

Response to reviewer 1

We would like to thank the reviewer for his/her important comments and suggestions.

1. A few comments regarding the method (described in section 3.1): Why are uniform distributions used to represent liquid and ice cloud effective radius, global dataset would clearly show a normal or log-normal distribution of these properties. What is the consequence of not considering the presence of both liquid and ice together on your method (and what is your reason for not considering them at all?) - these situations occur very often!

Response: The purpose of this article is to develop a cloud masking algorithm for aerosol retrievals, which concerns mostly very small cloud fractions. We use uniform distributions for liquid / ice cloud effective radius in order to make sure that the NN has equal sensitivity to clouds with both small and large particles. We added this statement to the manuscript at line 158 of the revised manuscript. Furthermore, Di Noia et al. (2019, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2018-345>) has also used uniform distributions and demonstrated that this allows accurate retrieval of effective radius and variance.

The presence of both liquid and ice cloud together is indeed frequent. However, in case of pixels with small total cloud fractions (the focus of the present paper) these situations should occur less frequent.

To investigate whether considering scenes with both liquid and ice clouds on the cloud mask, we trained a new NN for a training set including also mixed liquid/ice scenes. From the comparison with aerosol retrieval goodness-of-fit mask (NN-chi2) and MODIS cloud mask on 1 July 2008, the performance isn't improved (the same conclusion also holds for retrieving liquid / ice cloud fraction separately).

Table 1. Performance on 1 July 2008 using training set with mixed-cloudy pixels.

Comparison between cloud masks (global)			
	NN-MODIS	NN-chi2	MODIS-chi2
thresholds	Similarity, effectiveness, info loss	Similarity, effectiveness, info loss	Similarity, effectiveness, info loss
0.01	87.56%, 88.82%, 16.80%	86.04%, 85.10%, 9.13%	87.41%, 88.86%, 20.10%
0.05	85.59%, 84.78%, 11.96%	82.16%, 79.25%, 2.86%	86.38%, 86.85%, 16.07%
0.1	83.90%, 81.69%, 10.27%	77.98%, 73.89%, 0.94%	84.79%, 84.19%, 12.14%
0.2	81.07%, 75.90%, 7.89%	70.36%, 64.66%, 0.30%	81.79%, 79.78%, 7.86%

Experiment: mixed_cloudy_total on 20080701
Similarity: correct prediction / all
Effectiveness: successfully filtered clouds / all clouds
Info loss: wrongly flagged clear pixels / all clear pixels

Table 2. Performance on 1 July 2008 using training set without mixed-cloudy pixels.

Comparison between cloud masks (global)			
	NN-MODIS	NN-chi2	MODIS-chi2
thresholds	Similarity, effectiveness, info loss	Similarity, effectiveness, info loss	Similarity, effectiveness, info loss
0.01	86.68%, 95.42%, 43.74%	88.48%, 93.21%, 35.89%	87.41%, 88.86%, 20.10%
0.05	87.37%, 87.94%, 14.37%	84.76%, 82.58%, 4.00%	86.38%, 86.85%, 16.07%
0.1	85.00%, 83.27%, 10.43%	79.12%, 75.28%, 1.09%	84.79%, 84.19%, 12.14%
0.2	81.33%, 75.70%, 6.65%	69.83%, 64.02%, 0.29%	81.79%, 79.78%, 7.86%

Experiment: I13P12 on 20080701
 Similarity: correct prediction / all
 Effectiveness: successfully filtered clouds / all clouds
 Info loss: wrongly flagged clear pixels / all clear pixels

In the revised version, at line 182, we state that

“We do not consider situations that are partly covered by both ice and liquid clouds because experiments indicate that this does not improve the NN performance”.

2. The conclusions of the comparisons to MODIS are too optimistic in my opinion. For instance I.244-245, it is clear from the maps that the zonal fraction distribution does not agree very well. NN misses high cloud fractions in the tropics (along the ITCZ and in the warm pool region), see Fig 2. This seems to be related to convective clouds not being well identified by the NN approach. That can again be verified by looking at convective clouds over land during hemispheric summers not being identified by NN (e.g. above South America in the top row of Fig 3). Could you provide an explanation for this issue? And in any case it might be worth better discussing these limitations (that one and possible others) in your conclusion. You partly attribute the differences to the incorrect detection of aerosol as clouds by MODIS, which is true, but can't be the only reason. Also, the argument of cloud moving during the acquisition seems strange, how long does the acquisition take?

Response: We rephrased the discussion of the global comparison to MODIS in the revised version, giving more attention to the limitation of the cloud fraction retrieved by the NN. We included a histogram of the cloud fractions retrieved by the NN and MODIS respectively. From this histogram it becomes clear that that the underestimation of the NN cloud fraction is mainly caused by the fact that the NN retrieves a cloud fraction close to 1 (0.95-1) for much fewer pixels (about 50%) than MODIS (As shown below). For these pixels, the NN often retrieves cloud fraction in the range 0.8-0.95 instead.




Figure 2. Histogram of cloud fraction by MODIS and NN in the year 2008.

The NN also retrieves more cases with very low cloud fraction (0-0.05) which is caused by the fact that the NN misses some clouds and by the fact that MODIS confuses dust with clouds. The latter aspects are already discussed in detail in the paper. We have no indications that the differences are related to convective clouds.

The acquisition interval between MODIS and PARASOL can be several minutes, and it is different for each PARASOL viewing angle. In Figure 3 of this response we show the intensity at 760nm from one viewing angle and over-plot it on MODIS true reflectance. As is circled in the picture, some clouds indeed moved during the acquisition interval between MODIS and this PARASOL viewing angle.




Figure 3. PARASOL intensity at 670nm with MODIS true reflectance as background, 01 July 2008 near Somalia. The circled is moved cloud during the acquisition interval.

3. Have you considered providing the ice and liquid cloud fraction separately? This would make your method even more attractive and help to understand the performance of your method for instance by comparison to MODIS. One strong benefit of MAP measurements is the phase detection. It feels to me that this would be a small effort to add to your NN method considering the way it is constructed for a very high gain. In any case it is important to you characterise better what cloud type contribute to your uncertainties in CF estimates.

Response: To investigate whether considering scenes with both liquid and ice clouds on the cloud mask, we trained a new NN for a training set including also mixed liquid/ice scenes, where the NN outputs the liquid and ice CF separately. However, the cloud mask did not improve. It is more challenging for the NN to retrieve two separate cloud fractions instead of one.

4. The main conclusion should be more clear. It seems to me that the NN approach leads to similar result to the goodness-of-fit method but that the latter is very computationally expensive. In that sense, a complete transition to the NN approach could be encouraged for future missions, is that correct?

Response: The goodness-of-fit method is indeed effective but computationally expensive (because it will not be available before aerosol retrieval finished), so in the aerosol retrieval, we will first apply a cloud mask and then do aerosol retrieval on the remaining pixels. The goodness-of-fit mask is applied after retrievals finished to filter residual clouds. Instead of replacing goodness-of-fit mask completely, the conclusion of the article is that in the aerosol retrieval process, the NN cloud mask based on MAP measurements alone can replace the prior cloud mask provided by a cloud imager like MODIS. In the revised version the conclusions are reworded to make this more clear.

Specific comments

1. There is no section describing the satellite data and its availability, as required in the AMT author guidelines. Additionally it would be useful to indicate in section 2.3 what version of the MODIS cloud mask is used.

Response: We added the data availability section to the revised version. The question about the cloud mask version is answered below.

2. Overall, there are large multi-panel figures that would require a labelling of the panels to be better understood, please add these and adjust the text discussions accordingly. Note that this is a requirement in AMT guidelines to authors.

Response: We modified this in the revised version.

3. I. 15: “Climate change, which refers to long-term changes in temperature and weather patterns” - this statement is too limiting, please revise it.

Response: We removed this sentence in the revised version.

4. I. 23: Ice crystals are not directly formed from condensation nuclei, this is a bit misleading.

Response: We rephrased it to: “Aerosols affect Earth’s climate by scattering and absorbing radiation (aerosol-radiation interactions) and acting as condensation nuclei for cloud droplets and as ice nucleating particles to promote ice formation.”

5. I. 57: Surely there are other reasons for retrievals not to fit (other non-retrieved parameters from the forward models). Could you be a bit more specific on how this method attributes the misfit to the presence of a cloud?

Response: We added the phrase: “ ..., because the forward model of a clear-sky aerosol retrieval cannot fit the characteristic spectral and angular signals caused by scattering on cloud particles (e.g. the cloud bow in polarization), as demonstrated by Stap et al. (2014, 2016, 2016).

6. I. 78: “PARASOL contain unique sensitivity to clouds” - please be more specific.

Response: The sentence “... that the MAP measurements of PARASOL contain unique sensitivity to clouds” means that MAP measurements can capture some polarimetric and/or angular features of clouds (such as cloudbow). We revised the paper as indicated in the response to the previous comment.

7. Section 2.3: What version of the MODIS Cloud Mask have you used? In general, the paper lacks a clear description of the dataset that are used (including full name, DOI and access)

Response: The version of MODIS is MYD35_L2, collection 6.1 (DOI: 10.5067/MODIS/MYD35_L2.061, last access: 5 Sept 2022). We added this in the revised version.

8. I. 217: “The higher the effectiveness, the fewer aerosol retrievals are attempted on cloudy pixels”: please be more specific on what is meant here, is there more than one aerosol retrieval attempted on a cloudy pixel?

Response: After a cloud mask is applied, the aerosol retrievals will be applied on the clear-flagged pixels. When the “effectiveness” is higher, fewer actually cloudy pixels are wrongly flagged as clear, so there are fewer cases in which aerosol retrievals are applied on actually-cloudy pixels. We added this explanation to the revised version.

9. I. 255: What have you done to mitigate this effect? Be more specific.

Response: We applied different cloud fraction to each viewing angle during Independent Pixel Approximation in generating training set. The details can be found at Line 185 of the revised version.

10. Fig. 6: Very little can be seen on this figure in my opinion, I’d suggest removing it. The “NN seems more blue” (I. 284) is not quantitative enough for the standards here.

Response: Based on the reviewer’s suggestions, we remove the subfigures on 1 Jan 2008, but still keep the figures on 1 July 2008, because the figure 6 provides global comparison between NN / MODIS cloud fraction and the goodness-of-fit mask (where meaningful aerosol properties can be retrieved). The information conveyed in the figure is that goodness-of-fit mask is much stricter to clear than NN / MODIS cloud mask (for some other reasons as listed in line 307 of revised version), so for validation of aerosol property quality, goodness-of-fit mask shall always be applied regardless of whether or which cloud mask is applied before aerosol retrieval. The quantitative comparison of them is shown in figure 7.

We rephrase “NN seems more blue” as “NN predicts more pixels with cloud fraction less than 0.1 (plotted in blue)” in the revised version I 304.

11. Fig. 8: This figure contains a lot of information and it is not clear what the point beyond the fact that there are little differences (at least notable in this figure) between POLDER using

different masks and AERONET. Fig. 9 should be sufficient to make that point.

Response: Based on the reviewer's suggestions, we removed the plots from the article.

12. I. 320: "For both AOD and AE, applying a cloud mask (either MODIS or PARASOL-NN) can improve the percentage of retrievals within the requirements": it does not seem so clear from the figure, please be more quantitative in your analyses to justify this conclusion. There are some differences, but are they significant?

Response: Indeed the improvement is quite small, i.e. by about 2 percent-points as indicated by Fig. 10 a. Therefore we changed

"... applying a cloud mask (either MODIS or PARASOL-NN) can improve the percentage of retrievals within the requirements, ..."

to

"... applying a cloud mask (either MODIS or PARASOL-NN) can slightly improve the percentage of retrievals within the requirements, ..." (adding the word 'slightly', l 337 of the revised version)

13. I. 351: Could you add some information on what you expect improvements would be for the method as applied to 3MI and PACE? Increased precision?

Response: We included this sentence to make the reader aware of the wider applicability of the approach (beyond PARASOL), but not necessarily to highlight improved performance of these instruments. Analysis of the sensitivity of the approach to instrument characteristics is subject to future work. We added this statement to the revised manuscript. (l 380, revised version)