Retrieval of aerosol parameters from the oxygen A band in the presence of chlorophyll fluorescence

3

4 A. F. J. Sanders¹ and J. F. de Haan¹

5 [1]{Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI), De Bilt, The Netherlands}

6 Correspondence to: A. F. J. Sanders (bram.sanders@knmi.nl)

7

8 Abstract

9 We have investigated precision of retrieved aerosol parameters for a generic aerosol retrieval 10 algorithm over vegetated land using the O₂ A band. Chlorophyll fluorescence is taken into 11 account in the forward model. Fluorescence emissions are modeled as isotropic contributions 12 to the upwelling radiance field at the surface and they are retrieved along with aerosol 13 parameters. Precision is calculated by propagating measurement errors and a priori errors, 14 including model parameter errors, using the forward model's derivatives. Measurement errors consists of noise and calibration errors. Model parameter errors considered are related to the 15 single scattering albedo, surface pressure and temperature profile. We assume that 16 measurement noise is dominated by shot noise; thus, results apply to grating spectrometers in 17 particular. In a number of retrieval simulations, we describe precision for various atmospheric 18 19 states, observation geometries and spectral resolutions of the instrument. These precision 20 levels may be compared against user requirements. A comparison of precision estimates with 21 the literature and an analysis of the dependence on the a priori error in the fluorescence 22 emission indicate that aerosol parameters can be retrieved in the presence of chlorophyll 23 fluorescence: if fluorescence is present, fluorescence emissions should be included in the state 24 vector to avoid biases in retrieved aerosol parameters.

25

26 **1** Introduction

Chlorophyll in terrestrial vegetation exhibits fluorescence in the red and near-infrared
wavelength range. The oxygen A band around 760 nm is located in the fluorescence
wavelength region and is often used for cloud retrieval (e.g. Koelemeijer et al., 2001: Fast

Retrieval Scheme for Clouds from the Oxygen A Band (FRESCO); Rozanov and 1 2 Kokhanovsky, 2004: Semi-Analytical Cloud Retrieval Algorithm (SACURA)) but 3 increasingly also for aerosol retrieval. Current and future operational algorithms employ the 4 O₂ A band for retrieval of aerosol parameters per se (e.g. Sanders et al. 2012; Dubuisson et 5 al., 2012) or for aerosol correction as part of a more convolved trace gas retrieval (e.g. O'Dell et al., 2012; Butz et al., 2012; Reuter et al., 2010; Yoshida et al., 2011). Recently, 6 7 advancements have been made into remote sensing of fluorescence emissions from space 8 using hyperspectral radiance measurements (Frankenberg et al., 2011a; Joiner et al., 2011, 9 2012b, 2013; Guanter et al., 2012). If the relatively small fluorescence signal is strong enough 10 to enable fluorescence retrieval from space, the question arises whether fluorescence 11 emissions will interfere with aerosol retrieval from the O₂ A band and, if so, how to account 12 for fluorescence in an aerosol retrieval algorithm. A number of previous studies have investigated the potential of the O₂ A band for retrieval of 13 14 aerosol parameters. Early papers discussing aerosol retrieval from the O_2 A band are by 15 Badayev and Malkevich (1978) and Gabella et al. (1999). Corradini and Cervino (2006) 16 present a simulation study of retrieval of the extinction profile for instrument characteristics 17 of the Scanning Imaging Absorption Spectrometer for Atmospheric Cartography (SCIAMACHY: Bovensmann et al., 1999). Actual case studies exploiting hyperspectral O₂ A 18 19 band measurements have been performed by Koppers and Murtagh (1997) for data from the Global Ozone Monitoring Experiment (GOME: Burrows et al., 1999), and by Kokhanovsky 20 21 and Rozanov (2010) and Sanghavi et al. (2012) for data from SCIAMACHY. Koppers and 22 Murtagh (1997) retrieve surface albedo simultaneously with aerosol optical thickness and 23 height distribution, while in the retrievals proposed by Kokhanovsky and Rozanov (2010) and 24 Sanghavi et al. (2012) the surface albedo basically is a model parameter (i.e. surface albedo 25 not fitted). Sensitivity studies to consolidate instrument requirements for O₂ A band aerosol retrieval include studies for Sentinel-4/5 (Ingmann et al., 2012) by Siddans et al. (2007) and 26 27 Hasekamp and Siddans (2009). Sanders et al. (2012) prepare for aerosol layer height retrieval 28 with the Tropospheric Monitoring Instrument on the Sentinel-5 Precursor mission 29 (TROPOMI: Veefkind et al., 2012). In none of these studies the role of fluorescence 30 emissions in retrieval of aerosol parameters is discussed. 31 Furthermore, there are indications that the FRESCO cloud retrieval algorithm also provides 32 information on aerosols in case of optically thick aerosol layers (Wang et al., 2012).

- 33 Dubuisson et al. (2009) present a method to retrieve the altitude of aerosol plumes over ocean

1 from the ratio of reflectances in the two O₂ A band channels of the Medium Resolution 2 Imaging Spectrometer (MERIS: Rast et al., 1999) and the Polarization and Directionality of the Earth's Reflectance (POLDER: Deschamps et al., 1994) instrument. Finally, we mention 3 4 the work by Van Diedenhoven et al. (2005) who showed that retrieved apparent surface 5 pressure (i.e. retrieved surface pressure when ignoring aerosol scattering) with SCIAMACHY depends systematically on aerosol parameters. This illustrates in yet another way that the 6 7 O₂ A band contains aerosol information available for retrieval. 8 Photosynthesis in chlorophyll pigments is driven by absorption of visible solar radiation

9 between about 400 and 700 nm (photosynthetically active radiation). Part of the energy 10 absorbed by chlorophyll that is not used for carbon fixation is re-emitted at longer wavelengths in the 650 to 800 nm wavelength range (fluorescence). Interest in remote sensing 11 12 of solar-induced chlorophyll fluorescence arises, because it is an indicator of photosynthetic 13 activity (e.g. Maxwell and Johnson, 2000; Krause and Weis, 1991). Frankenberg et al. 14 (2011b) indeed show a strong linear correlation between satellite retrievals of fluorescence 15 and gross primary production from vegetation models. Satellite-based remote sensing of 16 fluorescence would thus offer a way to measure carbon fluxes associated with gross primary 17 production on a global scale.

18 For the present study, it is important to know typical values of fluorescence emissions at the 19 O₂ A band. Guanter et al. (2012) retrieved fluorescence emissions at 755 nm, which is near the start of the O₂ A band, using measurements from the Greenhouse Gases Observing 20 Satellite (GOSAT: Kuze et al., 2009). They report monthly 2° by 2° average values up to 1.8 21 mW m⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹. This range agrees with Frankenberg et al. (2011b), who also use GOSAT 22 measurements but employ a different retrieval method. Around the O₂ A band, fluorescence 23 24 emissions typically decrease with wavelength. Laboratory measurements of leaf fluorescence 25 as well as leaf and canopy models show that emissions at 770 nm can be up to a factor of two smaller than emissions at 755 nm (e.g. Amoros-Lopez et al., 2008; Guanter et al., 2010). A 26 27 linear wavelength dependence seems sufficient to describe the spectral behavior across the O₂ 28 A band.

Fluorescence emissions are a slowly varying function of wavelength. There are basically two mechanisms for retrieving fluorescence emissions from space: filling-in of Fraunhofer lines and filling-in of atmospheric absorption bands (e.g. oxygen bands). Filling-in of atmospheric absorption bands occurs because photons emitted at the surface pass the atmosphere only

once, whereas photons reflected by the surface pass the atmosphere twice before reaching the 1 2 detector. These mechanisms make it in principle possible to distinguish light reflected by the 3 atmosphere-surface from fluorescence emissions. Fig. 1 shows monochromatic reflectance 4 spectra and simulated measurements at a spectral resolution of 0.1 nm and 0.5 nm. The 5 atmosphere contains aerosols (aerosol optical thickness of 0.4 and a layer pressure of 700 hPa) over vegetated land (albedo of 0.20 at 758 nm) with a representative fluorescence 6 emission (1.2 mW m⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹ at 758 nm). Simulated measured reflectance spectra in the 7 8 right panel of Fig. 1 correspond to retrievals in Fig. 4: for details of these simulations, see 9 Sect. 4.2. Note that for this representative scenario the increase in continuum reflectance 10 (hence in radiance) due to the fluorescence emission is about 2%.

11 Frankenberg et al. (2011a) have shown that if fluorescence is not taken into account (i.e. zero 12 emissions assumed in retrieval, emissions not fitted), significant biases in retrieved aerosol 13 parameters (optical thickness, height of the Gaussian layer), surface albedo and surface 14 pressure occur. We have confirmed this finding: for the forward model described in Sect. 2 15 we find aerosol pressure biases up to 100 hPa and biases in optical thickness up to 2.0 as well as non-convergent retrievals. Apparently, errors in aerosol and fluorescence parameters are 16 17 correlated and so part of the fit residue caused by ignoring fluorescence is absorbed by other retrieval parameters. This finding, however, does not yet prove that it is actually impossible to 18 19 simultaneously retrieve aerosol and fluorescence parameters.

20 Even if derivatives are to some extent linearly dependent, which they are in this case as well 21 as in many other retrieval problems, parameters may still be fitted with acceptable precision levels. Fig. 2 shows normalized derivatives (i.e. normalized to one at their respective 22 maximum) of reflectance with respect to surface albedo, aerosol optical thickness, aerosol 23 24 mid pressure and fluorescence emission. Derivatives are calculated at a spectral resolution of 0.5 nm for the same atmospheric scenario as in Fig. 4 except that the surface albedo and 25 26 fluorescence emission are assumed independent of wavelength here for ease of interpretation. Overall, one can see that particularly spectral shapes of derivatives with respect to surface 27 28 albedo and fluorescence emission are similar, although there are small differences in the 29 continuum due to filling-in of Fraunhofer lines. This figure suggests that fluorescence 30 emissions will indeed disturb retrieval of surface albedo and of aerosol parameters through correlations, if substantial fluorescence is present and not taken into account. However, 31 32 retrieval simulations are needed to investigate whether spectral shapes are still sufficiently

1 different to simultaneously fit aerosol and fluorescence parameters and obtain acceptable

2 precision levels.

3 In other words, if the objective of retrieval is to estimate aerosol parameters from the O_2 A 4 band, the question is whether filling-in of Fraunhofer lines across the O₂ A band as well as 5 filling-in of the O₂ A band itself provides sufficient independent information to 6 simultaneously retrieve aerosol and fluorescence parameters and avoid biases in retrieved 7 aerosol parameters. If this is not the case, external information on fluorescence emission is 8 needed to minimize its impact on aerosol retrieval. Note that if the objective of retrieval is to 9 estimate fluorescence emissions, it is much more efficient to use filling-in of Fraunhofer lines 10 outside atmospheric absorption bands, because complicated radiative transfer calculations are 11 not needed (Frankenberg et al., 2011a; Joiner et al., 2011, 2012b, 2013; Guanter et al., 2012). 12 In this paper we therefore take the following approach to answering the question how well we 13 can retrieve aerosol parameters from the O_2 A band in the presence of chlorophyll 14 fluorescence. For a number of atmospheric states, observation geometries and instrument 15 properties, we perform a linear error analysis when simultaneously fitting aerosol and 16 fluorescence parameters to investigate errors in retrieved parameter values. Next to instrument 17 noise we also take calibration errors into account. Contributions of model parameter 18 uncertainties (single scattering albedo, temperature profile and surface pressure) are included 19 in reported precision levels by adding these parameters to the state vector with appropriate a 20 priori errors. In the end, the question whether or not aerosol and fluorescence parameters can 21 be simultaneously retrieved should of course be understood in terms of meeting scientific user 22 requirements: precision levels reported in this paper may be compared with such requirements 23 to decide whether or not precision levels are indeed acceptable. The focus of this paper is the 24 effect of fluorescence on retrieval of aerosol parameters. However, we will also report 25 retrieval precision of fluorescence emissions.

The instrument noise model that we use for our simulations assumes that measurement noise is dominated by shot noise. Results are thus particularly relevant for missions carrying grating spectrometers for which the shot noise assumption is reasonable. This includes future satellite instruments such as TROPOMI on the Sentinel-5 Precursor mission, spectrometers on the Sentinel-5 and Sentinel-4 missions, the Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 instrument (OCO-2: Crisp et al., 2004), and instruments on the Earth Explorer 8 candidate missions Carbon Monitoring Satellite (CarbonSat: Meijer et al., 2012; Bovensmann et al., 2010) and 1 Fluorescence Explorer (FLEX: Kraft et al., 2012; ESA, 2008). Other satellite instruments

2 include SCIAMACHY and the Global Ozone Monitoring Experiment-2 (GOME-2: Callies et

3 al., 2000).

4 The paper is structured as follows: Sect. 2 gives a detailed description of the forward model.

Sect. 3 describes in more detail the method to calculate retrieval precision. Sect. 4 presents
results from the simulations. Sect. 5 provides a discussion of these results.

7

8 2 Forward model

9 2.1 Overview

10 The forward model used to calculate reflectance spectra and derivatives is part of a software 11 package developed at KNMI called DISAMAR. The abbreviation DISAMAR stands for 12 Determining Instrument Specifications and Analyzing Methods for Atmospheric Retrieval. It 13 is a comprehensive tool to support the development at KNMI of Level-2 algorithms for 14 satellite measurements of backscattered solar radiation.

15 Measured reflectance is defined as

16
$$R(\lambda_i) = \frac{\pi I(\lambda_i)}{\mu_0 E_0(\lambda_i)},$$
 (1)

where μ_o is the cosine of the solar zenith angle θ_o , and $I(\lambda_i)$ and $E_0(\lambda_i)$ are the radiance and 17 solar irradiance measured in the i^{th} spectral bin, respectively (the i^{th} bin is assigned nominal 18 wavelength λ_i). When simulating reflectance spectra, measured radiance $I(\lambda_i)$ and irradiance 19 20 $E_0(\lambda_i)$ result after convolving monochromatic (or high-resolution) radiance $I(\lambda)$ and irradiance 21 $E_0(\lambda)$ with their respective slit functions. Monochromatic radiance, in turn, is calculated by 22 multiplying monochromatic reflectance from the radiative transfer model with the high-23 resolution solar irradiance spectrum and adding a fluorescence term. The radiative transfer 24 model also provides derivatives of high-resolution reflectance spectra. These derivatives are 25 appropriately convolved with the radiance slit function to give derivatives of measured reflectance spectra (matrix K, see below). 26

Hence, key elements of the forward model are a *high-resolution solar irradiance spectrum*, an
 atmospheric model, including oxygen absorption cross section data, to describe the
 atmosphere-surface system, a *radiative transfer model* to calculate monochromatic reflectance

1 and an *instrument model* to describe the physics of the instrument. These elements will be

2 discussed in more detail below.

3 2.2 High-resolution solar irradiance spectrum

4 We use the high-resolution solar reference spectrum by Chance and Kurucz (2010), which has

5 a full width at half maximum (FWHM) of 0.04 nm and is oversampled by a factor of four.

6 The depth of Fraunhofer lines may thus be slightly underestimated. We only investigate

7 effects of spectral resolution of the observation for FWHMs of 0.1 nm and larger to avoid

8 retrieval artifacts due to the solar spectrum's finite resolution.

9 2.3 Atmospheric model

We choose a simple but generic atmospheric model to describe an atmosphere in whichRayleigh scattering, oxygen absorption, and scattering and absorption by aerosols takes place.

The ground surface is modelled as an isotropically reflecting (Lambertian) surface. Since we are interested in the effect of chlorophyll fluorescence, we only consider a vegetated land albedo A_s of 0.20 at 758 nm (Koelemeijer et al., 2003). In some simulations, the albedo is assumed to be independent of wavelength across the spectral window. In other simulations, the surface albede linearly shares around from 0.20 at 758 nm to 0.25 at 770 nm to model a

16 the surface albedo linearly slopes upward from 0.20 at 758 nm to 0.25 at 770 nm to model a

17 more realistic spectral dependence.

18 Chlorophyll fluorescence is modeled as an isotropic contribution to the upwelling radiance field at the surface in units of 10¹² photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹. The maximum fluorescence 19 emission near the start of the O_2 A band as retrieved by Guanter et al. (2012) is 1.8 mW m⁻² 20 sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹ (monthly 2° by 2° average). This value corresponds to $0.7 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ 21 nm⁻¹ at the start of the spectral window (758 nm). The fluorescence emission F_s is fully 22 23 incorporated in the radiative transfer model: upon transmission to the top of atmosphere, the 24 emission may undergo absorption by oxygen but also Rayleigh scattering and aerosol extinction. In some simulations, the fluorescence emission (in 10^{12} photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹) 25 is assumed to be independent of wavelength across the spectral window. In other simulations, 26 27 the fluorescence emission linearly slopes downward across the spectral window, such that emission is a factor of two smaller at the end of the window, to model a more realistic spectral 28

29 dependence.

The conventional unit of fluorescence in the literature is mW m⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹. Fluorescence emissions in our simulations (in 10^{12} photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹) depend on wavelength in that unit. We therefore report simulation results in units of 10^{12} photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹. For comparison with previous studies, we convert results into units of mW m⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹ where appropriate, taking 758 nm as the reference wavelength.

6 An aerosol layer is modelled as a layer of particles with an associated optical thickness τ 7 (constant volume extinction coefficient within the layer). Aerosols have a single scattering 8 albedo of 0.95 and a Henvey-Greenstein phase function with asymmetry parameter of 0.7. 9 This represents an average aerosol model as compared to long-term AERONET observations by Dubovik et al. (2002). Optical thickness, single scattering albedo and phase function are 10 11 assumed to be independent of wavelength across the spectral window. Optical thicknesses reported in this paper thus hold for wavelengths of the O_2 A band and are denoted as τ (760 12 13 nm).

Furthermore, we take a simplified aerosol profile that consists of a single layer with a fixed pressure difference between top and base of 100 hPa—pressure is the independent height variable. Hence a layer with a mid pressure P_{mid} of 700 hPa is located between 750 hPa and 650 hPa.

Finally, we use a Mid-Latitude Summer temperature profile. Rayleigh scattering is specified according to Bodhaine et al. (1999). The surface pressure is 1013 hPa. Oxygen is assumed to have a constant volume mixing ratio of 20.95%. In addition to line absorption, we include first-order line mixing and collision-induced absorption by O₂-O₂ and O₂-N₂ according to the papers by Tran et al. (2006) and Tran and Hartmann (2008). In agreement with Tran and Hartmann (2008), line parameters (three isotopologues) are taken from the Jet Propulsion Laboratory database.

25 **2.4 Radiative transfer model**

Monochromatic reflectances are calculated with the layer-based orders of scattering method. This is a variant of the doubling-adding method (e.g. De Haan et al., 1987; Hovenier et al., 2004) in which the adding of the different layers is replaced by orders of scattering for the atmospheric layers. Multiple scattering is taken into account, but polarization is ignored. Rotational Raman scattering is ignored as well (see Sect. 5). A pseudo-spherical correction is used as in Caudill et al. (1997). The spectral window extends from 758 nm to 770 nm, which covers almost the entire O₂ A band. Wavelengths beyond 770 nm do not contribute additional
 information content (Siddans et al., 2007). Calculations are done accurately using nine
 Gaussian points for integration over the polar angle (eighteen streams). Other settings for the
 radiative transfer calculations are optimized for accuracy as well.

5 It is essential that derivatives are calculated accurately, when assessing whether aerosol and 6 fluorescence parameters can be simultaneously determined from the measurement. 7 Derivatives of monochromatic reflectance with respect to the fit parameters are calculated in a 8 semi-analytical manner using reciprocity (equivalent to the adjoint method; e.g. Landgraf et 9 al., 2001). Such an approach is preferred over numerical techniques (e.g. finite-difference 10 methods), because derivatives can be calculated faster and much more accurately.

11 2.5 Instrument model

The instrument model contains slit functions for the convolution of high-resolution radiance spectra, irradiance spectra and derivatives. In addition, it contains a noise model to associate radiance and irradiance spectra with noise spectra. In some simulations, we also model a calibration error in reflectance spectra. Measurement noise and calibration errors are used to construct the measurement error covariance matrices **S**_e. Measurement noise and calibration errors are not added to the simulated reflectance spectra.

We assume that measurement noise can be characterized by shot noise. In that case, the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the radiance L is proportional to the square root of the radiance (in photons):

21
$$\operatorname{SNR}(L(\lambda_i)) = f(\lambda_i) \cdot \sqrt{L(\lambda_i)}$$
 (2)

In addition, we assume the proportionality factor $f(\lambda_i)$ to be independent of wavelength. If we know the signal-to-noise ratio for some reference radiance level L^{ref} at some reference wavelength λ_i^{ref} , we can calculate the signal-to-noise ratio for any other radiance level at any other wavelength following

26
$$\operatorname{SNR}(L(\lambda_i);\Delta\lambda) = \operatorname{SNR}(L^{ref}(\lambda_i^{ref});\Delta\lambda^{ref}) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{L(\lambda_i)}{L^{ref}(\lambda_i^{ref})}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\Delta\lambda}{\Delta\lambda^{ref}}}.$$
 (3)

1 Here, we have also explicitly accounted for the dependence of signal-to-noise ratio on spectral 2 sampling interval $\Delta\lambda$ (spectral bin). Finally, we assume the signal-to-noise ratio of the 3 irradiance to be a factor of ten higher than the signal-to-noise ratio of the reference radiance.

The default instrument model for this study consists of anticipated instrument characteristics for TROPOMI (Veefkind et al., 2012). The TROPOMI instrument model will be used in a set of simulations investigating the dependence of retrieval precision on atmospheric parameters. The radiance and irradiance slit functions *S* at the O₂ A band are flat-topped functions with a full width at half maximum of 0.5 nm:

9
$$S(\lambda_i, \lambda) = const \cdot 2^{-\left(\frac{\lambda_i - \lambda}{FWHM/2}\right)^4}$$
 (4)

10 The constant *const* normalizes the slit function to unit area. The spectral sampling interval is 11 0.1 nm. The signal-to-noise ratio at 758 nm (continuum) is 500 for a reference radiance L^{ref} (758 nm) of 4.5 \cdot 10¹² photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹. The reference radiance spectrum, which is 12 13 used for specification of the SNR within the Sentinel-5 and Sentinel-5 Precursor projects, 14 corresponds to a dark scene ('tropical dark', meaning a pure molecular atmosphere with a surface albedo of 0.02, a solar zenith angle of 0° and a viewing zenith angle of 0°). Hence, if 15 16 clouds or aerosols are present, or if the surface albedo is larger than 0.02, the actual SNR will 17 be (much) larger than 500. Furthermore, we take a multiplicative calibration error in 18 reflectance of 1%, which is the expected radiometric accuracy for the TROPOMI near-19 infrared bands. Calibration errors for different wavelengths are typically strongly correlated 20 and we assume a correlation (*e*-folding) length of 100 nm, which is the width of TROPOMI's 21 near-infrared detector.

22 In subsequent simulations, we investigate the dependence of retrieval precision on spectral 23 resolution and signal-to-noise ratio. When decreasing the FWHM, we keep the spectral 24 sampling ratio constant (i.e. five) and adjust the spectral sampling interval ($\Delta\lambda$) accordingly 25 (e.g. spectral bin of 0.02 nm at a FWHM of 0.1 nm). We also keep the number of photons entering the detector constant. Hence, signal-to-noise ratio will be scaled according to Eq. 3. 26 27 Signal-to-noise ratios reported in this paper always are reference values that hold for the default TROPOMI spectral sampling interval of 0.1 nm and the TROPOMI reference radiance 28 29 at 758 nm mentioned above.

3 Error propagation

For various atmospheric states, observation geometries and instrument properties, we simulate reflectance spectra of the O_2 A band using the forward model described in Sect. 2. We associate these reflectance spectra with corresponding measurement error covariance matrices. The forward model also provides derivatives of reflectance spectra with respect to the various fit parameters (e.g. aerosol and fluorescence parameters). We then calculate $1-\sigma$ errors in fit parameters by propagating measurement errors and a priori errors according to the optimal estimation formalism (Rodgers, 2000).

9 In symbols: Let's assume that the forward model *F* can be linearized for the purposes of an
10 error analysis. We write

11
$$\mathbf{R} \approx F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}),$$
 (5)

where **R** is the vector of measured reflectances, **x** is the state vector containing the fit parameters and $\mathbf{K} = \partial F(\mathbf{x}) / \partial \mathbf{x}$ is the Jacobian matrix (evaluated here at $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$). The *i*th element of **R** is the reflectance at wavelength λ_i . The reflectance is subject to measurement error, which is described by the measurement error covariance matrix **S**.:

$$16 \quad (S_{\varepsilon})_{ij} = \begin{cases} \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}(R_{i}) + \sigma_{calib}^{2}(R_{i}) & i = j \\ \sigma_{calib}(R_{i}) \cdot \sigma_{calib}(R_{j}) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{|\lambda_{i} - \lambda_{j}|}{\Delta l}\right) & i \neq j \end{cases},$$

$$(6)$$

17 where $\sigma_{c}^{2}(R_{i})$ is the variance of the noise error in R_{i} , $\sigma_{calib}^{2}(R_{i})$ the variance of the calibration 18 error in R_{i} and Δl is the calibration error's correlation length. The noise error and calibration 19 error are calculated according to the instrument model described in Sect. 2.5. The covariance 20 matrix $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ describing the error in retrieved parameters $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is then given by: 21 $\hat{\mathbf{S}} = (\mathbf{K}^{T} \mathbf{S}_{c}^{-1} \mathbf{K} + \mathbf{S}_{a}^{-1})^{-1}$. (7)

in which S_a is the covariance matrix describing knowledge of the fit parameters prior to the measurement. We assume that the a priori covariance matrix is diagonal, i.e. a priori errors are uncorrelated.

A column of **K** corresponds to the derivative of reflectance with respect to a particular fit parameter as a function of wavelength (after appropriate convolution with the slit function). If columns of **K** become strongly linearly dependent, the matrix $\mathbf{K}^T \mathbf{S}_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathbf{K}$ will be nearly singular and the error in some retrieved parameters (diagonal elements of \hat{S}) can become large (or rather, it becomes limited by the a priori error.) Note that if columns of **K** are nearly linearly dependent, the solution \hat{x} will typically also be more sensitive to systematic errors, such as numerical inaccuracies or model parameter errors.

5 Here, we investigate the effect of model parameter errors by including a number of the main 6 model parameters in the state vector and assigning them appropriate a priori errors (cf. 7 retrieval of the 'full state vector'; Rodgers, 2000, section 4.1.2). The a posteriori error 8 covariance matrix then provides the sum of the covariances of retrieval errors due to 9 measurement noise, smoothing errors and model parameter errors. The state vector thus 10 contains the retrieval quantities of interest (aerosol pressure, aerosol optical thickness), other 11 retrieval quantities for which the measurement may contain information (e.g. fluorescence 12 emission), and true model parameters for which the measurement probably does not contain 13 any information (e.g. aerosol single scattering albedo). In the latter case, the posterior 14 covariance is equal to the prior covariance, which affects precision of retrieval quantities through correlations. 15

16 We calculate retrieval precision for a full state vector and for a reduced state vector. State 17 vector elements and a priori errors are given in Table 1 (a priori values are equal to true 18 values). The main fit parameters are mid pressure of the aerosol layer (P_{mid}) , aerosol optical 19 thickness (τ) and surface albedo (A_s). These parameters have large a priori errors. Surface 20 albedo and surface emission (F_s) are assumed constant across the fit window in case of the 21 reduced state vector; surface albedo and surface emission are described by a second-order 22 polynomial in case of the full state vector (three wavelength nodes). Although a linear 23 wavelength dependence seems sufficient to describe the spectral behavior of realistic surface 24 albedos (Koelemeijer et al., 2003) and realistic surface emissions (Amoros-Lopez et al., 2008; 25 Guanter et al., 2010) across the O_2 A band, we use a second-order polynomial for the 26 wavelength dependence in the forward model for retrieval to allow the retrieval to account for 27 any residual higher-order spectral variations. Furthermore, the full state vector contains the 28 single scattering albedo (ω), surface pressure (P_s) and the temperature profile ($T(p_i)$). Finally, 29 the measurement error covariance matrix comprises noise errors in case of the reduced state 30 vector, and it comprises noise and calibration errors in case of the full state vector.

31 We take an a priori error for the single scattering albedo of 0.05. Thus, for a single scattering

32 albedo of 0.95, the 3- σ range covers 0.80 to 1.0, which is about the range of typical single

scattering albedos. We assume that the fluorescence emission is known with an a priori error 1 of $1.0 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹; the 3- σ range then also covers the range of realistic 2 emissions (Guanter et al., 2012). Furthermore, we assume that the surface pressure is known 3 4 with an a priori error of 3 hPa, which is in agreement with root-mean-square differences 5 between ground station observations and spatiotemporally interpolated 1° by 1° ECMWF 6 fields as found by Salstein et al., 2008. Finally, we take an a priori error for the temperature 7 profile of 2 K at every pressure level with a correlation length of 6 km. Other important 8 forward model uncertainties that are not considered include the phase function and the 9 presence of multiple aerosol/cloud layers (a single scattering layer is assumed in the retrieval). 10 Note that we assume that a linear error analysis can indeed be performed. In other words, we assume that for a specific atmospheric state the forward model is approximately linear within 11 12 the measurement and a priori error. If the model is non-linear, convergence may be 13 problematic or multiple minima in the cost function may exist. Investigating the effect of non-14 linearities on convergence and stability of retrieval is beyond the scope of this paper. 15

16 4 Results

17 **4.1** Dependence on atmospheric parameters

18 In a first set of simulations, we investigate the dependence of retrieval precision on 19 atmospheric parameters and solar and viewing zenith angles. We have used the TROPOMI instrument model described in the previous section. Fig. 3 shows the dependence of precision 20 21 of aerosol mid pressure (first row), aerosol optical thickness (second row), surface albedo (third row), and fluorescence emission (fourth row) on aerosol optical thickness for three 22 23 values of the mid pressure of the aerosol layer. The left column corresponds to retrieval of the 24 reduced state vector excluding calibration errors; the right column corresponds to retrieval of 25 the full state vector including calibration errors and uncertainties in additional model 26 parameters. For easy comparison, scales along the y-axes are the same. Results are presented for a solar zenith angle of 50° and nadir viewing direction. We will summarize the main 27 28 findings.

Dependence on fluorescence emission. Fluorescence emissions ranged between zero emission and a maximum emission of $0.7 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹ at 758 nm (or 1.8 mW m⁻² sr⁻¹ 1 nm⁻¹). Absolute errors in the main fit parameters are the same when varying fluorescence 2 emissions between zero emission and maximum emission and keeping the a priori error the 3 same. The results presented in Fig. 3 therefore hold for fluorescence emissions in this range. 4 Relative errors in retrieved fluorescence emission of course decrease with increasing 5 emissions.

6 Dependence on aerosol optical thickness. Precision of retrieved aerosol mid pressure and 7 optical thickness generally improves with increasing τ (stronger aerosol signal). One can see 8 that precision of retrieved aerosol optical thickness is slightly worse for an optical thickness 9 of 1.0 compared to an optical thickness of 0.6 when the full state vector is retrieved. This is 10 presumably due to the uncertainty in the single scattering albedo. Precision of retrieved 11 surface albedo and fluorescence emission generally deteriorates with increasing τ (shielding 12 of the surface below the aerosol layer).

13 Dependence on mid pressure. Precision of aerosol parameters generally improves with 14 decreasing pressure (increasing altitude). At larger pressure differences between aerosol layer 15 and ground surface, it is easier to distinguish aerosol contributions from surface contributions.

16 Dependence on solar zenith angle. We have tested retrieval precision for solar zenith angles of 0° , 50° and 75° (not shown). Precision of aerosol parameters tends to improve with increasing 17 18 solar zenith angle. If the solar zenith angle increases, a unit area of surface receives less light 19 (weaker aerosol signal) but path lengths through the aerosol layer are longer (stronger aerosol 20 signal). Apparently, the latter effect dominates. As for the dependence of precision of 21 retrieved fluorescence emissions on solar zenith angle, we cannot make any statements with 22 our forward model. We have modeled fluorescence emission at canopy level as being 23 independent of solar zenith angle. However, the broadband downwelling flux of 24 photosynthetically active radiation depends on solar zenith angle and hence so must the 25 fluorescence emission.

Dependence on viewing zenith angle. We have tested retrieval precision for viewing zenith angles of 0°, 50° and 70° (not shown). Precision of aerosol parameters tends to improve with increasing viewing zenith angle (longer path lengths through aerosol layer, hence stronger aerosol signal). Precision of retrieved fluorescence emission typically deteriorates with increasing viewing zenith angle (longer path lengths through aerosol layer, more extinction of fluorescence emission, hence weaker fluorescence signal).

Reduced state vector and full state vector. Precision levels for the full state vector are
 assumed to represent realistic precision levels and they may be compared against scientific
 user requirements. We see that errors are considerably larger for retrieval of the full state
 vector compared to the reduced state vector.

5 4.2 Dependence on instrument properties

6 In a second set of simulations we investigate the dependence of retrieval precision on spectral resolution and signal-to-noise ratio for retrieval of the full state vector. We assume an 7 8 atmospheric scenario of an aerosol layer with optical thickness of 0.4 between 750 hPa and 9 650 hPa, vegetated land with an albedo of 0.20 at 758 nm and a fluorescence emission of $0.46 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹ at 758 nm (or 1.2 mW m⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹). The solar zenith 10 angle is 50° and the viewing direction is nadir. Recall that reported signal-to-noise ratios are 11 12 reference values that hold for a spectral sampling interval of 0.1 nm and the TROPOMI 13 reference radiance at 758 nm. The spectral resolution (FWHM) is varied while keeping the 14 spectral sampling ratio constant (i.e. five). Signal-to-noise ratios are scaled with the square 15 root of the spectral sampling interval (amount of light entering detector is constant)

16 Fig. 4 shows the dependence of retrieval precision on resolution for three values of the signal-

17 to-noise ratio. Precision of all four parameters varies almost linearly with spectral resolution.

18 However, the improvement of precision when going to finer resolutions is modest, except for

19 the fluorescence emission at high signal-to-noise ratio.

20 4.3 Dependence on a priori error in fluorescence emission

21 In a third set of simulations, we investigate the dependence of retrieval precision on the a 22 priori error in the fluorescence emission. We assume the same atmospheric scenario as in Sect. 4.2. Note that given the range of typical fluorescence emissions, an a priori error of 23 $1.0 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹ essentially corresponds to an unconstrained retrieval (i.e. 24 no a priori knowledge). Interestingly, if the a priori error is decreased below this value, 25 precision of retrieved mid pressure, aerosol optical thickness and surface albedo hardly 26 improve in the range tested. We remark that for low optical thicknesses (τ of, say, 0.2) a 27 modest improvement in precision is found (not shown). On the other hand, precision of 28 retrieved fluorescence emission improves if the a priori error is decreased below $1.0 \cdot 10^{12}$ 29 photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹. This makes sense, as the a priori error starts dominating the a 30

1 posteriori error. For example, for an a priori error of $0.1 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹, 2 precision of retrieved fluorescence is approximately $0.09 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹.

3

4 5 Discussion

5 In this study, we have investigated precision of retrieved parameters for a generic aerosol 6 retrieval algorithm over vegetated land using the O_2 A band. In a number of retrieval 7 simulations, we have described retrieval precision for various atmospheric states, observation 8 geometries and instrument properties. Chlorophyll fluorescence is taken into account in the 9 forward model. Fluorescence emissions are modeled as isotropic contributions to the 10 upwelling radiance field at the surface and they are retrieved along with aerosol parameters. 11 The set of fit parameters comprises the mid pressure of the aerosol layer, aerosol optical 12 thickness, fluorescence emission and surface albedo. An estimate of errors due to model 13 parameter errors (single scattering albedo, temperature profile and surface pressure) is 14 included in reported precision levels by adding these parameters to the state vector with 15 appropriate a priori errors. Precision is calculated by propagating measurement errors and a priori errors (including model parameter errors) using the forward model's derivatives. 16 Forward model uncertainties that are not considered in the reported error analysis include the 17

18 aerosol's phase function and the presence of more than one scattering layer. The reason for 19 not considering the phase function is that computation of derivatives with respect to the phase 20 function is currently not implemented, as DISAMAR has been developed for single-viewing (nadir) instruments. Furthermore, we assume a single layer with a fixed pressure difference 21 between top and base in retrieval, because the O₂ A band contains limited aerosol profile 22 23 information (Siddans et al., 2007; Corradini and Cervino, 2006; cf. Daniel et al., 2003). If the 24 assumed pressure thickness differs from the true one or if more than one scattering layer is 25 present, retrieved aerosol mid pressure will be an effective scattering height parameter (cf. 26 Joiner et al., 2012a). Retrieval simulations have shown that biases in retrieved aerosol 27 parameters do not change significantly if the a priori error in the fluorescence emission is 28 reduced as in Fig. 5 (Sect. 4.3).

29 Whether errors in retrieved parameters are acceptable depends on scientific user requirements.

- 30 We have reported retrieval errors so that the reader can evaluate their magnitudes. Errors in
- 31 retrieved mid pressure, aerosol optical thickness and fluorescence emission may be put into

perspective by comparing them against the benchmark numbers provided in Table 2. If we 1 2 compare these numbers to retrieval precision for the first set of simulations (TROPOMI instrument model), we can make the following observations. For most cases considered, 3 4 precision of retrieved pressure is below the TROPOMI threshold requirement of 100 hPa for 5 optical thicknesses of 0.5 (at 760 nm) or higher. Precision of retrieved τ is typically between 0.1 and 0.2, which is in approximately the same range as the total uncertainty in MODIS 6 optical thickness (at 550 nm) as found in the large-scale validation study by Levy et al. 7 8 (2010), especially for larger optical thicknesses. Finally, precision of retrieved fluorescence 9 emission at 758 nm is about a factor of 3 to 7 larger as the precision reported by Guanter et al. 10 (2012). The error estimates provided by Guanter et al. (2012) include only measurement 11 noise. For viewing zenith angles approaching 70°, however, precision may increase up to $0.8 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹ (not shown), which is quite close to the a priori error. 12

13 We have also investigated the dependence of retrieval precision on the a priori error in the 14 fluorescence emission. As the baseline a priori uncertainty we have assumed a 1- σ error of $1.0 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹ covering the range of realistic fluorescence emissions at 15 the O_2 A band. For the case considered, we have found that precision of retrieved aerosol 16 17 parameters hardly improves if the a priori error is decreased below this value. A fluorescence 18 emission constraint for aerosol retrieval from the O_2 A band may, for example, be provided in a pre-retrieval step based on a fast fluorescence retrieval using Fraunhofer lines in the 19 20 continuum. But note that an a priori fluorescence emission from such a pre-retrieval step also 21 has an error, which is supposedly in the range of a priori errors of Fig. 5 (e.g. Buchwitz et al., 22 2013). The results then indicate that if the objective of the O_2 A band retrieval is the retrieval 23 of aerosol parameters, precision will hardly benefit from such a pre-retrieval step. Providing a 24 better a priori value in the sense of a starting value for the fit might still help to improve the 25 convergence rate or convergence to the global χ^2 -minimum in case of a strongly non-linear

26 forward model. This needs to be further investigated.

In Sect. 4, we have described the dependence of retrieval precision on optical thickness, aerosol layer pressure, fluorescence emission, and solar and viewing zenith angles. We remark that exceptions to the overall trends exist. We have noticed in our work on the O_2 A band that retrieval precision can significantly deteriorate for very specific combinations of aerosol pressure, optical thickness, aerosol properties (phase function and single scattering albedo), surface albedo and observation geometry. These singular cases often occur for optically thin layers over land and may be related (but not limited) to situations of a so-called critical surface albedo (e.g. Seidel and Popp, 2012). This illustrates the importance of a proper error analysis: by calculating derivatives we know whether for a specific retrieved state the system is becoming singular. At this point, it is important to note that these near-singular inversions are characteristic of aerosol retrieval in general and not so much specific for aerosol retrieval over fluorescing vegetated areas.

7 Finally, the dependence of retrieval precision on spectral resolution and signal-to-noise ratio 8 was investigated. Table 3 provides instrument specifications for a number of satellite grating 9 spectrometers that will be operational in the coming years. We have also calculated the respective reference signal-to-noise ratios (indicated in bold) that hold for the TROPOMI 10 11 spectral sampling interval and TROPOMI reference radiance (as in Fig. 4). Prospective retrieval precision for the Sentinel-4/5 instruments, OCO-2 and CarbonSat can be directly 12 13 evaluated in Fig. 4 using values for the spectral resolution and reference SNR from Table 3. 14 Note that all instruments mentioned in Table 3 are oversampled.

In conclusion, the error analysis indicates that precision of retrieved aerosol parameters is 15 16 acceptable when aerosol and fluorescence parameters are retrieved simultaneously. In 17 addition, the analysis of the dependence on the a priori error in the fluorescence emission indicates that precision of retrieved aerosol parameters hardly improves if external 18 information on fluorescence is available. Thus, we have no indications at this point that 19 aerosol parameters cannot be retrieved from the O_2 A band in the presence of chlorophyll 20 21 fluorescence: if fluorescence is present, fluorescence emissions should and can be included in 22 the state vector to avoid biases in retrieved aerosol parameters. This agrees with Frankenberg et al. (2012) who showed that biases in retrieved CO_2 volume mixing ratios and aerosol 23 24 parameters from the ACOS (Atmospheric Carbon Observations from Space) CO₂ retrieval algorithm (O'Dell et al., 2012) decrease if fluorescence is included in the fit (figure 5 and 25 26 figure 8 in Frankenberg et al., 2012).

Rotational Raman scattering is not taken into account in this study. There are indications that for typical observation geometries and significant fluorescence emissions (larger than approximately 0.5 mW m⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹) the contribution to the top-of-atmosphere radiance due to Rotational Raman scattering is smaller than the contribution due to fluorescence (Vasilkov et al., 2013; Sioris et al., 2003). At first glance, spectral shapes of the two filling-in effects seem comparable (Vasilkov et al., 2013) but there are slight differences: after all, origins of the respective signals are different. Rotational Raman scattering is well known and can, at least in principle, be included in the radiative transfer calculations. In that case, rotational Raman scattering does not need to be fitted and fluorescence emissions can still be retrieved. It remains to be investigated what the precise effect of neglecting rotational Raman scattering on retrieval of aerosol from the O₂ A band in the presence of fluorescence is.

6 The computational effort for an operational O_2 A band aerosol retrieval algorithm is 7 substantial. The most time-consuming step is the radiative transfer modeling: line-by-line 8 calculations are necessary as oxygen is a strong line absorber. Substantial reduction in 9 computation time can be achieved by using variants of *k*-distribution methods (e.g. Hasekamp 10 and Butz, 2008). Errors in radiances can be limited, but errors in derivatives may still be 11 substantial. The effect of these approximations on aerosol retrieval also remains to be 12 investigated.

In our analysis, we assume that the retrieval solution \hat{x} was found so that we could perform an error analysis. However, the forward model is typically non-linear and the retrieval solution has to be found in an iterative manner. Hence, the question is raised what the effect is of including fluorescence emission as a fit parameter on the stability of retrieval. We did some preliminary tests, which indicated that retrieval is stable even with starting values differing strongly from true values.

19

20 Acknowledgements

This work has been performed within ESA's AEROPRO project and within the TROPOMI national program funded by the Netherlands Space Office (NSO). We thank Yasjka Meijer and Ben Veihelmann from the AEROPRO team at ESA, and Piet Stammes, Ofelia Vieitez and Maarten Sneep at KNMI for useful discussions. A Fortran 77 code for line-mixing in the O_2 A band, including the updates discussed in Tran and Hartmann (2008), was kindly provided by J.-M. Hartmann.

1 References

- 2 Amoros-Lopez, J., Gomez-Chova, L., Vila-Frances, J., Alonso, L., Calpe, J., Moreno, J., and
- 3 Del Valle-Tascon, S.: Evaluation of remote sensing of vegetation fluorescence by the analysis

4 of diurnal cycles, Int. J. Remote Sens., 29:17–18, 5423–5436, 5 doi:10.1080/01431160802036391, 2008.

6 Badayev, V.V., and Malkevich, M.S.: On the possibility of retrieval of aerosol extinction

7 vertical profile using satellite observation of reflected radiation in the oxygen 760 nm band,

8 Izvestia of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Atmospheric and Oceanic Physics, 14(10), 722–

- 9 727, 1978.
- 10 Bodhaine, B.A., Wood, N.B., Dutton, E.G., and Slusser, J.R.: On Rayleigh Optical Depth
- 11 Calculations, J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech., 16, 1854–1861, 1999.
- 12 Boesch, H., Baker, D., Connor, B., Crisp, D., and Miller, C.: Global Characterization of CO₂

13 Column Retrievals from Shortwave-Infrared Satellite Observations of the Orbiting Carbon

- 14 Observatory-2 Mission, Remote Sens., 3, 270–304, doi:10.3390/rs3020270, 2011.
- 15 Bovensmann, H., Burrows, J.P., Buchwitz, M., Frerick, J., Noël, S., Rozanov, V.V., Chance,
- 16 K.V., and Goede, A.P.H.: SCIAMACHY: Mission objectives and measurement modes, J.
- 17 Atmos. Sci., 56(2), 127–150, 1999.
- 18 Bovensmann, H., Buchwitz, M., Burrows, J.P., Reuter, M., Krings, T., Gerilowski, K.,
- 19 Schneising, O., Heymann, J., Tretner, A., and Erzinger, J.: A remote sensing technique for

20 global monitoring of power plant CO₂ emissions from space and related applications, Atmos.

- 21 Meas. Tech., 3, 781–811, doi:10.5194/amt-3-781-2010, 2010.
- 22 Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., Bovensmann, H., Pillai, D., Heymann, J., Schneising, O., Rozanov,
- 23 V., Krings, T., Burrows, J.P., Boesch, H., Gerbig, C., Meijer, Y., and Löscher, A.: Carbon
- 24 Monitoring Satellite (CarbonSat): assessment of scattering related atmospheric CO₂ and CH₄
- 25 retrieval errors and first results on implications for inferring city CO₂ emissions, Atmos.
- 26 Meas. Tech. Discuss., 6, 4769–4850, doi:10.5194/amtd-6-4769-2013, 2013.
- 27 Burrows, J.P., Weber, M., Buchwitz, M., Rozanov, V., Ladstätter-Weißenmayer, A., Richter,
- 28 A., DeBeek, R., Hoogen, R., Bramstedt, K., Eichmann, K.-U., Eisinger, M., and Perner, D.:
- 29 The Global Ozone Monitring Experiment (GOME): Mission Concept and First Scientific
- 30 Results, J. Atmos. Sci., 56, 151–175, 1999.

- 1 Butz, A., Galli, A., Hasekamp, O., Landgraf, J., Tol, P., and Aben, I.: TROPOMI aboard
- 2 Sentinel-5 Precursor: Prospective performance of CH₄ retrievals for aerosol and cirrus loaded
- 3 atmospheres, Remote Sens. Environ., 120, 267–276, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2011.05.030, 2012.
- 4 Callies, J., Corpacciolli, E., Eisinger, M., Hahne, A., and Lefebvre, A.: GOME-2 Metop's
- 5 Second-Generation Sensor for Operational Ozone Monitoring, ESA Bulletin, 102, 28–36,
 6 2000.
- 7 Caudill, T.R., Flittner, D.E., Herman, B.M., Torres, O., and McPeters, R.D.: Evaluation of the
- 8 pseudo-spherical approximation for backscattered ultraviolet radiances and ozone retrieval, J.
- 9 Geophys. Res., 102:D3, 3881–3890, 1997.
- 10 Chance, K. and Kurucz, R.L.: An improved high-resolution solar reference spectrum for
- 11 earth's atmosphere measurements in the ultraviolet, visible, and near infrared, J. Quant.
- 12 Spectrosc. Ra., 111, 1289–1295, doi:10.1016/j.jqsrt.2010.01.036, 2010.
- 13 Corradini, S., and Cervino, M.: Aerosol extinction coefficient profile retrieval in the oxygen
- 14 A-band considering multiple scattering atmosphere. Test case: SCIAMACHY nadir simulated
- 15 measurements, J. Quant. Spectrosc. Ra., 97, 354–380, doi:10.1016/j.jqsrt.2005.05.061, 2006.
- 16 Crisp, D., Atlas, R.M., Breon, F.-M., Brown, L.R., Burrows, J.P., Ciais, P., Connor, B.J.,
- 17 Doney, S.C., Fung, I.Y., Jacob, D.J., Miller, C.E., O'Brien, D., Pawson, S., Randerson, J.T.,
- 18 Rayner, P., Salawitch, R.J., Sander, S.P., Sen, B., Stephens, G.L., Tans, P.P., Toon, G.C.,
- 19 Wennberg, P.O., Wofsy, S.C., Yung, Y.L., Kuang, Z., Chudasama, B., Sprague, G., Weiss,
- 20 B., Pollock, R., Kenyon, D., and Schroll, S.: The Orbiting Carbon Observatory (OCO)
- 21 Mission, Adv. Space Res., 34(4), 700–709, 2004.
- 22 Daniel, J.S., Solomon, S., Miller, H.L., Langford, A.O., Portmann, R.W., and Eubank, C.S.:
- Retrieving cloud information from passive measurements of solar radiation absorbed by
 molecular oxygen and O₂-O₂, J. Geophys. Res., 108, D164515, doi:10.1029/2002JD002994,
 2003.
- De Haan, J.F, Bosma, P.B., and Hovenier, J.W.: The adding method for multiple scattering
 calculations of polarized light, Astron. Astrophys., 183, 371–391, 1987.
- 28 Deschamps, P.-Y., Bréon, F.-M., Leroy, M., Podaire, A., Bricaud, A., Buriez, J.-C., and Sèze,
- 29 G.: The POLDER mission: Instrument characteristics and scientific objectives, IEEE T.
- 30 Geosci. Remote, 32, 1398–1411, 1994.

- 1 Dubovik, O., Holben, B., Eck, T.F., Smirnov, A., Kaufman, Y.J., King, M.D., Tanré, D., and
- 2 Slutsker, I.: Variability of absorption and optical properties of key aerosol types observed in
- 3 worldwide locations, J. Atmos. Sci., 59, 590–608, 2002.
- 4 Dubuisson, P., Frouin, R., Dessailly, D., Duforêt, L., Léon, J.-F., Voss, K., and Antoine, D.:
- 5 Estimating the altitude of aerosol plumes over the ocean from reflectance ratio measurements
- 6 in the O₂ A-band. Remote Sens. Environ., 113, 1899–1911, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2009.04.018,
- 7 2009.
- 8 Dubuisson, P., Riedi, J., Ramon, D., Monsterleet, B., Pascal, N., Matusiak, S., and Lifermann,
- 9 A.: Estimating aerosol altitude over ocean from O₂ A-band absorption using MERIS
- 10 observations, Proceedings of Advances in Atmospheric Science and Applications, Bruges,
- 11 Belgium, 18–22 June 2012, 2012.
- 12 European Space Agency (ESA): ESA SP-1313/4 Candidate Earth Explorer Core Missions –
- 13 Reports for Assessment: FLEX Fluorescence EXplorer, ESTEC, Noordwijk, The
- 14 Netherlands, available at: <u>http://esamultimedia.esa.int/docs/SP1313-4_FLEX.pdf</u> (last access:
- 15 26 March 2013), 2008.
- 16 European Space Agency (ESA): GMES Sentinels 4 and 5 Mission Requirements Traceability
- 17 Document, issue 1, 20 September 2012, ESTEC, Noordwijk, The Netherlands, available at:
- 18 http://esamultimedia.esa.int/docs/EarthObservation/S4 5 5p MRTD issue 1.0 authorised.p
- 19 <u>df</u> (last access: 26 March 2013), 2012.
- 20 Frankenberg, C., Butz, A., and Toon, G.C.: Disentangling chlorophyll fluorescence from
- 21 atmospheric scattering effects in O₂ A-band spectra of reflected sun-light, Geophys. Res.
- 22 Lett., 38, L03801, doi:10.1029/2010GL045896, 2011a.
- 23 Frankenberg, C., Fisher, J.B., Worden, J., Badgley, G., Saatchi, S.S., Lee, J.-E., Toon, G.C.,
- 24 Butz, A., Jung, M., Kuze, A., and Yokota, T.: New global observations of the terrestrial
- 25 carbon cycle from GOSAT: Patterns of plant fluorescence with gross primary productivity,
- 26 Geophys. Res. Lett., 38, L17706, doi:10.1029/2011GL048738, 2011b.
- 27 Frankenberg, C., O'Dell, C., Guanter, L., and McDuffie, J.: Remote sensing of near-infrared
- 28 chlorophyll fluorescence from space in scattering atmospheres: implications for its retrieval
- 29 and interferences with atmospheric CO₂ retrievals, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 5, 2081–2094,
- 30 doi:10.5194/amt-5-2081-2012, 2012.

- Gabella, M., Kisselev, V., and Perona, G.: Retrieval of aerosol profile variations from
 reflected radiation in the oxygen absorption A band, Appl. Optics, 38(15), 3190–3195, 1999.
- Guanter, L., Alonso, L., Gómez-Chova, L., Meroni, M., Preusker, R., Fischer, J., and Moreno,
 J.: Developments for vegetation florescence retrieval from spaceborne high-resolution
 spectrometry in the O₂-A and O₂-B absorption bands, J. Geophys. Res., 115, D19303,
 doi:10.1029/2009JD013716, 2010.
- 7 Guanter, L., Frankenberg, C., Dudhia, A., Lewis, P.E., Gómez-Dans, J., Kuze, A., Suto, H., 8 and Grainger, R.G.: Retrieval and global assessment of terrestrial chlorophyll fluorescence 9 from GOSAT space measurements, Remote Sens. Environ., 121, 236-251, 10 doi:10.1016/j.rse.2012.02.006, 2012.
- Hasekamp, O.P., and Butz, A.: Efficient calculation of intensity and polarization spectra in
 vertically inhomogeneous scattering and absorption atmospheres, J. Geophys. Res., 113,
 D20309, doi:10.1029/2008JD010379, 2008.
- 14 Hasekamp, O., and Siddans, R.: Aerosols (Chapter 8), in: J.P. Veefkind (Ed.), CAMELOT
- Task 3 Report Retrieval simulations, ESA Contract No. 21533/07/NL/HE, issue 1, 30
 November 2009, 2009.
- Hovenier, J.W., Van der Mee, C.V.M., and Domke, H.: Transfer of polarized light in
 planetary atmospheres; basic concepts and practical methods, Kluwer, Dordrecht, The
 Netherlands, 2004.
- 20 Ingmann, P., Veihelmann, B., Langen, J., Lamarre, D., Stark, H., and Bazalgette Courrèges-21 Lacoste, G.: Requirements for the GMES Atmosphere Service and ESA's implementation 22 Sentinels-4/5 Remote 120, 58-69, concept: and -5p, Sens. Environ., 23 doi:10.1016/j.rse.2012.01.023, 2012.
- Joiner, J., Yoshida, Y., Vasilkov, A.P., Yoshida, Y., Corp, L.A., and Middleton, E.M.: First
 observations of global and seasonal terrestrial chlorophyll fluorescence from space,
 Biogeosciences, 8, 637–651, doi:10.5194/bg-8-637-2011, 2011.
- Joiner, J., Vasilkov, A.P., Gupta, P., Bhartia, P.K., Veefkind, P., Sneep, M., De Haan, J.,
 Polonsky, I., and Spurr, R.: Fast simulators for satellite cloud optical centroid pressure
 retrievals; evaluation of OMI cloud retrievals, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 5, 529–545,
 doi:10.5194/amt-5-529-2012, 2012a.

- 1 Joiner, J., Yoshida, Y., Vasilkov, A.P., Middleton, E.M., Campbell, P.K.E., Yoshida, Y.,
- 2 Kuze, A., and Corp, L.A.: Filling-in of near-infrared solar lines by terrestrial fluorescence and
- 3 other geophysical effects: simulations and space-based observations from SCIAMACHY and
- 4 GOSAT, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 5, 809–829, doi:10.5194/amt-5-809-2012, 2012b.
- Joiner, J., Guanter, L., Lindstrot, R., Voigt, M., Vasilkov, A.P., Middleton, E.M., Huemmrich,
 K.F., Yoshida, Y., and Frankenberg, C.: Global monitoring of terrestrial chlorophyll
 fluorescence from moderate spectral resolution near-infrared satellite measurements:
 methodology, simulations, and application to GOME-2, Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 6,
 3883–3930, doi:10.5194/amtd-6-3883-2013, 2013.
- 10 Koelemeijer, R.B.A., Stammes, P., Hovenier, J.W., and De Haan, J.F.: A fast method for 11 retrieval of cloud parameters using oxygen A band measurements from the Global Ozone
- 12 Monitoring Experiment, J. Geophys. Res., 106:D4, 3475–3490, 2001.
- 13 Koelemeijer, R.B.A., De Haan, J.F., and Stammes, P.: A database of spectral surface
- 14 reflectivity in the range 335-772 nm derived from 5.5 years of GOME observations, J.
- 15 Geophys. Res., 108, D24070, doi:10.1029/2002JD002429, 2003.
- 16 Kokhanovsky, A.A., and Rozanov, V.V.: The determination of dust cloud altitudes from a
- 17 satellite using hyperspectral measurements in the gaseous absorption band, Int. J. Remote
- 18 Sens., 31(10), 2729–2744, doi:10.1080/01431160903085644, 2010.
- 19 Koppers, G.A.A., and Murtagh, D.P.: Retrieval of height resolved aerosol optical thickness in
- 20 the atmospheric band (Chapter 5), in: G.A.A. Koppers, Radiative transfer in the absorption
- 21 bands of oxygen: Studies of their significance in ozone chemistry and potential for aerosol
- 22 remote sensing, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden, 1997.
- 23 Kraft, S., Del Bollo, U., Harnisch, B., Bouvet, M., Drusch, M., and Bézy, J.-L.: Fluorescence
- 24 Imaging Spectrometer concepts for the Earth Explorer Mission Candidate FLEX, Proceedings
- of International Conference on Space Optics, Ajaccio, Corse, 9–12 October 2012, 2012.
- 26 Krause, G.H. and Weis, E.: Chlorophyll fluorescence and photosynthesis: The basics, Annu.
- 27 Rev. Plant Phys., 42, 313–349, 1991.
- 28 Kuze, A., Suto, H., Nakajima, M., and Hamazaki, T.: Thermal and near infrared sensor for
- 29 carbon observation Fourier-transform spectrometer on the Greenhouse Gases Observing
- 30 Satellite for greenhouse gases monitoring, Appl. Optics, 48, 6716–6733, 2009.

- 1 Landgraf, J., Hasekamp, O., Box, M., and Troutmann, T.: A linearized radiative transfer
- 2 model for ozone profile retrieval using the analytical forward-adjoint perturbation approach,
- 3 J. Geophys. Res., 106:D21, 27,291–27,305, 2001.
- 4 Levy, R.C., Remer, L.A., Kleidman, R.G., Mattoo, S., Ichoku, C., Kahn, R., and Eck, T.F.:
- 5 Global evaluation of the Collection 5 MODIS dark-target aerosol products over land, Atmos.
- 6 Chem. Phys., 10, 10,399–10,420, doi:10.5194/acp-10-10399-2010, 2010.
- Maxwell, K. and Johnson, G.N.: Chlorophyll fluorescence—a practical guide, J. Exp. Bot.,
 51:345, 659–668, 2000.
- 9 Meijer, Y., Ingmann, P., Löscher, A., Sierk, B., Bovensmann, H., and Buchwitz, M.:
- 10 CarbonSat: ESA's Earth Explorer 8 Candidate Mission, Advances in Atmospheric Science
 11 and Applications, Bruges, Belgium, 18–22 June 2012, 2012.
- 12 O'Dell, C.W., Connor, B., Bösch, H., O'Brien, D., Frankenberg, C., Castano, R., Christi, M.,
- 13 Crisp, D., Eldering, A., Fisher, B., Gunson, M., McDuffie, J., Miller, C.E., Natraj, V.,
- 14 Oyafuso, F., Polonsky, I., Smyth, M., Taylor, T., Toon, G.C., Wennberg, P.O., and Wunch,
- 15 D.: The ACOS CO₂ retrieval algorithm Part 1: Description and validation against synthetic
- 16 observations, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 5, 99–121, doi:10.5194/amt-5-99-2012, 2012.
- 17 Rast, M., Bézy, J.L., and Bruzzi, S.: The ESA medium resolution imaging spectrometer
 18 MERIS: A review of the instrument and its mission, Int. J. Remote Sens., 20, 1681–1702.
- 19 Reuter, M., Buchwitz, M., Schneising, O., Heymann, J., Bovensmann, H., and Burrows, J.P.:
- 20 A method for improved SCIAMACHY CO₂ retrieval in the presence of optically thin clouds,
- 21 Atmos. Meas. Tech., 3, 209–232, 2010.
- Rodgers, C.D.: Inverse methods for atmospheric sounding: Theory and Practice, World
 Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 2000.
- Rozanov, V.V. and Kokhanovsky, A.A.: Semianalytical cloud retrieval algorithm as applied
 to the cloud top altitude and the cloud geometrical thickness determination from top-ofatmosphere reflectance measurements in the oxygen A band, J. Geophys. Res., 109, D05202,
 doi:10.1029/2003JD004104, 2004.
- Salstein, D.A., Ponte, R.M., and Cady-Pereira, K.: Uncertainties in atmospheric pressure
 fields from global analyses, J. Geophys. Res., 113, D14107, doi:10.1029/2007JD009531,
 2008.

- 1 Sanders, A.F.J., De Haan, J.F., and Veefkind, J.P.: Retrieval of aerosol height from the
- 2 oxygen A band with TROPOMI, in: Proceedings of Advances in Atmospheric Science and
- 3 Applications, Bruges, Belgium, 18–22 June 2012, 2012.
- 4 Sanghavi, S., Martonchik, J.V., Landgraf, J., and Platt, U.: Retrieval of optical depth and
- 5 vertical distribution of particulate scatterers in the atmosphere using O_2 A- and B-band
- 6 SCIAMACHY observations over Kanpur: a case study, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 5, 1099–1119,
- 7 doi:10.5194/amt-5-1099-2012, 2012.
- 8 Seidel, F.C. and Popp, C.: Critical surface albedo and its implications to aerosol remote
 9 sensing, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 5, 1653–1665, doi:10.5194/amt-5-1653-2012, 2012.
- 10 Siddans, R., Latter, B.G., and Kerridge, B.J.: Study to Consolidate the UVS Mission
- 11 Requirements for the Oxygen A-band, EUMETSAT Contract No. EUM/CO/05/1411/SAT,
- 12 version 1.2, 24 May 2007, available at:
- 13 www.eumetsat.int/Home/Main/Satellites/MeteosatThirdGeneration/Resources/Index.htm (last
- 14 access: 26 March 2013), 2007.
- 15 Sioris, C.E., Bazalgette Courrèges-Lacoste, G., and Stoll, M.-P.: Filling in of Fraunhofer lines
- 16 by plant fluorescence: Simulations for a nadir-viewing satellite-borne instrument, J. Geophys.
- 17 Res., 108, D44133, doi:10.1029/2001JD001321, 2003.
- Tran, H., Boulet, C., and Hartmann, J.-M.: Line mixing and collision-induced absorption by
 oxygen in the A band: Laboratory measurements, model, and tools for atmospheric spectra
 computations, J. Geophys. Res., 111, D15210, 2006
- Tran, H., and Hartmann, J.-M.: An improved O₂ A band absorption model and its
 consequences for retrievals of photon paths and surface pressure, J. Geophys. Res., 113,
 D18104, 2008.
- Van Diedenhoven, B., Hasekamp, O.P., and Aben, I.: Surface pressure retrieval from
 SCIAMACHY measurements in the O2 A Band: validation of the measurements and
 sensitivity on aerosols, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 5, 2109–2120, 2005.
- Vasilkov, A., Joiner, J., and Spurr, R.: Note on rotational-Raman scattering in the O2 A- and
 B-bands, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 6, 981–990, doi:10.5194/amt-6-981-2013, 2013.
- 29 Veefkind, J.P., Aben, I., McMullan, K., Förster, H., De Vries, J., Otter, G., Claas, J., Eskes,
- 30 H.J., De Haan, J.F., Kleipool, Q., Van Weele, M., Hasekamp, O., Hoogeveen, R., Landgraf,

1	J., Snel, R., Tol, P., Ingmann, P., Voors, R., Kruizinga, B., Vink, R., Visser, H., and Levelt,
2	P.F.: TROPOMI on the ESA Sentinel-5 Precursor: A GMES mission for global observations
3	of the atmospheric composition for climate, air quality and ozone layer applications, Remote
4	Sens. Environ., 120, 70-83, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2011.09.027, 2012.
5	Wang, P., Tuinder, O.N.E., Tilstra, L.G., and Stammes, P.: Interpretation of FRESCO cloud
6	retrievals in case of absorbing aerosol events, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 9057-9077,
7	doi:10.5194/acp-12-9057-2012, 2012.
8	Yoshida, Y., Ota, Y., Eguchi, N., Kikuchi, N., Nobuta, K., Tran, H., Morino, I., and Yokota,
9	T.: Retrieval algorithm for CO ₂ and CH ₄ column abundances from short-wavelength infrared
10	spectral observations by the Greenhouse gases observing satellite, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 4,
11	717-734, doi:10.519/amt-4-717-2011, 2011.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25 26	
<i>∠</i> /	

Table 1. State vector elements and a priori errors used for calculating retrieval precision. In case of retrieval of the reduced state vector, the measurement error covariance matrix comprises noise errors, and the surface albedo and fluorescence emissions are assumed constant across the fit window. In case of retrieval of the full state vector, the measurement error covariance matrix comprises noise and calibration errors, and the wavelength dependence of the surface albedo and fluorescence emissions in retrieval is described by a

7 second-order polynomial (three wavelength nodes).

State vector element	A priori error		
	Reduced state vector	Full state vector	
Aerosol mid pressure (P_{mid})	<mark>500 hPa</mark>	<mark>500 hPa</mark>	
Aerosol optical thickness (τ)	2.0	2.0	
Surface albedo (A_s)	0.2		
Surface albedo $(A_s^{758}, A_s^{764}, A_s^{770})$		0.2	
Fluorescence emission (F_s)	$1.0 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²		
	sr ⁻¹ nm ⁻¹		
Fluorescence emission (F_s^{758} ,		$1.0 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²	
F_s^{764}, F_s^{770})		$\mathrm{sr}^{-1} \mathrm{nm}^{-1}$	
Single scattering albedo (ω)		0.05	
Surface pressure (<i>p</i> _s)		<mark>3 hPa</mark>	
Temperature profile $(T(p_i))$		2 K (correlation length of	
		<mark>6 km)</mark>	



1 Table 2. Benchmark numbers for comparing precision of retrieved mid pressure, aerosol

2 optical unexhess and hubiescence emission as found in this study	2	optical th	ickness a	nd fluorescence	emission as	found in	this study
--	---	------------	-----------	-----------------	-------------	----------	------------

Param.	Benchmark	Description	Reference			
P _{mid}	100 hPa (50 hPa)	TROPOMI threshold (target) requirement on precision of retrieved Aerosol Layer Height	Veefkind et al. (2012)			
τ ^a	±(0.05 + 15%) ^b	Large-scale global validation of MODIS aerosol retrievals over 'dark' land (e.g. vegetation) with AERONET sunphotometer measurements; error envelope containing two- thirds of all collocations	Levy et al. (2010)			
Fs	$0.04 \cdot 10^{12}$ - $0.15 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s ⁻¹ cm ⁻² sr ⁻¹ nm ^{-1 c}	Precision of monthly 2° by 2° average F_s values at 755 nm retrieved from GOSAT observations; error estimate includes only measurement noise	Guanter et al. (2012)			
^a : <i>τ</i> at 760 nm						
^b : τ at 550 nm						
$^{\circ}$: 0.1 – 0.4 mW m ⁻² sr ⁻¹ nm ⁻¹ at 758 nm						

- 1 Table 3. Instrument specifications of the O_2 A band channel for a number of space-borne
- 2 grating spectrometers that will be operational in the coming years. Numbers printed bold can
- 3 be used to interpret Fig. 4.

Instrument	FWHM	$\Delta\lambda$	SNR	L_{ref} (758 nm)	Reference	SNR-ref. ^a
TROPOMI ^b	0.5 nm	0.1 nm	500	$4.5 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s ⁻¹ cm ⁻² sr ⁻¹ nm ⁻¹	Veefkind et al. (2012)	500
Sentinel-5	0.4 nm ^c	0.13 nm	500	$4.5 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s ⁻¹ cm ⁻² sr ⁻¹ nm ⁻¹	ESA (2012)	570
Sentinel-4	0.12 nm ^d	0.04 nm	566	$1.3 \cdot 10^{13}$ photons s ⁻¹ cm ⁻² sr ⁻¹ nm ⁻¹	ESA (2012)	526
OCO-2 ^e	0.042 nm	0.014 nm	814	$3.5 \cdot 10^{13}$ photons s ⁻¹ cm ⁻² sr ⁻¹ nm ⁻¹	Boesch et al. (2011)	780
CarbonSat	0.045 nm	0.015 nm	340	$2.0 \cdot 10^{13}$ photons s ⁻¹ cm ⁻² sr ⁻¹ nm ⁻¹	Bovensmann et al. (2010)	416
CarbonSat ^f	0.1 nm	0.033 nm	507	$2.0 \cdot 10^{13}$ photons s ⁻¹ cm ⁻² sr ⁻¹ nm ⁻¹	Meijer et al. (2012) and Bovensmann et al. (2010)	620

5 ^a: Reference SNR under the assumption of shot noise: holds for $\Delta\lambda$ of 0.1 nm and TROPOMI

- 6 reference radiance at 758 nm.
- 7 ^b : Sentinel-5 Precursor
- 8 ^c: threshold value
- 9 ^d: goal value

10 ^e: Note that OCO-2 measures light in only one polarization direction, which we ignore in the

11 computation of the reference signal-to-noise ratio.

^f: Spectral resolution and sampling ratio are taken from Meijer et al. (2012); signal-to-noise
ratio and corresponding radiance are taken from Bovensmann et al. (2010) and scaled to the
sampling interval of 0.033 nm assuming shot noise.



Figure 1. Left panel: High-resolution reflectance spectrum (left y-axis) with fluorescence emission (' F_s ': blue line) and without fluorescence emission ('no F_s ': red line), and a high-resolution solar irradiance spectrum (right y-axis, black line). Right panel: The high-resolution reflectance spectrum containing fluorescence emission of the left panel after convolution with the slit function at resolutions (full width at half maximum) of 0.1 nm (magenta line) and 0.5 nm (cyan line). The atmosphere contains aerosols (τ of 0.4 at the O₂ A band and P_{mid} of 700 hPa with a layer thickness of 100 hPa) over vegetated land $(A_s$ linearly sloping upward from 0.20 at 758 nm to 0.25 at 770 nm) with a representative fluorescence emission (F_s linearly sloping downward from 1.2 mW m⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹ to 0.6 mW m⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹). The solar zenith angle is 50° and the viewing direction is nadir. Zoom windows highlight filled-in Fraunhofer lines in the continuum; the magenta line in the zoom window of the right panel is given an artificial vertical offset to better reveal small filling-in peaks still visible at this spectral resolution. Note that filling-in of Fraunhofer lines inside the O_2 A band occurs as well. Simulated measurements in the right panel correspond to retrievals in Fig. 4 described in Sect. 4.2. Note that the actual fit window extends from 758 nm to 770 nm.



1

Figure 2. Derivatives of reflectance with respect to surface albedo (A_s) , fluorescence emission (F_s), aerosol optical thickness (τ) and aerosol layer mid pressure (P_{mid}) at a spectral resolution of 0.5 nm and normalized to one at their respective maximum. Derivatives are for the same atmospheric scenario as in Fig. 1 and Fig. 4, which is described in Sect. 4.2, except that the surface albedo and surface emission are assumed independent of wavelength here for ease of interpretation. Note that the actual fit window extends from 758 nm to 770 nm.

- 8
- 9



1 Figure 3. Precision of the main fit parameters as a function of optical thickness for three 2 values of the mid pressure of the aerosol layer. Left column: retrieval of reduced state vector; 3 right column: retrieval of full state vector (for an explanation, see text and Table 1). First row: 4 mid pressure (P_{mid}); second row: aerosol optical thickness (τ); third row: surface albedo (A_s); 5 fourth row: fluorescence emission (F_s). Aerosols have a single scattering albedo of 0.95 and a 6 Henvey-Greenstein phase function with asymmetry parameter of 0.7; the aerosol layer has a 7 pressure thickness of 100 hPa; the ground surface has an albedo of 0.20 at 758 nm and exhibits fluorescence emissions. In case of the reduced state vector, the surface albedo and 8 9 fluorescence emission are constant across the fit window. In case of the full state vector, the surface albedo linearly slopes upward from 0.20 at 758 nm to 0.25 at 770 nm and the 10 11 fluorescence emission linearly slopes downward such that emission is a factor of two smaller 12 at the end of the fit window. Note, however, that the full state vector contains the surface albedo and fluorescence emission at wavelength nodes 758 nm, 764 nm and 770 nm; in 13 14 retrieval these parameters are in principle allowed to depend quadratically on wavelength. 15 Absolute errors were the same across the range of fluorescence emissions investigated (see 16 text). The solar zenith angle is 50° and the viewing direction is nadir. Results hold for the TROPOMI instrument model (FWHM of 0.5 nm). Note that precision values for F_s are scaled 17 with a factor $1 \cdot 10^{12}$. 18 19 20

21

3 Figure 4. Precision of the main fit parameters as a function of spectral resolution for three 4 values of the signal-to-noise ratio and for retrieval of the full state vector. Top left: mid 5 pressure (P_{mid}) ; top right: aerosol optical thickness (τ) ; bottom left: surface albedo (A_s) at three wavelength nodes; bottom right: fluorescence emission (F_s) at three wavelength nodes. 6 7 Results are for the following atmospheric scenario: aerosol layer at 700 hPa with optical 8 thickness of 0.4, default aerosol model, surface albedo at 758 nm of 0.20, and a fluorescence emission at 758 nm of $0.46 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹ (or 1.2 mW m⁻² sr⁻¹ nm⁻¹). The 9 solar zenith angle is 50° and the viewing direction is nadir. The reference signal-to-noise 10 11 ratios hold for the TROPOMI reference radiance at 758 nm and spectral sampling interval of 12 0.1 nm. When varying spectral resolution, signal-to-noise ratios are scaled with the square 13 root of the spectral sampling interval (amount of light entering detector is constant). For details, see Sect. 2.5. Note that precision values for F_s are scaled with a factor $1 \cdot 10^{12}$. 14

- 15
- 16
- 17

Figure 5. Precision of the main integrameters as a function of the a prior erform the fluorescence emission for two spectral resolutions and for retrieval of the full state vector. Top left: mid pressure (P_{mid}); top right: aerosol optical thickness (τ); bottom left: surface albedo (A_s) at three wavelength nodes; bottom right: fluorescence emission (F_s) at three wavelength nodes. Results are for the same atmospheric scenario and observation geometry as in Fig. 4. The reference signal-to-noise ratio is 500. Note that precision values for F_s are scaled with a factor $1 \cdot 10^{12}$.