







An algorithm of scattering cloud retrieval based on Neural Network for TROPOMI using Oxygen absorption band

Xiaoyun Zhang, Ping Wang, Tao Xie, Piet Stammes, Gijsbert Tilstra, Olaf Tuinder, Maarten Sneep, Feng Lu

> ping.wang@knmi.nl xiaoyun.zhang@knmi.nl

> > July 4, 2024

Outline

- Motivation
 - FRESCO+ - FRESCO-S - FRESCO-N
- Introduction
 - DISAMAR & FRESCO-N model
- ✤ Algorithm - FRESCO-N
 - Forward model - NN Sequential model
 - DISAMAR & Training datasets
 - Retrieval model - Optimal Estimation
 - TROPOMI datasets & case scenario data
- Results
 - Predicted High resolution spectra
 - Retrieval
 - Compare with Fresco, DISAMAR, Suomi NPP Cloud Products
- Summary

Motivation

FRESCO+ - - FRESCO-S - - FRESCO-N Fast Retrieval Scheme for Clouds from the Oxygen A-band

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-6565-2008 © Author(s) 2008. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License.

Article	Peer review	Metrics	Related articles
---------	-------------	---------	------------------

 \odot

14 Nov 2008

FRESCO+: an improved O₂ A-band cloud retrieval algorithm for tropospheric trace gas retrievals

P. Wang, P. Stammes, R. van der A, G. Pinardi, and M. van Roozendael

Abstract. The FRESCO (Fast Retrieval Scheme for Clouds from the Oxygen A-band) algorithm has been used to retrieve cloud information from measurements of the O₂ A-band around 760 nm by GOME, SCIAMACHY and GOME-2. The cloud parameters retrieved by FRESCO are the effective cloud fraction and cloud pressure, which are used for cloud correction in the retrieval of trace gases like O₃ and NO₂. To improve the cloud pressure retrieval for partly cloudy scenes, single Rayleigh scattering has been included in an improved version of the algorithm, called FRESCO+. We compared FRESCO+ and FRESCO effective cloud fractions and cloud pressures using simulated spectra and one month of GOME measured spectra. As expected, FRESCO+ gives more reliable cloud pressures over partly cloudy pixels. Simulations and comparisons with ground-based radar/lidar measurements of clouds show that the FRESCO+ cloud pressure is about the optical midlevel of the cloud. Globally averaged, the FRESCO+ cloud pressure is about 50 hPa higher than the FRESCO cloud pressure, while the FRESCO+ effective cloud fraction is about 0.01 larger.

The effect of FRESCO+ cloud parameters on O_3 and NO_2 vertical column density (VCD) retrievals is studied using SCIAMACHY data and ground-based DOAS measurements. We find that the FRESCO+ algorithm has a significant effect on tropospheric NO_2 retrievals but a minor effect on total O_3 retrievals. The retrieved SCIAMACHY tropospheric NO_2 VCDs using FRESCO+ cloud parameters (v1.1) are lower than the tropospheric NO_2 VCDs which used FRESCO cloud parameters (v1.04), in particular over heavily polluted areas with low clouds. The difference between SCIAMACHY tropospheric NO_2 VCDs v1.1 and ground-based MAXDOAS measurements performed in Cabauw, The Netherlands, during the DANDELIONS campaign is about -2.12×10^{14} molec cm⁻².

Wang, P., Stammes, P., van der A, R., Pinardi, G., and van Roozendael, M.: FRESCO+: an improved O_2 A-band cloud retrieval algorithm for tropospheric trace gas retrievals, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 8, 6565–6576, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-6565-2008, 2008. Fresco+

- Cloud Effective Fraction
- Cloud Pressure
- Lambertian Clouds(albedo 0.8) & Single Rayleigh Scattering
- Fit limit wavelengths around 760nm 758-759, 760-761, 765-766nm

 $R_{\rm sim} = (1-c)T_s A_s + (1-c)R_s + cT_c A_c + cR_c.$

Fresco-N

- Cloud Fraction
- Cloud Pressure
- Cloud Optical Thickness
- Scattering Clouds(HG-Phase Function)
- High resolution spectra from TROPOMI O₂-A: 757-770nm & O₂-B: 685-691nm
- A NN-model & OE

Introduction



 (a)
 Top of atmosphere
 (b)
 Top of atmosphere

 P=0.1 hPa
 Interval 3
 Interval 3
 Interval 3

 P=600 hPa
 Interval 2, Fit interval
 Interval 4
 Interval 4

 P=700 hPa
 Interval 1
 Interval 1
 Interval 5

 Ferror Brain
 Ground surface
 Ground surface
 Ground surface

In DISAMAR the atmosphere is vertically divided into pressure intervals. Each interval is divided into a number of homogeneous layers



DISAMAR Retrieval Model

- Optimal Estimation (OE)
- Differential Optical Absorption Spectroscopy (DOAS)
- Differential and Smooth Absorption Separated (DISMAS) methods

Introduction

➢ FRESCO-N



FRESCO-N flow chart

Meteorological Datasets

- Surface pressure
- Temperature profile
 - - From ERA5 hourly datasets
- TROPOMI ground pixel & scanline
- O₂-A band Radiance
- Irradiance
- ISRF
- SZA SAA VAA VZA

State vector (fit parameters)

- Cloud optical thickness (COT)
- Cloud pressure (CLP)
- Cloud fraction (CLF)

Spectra predicted by NN models (Cloud Free & Fully cloudy)

- Reflectance
- Derivatives of Reflectance with respect to state vectors

- Forward Model training dataset collection
- Fit Window
 - O_2 -A : from 757.0nm to 770.0nm
- Cross Section Database
 - o HITRAN2020
- Henyey-Greenstein phase function
 - Asymmetric factor (g): 0.85
 - o Gaussian points: 10



Training Datasets preparation - - Scenario data for spectra simulation



400, 000 cases in total Land surface cases: about 70% Water surface cases: about 30% Meteorological data read from ERA5

Geometrics of TROPOMI: Selected randomly from one TROPOMI Orbit

State Vector (Fit parameters) Cloud Fraction (CLF) Cloud Optical Thickness (COT) Cloud Pressure (middle) (CLP) Cloud Pressure Thickness (intervalDP)

O₂-A 757-770nm HIT2020



derivatives of reflectance with respect to state vectors

Forward Model - - NN Sequential model



Layers: [256,256,256] epoch:300, batch size:600



Test FRESCO-N model -- Fully cloud

Cases distribution:

- Skip cloud edge
- SZA<75
- Fully cloudy
- Thick clouds
- 40 cases



Input case data for DISAMAR:

- Surface albedo (DLER)
- Surface Pressure (ERA5)
- Temperature profile (ERA5)
- Geometrics from TROPOMI:
 - SZA

0.8

- 0.2

- SAA
- VZA
- VAA
- **TROPOMI** Radiance & Irradiance
- Cloud Fraction(NPPC) Slit Function (calculated per ground pixel) (ISRF)
 - Interval top & base pressure
 - (pressure thickness of fit interval)
 - 100hPa
 - A-priori value and variance of COT
 - 30/5 •

> DISAMAR Retrievals compared to Fresco & NPPC products



g=0.85 & 20 Gaussian points

FRESCP-N Retrievals compared to DISAMAR & Fresco & NPPC products



FRESCP-N Retrievals compared to DISAMAR & Fresco & NPPC products



State Vector (fit parameters)

Summary

- Generally, replacing the line-by-line radiative transfer model (DISAMAR) with a neural network (NN) model can significantly reduce the time consumption. The runtime for one case decreases from over 3 hours to just several seconds.
- Although the spectra predicted by the NN model show a high correlation with the DISAMAR simulation, the loss fluctuates during the training process. There is still a lot of work to be done to train a more reliable NN model.
- The target features (spectra) of the training datasets were calculated with an asymmetric factor of 0.85 and 10 Gaussian points. Although this approach is much faster than using 20 Gaussian points, the convergence in FRESCO-N becomes worse. This is similar to what we did in the DISAMAR retrieval.
- The retrievals of COT show a correlation coefficient of 0.98 with the NPP-COT data, while CLP shows a correlation coefficient of 0.98 with the values retrieved by FRESCO and DISAMAR.

Thanks for your attention !