



Using Wind Spectra to Assess Scatterometer Resolution

E. Rodríguez Jet Propulsion Laboratory California Institute of Technology







- Freilich and Chelton (1986) took a first look at the spectral behavior of Winds
- Subsequently, many investigators have looked at the spectra (Patoux & Brown, Milliff & Morzel, Chelton & Freilich)
- What is slightly new is the use of the spectra to determine resolution for Qscat/Ascat
 - Although Dudley Chelton is always advocating this definition of resolution
 - Resolution is signal dependent
- Have had some discussions recently with Ad Stoffelen and Marcos Portabella about the approach
 - Correlation based estimation vs direct spectral estimation





- **Spectral Estimation Method**
- Spectral method:
 - Extract data record for selected area
 - Remove mean and linear trend
 - Weight
 - IFFTI²
 - Ensemble average
- Correlation method
 - Extract data record for selected area
 - Compute correlation function for ensemble
 - Weight
 - FFT
- The two methods should be identical for infinite record (or periodic) signals
 - They need not agree when signal lengths are truncated before the correlation has vanished

















Tropical Spectra Example Region III





V lat: [5N,25N], lon: [140E,250E]



Tropical Spectra Example Region III





White noise dominated spectrum



Tropical Spectra Example Region III





V lat: [5N,25N], lon: [140E,250E]





Hamming Weight Spectrum





Mid-Latitude Spectra Region 1





V lat: [25S,45S], lon: [160E,280E]

Removing White Noise Contribution





• Assume spectrum can be modeled as

$$S(k) = ak^{-b} + n$$

- Perform nonlinear fit for spectral parameters, fitting in the high frequency region
- Subtract estimated n from measured spectrum to get an estimate of the signal spectrum
- Due to ASCAT low-pass roll-off, the process is suboptimal for ASCAT: noise is underestimated
- The QuikSCAT fits are excellent



Corrected Tropical Spectra Region III





V lat: [5N,25N], lon: [140E,250E]



Corrected Mid-Latitude Spectra JPL



V lat: [25S,45S], lon: [160E,280E]





Backups





Region I Spectra





U Spectral slope

U Spectral slope

-4

 $^{-5}_{10^{1}}$

-4

-5 L 10¹

Region I Spectral Slopes

A . /

 10^{3}

 10^{3}



U lat: [25S,45S], lon: [160E,280E]

-5 L 10¹

n

-5 L 10¹

 10^{3}

 10^{3}

▲ASCAT 12.5 km grid

 10^{2}

 10^{2}

Wavelength (km)

▲ QSCAT 12.5 km grid

• ASCAT 25.0 km grid

 10^{2}

 10^{2}

Wavelength (km)

• QSCAT 25.0 km grid



V lat: [25S,45S], lon: [160E,280E]



Region II Spectra









Region II Spectral Slopes



U lat: [5S,25S], lon: [160E,280E]



V lat: [5S,25S], lon: [160E,280E]





Region III Spectra







Region III Spectral Slopes



U lat: [5N,25N], lon: [140E,250E]



V lat: [5N,25N], lon: [140E,250E]





Region IV Spectra







Region IV Spectral Slopes



U lat: [25N,45N], lon: [150E,230E]



V lat: [25N,45N], lon: [150E,230E]







Estimated Spectral Slopes

	Qscat U slope	std	Qscat V slope	std	Ascat U slope	std	Ascat V slope	std
25 km								
Region 1	-1.90	0.10	-1.89	0.10	-2.32	0.06	-2.28	0.06
Region 2	-1.60	0.11	-1.43	0.11	-1.82	0.09	-1.92	0.09
Region 3	-1.50	0.12	-1.45	0.12	-2.28	0.16	-2.43	0.16
Region 4	-1.82	0.08	-1.98	0.08	-2.44	0.08	-2.41	0.08
12.5km								
Region 1	-1.76	0.11	-1.73	0.11	-1.99	0.05	-1.70	0.05
Region 2	-1.29	0.10	-1.37	0.10	-1.50	0.05	-1.38	0.05
Region 3	-1.10	0.12	-1.36	0.12	-1.58	0.05	-1.51	0.05
Region 4	-1.78	0.08	-1.87	0.08	-2.02	0.05	-1.85	0.05

 Spectral noise and signal estimates are consistent with co-located crosscorrelation data: ASCAT has lower white noise at high frequencies due to low-pass

- ASCAT spectral slopes exhibit distortions of to scales ~200km
- ASCAT underestimates slopes relative to QuikSCAT

• 12.5 km slopes are consistently higher than 25 km slopes: is the noise not white?