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Abstract

The impact of horizontal heterogeneities, liquid water path (LWP from AMSR-E), and cloud fraction (CF) on MODIS cloud effective radius ($r_e$), retrieved from the 2.1 µm ($r_{e2.1}$) and 3.8 µm ($r_{e3.8}$) channels, is investigated for warm clouds over the southeast Pacific. Values of $r_e$ retrieved using the CERES Edition 4 algorithms are averaged at the CERES footprint resolution ($\sim 20$ km), while heterogeneities ($H_o$) are calculated as the ratio between the standard deviation and mean 0.64 µm reflectance. The value of $r_{e2.1}$ strongly depends on CF, with magnitudes up to 5 µm larger than those for overcast scenes, whereas $r_{e3.8}$ remains insensitive to CF. For cloudy scenes, both $r_{e2.1}$ and $r_{e3.8}$ increase with $H_o$ for any given AMSR-E LWP, but $r_{e2.1}$ changes more than for $r_{e3.8}$. Additionally, $r_{e3.8} - r_{e2.1}$ differences are positive (<1 µm) for homogeneous scenes ($H_o < 0.2$) and LWP $> 50$ g m$^{-2}$, and negative (up to −4 µm) for larger $H_o$. Thus, $r_{e3.8} - r_{e2.1}$ differences are more likely to reflect biases associated with cloud heterogeneities rather than information about the cloud vertical structure. The consequences for MODIS LWP are also discussed.

1 Introduction

Cloud optical thickness ($\tau$) and effective radius ($r_e$) derived from visible and near-infrared satellite instruments have become the standard observational dataset in cloud-atmospheric research. The availability of these parameters at high temporal and spatial resolution over the globe over long time periods makes them particularly suitable for climate studies (e.g., Stubenrauch et al., 2013). Among several practical simplifications that make the inverse problem of determining $r_e$ and $\tau$ tractable, is the assumption that clouds are horizontally homogeneous (plane-parallel) objects. Nevertheless, the effect of neglecting the cloud 3-D structure and the associated radiative fields can be a significant source of retrievals error (Marshak et al., 2006). Given this uncertainty, there is...
an increasing interest in understanding how the 3-D radiative effects can obscure the physical insight gained from satellite observations.

Multi-spectral instruments such as the MODerate resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) offer practical ways to explore 3-D related artifacts in the retrievals. Since 3-D radiative effects are wavelength dependent, the use of three MODIS $r_e$ retrievals from the 1.6, 2.1, and 3.8 µm channels, provides a simple framework to explore biases in the observations (e.g., Zhang and Platnick, 2011). Although in principle $r_e$ retrieved at 3.8 µm is less sensitive to plane-parallel biases and 3-D radiative effects, determining the effects of cloud heterogeneities with the use of multispectral $r_e$ retrievals is difficult as the different photon penetration of the three MODIS channels in theory should also capture physical information of the cloud vertical structure (Platnick, 2000). This implies that the 3.8 µm-based $r_e$ is more influenced by properties closer to the cloud top than the 2.1 and 1.6 µm counterparts.

In this contribution, we explore the ways that cloud properties retrieved from Aqua MODIS radiances vary for different cloud dynamical configurations and spatial heterogeneities at spatial resolutions typical of synoptic/climate studies. The goal here is to determine the bias magnitude in $r_e$ due to heterogeneities as well as understanding the physical information that can be obtained from $r_e$ differences calculated at two wavelengths (3.8 and 2.1 µm).

2 Dataset

Here we use values of $\tau$ and $r_e$ retrieved from Aqua MODIS data using algorithms that will be used generate the Clouds and Earth’s Radiant Energy System (CERES) Edition-4 products and averaged in the same manner as the CERES Single Scanner Footprint (SSF) product (CERES, 2012) to create a pseudo-SSF, hereafter, PSSF. The Edition-4 algorithm changes relative to the CERES Edition-2 techniques (Minnis et al., 2011a) are mostly summarized by Minnis et al. (2010). The cloud parameters are derived from 1 km MODIS radiances sampled every other scan line and fourth
element, and convolved with the CERES instrument point spread function to produce averages and standard deviations that match the CERES instrument footprint (\sim 20 \text{ km at nadir}). The PSSF used here includes several hundred parameters including averages and standard deviations of the MODIS radiances, \( \tau \) retrieved at 0.64 \text{ \mu m}, and three \( r_e \) values retrieved from the 1.2, 2.1, and 3.8 \text{ \mu m} MODIS channels. The multispectral retrievals for \( r_e \) use the same method as that described by Minnis et al. (2011) to obtain \( r_e \) at 3.8 \text{ \mu m}, \( r_{e3.8} \), except that the 1.2 and 2.1 \text{ \mu m} reflectances substitute for the 3.8 \text{ \mu m} brightness temperatures in the iterative solution to yield \( r_{e1.2} \) and \( r_{e2.1} \), respectively. In this investigation we only use the 3.8 and 2.1 \text{ \mu m}-based \( r_e \), because they have proven to yield contrasting sensitivities to both the cloud vertical and horizontal structure (Platnick, 2000; Zhang and Platnick, 2011). The 1.2 \text{ \mu m}-based \( r_e \) retrieval is still experimental and will require further evaluation before being used for scientific analyses. Cloud fraction (CF) is also convolved from the clear and cloudy MODIS pixels within each CERES footprint. Although the CERES cloud algorithm differs from that of the MODIS Atmospheres team (Platnick et al., 2005), both results agree well for \( r_{e3.8} \), with some small differences mainly explained by the tendency of the MODIS team Collection 5 retrievals to discard pixels with very thin clouds or near the cloud edges in broken scenes (Minnis et al., 2011b). Figure 1a shows the mean CERES \( r_{e3.8} \) (colors) and \( \Delta r_e = r_{e3.8} - r_{e2.1} \) (contours) during the period of study. The \( r_{e3.8} \) values agree with MODIS team counterpart in Zhang and Platnick (2011) and Nakajima et al. (2010), in terms of magnitude and westward gradient. Moreover, as in the MODIS team retrievals, \( r_{e2.1} \) is generally larger than \( r_{e3.8} \), with a westward increase of \( |\Delta r_e| \) (Fig. 1a, contours), consistent with larger liquid water paths as well (O’Dell et al., 2008). These features are also common to other marine stratocumulus regimes (Zhang and Platnick, 2010).

We computed a heterogeneity index \( H_\sigma \), defined as the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean MODIS 0.64 \text{ \mu m} reflectance at the PSSF resolution (\sim 20 \text{ km at nadir}). We note that \( H_\sigma \) defined here differs from that in Zhang and Platnick (2011), which is calculated at a 1 km resolution from the 0.86 \text{ \mu m} MODIS reflectances. While 1 km \( H_\sigma \) is more adequate for studying 3-D radiative effects, the use of a coarser \( H_\sigma \) is relevant for
determining how spatial heterogeneities might bias the retrievals at typical resolutions used in regional/climate studies.

Finally, as explained in Painemal et al. (2012), in order to create regular-grid maps, we spatially average the PSSF variables to a resolution of 0.5 (each new grid contains at least one PSSF near the scan edge).

Independent liquid water path LWP retrievals are from the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer-EOS, AMSR-E (Wentz and Meissner, 2000), and spatially averaged to a 0.5° spatial resolution from the 0.25° native resolution. In order to minimize precipitation biases in AMSR-E LWP, we limited our analysis to clouds with LWP < 150 g m⁻². While this threshold screens cases with moderate and heavy precipitation, it still allows cloud sampling with light precipitation (e.g., Leon et al., 2009).

As in Zhang and Platnick (2011), our focus is on the marine stratocumulus regime of the Southeast Pacific, defined here as encompassing the oceanic area within the bounds, 100–70° W, 33–5° S. We analyze 15 months of daily satellite passes during the August–December period, when the cloud deck is at its maximum spatial development, from 2002 to 2004. The solar zenith angles between 20° and 35° allow us to isolate the effect of cloud heterogeneities from the solar zenith angle influence in the retrievals, especially for very oblique angles (Kato and Marshak, 2009).

3 Cloud fraction and heterogeneity

Mean $H_\sigma$ shows typical values between 0.1 and 0.4, with increasing heterogeneities westward (Fig. 1b). As expected, $H_\sigma$ and CF spatially co-vary, with a decrease in cloud fraction generally concomitant with larger $H_\sigma$. The spatial similarities between $r_e$, $\Delta r_e$, $H_\sigma$, and CF motivate a more detailed inspection of the factors that control $\Delta r_e$.

The histogram in Fig. 2a shows that the scene heterogeneity tends to increase with CF until CF reaches 60%. For higher CFs, $H_\sigma$ is anti-correlated with CF, whereas for nearly overcast scenes, the liquid water path modulates $H_\sigma$, as shown in the following sections. Figure 2b and c depicts the binned values of $r_{e3.8}$ and $r_{e2.1}$ as functions of
4 Heterogeneity and AMSR-E liquid water path in cloudy scenes

For cloudy scenes, when CF > 98 %, an LWP-dependent analysis is essential because one should expect a relationship between LWP, $H_\sigma$, and the cloud vertical structure. The latter is associated with the fact that a greater LWP yields more vigorous up and down drafts, active collision-coalescence, and, therefore, a larger $r_e$ and potential drizzle (e.g., Leon et al., 2008). To tackle the problem of untangling the heterogeneity bias from the physical information, we use AMSR-E LWP, a retrieval that is insensitive to 3-D radiative transfer effects. Similar to the approach in Sect. 3, we binned the MODIS retrievals as functions of both $H_\sigma$ and AMSR-E LWP. Figure 3a shows the dual dependence of $r_{e3.8}$ on $H_\sigma$ and LWP. Irrespective of $H_\sigma$, $r_{e3.8}$ increases with LWP, which is consistent with more active collision and coalescence when water content increases. In addition, $r_{e3.8}$ increases with $H_\sigma$ are also apparent, in agreement with other studies (Zhang and Platnick, 2011; Zhang et al., 2012). The magnitude of the change in $r_{e3.8}$ with $H_\sigma$ is confined to 3–4 µm for any given LWP bin.

Differences between $r_{e3.8}$ and $r_{e2.1}$ are depicted in Fig. 3b. The largest differences, near 4 µm, are observed for the most heterogeneous cases, irrespective of
LWP. For $H_\sigma = 0.1$, $\Delta r_e$ is small, with positive values for LWP $>$ 50 gm$^{-2}$ ($\sim$ 0.8 µm for LWP $=$ 125 gm$^{-2}$). Larger values of $r_{e3.8}$ relative to those for $r_{e2.1}$ are consistent with aircraft observations over this region, which show that $r_e$ monotonically increases with height until reaching its maximum at the cloud top (Painemal and Zuidema, 2011).

Finally, Fig. 3c shows the expected decrease of $\tau$ with increasing $H_\sigma$, as well as the optical thickening with increasing LWP.

5 Revisiting the impact of $H_\sigma$ on MODIS liquid water path

Because the product of $r_e$ and $\tau$ can be used to estimate LWP, we center our focus on LWP. Here, we express the MODIS LWP by assuming a cloud having a vertical increase of water content and $r_e$ with height:

$$\text{MODIS LWP} = \frac{5}{9} \rho_w \cdot r_e \cdot \tau,$$

where $\rho_w$ denotes the density of the liquid water. LWP in Eq. (1) is $5/6$ the magnitude of that calculated for a vertically homogeneous cloud and it is adopted here because it yields better agreement with microwave estimates (Seethala and Horvath, 2010).

Figure 4 shows the binned MODIS LWP, $LWP_{3.8}$, and $LWP_{2.1}$, using $r_{e3.8}$ and $r_{e2.1}$, respectively, as a function of AMSR-E LWP only. In addition, the binned $H_\sigma$ is also reported (blue line, and right axis). The MODIS-AMSR-E mean bias and root mean square pairs are, respectively, 4.8 and 18.3 gm$^{-2}$ for $LWP_{3.8}$, and 7.3 and 17.6 gm$^{-2}$ for $LWP_{2.1}$. Because $r_{e3.8}$ is, on average, smaller than $r_{e2.1}$, $LWP_{3.8}$ yields a slightly smaller mean bias, particularly for LWP $<$ 110 gm$^{-2}$. In contrast, MODIS biases become negative for AMSR-E LWP $>$ 110 gm$^{-2}$. A similar finding was observed by Painemal et al. (2012) between the Tenth Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite (GOES-10) and the TRMM Microwave Imager (TMI) LWP values. The bias sign shift is also in qualitative agreement with the annual maps of Seethala and Horvath (2010).
over maritime stratocumulus regimes. They found that the MODIS LWP exceeded its AMSR-E counterpart near the coast, whereas the opposite was observed 15° offshore. This westward change also co-occurs with a westward increase of the mean LWP. The causes of a LWP dependence on MODIS-AMSR-E bias seems to be related to the increasing cloud heterogeneities with increasing LWP, as depicted in Fig. 4 (blue line). Smaller values of MODIS LWP compared to their AMSR-E counterparts for high $H_\sigma$ implies that increases in $r_e$ cannot completely offset the decrease in $\tau$ for heterogeneous clouds. We explore this idea in more detail by taking averages of all LWP bins as a function of $H_\sigma$ bins. The results in Fig. 5a reveal the close match between $r_{e2.1}$ and $r_{e3.8}$ for homogeneous cases and the greater increase of $r_{e2.1}$ with $H_\sigma$ (black and red lines). In terms of LWP (Fig. 5b), decreases in MODIS LWP with $H_\sigma$ are more dramatic for LWP$_{3.8}$. Here, the AMSR-E LWP is constant at 80 g m$^{-2}$ by design.

We quantify the influence of $H_\sigma$ by analyzing fractional changes of MODIS LWP relative to fractional changes in $H_\sigma$, $\frac{\partial \ln(LWP_\kappa)}{\partial \ln(H_\sigma)}$, with $\kappa = 3.8, 2.1$. It follows from Eq. (1) that:

$$\frac{\partial \ln(LWP_\kappa)}{\partial \ln(H_\sigma)} = \frac{\partial \ln(r_e_\kappa)}{\partial \ln(H_\sigma)} + \frac{\partial \ln(\tau)}{\partial \ln(H_\sigma)}$$

(2)

where $m_{LWP_\kappa}$, $m_{r_\kappa}$, and $m_\tau$ in Eq. (2), are calculated as the slopes of the natural logarithm of the curves in Fig. 5a and b (Table 1). As a consistency check, we compared the calculated left and right hand sides in Eq. (2) and found that the combined $r_e$ and $\tau$ slopes depart by less than 24% from those for LWP. In terms of the $r_e$ slopes, $m_{r_{3.8}}$ is smaller than $m_{r_{2.1}}$ (0.34) by 50%. The dominant dependence of LWP on $\tau$ and the negative sign of the $\ln(\tau) - \ln(H_\sigma)$ slope ($m_\tau = -0.44$) explains why the MODIS LWP decreases with $H_\sigma$, and the LWP bias decreases and changes sign with AMSR-E LWP (Figs. 5b and 4, respectively). The values in Table 1 also help explain why changes in LWP$_{2.1}$ with $H_\sigma$ are smaller than those for LWP$_{3.8}$. 

12732
6 Conclusions

Motivated by studies that support both the physical and the 3-D-radiative interpretation of the $r_e$ differences at the 3.8 and 2.1 µm MODIS channels, we endeavored to understand the contribution of LWP and $H_\sigma$ to the $\Delta r_e$ variability. Homogeneous clouds have larger values of $r_{e3.8}$ relative to $r_{e2.1}$, indicating a physical increase of $r_e$ toward the cloud top and a negligible effect of precipitation in the retrievals, contrary to the findings in Nakajima et al. (2010). Our results are consistent with aircraft observations of cloud microphysics over the region of study, which show an adiabatic-like cloud behavior (Painemal and Zuidema, 2011). The current study also shows that the use of $\Delta r_e$ for microphysical studies without knowledge of $H_\sigma$ will lead to spurious results. Because $H_\sigma$ typically increases with LWP, cumulus-like clouds will continue to pose a formidable challenge for passive remote sensing. Overall, we conclude that $\Delta r_e$ is more suitable as a metric to investigate cloud heterogeneities rather than the cloud physical structure in marine stratocumulus clouds.

A result of interest for cloud-aerosol interaction studies is the lack of sensitivity of $r_{e3.8}$ to CF. Although a weaker dependence of $r_{e3.8}$ on CF is expected from the reduced photon vertical penetration at 3.8 µm and from the smaller sensitivity to sub-pixel variability (plane-parallel bias) than retrievals at 2.1 µm, the negligible dependence of $r_{e3.8}$ on CF is rather unexpected. We hypothesize that this is related to the fact that our observations are $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ averages, which allow further error cancellation (e.g., Marshak et al., 2006). We recommend caution when using $r_{e2.1}$ combined with nearly collocated aerosol optical thickness, especially if broken clouds dominate the $r_e$ retrieval scenes. A similar problem might arise if variability in $r_{e2.1}$ is analyzed as a function of meteorological factors, since they are likely to be correlated with cloud cover variability (e.g., Lebsock et al., 2008).

The problem of determining errors in MODIS-based LWP is difficult because of the dissimilar responses of $r_e$ and $\tau$ to changes in cloud heterogeneities. Our results also provide interpretation of the AMSR-MODIS LWP bias correlation with $\Delta r_e$ reported by
Seethala and Horvath (2010). The smaller values of MODIS LWP relative to the AMSR-E values, when \( r_{e2.1} \) greatly exceeds \( r_{e3.8} \), are associated with the rapid decrease of \( \tau \) with \( H_\sigma \) as the AMSR-E LWP increases. It is still puzzling why the MODIS LWP is slightly larger than AMSR-E LWP for highly homogeneous cases. A plausible cause might be linked to the thermal emission underestimation within the AMSR-E LWP algorithm (Seethala and Horvath, 2010), although unexplained overestimates of MODIS \( r_e \) relative to in-situ observations (Painemal and Zuidema, 2011) might also contribute to overestimates of MODIS LWP relative to AMSR-E LWP.

Concerning plausible ways to ameliorate the MODIS bias, regressions between MODIS LWP and \( H_\sigma \) for different LWP bins might be used to remove the \( H_\sigma \) dependence in operational retrievals. Nevertheless, other considerations such as solar zenith angle dependence, cloud cover variability or potential biases in the microwave dataset have to be carefully considered before attempting a LWP correction for operational purposes.
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**Table 1.** MODIS fractional changes relative to fractional changes in $H_\sigma$, Eq. (2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m_{LWP}$</th>
<th>$m_{\kappa} + m_\tau$</th>
<th>$m_{r\kappa}$</th>
<th>$m_\tau$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa = 3.8$</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa = 2.1$</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Average fields during the period of study: (a) $r_{e3.8}$ (color) and $\Delta r_e = r_{e3.8} - r_{e2.1}$ (contours), (b) $H_\sigma$ (colors) and cloud fractions (contours). The continent is represented by the white region.
Fig. 2. (a) Number of samples contained in each \( H_\sigma \)-CF bin (logarithmic scale). (b) Mean \( r_{e3.8} \) for each \( H_\sigma \)-CF bin, (c) same as Fig. 1b but for \( r_{e2.1} \). The bin sizes are 3% and 0.016 for CF and \( H_\sigma \), respectively.
Fig. 3. Binned values for cloudy scenes (CF > 98%) as a function of $H_\sigma$ and AMSR-E LWP: (a) $r_{e3.8}$, (b) $\Delta r_e = r_{e3.8} - r_{e2.1}$, with zero values denoted by the black contour, and (c) $\tau$. The bin sizes are 0.016 and 7.5 gm$^{-2}$ for CF and $H_\sigma$, respectively. Bins constructed with less than 30 samples were excluded.
Fig. 4. MODIS LWP (red and black lines) and $H_0$ (blue line) binned as a function of AMSR-E LWP only (left and right axis, respectively). Red and black lines correspond to the binned MODIS LWP$_{3.8}$ and LWP$_{2.1}$, respectively, whereas the error bars denote the standard deviation. The dashed gray line is the 1:1 relationship.
**Fig. 5.** (a) $r_{e3.8}$, $r_{e2.1}$, and $\tau$ binned by AMSR-E LWP and $H_\sigma$, and subsequently averaged for all LWP bins (red, black, and blue lines, respectively). (b) As in Fig. 5a, but for LWP (AMSR-E LWP is constant at 80 gm$^{-2}$ by design).