Atmospheric
Measurement
Techniques

Open Access

Discussions

AMTD

Interactive
comment

Interactive comment on "**An LES-based airborne Doppler lidar simulator for investigation of wind profiling in inhomogeneous flow conditions**" *by* **Philipp Gasch et al.**

Alan Brewer (Referee)

alan.brewer@noaa.gov

Received and published: 22 October 2019

An LES-based airborne Doppler lidar simulator for investigation of wind profiling in in-homogeneous flow conditions This is an excellent tool for evaluating airborne Doppler lidar measurement design and will be an invaluable part of experimental design. The authors have done an excellent job of addressing the key considerations of airborne Doppler lidar sampling strategy. General comments: It was not clear to me if the paper was designed to illustrate the capabilities of the simulator using a single set of LES and lidar configurations or if the authors are attempting to explore the operational trade space of an airborne system with sufficient detail so that the community could

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

use this paper as a design tool rather than the simulator itself. If the goal of the paper is to illustrate the application of the tool, then I think the authors need not explore as much of phase space in every degree of freedom. A single variable plot accompanied by discussion of the underlying mechanism for the relationship for each of the major impacts would suffice. Concentrate on those plots/relationships that show significant structure and focus there. For example Fig 10 would benefit from another approach that highlights the differences between the two plots (highlighting the effect/impact of noise) and changing structure within a plot (slow increase in RMSE/REL). The actual values of the static variables in the plots are only meaningful for one particular set of conditions (both LES and lidar characteristics) and may not be of interest to a wide range of folks. How certain variables change wrt the chosen independent variable is of interest as it will generally do so for all configurations. These relationships should be highlighted and the underlying mechanism explained if possible. If the goal of the paper is to probe the trade space of all systems/conditions, then I think some effort should go into finding fewer "normalized" variables that are independent of specific choices for system values or LES characteristics. For example – my understanding is that the underlying bias sensitivity of the horizontal wind fit to coherent structures in the vertical wind field comes down to how many "pairs" of these features you average/accumulate over prior to doing a fit. As you increase the number of pairs of up/down motions in the volume – the residual of the fit may have a higher RMS, but the bias will decrease. This condition will depend on the dominant spatial scale of the turbulence, the size of the sample volume, the density of the sample points... A potential "normalized" variable might be the number of independent turbulent scale lengths per sample volume. For a given turbulence profile in the LES and a given scan pattern and beam PRF, one could imagine a profile of this "normalized" variable and corresponding uncertainty in the fit... If the authors are able to combine variables and break the analysis into the underlying mechanisms, it may serve to widen the impact of the paper and reduce the number of variables that have to be studied. I'm happy to discuss directly with the authors if need be – I'll ask the editor to share my contact information. For our application, we have a

fixed scan geometry (wedge scanner) so the only system variables we have to adjust are scan rate, beam PRF & pulse width. The adjustable fit parameters are height resolution and number of sweeps to integrate over. The hope would be to use a vertical transect to characterize the strength and dominant spatial scale of the turbulence as a function of height then combine that with the system/scan parameters to come up with a normalized variable "number of turbulent scale lengths per sweep" as a function of height. The hope would be that we could use that profile and your results to determine the uncertainty in the horizontal wind fit as a function of number of sweeps integrated. . . Another set of variables that could be combined – SNR, beam PRF, and LOS vel uncertainty (using the CRLB discussed below). Once the results are expressed in these terms, they are no longer only applicable to the system defined in the study. At 50 pages, this is a long manuscript and the length may limit its impact and applicability. Much of the wind profiling theory section, evaluation of errors section (definitions) could be moved to appendices. Some concerns/questions on the approach taken in the study (some of these may be redundant with first section) 1. Vertically averaging/combining results when you have a height dependent footprint combined with a height dependent turbulence profile / integral scale. Are each of the 9600 profile points from different distances below the AC? If so – how does the dominant spatial scale of the turbulence compare to the spatial scale of the sample volume/arc? (ie "number of independent samples" within a scan arc).

2. Sensitivity to static errors in pointing/orientation – does this just fall within the RMS of the assumed uncertainty in pointing or does a static offset impact the fit differently?

3. Dependence on one set of operational parameters (one lidar design) coupled with non-physical simplifications (constant uncertainty in vel as a function of height) is problematic. Need to find a set of independent variables that the user can calculate for their system / scan design.

4. Break analysis into single dimensions where possible and describe the underlying process if you have been able to glean that from the analysis so the user can project

the result into their operational space. 5. Describe mechanism behind bias mentioned in paper in more detail.

Specific Comments Pg 1 Line 10: "laser system noise" - detection uncertainty (see Cramer Rao Lower bound- CRLB) "beam pointing inaccuracy due to system vibrations" – We have found dominant "pointing" errors come from Inertial Navigation Unit (INU) orientation uncertainties. Most concerning are bias errors rather than RMS from vibration. Pg 1 Line 11: "system setups" – define first use Pg 1 Line 16: "short horizontal averaging distances" Along track vs cross track? Pg 2 Line 9: "the vertical wind through nadir " - the vertical wind with nadir Pg 2 Line 20: "while neglecting the non-standard beam geometry" poorly worded / not clear Pg 2 Line 22: anelastic -> an elastic Pg 4 Line 13: "collinearity in model geometry" you mention this on Pg 2 in terms of the matrix inversion, but given that this is a primary research question, you should describe more fully. This will allow the reader to better interpret the phrase at the end of this sentence. Pg 4 Line 30: "5 x 5 x 1.8 km" I am concerned whether this will allow for sufficient independence in the multiple sampling configuration described at Pg 6 Line 10 (see comment below). By using one small set of data and varying the sampling heading angle of the plane through the domain, all paths share a common volume in the center and are not completely independent. This will impact each height differently due to sampling footprint as a function of distance below plane. I assume that the dominant turbulent spatial scales at each height are also different – so this further complicates the interpretation.

Pg 5 Line 5: "The boundary layer height is approximately. . ." At first consideration, it would seem that an important quantity would be the relationship between the integral scale and the scan volume/sample arc length - how many "integral scale" lengths are averaged over in one scan/retrieval. Do you vary this relationship and, if so, is it done by changing the input wind field or only the scan configuration? After my initial reading, it seems you are averaging your results in height, so you may be diluting the effect by averaging over multiple conditions in height. As mentioned in the prior comment, you

have both height dependent sample volumes and turbulent length scales.

Pg 6 Line 11: "As the different flight tracks lead to different air mass volumes being sampled, the different flight directions are independent and can be used to increase the sample size of the statistical analysis" This is the phrase I was basing the Pg4 line 30 comment about independence.

Pg 6 Line 27: "For the frozen-in-time wind field, the LES coordinate" Are you considering atmospheric features that might be correlated to the ground - ie land usage or topographic effects? Making measurements in complex terrain might lead to making measurements in where coherent features in the vertical wind field might be present .

Pg 7 Line 29: "direction noise" Several issues to consider here: 1) While it may end up being a similar effect in the end our experience is that the estimation of orientation angles p,r,y and their angular rates are more prone to error then reading an encoder on the scanner. 2) The uncertainty in pointing angle also feeds into the LOS platform motion correction algorithm which then feeds back into the wind profile. 3) The static/low frequency component of the pointing offset is more problematic than a zero mean Gaussian noise source on the pointing. Depending on the inertial navigation unit (INU), errors in the drift correction of the sensor can lead to low frequency/static errors. 4) Latency in the communication with INU sensor and fast scanning/beam rates can lead to static offsets in orientation/angular rates estimation.

While you can use the ground to "calibrate" the static angle offsets – time varying, low frequency effects can still be present in the data. Upward looking scans, cloud cover, operation over water could all lead to periods where ground strikes are not available. Being able to quantify the sensitivity of these errors propagated into the wind profiles would be great.

Pg 8 Line 15: "detector noise, speckle effects and turbulence within the measurement volume" In areas where there are adequate aerosol, the dominant mechanism for uncertainty in the Doppler measurement comes from uncertainty in estimating the

spectral peak (take a look at Frehlich, Coherent Doppler lidar measurements of winds in the weak signal regime). CRLB depends on SNR, pulse width, and averaging time – (beam rate, vertical resolution, distance from AC) these are quantities that are part of the trade space when designing a scan/sample strategy.

Within a beam you will get a range of SNR and hence uncertainty in the LOS Vel measurement (as a function of range). Setting up your runs with a single velocity error for all ranges is not representative of a true measurement. This effect is only exacerbated when you add a variable aerosol field as a function height as well.

Pg 8 Line 27 "System components" (and used elsewhere) this is an ambiguous term. In this case it would seem that you are referring to pointing vectors – but elsewhere you seem to have different meaning.

Pg 9 Line 6 "aircraft center of gravity..." The moment arm should be between the location of the INU and the center of the final turning mirror in the scanner.

Pg 10 Line 2 "restore" do you mean isolate?

Pg 10 Line 4 "system noise" No matter how well you apply the alignment calibration, there will always be a non-zero static offset. You should consider a sensitivity analysis of the wind profiles to static errors in the orientation. (rather than always assuming the errors are zero mean.)

Pg 10 Line 34 "horizontal wind profile" It can remove the effect of a static profile, but not the natural variability. If you are trying to measure w'^2 – the variability in the horizontal wind will still manifest in the w'^2 profile.