Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 7, 3113–3157, 2014 www.atmos-meas-tech-discuss.net/7/3113/2014/ doi:10.5194/amtd-7-3113-2014 © Author(s) 2014. CC Attribution 3.0 License.



This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Atmospheric Measurement Techniques (AMT). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in AMT if available.

# Aerosol optical and microphysical retrievals from a hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset – DISCOVER-AQ 2011

P. Sawamura<sup>1,5,\*</sup>, D. Müller<sup>3</sup>, R. M. Hoff<sup>2</sup>, C. A. Hostetler<sup>1</sup>, R. A. Ferrare<sup>1</sup>, J. W. Hair<sup>1</sup>, R. R. Rogers<sup>1</sup>, B. E. Anderson<sup>1</sup>, L. D. Ziemba<sup>1</sup>, A. J. Beyersdorf<sup>1</sup>, K. L. Thornhill<sup>1</sup>, E. L. Winstead<sup>1</sup>, and B. N. Holben<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA 23681, USA
 <sup>2</sup>University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD 21250, USA
 <sup>3</sup>University of Hertfordshire, College Lane, Hatfield, Herts, AL 10 9AB, UK
 <sup>4</sup>NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA
 <sup>5</sup>Oak Ridge Associated Universities (ORAU), TN 37831, USA
 <sup>\*</sup>formerly at: University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD 21250, USA

Received: 20 February 2014 - Accepted: 7 March 2014 - Published: 28 March 2014

Correspondence to: P. Sawamura (patricia.sawamura@nasa.gov)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.





## Abstract

Retrievals of aerosol microphysical properties (e.g. effective radius, volume and surface-area concentrations) and aerosol optical properties (e.g. complex index of refraction and single scattering albedo) were obtained from a hybrid multiwavelength lidar

- dataset for the first time. In July of 2011, in the Baltimore-Washington DC region, synergistic profiling of optical and microphysical properties of aerosols with both airborne in-situ and ground-based remote sensing systems was performed during the first deployment of DISCOVER-AQ. The hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset combines elastic ground-based measurements at 355 nm with airborne High Spectral Resolution Lidar
- (HSRL) measurements at 532 nm and elastic measurements at 1064 nm that were obtained less than 5 km apart of each other. This was the first study in which optical and microphysical retrievals from lidar were obtained during the day and directly compared to AERONET and in-situ measurements for 11 cases. Good agreement was observed between lidar and AERONET retrievals. Larger discrepancies were observed between
- <sup>15</sup> lidar retrievals and in-situ measurements obtained by the aircraft and aerosol hygroscopic effects are believed to be the main factor of such discrepancies.

#### 1 Introduction

Aerosols are known to play an important role in chemical processes, cloud formation, air quality, radiative balance, among other atmospheric processes. In the last few
decades great progress has been achieved towards a better understanding of the optical and physical properties of aerosols, and also on how changes in those properties affect the atmospheric radiative processes. Currently, many instruments onboard satellites allow for retrievals of column-integrated properties of aerosols on a daily basis. In addition to satellites, a number of ground-based networks contribute with continuous aerosol observations. However, despite this continuous advance, it is indisputable that many gaps in our understanding of aerosols are yet to be filled.





Aerosols originate both naturally and from anthropogenic processes. Globally, more than half of all particle emissions are of anthropogenic origin (Jacobson, 2012). These particles enter the atmosphere through emissions and nucleation. While suspended in the atmosphere the sizes of these particles as well as their number distributions <sup>5</sup> evolve as they undergo coagulation, condensation, water uptake, chemical reactions, and removal processes.

The sizes and types of aerosols can be display large variations both in spatial and temporal scale. Therefore, a continuous effort to monitor the particles present in the boundary layer is necessary.

- An important aspect on how these particles affect our climate is that the radiative forcing due to aerosols depends on their vertical distribution. For instance, due to hygroscopic growth effects, scattering particles produce a greater forcing when the majority of aerosol particles are located in the lower troposphere, whereas absorbing particles will produce a greater forcing above clouds/cloudy layers or when the underlying
   <sup>15</sup> surface albedo is high (Haywood and Ramaswamy, 1998). Also, surface temperature and climate responses depend on both vertical and horizontal distribution of aerosols
- (Hansen et al., 1997). And for that reason, a proper characterization of the vertical distribution of aerosols is necessary.

#### 2 Motivation

Retrievals based on the inversion of multi-spectral radiance measurements obtained by ground based and spaceborne radiometers are representative of the entire atmospheric column and therefore do not provide information on how the aerosols are distributed throughout the column. Lidars, on the other hand, are capable of determining the vertical distribution of aerosols with high spatial and temporal resolution. Many
 ground-based lidar networks across the globe such as the European Lidar Network (EARLINET: Bösenberg et al., 2003), the Micropulse Lidar Network (MPLNET: Welton



3116

et al., 2001), and the Asian Dust Network (ADNet: Sugimoto and Uno, 2009) contribute to regular aerosol observations.

Over the past decade, the development of inversion techniques for the retrieval of microphysical properties (such as effective radius, number, surface-area and volume

- <sup>5</sup> concentrations) and optical parameters (such as absorption and scattering coefficients, single scattering albedo and complex index of refraction) from multiwavelength lidar systems brought a new perspective in the study of the vertical distribution of aerosols (Müller et al., 1998, 1999a, b). In contrast to most radiometers (e.g. from MODIS and AERONET) which measure radiance over a large number of wavelengths, it has been demonstrated that from lidar backscatter and extinction measurements at three wave-
- demonstrated that from lidar backscatter and extinction measurements at three wavelengths, one can obtain retrievals of the aforementioned aerosol optical and physical properties.

More specifically, the recommended multiwavelength lidar dataset necessary to obtain such retrievals consists of a set of backscatter coefficients ( $\beta$ ) at 355 nm, 532 nm and 1064 nm and a set of extinction coefficients ( $\alpha$ ) at 355 nm and 532 nm (Veselovskii et al., 2002; Bockmann et al., 2005), which are the usual wavelength outputs from a Nd:YAG laser.

15

All microphysical retrievals from multiwavelength lidar data obtained to date, however, originated from ground-based Raman lidar systems which have one major drawbask. Reman liders are generally limited to nighttime exercises due to the work Re-

- <sup>20</sup> back: Raman lidars are generally limited to nighttime operations due to the weak Raman backscattering signal which makes it very sensitive to solar background radiation. Therefore it can be very difficult to characterize the aerosol variation throughout the day with Raman lidar systems. Wandinger et al. (2002) compared nighttime lidar retrievals of effective radius, volume and surface-area concentrations, complex
- index of refraction and single-scattering albedo with nighttime airborne in-situ measurements for two cases and obtained good agreement during LACE 98. In this study good agreement (< 30%) was obtained between the lidar retrievals and the in-situ measurements for cases of aerosols originated from forest fires. Veselovskii et al. (2009) compared early nighttime retrievals of mean and effective radius, angstrom coefficient,





complex index of refraction, and number and volume concentrations with late daytime AERONET retrievals for three cases under varying relative humidity conditions (August/September 2006 at GSFC). Good agreement was obtained between lidar retrievals and AERONET retrievals of fine mode.

 Moreover, most lidar-based aerosol microphysical characterization efforts took place in either Europe or East Asia (Müller et al., 2001; Wandinger et al., 2002; Veselovskii et al., 2002; Müller et al., 2003; Tesche et al., 2008; Noh et al., 2009; Balis et al., 2010; Müller et al., 2011). In the United States there is a shortage of multiwavelength lidar systems that are able to provide good quality backscatter and extinction profiles in the aforementioned wavelengths. Therefore, only a very limited number of case studies were performed in the US (Veselovskii et al., 2009, 2012a, c), and all of them utilized

one Raman lidar instrument.

In this work we obtained, for the first time to our knowledge, retrievals of optical and microphysical properties of aerosols using a so-called hybrid multiwavelength lidar

- <sup>15</sup> dataset which consists on the combination of both elastic and High Spectral Resolution Lidar (HSRL) techniques as well as ground-based and airborne measurement platforms. Elastic measurements were obtained by a ground-based system at 355 nm and an airborne system operating at 1064 nm. HSRL measurements at 532 nm were also carried out onboard the airborne system. In addition of being the first time that
- 20 retrievals of this kind were obtained from a combination of ground-based and airborne elastic and HSRL measurements, it is also the first study of this kind, to our knowledge, in which all lidar measurements were obtained during daytime.

Retrievals of effective radius, volume and surface-area concentrations, as well as the complex refractive index and single-scattering albedo were obtained from the inversion

<sup>25</sup> of the hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset utilizing the inversion algorithm described by Müller et al. (1998).

The data utilized in this work were obtained during the first deployment of DISCOVER-AQ which took place in the Baltimore-Washingtion DC corridor in July 2011. The DISCOVER-AQ project (Deriving Information on Surface conditions





from Column and Vertically Resolved Observations Relevant to Air Quality) is a fiveyear field experiment funded by the NASA Earth Venture program. The goal of DISCOVER-AQ is to improve our understanding on how to relate total-column observations with near-surface conditions of aerosol and trace gases (Hoff et al., 2012; DISCOVER-AQ, 2011).

During this campaign a number of ground-based and airborne instruments were deployed throughout the Baltimore-Washington DC region providing the data necessary to construct the hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset. Optical and physical parameters of aerosols from airborne in-situ instruments as well as from ground-based sunphotometers were also obtained during this experiment and compared with our lidar retrievals. Figure 1 shows a map with the locations of interest during this study.

The hybrid lidar dataset as well as the inversion methodology are described in more detail in Sect. 3. Discussion of results and comparison of the lidar retrievals with airborne in-situ measurements as well as with AERONET inversion products are presented in Sect. 4.

#### 3 Methodology

5

10

15

#### 3.1 Hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset

In order to obtain retrievals of the optical and microphysical properties of aerosols from a multiwavelength lidar system, a minimum set of backscatter and extinction coefficient
 measurements is required as demonstrated by Veselovskii et al. (2004) and Bockmann et al. (2005). As previously mentioned, most studies and efforts in characterizing the optical and microphysical properties of tropospheric aerosols through the inversion of multiwavelength lidar data have taken place in either Europe or Asia. Furthermore, most of those studies utilized Raman lidar systems that were specifically designed for
 multiwavelength measurements. These instruments were designed to emit and recieve photons of all three wavelengths at the same time and through the same optical path





allowing for completely collocated measurements, and therefore a more self-consistent  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  dataset.

Compared to a few years ago, the availability of multiwavelength lidar systems has increased. But still, most of those systems are operated by the European Aerosol Li-

<sup>5</sup> dar Research Network (EARLINET). Many lidar groups across the globe still operate instruments that are not capable of providing a complete  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  dataset.

As an alternative to the  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  inversion methodology, some studies were carried out also in the framework of EARLINET in which backscatter and extinction coefficients obtained from a Raman lidar were combined with optical depth measured by sunpho-

- tometer in order to derive the microphysical properties of aerosols (Pahlow et al., 2006; Tesche et al., 2008). Wagner et al. (2013) combined backscatter and extinction coefficients obtained from a Raman lidar and retrievals of volume concentration and column values of the volume-specific backscatter and extinction values obtained from AERONET in an optimization algorithm in order to obtain vertically resolved distribu-
- tions of optical and microphysical properties of fine and coarse mode particles. However, the main challenge that comes to mind in this type of Raman lidar and AERONET data combination is temporal data collocation. Sunphotometers are fundamentally designed to be operated during daytime while Raman lidars allow for good measurements mostly during nighttime.

<sup>20</sup> The objective of this work was to explore the feasibility of applying the  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  inversion methodology to a hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset in order to expand the aerosol microphysical characterization efforts beyond what has been done so far.

During DISCOVER-AQ, the NASA UC-12 aircraft flew across the Baltimore-Washington DC region with the HSRL-1 system on board obtaining profiles of extinc-

tion and backscatter coefficients at 532 utilizing the HSRL technique as well as profiles of backscatter coefficient at 1064 with the elastic technique (Hair et al., 2008). Measurements of depolarization ratio at 532 nm and 1064 nm were also obtained simultaneously with the HSRL-1 system. Profiles of backscatter and extinction coefficient at





355 nm were obtained at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) using a commercial ground-based elastic lidar (Leosphere, ALS-450).

In order to combine the dual-platform lidar measurements (e.g., airborne and groundbased), a collocation radius of 5 km centered at the Department of Physics at UMBC (39.25°, -76.71°) was considered. Figure 2 depicts the setup. Within this radius it is assumed that the airmass is homogeneous enough so that measurements from different

instruments can be combined, and we examine this assumption.

The hybrid dataset not only combines dual-platform measurements, but it also combines both elastic and high spectral resolution lidar techniques which can be a challenging task.

The HSRL is a more robust technique when compared to the standard elastic lidar technique since it utilizes spectral delineation to separate the signal contribution due to aerosol and molecules which allows for the determination of both backscatter and extinction coefficients independently. Elastic lidar systems, however, measure the total

- attenuated backscatter due to molecules and aerosols together. For this type of system, the extinction coefficient is retrieved with the assumption of a constant extinction-tobackscatter ratio (i.e. lidar ratio). The lidar ratio, as an intensive property, varies with the type of aerosol. Therefore, the assumption of a constant lidar ratio throughout the whole column of the atmosphere can be problematic in cases when layers of different types of
- <sup>20</sup> aerosols are present. In order to assess the feasibility of this new retrieval methodology, we tested the 5 km airmass homogeneity assumption as well as the constant lidar ratio assumption. This is discussed in the next section.

#### 3.1.1 Elastic lidar retrievals

5

10

During this experiment, in addition to the airborne HSRL-1 system and the ALS-450, another elastic lidar obtained measurements at 532 nm at UMBC (ELF: Elastic Lidar Facility).

The Leosphere ALS-450 is a commercial, eye-safe elastic lidar system that utilizes a tripled pulse laser source Nd:YAG at 355 nm at 20 Hz repetition rate generating





measurements with temporal and spatial resolution of 1 min and 15 m, respectively. ELF utilizes a Q-switched Continuum Surelite II Nd:YAG operating at 1064 nm and 532 nm with a 10 Hz repetition rate. ELF's signal is digitized with a Licel TR20-160 photon counter and averaged for one minute, with a vertical resolution of 7.5 m. More details on ELF system can be found elsewhere (Comer, 2003; Engel-Cox et al., 2006). The technical specifications of the HSRL system can be found in details in Hair et al. (2008).

Both elastic systems utilize similar algorithms to retrieve the extinction coefficient from the total attenuated backscatter signal which relies on closing the integrated extinction profile to aerosol optical depth (AOD) measurements obtained by a collocated AERONET sunphotometer. Having an elastic lidar at 532 nm at the same location as the ALS-450 enabled us to assess the two aforementioned assumptions at the same time by comparing the extinction coefficient profiles from ELF and from HSRL-1 using the same spatial subset proposed (i.e. r < 5 km). Figure 3 shows the profiles compar-

- <sup>15</sup> ison for all cases analyzed in this work (itemized in Table 1) which shows sufficient agreement. The error bars (shaded area) in the HSRL profile are the standard deviation of the profiles during an UMBC overpass which usually lasted between 1 and 2 min, resulting in a 5–10 profile average. The errors in ELF profiles are the standard deviation of 15 profiles which represent a 15 min average centered at the UMBC over-
- <sup>20</sup> pass by the UC-12. The agreement observed between HSRL and ELF profiles was a good indicator of the feasibility of combining dual-platform, dual-technique lidar data to perform the retrievals. For the cases in hand the aerosol intensive properties do not show much variation with altitude, therefore the assumption of a constant lidar ratio throughout the atmosphere is reasonable. The agreement between both profiles also
- indicates that the assumption of a homogeneous airmass within 5 km and/or 15 min is reasonable as well. In Fig. 3 we also show the extinction profiles obtained from in-situ measurements onboard the P3B over the closest spiral sites. Good agreement can be observed in most cases which corroborates and also extends the airmass horizontal homogeneity assumption to larger distances (Padonia and Beltsville sites were about





 $22\,km$  from UMBC and Essex about 10 km). The discrepancies observed in other cases were mostly in isolated layers aloft where the homogeneity assumption fails.

The method utilized to obtain the aerosol extinction and backscatter profiles for both elastic lidar systems is an iterative algorithm that selects the optimum lidar ratio value

- <sup>5</sup> by minimizing the residual between the AERONET AOD and the lidar AOD calculated from the integrated extinction coefficient profile. Some small differences in the algorithm utilized for ELF and the ALS-450 should be noted. ELF's algorithm utilizes AOD measurements of an entire day in the residue minimization process thus resulting in a single value of lidar ratio for that particular day. The algorithm utilized with the ALS-
- <sup>10</sup> 450 dataset, however, was run in a case-by-case scenario obtaining a lidar ratio value for each case. Figure 4 shows the so-called  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  dataset as well as the lidar ratio values at 355 and 532 nm obtained from both HSRL-1 and ALS-450. The error bars in the profiles at 355 nm were obtained by varying the system constant in the lidar equation by 5% and then averaging the lidar ratio values obtained and the corresponding profiles. In a couple of cases, like seen in plots B and C from Fig. 4, the algorithm
- found a larger number of acceptable lidar ratio values but it did not, however, translate to a large variation in the backscatter and extinction profiles.

# 3.1.2 Lidar inversion algorithm for retrieval of microphysical and optical properties of aerosols

- The idea of retrieving aerosol size distributions from multiwavelegth lidar measurements started back in the 1980s, with Heintzenberg and Qing offering two different approaches (Heintzenberg et al., 1981; Qing et al., 1989). Based on the work of Qing et al. (1989) this topic was revitalized in the mid 1990s, culminating in the late 1990s in the first version of an inversion algorithm to retrieve aerosol microphysical properties from multiwavelength lidar data that consist of a combination of particle backscatter and
- extinction coefficients measured at multiple wavelengths (Müller et al., 1998). Since then, many studies have been carried out showing that measurements of combined backscatter and extinction coefficients allow indeed for the retrieval of aerosol size





distributions parameters with reasonable accuracy (Müller et al., 1999a; Veselovskii et al., 2002; Bockmann et al., 2005).

The first retrievals from lidar data were derived with the inversion method described by Müller et al. (1998, 1999a, b, 2000). This method was specifically developed to  $_5$  process optical data from an eleven-channel, six-wavelengths scanning Raman lidar system (Althausen et al., 2000). Since then, the algorithm was further refined to handle more limited datasets, dubbed  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  (or simply 3 + 2) (Müller et al., 2001; Veselovskii et al., 2002; Bockmann et al., 2005). The  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  dataset is the minimum requirement for the retrieval of microphysical particle properties with the current inversion algorithm.

- The problem of retrieving intrinsic physical characteristics of aerosols from a limited set of optical measurements is known to be an ill-posed problem in inversion theory. In summary, the algorithm relies on the relationship of the spectral optical data (i.e. extinction and backscatter coefficients) to the physical characteristics of *spherical* aerosols (i.e. size and complex index of refraction) through kernel functions that are re-
- <sup>15</sup> lated to the extinction and backscatter efficiencies described by Mie theory (Mie, 1908; Bohren and Huffman, 1983). In order to solve the equations, which can be found in the literature referenced herein, the size distribution is discretized and approximated by a linear combination of triangular-shaped B-spline functions. The ill-posedness of the problem arises when solving the matrix equations for the weight factors of the linear
- <sup>20</sup> combination of those triangular functions. In this case regularization methods must be introduced because the simple solution of such equation results in error amplification and discontinuity of solutions due to the ill-posedness of the mathematical problem. The procedure aims at stabilizing the solution space by introducing mathematical and physical constraints during the inversion process, as well as after the inversion process during post-processing.

The current inversion algorithm employs non-descriptive methods, meaning that they do not require any a priori information. It utilizes a minimization concept, also known as method of minimum distance (Tikhonov and Arsenin, 1977; Twomey, 1977), to find the solutions. In simple terms, this method selects solutions for which the residual between





the solution of the forward problem and the back-calculated solution obtained from the inversion results is smaller than a pre-determined value > 0. A smoothness constraint is also applied for the size distribution.

- In order to obtain the "optimum" smoothness of the size distribution one must find an optimum value for a variable called Lagrange multiplier  $\gamma$ . In the original version of the inversion algorithm, the generalized cross validation (GCV) was utilized to find this optimum  $\gamma$ . Currently, the algorithm employs a modified minimum discrepancy method described by Veselovskii et al. (2002).The mathematical details of this method can be found in Müller et al. (1999a), Twomey (1977) and Weitkamp (2005).
- <sup>10</sup> As the inversion problem must be discretized, one must utilize a so-called inversion window which determines the size and complex index of refraction range in which the inversion will take place. The inversion window utilized in this work was  $R_{\min} = 0.01 \,\mu\text{m} : 0.01 \,\mu\text{m} : 0.2 \,\mu\text{m}, R_{\max} = 0.5 \,\mu\text{m} : 0.5 \,\mu\text{m} : 5 \,\mu\text{m}, \text{Re}[m] = 1.325 : 0.025 : 1.5, \text{ and Im}[m] = 0 : 0.001 : 0.03. R_{\min} \text{ and } R_{\max} \text{ represent the values for the left and right-most edge of the size distribution, respectively. Re}[m] and Im[m] are the real and imaginary parts of the complex index of refraction (m), respectively. The algorithm as-$
- sumes a wavelength-independent *m*. A look-up table of kernel functions is utilized to speed the calculations during the inversion process. The  $R_{\text{max}}$  window was limited to the  $R_{\text{max}}$  range of the kernel functions in this look-up table.
- The inversion procedure was run 7 times for each layer. In 6 of those runs, random errors of up to 15% were added to the  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  input set while the remaining run did not have any noise added. This random error is included to account for errors in the measurements. Each inversion run generates a space solution which has to be further constrained in the post-processing step which is the most time consuming part of the
- <sup>25</sup> process. The constraints are different combinations of  $R_{min}$ ,  $R_{max}$  and other regularization parameters that are set manually, making it a very time-consuming task. For each of those 7 solution spaces generated, 5 to 10 post-processing constraints are chosen based on a number of criteria which includes: number of final solutions, physically meaningful complex index of refraction values, and shape of size distribution.



Therefore, for each layer analyzed, approximately 20 to 40 solutions are averaged for each variable: effective radius ( $R_{eff}$ ), volume concentration, surface-area concentration, real and imaginary parts of *m* and single scattering albedo ( $\omega_0$ ). The errors reported for these parameters are the standard deviation of this average (Weitkamp, 2005; Veselovskii et al., 2002).

#### 4 Results

During the first deployment of DISCOVER-AQ, 16 flights were conducted by the P-3B aircraft and 14 by the UC-12 from 28 June to 29 July in the Baltimore-Washington DC area. There were 10 days in which measurements from both aircraft as well as from ALS-450 were obtained in synergy (Days 5, 10, 11, 14, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27 and 29 of July). Figure 5 shows the AOD values at 440 nm during those 10 days obtained from AERONET stations in Beltsville, Essex, Padonia, UMBC and Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC). Retrievals of microphysical and optical properties from inversion of the hybrid lidar dataset were obtained for the days with higher aerosol loading ( $\tau > 0.4$  at 440 nm). 5 July was a borderline case in terms of AOD values but it was the only day in which long-range transport of smoke was observed. 11 July was not included due to the presence of scattered clouds. Figure 6 shows the total attenuated backscatter co-

efficient measured by ELF (at 532 nm) on 5 July in which several layers were observed. Nighttime optical and microphysical retrievals between 1 and 3 km of altitude were also obtained from a multiwavelength Raman lidar for two cases during DISCOVER-AQ 2011. Those retrievals were obtained with a recently developed algorithm in which a  $3\beta + 1\alpha$  dataset is utilized instead. Veselovskii et al. (2012c) reported retrievals from 20 July obtained from approximately 01:00 UTC to 06:00 UTC at GSFC. The ranges of values retrieved for volume concentration, effective radius and real part of *m* were: 15– 45  $\mu$ m<sup>3</sup> cm<sup>-3</sup>, 0.15–0.25  $\mu$ m, and 1.4–1.47, respectively. Utilizing the same lidar system

at GSFC, Veselovskii et al. (2012b) reported the temporal evolution of effective radius, volume concentrations and both real and complex parts of m for 22 July between





01:00 and 07:00 UTC approximately. The volume concentration (averaged between 1.2–1.4 km) was shown to rise with time, reaching a maximum value of 35 μm<sup>3</sup> cm<sup>-3</sup> between 03:30–05:00 UTC. The effective radius (also averaged between 1.2–1.4 km) was shown to be nearly constant at 0.2 μm for that same time period. Re[*m*] values
<sup>5</sup> ranged between 1.44–1.46 and Im[*m*] was mostly constant at about 0.006. Compared to the daytime lidar retrievals obtained in this study, the values agree within one standard deviation, except for the upper limit of volume concentrations which is slightly higher in our retrievals.

Figure 7 shows the results obtained for effective radius, volume and surface-area concentrations, single scattering albedo and complex index of refraction from inversion of the hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset  $(3\beta + 2\alpha)$ , from AERONET inversions and from in-situ measurements obtained by the P-3B aircraft. Table 2 summarizes the averages over all layers analyzed in this study for each aerosol parameter. In Table 2 we present different averaging subsets for AERONET retrievals since both Level 1.5

- and Level 2.0 were utilized in the comparison. Subset 1 contains the AERONET data described in Table 1 which are Level 1.5. Subset 2 contains only the AERONET data described in Table 1 which are Level 2.0. Subset 3 contains all Level 2.0 data from 1–31 July 2011. It should be noted that subset 1 contains subset 2. Subset 1 contained an average of 10 data points while subset 2 for size-related parameters contained an
- <sup>20</sup> average of 5 data points and for optical-related parameters, 3 data points. Subset 3 contained an average of 47 data points for size-related parameters and 16 data points for optical-related parameters. The number between parentheses in columns  $R_{\rm eff}$  and  $\omega_0$  for the AERONET data represent the number of data points in each subset for each station.

#### 25 4.1 Comparison to in-situ measurements

The P-3B aircraft carried two three-wavelength integrating nephelometers (TSI model 3563), an Ultra High Sensitivity Aerosol Spectrometer (UHSAS), a Particle Soot Absorption Photometer (PSAP), among other particle counters and instruments that



measured the aerosols chemical composition. UHSAS obtained size distribution of the aerosols within the size range of 60 nm to 1  $\mu$ m in diameter. The two nephelometers ran in parallel, with one being operated at dry conditions with relative humidity (RH) of less than 40%, and the other operating at a nominal RH of 80 ± 4% (Ziemba et al.,

<sup>5</sup> 2013). The combination of measurements from the nephelometer at 550 nm and the PSAP at 532 nm allowed for the calculation of single-scattering albedo profiles, i.e., scattering-to-extinction ratio profiles, that were compared to lidar retrievals of single scattering albedo at 532 nm.

The P-3B flew in ascending/descending spirals over a number of locations in order to obtain vertical profiles of in-situ measurements of optical, physical and chemical properties of aerosols. UMBC was not one of those locations, however, due to air traffic limitations. In order to compare the lidar retrievals to the airborne in-situ measurements we utilized the data obtained during the spirals over the three closest locations: Beltsville, Essex and Padonia (Fig. 1).

15

The in-situ data utilized to compare with the lidar retrievals are mostly representative of dry instead of ambient conditions. Corrections with respect to hygroscopic growth effects were not applied in this study and this limitation will be discussed later.

# 4.2 Comparison to AERONET retrievals

The Aerosol Robotic Network (AERONET) is a global network that provides retrievals of aerosol optical and microphysical properties in the total atmospheric column from direct and diffuse radiation measurements at multiple wavelengths by sun/sky radiometers (Holben et al., 1998).

Since 2011 the Distributed Regional Aerosol Gridded Observation Networks (DRAGON) has been deployed in many field campaigns in order to provide a more extensive yet regionally dense AERONET-like dataset to address satellite validation and in-situ comparisons (Holben et al., 2011). DRAGON was first deployed during DISCOVER-AQ 2011 and stations at Beltsville, Essex and Padonia, here referred to as AERONET stations, were DRAGON stations.



The AERONET volume particle size distributions are retrieved in 22 logarithmically equidistant bins in the radius range size of  $0.05 \,\mu\text{m} \le r \le 15 \,\mu\text{m}$ . The ranges of retrievable real and imaginary parts of the *m* are  $1.33 \le \text{Re}[m] \le 1.6$  and  $0.0005 \le \text{Im}[m] \le 0.5$ , respectively. Details on the algorithms can be found in Dubovik and King (2000) and Dubovik et al. (2000).

Only the fine mode retrievals were considered in the comparison. Also, as the retrievals are obtained for the total column of the atmosphere, the volume particle size distribution is retrieved per unit area ( $\mu m^3 cm^{-2}$ ) instead of per unit volume ( $\mu m^3 cm^{-3}$ ). In order to compare AERONET to lidar retrievals it is necessary to introduce an "aerosol layer height" (ALH) that represents the altitude below which most aerosol particles are

10

confined. For this study, based on the lidar data analyzed we chose ALH = 1.5 km.
With respect to data quality, AERONET releases its aerosol products as Level 1.5 and 2.0. A number of criteria must be met for the retrievals to be accepted as Level 1.5 and then Level 2.0. These criteria are presented in detail by Holben et al. (2006).

- <sup>15</sup> In particular,  $\omega_0$  and *m* are only "quality assured" (Level 2.0) when AOD at 440 is greater or equal to 0.40 (Dubovik et al., 2000). Due to the large number of criteria utilized to screen the data, Level 2 data during the period analyzed in this study is very scarce. Therefore for the comparison with lidar retrievals we utilized both Level 1.5 and Level 2.0. It should be noted that size-related parameters (i.e. effective radius
- and volume and surface-area concentrations) usually contains more Level 2 data compared to optical-related parameters (i.e. single-scattering albedo and complex index of refraction).

DRAGON sunphotometers were pre- and post-calibrated for DISCOVER-AQ 2011 and the data goes through the same quality control and quality assurance as the data

obtained by the regular AERONET instruments. However we learned later in this study that some DRAGON stations, like Padonia, had possible instrumental issues. Level 2.0 AERONET data was not available for Padonia station. Thus, the comparisons presented in this study with respect to this particular station should be carefully considered.





The retrievals of  $\omega_0$  and *m* are reported at wavelengths 440 nm, 675 nm, 870 nm and 1020 nm. A third-order polynomial regression was utilized to interpolate the AERONET retrievals at 532 nm in order to compare them to the lidar retrievals also at 532 nm.

- As can be seen in both Fig. 7 and Table 2 the lidar retrievals, in general, showed bet-
- ter agreement with AERONET retrievals than with the in-situ measurements obtained onboard the P-3B. On average the lidar retrievals compared better with the AERONET retrievals obtained at Essex station for both subsets 1 and 2. The average results presented for different AERONET subsets in Table 2 show differences between the mean values obtained for the whole month and the mean values obtained over the 5 days
- analyzed in this study (July 05, 20, 21, 22, and 29). For instance, we observe bigger differences among parameters related to size distribution than among optical parameters when comparing subsets 1, 2, and 3. This difference can be expected as the 5 days chosen for analysis in this study experienced the highest aerosol loading when compared to the rest of the month. For effective radius we observe an increase in
- <sup>15</sup> bias between the lidar and AERONET retrievals that ranged between [-6%, +6%] for subsets 1 and 2 to -11% for subset 3. Bias in volume and surface-area concentrations shifted from [-18%, +27%] to [-43%, -27%]. As for the optical parameters the changes were less significant: single-scattering albedo went from [-1.1%, +3.2%] to [-1%, +3.2%], Re[*m*] from [+0.7%, +2.9%] to [+0.7%, +2.2%], and Im[*m*] from
- [-40%, +40%] to [-40%, +60%]. The bigger difference in the latter is related to the retrievals at UMBC which throughout the campaign displayed a systematic bias towards larger values in the imaginary part of the *m* even for Level 2.0 retrievals. The origin of this bias is still unknown but it has been speculated that calibration issues might be at fault.
- <sup>25</sup> The lidar retrievals of volume and surface-area concentrations and real part of *m* agree marginally better with AERONET level 2.0 retrievals (subset 2) than with level 1.5 retrievals (subset 1). For most parameters, as can be seen in Table 2, the differences between AERONET results averaged over subsets 1 and 2 were very small.





Table 3 shows the difference in mean effective radius values for the month of July for each AERONET/DRAGON stations considered in this study for three distinct ranges of aerosol optical depth at 440 nm. The differences between Level 1.5 and Level 2.0 for effective radius never exceed 0.01 µm except for Padonia station which does not have Level 2.0 data. However, when compared the other stations, the Level 1.5 effective

radius retrieved for Padonia is also within 0.01 μm from both Level 1.5 and Level 2.0 retrievals obtained at the other stations.

Table 4 shows the same comparison as Table 3 but for single-scattering albedo. Here we can clearly see the negative bias in the Level 1.5  $\omega_0$  values obtained for  $\tau_{440} \leq 0.4$  for UMBC and Padonia stations. Level 2.0 data at UMBC is about 0.03 lower

 $\tau_{440} \ge 0.4$  for OMBC and Fadoria stations. Level 2.0 data at OMBC is about 0.03 lower compared to Beltsville, Essex and GSFC stations. Padonia Level 1.5 average retrieval for  $\tau_{440} \ge 0.4$  agrees well with both Level 1.5 and 2.0 retrievals from Beltsville, Essex and GSFC stations.

#### 4.3 Size parameters

20

<sup>15</sup> A systematic bias was observed between the lidar retrievals and in-situ measurements of volume and surface-area concentrations.

Compared to lidar retrievals, P-3B measurements showed an average underestimation of about 81 % and 77 % for volume and surface-area concentrations, respectively. The effective radius showed a lower bias of 21 %. The shape of the profiles, however, were in good agreement.

It should be noted that size distribution data from the UHSAS are typically reported referenced to calibrations using polystyrene latex sphere (PSL) particles with a refractive index of 1.59. Because the UHSAS employs an optical detection scheme, sizing (and thus the derived surface area, volume, and effective radius) is sensitive to changes

in the real-part of the particle refractive index. In order to better compare to realistic particle compositions which were mixtures of organic compounds and ammonium sulfate (AS), data were corrected using monodisperse AS calibration aerosol (refractive index of 1.53). Resulting correction factors varied from flight-to-flight due to variations in





aerosol composition and had average values of 1.44, 1.22, and 1.28 for volume, surface area, and effective radius, respectively. Note that this correction applies only to in situ size distributions at dry RH (less than 40%).

After applying the aforementioned correction factors to the UHSAS measurements, we observed an overall improvement on the comparisons between the lidar retrievals and the UHSAS measurements. Volume and surface area concentrations still show underestimation when compared to the lidar retrievals, but they were both reduced to 71 %. Effective radius, on the other hand, improved to an average of -3 %, showing a slight overestimation with respect to the lidar retrievals. The in-situ size parameters displayed in Fig. 7 represent the corrected data.

The differences observed in volume and surface-area concentrations between lidar retrievals and in-situ measurements were first thought to be related to possible inlet issues in the P3B aircraft. Ziemba et al. (2013), however, concluded that particle loss due to the aerosol inlet was likely negligible after obtaining good correlation ( $r^2 = 0.88$ ) between in-situ extinction coefficient measurements from the P-3B at 532 nm and those obtained from HSRL also at 532 nm. This improved correlation (from  $r^2 = 0.81$ ) was obtained after the optical measurements obtained from the P-3B was corrected for the ambient RH using the measurements of hygroscopicity also obtained onboard. With this comparison Ziemba et al. (2013) found a liquid-water contribution to ambient 20 extinction of up to 43 %.

After ruling out possible aircraft inlet issues, the most likely factor contributing to this difference observed is related to the aforementioned aerosol hydration processes. Condensation and evaporation from the particles surfaces during sampling are known to occur (Biswas et al., 1987; Leaitch and Isaac, 1991) which dries the aerosol dur-<sup>25</sup> ing probing. The two nephelometers onboard the P-3B were utilized to calculate the changes in aerosol scattering due to hygroscopic growth, commonly expressed as f(RH). The hygroscopic growth, however, is determined by the relative increase in the diameter of the aerosol particles due to water uptake, commonly expressed by the grow factor g(RH) which was not measured during DISCOVER-AQ. Therefore, corrections





to the size distributions obtained by both UHSAS and LAS instruments with respect to water uptake were not performed.

Assuming that the size parameters obtained from the lidar retrievals are representative of particles in ambient humidity conditions and the ones obtained from the UHSAS

- <sup>5</sup> on board P-3B are representative of particles in dry conditions, the ratio of volume concentration can be considered a first approximation for  $\bar{g}^3(RH)$  and the ratio of surfacearea concentrations an approximation for f(RH).  $\bar{g}(RH)$  would be an average or effective growth factor for the entire range of diameters considered in the measurement. The ratio obtained in this study for the growth factor was  $\bar{g} = 1.75 \pm 0.17$ . The values for
- <sup>10</sup>  $\bar{g}$ (RH) reported in the literature for ammonium sulfate at 355 nm and 532 nm fall within the range 1.44–1.46 at RH = 80 % and 1.69–1.77 at RH = 90 % (Michel Flores et al., 2012; Gysel et al., 2002; Dinar et al., 2008; Sjogren et al., 2007). In terms of *f*(RH), the value obtained from the ratio between lidar and UHSAS surface-area concentration values was *f*(RH) = 2.16 ± 0.34. Average values of *f*(RH) for 11:00–13:00 EDT during DISCOVER-AQ (below 1 km of altitude) ranged between 1.28 and 1.91 (Ziemba et al.,
- 2013).

We would like to emphasize the fact that the value obtained for  $\bar{g}(RH)$  in this study can only be considered as a rough estimate of the hygroscopic growth factor. Also, the difference between the f(RH) value obtained from this comparison and the values ob-

tained by Ziemba et al. (2013) was marginal within 1 to 2 standard deviations. Aerosol hydration processes were clearly a major factor in the difference observed between the size parameters retrieved from lidar data and from the airborne in-situ measurements. However it remains inconclusive whether the difference was *solely* due to hydration processes. This matter will be subject to further investigation in future studies.

# 25 4.4 Single-scattering albedo and complex index of refraction

The average single-scattering albedo value obtained from the lidar retrievals was  $\omega_0 = 0.95 \pm 0.02$  which agrees with the values reported in the literature for the Baltimore-Washington DC region at this particular time of the year. Dubovik et al. (2002)





analyzed 8 years of worldwide AERONET retrievals and reported an average value of  $\omega_0(550 \text{ nm}) \sim 0.97$  for the GSFC station between June and September.

Measurements obtained by the P-3B shows a systematic overestimation with respect to lidar retrievals with an average value of  $\omega_0 = 0.99 \pm 0.01$  for all spiral sites.

- <sup>5</sup> Another aircraft experiment conducted in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States in July 1993, SCAR-A (Remer et al., 1997) reported a best estimate value similar to those obtained by the P-3B,  $\omega_0(450 \text{ nm}) \sim 0.98-0.99$ . On the other hand, during another field campaign conducted in the Mid-Atlantic region on July 1996 (TAR-FOX), Hegg et al. (1997) found that aerosol absorption was a significant contributor to the total dry extinction measured (~ 25 %) which averaged over the vertical profiles in order to assess its contribution to the total optical depth resulted on an average  $\omega_0(550 \text{ nm}) = 0.90$ . When hydration of aerosols was considered they estimated an upper limit of  $\omega_0(550 \text{ nm}) = 0.94$ .
- The *m* values obtained from our lidar retrievals also agree well with the values re-<sup>15</sup> ported on the literature. Combining simultaneous in-situ size distribution profile measurements obtained onboard an aircraft with lidar aerosol backscatter and optical depth profiles, Redemann et al. (2001) obtained profiles of *m* for two case studies during TARFOX. Redemann et al. (2001) reported for the first case study values of 1.33-0.0012i (0–250 m, RH = 80–100 %), 1.38-0.004i (250–1650 m, RH = 50–65 %), and 1.45 - 0.002i (1650–4030 m, RH = 30–50 %). For the second case study it was found 1.45 - 0.003i (150–1280 m, RH = 60–70 %), and 1.45 - 0.008i (1280–1980 m, RH = 40–60 %) resulting in an average Re[*m*] =  $1.41 \pm 0.06$  and Im[*m*] =  $0.004 \pm 0.003$ ,
- which agrees with the lidar average results. Dubovik et al. (2002) reported  $Re[m] = 1.40 \pm 0.01$  at GSFC (averaged over all wavelengths) from AERONET retrievals.
- There are still many uncertainties on how light-absorbing aerosols affect our climate. The main uncertainties are related to their mixing state with other particles as well as with how light-absorbing particles respond to changes in ambient RH (Redemann et al., 2001; Haywood and Ramaswamy, 1998; Andreae, 2001). Bond et al. (2006) discusses how absorption due to light-absorbing carbon particles increases when they are mixed





with other particles and how this change affect their radiative effects. A modeling study by Redemann et al. (2001) showed that mid-visible light absorption can increase up to 15% when dry absorption measurements are corrected for humidification for RH varying from 30 to 80% assuming aerosols made up by sulfate shells and black carbon

- <sup>5</sup> cores (dry soot mass fraction of 18 %; internal mixture). An increase of 35 % in absorption was obtained upon changes from 30 to 95 % in RH. Also according to Redemann et al. (2001): "We find that assuming humidification factor to be equal to unity may introduce overestimates in the single-scattering albedo of up to ~ 0.05 (more for smaller dry particles in narrow size distributions, less for larger particles in broad distributions)."
- <sup>10</sup> Therefore, it is clear that caution is needed when comparing single-scattering albedo retrievals obtained from remote sensors such as lidars or sun-sky radiometers (AERONET) which measures scattering from aerosols at ambient RH, with measurements from in-situ samplers which measure particles at drier conditions either due to inlet effects, or intentionally by drying the aerosols before sampling them. Measure-
- <sup>15</sup> ments of ambient RH were also obtained onboard the P-3B and the average RH values, considering all cases and layers analyzed in this work, were RH =  $70 \pm 10$  in Beltsville, RH =  $70 \pm 8$  in Essex and RH =  $71 \pm 8$  in Padonia. When comparing our lidar retrievals of  $\omega_0$  to the in-situ measurements obtained onboard P-3B, no corrections with respect to humidification factors were performed which might explain the larger difference ob-<sup>20</sup> served.

The single-scattering albedo values obtained from AERONET stations fall in between the retrievals obtained from lidar and those obtained from in-situ measurements. The values agree with the lidar retrievals within one standard deviation.

# 4.4.1 (5 July) Unusual single-scattering albedo case

<sup>25</sup> During the first week of July wildfires were observed in North and South Carolina in the United States as well as in northern Canada (UMBC ALG Smog Blog, 2011). On July 05 moderate to dense smoke was observed across the southeastern states and long range transport of smoke from those fires was observed with the lidars that

3134



were operating at UMBC during DISCOVER-AQ (Fig. 6). Airmass back-trajectories (not shown here) helped us to determine that some layers observed over Baltimore was likely to be residual smoke from the southern fires. As previously mentioned, this case did not present very high AOD values. Out of the cases analyzed, July 05 pre-5 sented the smallest range of effective radius values from the lidar retrievals and this trend was consistent with the P-3B observations and AERONET retrievals as can be seen in Fig. 7. The retrievals obtained from the lidar data of the first overpass on July 05 (case A) showed a small value of  $\omega_0$  and a large value of Im[m] for the top layer (2.46 km - 2.78 km). The values obtained,  $\omega_0 = 0.89 \pm 0.05$  and  $\text{Im}[m] = 0.013 \pm 0.005$ fall within the range of values observed for biomass burning cases presented by 10 Dubovik et al. (2002):  $0.88 \le \omega_0(440 \text{ nm}) \le 0.94 \text{ and } 0.00093 \le \text{Im}[m](440 \text{ nm}) \le 0.021$ . However, both retrievals of  $\omega_0$  and Im[m] for this particular case also showed large variation making it a less trustworthy retrieval. Therefore, definite conclusions on the retrieval sensitivity to capture the properties of a smoke layer could not be properly drawn in this case. Re[m] obtained from lidar for this case agreed with values obtained at UMBC and Padonia AERONET stations.

### 4.4.2 (22 July) Unusual size parameter case

in black.

The inversion code utilized for the lidar data can sometimes retrieve artificial bimodality in the size distributions. In order to identify those cases, the algorithm calculates the effective radius fine-to-total mode fraction  $(R_{eff}^{fine}/R_{eff}^{total})$  that varies from 0 to 1. This number can be used as a "quality flag": the lower the number, the worse the retrieval. The cases from 22 July presented the lowest values of  $R_{eff}^{fine}/R_{eff}^{total}$  which translated into larger variation of the individual lidar retrievals causing the larger error bars observed in cases G and H from Fig. 7. It was later found that  $R_{eff}^{fine}/R_{eff}^{total}$  correlated with the 4 depolarization ratio measurements obtained from the HSRL-1 lidar system. Figure 8 shows two distinct clusters with data from 22 July in red and the data from other dates





The lidar inversion algorithm utilizes Mie theory for the calculations. Therefore, some retrieval sensitivity with respect to the presence of non-spherical aerosol particles is to be expected. The origin of the non-spherical particles observed in this particular case remains unknown.

#### 5 5 Conclusions

10

25

For the first time we present daytime retrievals of optical and microphysical properties of aerosols derived from a hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset. In particular, it was also the first study ever performed in the United States in which daytime multiwavelength lidar retrievals were obtained and compared to measurements obtained from airborne in-situ and AERONET retrievals.

Comparison of remote sensing retrievals with in-situ measurements of aerosols are usually technically challenging due to a number of factors. By definition, remote sensing instruments do not probe aerosols directly, measuring instead radiation that is scattered and/or emitted from them, while in-situ instruments usually collect aerosols either

- on filters or chambers in order to make measurements. If not properly characterized and calibrated, in-situ instruments may produce different results due to under-sampling as well as changes in temperature and relative humidity in the environment being sampled. Remote sensing instruments, on the other hand, present a different set of potential problems. The instruments must also be well calibrated and characterized, but in addition to that, the algorithms must be systematically validated to assure the quality
- of retrievals.

In this study we compared lidar retrievals of effective radius, volume and surfacearea concentrations, single-scattering albedo and complex index of refraction with both AERONET level 1.5 and 2.0 retrievals which have been extensively studied and validated, and aircraft in-situ measurements (except *m*).

During DISCOVER-AQ 2011 the lidar retrievals showed good agreement with AERONET retrievals for all parameters. The choice of an ALH of 1.5 km to convert



AERONET retrievals of volume and surface-area concentrations from unit area to unit volume was based on continuous lidar observations throughout the campaign and was shown to be reasonable, although some error may be introduced in cases when the aerosol mixed layer height is variable. AERONET station at UMBC showed a negative

<sup>5</sup> bias in terms of single-scattering albedo, which was possibly caused by calibration issues during DISCOVER-AQ, but it was still within one standard deviation from other AERONET stations as well as with the lidar retrievals. In general, the values of single-scattering albedo and complex index of refraction obtained from the lidar retrievals in this study showed good agreement with values reported in the literature for the eastern
 <sup>10</sup> United States during Summer.

The airborne in-situ measurements showed larger discrepancies with respect to the lidar retrievals and the reasons, while still speculative, are most likely related to the hydration factors that were not taken into account in this study. Compared to other studies in which hydration factors were considered, the differences observed seem reasonable.

15

Values of effective radius, volume concentration and *m* obtained from the inversion of the hybrid  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  agreed within one standard deviation to multiwalength Raman lidar retrievals obtained for the cases of 20 July and 22nd at GSFC during nighttime with an alternative  $3\beta + 1\alpha$  algorithm.

<sup>20</sup> The work presented in this dissertation is of particular significance not only due to the novel hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset utilized for the inversion of optical and microphysical parameters, but also because it is the first study to our knowledge in which retrievals were obtained during daytime, and the first to be able to compare results both with AERONET retrievals and in-situ aircraft measurements. Similar studies

have been conducted in the past but all microphysical lidar retrievals were obtained at nighttime and only a small number of cases were analyzed. In this study we analyzed 11 case studies.

The combination of different lidar techniques for retrievals of this kind is an attractive idea given that most lidar groups across the globe do not possess multiwavelength





lidar systems that are capable of providing the  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  dataset. With the increasing number of collaborative projects and intensive field campaigns in which a number of different instruments are deployed in synergy, the possibilities of having multiple lidar systems deployed in proximity to each other increase, thus increasing the opportunities of characterizing the aerosols in different areas of the globe.

The methodology applied in this study was rather time-consuming and not practical for daily operational use. Nonetheless, the methodology can possibly be applied within the context of other field campaigns, hopefully with longer records of measurements for better assessment of more diverse atmospheric conditions as well as to test the sensitivity of the lidar retrievals especially with respect to the presence of light-absorbing aerosols.

NASA Langley Research Center (LaRC) recently developed the first airborne multiwavelength HSRL instrument capable of providing a robust  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  dataset. HSRL-2 is an upgraded version of the airborne HSRL-1 system utilized in this study and it is capable of providing HSRL measurements at 355 and 532 nm, as well as elastic mea-

- <sup>15</sup> capable of providing HSRL measurements at 355 and 532 nm, as well as elastic measurements at 1064 nm (Hostetler et al., 2013a, b). In addition to the new instrument NASA LaRC is also developing a new automated lidar inversion algorithm (Chemyakin et al., 2012) which will allow for more systematic validation of multiwavelength lidar retrievals.
- 20 Acknowledgements. This work was funded by grant NNX10AR38G (NASA DISCOVER-AQ).

#### References

10

- Althausen, D., Müller, D., A., A., Wandinger, U., Hube, H., Clauder, E., and Zörner, S.: Scanning six-wavelength eleven-channel aerosol lidar, J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech., 17, 1469–1482, 2000. 3123
- Andreae, M. O.: The dark side of aerosols, Nature, 409, 671–672, 2001. 3133 Balis, D., Giannakaki, E., Müller, D., Amiridis, V., Kelektsoglou, K., Rapsomanikis, S., and Bais, A.: Estimation of the microphysical aerosol properties over Thessaloniki, Greece, dur-



3139

ing SCOUT-O<sub>3</sub> campaign with the synergy of Raman lidar and Sun photometer data, J. Geophys. Res., 115, D8, doi:10.1029/2009JD013088, 2010. 3117

- Biswas, P., Jones, C. L., and Flagan, R. C.: Distortion of size distributions by condensation and evaporation in aerosol instruments, Aerosol Sci. Tech., 1, 231–246, 1987. 3131
- <sup>5</sup> Bockmann, C., Mironova, I., and Muller, D.: Microphysical aerosol parameters from multiwavelength lidar, J. Opt. Soc. Am. A, 22, 518–528, 2005. 3116, 3118, 3123

Bohren, C. F. and Huffman, D. R.: Absorption and scattering of light by small particles, Wiley Science Paperback Series, Wiley, 1983. 3123

- Bond, T. C., Habib, G., and Bergstrom, R. W.: Limitations in the enhancement of visible light
- absorption due to mixing state, J. Geophys. Res., 111, D20, doi:10.1029/2006JD007315, 2006. 3133
  - Bösenberg, J., Matthias, V., Amodeo, A., Amoiridis, V., Ansmann, A., Baldasano, J. M., Balin, I., Balis, D., Böckmann, C., Boselli, A., Carlsson, G., Chaikovsky, A., Chourdakis, G., Comerón, A., Tomasi, F., Eixmann, R., Freudenthaler, V., Giehl, H., Grigorov, I., Hågård, A., Iarlori, M.,
- <sup>15</sup> Kirsche, A., Kolarov, G., Komguem, L., Kreipl, S., Kumpf, W., Larchevêque, G., Linné, H., Matthey, R., Mattis, I., Mekler, A., Mironova, I., Mitev, V., Mona, L., Müller, D., Music, S., Nickovic, S., Pandolfi, M., Papayannis, A., Pappalardo, G., Pelon, H., Pérez, C., Perrone, R. M., Persson, R., Resendes, D. P., Rizi, V., Rocadenbosch, F., Rodrigues, J. A., Sauvage, L., Schneidenbach, L., Schumacher, R., Shcherbakov, V., Simeonov, V., Sobolewski, P., Spinelli,
- N., Stachlewska, I., Stoyanov, D., Trickl, T., Tsaknakis, G., Vaughan, G., Wandinger, U., Wang, X., Wiegner, M., Zavrtanik, M., and Zerefos, C.: EARLINET: A European Aerosol Research Lidar Network to Establish an Aerosol Climatology, Tech. rep., Max Planck Institute for Meteorology, 2003. 3115

Chemyakin, E., Kolgotin, A., Romanov, A., and Müller, D.: Automated, unsupervised inversion

of multiwavelength Raman lidar data: Statistical analysis of microphysical parameters, in: Proceedings of the 26th International Laser Radar Conference, Porto Heli, Greece, 2012, S1P–49, 2012. 3138

Comer, J.: UMBC Elastic Backscatter Lidar Facility (ELF): subvisible cirrus cloud and aerosol measurements during ABOVE 2002, Master's thesis, University of Maryland, Baltimore

- 30 County, 2003. 3121
  - Dinar, E., Abo Riziq, A., Spindler, C., Erlick, C., Kiss, G., and Rudich, Y.: The complex refractive index of atmospheric and model humic-like substances (HULIS) retrieved by a cavity ring down aerosol spectrometer (CRD-AS), Faraday Discuss., 137, 279–295, 2008. 3132





- DISCOVER-AQ: NASA Venture Program, available at: http://www.nasa.gov/mission\_pages/ discover-aq/index.html (last access: 19 March 2014), 2011. 3118
- Dubovik, O. and King, M. D.: A flexible inversion algorithm for retrieval of aerosol optical properties from Sun and sky radiance measurements, J. Geophys. Res., 105, 20673–20696, 2000. 3128

5

25

- Dubovik, O., Smirnov, A., Holben, B., King, M. D., Kaufman, Y. J., Eck, T. F., and Slutsker, I.: Accuracy assessment of aerosol optical properties retrieval from AERONET sun and sky radiance measurements, J. Geophys. Res., 105, 9791–9806, 2000. 3128
- Dubovik, O., Holben, B., Eck, T. F., Smirnov, A., Kaufman, Y. J., King, M. D., Tanré, D., and Slutsker, I.: Variability of absorption and optical properties of key aerosol types observed in worldwide locations, J. Atmos. Sci., 59, 590–608, 2002. 3132, 3133, 3135
  - Engel-Cox, J. A., Hoff, R. M., Rogers, R., Dimmick, F., Rush, R. C., Szykman, J. J., Al-Saadi, J.,
     Chu, D. A., and Zell, E. R.: Integrating lidar and satellite optical depth with ambient monitoring for 3-dimensional particulate characterization, Atmos. Environ., 40, 8056–8067, 2006. 3121
- <sup>15</sup> Gysel, M., Weingartner, E., and Baltensperger, U.: Hygroscopicity of aerosol particles at low temperatures. 2. Theoretical and experimental hygroscopic properties of laboratory generated aerosols, Environ. Sci. Technol., 36, 63–68, 2002. 3132
  - Hair, J. W., Hostetler, C. A., Cook, A. L., Harper, D. B., Ferrare, R. A., Mack, T. L., Welch, W., Izquierdo, L. R., and Hovis, F. E.: Airborne High Spectral Resolution Lidar for profiling aerosol optical properties, Appl. Optics, 47, 6734–6752, 2008. 3119, 3121
- optical properties, Appl. Optics, 47, 6734–6752, 2008. 3119, 3121
   Hansen, J. E., Sato, M., and Ruedy, R.: Radiative forcing and climate response., J. Geophys. Res., 102, 6821–6864, 1997. 3115
  - Haywood, J. M. and Ramaswamy, V.: Global sensitivity studies of the direct radiative forcing due to anthropogenic sulfate and black carbon aerosols, J. Geophys. Res., 103, 6043–6058, 1998. 3115, 3133
  - Hegg, D. A., Livingston, J., Hobbs, P. V., Novakov, T., and Russell, P.: Chemical apportionment of aerosol column optical depth off the mid-Atlantic coast of the United States, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 102, 25293–25303, 1997. 3133
  - Heintzenberg, J., Müller, H., Quenzel, H., and Thomalla, E.: Information content of optical data
- with respect to aerosol properties: numerical studies with a randomized minimization-searchtechnique inversion algorithm, Appl. Optics, 20, 1308–1315, 1981. 3122
  - Hoff, R. M., Berkoff, T., Delgado, R., Sawamura, P., Ferrare, R. A., Hair, J., Hostetler, C., Rogers, R., Obland, M., Anderson, B., Crawford, J., and Holben, B.: DISCOVER-AQ: De-





termining the relationship between satellite retrieved column AOD, extinction profiles and surface  $PM_{2.5}$ , in: Proceedings of 26th International Laser Radar Conference, Porto Heli, Greece, 2012. 3118

 Holben, B. N., Eck, T. F., Slutsker, I., Tanré, D., Buis, J. P., Setzer, A., Vermote, E., Reagan, J. A.,
 Kaufman, Y. J., Nakajima, T., Lavenu, F., Jankowiak, I., and Smirnov, A.: AERONET – a federated instrument network and data archive for aerosol characterization, Remote Sens. Environ., 66, 1–16, 1998. 3127

- Holben, B. N., Eck, T. F., Slutsker, I., Smirnov, A., Sinyuk, A., Schafer, J., Giles, D., and Dubovik, O.: AERONET's Version 2.0 quality assurance criteria, in: Proc. SPIE 6408, Remote
- Sensing of the Atmosphere and Clouds, 64080Q, 64080 pp.Q–64080Q–14, 2006. 3128 Holben, B. N., Eck, T., Schafer, J., Giles, D., and Sorokin, M.: Distributed Regional Aerosol Gridded Observation Networks (DRAGON) White Paper, available at: http://aeronet.gsfc. nasa.gov/new\_web/Documents/DRAGON\_White\_Paper\_A\_system\_of\_experiment.pdf (last access: 19 March 2014), 2011. 3127
- <sup>15</sup> Hostetler, C. A., Ferrare, R., Hair, J., Cook, A., Harper, D., Rogers, R. R., Müller, D., Burton, S., Obland, M. D., Scarino, A. J., Schmid, B., Fast, J., Berg, L., Flynn, C., Cairns, B., Russell, P., Redemann, J., and Shinozuka, Y.: Airborne Multi-wavelength High Spectral Resolution Lidar Observations and Applications from TCAP, available at: http://asr.science.energy.gov/ meetings/stm/posters/view?id=797 (last access: 19 March 2014), 2013a. 3138
- Hostetler, C. A., Ferrare, R., Hair, J., Cook, A., Harper, D., Mack, T., Hare, R., Cleckner, C., Rogers, R. R., Müller, D., Chemyakin, E., Burton, S., Scarino, A. J., Obland, M. D., Chand, D., Tomlinson, J., Cairns, B., Russell, P., Redemann, J., Shinozuka, Y., Schmid, B., Fast, J., Berg, L., and Flynn, C.: Airborne Multi-wavelength High Spectral Resolution Lidar Observations and Applications from TCAP, available at: http://asr.science.energy.gov/meetings/ stm/2013/presentations/Ferrare-TCAP-HSRL-03192013.pdf (last access: 19 March 2014), 2013b. 3138
  - Jacobson, M.: Air Pollution and Global Warming: History, Science, and Solutions, Cambridge University Press, 2012. 3115
  - Leaitch, W. and Isaac, G.: Tropospheric aerosol size distributions from 1982 to 1988 over eastern North America, Atmos. Environ. A-Gen., 25, 601–619, 1991. 3131
- Michel Flores, J., Bar-Or, R. Z., Bluvshtein, N., Abo-Riziq, A., Kostinski, A., Borrmann, S., Koren, I., Koren, I., and Rudich, Y.: Absorbing aerosols at high relative humidity: linking hygro-

30





scopic growth to optical properties, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 5511-5521, doi:10.5194/acp-12-5511-2012, 2012. 3132

- Mie, G.: Beiträge zur Optik trüber Medien, speziell kolloidaler Metallösungen, Ann. Phys., 25, 377–445, 1908. 3123
- Müller, D., Wandinger, U., Althausen, D., Mattis, I., and Ansmann, A.: Retrieval of physical particle properties from lidar observations of extinction and backscatter at multiple wavelengths, Appl. Optics, 37, 2260–2263, 1998. 3116, 3117, 3122, 3123
  - Müller, D., Wandinger, U., and Ansmann, A.: Microphysical particle parameters from extinction and backscatter lidar data by inversion with regularization: Theory, Appl. Optics, 38, 2346– 2357, 1999a. 3116, 3123, 3124
- 10 2357, 1999a. 3116, 3123, 3124 Müller, D. Wandinger, H. and Ansmann

20

Müller, D., Wandinger, U., and Ansmann, A.: Microphysical particle parameters from extinction and backscatter lidar data by inversion with regularization: simulation, Appl. Optics, 38, 2358–2368, 1999b. 3116, 3123

Müller, D., Wagner, F., Wandinger, U., Ansmann, A., Wendisch, M., Althausen, D., and von

- Hoyningen-Huene, W.: Microphysical particle parameters from extinction and backscatter lidar data by inversion with regularization: experiment, Appl. Optics, 39, 1879–1892, 2000.
   3123
  - Müller, D., Wandinger, U., Althausen, D., and Fiebig, M.: Comprehensive particle characterization from three-wavelength Raman-lidar observations: case study, Appl. Optics, 40, 4863– 4869, 2001. 3117, 3123
  - Müller, D., Franke, K., Ansmann, A., Althausen, D., and Wagner, F.: Indo-Asian pollution during INDOEX: Microphysical particle properties and single-scattering albedo inferred from multiwavelength lidar observations, J. Geophys. Res., 108, D19, doi:10.1029/2003JD003538, 2003. 3117
- Müller, D., Kolgotin, A., Mattis, I., Petzold, A., and Stohl, A.: Vertical profiles of microphysical particle properties derived from inversion with two-dimensional regularization of multiwavelength Raman lidar data: Experiment, Appl. Optics, 50, 2069–2079, 2011. 3117
  - Noh, Y. M., Müller, D., Shin, D. H., Lee, H., Jung, J., Lee, K. H., Cribb, M., Li, Z., and Kim, Y. J.: Optical and microphysical properties of severe haze and smoke aerosol measured by inte-
- 30 grated remote sensing techniques in Gwangju, Korea, Atmos. Environ., 43, 879–888, 2009. 3117





Back Close Full Screen / Esc Printer-friendly Version Interactive Discussion

AMTD

7, 3113-3157, 2014

microphysical

retrievals from

P. Sawamura et al.

**Title Page** 

Abstract

Tables

**Discussion** Paper

Introduction

References

Figures



Discussion

- Res.-Atmos., 102, 16849-16859, 1997, 3133 Sjogren, S., Gysel, M., Weingartner, E., Baltensperger, U., Cubison, M., Coe, H., Zardini, A., Marcolli, C., Krieger, U., and Peter, T.: Hygroscopic growth and water uptake kinetics of two-
- phase aerosol particles consisting of ammonium sulfate, adipic and humic acid mixtures. J. 15 Aerosol Sci., 38, 157-171, 2007. 3132
  - Sugimoto, N. and Uno, I.: Observation of Asian dust and air pollution aerosols using a network of ground-based lidars (ADNet): realtime data processing for validation/assimilation of chemical transport models, IOP C. Ser. Earth Env., 7, 2009. 3116
- Tesche, M., Müller, D., Ansmann, A., Hu, M., and Zhang, Y.: Retrieval of microphysical prop-20 erties of aerosol particles from one-wavelength Raman lidar and multiwavelength Sun photometer observations, Atmos. Environ., 42, 6398-6404, 2008. 3117, 3119
  - Tikhonov, A. and Arsenin, V.: Solutions of ill-posed problems, Scripta Series in Mathematics, Winston, 1977. 3123
- Twomey, S.: The influence of pollution on the shortwave albedo of clouds, J. Atmos. Sci., 34, 25 1149-1154, 1977. 3123, 3124
  - UMBC ALG Smog Blog: US Air Quality, available at: http://alg.umbc.edu/usag/archives/2011 07.html (last access: 19 March 2014), 2011. 3134
  - Veselovskii, I., Kolgotin, A., Griaznov, V., Müller, D., Wandinger, U., and Whiteman, D. N.: In-
- version with regularization for the retrieval of tropospheric aerosol parameters from multi-30 wavelength lidar sounding, Appl. Optics, 41, 3685-3699, 2002. 3116, 3117, 3123, 3124, 3125

aerosol size distribution from multiwavelength laser radar measurements, Appl. Optics, 28,

5

10

5259-5265, 1989. 3122

Conclusions References Figures Tables Back Close Full Screen / Esc Printer-friendly Version Interactive Discussion

AMTD

7, 3113-3157, 2014

Aerosol optical and

microphysical

retrievals from

a hybrid lidar dataset

P. Sawamura et al.

**Title Page** 

Abstract

Introduction

Discussion

Paper

**Discussion** Paper

Discussion Pape

**Discussion** Pape

Veselovskii, I., Kolgotin, A., Griaznov, V., Müller, D., Franke, K., and Whiteman, D. N.: Inversion of multiwavelength Raman lidar data for retrieval of bimodal aerosol size distribution, Appl. Optics, 43, 1180–1195, 2004. 3118

Veselovskii, I., Whiteman, D. N., Kolgotin, A., Andrews, E., and Korenskii, M.: Demonstration of aerosol property profiling by multiwavelength lidar under varying relative humidity condi-

tions, J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech., 26, 1543–1557, 2009. 3116, 3117

10

- Veselovskii, I., Dubovik, O., Kolgotin, A., Korenskiy, M., Whiteman, D. N., Allakhverdiev, K., and Huseyinoglu, F.: Linear estimation of particle bulk parameters from multi-wavelength lidar measurements, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 5, 1135–1145, doi:10.5194/amt-5-1135-2012, 2012a. 3117
- Veselovskii, I., Kolgotin, A., Korenskiy, M., Whiteman, D., Dubovik, O., and Volkov, N.: Linear estimation of time series of bulk particle parameters from multiwavelength lidar measurements, in: Proceedings of the 26th International Laser Radar Conference, Porto Heli, Greece, 2012, S3P–15, 2012b. 3125
- <sup>15</sup> Veselovskii, I., Whiteman, D. N., Kolgotin, A., Korenskiy, M., and Perez-Ramirez, D.: Retrieval of height-temporal distributions of particle parameters from multiwavelength lidar measurements during DISCOVER-AQ 2011 campaign, in: Proceedings of the 26th International Laser Radar Conference, Porto Heli, Greece, 2012, S30–14, 2012c. 3117, 3125

Wagner, J., Ansmann, A., Wandinger, U., Seifert, P., Schwarz, A., Tesche, M., Chaikovsky, A., and Dubovik, O.: Evaluation of the Lidar/Radiometer Inversion Code (LIRIC) to determine

- and Dubovik, O.: Evaluation of the Lidar/Radiometer Inversion Code (LIRIC) to determine microphysical properties of volcanic and desert dust, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 6, 1707–1724, doi:10.5194/amt-6-1707-2013, 2013. 3119
  - Wandinger, U., Müller, D., Böckmann, C., Althausen, D., Matthias, V., Bösenberg, J., Weiß, Fiebig, M., Wendisch, M., Stohl, A., and Ansmann, A.: Optical and microphysical charac-
- terization of biomass-burning and industrial-pollution aerosols from multiwavelength lidar and aircraft measurements, J. Geophys. Res., 107, D21, doi:10.1029/2000JD000202, 2002.
   3116, 3117
  - Weitkamp, C.: Lidar: Range-resolved Optical Remote Sensing of the Atmosphere, Springer Series in Optical Sciences, Springer, 2005. 3124, 3125
- Welton, E. J., Campbell, J. R., Spinhirne, J. D., and Scott, V. S.: Global monitoring of clouds and aerosols using a network of micro-pulse lidar systems, in: Lidar Remote Sensing for Industry and Environmental Monitoring, edited by: Singh, U. N., Itabe, T., and Sugimoto, N., vol. 4153 of Proc. SPIE, 151–158, 2001. 3115

Ziemba, L. D., Lee Thornhill, K., Ferrare, R., Barrick, J., Beyersdorf, A. J., Chen, G., Crumeyrolle, S. N., Hair, J., Hostetler, C., Hudgins, C., Obland, M., Rogers, R., Scarino, A. J., Winstead, E. L., and Anderson, B. E.: Airborne observations of aerosol extinction by in situ and remote-sensing techniques: Evaluation of particle hygroscopicity, Geophys. Res. Lett., 40, 417–422, 2013. 3127, 3131, 3132

5





**Table 1.** List of cases analyzed. The letters in the first column represent the same cases as the ones depicted in Figs. 3 and 4. Time column lists the time span of the combined HSRL-1 and ALS-450 measurements. Layers were chosen in regions where the intensive properties such as color ratio and depolarization ratio did not vary much. P-3B in situ column lists the location of spirals which were used to compare lidar retrievals with in-situ measurements and P $\Delta t$  lists the respective time gap between the overpass at UMBC and the spirals. AERONET column lists the AERONET stations that were utilized for the retrievals comparison including levels 1.5 and 2.0, and A $\Delta t$  lists the respective time gap between the measurements at UMBC and the AERONET measurements. Figure 1 shows the AERONET and P-3B spirals locations.

	Day/Time (UTC)	Layers	P-3B in-situ	$P\Delta t$ (min)	AERONET	$A\Delta t$ (min)
(A)	5 Jul, 09:41–09:59	1.20–1.50 km (200 m) 1.65–2.00 km (350 m) 2.46–2.78 km (320 m)	Beltsville	+20	UMBC, GSFC, Essex, Padonia	+90, +90 +90, +90
(B)	5 Jul, 10:52–11:02	0.75–1.17 km (420 m) 1.56–1.70 km (140 m) 2.61–2.76 km (150 m)	Padonia	-30	UMBC, GSFC, Essex, Padonia	+20, +20 +20, +20
(C)	5 Jul, 11:58–12:10	0.84–1.08 km (240 m) 1.41–1.60 km (190 m) 2.19–2.34 km (150 m)	Beltsville Essex	+15 -15	UMBC, GSFC, Essex, Padonia, Beltsville	$\pm 40, \pm 40$ $\pm 40, \pm 40$ $\pm 40$
(D)	20 Jul, 19:54–20:17	0.50–1.50 km (1 km) 1.50–2.50 km (1 km)	Beltsville Padonia	-45 -30	UMBC, Essex Padonia	+90, +60, +5
(E)	21 Jul, 14:47–14:54	0.50–0.75 km (250 m) 1.00–1.50 km (500 m) 2.00–2.50 km (500 m)	Beltsville Padonia	+40 +60	UMBC, GSFC Essex, Padonia	-40, -90, -90, -30
(F)	21 Jul, 20:48–20:55	1.26–1.65 km (390 m)	Essex, Padonia	+30, -40	UMBC, GSFC, Essex, Padonia, Beltsville	+140, +140, +140, -40, +120
(G)	22 Jul, 14:53–15:08	1.00–1.50 km (500 m) 2.00–2.60 km (600 m)	Beltsville Padonia	-60 -30	UMBC, GSFC, Essex	-120, +15 -60
(H)	22 Jul, 18:22–18:28	0.50–1.00 km (500 m) 1.50–2.00 km (500 m)	Beltsville Essex	+5 -15	UMBC	+90
(I)	29 Jul, 15:18–15:29	0.50–1.30 km (800 m) 1.50–1.86 km (360 m)	Beltsville Padonia	+5 +30	GSFC, Padonia, Essex, Beltsville	(-5, -120), (-60, -120) (-60, -120), -120
(J)	29 Jul, 20:12–20:18	0.50–2.00 km (1.5 km)	Beltsville, Essex	+5, -20	UMBC, Essex, Padonia	(+2, +60), +2, (+15, +60)
(K)	29 Jul, 21:21–21:39	0.72–1.30 km (580 m) 1.50–2.50 km (1 km)	Padonia	-60	UMBC, Essex, Padonia	(+5, -30), +60, -30





**Table 2.** Average of results obtained from lidar retrievals (i.e.  $3\beta + 2\alpha$ ), in-situ measurements from P-3B flights, and AERONET retrievals of effective radius ( $R_{eff}$ ), volume and surface-area concentrations, and single scattering albedo. Real and imaginary parts of the complex index of refraction were compared to AERONET only. Maximum aerosol layer height (AHL) was assumed as 1.5 km in order to convert AERONET volume and surface-area concentrations from per unit area to per unit volume. Mean values from AERONET are presented for three different averaging subsets. Number of data points for each subset is presented between parentheses for size and optical related parameters.

	R <sub>eff</sub> [μm]	Vol. Conc. [µm <sup>3</sup> cm <sup>-3</sup> ]	S-Area Conc. [µm <sup>2</sup> cm <sup>-3</sup> ]	Ø	Re( <i>m</i> )	lm( <i>m</i> )
$3\beta + 2\alpha$	$0.18 \pm 0.05$	$45 \pm 23$	$821 \pm 369$	$0.95 \pm 0.02$	$1.39 \pm 0.03$	$0.005 \pm 0.002$
P-3B Beltsvile	$0.13 \pm 0.02$	$10 \pm 5$	$224 \pm 74$	$0.99 \pm 0.01$	N/A	N/A
P-3B Essex	$0.13 \pm 0.02$	$8 \pm 4$	$181 \pm 65$	$0.99 \pm 0.01$	N/A	N/A
P-3B Padonia	$0.14 \pm 0.02$	8±3	$178 \pm 57$	$0.99 \pm 0.01$	N/A	N/A
AERO UMBC <sup>a</sup>	0.17 ± 0.02 (11)	$54 \pm 20$	$963 \pm 350$	$0.94 \pm 0.03$ (11)	$1.41 \pm 0.03$	$0.007 \pm 0.004$
AERO UMBC <sup>b</sup>	0.17 ± 0.01 (8)	$51 \pm 21$	$925 \pm 377$	0.94 ± 0.02 (5)	$1.40 \pm 0.03$	$0.007 \pm 0.003$
AERO UMBC <sup>°</sup>	0.16 ± 0.02 (51)	$31 \pm 19$	$580 \pm 311$	0.94 ± 0.02 (15)	$1.41 \pm 0.03$	$0.008 \pm 0.003$
AERO GSFC <sup>a</sup>	0.18 ± 0.03 (10)	$51 \pm 15$	$871 \pm 297$	0.98 ± 0.01 (10)	$1.40 \pm 0.04$	$0.003 \pm 0.002$
AERO GSFC <sup>b</sup>	0.19 ± 0.03 (4)	$47 \pm 19$	$747 \pm 364$	0.98 ± 0.01 (3)	$1.41 \pm 0.04$	$0.003 \pm 0.002$
AERO GSFC <sup>°</sup>	0.16 ± 0.03 (53)	$33 \pm 21$	$603 \pm 333$	0.98 ± 0.01 (20)	$1.40 \pm 0.03$	$0.003 \pm 0.002$
AERO Essex <sup>a</sup>	0.18 ± 0.02 (10)	$47 \pm 16$	$783 \pm 259$	0.97 ± 0.02 (10)	$1.43 \pm 0.02$	$0.004\pm0.003$
AERO Essex <sup>b</sup>	0.18 ± 0.02 (4)	$45 \pm 21$	$761 \pm 323$	0.96 ± 0.03 (2)	$1.41 \pm 0.03$	$0.005 \pm 0.005$
AERO Essex <sup>c</sup>	0.16 ± 0.03 (45)	$27 \pm 21$	$471 \pm 345$	0.97 ± 0.02 (13)	$1.42 \pm 0.04$	$0.004 \pm 0.002$
AERO Beltsville <sup>a</sup>	0.17 ± 0.02 (4)	$40 \pm 13$	$673 \pm 250$	0.98 ± 0.02 (4)	$1.42 \pm 0.03$	$0.003 \pm 0.002$
AERO Beltsville <sup>b</sup>	0.17 ± 0.01 (2)	$40 \pm 20$	$732 \pm 375$	N/A	N/A	N/A
AERO Beltsville <sup>c</sup>	$0.16 \pm 0.02$ (70)	$27 \pm 21$	$487 \pm 315$	0.97 ± 0.02 (10)	$1.40 \pm 0.03$	$0.003 \pm 0.002$
AERO Padonia <sup>a</sup>	$0.18 \pm 0.02$ (10)	$57 \pm 27$	$968 \pm 479$	$0.95 \pm 0.02$ (10)	$1.41 \pm 0.03$	$0.006\pm0.003$

<sup>a</sup> Level 1.5: Data subset used to compare with lidar retrievals listed in Table 1.

<sup>b</sup> Level 2.0: Data subset used to compare with lidar retrievals listed in Table 1 (less data points).

<sup>c</sup> Level 2.0: Average of July 2011 data.





<b>AMTD</b> 7, 3113–3157, 2014					
Aerosol optical and microphysical retrievals from a hybrid lidar dataset					
P. Sawan	P. Sawamura et al.				
Title	Title Page				
Abstract	Introduction				
Conclusions	References				
Tables Figures					
I	۶I				
•	•				
Back	Close				
Full Screen / Esc					
Printer-frier	Printer-friendly Version				
Interactive Discussion					

**Discussion** Paper

**Discussion** Paper

**Discussion** Paper

**Discussion** Paper

**Table 3.** July mean values of effective radius  $R_{\rm eff}$  for different aerosol loadings and different quality levels for all AERONET/DRAGON stations considered in this study.

	R <sub>eff</sub>					
	$0 \le \tau_{440} \le 0.2$		$0.2 \le \tau_{440} \le 0.4$		$\tau_{440} \ge 0.4$	
	Level 1.5	Level 2.0	Level 1.5	Level 2.0	Level 1.5	Level 2.0
Beltsville	0.14 ± 0.01 (27)	0.14 ± 0.01 (17)	0.15±0.01 (21)	0.16±0.01 (10)	0.18±0.02 (22)	0.19 ± 0.02 (10)
Essex	0.15 ± 0.02 (38)	0.15 ± 0.02 (20)	0.16 ± 0.02 (28)	0.16 ± 0.01 (12)	0.19 ± 0.02 (36)	0.18 ± 0.03 (13)
GSFC	0.14 ± 0.01 (49)	0.14 ± 0.01 (25)	0.15 ± 0.01 (29)	0.15 ± 0.01 (10)	0.18 ± 0.03 (43)	0.18 ± 0.03 (20)
UMBC	0.14 ± 0.01 (37)	0.14 ± 0.01 (23)	0.15 ± 0.01 (35)	0.15 ± 0.01 (21)	0.17 ± 0.02 (32)	0.18 ± 0.02 (15)
Padonia	$0.14 \pm 0.02$ (41)	N/A	0.15 ± 0.02 (50)	N/A	0.18 ± 0.02 (37)	N/A

Table 4. July mean values of single scattering albedo $\omega_0$ for different aerosol loadings ar	۱d
different quality levels for all AERONET/DRAGON stations considered in this study.	

	$\omega_0$ at 532 nm				
	$0 \le \tau_{440} \le 0.2$	$0.2 \le \tau_{440} \le 0.4$	$ au_{440} \ge 0.4$		
	Level 1.5	Level 1.5	Level 1.5	Level 2.0	
Beltsville	0.93 ± 0.05 (27)	0.96 ± 0.03 (21)	0.97 ± 0.02 (22)	0.97 ± 0.02 (10)	
Essex	0.96 ± 0.03 (38)	0.97 ± 0.02 (28)	0.97 ± 0.05 (36)	0.97 ± 0.02 (13)	
GSFC	0.96 ± 0.03 (49)	0.96 ± 0.02 (29)	0.98 ± 0.01 (43)	0.98 ± 0.01 (20)	
UMBC	0.84 ± 0.07 (37)	0.90 ± 0.04 (35)	0.94 ± 0.03 (32)	0.94 ± 0.02 (15)	
Padonia	0.84 ± 0.05 (41)	0.92 ± 0.06 (50)	0.97 ± 0.02 (37)	N/A	







Fig. 1. Map of Baltimore-Washington DC region with the locations considered for the lidar retrievals comparison to AERONET retrievals and in-situ airborne measurements during DISCOVER-AQ.





**Fig. 2.** Setup of airborne and ground-based instruments at UMBC during DISCOVER-AQ 2011. A maximum radius of 5 km was considered to construct the hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset using HSRL and ALS-450 data.





**Fig. 3.** Extinction coefficient profiles obtained by HSRL (black solid lines) and by elastic lidar (blue dashed lines) at 532 nm for the cases listed in Table 1. Standard deviation of HSRL profiles are due to the profiles variation during a UMBC overpass (~ 1–2 min, ~ 8 profiles). Standard deviation of ELF profiles are due to profiles variation within 15 min centered at the overpass time. The dot-dashed lines represent in-situ measurements obtained onboard the P3B, over spiral sites that were closest to UMBC (red: Padonia, green: Beltsville, orange: Essex). The in-situ profiles have been corrected to the ambient relative humidity.



Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

**Discussion** Paper

**Discussion** Paper





**Fig. 4.**  $3\beta + 2\alpha$  and lidar ratio values obtained from the hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset. Green and red lines are airborne profiles at 532 nm (HSRL) and 1064 nm (elastic), respectively. Blue lines are from ground-based elastic lidar at 355 nm. Letters correspond to each case analyzed which are listed in detail in Table 1.







**Fig. 5.** Aerosol optical depth (AOD) at 440 nm obtained from AERONET stations at Essex, Beltsville, Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), UMBC and Padonia during all 10 days during DISCOVER-AQ in which there synergistic measurements among UC-12, P-3B and the ground-based lidar at UMBC. Empty symbols represent available level 1.5 retrievals of size-related products, single scattering albedo and complex index of refraction. Cyan-filled symbols represent available level 2.0 retrievals of only size-related products. Red-filled symbols represent available level 2.0 retrievals size-related products, single scattering albedo, and complex index of refraction. *X* axis of each window represents a day of AERONET measurement: sunrise to sunset.



Discussion Paper

**Discussion** Paper

Discussion Paper

**Discussion** Paper





**Fig. 6.** Total attenuated backscatter coefficient cross-section obtained with elastic lidar (ELF) at 532 nm at UMBC on 5 July. Long range transport of smoke from fires occurring in the South-eastern portion of the US was observed.





**Discussion** Paper



**Fig. 7.** Results of effective radius, volume and surface-are concentrations, single scattering albedo and complex index of refraction obtained from inversion of the hybrid multiwavelength lidar dataset  $(3\beta + 2\alpha)$ , from AERONET inversions and from in-situ measurements obtained by the P-3B aircraft (at dry conditions).







**Fig. 8.** Effective radius fine-to-total mode fraction from lidar retrievals vs. total (volume) depolarization ratio at 532 nm retrieved from HSRL-1. All cases and layers are displayed. Red circles represent 22 July data.

