On the characteristics of ASCAT wind direction ambiguities

Wenming Lin, Marcos Portabella

Institut de Ciències del Mar (ICM-CSIC), Barcelona, Spain

Ad Stoffelen, Anton Verhoef

Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI),

De Bilt, The Netherlands

Institute of Marine Sciences

Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute
Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management

1. Motivation



- The inversion of ASCAT backscatter measurement triplets generally leads to two wind ambiguities with similar wind speed values and opposite wind directions.
- However, for up-, down- and cross-wind (with respect to the mid beam azimuth direction) cases, the inversion often leads to three or four wind solutions.
- Are these so-called "high-rank" solutions meaningful in terms of probability of being the true wind or rather artefacts of the inversion procedure?





Fig.1 Intersection of the cone with plane $z_{fore} + z_{aft} = 2z_{ref}$ for (*a*) WVC number 1 and (*b*) WVC number 41, for a value of corresponding approximately to a speed of 8 m/s.

2. Wind inversion-Review

- Generally, ASCAT wind inversion includes the following **two typical situations:**

✓ When the triplets lie close to the cone surface, the inversion typically leads to two wind solutions.

✓ When triplets lie far away from the cone surface, the inversion leads to typically three or four solutions

◆ **The third situation:** For a triplet close to the cone surface at an up-/down-wind location. There are two well-defined minima and two secondary minima.







3. Criterion for rejecting high-rank solutions









3. Criterion for rejecting high-rank solutions

- In summary, the high-rank solutions are rejected for wind retrievals with first-ranked wind speed > 4 m/s for all WVCs, according to the below criterion,

$$MLE_1 < 0 \; or \; MLE_2 < 0 \; or \; \left| MLE_3 / MLE_1 \right| > T$$

The threshold T is determined by assuming that the rank-1 MLE distributions of 2-sols cases and spurious high-rank solution cases are expected to be similar.



Fig.4 Probability Distribution Function of the first ranked MLE at WVC number 1, for two-solution (solid line) and rejected high-rank cases with different thresholds (see legend). The standard deviation between the PDF of the two-solution cases and that of the rejected high-rank cases is illustrated as a function of the threshold in the upper left corner of this figure.

4. Effectiveness analysis

- To verify the impact of the high-rank solution rejection procedure on ASCAT wind retrievals, the number of geometry-related high-rank solutions that would be selected by the 2D-Var AR module if they were not rejected is examined. This number divided by the total number of cases with rejected high-rank solutions is denoted by R_s.

Table 1. The percentage of triplets with rejected high-rank solutions that selected by the AR module. WVC number 1 corresponds to highest incidence angle (outer-most WVC), and WVC number 41 corresponds to lowest incidence angle (inner-most WVC)

Wind speed (m/s)		4<v≤6	6<v≤10	v>10
WVC number 1	Rain free	0.3	0.07	0.07
	Rainy	5.3	3.6	3.9
WVC number 41	Rain free	2.2	0.5	0
	Rainy	11.2	6.9	3.2



TMI RR(color patches) collocated with ECMWF winds(arrows)



ASCAT wind field observed on September 24, 2008 UTC 20:32. The wind speeds are indicated by color **patches.The red circles indicate WVCs which high-rank solutions were selected by 2DVAR, but should be rejected according to the criterion in AMT paper.**



(Left-panel) ECMWF wind field collocated with TMI-RR(Color patches); (Right-panel) ASCAT ambiguities. Color patches indicate the wind speed for each WVC. Yellow arrows indicate the high-rank spurious solutions selected by 2D-VAR. **Note that this case was in the left swath of ASCAT observation.**



Illustration of ASCAT ambiguities and MLE ratio.

4. Effectiveness analysis



Fig 5. The mean VRMS difference w.r.t. (a) ECMWF winds and (b) buoy winds as a function of WVC number, WVCs on both left and right swaths are numbered from 1 (outermost WVC) to 41 (innermost WVC). Marker 'I' denotes the uncertainty bar of the estimated mean VRMS for each WVC bin.

5. Conclusions

- It is found that the quality (using both ECMWF and buoy winds as reference) of the less ambiguous (with rejected high-rank solutions) WVCs is similar to that of the dual-ambiguity cases;
- whereas the quality of fully ambiguous (with kept 3rd and 4th ranks) WVCs is much lower, as expected (since they correspond to poor quality cases).
- However, for inner swath WVCs, where the wind direction skill is somewhat lower, the rejection procedure is less effective, suggesting that no rejections should be performed for such WVCs below 6 m/s.
- Rejected high ranks are more likely to be selected by the AR module (denoted as R_s cases) over rainy areas than over dry areas, which suggests a more negative effect of such cases in rainy conditions when not rejected. However, a significant amount of R_s cases show high-rank solutions to be (slightly) closer to buoy data than low-rank solutions. This shows a potential ASCAT rain-contamination effect on ASCAT WVCs.

Reference:

- Lin, W., Portabella, M., Stoffelen, A., and Verhoef, A.: On the characteristics of ASCAT wind direction ambiguities, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 6, 1053-1060, doi:10.5194/amt-6-1053-2013, 2013.

Thank you for your attention!