



## Abstract

As an update to our previous use of the Collection 4 Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) over-water aerosol optical depth (AOD, symbol as  $\tau$  data, we examined ten years of Terra and eight years of Aqua data Collection 5 data for its potential usage in aerosol data assimilation. Uncertainties in the over-water MODIS AOD were studied as functions of observing conditions, such as surface characteristics, aerosol optical properties, and cloud artifacts. Empirical corrections and quality assurance procedures were developed and compared to Collection 4 data. After applying quality assurance and empirical correction procedures, the Root-Mean-Square Error (RMSE) in the MODIS Terra and Aqua AOD are reduced by 30% and 10–20%, respectively. Ten years of Terra and eight years of Aqua quality-assured level 3 MODIS over-water aerosol products were produced. The newly developed MODIS over-water aerosol products will be used in operational aerosol data assimilation and aerosol climatology studies, and will also be useful to other researchers who are using the MODIS satellite products in their projects.

## 1 Introduction

Recent studies have shown that the assimilation of satellite aerosol products, such as the near real time Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) aerosol optical depth product, can improve aerosol analyses and forecasts (e.g. Zhang et al., 2008). However, biases and uncertainties exist in satellite aerosol data due to the complications inherent to retrieval processes and varying observational conditions (e.g. Zhang and Reid, 2006; Liu and Mishchenko, 2008; Kahn et al., 2009). The impact of product uncertainty is application specific. In the area of data assimilation for aerosol forecasting, the tightest tolerances are required, because any noise or systematic high bias in the product will propagate through the forecasting cycle.

ACPD

10, 20239–20265, 2010

## Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**Collection 5 MODIS  
over-ocean aerosol  
optical depth product**

Y. Shi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Products from the MODIS sensors can provide high spatial and spectral resolution aerosol data with observations twice a day that cover most of the planet. Retrievals are possible over global oceans and most vegetated regions. MODIS data is also easily accessible in near real time. These advantages make MODIS one of the most popular satellite aerosol products in current aerosol research for numerous applications. To employ MODIS data in an aerosol forecasting system, Zhang and Reid (2006) created a series of procedures to remove outliers and reduce bias in MODIS Collection 4 (C4), level 2, over water, aerosol products. The data performances for the year 2005 were examined as the functions of main sources of uncertainties, such as boundary conditions, cloud contaminations, and aerosol microphysics. Empirical studies and quality control procedures were applied to create quality assured MODIS level 3 aerosol products. The newly generated MODIS aerosol products from Zhang and Reid (2006) are specifically made for aerosol data assimilation and forecasting where they have been successfully used (e.g. Zhang et al., 2008). MODIS AOD data assimilation is now operationally used at the Fleet Numerical Meteorology and Oceanography Center (FN-MOC) to aid Navy Aerosol Analysis and Prediction System (NAAPS) forecasts.

However, after Zhang and Reid's study, the MODIS Collection 5 (C5), level 2, aerosol products have been distributed since 2007. Developers suggested very minor differences between C4 and C5 data over oceans (personal communication Robert Levy and Lorraine Remer, NASA Goddard SFC). However, before C5 data could be incorporated into the operational data stream, it was necessary to verify the data for the specific purpose of data assimilation (Kahn et al., 2009) and re-evaluate the procedures developed for C4 for their potential to improve the MODIS C5 aerosol products. Instead of using only one year of data, this paper applies Zhang and Reid's methods to the C5 over-ocean aerosol data, using ten years of Terra data and eight years of Aqua data to analyze the temporal performance differences between C4 and C5 MODIS products. After applying the empirical corrections and quality assurance procedures, the more robust new aerosol products were generated for the MODIS data for all the available time periods.

## 2 Data

The ground-based aerosol observations from the AERosol RObotic NETwork (AERONET) were used to validate MODIS satellite data. AERONET is a global network of Sun photometers that provides ground-based aerosol optical depth measurements and optical property retrievals (Holben et al., 1998). All available level 2.0 AOD data (cloud screened and quality assured), which has a reported uncertainty on the order of 0.015 (e.g. Holben et al., 1998) were used. In order to evaluate satellite aerosol products, both MODIS Terra and Aqua satellite aerosol products were collocated with the ground-based AERONET data. To minimize the spatial and temporal difference between these data, pairs of AERONET Sun photometer data and MODIS aerosol retrievals were matched where the spatial distance between two observations are within  $0.3^\circ$  (latitude/longitude) and the difference in observation times are within  $\pm 30$  min. AERONET data were averaged temporally within the one-hour collocation time window. However, the satellite observations are not averaged spatially. Many previous studies used averaged satellite data and Sun photometer data to blur the spatial and temporal differences between the two data sets (Remer et al., 2005; Kahn et al., 2009; Hsu et al., 2006). This approach is understandable considering the spatial and temporal differences between the observations. AERONET provides point observations at a given time, whereas a satellite retrieval is a two dimensional spatial observation at a given time. Because of the different sampling methods, differences between the two types of observations can exist. However, in this study, in order to investigate the uncertainties in the satellite retrievals due to observing conditions at a pixel level, satellite data were not averaged.

Both AERONET and MODIS aerosol data at the  $0.55 \mu\text{m}$  spectral wavelength were used in this study, and discussions mentioned hereafter refer to the aerosol data at the  $0.55 \mu\text{m}$ , or unless specifically mentioned otherwise. Note that the AERONET data do not include observations at the  $0.55 \mu\text{m}$  spectral channel, and therefore, the AERONET observations from  $0.50$  and  $0.67 \mu\text{m}$  were used to estimate aerosol optical depth values at the  $0.55 \mu\text{m}$  based on the method by O'Neill et al. (2001).

### Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**Collection 5 MODIS  
over-ocean aerosol  
optical depth product**

Y. Shi et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

As satellite over-ocean retrievals were used, only AERONET data from coastal or island sites were selected. Three collocated data sets are included in this study. (1) Terra MODIS C5 aerosol products and AERONET level 2.0 data from 2000 to 2008; (2) Aqua MODIS C5 aerosol products and the AERONET level 2.0 data from 2002 to 2008; and (3) MODIS Terra and Aqua C5 aerosol products and AERONET level 1.5 data for 2009 for independent validation efforts. The level 1.5 AERONET data were used for 2009 because the complete set of the quality assured level 2.0 AERONET data are not readily available yet. All three data sets were also collocated with the near surface wind speed data from the Navy Operational Global Analysis and Prediction System (NOGAPS) weather forecast model (Hogan and Rosmond, 1991). Because the NOGAPS analyzed wind data are only reported at four fixed times per day (00:00, 06:00, 12:00, and 18:00 UTC), aerosol data are coupled with the wind data by matching the observation time with the closest model output time.

### 3 Evaluation of MODIS Collection 5 aerosol products

In Zhang and Reid (2006), three major sources of uncertainties were identified in the over water, C4 MODIS AOD retrievals that could affect the accuracy of satellite derived aerosol properties for aerosol data assimilation/forecasting problems: a) lower boundary conditions, such as near surface wind, and white caps; b) cloud contamination and cloud artifacts, and c) uncertainties related to aerosol microphysical properties. Similar excises were performed for the MODIS C5 over water aerosol products.

A fixed near surface wind speed of  $6 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  is used in the current operational MODIS aerosol retrieval scheme (Remer et al., 2005, 2008). Zhang and Reid (2006) showed that in the MODIS C4 products, uncertainties in MODIS AOD ( $\Delta\text{AOD}$ , difference between the AERONET and MODIS AOD) increase as a function of the NOGAPS near surface wind speeds ( $u$ ). In the MODIS C5 products, similar  $\Delta\text{AOD}$  and  $u$  relationships were also found for both Terra and Aqua aerosol optical depth data. Also, although both Terra and Aqua AOD data have positive biases as a function of  $u$  throughout the

analysis,  $\Delta\text{AOD}$  for Terra are consistently higher than  $\Delta\text{AOD}$  for Aqua, indicating that the AOD values for Terra ( $\text{AOD}_{\text{Terra}}$ ) are systematically higher than the AOD values for aqua ( $\text{AOD}_{\text{Aqua}}$ ) on the multi-year global averages. This finding is consistent with what was reported by Remer et al. (2008), where a calibration difference between the Aqua and Terra MODIS was suggested.

Cloud contamination and cloud artifacts are one of the long lasting issues in satellite aerosol retrieving processes. Positive correlations between the cloud fraction and the magnitude of overestimation in MODIS AOD were found in both C4 and C5 products. However, the underestimation of AOD under cloud free conditions shown in the C4 products is not found in the C5 products (Fig. 1), possibly due to either the improvements in the aerosol microphysical parameters as mentioned below, and also possibly due to the use of the level 2.0 AERONET data in the current analysis.

Zhang and Reid (2006) found that the predefined constant parameters used in aerosol models have a significant influence on aerosol retrievals, as an overestimation in AOD occurs for fine aerosols ( $\eta < 0.6$ ) and underestimation occurs for coarse aerosols ( $\eta > 0.6$ ).  $\eta$  is defined as the fine mode to total aerosol optical depth, and could be refer to as either the  $\eta$  included in the MODIS aerosol product ( $\eta_{\text{modis}}$ ) or the AERONET  $\eta$  ( $\eta_{\text{sp}}$ ) that was derived from the AERONET data using the a spectral de-convolution algorithm by O'Neill et al. (2003). Different from the C4 product, the effects of  $\eta$  to MODIS retrieved AOD are much reduced in the C5 product. The improvements are partially due to the readjustments in the MODIS reported  $\eta$  (Remer et al., 2005). Zhang and Reid (2006) compared  $\eta$  values from the collocated MODIS C4 and AERONET data for moderate to high aerosol loading cases (AERONET  $\text{AOD} > 0.2$ ) and found the correlations of 0.69 and 0.70, and slopes of 0.42 and 0.49, for Aqua and Terra, respectively. Similar comparisons were made using the over-ocean MODIS C5 aerosol products with the same study period as used in Zhang and Reid (2006). The correlations between the MODIS C5 and AERONET  $\eta$  are 0.67 and 0.74, and the slopes are improved to 0.60 and 0.70 for Aqua and Terra, respectively. Note that the level 2 instead of level 1.5 AERONET data were used in this analysis and part of the

**Collection 5 MODIS  
over-ocean aerosol  
optical depth product**

Y. Shi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



improvements seen here could be due to the use of a better quality AERONET data, but the influence of the different versions of AERONET data should be small as more than a year worth of data were used.

In summary, comparing with the C4 and C5 MODIS over-water aerosol products, the improvements in aerosol microphysics are clearly noticeable, but the biases in MODIS AOD due to surface wind effects and cloud contaminations still exist. Lastly, although the uncertainties due to the radiometric calibration could also be important (e.g. Remer et al., 2005), however, is beyond the focus of this study and thus are not discussed.

## 4 Quality check and quality assurance procedures

As the analysis indicated, biases and uncertainties in the satellite reported AOD values are functions of observing conditions, and can be studied and systematically removed or reduced. Based on these relationships, quality assurance (QA) and empirical correction procedures were developed, evaluated and applied, and new versions of level 3 MODIS aerosol products were generated for future data assimilation studies. The QA and empirical correction procedures follow the strategies illustrated in Zhang and Reid (2006). As improvements were made to the MODIS C5 aerosol product (Remer et al., 2008), and here a nine-year analysis was performed, comparing with the one year of analysis from Zhang and Reid (2006). Therefore, we expect the analysis from this study to be more statistically consistent.

### 4.1 Quality assurance analysis

Quality assurance steps were performed before the empirical corrections to ensure that cloud contaminated pixels and isolated retrievals are removed from the final products, and also to ensure that empirical corrections will not be biased by these retrievals. The three separate steps for this procedure include standard error checks, buddy checks, and QA flag checks.

## Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





A standard error check was performed to determine the spatial variation of the MODIS AOD values surrounding a valid retrieval. Pixels with high spatial variations of the MODIS AOD were assumed to be cloud contaminated retrievals and were removed from future analysis. This technique is used to detect retrievals near the edges of the clouds, as studies have found a correlation between MODIS AOD and cloud fraction (Leob and Manalo-Smith, 2005) that can be attributed mostly to cloud contamination and cloud artifacts (Zhang et al., 2005a). Standard error is calculated using:

$$\text{STD\_error} = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (1)$$

Where  $\sigma$  is the standard deviation

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \mu)^2} \quad (2)$$

$N$  is sample size,  $x_i$  is each sample value,  $\mu$  is the expected value. Here standard error is calculated for every 3×3 pixels around a given retrieval.

Figure 2a and b show the average standard error threshold as a function of MODIS Terra and Aqua AOD, respectively, estimated using three years (2005–2007) of level 2, C5 MODIS data. Linear relationships between the standard error and AOD were found when standard errors are greater than 0.01 while polynomial relationships were found for standard errors smaller than 0.01. For close to zero AOD values, the reported uncertainty in MODIS AOD is  $\pm 0.03$  (Remer et al., 2005), therefore, a threshold of 0.01 in standard error is given for AOD values less than 0.178 (0.195) to avoid removals of “good” data with low AOD values for Terra (Aqua). The linear fit of 1.5 standard deviation points serve as an upper limit for larger AOD. The relations

$$\text{STD\_error} = -0.0025 + 0.070 \times \text{AOD} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{STD\_error} = 0.0060 + 0.082 \times \text{AOD} \quad (4)$$

**Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product**

Y. Shi et al.

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	





represent the limits for Terra and Aqua larger AOD situations respectively. Data located above these thresholds are considered to have an unacceptable standard error and are removed.

Buddy checks were then performed to remove isolated pixels. A given pixel is removed if there are no valid retrievals among its immediate neighbors, which indicates that this isolated pixel could be located between clouds. The quality flag included in the aerosol products is utilized as a last step to filter the data. Only retrievals that are flagged as “best” and “good” data, with reported cloud fraction less than 80%, were used.

## 4.2 Empirical corrections

Empirical corrections were developed using data that passed the quality assurance filters and were observed with a cloud fraction of less than 80%. These corrections are aimed to reduce the biases from cloud artifacts, surface wind speed effects, and aerosol microphysics effects. The procedures for developing the empirical equations for MODIS AOD products at the 0.55  $\mu\text{m}$  spectrum were created for two cases: (1) low AOD case (MODIS AOD < 0.2), where biases in the aerosol products are highly dependant on the lower boundary conditions, such as the near surface wind speed and cloud artifacts; and (2) high AOD case (MODIS AOD > 0.2), where aerosol microphysical effects and cloud contamination are critical (Zhang and Reid, 2005). Obvious outliers were hand checked and removed, and regressions were made from all available results to generate coefficients for correction equations. The empirical correction equations were derived following Zhang and Reid (2006).

For the low AOD case (AOD < 0.2), equations were generated as functions of near surface wind speed ( $u$ ) and cloud fraction ( $F_{\text{cld}}$ ).

$$\text{AOD}_{\text{new}} = \text{AOD}_{\text{old}} + A - B \times u - C \times F_{\text{cld}} \quad (5)$$

$A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  are calculated separately for different values of Glint Angle ( $\psi$ ) with coefficients shown in Table 1. Also shown are the parameters from the C4 MODIS for

### Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



comparison. Similar values for parameters  $B$  (for wind) and  $C$  (for cloud fraction) between the C4 and C5 products suggest that the impacts of wind speed and cloud fraction to the MODIS AOD retrievals for low AOD cases are still exist and are similar in magnitudes to those derived for the C4 products.

5 For the high AOD case ( $AOD > 0.2$ ), the empirical corrections were derived as functions of cloud fraction and fine mode fraction ( $\eta$ ). As both Zhang and Reid (2006) and this study suggested that biases in the over water MODIS AOD data can be characterized given cloud fraction and  $\eta$  values. Therefore, at first, the valid ranges of cloud fraction and  $\eta$  were divided into sub-sections, and the performance of the C5 MODIS  
10 AOD data was studied for each given sub-section of cloud fraction, and  $\eta$ , and later the regression analysis was applied to estimate the parameters in the empirical correction (Eq. 6). Details of the regression analysis can also be found in Zhang and Reid (2006). The investigations of data performances as functions of influence factors are sensitive to how the observation conditions are divided. Thus, the Monte Carlo method was  
15 used to reduce the uncertainties brought in by the variation of thresholds and to generate more robust parameters. Based on the thresholds of cloud fraction ( $F_{\text{cld}}$ ) and fine mode fraction, which ensure that the data are equally distributed in all categories of observation conditions, small random variations were introduced, and 2187 cases were computed. The comparisons with the coefficients of Eq. (6) for C4 and C5 products are  
20 shown in Table 2:

$$AOD_{\text{new}} = AOD_{\text{old}} \times (A - B \times F_{\text{cld}} + C \times \eta) + D \quad (6)$$

These equations indicate that cloud fraction and  $\eta$  are of critical importance as a 100% change of cloud fraction and  $\eta$  could lead to a 10–20% and 10%–30% change in MODIS AOD, respectively. Comparing with parameters from the C4 products, the impact of cloud contaminations has a similar magnitude, which is shown as parameter  $B$   
25 in Eq. (6), in both the C4 and C5 products, yet the impact of  $\eta$  is much reduced in the C5 products, as suggested by analysis in Sect. 3. Details in the regression analysis can also be found in Zhang and Reid (2006).

---

**Collection 5 MODIS  
over-ocean aerosol  
optical depth product**Y. Shi et al.

---

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

### 4.3 Validation

Using empirical corrections and quality assurance procedures developed in the previous section, new over-ocean AOD data sets from the MODIS C5 Terra and Aqua were generated for 2000–2008 and 2002–2008, respectively.

To evaluate the newly developed AOD data sets, inter-comparisons were made using the AOD values from the new data sets against the AERONET data, as shown in Fig. 3. Figure 3a shows a comparison of AERONET and the original MODIS Terra AOD, and Fig. 3b and c show the same comparisons but with the Terra AOD after quality assurance only and the newly generated MODIS Terra AOD for nine years of data, respectively. Comparing Fig. 3a, b and c, the slope of MODIS versus AERONET AOD is corrected in the empirical correction steps and most outliers (as indicated by a red circle) are removed in the quality assurance steps. One important parameter for evaluating the quality of the new data set is the Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) of AOD between MODIS and AERONET, which is calculated using

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_n (\text{AOD}_{\text{AERONET}} - \text{AOD}_{\text{MODIS}})^2} \quad (7)$$

The overall RMSE between MODIS (Terra) and AERONET AOD decreases 34%, from 0.092 to 0.061, with 0.066 after quality assurance procedures and decreases 29%, from 0.137 to 0.097, in high AOD cases ( $\text{AOD}_{\text{AERONET}} > 0.2$ ), with 0.104 after quality assurance procedures. The slope of linear fit line (red line) increases from 0.78 to 0.90 to 0.98. A threshold cloud fraction of 80% is applied for these results with a data loss of 25% after quality assurance steps and 26% after all procedures. Figure 4a, b and c show comparisons of Aqua MODIS and AERONET AOD values before and after corrections for seven years of data. Results for Terra and Aqua are similar. The overall RMSE between Aqua and AERONET AOD decreases by 21% for all and decreases 12% for high AOD cases. The slopes of the linear fit line increase from 0.87 to 0.93 to 0.97, with a data loss of 23.5% after quality assurance steps and 24% after all procedures.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**Collection 5 MODIS  
over-ocean aerosol  
optical depth product**

Y. Shi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The empirical corrections and quality assurance (QA) procedures were also validated through the study of independent data sets that are not used in generating Eq. (5) through Eq. (6). Figure 5 is similar to Figs. 3 and 4, except when using the collocated MODIS Terra/Aqua and AERONET level 1.5 data for 2009. The AERONET level 1.5 instead of Level 2.0 data were used because the AERONET level 2.0 data are reported after yearly round instrumental calibrations (personal communication from Thomas Eck, NASA), and there were not enough AERONET level 2.0 data available for 2009. Again, most outliers are removed, and the slope of the MODIS and AERONET AOD is improved from 0.84 to 0.98 for Terra and from 0.89 to 1.0 for Aqua. The RMSE of AOD is reduced by 42% for Terra and 12% for Aqua. Figure 5 suggests that the empirical corrections and QA procedures developed in this study are robust.

To demonstrate the changes for the newly generated data spatially, Fig. 6a–d were created by spatially averaging the AOD data in every one-degree latitude and longitude square for 2005 and 2006. Figure 6a and b show the spatial plots of the original MODIS Terra C5 and the newly developed data. The main features are similar before and after the empirical corrections and QA procedures, although the aerosol distribution patterns are smoother for the newly developed data set. This is because the standard-error-check step works as a high-pass filter, which removes the high frequency noises while maintaining the low frequency signals. A large reduction of AOD is found over the southern oceans. A high AOD (0.3–0.5) zone is located over the southern oceans in Fig. 6a, but this aerosol zone is not found in Fig. 6b, indicating that this high AOD zone might be caused by cloud contamination and thus was mostly removed by quality assurance steps (Zhang and Reid, 2006). Figure 6c and d show the plots similar to those in Fig. 6a and b, except for the Aqua aerosol products before and after empirical corrections and QA procedures. Again, the primary patterns are preserved and the suspiciously high AOD band over the southern oceans is removed, suggesting that the potential cloud contamination issue exists in both Terra and Aqua aerosol products.

For diagnostic (prognostic) purposes, the RMSE values of the MODIS AOD data were plotted as functions of the AERONET AOD (MODIS AOD) and cloud fraction for

both Terra and Aqua with original (Fig. 7) and newly generated data (Fig. 8). Shown in Fig. 7a and c, for the AERONET AOD values smaller than 0.3, the RMSE values of the MODIS C5 Terra (Aqua) data are fluctuating around a noise floor of 0.06 (0.057), with the noise floor values of 0.048, 0.061 and 0.086 (0.046, 0.063 and 0.083) for the 0–30%, 30–60% and 60–100% cloud fraction cases respectively. For the AERONET AOD values greater than 0.3, the second order polynomial relations were estimated between the RMSE of MODIS C5 data the AERONET AOD. Similar relations were also found by performing the prognostic analysis using the MODIS AOD instead of AERONET AOD data as shown in Fig. 7b. For all cloud ranges and AOD ranges, the RMSEs of the new MODIS data are reduced with significant reductions in noise floors (Fig. 8). The noise floors are 0.044 (0.044) for total AOD, 0.042 (0.042) for 0–30% cloud, 0.047 (0.047) for 30–60% cloud, and 0.049 (0.052) for 60–80% cloud for Terra (Aqua). The cloud contamination introduced fluctuations of RMSE are weakened, indicated that the cloud introduced uncertainties and noises are reduced.

As discussed before, the uncertainties in satellite aerosol retrievals are highly influenced by cloud fractions, and one of the most troublesome areas is the high-latitude southern oceans. For example, the averaged cloud fraction over 40° S–60° S is 45% annually (estimated using the MOD04 cloud fraction data from 2006). And if we assume an AOD value of 0.25 (representative value for the high AOD band over southern oceans from Fig. 6), and based on Figs. 7 and 8, we estimated that the corrected MODIS AOD data have 30–35% of RMSE reductions comparing with the original MODIS AOD, over the southern oceans.

We also examined the yearly performance of newly generated aerosol products. Evaluated against the AERONET data, the differences between the RMSEs for MODIS AOD before and after corrections were estimated from 2000 to 2008 for Terra and from 2002 to 2008 for Aqua and for three AOD regimes: MODIS AOD<0.2; MODIS AOD>0.2; and all available AOD retrievals. The percentages of improvements were calculated for all three AOD ranges, as shown in Fig. 9. In all AOD regimes the RMSEs from the new products are consistently smaller than the original products for all

**Collection 5 MODIS  
over-ocean aerosol  
optical depth product**

Y. Shi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



available years, with the percentages of improvements ranging from 15 to 40% for all available AOD retrievals.

## 5 Conclusions and discussions

This study evaluated uncertainties of satellite over-water aerosol products by comparing satellite data with ground-based AERONET data and by using ten years of Terra MODIS C5 data and eight years of Aqua MODIS C5 data. Uncertainties were examined as functions of near surface wind speed, cloud fraction, and aerosol microphysics in order to develop empirical correction procedures. Strong relationships were found between uncertainties in the MODIS C5 aerosol products and three potential uncertainty sources: near surface wind speed, cloud fraction and microphysics. This is similar to what was shown in the MODIS C4 aerosol products (Zhang and Reid, 2006). Yet the improvements in MODIS  $\eta$ , and the effects of aerosol microphysics to the retrieved MODIS AOD are noticeable in the over-water MODIS C5 aerosol product. Quality assurance steps were also established to remove data samples with possible cloud contamination. New products with less uncertainty were generated as level 3 over-ocean MODIS aerosol products for future data assimilation and model use. This study suggests that, after the QA and empirical corrections, the RMSE of the over-water operational MODIS C5 aerosol products is improved by more than 20–30% for Terra and more than 10–20% for Aqua globally, and by 30–35% over the southern. This study will be extended to over-land areas by including products from other sources such as the Deep Blue products (Hsu et al., 2006).

*Acknowledgements.* This research was funded by the Office of Naval Research Code 322, the Office of Naval Research Young Investigator Program, and the NASA Interdisciplinary Science Program. We acknowledge and appreciate the AERONET program and their contributing principal investigators and their staff for establishing and maintaining the coastal sites used in this investigation. We thank Lorraine Remer for her thoughtful suggestions and comments.

### Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## References

- Hogan, T. F. and Rosmond, T. E.: The Description of the Navy Operational Global Atmospheric Prediction Systems Spectral Forecast Model, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 119(8), 1786–1815, doi:10.1175/1520-0493(1991)119<1786, TDOTNO>2.0.CO;2., 1991.
- 5 Holben, B. N., Eck, T. F., Slutsker, I., Tanré, D., Buis, J. P., Setzer, A., Vermote, E., Reagan, J. A., Kaufman, Y. J., Nakajima, T., Lavenu, F., Jankowiak, I., and Smirnov, A.: A ERONET-A Federated Instrument Network and Data Archive for Aerosol Characterization, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 66, 1–16, PI1s003-4257 (98)00031-5, 1998.
- 10 Hsu, N. C., Tsay, S., King, M. D., and Herman, J. R.: Deep Blue Retrievals of Asian Aerosol Properties During ACE-Asia, *IEEE T. Geosci. Remote*, ISSN 0196-2892 CODEN IGRSD2., 44(1), 3180–3195, 2006.
- Kahn, R. A., Nelson, D. L., Garay, M. J., Levy, R. C., Bull, M. A., Diner, D. J., Martonchik, J. V., Paradise, S. R., Hansen, E. G., and Remer, L. A.: MISR Aerosol Product Attributes and Statistical Comparisons with MODIS, *Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 15 *IEEE T. Geosci. Remote*, 47(12), 4095–4114, doi:10.1109/TGRS.2009.2023115, 2009.
- Liu, L. and Mishchenko, M. I.: Toward unified satellite climatology of aerosol properties: Direct comparisons of advanced level 2 aerosol products, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Ra. Transf.*, 109(14), 2376–2385, doi:10.1016/j.jqsrt.2008.05.003, 2008.
- 20 Loeb, N. G. and Manalo-Smith, N: Top-of-Atmosphere Direct Radiative Effect of Aerosols over Global Oceans from Merged CERES and MODIS Observations, *J. Climate*, 18, 3506–3526, 2005.
- O'Neill, N. T., Dubovik, O., and Eck, T. F.: A modified Angstrom Coefficient for The Characterization of Sub-micron Aerosols, *App. Opt.*, 40(15), 2368–2374, 2001.
- O'Neill, N. T., Eck, T. F., Smirnov, A., Holben, B. N., and Thulasiraman, S.: Spectral Discrimination of Coarse and Fine Mode Optical Depth, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(D17), 4559, doi:10.1029/2002JD002975, 2003.
- 25 Remer, L. A., Kaufman, Y. J. , Tanré, D. , Matoo, S., Chu, D. A., Martins, J. V., Li, R.-R., Ichoku, C. , Levy, R. C., Kieidman, R. G., Eck, T. F., Vermote, E., and Holben, B. N.: The MODIS Aerosol Algorithm, Products, and Validation, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 62(4), 947–973, doi:10.1175/JAS3385.1, 2005.
- 30 Remer, L. A., Kleidman, R. G., Levy, R. C., Kaufman, Y. J., Tanré, D., Mattoo, S., Martins, J. V., Ichoku, C., Koren, I., Yu, H., and Holben, B. N.: Global aerosol climatology from the MODIS

### Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





- satellite sensors, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D14S07, doi:10.1029/2007JD009661, 2008.
- Zhang, J., Reid, J. S., and Holben, B. N.: An analysis of potential cloud artifacts in MODIS over ocean aerosol optical thickness products, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32, L15803, doi:10.1029/2005GL023254, 2005.
- 5 Zhang, J. and Reid, J. S.: MODIS Aerosol Product Analysis for Data Assimilation: Assessment of Over-Ocean level 2 Aerosol Optical Thickness Retrievals, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111, D22207, doi:10.1029/2005JD006898, 2006.
- Zhang, J., Reid, J. S., Westphal, D. L., Baker, N. L., and Hyer, E. J.: A system for operational aerosol optical depth data assimilation over global oceans, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D10208,
- 10 doi:10.1029/2007JD009065., 2008.

---

**Collection 5 MODIS  
over-ocean aerosol  
optical depth product**Y. Shi et al.

---

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[I◀](#)[▶I](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

## Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.

**Table 1.** Coefficients from Eq. (5) for Terra and Aqua for different ranges of Glint Angle ( $\psi$ ) in Eq. 5)  $AOD_{\text{new}} = AOD_{\text{old}} + A - B \times u - C \times F_{\text{cld}}$  for the MODIS C5 data. The coefficients for the MODIS C4 data are in parenthesis.

		<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>
Terra	$30^\circ < \psi < 60^\circ$	0.0184 (0.05)	0.0039 (0.0038)	0.0003 (0.0003)
	$60^\circ < \psi < 80^\circ$	0.0042 (0.02)	0.0017 (0.0017)	0.0003 (0.0001)
	$\psi > 80^\circ$	0.0014 (0.02)	0.0011 (0.0007)	0.0002 (0.0001)
Aqua	$30^\circ < \psi < 60^\circ$	0.0250 (0.05)	0.0045 (0.0069)	0.0003 (0.0003)
	$60^\circ < \psi < 80^\circ$	0.0109 (0.03)	0.0021 (0.0026)	0.0002 (0.0000)
	$\psi > 80^\circ$	0.0029 (0.02)	0.0004 (0.0004)	0.0002 (0.0004)

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.

**Table 2.** Coefficients for Terra and Aqua in Eq. (6)  $AOD_{new}=AOD_{old} \times (A - B \times F_{cld} + C \times \eta) + D$  for C5 and C4 data.

		<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>
Terra	C5	0.863	0.0019	0.13	$-0.028 + 0.00036 \times F_{cld} + 0.062 \times \eta$
	C4	0.673	0.0021	0.46	0.025
Aqua	C5	0.840	0.0010	0.30	$-0.00074 - 0.00014 \times F_{cld} + 0.00266 \times \eta$
	C4	0.558	0.0018	0.63	0.020

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc


Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Collection 5 MODIS  
over-ocean aerosol  
optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.



**Fig. 1.** Scatter plots of MODIS versus AERONET level 2.0 AOD at 0.87 μm under cloud free conditions with correlation and slope of the linear regression. Blue lines are linear regression lines through the data points and the black lines show the 95% confidence interval of the blue lines. Blue dots represent the outliers that have an absolute difference between MODIS and AERONET AOD larger than 0.4. **(a)** for C5 Terra AOD, year 2000–2008, and **(b)** for C5 Aqua AOD 2002–2008.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc


Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.




**Fig. 2.** Scatter plot of standard error threshold of AOD versus AOD at 0.55 μm. Dots represent the averaged Standard Error (blue) of AOD and the 1.5 standard deviation (red) for every 0.05 of AOD when AOD < 0.5 and 0.3 of AOD when AOD > 0.5. In small AOD cases, light blue lines show the cut off of 0.01 in standard error. The blue lines and red lines (large AOD cases) show the linear fit of corresponding dots. **(a)** for C5 Aqua MODIS AOD. **(b)** for C5 Terra MODIS AOD.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


Collection 5 MODIS  
over-ocean aerosol  
optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.



**Fig. 3.** Density plot of Terra MODIS versus AERONET level 2.0 AOD at  $0.55 \mu\text{m}$  for 2000–2008. Color contour shows the number density of data per unit plotting area. The black color indicates areas with low data density and the orange color indicates regions with high data density. The red line is the linear regression line for all data and the black lines are the 1.0 standard deviation line of the red line. **(a)** for the MODIS C5 aerosol products. **(b)** for the aerosol data that passed the quality assurance filters. **(c)** for the newly generated level 3 MODIS AOD.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back


Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version


Interactive Discussion





**Fig. 4.** Density plots of Aqua MODIS versus AERONET level 2.0 AOD at  $0.55\ \mu\text{m}$  for 2002–2008. Color contour shows the number density of data per unit plotting area. The black color indicates areas with low data density and the orange color indicates regions with high data density. The red line is the linear regression line for all data and the black lines are the 1.0 standard deviation line of the red line. **(a)** for the original C5 aerosol products. **(b)** for the aerosol data that passed the quality assurance filters. **(c)** for the newly generated level 3 MODIS AOD.






**Fig. 5.** Scatter plot of MODIS versus AERONET level 1.5 AOD at  $0.55 \mu\text{m}$  for 2009. The blue line is the linear regression line for all data and the black lines are the 1.0 standard deviation line of the blue line. **(a)** for the Terra MODIS C5 aerosol products. **(b)** for the newly generated Terra MODIS AOD. **(c)** for the Aqua MODIS C5 aerosol products. **(d)** for the newly generated Aqua MODIS AOD.

**Collection 5 MODIS  
over-ocean aerosol  
optical depth product**

Y. Shi et al.




**Fig. 6.** Spatial distribution of AOD at  $0.55 \mu\text{m}$  from the MODIS C5 aerosol products. The black color represents regions with no data, the blue color represents areas with low AOD loadings, and the pink color indicates locations with extreme high AOD values. **(a)** for the original Aqua MODIS data. **(b)** As in (a) but for the newly generated Aqua AOD. **(c)** and **(d)** As in (a) and (b) but for Terra AOD.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Collection 5 MODIS  
over-ocean aerosol  
optical depth product


Y. Shi et al.



**Fig. 7.** RMSE of MODIS Terra and Aqua C5 AOD comparing to AERONET AOD as a function of AERONET AOD and MODIS AOD. Data under different cloud fraction conditions are indicated with different colors. The red, green, purple, and black colors represent data with MODIS cloud fraction of 0–30%, 30–60%, 60–100%, and data from all cloud fraction ranges respectively.

## Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.




**Fig. 8.** RMSE of newly generated MODIS Terra and Aqua AOD comparing to AERONET AOD as a function of AERONET AOD and MODIS AOD. Data under different cloud fraction conditions are indicated with different colors. The red, green, purple, and black colors represent data with MODIS cloud fraction of 0–30%, 30–60%, 60–100%, and data from all cloud fraction ranges respectively.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)

## Collection 5 MODIS over-ocean aerosol optical depth product

Y. Shi et al.



**Fig. 9.** The percentages of improvements for the RMSEs between MODIS AOD and AERONET AOD at 0.55  $\mu\text{m}$  before and after corrections, for all data (green), data with MODIS AOD greater than 0.2 (blue), and data with MODIS AOD smaller than 0.2 (red). **(a)** for Terra 2000–2008, **(b)** for Aqua 2002–2008.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

⏪ ⏩

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

