

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jgsrt.2020.107008>

Access to this work was provided by the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) ScholarWorks@UMBC digital repository on the Maryland Shared Open Access (MD-SOAR) platform.

**Please provide feedback**

Please support the ScholarWorks@UMBC repository by emailing [scholarworks-group@umbc.edu](mailto:scholarworks-group@umbc.edu) and telling us what having access to this work means to you and why it's important to you. Thank you.

# **The retrieval of cloud properties based on spectral solar light diffuse transmittance measurements under optically thick cloud cover conditions**

A. A. Kokhanovsky (1), A. Smirnov (2), S. V. Korkin (3), G. Wind (4)

(1) VITROCISET Belgium SPRL, A Leonardo Company, Bratustrasse 7, 64295 Darmstadt, Germany

(2) Science Systems and Applications, Inc., Lanham, MD 20706 USA and Biospheric Sciences Laboratory, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771 USA

(3) USRA GESTAR, 7178 Columbia Gateway Drive, Columbia, Maryland 21046 USA

(4) Science Systems and Applications, Inc., Lanham, Maryland, USA, and Atmospheric Sciences Laboratory, NASA GSFC, Greenbelt, Maryland, USA

## **Abstract**

We propose a simple and fast cloud retrieval technique based on the spectral diffuse transmittance measurements under optically thick clouds. The technique is aimed at retrieval of cloud optical thickness, liquid water path and effective radius of particles in cloudy media. It is based on the asymptotic radiative transfer solutions valid at cloud optical thicknesses above 10. Also we use the parametrizations of the Mie theory results for local optical properties of clouds such as the single scattering albedo, extinction coefficient, and asymmetry parameter. This makes it possible to reduce the inverse problem solution to finding a root of a simple transcendent equation.

**Keywords:** solar light transmission function, terrestrial clouds, AERONET, radiative transfer, atmospheric optics, light scattering, inverse problem

## 1. Introduction

Cloud properties such as cloud optical thickness and effective radius of particles at a given location can change rapidly with time due to various dynamical, thermodynamical and aerosol-cloud interaction processes. Polar orbiting satellites observe cloud properties outside polar regions a very limited number of times per day [1]. Therefore, the cloud diurnal cycle at a given location can not be studied unless the location is a polar one. The geostationary systems have much better temporal sampling outside polar regions (1-2km spatial resolution with typically 5-15 min sampling) . However, the derived information is not always sufficient for understanding physical processes occurring within cloud systems on fine spatial and temporal scales. Satellite observations are well suited for the observations of cloud parameters at cloud tops. The information on the cloud properties (say, the shape and size of particles) at cloud base is hardly accessible by satellite systems. Therefore, a number of techniques had been developed for the determination of cloud properties using ground-based and shipborne observations [2-15].

The cloud transmission function in the visible light is not a monotonic function of the cloud optical thickness (COT) [8]. Initially it increases with COT (outside the direction towards the Sun, where one must account also for the direct light). However, it decreases monotonically with the cloud optical thickness in the diffuse scattering regime occurring for clouds with COT above 5.0 or so [8]. Such clouds can be readily recognized by the absence of increased light intensity in the direction of Sun and also by the cosine law for intensity of diffuse radiation measured in the principal plane. The almucantar measurements can be also used to distinguish the diffuse scattering regime because for thick clouds there is no azimuthal dependence in the transmitted radiation.

In this paper we propose a simple and fast technique to determine the cloud optical thickness from cloud transmittance measurements in the visible. The cloud transmittance in the visible also slightly depends on the size of particles in clouds. Therefore, we determine the effective radius (ER)  $a_{ef}$  (defined as the ratio of the third to the second moment of the droplet size distribution) of particles in clouds from the near-infrared measurements. This makes it possible to derive COT with higher accuracy and also determine the liquid/ice water path. The technique is valid for optically thick horizontally homogeneous cloud systems. Therefore, the broken cloud fields are out of scope of this research. The vertical inhomogeneity of clouds does not present a serious

obstacle to application of the developed technique for the determination of the cloud optical thickness because the profiles of liquid/ice water content and effective size of particles in clouds only weakly influence the cloud transmittance function in the visible. The retrievals of liquid water path and effective radius are affected by the vertical cloud inhomogeneity. The most accurate retrievals of these parameters are obtained for the case of clouds with weak vertical inhomogeneity. The technique is applied to AERONET [16] observations of a cloud field at the GSFC AERONET site (USA) and compared to the retrievals of cloud optical thickness as performed using standard AERONET cloud retrieval mode [9,10].

## 2. Theory

### 2.1 Retrieval of cloud optical thickness

The cloud bidirectional transmittance factor (BTF) or transmission function is defined as

$$T = \frac{\pi I}{\mu_0 F_0}, \quad (1)$$

where  $I$  is the transmitted diffuse light intensity,  $\mu_0$  is the cosine of the solar zenith angle (SZA),  $F_0$  is the extraterrestrial solar irradiance at a given wavelength. The BTF is related to the cloud transport optical thickness  $\tau_{tr}$  by the following equation in the case of nonabsorbing clouds [12,17]:

$$T = tu(\mu_0)u(\mu), \quad (2)$$

where the global transmittance

$$t = \frac{1}{a + b\tau_{tr}}, \quad (3)$$

$a=1.072$ ,  $b=0.75$ ,  $\mu$  is the cosine of the viewing zenith angle. The transport (reduced) cloud thickness is defined as:  $\tau_{tr} = (1 - g)\tau$ , where  $g$  is the asymmetry parameter (average cosine of scattering angle) and  $\tau$  is the cloud optical thickness (COT). The angular function  $u(\mu)$  can be derived using the following approximation [12,18]:

$$u(\mu) = \frac{3}{7}[1 + 2\mu]. \quad (4)$$

The accuracy of Eq. (2) with accounting for Eqs. (3), (4) is high at values of  $\tau_{tr}$  larger than 2.0 as demonstrated in Fig. 1, where the inverse value of BTF is shown as function of the scaled optical thickness at the solar zenith angle equal to 60 degrees and zenith observations for two values of asymmetry parameter  $g=0.75$  (typical for ice clouds), 0.85 (typical for water clouds). The calculations have been performed using simple analytical Eqs. (1-4) and also using the integro -

differential radiative transfer (RT) equation [18]. In particular, the exact radiative transfer results shown in Fig. 1 have been derived using the code IPOL (Intensity and POLarization) [19] for the Henyey – Greenstein phase function [20] at COTs in the range 1-100. IPOL is a Fortran 90/95, BLAS/LAPACK based, discrete-ordinates matrix-operator radiative transfer code. It is used for numerical simulation of monochromatic solar light scattering in a plane-parallel turbid media bounded from below by a reflecting surface. For faster convergence of the azimuth (Fourier) expansion, IPOL computes the first scattering order analytically, which is a standard technique. However, truncation of the phase function is not used since it spoils transmittance in the aureole [21]. Recent RT codes inter-comparison in a variety of scenarios indicated that numerical error of IPOL is at or below 0.1% including the aureole [22]. It follows that the relative error of Eq. (2) (with account for Eqs. (3), (4)) is small at  $\tau_{tr}$  larger than 1. It is interesting to note that the dependence of  $T$  on the scaled optical thickness is valid in a broader range of  $\tau_{tr}$  as compared to the range of validity of Eq. (2). The dependence of relative error of Eq. (2) with account for Eqs. (3), (4) on the value of  $\tau_{tr}$  is given in Fig.2 for various solar zenith angles. One concludes that the error is smaller than 5% at  $COT \geq 10$  (7) for water(ice)clouds. The smaller error for ice clouds is explained by the fact that the transport optical thickness is larger for ice clouds (for the same value of COT) and equations have better accuracy for larger values of  $\tau_{tr}$  ( see Fig.1). The error of Eq. (2) is below 1-2% at COTs above 15, which is smaller as compared to the measurement error.

Therefore, we conclude that Eq. (2) can be used to derive the cloud transport optical thickness via the following simple relationship:

$$\tau_{tr} = \frac{1}{b} \left[ \frac{u(\mu_0)u(\mu)}{T} - a \right]. \quad (5)$$

Taking into account that  $\tau_{tr} = (1 - g)\tau$ , one can easily derive cloud optical thickness  $\tau$  in case the asymmetry parameter  $g$  is known in advance or assumed. Usually it is assumed that  $g = 0.75$  for ice clouds and it is equal to 0.85 for water clouds. Uncertainty in the value of  $g$  introduces biases in the retrieved value of COT:

$$\tau = \frac{1}{\gamma b} \left[ \frac{u(\mu_0)u(\mu)}{T} - a \right], \quad (6)$$

where  $\gamma = 1 - g$  is the symmetry parameter. Note that  $\gamma$  is equal to 1 for the isotropic and Rayleigh scattering cases.

The absolute error in the retrieved COT can be presented in the following way:

$$\Delta\tau = \sqrt{k_1^2(\Delta T)^2 + k_2^2(\Delta\gamma)^2}, \quad (7)$$

where we ignore an error related to uncertainty in the angular function. The value of  $\Delta T$  is the absolute error of the measured diffuse transmittance,  $\Delta\gamma$  is the absolute uncertainty in the symmetry parameter and

$$k_1 = \frac{\partial\tau}{\partial T}, k_2 = \frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\gamma}. \quad (8)$$

These derivatives can be derived analytically:

$$k_1 = -\frac{a+b\gamma\tau}{b\gamma T}, k_2 = -\frac{\tau}{\gamma}. \quad (9)$$

If the value of the symmetry parameter  $\gamma$  is known without any bias, then one can derive:

$$\frac{\Delta\tau}{\tau} = \epsilon \frac{\Delta T}{T}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\epsilon = -1 - \frac{a}{b\gamma\tau}$ . It follows that  $\epsilon$  is close to -1 for large values of  $\tau$ . This means that the error in the retrieved value of COT is approximately equal to the error of the measured transmittance. Therefore, there is no large error enhancement.




Fig.1 The dependence of the inverse value of the BTF on the scaled optical thickness calculated using Eqs. (2) - (4) and the radiative transfer code IPOL at single scattering albedo  $\omega_0 = 1$ , the Henyey - Greenstein phase function and two values of the asymmetry parameter (0.75, 0.85) at the zenith direction. The solar zenith angle is equal to 60 degrees.




Fig.2 The dependence of the relative error of the cloud BTF given by Eq. (2) on the cloud optical thickness at  $g=0.75, 0.85$  in the absence of absorption in clouds. The Henyey-Greenstein phase function has been assumed. The solar zenith angle is 54, 60, and 75 degrees. The observation is in the zenith direction.

## 2.2 Retrieval of liquid water path and effective size of particles in clouds

### 2.2.1. The direct problem: the parameterization of the bidirectional transmission function with respect to liquid water path and effective size of particles

The retrieval of COT discussed above can be biased because dependence of the asymmetry parameter on size and shape of particles is ignored. Although these effects can be neglected for the procedure of scaled optical thickness determination. Because the radiative budget under clouds is governed by  $\tau_{tr}$  ( see Eq. (3)) and the reduced COT is less influenced by cloud microstructure, the value of  $\tau_{tr}$  must be reported in output of cloud retrieval algorithms whenever it is possible. The accuracy of COT retrievals (especially for water clouds) can be increased, if the size of particles is determined from the cloud BTF in the shortwave infrared (SWIR). The single scattering albedo  $\omega_0$  differs from unity in the SWIR and depends on the size of particles because condensed water absorbs incoming light in SWIR. The absorption is generally stronger for larger particles. This leads to increase of cloud absorptance and decrease of transmittance with the size of particles (at fixed  $g$ ). On the other hand, the asymmetry parameter increases with the size of particles. This leads to decrease of the scaled COT and increase of the BTF at fixed absorption. These two different tendencies lead to nonmonotonic behavior of the function  $T(a_{ef})$ . Therefore, the determination of the effective radius from spectral BTF is not straightforward and multiple solutions of inverse problem are possible. For sufficiently large particles it follows that  $T$  is a decreasing function of  $a_{ef}$  (in water absorption bands) [8]. The opposite is true at the single scattering albedo (SSA)  $\omega_0 = 1$  because, clouds with larger particles are characterized generally by the smaller reduced COT.

The value of  $\omega_0$  is close to 1.0 for clouds in the near IR and SWIR [17]. Then it follows for the BTF [12, 17]:

$$T = \frac{u(\mu_0)u(\mu) \sinh(y)}{\sinh(x+ay)}, \quad (11)$$

where



$$x = \kappa\tau, y = 4\sqrt{\frac{\beta}{3\gamma}}, \quad (12)$$

$\kappa = \sqrt{3\beta\gamma}$  is the diffusion exponent and  $\beta = 1 - \omega_0$  is the probability of photon absorption. We also can write:  $\gamma = \frac{4\kappa}{3\gamma}$ . Eq.(2) follows from Eq.(11) at  $\omega_0 = 1$  [17]. The accuracy of Eq. (11) is presented in Figs. 3, 4. It follows that the error of approximations is below 10% at SSA smaller than 0.98 (characteristic for non-precipitating clouds) and COT in the range 8-50. The errors for larger COTs are also small at SSA below 0.99. The relative error of the approximations at larger values of SSA increase because  $t \rightarrow 0$  in the case of thick absorbing clouds. Then the measurements are accompanied by larger experimental errors and noise, which makes the cloud property retrievals not reliable anyway.




Fig.3a. The dependence of transmission function on cloud optical thickness at several values of SSA, zenith observations and solar zenith angle 60 degrees (symbols- exact calculations using Henyey – Greenstein phase function with  $g=0.85$ ; lines- Eq.(11)).




Fig. 3b. The same as in Fig.3a except for a smaller range of COTs.




Fig.4a. The relative error of Eq. (11) as function of cloud optical thickness at several values of SSA. Other parameters used in calculations are the same as in Fig.3a.




Fig.4b. The same as in Fig.4a but for larger range of COTs. The results for the case of 0.95 are not shown because such small values of SSA do not occur in nonprecipitating clouds.




Fig. 4c. The dependence of relative error of Eq. (11) on COT for various values of SSA and SZA.

The diffusion exponent  $\kappa$  and also the similarity parameter  $y$  (see Eq. (12) ) depend on the size of particles. We have found that they can be approximated by the following function:

$$f = c_0 + c_1 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{v_1 a_{ef}}\right) + c_2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{v_2 a_{ef}}\right), \quad (13)$$

where  $a_{ef}$  is in microns. The coefficients of this function, listed in Table 1, have been calculated using Mie theory at the refractive index  $1.3085+0.000079i$  (at 1640nm) for the droplet size distribution:

$$\varphi(a) = D \left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^6 \exp\left(-\frac{6a}{a_0}\right), \quad (14)$$

where  $D = \frac{6^5}{140a_0}$ ,  $a_0 = \frac{2a_{ef}}{3}$  is the mode radius. The accuracy of fitting is shown in Fig.5 as the function of inverse effective radius of droplets.

Table 1. The parameters of the fitting function (13). The refractive index of water used in Mie calculations was  $1.3085+0.000079i$  ( at the wavelength 1640nm).

$f$	$c_0$	$c_1$	$c_2$	$v_1, 1/\mu\text{m}$	$v_2, 1/\mu\text{m}$
$\kappa$	0.03394	0.04652	0.07901	0.10645	0.01522
$y$	0.17267	1.20144	0.72656	0.01466	0.10401

The cloud optical thickness also depends on the effective radius. It can be presented as product of the cloud extinction coefficient and a cloud geometrical thickness  $L$ :

$$\tau = k_{ext} L, \quad (15)$$

where it follows in the geometrical optics approximation:

$$k_{ext} = \frac{3C}{2a_{ef}}, \quad (16)$$

where  $C$  is the volumetric concentration of droplets. Let us introduce the normalized extinction coefficient:

$$K = \frac{k_{ext}}{C} \quad (17)$$

and the liquid water path (LWP):

$$W = C\rho L, \quad (18)$$

where  $\rho$  is the density of water. Then it follows:

$$\tau = KW/\rho. \quad (19)$$

The normalized extinction coefficient can be approximated by the following equation:

$$K = \frac{3}{2a_{ef}} \left( 1 + \frac{v}{x_{ef}^{\frac{2}{3}}} + \frac{\varsigma}{x_{ef}^{\frac{4}{3}}} \right), \quad (20)$$

where  $x_{ef}=ka_{ef}$ ,  $k=2\pi/\lambda$ ,  $\lambda$  is the wavelength,  $v=1.1$ ,  $\varsigma=4.8$ . The pair  $(v, \varsigma)$  has been derived fitting Eq. (20) to the results of Mie calculations. It should be noted that Eq. (20) provides correct geometrical optics result ( $K=1.5/a_{ef}$ ) as  $x_{ef} \rightarrow \infty$ . The accuracy of Eq. (20) is shown in Fig.6 at the wavelengths 440 and 1600nm. We have assumed that water clouds do not absorb radiation at 440nm and the real part of water refractive index is 1.345. It follows that Eq. (20) is very accurate at both wavelengths for the range of effective radii common in water clouds. For completeness, we also show the dependence of the parameters of  $g, \omega_0$  at 1640nm and the parameters  $g, K$  at 440nm as functions of  $a_{ef}$  in Fig.7. We note that the asymmetry parameter does not deviate significantly from the value  $g=0.85$  used in the studies of the accuracy of the approximation presented above. It can be approximated by the following analytical function at 440nm:

$$g = 0.88 - \frac{2.14}{x_{ef}} + \frac{10.2}{x_{ef}^2}, \quad (21)$$

Also, as it follows from Fig.7a, the value of  $\omega_0$  is larger than 0.99 at 1640nm for the range of radii usually occurring in nonprecipitating clouds and  $1-\omega_0$  is linearly proportional to  $a_{ef}$  in the range of droplet radii characteristic for nonprecipitating clouds. Namely in this range the error of the analytical equations for the cloud transmission function presented here is the smallest one.

The analytical equations presented above can be used for the solution of both direct and inverse problems of cloud optics. In particular, we show the dependence of the transmission function on the effective radius of droplets calculated using Eq. (12) and exact radiative transfer calculations at COTs (500nm) equal to 8, 16, and 32, SZA=30 degrees, VZA=0 degrees in Fig.8. It follows that the accuracy of the parametrization is accurate enough for the solution of both direct and inverse problems of cloud optics. The accuracy increases with the size of particles and COT.

It follows that for a given value of the transmission function, multiple solutions for the value of effective radius are possible (see also Fig.9). To avoid this problem, one needs to use spectral measurements and not measurements at just two wavelengths (say, at 440 and 1640nm).




Fig.5a. The diffusion exponent as function of the inverse effective radius of droplets




Fig.5b. The similarity parameter as function of the inverse effective radius of droplets




Fig.6. The normalized cloud extinction coefficient at 1640nm.






Fig.7a. The asymmetry parameter and single scattering albedo of water clouds calculated using Mie theory at 1640nm. The parameter  $c$  is equal to  $0.0005 \mu m^{-1}$ .




Fig.7b. The asymmetry parameter and normalized extinction coefficient of water clouds calculated using Mie theory at 440nm.




Fig.8. The dependence of the transmission function on the effective radius of particles calculated using Eq. (12) (lines) and exact radiative transfer [7] at COTs (500nm) equal to 8, 16, and 32 (SZA=30 degrees and VZA=0 degrees) .




Fig.9 The dependence of the transmission function on the effective radius of particles calculated using Eq. (12) (lines) at COTs (500nm) equal to 5, 10, 20, 30, 40 (SZA=30 degrees and VZA=0 degrees) .

## 2.2.2 The inverse problem

### 2.2.2.1 The solution of inverse problem for underlying black surface

The retrieval of the parameters  $a_{ef}$  and  $W$  can be performed in a way as described below. First of all LWP can be expressed via the cloud optical thickness in the visible:

$$W = \frac{\rho \tau(440nm)}{K} , \quad (22)$$

where  $K$  is given by Eq. (20) and  $\tau(440nm)$  is given by Eq. (6) with account for Eq. (21) for the asymmetry parameter. The only one unknown parameter in Eq. (21) is the effective radius of

particles. Substituting the value of  $W$  presented by Eq. (20) to Eq. (12), we arrive to a transcendent equation for the determination of a single unknown parameter ( $a_{ef}$ ) :

$$T(\lambda) - t(\lambda)u(\mu_0)u(\mu)=0, \quad (23)$$

where

$$t = \frac{\sinh y}{\sinh(x+ay)} \quad (24)$$

is the global transmittance defined as [17]

$$t = 4 \int_0^1 d\mu_0 \int_0^1 \bar{T}(\mu_0, \mu) d\mu. \quad (25)$$

Here  $\bar{T}(\mu_0, \mu)$  is the azimuthally averaged transmission function. The value of  $a_{ef}$  derived from Eq. (23) can be used to determine the liquid water path  $W$  using Eq. (22). The cloud optical thickness is found from Eq. (6).

As it was emphasized above, such an approach leads to multiple solutions (see Fig.9 ). To increase the accuracy of the inverse problem solution, one must minimize the following function:

$$F(\lambda) = \frac{T_{meas}(\lambda)}{T_{meas}(\lambda_0)} - \frac{t(\lambda)}{t(\lambda_0)}, \quad (26)$$

where  $\lambda_0$  is the reference wavelength (say, 1020nm).

For instance, the dependence of the ratio  $\rho = \frac{T(1640nm)}{T(1020nm)}$  on the size of particles is given in Fig.10.

It follows that this ratio can be used to derive the size of particles in unique way at COTs larger than about 20. Otherwise, multiple solutions of inverse problem are possible. Also the value of  $\rho$  can be measured with higher accuracy as compared to the value of the transmission function at a given wavelength. This leads to the increased accuracy of the inverse problem solution.

#### ***2.2.2.2 The solution of inverse problem for underlying non-black Lambertian surface***

Eq. (26) is valid only for black underlying surfaces (e.g., ocean). Land surfaces often strongly reflect incoming solar light, which can be reflected again from the cloud (multiple times) thus causing an increase of the transmission function as observed by a ground instrument. This enhancement can be studied using the following approximation valid for Lambertian underlying surfaces with albedo  $A$ :

$$T_{surf} = T + \frac{At(\mu_0)r_p(\mu)}{1-Ar_s}, \quad (27)$$

where  $T$  is given by Eq. (11) and

$$r_s = \exp(-y) - t \exp(-x - y), r_p(\mu) = \exp(-yu(\mu)) - tu(\mu) \exp(-x - y), t(\mu_0) = tu(\mu_0). \quad (28)$$

It follows from Eq. (19) at SSA equal to 1:

$$T_{surf} = tu(\mu_0)u(\mu) + \frac{Atu(\mu_0)(1-tu(\mu))}{1-A(1-t)}. \quad (29)$$

This enables analytical determination of global transmittance for known surface albedo  $A$ :

$$t = \frac{(1-A)T}{(1-A)u(\mu_0)u(\mu) + A(T + u(\mu_0))}. \quad (30)$$

Then one can derive:

$$\tau_{tr} = \frac{1}{b}(t^{-1} - a), \quad \tau = \frac{\tau_{tr}}{\gamma}. \quad (31)$$

These equations generalize the technique of the COT determination described in the previous section on the case of reflecting underlying surfaces.

Also it follows from Eq. (26) for the cost function for multiple wavelengths:

$$F(\lambda) = \frac{T_{meas}(\lambda)}{T_{meas}(\lambda_0)} - \Phi(\lambda) \frac{t(\lambda)}{t(\lambda_0)}, \quad (32)$$

where

$$\Phi(\lambda) = \frac{1+S(\lambda,\mu)}{1+S(\lambda_0,\mu)} \quad (33)$$

and

$$S(\lambda) = \frac{Ar_p(\lambda,\mu)}{(1-Ar_s(\lambda))u(\mu)}. \quad (34)$$

We show the ratio  $\rho = \frac{T(1640nm)}{T(1020nm)}$  for the surface albedo equal to 0 and 0.4 in Fig.10. It follows that the sensitivity to the ER increases with the surface albedo and COT.




Fig.10. The dependence of the ratio  $\rho = \frac{T(1640nm)}{T(1020nm)}$  on the size of particles at several values of COT for the case of black underlying surface (symbols+lines) and the case of surface albedo  $A=0.4$  (lines). The results presented in the right panel are the same as in the left panel except just for the COTs equal to 20, 30, and 40.

### 2.2.2.3 Fast semi-analytical cloud retrieval technique based on measurements at three wavelengths

We apply the technique described above to the synthetic measurements of the BTF at three wavelengths: 440, 1020, and 1640nm. Then Eq. (32) is transformed to

$$F(\lambda) = \frac{T_{meas}(1640nm)}{T_{meas}(1020nm)} - \Phi(1640nm) \frac{t(1640nm)}{t(1020nm)}. \quad (35)$$

This function depends both on ER and LWP. The LWP can be expressed via the transmission function at 440nm (see Eq. (14)). Therefore, the effective radius is to be found from the single transcendent equation:

$$\frac{T_{meas}(1640nm)}{T_{meas}(1020nm)} - \Phi(1640nm) \frac{t(1640nm)}{t(1020nm)} = 0. \quad (36)$$

The example of retrievals at different values of the measurement errors (0, -5%, +5%) is given in Figs.11, 12. The solution of Eq. (36) has been performed using the Brent's method[23]. Eq. (36) is valid at any underlying surface spectral reflectance. It has been assumed that the surface is black at 440 and 1640nm. The contribution of surface reflectance to the detected signal under clouds is often low because the cloud tBTF is low at 1640nm. We have assumed that the underlying surface is reflective with albedo 0.4 at 1020nm. We conclude that COT is determined with accuracy better

than 10% for COTs larger than 20 and errors of measurements below 5%. The error of retrievals can reach 30% depending on the values of ER and errors of measurements for thin clouds (at COT=5). The uncertainty of LWP and ER retrieval is better than 30% (depending on ER and error of measurements) for most of cases if COT is larger than 30. This points to the fact that the measurements of cloud transmission function must be performed with the highest possible precision.

In the next section we apply the proposed fast Semi-Analytical Retrieval technique based on cloud transmittance measurements (SARMAT) at the triplet 440/1020/1640nm by the CIMEL radiometer. Also we compare our results to those derived from the cloud mode AERONET observations and look-up-table approach [10].




Fig.11. The errors of the cloud optical thickness determination for the effective radius in the range 3-33 microns as function of COT.






Fig.12. The errors of the effective radius and LWP determination for the effective radius in the range 3-33 microns as function of COT.

### 3 Application of the developed inversion scheme to experimental measurements of the solar light transmitted by a cloud layer

Sun/sky radiometer CIMEL has been deployed by AERONET since early 90s [16]. It has 1.2 degree field of view and takes measurements of direct sun and diffuse sky radiances at various wavelengths within 0.34-1.64  $\mu\text{m}$  spectral range. When Sun is blocked by the clouds CIMEL sun/sky radiometer switches to the “cloud mode” taking measurements of sky radiances in the zenith direction [9,10,15]. Sky measurements in the cloud mode are performed at 10s interval for standard CIMELs and at  $\sim 35\text{s}$  for the instruments with polarizers. CIMEL digital counts should be multiplied by calibration coefficients for sky channels to get the values of radiance at each channel. The calibration coefficients and also the extraterrestrial solar irradiance  $F_0$  (see Eq.(1)) integrated over filter spectral function for each channel are given in Table 2. We also show the spectral albedo estimated using MODIS measurements in Table 2.

Table 2. The values of the extraterrestrial irradiance  $F_0$  [24] and calibration constants  $B$  for each channel for the CIMEL instrument used. The dimensionless constant  $K=\pi B/F_0$  can be used to derive the transmittance from CIMEL digital counts  $M$  (namely, it follows:  $T=KM/\mu_0$ ). The last column gives the spectral surface albedo for the GSFC AERONET (38.99N, 76.84W) site derived from Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer observations [25-28]. The constants given

in this Table are not universal and must be assessed for each optical instrument/site individually. The measurements have been performed on May 1, 2019,

$\lambda, \mu m$	$F_0, W/\frac{m^2}{\mu m}$	$B, W/\frac{m^2}{\mu m}/sr$	$K$	$A$
0.440	1789.16	0.24483	4.299e-4	0.041
0.500	1948.01	0.26034	4.199e-4	0.061
0.675	1485.15	0.16531	3.497e-4	0.071
0.870	973.18	0.12438	4.016e-4	0.428
1.020	702.65	0.18957	8.484e-4	0.408
1.640	233.12	0.03233	4.359e-4	0.236

The dependence of measured transmission function at the near IR wavelengths at the transmission function at 440nm is shown in Fig.13. It follows that  $T(1020nm)$  is almost linear function of  $T(440nm)$ . This is not the case for the  $T(1640nm)$ . The transmission function value at 1640nm has risen from 0.05 till 0.5 during the experiment ( see Fig.14). There is also the trend for the increase of  $T(440nm)$  with time ( see Fig.14). This points to the fact that the COT had decreased with time over AERONET site location considered in this paper. The retrieved COT using the technique described in this paper (see Eq. (21)) at three wavelengths (440/1020/1640nm) with account for the surface reflectance (see Table 2) is shown in Fig.15 together with the COT retrieved using standard AERONET cloud mode retrieval techniques based on the look-up-table approach. One can see that the COT is generally decreasing with time, as one may expect ( see Fig.14). The difference between two retrievals is below 10% ( see Fig.16), which is an excellent result taking into account that the current AERONET cloud mode COT retrieval is characterized by the 18% retrieval uncertainty. Also different wavelengths are used in the retrieval process (670/875nm for the standard AERONET cloud mode retrieval and 440/1020/1640nm for our fast retrieval technique). The retrieved LWP and ER in the framework of SARMAT is given in Figs. 17-18. It follows that the average radius of droplets during the observational time was 9.8 microns with the standard deviation (STDV) 3.4 microns. Both ER and LWP decrease with time with average LWP equal to  $183.3g/m^2$  and  $STDV=82.1 g/m^2$ . The coefficient of variance ( $STDV/average$ , see Table 3) was similar for COT, ER, and transmission function at 440nm and 1020nm ( about 30%). The coefficient of variance of  $T(1640nm)$  and LWP was a bit larger (see Table 3). The results of

satellite retrievals (MOD06 product) of the respective cloud parameters are shown in Table 3. We see that ground and satellite data provide similar results – especially taken into account different spatial scales of ground and satellite measurements (couple of meters for low cloudiness existing at the time of measurements, see <https://mplnet.gsfc.nasa.gov/>) and 1km satellite retrievals.




Fig.13. The dependence of the transmission function at 1020 and 1640nm as function of transmission function at 440nm derived from CIMEL measurements.




Fig.14. The dependence of transmission functions at 440 and 1640nm on time as measured by CIMEL. Time given here and below is the Greenwich Meridian Time (GMT)




Fig.15. The inter-comparison of current AERONET cloud mode COT and one retrieved from the fast asymptotic radiative transfer algorithm. Values from the MODIS cloud product for Terra and Aqua are also shown.




Fig.16. The time series of difference between AERONET cloud mode COT and one retrieved from the fast asymptotic radiative transfer algorithm




Fig.17. The time series of LWP as derived from CIMEL measurements




Fig.18. The time series of effective radius as derived from CIMEL measurements. The results derived from satellite measurements are also shown.

Table 3. The statistics of retrieved cloud parameters and measured transmission functions at 440, 1020, and 1640nm. We also show the results of retrievals based on satellite MODIS Terra (38.987N, 76.851W, 16:45 GMT) and Aqua (38.998N, 76.883W, 18:25GMT) observations. Good agreement between satellite and averaged ground observations is found, although the spatial scale of satellite (1km) and ground (several squared meters) observations is quite different. Different COTs, ERs, and LWPs for Terra and Aqua due to different near-infrared wavelengths (1.6, 2.2, and 3.7 microns) used in the retrieval process for the assumed vertically homogeneous clouds although real – world clouds are vertically inhomogeneous turbid media.

Parameter	Average	Standard deviation	Coefficient of variance	Terra MODIS retrievals	Aqua MODIS retrievals
COT	34.3	2.8	0.27	24.84 25.16	- 21.58

				25.36	22.02
ER, microns	9.8	9.4	0.29	8.98 9.4 10.05	- 8.81 9.85
LWP, $g/m^2$	183.3	82.1	0.45	133.0 150.0 162.0	- 120.0 138.0
T(440nm)	0.307	0.085	0.28	-	-
T(1020nm)	0.336	0.097	0.29	-	-
T(1640nm)	0.163	0.096	0.59	-	-

#### 4 Conclusion

In this work we have proposed a simple technique to retrieve the optical thickness, reduced optical thickness, liquid/water path, and effective radius of droplets/crystals of optically thick clouds from CIMEL observations at 440/1020/1640nm in the assumption that clouds are vertically and horizontally homogeneous and have cloud optical thickness above 10 or so. The technique has been applied to the CIMEL observations and close correspondence with CIMEL cloud mode measurements have been found. The algorithm described above can be applied if the radiative transfer in cloud occurs in the asymptotic regime. The standard AERONET cloud mode retrieval also is applicable for the broken cloud conditions, which is not the case for the algorithm described in this paper. The occurrence of asymptotic regime, where the accuracy of SARMAT is highest, can be detected by performing the following tests:

- (1) the BTF measurements in the principal plane follow the angular pattern described by Eq.(4) (cosine law) and there is no transmittance enhancement in the direction of Sun obscured by a cloud;

(2) the almucantar measurements show that there are no azimuthal variations of the transmitted solar light under the cloud.

Another possibility with respect to the quantification of the radiative transfer regime in cloud is the use of a lidar. Basically, our technique can be applied if the ground-based lidar return from upper cloud boundary is weak or not existent. Lidar polarization ratio can be used to distinguish water/ice clouds. Also lidar measurements can be used to get the cloud optical thickness for thin clouds not covered by the technique described in this paper.

Our technique can be used to retrieve the properties of mixed clouds as well. However, the results (except for the transport optical thickness) will be biased unless *a priori* information on the percentage of ice phase in a cloud is known or retrieved from independent measurements.

## **5 Acknowledgements**

The authors thank Ilya Slutsker for providing calibration coefficients and spectral surface albedos.

A. K. also acknowledges the support of International Space Science Institute (ISSI) provided via the ISSI team "Are we doing the right satellite observations and analyses for quantifying cloud-mediated aerosol climate forcing?" S.K. thanks Alexei Lyapustin, NASA GSFC, for the support.



## References

- [1] Stephens GL, Kummerow C. The remote sensing of clouds and precipitation from space: a review. *J. Atmos. Sci.* 2007; 64 (11):3742-3765.
- [2] Yershov OA, Lamden KS, Levin IM, Salganik IN, Shifrin KS. Determination of the optical thickness of clouds above the sea from brightness measurements. *Izvestiya, Atmospheric and Oceanic Physics.* 1988; 24 (5): 396-400.
- [3] Yershov OA, Levin IM, Salganik IN, Sheberstov SV. Optical thickness of clouds over the sea. *Izvestiya, Atmospheric and Oceanic Physics.* 1991; 27 (6): 471-474.
- [4] Leontieva E, Stamnes K. Estimations of cloud optical thickness from ground-based measurements of incoming solar radiation in the Arctic. *J. Climate.* 1994;7: 566–578.
- [5] Leontieva E, Stamnes K. Remote sensing of cloud optical properties from ground-based measurements of transmittance: a feasibility study. *J. Appl. Meteorology.* 1996; 35: 2011-2022.
- [6] Marshak A, Knyazikhin Y, Davis AB, Wiscombe WJ, Pilewskie P. Cloud-vegetation interaction: use of normalized difference cloud index for estimation of cloud optical thickness, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 2000; 27(12):1695–1698, doi:10.1029/1999GL010993.
- [7] Marshak A, Knyazikhin Y, Evans KD, Wiscombe WJ (2004), The “RED versus NIR” plane to retrieve broken-cloud optical depth from ground-based measurements. *J. Atmos. Sci.* 2004; 61: 1911–1925.
- [8] Kikuchi N, Nakajima T, Kumagai H, Kuroiwa H, Kamei A, Nakamura R, Nakajima T Y. Cloud optical thickness and effective particle radius derived from transmitted solar radiation measurements: comparison with cloud radar observations. *J. Geophys. Res.* 2006: 111, D07205, doi:10.1029/2005JD006363.

- [9] Chiu JC, Marshak A, Knyazikhin Y, Wiscombe WJ, Barker HW, Barnard JC, Luo Y. Remote sensing of cloud properties using ground-based measurements of zenith radiance, *J. Geophys. Res.* 2006; 111, D16201, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JD006843>.
- [10] Chiu J C, Huang C H, Marshak A, Slutsker I, Giles D M, Holben B N, Knyazikhin Y, Wiscombe W J. Cloud optical depth retrievals from the Aerosol Robotic Network (AERONET) cloud mode retrievals. *J. Geophys. Res.* 2010; 115: D14202, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD013121>, 2010.
- [11] Chiu J C, Marshak A, Huang CH, Várnai T, Hogan R J, Giles D M, Holben B N, O'Connor E J, Knyazikhin Y, Wiscombe W J. Cloud droplet size and liquid water path retrievals from zenith radiance measurements: examples from the Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Program and the Aerosol Robotic Network. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 2012; 12: 10313-10329, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-10313-2012>.
- [12] Kokhanovsky AA, McBride PJ, Schmidt KS, Pilewskie P. The determination of cloud optical thickness and effective particle size from measurements of transmitted solar diffuse light. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*. 2013; 10: 1512-1516. DOI: 10.1109/LGRS.2013.2261274.
- [13] Brückner M, Pospichal B, Macke A, Wendisch M. A new multispectral cloud retrieval method for ship-based solar transmissivity measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.* 2014; 119: 1–17, doi:10.1002/2014JD021775.
- [14] LeBlanc SE, Pilewskie P, Schmidt K S, Coddington O. A spectral method for discriminating thermodynamic phase and retrieving cloud optical thickness and effective radius using transmitted solar radiance spectra, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* 2015; 8: 1361–1383, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-8-1361-2015>.

- [15] Shonk JKP, Chiu JC, Marshak A, Giles D M, Huang CH, Mace GG, Benson S, Slutsker I, Holben BN. The impact of neglecting ice phase on cloud optical depth retrievals from AERONET cloud mode observations, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* 2019;12: 5087–5099, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-12-5087-2019>.
- [16] Holben B N. AERONET: A federated instrument network and data archive for aerosol characterization, *Remote Sens. Environ.* 1998;66: 1–16.
- [17] Kokhanovsky A. *Cloud Optics*. 2006; Berlin: Springer.
- [18] Sobolev VV. *Light scattering in planetary atmospheres*. 1975; Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- [19] Korkin S, Lyapustin A. Matrix exponential in C/C++ version of vector radiative transfer code IPOL. *J. Quant.Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.* 2019; 227: 106–110.
- [20] Henyey LG, Greenstein JL. Diffuse radiation in the Galaxy. *Astrophysical Journal*. 1941; 93: 70-83, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/144246>
- [21] Korkin S., Lyapustin A., and Rozanov V. Modifications of discrete ordinates method for computations with high scattering anisotropy: comparative analysis. *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer* 2012, 113, 2040–2048.
- [22] Emde C, Barlakas V, Cornet C, Evans F, Korkin S, Ota Y, Labonnote LC, Lyapustin A, Macke A, Mayer B, et al. IPRT polarized radiative transfer model intercomparison project—Phase A. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.* 2015, 164: 8–36.
- [23] Brent, RP. *Algorithms for minimization without derivatives*, 1973. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- [24] Coddington O, Lean J L, Pilewskie P, Snow M, Lindholm D. A solar irradiance climate data record. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*. 2016, 97: 1265–1282.

- [25] Wang Z, Schaaf C B, Sun Q, Shuai Y, Roman M O: Capturing rapid land surface dynamics with Collection V006 MODIS/BRDF/NBAR/Albedo (MCD43) product. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 2018, 207: 50-64.
- [26] Sinyuk A, et al. The AERONET Version 3 aerosol retrieval algorithm, associated uncertainties and comparisons to Version 2. *Atmos. Meas. Techniques*. 2019, submitted.
- [27] Platnick S, Meyer K, King M D , Wind G, Amarasinghe N, Marchant B, Arnold G T , Zhang Z, Hubanks P A , Holz R E , Yang P, Ridgway W L , and Riedi J: The MODIS cloud optical and microphysical products: Collection 6 updates and examples from Terra and Aqua. *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, 2017, 55: 502–525, doi:10.1109/TGRS.2016.2610522.
- [28] [https://www.umb.edu/spectralmass/terra\\_aqua\\_modis/modis\\_brdf\\_albedo\\_product\\_mcd43](https://www.umb.edu/spectralmass/terra_aqua_modis/modis_brdf_albedo_product_mcd43)