Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/amt-2020-60-SC1, 2020

Atmospheric Measurement Techniques Discussions

Interactive comment on "Evaluation of a Method for Converting SAGE Extinction Coefficients to Backscatter Coefficient for Intercomparison with LIDAR Observations" *by* Travis N. Knepp et al.

Christine Bingen

christine.bingen@aeronomie.be

Received and published: 19 March 2020

Estimating the PSD from Mie calculation based on assumptions of composition (75%-25%), particle shape (spherical) and size distribution (lognormal), based on a lookup table as explained in ll. 124-133 is a method that has been developed for the case of SAGE II by Bingen et al. (2004). These previous studies are thus an obvious precursor of the present work and should be duly cited.

Furthermore, it is surprising that the authors claim that the SAGE derived backscatter coefficient "will be independent of wavelength combination", since "it can be trivially demonstrated that, working strictly within the confines of theory, this is the case" (ll

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

166-167). What the authors mean here is not clear. On the contrary, it is known that Mie theory is valid for spherical particles with a size in the same order of magnitude as the wavelength. In this respect, using wavelengths of 385 of 1020 nm (as in Eq. (4)) is not equivalent at all, the extinction coefficient at the different wavelengths being particularly sensitive to different size ranges (Bingen et al., 2002), and possibly, to different modes present in the aerosol population. Hence, using a wavelength as close as possible to the lidar wavelength (355 nm) in Eq. (4) should be the best choice to provide a coherent conversion of the extinction measurements to an estimate of the backscatter coefficient.

Also, the authors do not validate of their estimate of the lidar ratio, although several studies provide comparisons data. For instance, Vernier et al. (2011) derived a climatology of extinction-to-backscatter ratio based on GOMOS and CALIPSO measurements at 525 nm. Also, Bingen et al. (2017) present an intercomparison between GOMOS aerosol extinction coefficient and lidar measurements from several ground-based stations including Mauna Loa, and discuss the results of these intercomparisons as a function of the choice of extinction-to-backscatter ratio. Finally, Painemal et al. (2019) published lidar ratios above oceans retrieved from CALIPSO and CloudSat. These results would be usefully compared to the results of the present study to assess the robustness of lidar ratio estimates from these satellite measurements.

Bingen, C., F. Vanhellemont, and D. Fussen, A new regularized inversion method for the retrieval of stratospheric aerosol size distributions applied to 16 year SAGE II data (1984–2000): Method, results and validation, Ann. Geophys., 21, 797– 804, 2002.

Bingen, C., D. Fussen, and F. Vanhellemont, A global climatology of stratospheric aerosol size distribution parameters derived from SAGE II data over the period 1984–2000: 2. Reference data, J. Geophys. Res., 109, D06202, doi:10.1029/2003JD003511, 2004.

Bingen, C., Robert, C. E., Stebel, K., Brühl, C., Schallock, J., Vanhellemont, F.,

Mateshvili, N., Höpfner, M., Trickl, T., Barnes, J. E., Jumelet, J., Vernier, J.-P., Popp, T., de Leeuw, G., and Pinnock, S.: Stratospheric aerosol data records for the climate change initiative: Development, validation and application to chemistry-climate modelling, Remote Sens. Environ., 203, 296– 321, 2017.

Painemal,D., M. Clayton, R. Ferrare, S. Burton, D. Josset, and M. Vaughan, Novel aerosol extinction coefficients and lidar ratios over the ocean from CALIPSO–CloudSat: evaluation and global statistics, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 12, 2201-2217, doi:10.5194/amt-12-2201-2019, 2019

Vernier, J.-P., T.D. Fairlie, M. Natarajan, F.G. Wienhold, J. Bian, Increase in upper tropospheric and lower stratospheric aerosol levels and its potential connection with Asian pollution, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., p. 120, doi:10.1002/2014JD022372, 2015

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2020-60, 2020.