

# ***Interactive comment on “Quantifying and correcting the effect of vertical penetration assumptions on droplet concentration retrievals from passive satellite instruments” by Daniel P. Grosvenor et al.***

## **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 7 February 2018

Grosvenor et al. (2018) AMTD, REVIEW:

The manuscript describes a method that, in principle, corrects errors in adiabatic satellite cloud droplet number concentration ( $N_d$ ) due to the inconsistency of utilizing satellite cloud effective radius ( $r_e$ ) that represents values slightly below the cloud top, whereas satellite cloud optical depth ( $\tau$ ) fully captures the optical thickness of the clouds. To achieve this goal, the authors simulate a number of idealized cloud profiles with a 1D radiative transfer model, and then retrieve  $r_e$  and  $\tau$  from the synthetic reflectances. Next, the authors derive an “effective”  $\tau$  that corresponds to the optical

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



thickness where the retrieved  $r_e$  and the synthetic  $r_e$  match each other (the vertical penetration effect). They use the difference between the retrieved and the effective  $\tau$  (applying a fit to their theoretical calculations) to quantify the error in MODIS-based  $N_d$  that does not account for the fact that the satellite  $r_e$  is not exactly that at the cloud top due to the vertical photon penetration, which is in turn dependent on the sensor wavelength and the specific thickness of the cloud (and probably solar zenith angle and viewing geometry).

The manuscript makes an interesting use of the results in Platnick (2000), which shows that the retrieved  $r_e$  should differ from the observed  $r_e$  by a few  $\mu\text{m}$  (or less) due to the photon penetration. The manuscript is concise and well-written, however when I first browsed the paper, I got confused about whether the authors wanted to show a real satellite bias in  $\tau$  (and  $N_d$ ) or a methodological bias (I realized it was the latter). My fundamental criticism of Grosvenor et al. is that, from a remote sensing point of view, the problem is not that the satellite  $\tau$  should be reduced because  $r_e$  is not at the cloud top. Instead, it is that  $r_e$  is smaller than the observed  $r_e$  at the top due to vertical stratification, and probably  $r_e$  should be somehow increased (i.e.  $r_e$  drives the uncertainty in  $N_d$ ). This is the correct interpretation, as it is well known from the early work by Nakajima (King and co-authors) that satellite  $\tau$  is almost insensitive to the cloud vertical structure, and only  $r_e$  can be greatly affected by the vertical stratification. So, the  $N_d$  bias should be expressed in terms of a  $\Delta r_e$ . Another inconsistency (related to my previous comment) is with the use of the (pseudo) adiabatic model, which if I interpret correctly, it implies that the liquid water path (LWP) is proportional to  $r_e \tau$ . So, any error calculation applied to  $N_d$  has to be also valid for LWP. However, if we apply equation (13) to LWP, i.e.:

$$\text{LWP}_{\text{uncorrected}}/\text{LWP}_{\text{corrected}} = (\tau/(\tau - \Delta\tau))$$

Using a  $\Delta\tau = 4.5$  for  $\tau = 10$  (figure 1a), then  $\text{LWP}_{\text{uncorrected}}/\text{LWP}_{\text{corrected}} = 10/6.5 = 1.54$ . A 54% overestimation in LWP is clearly a mathematical contradiction. On the other hand, if, for instance, we utilize the results in Platnick (2000) for a cloud top  $r_e = 12$

[Printer-friendly version](#)
[Discussion paper](#)


um, and a retrieved  $r_e = 10.7 \text{ um}$  ( $2.1 \text{ um}$  wavelength), we get:

$$\text{LWP}_{\text{uncorrected}}/\text{LWP}_{\text{corrected}} = r_{\text{uncorrected}}/r_{\text{corrected}} = 10.7/12 = 0.89.$$

That is, the retrieved  $r_e$  yields an underestimation of LWP. Again, this result points to a main reasoning problem in the manuscript, which is, the error should not be expressed in terms of  $\tau$ .

Lastly, the authors say that there are several other errors that can bias  $r_e$  and  $\tau$ . This is a key statement, and a literature review will show that biases in  $r_e$  are not dominated by the cloud vertical stratification (I am not aware of any studies that actually show an adiabatic signature in the satellite  $r_e$  bias). For instance, If one calculates the difference between MODIS  $r_e$  at  $2.1 \text{ um}$  and  $3.7 \text{ um}$ , the difference is positive everywhere over the ocean (the difference can be larger than  $5 \text{ um}$ , see Fig. 10 in Zhang and Platnick, 2011). This result suggests that the error discussed in Grosvenor et al. is negligible. So, I find it surprising that the authors found errors up to 50 % in  $N_d$  (Figure 6), which is very large. Since their results are only valid in a plane parallel world (sub-pixel variability is not accounted for) and with the use of idealized profiles, the validity of the correction cannot be demonstrated. The authors do discuss some of these issues but, unfortunately, the main concern remains, that is, it is unclear that the correction will yield an improved estimate of cloud droplet number concentration.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2017-477, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

