hollingsworth, Ed., 1989, vol. 1, pp. 171–300.
- [3] M. T. Chahine, "Remote sounding of cloudy atmospheres. I. The single cloud layer," J. Atmos. Sci., vol. 31, pp. 233–243, 1974.
- [4] —, "Remote sounding of cloudy atmospheres. II. Multiple cloud formations," J. Atmos. Sci., vol. 34, pp. 744–757, 1977.
- [5] —, "Determination of the temperature profile in an atmosphere from its outgoing radiance," J. Optic. Soc. Amer., vol. 58, pp. 1634–1637, 1968.
- [6] V. Cuomo, R. Rizzi, and C. Serio, "An objective and optimal estimation approach to cloud-clearing for infrared sounder measurements," *Int. J. Remote Sens.*, vol. 14, pp. 729–743, 1993.
- [7] J. R. Eyre, "Inversion of cloudy satellite sounding radiances by nonlinear optimal estimation. I: Theory and simulation for TOVS," Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., vol. 115, pp. 1007–1026, 1989.
- [8] —, "Inversion of cloudy satellite sounding radiances by nonlinear optimal estimation. II: Application to TOVS data," *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, vol. 115, pp. 1027–1037, 1989.
- [9] —, "The information content of data from satellite sounding systems: A simulation study," Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., vol. 116, pp. 401–434, 1990.
- [10] E. Fishbein, C. B. Farmer, S. L. Granger, D. T. Gregorich, M. R. Gunson, S. E. Hannon, M. D. Hofstadter, S.-Y. Lee, S. S. Leroy, and L. L. Strow, "Formulation and validation of simulated data for the Atmospheric Infrared Sounder (AIRS)," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sensing*, vol. 41, pp. 314–329, Feb. 2003.

- [11] M. D. Goldberg, Y. Qu, L. M. McMillin, W. Wolff, L. Zhou, and M. Divakarla, "AIRS near-real-time products and algorithms in support of operational numerical weather prediction," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sensing*, vol. 41, pp. 379–389, Feb. 2003.
- [12] R. A. Hanel, B. J. Conrath, D. E. Jennings, and R. E. Samuelson, *Exploration of the Solar System by Infrared Remote Sensing*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992.
- [13] H.-M. Juang, S. Y. Hong, and M. Kinamitsu, "The NCEP regional spectral model: An upate," *Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc.*, vol. 78, pp. 2125–2128, 1997.
- [14] L. D. Kaplan, M. T. Chahine, J. Susskind, and J. E. Searl, "Spectral band passes for a high precision satellite sounder," *Appl. Opt.*, vol. 16, pp. 322–325, 1977.
- [15] A. Mehta and J. Susskind, "Outgoing longwave radiation from the TOVS Pathfinder Path A data set," J. Geophys. Res., vol. 104, pp. 12193–12212, 1999.
- [16] —, "Longwave radiative flux calculations in the TOVS pathfinder path A data set," NASA CR 1999-208 643, Greenbelt, MD, 1999.
- [17] L. M. McMillin and C. Dean, "Evaluation of a new operational technique for producing clear radiances," J. Appl. Meteorol., vol. 21, pp. 1005–1014, 1982.
- [18] T. S. Pagano, H. H. Aumann, D. E. Hagan, and K. Overoye, "Prelaunch and in-flight radiometric calibration of the Atmospheric Infrared Sounder (AIRS)," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sensing*, vol. 41, pp. 265–273, Feb. 2003.
- [19] C. D. Rodgers, "Retrieval of atmospheric temperature and composition from remote measurements of thermal radiation," *Rev. Geophys. Space Phys.*, vol. 14, pp. 609–624, 1976.
- [20] P. W. Rosenkranz, "Retrieval of temperature and moisture profiles from AMSU-A and AMSU-B measurements," in *Proc. IGARSS*, 2000.
- [21] W. L. Smith, "An improved method for calculating tropospheric temperature and moisture from satellite radiometer measurements," *Mon. Weather Rev.*, vol. 96, pp. 387–396, 1968.
- [22] L. L. Strow, S. E. Hannon, S. De Souza-Machado, H. E. Motteler, and D. Tobin, "An overview of the AIRS radiative transfer model," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sensing*, vol. 41, pp. 303–313, Feb. 2003.
- [23] J. Susskind, C. Barnet, and J. Blaisdell, "Determination of atmospheric and surface parameters from simulated AIRS/AMSU/HSB sounding data: Retrieval and cloud clearing methodology," *Adv. Space Res.*, vol. 21, pp. 369–384, 1998.
- [24] J. Susskind, P. Piraino, L. Rokke, L. Iredell, and A. Mehta, "Characteristics of the TOVS pathfinder path A data set," *Bull. Amer. Meterol. Soc.*, pp. 1449–1472, 1997.
- [25] S. Twomey, "On the numerical solution of the Fredholm integral equations of the first kind by inversion of the linear system produced by quadrature," J. ACM, vol. 10, pp. 79–101, 1963.



Joel Susskind was born in Brooklyn, NY, on April 9, 1944. He received the A.B. degree from Columbia University, New York, in 1964 and the Ph.D. degree in physical chemistry from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1968, where he did research in experimental and theoretical microwave gas phase spectroscopy. He conducted Postdoctoral research in high-resolution IR gas phase spectroscopy with the Chemistry Department, University of Minnesota, MN, from 1968 to 1970 and with the Physics Department, Florida State University, Tallahassee,

from 1970 to 1972.

He carried out research with the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, New York, from 1973 to 1977, involving atmospheric spectroscopy and radiative transfer and the development of methodology to analyze atmospheric sounding data from a suite of IR and microwave sounding instruments. He is currently a Senior Scientist in the Laboratory for Atmospheres, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, where he has worked since 1977, doing research in IR and microwave remote sensing. He is currently the NASA Polar Orbiting Environmental Satellite Project Scientist and a member of the AIRS Science Team.



**Christopher D. Barnet** was born in Staten Island, NY, on October 30, 1952. He received the B.S. degree in electronics technology in 1976 and the M.S. degree in solid-state physics in 1978, both from Northern Illinois University (NIU), DeKalb. He received the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in 1988 and 1990, respectively, from New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, both in astronomy.

In 1979, he held a research position with NIU, studying the superconducting properties of tertiary compounds. From 1981 to 1986, he was with

Lockheed Engineering and Management, Company, Las Cruces, NM, and Nicolet's FTIR Instrument Division, Madison, WI. His National Research Council NRC Postdoctoral Associateship with NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) from 1990 to 1992 utilized coupled radiative–dynamic models to understand IR and visible observations of the outer planets' stratospheres and tropospheres made by the Voyager Spacecraft's IRIS interferometer and Hubble Space Telescope (HST). From 1992 to 1995, he was with the Institute for Space and Terrestrial Science, Toronto, ON, Canada, using the HST to study the outer planets' atmospheres using visible and ultraviolet observations and multiscattering radiative–transfer models. Since 1995, he has been worked on advanced algorithms for terrestrial infrared and microwave remote sensing, first with Science Applications International Corp./General Sciences Corp., Beltsville, MD, and currently with the Joint Center for Earth Systems Technology, Baltimore, MD.



John M. Blaisdell was born in Buffalo, NY, on July 12, 1956. He received the B.A. degree in mathematics and the B.S. degree in physics from the University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, in 1978. He received the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in 1978 and 1980, respectively, from the University of Illinois, Urbana, both in physics. His dissertation research covered electronic structure of metal oxide semiconductors in the vicinity of surface defects.

From 1982 to 1983, he was with the Chemistry Department, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD,

where he studied the electronic structure of molecular crystals. He has been with Science Applications International Corp./General Sciences Corp., Beltsville, MD, since 1983, working on space and atmospheric applications. Since 1993, he has been implementing scientific algorithms for atmospheric sounding applications.