

Detection and analysis of cloud boundary in Xi'an, China employing 35 GHz cloud radar aided by 1064 nm lidar

Yun Yuan , Huige Di *, Yuanyuan Liu , Tao Yang , Qimeng Li, Qing Yan, Wenhui Xin, Shichun Li, Dengxin Hua*

School of Mechanical and Precision Instrument Engineering, Xi'an University of Technology, Xi'an 710048, China

* Corresponding author: dihuige@xaut.edu.cn, dengxinhua@xaut.edu.cn

Lidar @1064 nm and Ka-band millimeter-wave cloud radar (MMCR) are powerful tools for detecting the height distribution of cloud boundaries, and can monitor the entire life cycle of cloud layers. In this study, lidar and MMCR are employed to jointly detect cloud boundaries under different conditions. By enhancing the echo signal of lidar @1064 nm and combining its Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), the cloud signal can be accurately extracted from the aerosol signals and background noise. The interference signal is eliminated from Doppler spectra of the MMCR by using the noise ratio of the smallest measurable cloud signal (SNR_{min}) and the spectral point continuous threshold (N_{ts}). Moreover, the quality control of the reflectivity factor of MMCR obtained by the inversion is conducted, which improves the detection accuracy of the cloud signal. We analyzed three typical cases studies; case one presents two interesting phenomena: a) at 19:00–20:00 CST (China standard time), the ice crystal particles at the cloud top boundary are too small to be detected by MMCR, but they are well detected by lidar. b) at 19:00–00:00 CST, the cirrus cloud tranists to altostratus where the cloud particles eventually grow into large sizes, producing precipitation. Further, MMCR has more advantages than lidar in detection the cloud top boundary within this period. Considering the advantages of the two devices, the change characteristics of the cloud boundary in Xi'an from December 2020 to November 2021 were analysed, with MMCR detection data as the main data and lidar data as the assistant data. The seasonal variation characteristics of clouds show that, in most cases, high clouds often occur in summer and autumn, and the low clouds are usually in winter. The normalised cloud cover shows that the maximum and minimum cloud cover occur in summer and winter, respectively. Furthermore, the cloud boundary frequency distribution results for the whole of observation period show that the cloud bottom boundary below 1.5 km is more than 1%, the frequency within the height range of 3.06–3.6 km is approximately 0.38%, and the frequency above 8 km is less than 0.2%. The cloud top boundary frequency distribution exhibits the characteristics of a bimodal distribution. The first narrow peak lies at approximately 1.0–3.1 km, and the second peak appears at 6.4–9.8 km.

Keywords: Cloud detection; cloud boundary; Lidar; Ka-band millimeter-wave cloud radar (MMCR); Frequency distribution; Remote sensing and sensors

1 Introduction

A cloud is a mixture of water droplets or ice crystals suspended in the air at a certain height through condensation or condensing after the water vapour in the atmosphere reaches saturation (Wang et al., 1998; Zhou et al., 2016; Wild et al., 2012; Stephens et al., 2012). Cloud vertical structure information (Thorsen et al., 2013; Lohmann et al., 2017; Stephens et al., 2005; Wang et al., 1995; Nakajima et al., 1991) reflects the thermodynamic and dynamic processes of the atmosphere and participates in the global water cycle through formation, development, movement,

37 and dissipation (Wild et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2017; Sherwood et al., 2014; Dong et al., 2010).
38 However, the vertical structure distribution of clouds has great temporal and spatial heterogeneity and a high rate of
39 change, which leads to great challenges in accurately evaluating the radiation effects of clouds at different cloud
40 types and heights. Research on the characteristics of vertical cloud structures has always been an important
41 direction in cloud physics research (Zcab et al., 2019). Cloud boundaries are the main information in the study of
42 vertical cloud structure, mainly referring to the cloud bottom and top boundaries, including the side boundary. The
43 cloud boundary in this study mainly refers to the cloud bottom and top boundaries. Multilayer clouds also include
44 boundary information of intermediate discontinuous clouds (Zhou et al., 2019; Varikoden et al., 2011; Li et al.,
45 2013; Ward et al., 2004; Zhang et al., 2018; Kuji et al., 2013; Kitova et al., 2003; Cao et al., 2021). With the
46 development of remote sensing detection technology, Ka-band millimeter-wave cloud radar (MMCR) (Görsdorf et
47 al., 2015; Kollias et al., 2017; Kollias et al., 2007) and lidar (Apituley et al., 2000; Protat et al., 2011; Motty et al.,
48 2018; Cordoba et al., 2017) have become effective instruments for cloud boundary detection.

49 Common methods for detecting cloud boundaries using lidar include the threshold method and differential
50 zero-crossing method. The threshold method (Kovalev et al., 2005) uses a background signal to measure the echo
51 signal amplitude. The first point where the echo signal is higher than the background signal and exceeds the set
52 threshold is the cloud bottom boundary. However, because of the existence of noise, a point with a marked increase
53 in amplitude may not be found under the condition of a low signal-to-noise ratio (*SNR*); therefore, the cloud bottom
54 boundary cannot be judged. Pal et al. (1992) proposed the differential zero-crossing method through Calculation of
55 dP/dr using lidar backscattering intensity P and range r , and the first derivative of backscatter intensity dP/dr
56 changes sign from negative to positive and this zero crossing is cloud bottom. The threshold, differential
57 zero-crossing, and variant detection methods are all based on the feature points of cloud boundaries (Streicher et al.,
58 1995). They are easily affected by noise, and some indicators must be introduced in the specific implementation
59 process to determine the cloud boundary by changing the experience threshold frequently during calculation, which
60 causes difficulties in accurate cloud boundary detection. Young et al. (1995) designed an independent
61 double-window algorithm to detect cloud bottom and top boundaries by combining the lidar signal and a known
62 atmospheric backscatter signal. However, the algorithm needs to manually adjust the window size or the selection
63 of the threshold. Based on the wavelet covariance transform method, Morille et al. (2007) determined the local
64 maxima on both sides of the cloud peak as cloud bottom and cloud top, but this method mistake some real signals
65 at the cloud bottom as noise and miss some information at the cloud top, and resulting in overestimation and
66 underestimation of cloud base and cloud top height respectively. Mao (2011) adopted a multiscale hierarchical
67 detection algorithm, selected the starting and ending points of the feature area as the cloud bottom and cloud peak,
68 and detected the cloud top and bottom through multiple iterative updates.


69 The determination of the cloud boundary by MMCR is mainly based on the threshold of the echo reflectivity factor
70 used to detect the cloud boundary (Hobbs et al., 1985; Platt et al., 1994). Kollias et al. (2007) judge step by step
71 from the bottom to the top of the reflectivity. If the *SNR* of more than nine consecutive distance gates reaches the
72 set threshold, these gates represented as cloud signals; otherwise, it is deemed a noncloud signal. Clothiaux et al.
73 (1999) used 35 GHz millimeter wave cloud measuring radar to analyse different types of clouds and considered that
74 the dynamic range of the cloud reflectivity factor is from -50 to 20 dBZ. The existence of certain ground object

75 echoes and biological groups (including insects and other biological particles) in the lower atmosphere interferes
76 with real cloud echo signals (Luke et al., 2008; Görsdorf et al., 2015; Oh et al., 2016; Melnikov et al., 2013;
77 Melnikov et al., 2015). If the subjective reflectivity factor threshold is directly used to determine the cloud signal, it
78 is not suitable for all cloud types. Therefore, when a cloud signal cannot be accurately identified, large errors in the
79 detection of cloud boundaries result.

80 Research on the macro- and microscopic structures of clouds in a specific area mainly relies on ground-based
81 observations. Currently, for better cloud detection, it is necessary to combine lidar and MMCR to observe and study
82 local clouds (Sauvageot et al., 1996; Intrieri et al., 1993; Wang et al., 2000; Sasse et al., 2001; Borg et al., 2011;
83 Delanoe and Hogan, 2008). This study combined the advantages of lidar and MMCR in detecting clouds to achieve
84 high-precision cloud boundary detection and inversion. We effectively identify cloud signals from Doppler spectra
85 data of MMCR, and through data quality control, the interference signal caused by floating debris is eliminated to
86 improve the detection accuracy of the cloud boundary. Based on the idea that the MMCR only presents the cloud
87 signal to make cloud boundary detection simple and easy to operate, in this study, we effectively separate the cloud
88 signal from aerosol and background noise by enhancing and transforming the lidar signal and combining the SNR
89 (Xie et al., 2017) to realise the accurate detection of cloud boundaries. By analysing the results of cloud boundary
90 detection by the two instruments under special weather conditions in Xi'an, the cloud boundary evaluation criteria
91 for the joint observation of the two instruments are established, and the variation characteristics of cloud boundary
92 height over Xi'an in 2021 are statistically analysed in detail.

93 2 Observation and Instrument

94 Xi'an City (107°.40'-109°.49'E, 33°.42'-34°.45'N), Shaanxi Province (105°29'-111°15'E, 31°42'-39°35'N) is
95 located in the Guanzhong Basin in the middle of the Weihe River Basin, bordering the Weihe River and Loess
96 Plateau to the north and the Qinling Mountains to the south. Xi'an has a semi-humid climate. Owing to its special
97 geographical location, it is particularly urgent to analyse cloud observations and analyses in Xi'an. The lidar and
98 MMCR are installed at the Jinghe National Meteorological Station in China, placed side-by-side at a distance of 50
99 m, and both adopt the vertical observation mode to obtain the vertical structure information of clouds. Black line
100 represents Shaanxi Province, dark blue represents the Yellow River, wathet blue represents the Weihe River, and
101 red dot indicates the location of the Jinghe National Meteorological Station in Fig. 1.



102
103 Fig. 1. Geographical coverage of Shaanxi Province (105°29'-111°15'E, 31°42'-39°35'N). The red dot indicates the location of the
104 Jinghe National Meteorological Station in Xi'an (107°.40'-109°.49'E, 33°.42'-34°.45'N).

105 The lidar used in this study was developed by Xi'an University of Technology. The MMCR is the HT101
 106 all-solid-state cloud radar researched by Xi'an Huateng Microwave Co., Ltd. The main parameters are listed in
 107 Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

108 Table 1 Main parameters of the lidar

Indicators	Devices	Main parameter
Launch system	Laser	Nd:YAG; <u>0.75J@1064nm</u>
Receiving system	Cassegrain telescope	Φ400 mm
	Filter	0.5 nm
Detection system	Detector	APD
	Sampling mode	Analog detection
Spatiotemporal resolution	Time resolution	2 min
	Range resolution	3.75 m
	Pulse accumulation	2000

109
 110 Table 2 Main parameters of MMCR

Indicators	Detailed description	
Radar system	All solid-state; All coherent Doppler; Pulse compression	
Working frequency	35 GHz, and wavelength is 8.6 mm	
Detection altitude range	15 km	
Detection blind area	150 m	
Spatiotemporal resolution	Time resolution	5 s
	Range resolution	30 m
Scanning mode	Vertical headspace fixed pointing	
Pulse width	1 μs、5 μs、20 μs	
Detection accuracy	$Z \leq 0.5 \text{ dB}$ 、 $V \leq 0.5 \text{ m/s}$ 、 $W \leq 0.5 \text{ m/s}$	

111 3 Method

112 Using active instruments to determine cloud boundaries through remote sensing measurements, echo signals in
 113 clear-sky areas decay rapidly with increasing detection distance. When a cloud signal is detected, the amplitude of
 114 the echo signal begins to increase sharply. Usually, during the actual observation, the background noise or aerosol
 115 layer also increases the amplitude of the echo signal, but the backscattering intensity of the cloud layer is more
 116 continuous and stronger than the aerosol layer and background noise. Therefore, cloud layer and cloud boundary
 117 detection can be realised according to the characteristic changes in the echo signals.

118 3.1 Lidar cloud boundary detection

119 The lidar equation owing to elastic backscattering (Wandinger, 2005; Motty et al., 2018) can be written as,
 120

$$P(\lambda, r) = P_0 \frac{c\tau}{2} A\eta \frac{O(r)}{r^2} \beta(\lambda, r) \cdot \exp\left[-2\int_0^r \sigma(\lambda, r) dr\right], \quad (1)$$

121 where λ is the wavelength of the emitted light, r represents the detection distance, and $\beta(\lambda, r)$ and $\sigma(\lambda, r)$ are the
 122 atmospheric backscattering and extinction coefficients, respectively. $O(r)$ is the laser-beam receiver field-of-view

123 overlap function, c is the speed of light, P_0 is the average power of a single laser pulse, τ is the temporal pulse
 124 length, η is the overall system efficiency, and A is the area of the primary receiver optics responsible for the
 125 collection of backscattered light.

126 Considering the influence of the background noise and response noise of the photomultiplier detector, Eq. (1) can
 127 be further expressed as

$$128 \quad P(\lambda, r) = C \cdot \frac{\Delta r}{r^2} \cdot \beta(\lambda, r) \cdot \exp\left[-2 \int_0^r \sigma(\lambda, r) dr\right] + E(\lambda, r) + N_{back}(\lambda, r'), \quad (2)$$

129 where C is the system constant, which is determined by the laser energy, receiving area of the telescope, and
 130 quantum efficiency of the detector. Δr is the detection range resolution of the system. $N_{back}(\lambda, r')$ is the background
 131 noise received by the system. $E(\lambda, r)$ represents the noise introduced to the detection system by calibration.

132 To avoid amplifying the high-level noise signals, we do not perform distance square correction in Eq. (2) but
 133 directly process it as follows:

$$134 \quad P_{new}(\lambda, r) = \frac{P(\lambda, r) - E(\lambda, r) - N_{back}(\lambda, r')}{C \cdot \Delta r}. \quad (3)$$

135 For ground-based lidar, the echo signal at a certain height range (>15 km in this study applied to the Xi'an region)
 136 can be considered as molecular scattering, $N_{back}(\lambda, r')$ can be estimated with the signal within this range, and the
 137 standard deviation of the noise within the distance range is calculated as follows:

$$138 \quad Sd = \left[\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(x_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (4)$$

139 where x denotes the background noise signal. The noise of the lidar signal can be expressed as


$$140 \quad Noise(r) = k \cdot Sd. \quad (5)$$

141 After the statistical analysis of the system noise, we set $k = 4$ in this study. The algorithm flow chart of detecting
 142 cloud boundary by lidar is shown in Fig. 2. Usually, the moving average of $P_{new}(\lambda, r)$ of lidar echo signal is
 143 calculated to reduce the influence of random noise. However, the selection of a sliding window directly affects the
 144 signal quality. Therefore, wavelet denoising is used to deal with $P_{new}(\lambda, r)$, select symlets7 wavelet base as the
 145 wavelet decomposition basis function, the decomposition layer is 5, and the threshold value is the heursure based
 146 heuristic threshold value provided by MATLAB. Compared with the smooth function, wavelet denoising can avoid
 147 eliminating cloud signals with steep changes due to too much smoothing. Obtaining cloud boundaries mainly
 148 includes three parts. The first part is signal preprocessing. $P_{new_s}(\lambda, r)$ after wavelet de-noising is discretized based
 149 on the estimates of noise, and get useful signals $P_{new_s1}(\lambda, r)$ and $P_{new_s2}(\lambda, r)$. The second part is to enhance the
 150 signal to make the cloud signal sharper from the background noise and aerosol signal. Average signals $P_{new_s1}(\lambda, r)$
 151 and $P_{new_s2}(\lambda, r)$ to obtain $P_{new_sf}(\lambda, r)$. Ascending arrangement are conducted for $P_{new_sf}(\lambda, r)$ and the new sequence
 152 R_S and the corresponding index id are recorded. The maximum and minimum R_S are denoted as Ma and Mi ,
 153 respectively. By building a new mapping proportion coefficient $Pe(i)$, the enhanced signal $P_{new_sp}(\lambda, r)$ is obtained.
 154 Get $P_{new_sp-smooth}$ after smoothing $P_{new_sp}(\lambda, r)$. The slope K_1 of *baseline-1* obtained from the points (15, V1) and
 155 (endpoint, V2) on $P_{new_sp-smooth}$, and *baseline-2* got by using K_1 and point (starting point, V0) as shown in Fig.
 156 3b) and Fig. 4b). Signals exceeding *baseline-2* are regarded as candidate cloud signals as shown in Fig. 3b) and Fig.
 157 4b). The third part is to extract cloud signal and realize boundary detection by combining the SNR of echo signal.
 158 By fitting the echo signal slope in the height range of 15–20 km, the slope is used as the slope to distinguish the


159 cloud and aerosol layers (as shown by the magenta line in Fig. 3b and Fig. 4b). Without considering the bottom
 160 echo signal (0–2 km), the amplitude of the echo signal received by the lidar decreased with increasing detection
 161 height according to the fitted slope, as shown by the blue line baseline in Figs. 3b) and 4b). When the beam senses
 162 the presence of clouds, the amplitude of the echo signal will exceed the blue baseline. The *SNR* of the echo signal is
 163 an important parameter for distinguishing the cloud and aerosol layers in the echo signal and calculating the *SNR* of
 164 P_{new_sf} using Eq. (6) (Xie et al., 2017),

$$165 \quad SNR(r, \lambda) = \frac{N \cdot P(r, \lambda)}{\sqrt{N \cdot P(r, \lambda) + N \cdot P_{back}}}, \quad (6)$$

166 where N is the pulse accumulation, P_{back} is the solar background noise power, and *SNR* in Shannon formula is the
 167 power ratio of signal to noise, which is a dimensionless unit. As shown in Figs. 3c) and 4c), the *SNR* of the cloud
 168 layer is higher than that of the aerosol layer and background noise, and the *SNR* in the cloud layer is approximately
 169 greater than 5 (obtained based on multi-data statistical analysis in different situations). Combined with the *SNR*
 170 threshold, the detected cloud information is shown in Figs. 3d) and 4d). Compared with the traditional method of
 171 finding cloud bottom and cloud top from echo signals, this method first accurately extracts cloud signals, and then
 172 obtains cloud boundaries (cloud bottom and top). This method greatly reduces the interference caused by noise and
 173 aerosol signal.




174
 175 Fig. 2 Use lidar to detect cloud boundary. 1) signal preprocessing, 2) baseline determination based on enhanced signal, 3) identifying
 176 cloud boundary with *SNR*



177
178
179

Fig. 3 Detection results of lidar at 12:13 on March 5, 2021. a) P_{new_sf} of the 1064 nm signal, b) P_{new_sp} of the 1064 nm signal, c) SNR of P_{new_sf} , d) cloud information detected



180
181
182

Fig. 4 Detection results of lidar at 22:44 on June 8, 2021. a) P_{new_sf} of the 1064 nm signal, b) P_{new_sp} of the 1064 nm signal, c) SNR of P_{new_sf} , d) cloud information detected


183 3.2 MMCR cloud boundary detection

184 Identifying cloud signals from Doppler spectra of the MMCR is affected by the noise level, particularly when the
185 SNR is low. As shown in Fig. 5 (Di et al., 2022), if all spectral points above the noise level are integrated, it will
186 result in a large error in the inversion of its characteristic parameters (reflectivity factor, spectral width, radial
187 velocity, etc.). Therefore, it is necessary to carefully identify cloud signals in Doppler spectra signal. Fig. 6 includes
188 two parts: recognition of cloud signals from Doppler spectra of MMCR and data quality control for MMCR. Part

189 one is mainly to prepare for obtaining effective cloud signals. Generally, cloud signals have a certain number of
 190 continuous spectral points and SNR . With the part one of Fig. 6, we use the segmental method to calculate the noise
 191 level, and take it as the noise and signal boundary (as shown is Fig. 5). If spectral data amplitude is greater than
 192 SNR_{min} , and search for consecutive velocity bins in its spectral data and record the number of bins. When the
 193 number is larger than N_{ts} , and the corresponding spectral signals is determined as an effective spectrum segment.
 194 Intersections of effective spectral segment and noise and signal boundary are left and right endpoints of cloud
 195 spectral, that is, the starting and end point of the spectral moment calculation.

$$196 \quad SNR_{min} = \frac{25 \sqrt{N_F - 2.1325 + \frac{170}{N_P}}}{N_F \cdot N_P}, \quad (7)$$

197 where N_F is incoherent accumulation, and N_P is the number of fast fourier transform sampling points. The N_F and
 198 N_P of the MMCR used in this study are 32 and 256, respectively, and the SNR_{min} obtained by calculating the SNR_{min}
 199 is -17.74 dB. The SNR_{min} is adjusted according to the measured data of the MMCR and SNR_{min} is finally determined
 200 as -20 dB. Based on the research results of Shupe et al. (2008), N_{ts} is set to 7.



201
 202 Fig. 5 Schematic diagram of cloud signal recognition in Doppler spectra

203 The echo signals of floating debris in the low-level atmosphere have the characteristics of a small reflectivity factor,
 204 low velocity, and large spectral width. To further eliminate interfering wave information, we obtained the data
 205 quality control threshold by counting the characteristic changes in planktonic echoes in the boundary layer under
 206 cloud-free conditions. As shown in 2) of Fig. 6, when the reflectivity factor $Z < -20$ dBZ, the absolute value of
 207 radial velocity < 0.2 m/s, and the velocity spectrum width > 0.3 m/s are used as the threshold of noncloud
 208 information in bin. If the characteristic parameters of each bin meet the threshold, and assign NaN to the
 209 corresponding bin in reflectivity factor. The echo signals of floating debris in reflectivity factor are eliminated by
 210 the method, and the quality-controlled for reflectivity factor is realised.




Fig. 6 Flow chart of MMCR cloud boundary detection. 1) recognition of cloud signals from Doppler spectra of MMCR, and 2) cloud boundary with data quality control

According to the algorithm flow in Fig. 6, Doppler spectra data at 22:44:00 on 8 June 2021 are analysed to obtain the cloud signals of the MMCR reflectivity factor, radial velocity, and velocity spectrum width, as shown in Fig. 7a)–c). The noncloud signals at the bottom (0–2 km) are effectively eliminated using the quality control algorithm shown in 2) of Fig. 6, and the accurate recognition of cloud boundary is realised in Fig. 7d).




Fig. 7 Meteorological signals of MMCR at 22:44 on 8 June 2021. a) reflectivity factor, b) radial velocity, c) velocity spectrum width, d) reflectivity factor after quality control

221 **4 Results and discussion**


222 **4.1 Joint observation and analysis of various types of clouds**

223 Clouds change rapidly (Veselovskii et al., 2017). They often appear in the form of single-layer, multilayer, and
224 precipitating clouds. Section 4 uses the data inversion method proposed in Section 3 to analyse the changing
225 characteristics of clouds under different conditions to obtain reliable cloud macroinformation. Although the spatial
226 and temporal resolutions of the two detection devices are different, their close proximity allows a good
227 ‘point-to-point’ quantitative comparison between lidar and MMCR. Before data comparison and analysis, the low
228 spatial resolution of MMCR and low temporal resolution of the lidar were interpolated to keep the spatial and
229 temporal resolutions of the two consistent (the time resolution is 5 s, and the spatial resolution is 3.75 m).

230 1) First case study period

231 Clouds in the sky often appear as single-layer clouds and the inversion of macroscopic parameters is simpler than
232 that of multilayer clouds. June 08-09, 2021 (19:00–06:00 China standard time (CST)), lidar and MMCR jointly
233 monitored the appearance of monolayer clouds in Xi'an. According to the data method described in Section 3.1, we
234 can obtain cloud change information of time-height-indicator (THI) for SNR of P_{new_sf} and P_{new_sp} of lidar
235 @1064nm with a duration of 7 hours, as shown in Figs. 8a) and 8b). The inversion results show that the thickness
236 of the cloud layer is approximately 2 km, and the height of the cloud bottom decreases from 8 km to 4 km with the
237 passage of the observation time. After 05:00 CST, the cloud layer developed deeper, and the laser beam penetrated
238 0.1 km into the cloud layer and was quickly attenuated. Rainfall begins at 06:00 CST, and the lidar cannot continue
239 effective observation, and the experiment ends. The SNR in Fig. 8a) causes the SNR of the bottom signal to be large
240 (0–2 km, and the echo signal within the range is not considered in the following cases). Cloud signals have a higher
241 SNR than aerosols and background noise. P_{new_sp} highlights the cloud information from the aerosol signal and
242 background noise, and the details of the instability of the laser energy from 23:00 to 00:30 CST are displayed in Fig.
243 8b). Combined with the SNR ($SNR > 5.2$ without considering the low-level saturation zone) and P_{new_sp} thresholds
244 of the cloud signal in Fig. 8a) and 8b), the cloud layer signal detected from the echo signal is shown in Fig. 8c).

245 Cloud reflectivity factor of the MMCR for the same observation time period, and the cloud signals observed by the
246 two devices have good macrostructural similarity before 06:00 CST. As shown in Fig. 8d), when the quality control
247 of reflectivity factor is not conducted, noncloud signals in the range of 0–2 km are not prominent, and there are
248 some interference signals around the cloud. If we directly detect the cloud boundary with reflectivity factor in Fig.
249 8a), it will inevitably lead to underestimation or overestimation of the cloud boundary. We can effectively eliminate
250 the noncloud signals at the bottom atmosphere and the interference signals around the clouds using data quality
251 control for the reflectivity factor in Fig. 8e). According to the reflectivity factor of the MMCR, from 03:00 CST to
252 the end of observation, the cloud layer developed deeper, the cloud bottom height gradually decreased from 7 km to
253 300 m, and the cloud top height developed to ~12 km (the lidar signal fails to show this detail). When rain appeared
254 at 06:00 CST (the microwave radiometer accurately records the rainfall time), MMCR cannot accurately detect the
255 cloud bottom height, but lidar could detect it effectively (the cloud bottom boundary was ~3.8 km). In this case, we
256 can apply lidar and MMCR to detect cloud bottom and top boundaries, respectively, to achieve high-precision
257 detection of cloud boundaries.



258

259

260

261

Fig. 8 THI of the echo signal of the lidar @1064 nm from 08 to 09 June 2021. a) SNR of P_{new_sf} , b) P_{new_sp} of the 1064 nm signal, c) cloud information detection results from lidar, d) reflectivity factor without quality control, e) reflectivity factor with quality control (black dotted line indicates rainfall time)

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

The cloud boundary is retrieved from the cloud signals detected by lidar and MMCR (Fig. 8c and Fig. 8e), and the results are shown in Fig. 9. Between 19:00 and 05:00 CST, the cloud bottom boundary height distributions retrieved by the two instruments were in agreement. Between 21:00 and 06:00 CST, with the development of clouds, the MMCR can detect more cloud information than lidar, especially from 03:00 to 06:00 CST. Although lidar cannot penetrate more clouds during this period, it can provide an effective cloud bottom boundary. At 19:00–20:00 CST, in cloud top boundaries where the ice crystals are too small to be detected by the MMCR, lidar detects the real cloud top. This is attributable to the echo intensity of the MMCR being proportional to the 6th power of the particle diameter, and the lidar echo signal is proportional to the square of the particles. From 19:00 to 00:00 CST, cirrus cloud transition to altostratus, where size of cloud particles increases in the form of collision and finally produces precipitation. In this process, the lidar beam entering the cloud is attenuated, but MMCR has a good advantage in cloud-top detection.




Fig. 9 Cloud boundary detected by lidar and MMCR from 8 to 9 June, 2021

273

274

275 2) Second case study period

276 From 4 to 5 March 2021, the MMCR and lidar conducted joint observations with a total observation time of 23 h.

277 By inverting the echo signal of the lidar @1064 nm, we obtained P_{new_sp} of the echo signal and the SNR of P_{new_sf} ,

278 and the plotted THIs are shown in Figs. 10a) and 10b). These THIs reveal that the double layers of the clouds

279 appeared in the sky during the observation period. The low-level cloud is located at a height of 4 km, and its

280 thickness is approximately 2 km; the high-level cloud lies at 7 km, and its thickness is ~ 2.7 km. The SNR of the

281 low-level cloud was significantly stronger than that of the high-level cloud, as shown in Fig. 10a). From the

282 characteristic distribution of the P_{new_sp} signal in Fig. 10b), the low-level cloud rained from 18:30 to 18:45 CST (the

283 rainfall time is obtained by checking the microwave radiometer), and the cloud bottom height decreased sharply from

284 4 km to 0.6 km. Subsequently, the cloud layer gradually dissipated from 2 km to 0.05 km, and the dispersal that

285 occurred from 02:00 to 10:00 CST was too strong for the lidar to detect more detailed information about the

286 low-altitude cloud. We also observed the high-level cloud change characteristics shown in Fig. 10b). From 17:00 to

287 01:00 CST, there was a relatively weak P_{new_sp} signal in the height range between 7 km and 10 km. This indicates

288 that the high-level cloud may be in the formation stage at this time, and the particle diameter and number


289 concentration of clouds are so small that lidar can only receive a very weak echo signal. As the observations

290 progressed, the development of high-level clouds became relatively mature, and the structure was relatively stable

291 from 01:00 to 15:00 CST (except at 13:00 CST). Combined with the thresholds of the SNR and intensity

292 information of the cloud signal in Fig. 10a) and 10b), complete cloud signal detection can be realised, as shown in

293 Fig. 10c).




294

295 Fig. 10 THI of the echo signal of the lidar @1064 nm from 4 to 5 March, 2021. a) SNR of P_{new_sf} , b) P_{new_sp} of the 1064 nm signal, c)
 296 cloud information detection results, d) reflectivity factor without quality control, e) reflectivity factor with quality control (black dotted
 297 line indicates rainfall time)

298 During lidar observations, the MMCR also observed double clouds. Figs. 10d) and 10e) show the signal
 299 distribution characteristics of the reflectivity factor of the MMCR without quality control and after quality control,
 300 respectively. It can be seen in Fig. 10e) that after data quality control, the noncloud signals and interference signals
 301 at the bottom are effectively eliminated. The joint observation results of the lidar and MMCR reveal that the
 302 appearance and shape of clouds observed by the two are similar, and the occurrence of rainfall was monitored from
 303 18:30 to 18:45 CST. From 17:00 to 01:00 CST, the penetration ability of the MMCR was markedly better than that
 304 of the lidar, and more high-level cloud information was obtained. However, between 01:00 and 04:00 CST for
 305 high-level clouds (approximately 8 km), the MMCR detected only part of the debris cloud echo signal, whereas the
 306 lidar detected more cloud information. We can speculate that the main reason for this is that clouds were in the
 307 growth stage during this time period, their particle diameters were small, or their concentrations were low. The echo
 308 signal of the MMCR is proportional to the 6th power of the particle diameter, whereas the echo signal of the lidar is
 309 proportional to the 2nd power of the particle diameter; therefore, the lidar can detect clouds that the MMCR cannot

310 detect. From 10:00 to 15:00 CST, the MMCR also failed to detect the thin cloud signal in the lower layer (a height
 311 of approximately 4 km). Another reason for MMCR failing to detect thin clouds may be that its spatial resolution is
 312 lower than that of lidar, which makes it unable to detect thin clouds.

313 The height distribution of the double-layer cloud boundaries was detected based on the cloud signals (Fig. 10c and
 314 Fig. 10e) jointly observed by lidar and MMCR, as shown in Fig. 11. The cloud boundary height distribution shows
 315 that the cloud boundary height distributions detected by lidar and MMCR are relatively consistent for low-level
 316 clouds. For high-level clouds, the heights of the cloud bottom boundary detected by the two instruments were
 317 similar, and the cloud top boundary detected by MMCR was higher than that detected by lidar. However, compared
 318 with MMCR, lidar is superior in detecting thin cloud information.




319 Fig. 11 Cloud boundary detected by the lidar and MMCR from 4 March to 5, 2021

320
 321 3) Third case study period


322 On 10 March 2021 lidar and MMCR jointly observed clouds before rainfall for 6 h (06:00–11:00 CST, and began to
 323 rain at 10:45 CST). Fig. 12a) shows the distribution of the SNR of P_{new_sf} with time and space, Fig. 12b) shows the
 324 THI of P_{new_sp} of the @1064 nm echo signal, and Fig. 12c) shows the cloud signal detected by the thresholds of the
 325 SNR and P_{new_sp} . We inverted the reflectivity factor of the MMCR and performed data quality control operations on
 326 them. The results are shown in Fig. 12d) and Fig. 12e), which are the reflectivity factor of the MMCR without
 327 quality control and quality control, respectively. From the comparison, it is evident that data quality control can
 328 eliminate the interference signal very well, which simplifies the process of merging the high-level convective cloud
 329 and the low-level stratiform cloud.

330 By comparing the cloud information detected by the lidar and MMCR (Fig. 12c and Fig. 12e), we can see that
 331 during the period from 06:00 to 10:00 CST, the energy of the lidar beam is severely attenuated at a height of
 332 approximately 4 km, resulting in a very weak echo signal and SNR above 4 km. As the observation time progressed,
 333 the phenomenon of virga (> -15 dBZ) occurred in the cloud (Ellis et al., 2011; Williams et al., 2014). The severe
 334 attenuation of lidar in the cloud leads to a sharp decrease in its detection ability, whereas the millimeter wave still
 335 has a strong penetrating ability. When rainfall occurs (the microwave radiometer showed that rainfall occurred at
 336 10:45 CST), neither lidar nor MMCR can effectively identify the cloud bottom boundary, but MMCR can still
 337 detect cloud top boundary information. The height distributions of the cloud boundaries detected by lidar and
 338 MMCR are shown in Fig. 13. The height distribution of the cloud bottom and cloud top boundaries detected by the

339 two instruments is almost the same from 06:00 to 09:00 CST (the cloud bottom boundary is approximately 3 km,
 340 and the cloud top boundary is approximately 4.1 km). A drizzle fell from 09:00 to 10:45 CST, and the lidar obtained
 341 an effective cloud bottom boundary. The boundary of the high-level convective cloud at ~8 km and the deep cloud
 342 layer from 10:45 CST to the end of the observation period can only be detected by MMCR.



343
 344 Fig. 12 THI of echo signal of the lidar and MMCR on 10 March, 2021. a) SNR of P_{new_sf} , b) P_{new_sp} of the 1064 nm signal, c) cloud
 345 information detection results, d) reflectivity factor without quality control, e) reflectivity factor with quality control (black dotted line
 346 indicates rainfall time)




347
 348 Fig. 13 Cloud boundary detected by the lidar and MMCR on 10 March, 2021

349 From the differences in the height distribution of the cloud boundaries reached by the two devices in the above
 350 three different situations, it can be seen that when a single layer of stratiform clouds appears in the sky, the heights
 351 of the cloud bottom boundary detected by the MMCR and lidar are approximately the same. When there are
 352 multilayer clouds, MMCR and lidar have good consistency in the detection results of the cloud bottom boundary
 353 height of the low-level cloud; however, the energy of the lidar beam attenuates significantly in the low-level cloud,
 354 resulting in an inability to fully obtain the effective bottom boundary of low-level clouds and the height boundary
 355 of high-level clouds. In this case, the MMCR can obtain more complete height information for the multilayer cloud
 356 boundary. Usually, the closer rainfall is, the deeper the cloud layer develops, the more severely the beam of the
 357 lidar will be attenuated, and more cloud information cannot be obtained. In other words, MMCR still has the ability
 358 to penetrate the cloud layer and detect complete cloud information. Therefore, the joint observation of lidar and
 359 MMCR can comprehensively identify and detect cloud boundary conditions in detail. The difference between the
 360 cloud boundaries detected by the two may also be due to the different scattering mechanisms of cloud particles to
 361 millimeter-wave electromagnetic waves and laser beams or the difference in the methods used by the two devices
 362 to determine the cloud boundary; thus, there are some differences in the cloud boundary height results.

363 4.2 Analysis of cloud boundary distribution characteristics in Xi'an


364 To further analyse the changes in the height distribution of cloud boundaries in Xi'an, we plan to use MMCR and
 365 lidar data for cloud boundary analysis. Accordingly, it is necessary to analyse the correlation of the cloud bottom
 366 boundary height detected by the two devices. We randomly selected 80 h of data in the joint observation period (to
 367 avoid the rainfall period) and calculated the cloud boundary detection results of lidar and MMCR according to the
 368 data processing methods in Sections 3.1 and 3.2. As shown in Fig. 14, when the quality control of the MMCR is
 369 performed, the correlation between the detected cloud boundary and lidar detection result increases from 0.627 (in
 370 Fig. 14a)) to 0.803 (in Fig. 14b)). Moreover, under the premise that the difference in cloud boundaries caused by
 371 the different detection principles and algorithms of the two devices cannot be avoided, we can use the cloud
 372 boundary data detected by MMCR to replace the missing lidar data.



373
 374 Fig. 14 Correlation between lidar and MMCR cloud bottom. a) without quality control; b) with quality control)

375 From the above three cloud observation cases, it can be seen that MMCR has more advantages than lidar in
 376 detecting cloud-top boundaries. Therefore, when calculating the cloud boundary height distribution characteristics
 377 over Xi'an, we only counted the cloud top boundary height detected by the MMCR and considered it as the actual

378 cloud top boundary. From December 2020 to November 2021, MMCR and lidar stored 302 d (7248 h) and 126 d
 379 (872.5 h) of observational data, respectively. During the 12-month observation period, the maximum detection
 380 altitude of the MMCR changed. From December 2020 to June 2021, the maximum detection range of MMCR is
 381 12.6 km, and the maximum detection height is changed to 18 km. The total observation hours of MMCR and lidar
 382 for each month are shown in Fig. 15. The hours of lidar, MMCR, and simultaneous measurements are 872.5 h. In
 383 this study, the four seasons were defined as follows: spring from March to May (MAM), summer from June to
 384 August (JJA), autumn from September to November (SON), and winter from December to February (DJF).



385
386 Fig. 15 Monthly observation hours of lidar and MMCR

387 Table 3 establishes the rules for recording effective cloud bottom information in the observation process using
 388 MMCR and lidar under different conditions to improve the detection accuracy of the cloud-bottom boundary.


389 Table 3 Cloud bottom height recording guideline

Detection equipment	Observation	Detection conditions	Record cloud bottom boundary
Both the lidar and MMCR	Case 1	Geometrical thin cloud: the lidar detects bottom; MMCR did not detect the cloud bottom	Results of the lidar
	Case 2	Drizzle: the lidar detects bottom; bottom of MMCR is invalid	Results of the lidar
	Case 3	Both the lidar and MMCR detect cloud bottom	Record the lower value of the cloud bottom boundary
MMCR	Case 4	MMCR detected cloud bottom	Results of MMCR
	Case 5	Drizzle: bottom of MMCR is invalid	No results are recorded

390 This study defines ‘cloud occurrence frequency’ as the ratio of cloud occurrence times to total detection times
 391 during the analysed period. The total sample size is N , and the sample size of cloud boundaries appearing at
 392 different height levels (altitude range from 1.5 km to 12 km is divided into 50 levels) is n_i . The seasonal distribution
 393 characteristics of the cloud boundary height are calculated according to Eq. (8),

394
$$y_{cloud} = \frac{n_i}{N} (n_i \in N, i = 1 \dots 50). \quad (8)$$


395 Fig. 16 shows the vertical frequency distribution of the cloud boundary seasonally from December 2020 to
 396 November 2021. For the vertical distribution of cloud base, the first narrow peaks is the boundary layer clouds (\leq
 397 1.5 km), the second peak is 2.5–3.5 km, and the third peak has a big range in vertical height, which is 4.7–10 km a
 398 in spring. Fig.16 (b) shows that the cloud bottom height in summer is mainly distributed at 3–9.5 km, indicating
 399 that middle and high clouds may be dominant. The distribution of cloud bottom is bimodal, the first peak is the
 400 boundary layer cloud peak, and the second peak is located at 2.7–3.7 km and 3.6–8.3 km in autumn and winter,
 401 respectively. The variation in cloud top with seasons shows a bimodal distribution, and spring and summer have a
 402 similar trend of cloud top boundary height distribution. The frequency of the cloud top boundary above 10 km was
 403 the highest, and the frequency below 2 km was the lowest in summer. The distribution characteristics of cloud top
 404 height in autumn and winter indicate that the frequency of low clouds is higher than that in the other two seasons.
 405 This is consistent with the results of Zhao et al. (2014) for the SGP site and Xie et al. (2017) for the SACOL site.
 406 Although there were some differences in the cloud boundary frequency distribution at some heights, the overall
 407 change trend was roughly the same.



408
 409 Fig. 16 Frequency distribution of cloud boundaries during (a) spring, (b) summer, (c) autumn, and (d) winter from December 2020 to
 410 November 2021 at Xi'an Jinghe National Meteorological Station


411 Fig. 17 a) shows the monthly variation frequency distribution of clouds. The months with the largest and smallest
 412 cloud occurrence frequencies are August and February, respectively. Almost more than 34% of the clouds appear in
 413 the form of single layer clouds every month. Compared with January, February, November, and December, the
 414 frequencies of double-layer clouds, triple-layer clouds, and more clouds in other months are higher. To show the
 415 relative change trend of cloud cover, we calculated the total cloud cover of each month by using the total cloud
 416 cover at each time stored by the MMCR. It was found that the maximum cloud cover was in April. Therefore, the

417 total cover of April was set to 1, and the normalized cloud cover distribution of 12 months was obtained, as shown
 418 in the Fig. 17 b). It can be seen from the distribution of cloud cover in every month that the cloud cover is high in
 419 summer and the least in winter, indicating that warm atmospheric conditions are more conducive to the formation
 420 and development of clouds.



421
 422 Fig. 17 Monthly variation in cloud frequency distribution and cloud cover from December 2020 to November 2021 a) monthly
 423 variation in the frequency of the number of cloud layers. b) monthly variation in cloud cover

424 As Fig.18 caption says it is the frequency distribution of cloud boundaries observed over Xi'an from December
 425 2020 to November 2021. Frequency of the cloud bottom boundary below the vertical height of 1.5 km is the highest,
 426 the frequency within the height range of 3.06 km and 3.6 km is approximately 0.4%, and the frequency above 8 km
 427 is less than 0.2%. The frequency of the cloud top boundary at vertical heights has a bimodal distribution, and the
 428 first narrow peak is located at 1.0–3.1 km, and the second peak lies at 6.4–10.5 km. Combined with the changing
 429 characteristics of cloud layers, it can be seen that during observation in Xi'an, the frequency of clouds below 3.5 km
 430 is the largest, and the frequency of high-level ice clouds or cirrus clouds above 8 km is small, which may be due to
 431 the limited detection sensitivity of MMCR at the top of high-level clouds where the particles size are very small.



432
 433 Fig. 18 Frequency distribution of cloud boundaries at vertical heights at Xi'an Jinghe National Meteorological Station from December
 434 2020 to November 2021

435 **5 Conclusions**

436 Based on the observation data of lidar, a new algorithm is proposed which can effectively extract cloud signals.
437 Compared with the previous method of identifying cloud bottom and cloud top from echo signals, the new method
438 mainly obtains effective cloud signals through suppressing noise signals and enhancing effective signals to realize
439 cloud boundaries. The algorithm has two main characteristics: 1) in the signal preprocessing, wavelet transform is
440 used for the original signal to avoid the defect of effective information loss caused by improper selection of smooth
441 window; 2) The SNR of the signal is considered.

442 The cloud signals in Doppler spectra are effectively extracted by analyzing the noise level, SNR_{min} , and the
443 continuous spectral points of Doppler spectra. The data quality control conditions for MMCR (reflectivity factor <
444 -20 dBZ, spectrum width > 0.3 m/s and radial velocity < 0.2 m/s) were established by analyzing the characteristic
445 of the interference of floating debris signals. By analysing the correlation of cloud bottom height between MMCR
446 and lidar, and the cloud bottom height detection by MMCR with data quality control have a good agreement with
447 lidar (the correlation coefficient is 0.803). Therefore, quality control is an important factor to improve signal
448 accuracy of MMCR.

449 In this study, combined with the respective advantages of MMCR and lidar in cloud detection, the cloud cover and
450 distribution of cloud boundaries characteristics are analyzed based on the observation data in Xi'an from December
451 2020 to November 2021. The result reveals that more than 34% of the clouds appear in the form of a single layer
452 every month. The cloud cover was lowest in spring and highest in summer. The seasonal variation in cloud
453 boundary height showed that the distribution characteristics of cloud boundaries in spring and summer were similar,
454 and the frequency of high-level clouds in the range of 8–10 km was greater than autumn and winter. The stratiform
455 clouds appearing below 3.5 km in autumn have the highest frequency, and high-level ice clouds or cirrus clouds
456 above 8 km in winter are less likely to appear. The findings can provide a preliminary analysis of cloud boundary
457 changes in Xi'an. If there are huge amounts of simultaneous observation data of the lidar and MMCR, the
458 comprehensive statistics and analysis of cloud macro and micro parameters in Xi'an can be realized, which can
459 provide better support for the study of climate change characteristics in Xi'an.

460 **Data availability**

461 The data and code related to this article are available upon request from the corresponding author.

462 **Author contributions**

463 Conceptualization: Yun Yuan

464 Investigation: Yun Yuan

465 Methodology: Yun Yuan and Huige Di

466 Software: Yun Yuan

467 Supervision: Huige Di and Dengxin Hua

468 Methodology and software improvement: Yuanyuan Liu, Tao Yang, Qimeng Li, Qing Yan, Wenhui Xin, and
469 Shichun Li.

470 Writing – original draft: Yun Yuan

471 Writing – review & editing: Yun Yuan and Huige Di

472 Project administration: Dengxin Hua

473 **Competing interests**

474 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest related to this work.

475 **Financial support**

476 This research has been supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, Innovative Research Group
477 Project of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant nos. 42130612, 41627807 and 61875162) and
478 the Ph.D. Innovation fund projects of Xi'an University of Technology (Fund No.310-252072106).

479 **References**

- 480 Apituley, A., van, Lammeren, A., and Russchenberg, H.: High time resolution cloud measurements with lidar
481 during CLARA, *Phys. Chem. Earth.*, 25(2), 107-113, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1464-1909\(99\)00135-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1464-1909(99)00135-5), 2000.
- 482 Borg, L. A., Holz, R. E., and Turner, D. D.: Investigating cloud radar sensitivity to optically thin cirrus using
483 collocated Raman lidar observations, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, L05807, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010gl046365>,
484 2011.
- 485 Cao, X., Lu, G., Li, M., and Wang, J.: Statistical Characteristics of Cloud Heights over Lanzhou, China from
486 Multiple Years of Micro-Pulse Lidar Observation, *Atmosphere.-Basel.*, 12(11), 1415,
487 <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12111415>, 2021.
- 488 Chen, Z., and Sun, X.: Dynamic spatial fusion of cloud top phase from PARASOL, CALIPSO, cloudsat satellite
489 data, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Ra.*, 224, 176-184, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2018.11.010>, 2019.
- 490 Clothiaux, E. E., Moran, K. P., Martner, B. E., Ackerman, T. P., Mace, G. G., Uttal, T., Mather, J. H., Widener, K.
491 B., Miller, M. A., and Rodriguez, D. J.: The atmospheric radiation measurement program cloud radars:
492 Operational modes, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, 16(7), 819-827,
493 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0426\(1999\)016%3C0819:TARMPC%3E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0426(1999)016%3C0819:TARMPC%3E2.0.CO;2), 1999.
- 494 Cordoba-Jabonero, C., Lopes, F. J. S., Landulfo, E., Cuevas, E., Ochoa, H., and Gil-Ojeda, M.: Diversity on
495 subtropical and polar cirrus clouds properties as derived from both ground-based lidars and CALIPSO/CALIOP
496 measurements, *Atmos. Res.*, 183, 151-165, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2016.08.015>, 2017.
- 497 Delanoe, J., and Hogan, R. J.: A variational scheme for retrieving ice cloud properties from combined radar, lidar,
498 and infrared radiometer, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 113, D07204, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007jd009000>, 2008.
- 499 Di, H., Yuan, Y., Yan, Q., Xin, W., Li, S., Wang, J., Wang, Y., Zhang, L., and Hua, D.: Determination of
500 atmospheric column condensate using active and passive remote sensing technology, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 15,
501 3555–3567, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-15-3555-2022>, 2022.
- 502 Dong, X., Xi, B., Crosby, K., Long, C. N., Stone, R. S., and Shupe, M. D.: A 10 year climatology of Arctic cloud
503 fraction and radiative forcing at Barrow, Alaska, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, D17212,
504 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009jd013489>, 2010.
- 505 Ellis, S. M., and Vivekanandan, J.: Liquid water content estimates using simultaneous S and K a band radar
506 measurements, *Radio. Sci.*, 46(RS2021), 1-15, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010RS004361>, 2011.
- 507 Görtsdorf, U., Lehmann, V., Bauer-Pfundstein, M., Peters, G., Vavriv, D., Vinogradov, V., and Volkov, V.: A 35-GHz
508 polarimetric Doppler radar for long-term observations of cloud parameters—Description of system and data

509 processing, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, 32(4), 675-690, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-14-00066.1>, 2015.

510 Hobbs, P. V., Funk, N. T., Weiss, Sr. R. R., Lohn, J. D., and Biswas, K. R.: Evaluation of a 35 GHz radar for cloud
511 physics research, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, 2(1), 35-48,
512 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0426\(1985\)002<0035:EOAGRF>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0426(1985)002<0035:EOAGRF>2.0.CO;2), 1985.

513 Intrieri, J. M., Stephens, G. L., Eberhard, W. L., and Uttal, T.: A method for determining cirrus cloud particle sizes
514 using lidar and radar backscatter technique, *J. Appl. Meteorol. Clim.*, 32(6), 1074-1082,
515 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450\(1993\)032%3C1074:AMFDCC%3E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(1993)032%3C1074:AMFDCC%3E2.0.CO;2), 1993.

516 Kitova, N., Ivanova, K., Mikhalev, M. A., and Ausloos, M.: Statistical investigation of cloud base height time
517 evolution, *Proc. SPIE-Int. Soc. Opt. Eng.*, 5226, 280-284, <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.519500>, 2003.

518 Kollias, P., Clothiaux, E. E., Miller, M. A., Albrecht, B. A., Stephens, G. L., and Ackerman, T. P.:
519 Millimeter-wavelength radars: New frontier in atmospheric cloud and precipitation research, *B. Am. Meteorol.*
520 *Soc.*, 88(10), 1608-1624, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-88-10-1608>, 2007.

521 Kollias, P., Clothiaux, E. E., Miller, M. A., Luke, E. P., Johnson, K. L., Moran, K. P., Widener, K. B., and Albrecht,
522 B. A.: The Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Program cloud profiling radars: Second-generation sampling
523 strategies, processing, and cloud data products, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, 24(7), 1199-1214,
524 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH2033.1>, 2007.

525 Kovalev, V. A., Newton, J., Wold, C., Wei, M.: Simple algorithm to determine the near-edge smoke boundaries
526 with scanning lidar, *Appl. Optics.*, 44(9), 1761-1768, <https://doi.org/10.1364/ao.44.001761>, 2005.

527 Kuji, M.: Retrieval of water cloud top and bottom heights and the validation with ground-based observations, *Proc.*
528 *SPIE-Int. Soc. Opt. Eng.*, 8890, 88900R, <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2029169>. 2013.

529 Li, J., Yi, Y., Stamnes, K., Ding, X., Wang, T., Jin, H., and Wang, S.: A new approach to retrieve cloud base height
530 of marine boundary layer clouds, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40(16), 4448-4453, <https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.50836>,
531 2013.

532 Lohmann, U., and Gasparini, B.: A cirrus cloud climate dial?, *Science.*, 357(6348), 248-249,
533 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan3325>, 2017.

534 Luke, E. P., Kollias, P., Johnson, K. L., and Clothiaux, E. E.: A technique for the automatic detection of insect
535 clutter in cloud radar returns, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, 25(9), 1498-1513,
536 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2007JTECHA953.1>, 2008.

537 Mao, F., Gong, W., and Zhu, Z.: Simple multiscale algorithm for layer detection with lidar, *Appl. Optics.*, 50(36),
538 6591-6598, <https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.50.006591>, 2011.

539 Melnikov, V. M., Istok, M. J., and Westbrook, J. K.: Asymmetric radar echo patterns from insects, *J. Atmos. Ocean.*
540 *Tech.*, 32(4), 659-674, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-13-00247.1>, 2015.

541 Melnikov, V., Leskinen, M., and Koistinen, J.: Doppler velocities at orthogonal polarizations in radar echoes from
542 insects and birds, *IEEE. Geosci. Remote. S.*, 11(3), 592-596, <https://doi.org/10.1109/LGRS.2013.2272011>, 2014.

543 Morille, Y., Haeffelin, M., Drobinski, P., and Pelon, J.: STRAT: An automated algorithm to retrieve the vertical
544 structure of the atmosphere from single-channel lidar data, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, 24(5), 761-775,
545 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH2008.1>, 2007.

546 Motty, G. S., Satyanarayana, M., Jayeshlal, G. S., Krishnakumar, V., and Mahadevan, Pillai, V. P.: Lidar observed
547 structural characteristics of higher altitude cirrus clouds over a tropical site in Indian subcontinent region, *J.*

548 Atmos. Sol.-Terr. Phys., 179, 367-377, [https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jastp.2018.08.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2018.08.013), 2018.

549 Nakajima, T., and King, M. D.: Determination of the optical thickness and effective particle radius of clouds from
550 reflected solar radiation measurements. Part I: Theory, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 47(15), 1878-1893,
551 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1990\)047%3C1878:DOTOTA%3E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1990)047%3C1878:DOTOTA%3E2.0.CO;2), 1990.

552 Oh, S. B., Kim, Y. H., Kim, K. H., Cho, C. H., and Lim, E.: Verification and correction of cloud base and top height
553 retrievals from Ka-band cloud radar in Boseong, Korea, *Adv. Atmos. Sci.*, 33(1), 73-84, [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00376-015-5058-y)
554 [10.1007/s00376-015-5058-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00376-015-5058-y), 2016.

555 Pal, S. R., Steinbrecht, W., and Carswell, A. I.: Automated method for lidar determination of cloud-base height and
556 vertical extent, *Appl. Optics.*, 31(10), 1488-1494, <https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.31.001488>, 1992.

557 Platt, C. M., Young, S. A., Carswell, A. I., Pal, S. R., McCormick, M. P., Winker, D. M., Delguasta, M., Stefanutti,
558 L., Eberhard, W. L., Hardesty, M., Flamant, P. H., Valentin, R., Forgan, B., Gimmetstad, G. G., Jäger, H.,
559 Khmelevtsov, S. S., Kolev, I., Kaprieolev, B., Lu, D., Sassen, K., Shamanaev, V. S., Uchino, O., Mizuno, Y.,
560 Wandinger, U., Weitkamp, C., Ansmann, A., and Wooldridge, C.: The experimental cloud lidar pilot study
561 (ECLIPS) for cloud-radiation research, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 75(9), 1635-1654,
562 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(1994\)075<1635:TECLPS>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1994)075<1635:TECLPS>2.0.CO;2), 1994.

563 Protat, A., Delanoe, J., May, P. T., Haynes, J., Jakob, C., O'Connor, E., Pope, M., and Wheeler, M. C.: The
564 variability of tropical ice cloud properties as a function of the large-scale context from ground-based radar-lidar
565 observations over Darwin, Australia, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 8363-8384,
566 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-8363-2011>, 2011.

567 Riddle, A. C., Gage, K. S., Balsley, B. B., Ecklund, W. L., and Carter, D. A.: Poker Flat MST Radar Data Bases,
568 NOAA. Tech. Memorandum. ERL. AL-11., <https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/21227>, 1989.

569 Sassen, K., and Mace, G.: Ground-based Remote Sensing of Cirrus Clouds, Oxford. University. Press., 168-196,
570 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195130720.003.0012>, 2001.

571 Sauvageot, H.: Retrieval of vertical profiles of liquid water and ice content in mixed clouds from Doppler radar and
572 microwave radiometer measurements, *J. Appl. Meteorol. Clim.*, 35(1), 14-23,
573 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450\(1996\)035%3C0014:ROVPOL%3E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(1996)035%3C0014:ROVPOL%3E2.0.CO;2), 1996.

574 Sherwood, S. C., Bony, S., and Dufresne, J. L.: Spread in model climate sensitivity traced to atmospheric
575 convective mixing, *Nature.*, 505(7481), 37-42, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12829>, 2014.

576 Shupe, M. D., Kollias, P., Poellot, M., and Eloranta, E.: On deriving vertical air motions from cloud radar Doppler
577 spectra, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, 25(4), 547-557, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2007JTECHA1007.1>, 2008.

578 Stephens, G. L., Li, J., Wild, M., Clayson, C. A., Loeb, N., Kato, S., L'ecuyer, T., Stackhouse, Jr, P. W., Lebsock,
579 M., and Andrews, T.: An update on Earth's energy balance in light of the latest global observations, *Nat. Geosci.*,
580 5(10), 691-696, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1580>, 2012.

581 Stephens, Graeme. L.: Cloud Feedbacks in the Climate System: A Critical Review, *J. Climate.*, 18(2), 237-273,
582 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-3243.1>, 2005.

583 Streicher, J., Werner, C., Köepp, F.: Verification of lidar visibility, cloud base height, and vertical velocity
584 measurements by laser remote sensing, *SPIE.*, 2506, 576-579, <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.221061>, 1995.

585 Thorsen, T. J., Fu, Q., and Comstock, J. M.: Cloud effects on radiative heating rate profiles over Darwin using
586 ARM and A-train radar/lidar observations, *J. Geophys. Res-Atmos.*, 118(11), 5637-5654,

587 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50476>, 2013.

588 Varikoden, H., Harikumar, R., Vishnu, R., Sasi Kumar, V., Sampath, S., Murali Das, S., and Mohan Kumar, G.:
589 Observational study of cloud base height and its frequency over a tropical station, Thiruvananthapuram, using a
590 ceilometer, *Int. J. Remote. Sens.*, 32(23), 8505-8518, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2010.542199>, 2011.

591 Veselovskii, I., Goloub, P., Podvin, T., Tanre, D., Ansmann, A., Korenskiy, M., Borovoi, A., Hu, Q., and Whiteman,
592 D. N.: Spectral dependence of backscattering coefficient of mixed phase clouds over West Africa measured with
593 two-wavelength Raman polarization lidar: Features attributed to ice-crystals corner reflection, *J. Quant.*
594 *Spectrosc. Ra.*, 202, 74-80, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2017.07.028>, 2017.

595 Wandinger, U.: Introduction to Lidar, Brooks/Cole Pub Co, https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-25101-4_1, 2005.

596 Wang, J., and Rossow, W. B.: Determination of cloud vertical structure from upper-air observations, *J. Appl.*
597 *Meteorol. Clim.*, 34(10), 2243-2258,
598 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450\(1995\)034%3C2243:DOCVSF%3E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(1995)034%3C2243:DOCVSF%3E2.0.CO;2), 1995.

599 Wang, J., and Rossow, W. B.: Effects of cloud vertical structure on atmospheric circulation in the GISS GCM, *J.*
600 *Climate.*, 11(11), 3010-3029, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26244244>, 1998.

601 Wang, Z.: Cloud property retrieval using combined ground-based remote sensors, The University of Utah, 2000.

602 Ward, J. G., and Merceret, F. J.: An automated cloud-edge detection algorithm using cloud physics and radar data, *J.*
603 *Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, 21(5), 762-765,
604 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0426\(2004\)021%3C0762:AACDAU%3E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0426(2004)021%3C0762:AACDAU%3E2.0.CO;2), 2004.

605 Wild, M.: New Directions: A facelift for the picture of the global energy balance, *Atmos. Environ.*, 55(none),
606 366-367, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.03.022>, 2012.

607 Williams, C. R., Bringi, V. N., Carey, L. D., Chandrasekar, V., Gatlin, P. N., Haddad, Z. S., Meneghini, R., Munchak,
608 S. J., Nesbitt, S. W., Petersen, W. A., Tanelli, S., Tokay, A., Wilson, A., and Wolff, D. B.: Describing the shape of
609 raindrop size distributions using uncorrelated raindrop mass spectrum parameters, *J. Appl. Meteorol. Clim.*,
610 53(5), 1282-1296, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-13-076.1>, 2014.

611 Xie, H., Zhou, T., Fu, Q., Huang, J., Huang, Z., Huang, Z., Bi, J., Shi, J., Zhang, B., and Ge, J.: Automated
612 detection of cloud and aerosol features with SACOL micro-pulse lidar in northwest China, *Opt. Express.*, 25(24),
613 30732-30753, <https://doi.org/10.1364/OE.25.030732>, 2017.

614 Young, S. A.: Analysis of lidar backscatter profiles in optically thin clouds, *Appl. Optics.*, 34(30), 7019-7031,
615 <https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.34.007019>, 1995.

616 Zhang, J., Chen, H., Xia, X., and Wang, W.: Dynamic and thermodynamic features of low and middle clouds
617 derived from atmospheric radiation measurement program mobile facility radiosonde data at Shouxian, China,
618 *Adv. Atmos. Sci.*, 33(1), 21-33, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00376-015-5032-8>, 2016.

619 Zhang, L., Dong, X., Kennedy, A, Xi, B., and Li, Z.: Evaluation of NASA GISS post-CMIP5 single column model
620 simulated clouds and precipitation using ARM Southern Great Plains observations, *Adv. Atmos. Sci.*, 34(3),
621 306-320, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00376-016-5254-4>, 2017.

622 Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., Guo, J., Feng, J., Cao, L., Wang, Y., Zhou, Q., Li, L., Li, B., Xu, H., Liu, L., An, N., and Liu,
623 H.: Climatology of cloud-base height from long-term radiosonde measurements in China, *Adv. Atmos. Sci.*,
624 35(2), 158-168, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00376-017-7096-0>, 2018.

625 Zhao, C., Wang, Y., Wang, Q., Li, Z., Wang, Z., and Liu, D.: A new cloud and aerosol layer detection method based

626 on micropulse lidar measurements, *J. Geophys. Res-Atmos.*, 119(11), 6788-6802,
627 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD021760>, 2014.

628 Zheng, J., Zhang, J., Zhu, K., Liu, L., and Liu, Y.: Gust front statistical characteristics and automatic identification
629 algorithm for CINRAD, *J. Meteorol. Res-Prc.*, 28(4), 607-623, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13351-014-3240-2>,
630 2014.

631 Zhou, C., Zelinka, M. D., and Klein, S. A.: Impact of decadal cloud variations on the Earth's energy budget, *Nat.*
632 *Geosci.*, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2828>, 2016.

633 Zhou, Q., Zhang, Y., Li, B., Li, L., Feng, J., Jia, S., Lv, S., Tao, F., and Guo, J.: Cloud-base and Cloud-top Heights
634 Determined from a Ground-based Cloud Radar in Beijing, China, *Atmos. Environ.*, 201(MAR.), 381-390,
635 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.01.012>, 2019.