

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

**On the relationship between the scattering phase function of cirrus and the atmospheric state**

**A. J. Baran<sup>1</sup>, K. Furtado<sup>1</sup>, L.-C. Labonnote<sup>2</sup>, S. Havemann<sup>1</sup>, J.-C. Thelen<sup>1</sup> and F. Marengo<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Met Office, Exeter, UK

<sup>2</sup>Université des Sciences et Technologies de Lille, France

*Correspondence to:* A. J. Baran (anthony.baran@metoffice.gov.uk)

4th December 2014

Re-revised for ACP

1 **Abstract.** This is the first paper to investigate the relationship **between the shape of the** scattering  
2 phase function of cirrus and the relative humidity with respect to ice ( $RH_i$ ), using space-based solar  
3 radiometric angle-dependent measurements. The relationship between  $RH_i$ , and the complexity of  
4 ice crystals has been previously studied using data from aircraft field campaigns and laboratory  
5 cloud chambers. However, to the best of our knowledge, there have been no studies to date that  
6 explore this relationship, through the use of remotely sensed space-based angle-dependent solar  
7 radiometric measurements. In this paper, **one** case study of semi-transparent cirrus, **which occurred**  
8 **on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2010 off the north-east coast of Scotland**, is used to explore the possibility of  
9 such a relationship. Moreover, for the first time,  $RH_i$  fields predicted by a high-resolution numerical  
10 weather prediction (NWP) model are combined with satellite retrievals of ice crystal complexity.  
11 The NWP model was initialised at midnight, on the 25th January 2010, and the mid-latitude  $RH_i$   
12 field was extracted from the NWP model at 1300 UTC. At about the same time, there was a  
13 Polarization and Anisotropy of Reflectance for Atmospheric science coupled with Observations  
14 from a Lidar (PARASOL) overpass, and the PARASOL swath covered the NWP model predicted  
15  $RH_i$  field. The cirrus case was located over Scotland, and over the North Sea. From the satellite  
16 channel based at  $0.865 \mu\text{m}$ , the directionally averaged and directional spherical albedos were  
17 retrieved between the scattering angles of about  $80^\circ$  and  $130^\circ$ . An ensemble model of cirrus ice  
18 crystals is used to predict phase functions that vary between phase functions that exhibit optical  
19 features (called pristine), to featureless phase functions. For each of the PARASOL pixels, the  
20 phase function that best minimised differences between the spherical albedos was selected. **This**  
21 **paper reports, for this one case study, an association between the most featureless phase function**  
22 **model and the highest values of NWP predicted  $RH_i$  (i.e., when  $RH_i > 1.0$ ).** For pixels associated  
23 **with NWP model predicted  $RH_i < 1$ , it was impossible to generally discriminate between phase**  
24 **function models at the 5% significance level.** It is also **shown** that the NWP model prediction of the  
25 vertical profile of  $RH_i$  is in good agreement **with dropsonde, in situ measurements and** independent

1 aircraft-based physical retrievals of  $RH_i$ . Furthermore, the NWP model prediction of the cirrus  
2 cloud-top height and its vertical extent is also found to be in good agreement with aircraft-based  
3 lidar measurements.

#### 4 **1. Introduction**

5 Cirrus or pure ice crystal cloud usually forms at temperatures of less than about  $-40^{\circ}\text{C}$ , and at  
6 altitudes greater than about 6 km (Wylie et al., 1999; Baran 2012; Guignard et al., 2012). The extent  
7 to which ice crystals can grow and form complex shapes is dependent on the environmental  
8 temperature, pressure, and  $RH_i$  (Marshall and Langleben 1954; Nakaya 1954; Hallett and Mason  
9 1958; Mason 1971; Heymsfield 1977; Liou 1986; Lynch 2002; Bailey and Hallett 2004; Bailey and  
10 Hallett 2009; Pfalzgraff et al., 2010; Ulanowski et al., 2013). In cirrus, the supersaturations with  
11 respect to ice can range between about 150% to -50% (Krämer et al., 2009). However, more recent  
12 studies of  $RH_i$  in mid-latitude cirrus, report values of about 60% to 120% (Gayet et al., 2011;  
13 Ulanowski et al., 2013), with the latter values being the more typical. With such a range of possible  
14 supersaturation values reported by previous authors, the range of ice crystal complexity, within the  
15 same cirrus, is likely to be significant (Bailey and Hallett, 2009). In this paper, ice crystal  
16 complexity can mean polycrystals, which may be compact or highly irregular, and ice aggregates,  
17 and these ice aggregates may also have low **area** ratios (i.e., the ratio between the ice crystal  
18 maximum dimension and the circumscribing circle of the same maximum dimension as the ice  
19 crystal). The monomers that make up the polycrystal or aggregate may also be surface roughened on  
20 their facets and/or contain air cavities, within their volumes.

21 The role of ice supersaturation in forming complex ice crystals has most recently been studied by  
22 Bailey and Hallett (2009), Pfalzgraff et al. (2010), Ulanowski et al. (2013) and **Magee et al. (2014)**.  
23 In the cloud chamber study by Pfalzgraff et al. (2010), it was reported that surface roughness was at  
24 its greatest when supersaturations were near zero. Moreover, Walden et al. (2003) observed surface  
25 roughness on precipitating ice crystals under conditions of near-zero supersaturation at the South

1 Pole. Other laboratory studies by Bacon et al. (2003), Malkin et al. (2012), and Ulanowski et al.  
2 (2013) show that ice crystals, under ice supersaturated conditions, can become surface roughened,  
3 through the development of prismatic grooves or dislocations on the ice crystal surface. However,  
4 as pointed out by Bacon et al. (2003) and others, the temperature and  $RH_i$  variables do not uniquely  
5 determine the number of monomers that make up the polycrystal or surface roughness. This is  
6 because ice crystal complexity and surface roughness may also depend on how the ice crystals were  
7 initiated, and thus may depend on the chemical composition of the initiating ice nuclei. A recent  
8 paper by Ulanowski et al. (2013) reported that for a few cases of mid-latitude cirrus, formed in  
9 Oceanic air, slightly higher values of ice crystal complexity were found than was the case for mid-  
10 latitude cirrus formed in Continental air (i.e., a polluted air mass). However, in the same study, no  
11 correlation was found between ice crystal complexity and instantaneous measurements of  $RH_i$ . As  
12 pointed out by Ulanowski et al. (2013), this lack of correlation could be due to the instantaneous  
13 measurements being obtained at a single point in time, whereas the ice crystals, on which the  
14 measurements were based, may have gone through different histories of supersaturation, and so for  
15 each measurement, the history of exposure to supersaturation can never be known. On the other  
16 hand, controlled laboratory studies by Ulanowski et al. (2013) of ice crystal analogues, show that  
17 under high levels of ice supersaturation, the ice crystals formed can be very complex relative to the  
18 regular ice crystals grown under conditions of low ice supersaturation. This latter laboratory study  
19 of Ulanowski et al. (2013) is consistent with the findings of Bailey and Hallett (2009).

20 Theoretical light scattering studies by (Schmitt and Heymsfield 2010; Macke et al., 1996a;  
21 Macke et al., 1996b; Yang and Liou 1998; Yang et al., 2008; van Diedenhoven 2014) have shown  
22 that the processes of surface roughness and air inclusions within ice crystals can profoundly alter  
23 their scattering phase functions. As surface roughness increases, the  $22^\circ$  and  $46^\circ$  halos are reduced  
24 or completely removed, resulting in featureless phase functions with a high degree of side  
25 scattering. This high degree of side scattering results in surface roughened ice crystals having lower

1 asymmetry parameter values relative to their smooth counterparts. The asymmetry parameter is one  
2 of the parameters of **importance in** climate models, since it affects how much incident solar  
3 irradiance is reflected back to space (Stephens and Webster 1981; Yang and Liou 1998; Yang et al.,  
4 2008; Ulanowski et al., 2006; Baran 2012). Therefore, it is important to constrain this parameter  
5 through observation using a variety of instruments such as those used in the studies by (Gayet et al.,  
6 2002; Field et al., 2003; Garrett et al., 2003; Gayet et al., 2011; Mauno et al., 2011; Ulanowski et  
7 al., 2013; van Diedenhoven et al., 2013; **Cole et al., 2014**). Other methods of removing or  
8 diminishing halos involve introducing air concavities from the basal ends of hexagonal ice crystals,  
9 or to embed spherical air bubbles within the ice crystal volume. The former method removes the  
10  $46^\circ$  halo and reduces the  $22^\circ$  halo (Macke et al., 1996b; Yang et al., 2008), and the latter method  
11 produces featureless phase functions, through multiple scattering between spherical air inclusions  
12 (Labonnote et al., 2001; Baran and Labonnote 2007; Xie et al., 2009). Although recent cloud  
13 chamber and theoretical ray-tracing studies by Neshyba et al. (2013) and Shcherbakov (2013),  
14 respectively, have shown that surface roughness may not necessarily completely remove the  $22^\circ$   
15 halo, it is as yet unclear, as to whether the results obtained in the laboratory are scalable to the real  
16 atmosphere. Indeed, in-situ studies on the occurrence of the  $22^\circ$  halo show that it is a rare event  
17 (Field et al., 2003; Gayet et al., 2011; Ulanowski et al. 2013). Clearly, further laboratory studies of  
18 ice crystals are needed, which combines angular scattering measurements at visible wavelengths  
19 with a detailed analysis of ice crystal habit, surface roughness and the degree of concavity, all  
20 obtained, as functions of time. The dimension of time is important to include as this would be a  
21 useful constraint to apply to theoretical studies of ice crystal growth and complexity (Barrett et al.,  
22 2012).

23 Radiometric angle-dependent observations of the transmitted and reflected intensities from  
24 cirrus tend to suggest that featureless phase functions best represent those measurements obtained  
25 from below and/or above the cloud (Foot 1988; Baran et al., 1999; Doutriaux-Boucher et al., 2000;

1 Baran et al., 2001; Jourdan et al., 2003; Baran 2012; Cole et al., 2013; Cole et al., 2014 and  
2 references contained therein). Aircraft-based instruments such as the Polar Nephelometer (PN),  
3 which is described by Gayet et al. (1997), have been used to measure the angular scattered intensity  
4 of naturally-occurring single ice crystals, at scattering angles between about  $15^\circ$  and  $162^\circ$ , at the  
5 wavelength of  $0.80\ \mu\text{m}$ . Clearly, the PN measured polar angle range encompasses the halo regions  
6 of  $22^\circ$  and  $46^\circ$ . Therefore, obtaining the ratio of the ice crystal scattered energy at the polar angle of  
7  $22^\circ$  to that at  $18.5^\circ$  (the latter being an angle at which no halo is formed by prismatic ice crystals)  
8 would be a quantitative measure of the presence of the  $22^\circ$  halo. Halo ratios greater than one are  
9 likely to be associated with pristine ice crystals, whilst halo ratios less than one are likely to be  
10 associated with irregular ice crystals. Using a mid-latitude cirrus case, Gayet et al. (2011) used the  
11 halo ratio to relate the occurrence of halos to instantaneous measurements of  $\text{RH}_i$ . The study found  
12 that at the trailing edge of the cirrus-band, at a temperature of  $-55^\circ\text{C}$ , the halo ratio  $< 1$ , but at the  
13 leading edge of the cirrus-band, the halo ratio  $> 1$ , at a temperature of  $-27^\circ\text{C}$ . The study did not find  
14 any systematic evidence for a relationship between the halo ratio and ice supersaturation, a finding  
15 that is consistent with Ulanowski et al. (2013). However, Gayet et al. (2011) did find that halo  
16 ratios  $> 1$  were more likely to be found at supersaturation values of around 100%, and no halo ratios  
17  $> 1$  were found at the highest supersaturation values, which approached 120%. Moreover, in the  
18 recent study by Ulanowski et al. (2013), a negative correlation is reported between the occurrence of  
19 halos and estimated ice crystal complexity. The measure of ice crystal complexity was derived from  
20 in-situ observations of spatial light scattering patterns from single particles obtained in several cases  
21 of mid-latitude cirrus. The in-situ findings of Gayet et al. (2011) and laboratory studies of  
22 Ulanowski et al. (2013) are consistent with previous studies (i.e., Bailey and Hallett, 2009, and  
23 references therein), which tend to show that more complex ice crystals are associated with relatively  
24 high values of  $\text{RH}_i$ .

1           The relationship between the scattering properties of atmospheric ice and the physical state in  
2 which the ice resides is important to explore, as this may lead to an improvement in the  
3 parameterization of ice optical properties in climate models. Such an improvement can only come  
4 about through a deeper understanding of how the growth of ice crystal complexity is related to the  
5 atmospheric state. This relationship could then be used to predict appropriate ice scattering  
6 properties for some given atmospheric state, rather than assuming the same scattering properties for  
7 all states that are found in a climate model, which is what is done at the present time. The most  
8 recent report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2013) stated that the  
9 coupling between clouds and the atmosphere was one of the largest uncertainties in predicting  
10 climate change. This uncertainty may well be reduced if appropriate parameterizations could be  
11 found between ice crystal scattering properties and the atmospheric state.

12       In this paper, for **one** case of mid-latitude cirrus, the relationship between the scattering phase  
13 function and  $RH_i$  is further studied, by combining with space-based multi-angle **spectral albedo**  
14 **retrievals** an NWP prediction of the  $RH_i$  field. The paper is split into the following sections. Section  
15 2 describes the NWP model, and the aircraft-based instruments used in this study. Section 3  
16 describes the single-scattering properties of ice crystals on which the satellite retrievals are based,  
17 and a brief description of the radiative transfer model is also given. The retrieval methodology is  
18 described in section 4 and results are discussed in section 5. Section 6 presents the conclusions of  
19 this study.

## 20 **2. The cirrus case, numerical weather prediction model and aircraft instrumentation**

21 **The conditions required for this paper are that the cirrus should be sufficiently optically thick to**  
22 **allow discrimination between various randomizations of the ensemble model using PARASOL**  
23 **retrievals, the aircraft and satellite should be co-incident, and there should be no underlying cloud**  
24 **or broken cloud fields. It is practically very difficult to obtain all these necessary conditions at the**  
25 **same time.** The cirrus case occurred on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2010 off the **north-east** coast of Scotland,

1 **which** is shown in Fig. 1. The figure shows a high-resolution MOderate Imaging Spectroradiometer  
2 (MODIS) composite image (Platnick et al., 2003) of semi-transparent cirrus obtained at 13:30 UTC.  
3 The semi-transparent cirrus can be clearly seen around the **north-east coast** of Scotland, whilst  
4 further to the east, lower level water cloud underlying the cirrus can be seen. At about the same  
5 time, as the image shown in Fig. 1 was taken the FAAM (Facility for Airborne Atmospheric  
6 Measurements) BAe-146 aircraft was measuring the same high-cloud field.

7 The FAAM aircraft is an atmospheric research facility, which is jointly owned by the Met Office  
8 and the National Environment Research Council (NERC). The cirrus case shown in Fig. 1 was  
9 sampled by the aircraft as part of the ‘Constrain’ field programme (Cotton et al., 2013). **In this**  
10 **paper, one case from the Constrain field programme is presented. There were several other**  
11 **Constrain cirrus cases but these did not meet the conditions necessary for this paper. This is because**  
12 **the other cases were either optically too thick, or there was no co-incidence between PARASOL**  
13 **and the aircraft, or there was substantial underlying cloud.**

14 **For the case presented in this paper,** the aircraft sampled the cirrus between the latitudes of about  
15  $58^{\circ}\text{N}$  and  $59^{\circ}\text{N}$ , and between the longitudes of about  $2.5^{\circ}\text{W}$  and  $4.5^{\circ}\text{W}$ . The aircraft in-situ  
16 instrumentation measured the temperatures of the cloud-top and base to be about  $-55^{\circ}\text{C}$  and  $-30^{\circ}\text{C}$ ,  
17 respectively. The aircraft began sampling the cloud at 11:55:06 UTC, and finished the sampling at  
18 15:49:44 UTC. During this sampling time, the aircraft flew three straight and level runs above the  
19 cloud, each of about 10 minutes duration, commencing at 13:19:00 UTC, 13:27:42 UTC, and at  
20 15:21:42 UTC, respectively. From the aircraft a dropsonde (measures vertical profiles of  
21 temperature, pressure, and relative humidity with respect to water) was released at 13:30:00 UTC.  
22 In this study, use is made of the aircraft data from the earlier two runs, and the dropsonde  
23 measurements, which most closely coincided with the PARASOL overpass. Note also, that there  
24 was an 8 minute interval between the two earlier straight and level runs, during which time the  
25 aircraft was manoeuvring into position. In this paper, use is made of observations from **four**



1 instruments deployed on the aircraft. **The first two** instruments were the active Leosphere ALS450  
2 elastic backscatter lidar and the passive Airborne Research Interferometer Evaluation System  
3 (ARIES).

4 The nadir-pointing lidar operates at 0.355  $\mu\text{m}$  with an integration time of 2 s and a vertical  
5 resolution of 1.5 m (Marenco et al., 2011). Further averaging of the signals has been done at post-  
6 processing, bringing the temporal resolution to 10 s (equivalent at aircraft science speed to a 1.5-2  
7 km footprint) and the vertical resolution to 45 m. The volume extinction coefficient is computed  
8 from the lidar returns using the Fernald-Klett method described in (Fernald 1984; Klett 1985),  
9 assuming a lidar ratio of 20 sr.

10 The ARIES instrument is fully described in Wilson et al. (1999), but briefly it is a modified  
11 Bomem MR200 interferometer, measuring infrared radiances between the wavenumbers of  
12  $3030.303\text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $500\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , at a spectral resolution of  $1\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The interferometer is capable of  
13 multiple viewing geometries both up and down, as well as cross-track. The nadir-pointing ARIES  
14 and lidar data used here are from the straight and level runs above the cirrus. **The other two**  
15 **instruments deployed on the aircraft were used to measure the in situ vertical profile of  $\text{RH}_i$ , these**  
16 **were the General Eastern GE 1011B Chilled Mirror Hygrometer (GE) and the Fluorescence Water**  
17 **Vapour Sensor (FWVS) fast Lyman-alpha hygrometer (Keramitsoglou et al. 2002; Fahey et al.**  
18 **2009).**

19 The  $\text{RH}_i$  field of the cirrus case, shown in Fig. 1, has been simulated using the Met Office high-  
20 resolution numerical weather prediction model (NWP). The NWP simulation of the  $\text{RH}_i$  field was  
21 obtained using a high-resolution limited area model nested inside a suite of coarser resolution  
22 models. The high-resolution domain had a horizontal grid spacing of approximately 1 km and  
23 received hourly lateral boundary conditions from a 4 km model on a larger domain. The 4 km  
24 model was nested inside a 12 km domain, which was in turn driven by an N216 global model  
25 forecast. The 1 km grid was centred on ( $58.60^\circ\text{ N}, -6.45^\circ\text{ W}$ ) with 1024 points East-to-West and 744

1 points North-to-South and a zonal and meridional grid spacing of 0.0135 degrees. The model time  
2 step was 50 second and the vertical level set comprised 70 levels, with a grid spacing of  
3 approximately 250 m at the altitudes of interest for this study.

4 The model is non-hydrostatic and employs the semi-Lagrangian advection scheme.

5 In terms of model-physics, the model is broadly comparable to the version of the Met Office  
6 operational UKV forecasting system that was used operationally until the autumn of 2011 (Lean et  
7 al. 2008). However, in an attempt to represent the simulated cloud system as well as possible, the  
8 following changes were made to the ice cloud microphysics. Firstly, the ice particle size distribution  
9 (PSD) parameterisation was changed so as to be consistent with the PARASOL radiative retrievals  
10 (see Section 3 for details). Secondly, the mass-diameter relation of the ice crystals was taken  
11 directly from the Constrain in-situ measurements (Cotton et al. 2013), and is therefore a 'best-  
12 estimate' of this property for the simulated cloud system. For this paper, the NWP model was  
13 initialized at midnight on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2010, and the RH<sub>i</sub> forecast field was extracted from the  
14 model on the same day but at the 1300 UTC time step.

15 At about the same time as the NWP model RH<sub>i</sub> field was extracted there was a PARASOL  
16 overpass at about 12:50 UTC. PARASOL has its central channels located at 0.443 μm, 0.490 μm,  
17 0.565 μm, 0.670 μm, 0.763 μm, 0.765 μm, 0.865 μm, 0.910 μm and 1.02 μm. In this study, use is  
18 made of the channel located at 0.865 μm, due to the sea surface at this wavelength being almost  
19 black. PARASOL can view the same nadir-pixel at up to 14 viewing directions, at scattering angles  
20 between approximately 70° and 180°, and each pixel has a resolution of 5.3 km × 6.3 km. The range  
21 of scattering angles sampled by PARASOL depends on the sun-satellite geometry, latitude of the  
22 pixel, and the position of the pixel on the satellite track (i.e., east or west). Given the latitude and  
23 time of the year of the case considered here, the range of scattering angles viewed by PARASOL  
24 was between about 80° and 130°, and the total number of viewing directions for each pixel was  
25 between 7 and 8. The solar zenith angle at the time of the PARASOL overpass was 75° and the

1 solar azimuth angle was  $187^\circ$ . The PARASOL analysis is performed on a pixel-by-pixel basis.  
2 Moreover, it should also be noted here that the NWP model field of  $RH_i$  is averaged over  
3 approximately the same area as each of the PARASOL pixels. In the next section, the ice crystal  
4 model, single-scattering properties and radiative transfer models are briefly described and defined,  
5 respectively.

### 6 **3. Ice crystal model and definitions of single-scattering properties.**

#### 7 3.1 Ice crystal model and the particle size distribution function (PSD)

8 The model of ice crystals used in this study has been developed by Baran and Labonnote (2007),  
9 and it is called the ensemble model of cirrus ice crystals. The model has previously been fully  
10 described by Baran and Labonnote (2007), but a brief description is given here, and the model is  
11 shown in Fig. 2. The model consists of six elements. The first element is the hexagonal ice column  
12 of aspect ratio unity, and the second element is the six-branched bullet-rosette. Thereafter,  
13 hexagonal monomers are arbitrarily attached, as a function of ice crystal maximum dimension,  
14 forming three, five, eight and ten monomer polycrystals. The ensemble model has previously been  
15 shown to predict the volume extinction coefficient, ice water content (IWC), and column integrated  
16 IWC, as well as the optical depth of mid-latitude and tropical cirrus to within current experimental  
17 uncertainties (Baran et al. 2009; Baran et al., 2011a; Baran et al., 2013). Moreover, the model also  
18 replicated one day of PARASOL cirrus observations of total reflectance, between the scattering  
19 angles of about  $60^\circ$  and  $180^\circ$  (Baran and Labonnote 2007). It was further shown by Baran and  
20 Labonnote (2007) that the second randomised member of the ensemble model, randomized in such  
21 a way as to produce featureless scattering matrix elements, replicated one day of the global linear  
22 polarized reflectance measurements at close to cloud-top.

23 To demonstrate why the ensemble model can replicate in-situ estimates of the volume  
24 extinction coefficient to within current experimental uncertainties, here the model predictions of the  
25 area ratio are compared against in-situ estimates of naturally-occurring area ratios. The area ratio,

1  $A_r$ , is a useful measure of particle non-sphericity using in-situ observations obtained from two-  
2 dimensional imaging probes. It is defined as the ratio of the projected area of a non-spherical  
3 particle to the area of a circumscribing circle of the same maximum dimension as the non-spherical  
4 particle. The averaged,  $\langle A_r \rangle$ , area ratio value predicted by each member of the ensemble is shown  
5 in Fig. 3, and in the figure, the predicted values are compared against in-situ estimates of  $A_r$ . The  
6 in-situ observations shown in Fig. 3 are obtained from a number of aircraft field campaigns that  
7 took place in the Arctic, mid-latitudes and tropics (Heymsfield and Miloshevich 2003; Field et al.,  
8 2008; McFarquhar et al., 2013). The  $A_r$  values from McFarquhar et al. (2013) were obtained in the  
9 Arctic at ice crystal maximum dimensions between about 35  $\mu\text{m}$  and 60  $\mu\text{m}$ , and the averaged-  
10 values of  $\langle A_r \rangle$  were reported to be between 0.65 to 0.58, but with a standard deviation of  $\pm 45\%$ .  
11 These averaged values were found for 80% of the estimates compiled by McFarquhar et al. (2013).  
12 The in-situ estimates of  $A_r$  from Heymsfield and Miloshevich (2003) are a synthesis of all the mid-  
13 latitude data (Eq. 2 from Heymsfield and Miloshevich 2003) compiled in that paper, and those  
14 estimates were prescribed an uncertainty of  $\pm 50\%$  for ice crystals less than 3000  $\mu\text{m}$ , the uncertainty  
15 reducing to  $\pm 25\%$ , for sizes greater than 3000  $\mu\text{m}$ . The data from Field et al. (2008) were obtained  
16 in the tropics at ice crystal maximum dimensions between about 200  $\mu\text{m}$  and 10000  $\mu\text{m}$ , and in Fig.  
17 3, the upper and lower bounds on the data from Field et al. (2008) are shown, but on those bounds,  
18 there is an uncertainty of  $\pm 30\%$ . Estimates of  $A_r$  for ice crystals between 20  $\mu\text{m} < D_{\text{max}} < 100 \mu\text{m}$   
19 were reported by Nousiainen et al., (2011) to be between 0.84 and 0.70 using tropical data, and the  
20  $A_r$  ratios in that paper were based on models of Gaussian Random spheres (Muinonen 2000).

21 To compare members of the ensemble model against the in-situ derived estimates of  $A_r$ , the  
22 maximum dimension is defined as follows. The maximum dimension of the hexagonal column is  
23 literally its maximum dimension (McFarquhar et al., 2013). The maximum dimension of the six-  
24 branched bullet-rosette, and other members of the ensemble, is defined as the maximum distance  
25 across the particle when projected onto a two-dimensional plane (Heymsfield and Miloshevich

1 2003; Field et al., 2008). The area ratio ( $A_r$ ) of the second member of the ensemble model shown in  
2 Fig. 2 assumes it to be in random orientation, which is a reasonable assumption since for the bullet-  
3 rosette there is little difference between the projected areas, if the particle is in random or preferred  
4 orientation due to its symmetry. All other members of the ensemble are assumed to be horizontally  
5 oriented along their maximum dimension, with respect to the incident radiation. The oriented  
6 members are randomly oriented about their other two angles in three-dimensional space, with  
7 respect to the polar angle, to obtain an average of the projected areas, and it is these averages that  
8 are plotted in Fig. 3. In calculating the averaged  $A_r$  values, the effect of shadowing is taken into  
9 account for each of the aggregated ensemble members. Figure 3 shows that the  $A_r$  ratio calculated  
10 for each member of the ensemble model is within the current experimental range of possible  $A_r$   
11 values reported in the literature. The area ratio of the five monomer aggregate at about  $2500 \mu\text{m}$  is  
12 larger relative to the other ice aggregates. This is due to the other aggregate members of the  
13 ensemble model being more longitudinally elongated. Figure 3 shows why the model, as  
14 demonstrated by previous studies, can predict the volume extinction coefficient and the optical  
15 depth of naturally-occurring cirrus to within current measurement uncertainties. In principle, given  
16 appropriate weights applied to the ensemble model, the volume extinction coefficient can be  
17 calculated for any type of cirrus (Baran et al., 2009; Baran et al., 2011a; Baran et al., 2013),  
18 assuming a representative PSD is applied. Currently, the members of the ensemble model are  
19 distributed into six equal intervals of the PSD. However, this distribution of the predicted area  
20 throughout the PSD can change, given further information on the most general weights to apply to  
21 the model.

22 In this study, the PSD assumed is the moment estimation parameterization of the PSD developed  
23 by Field et al. (2007), hereinafter referred to as F07. The F07 parameterization relates the 2<sup>nd</sup>  
24 moment (i.e., IWC) to any other moment via a polynomial fit to the in-cloud temperature. The  
25 parameterization is based on 10000 in-situ measurements of the PSD, and the measurements were

1 filtered using the method of Field et al. (2006) to reduce artefacts of ice crystal shattering at the  
2 inlet of the microphysical probes (Korolev et al., 2011), and the PSD was truncated at an ice crystal  
3 maximum dimension of 100  $\mu\text{m}$ . The in-situ observations were obtained from the mid-latitudes and  
4 Tropics, at in-cloud temperatures between about  $-60^{\circ}\text{C}$  and  $0^{\circ}\text{C}$ . The parameterization does not  
5 ignore ice crystals less than 100  $\mu\text{m}$ , but assumes that these ice crystals follow an exponential PSD.  
6 For ice crystal sizes greater than 100  $\mu\text{m}$ , the parameterization uses a gamma function, which was  
7 found to best-fit the in-situ measured PSDs. The parameterization adds together the exponential and  
8 gamma function to re-construct the full PSD, given the IWC and in-cloud temperature. It has been  
9 previously shown that the F07 parameterization is a good fit to in-situ measurements of tropical and  
10 mid-latitude PSDs (Baran et al., 2011a; Furtado et al., 2014). Since the parameterization  
11 fundamentally relates the 2<sup>nd</sup> moment of the PSD to any other moment via the in-cloud temperature,  
12 to estimate representative PSDs, a mass-dimensional relationship is required. In this paper, the  
13 ensemble model predicted mass-dimensional relationship is used to generate the F07 PSDs. The  
14 ensemble model mass-dimensional relationship was previously derived by Baran et al. (2011b) and  
15 in that paper, it was shown that the ensemble model predicts the ice crystal mass of each particle to  
16 be given by  $0.04D^2$ , where  $D$  is the maximum dimension of each ice crystal, and the mass is in SI  
17 units. The ensemble model mass-dimensional relationship is within the upper uncertainty of the  
18 Constrain derived mass-dimensional relationship derived by Cotton et al. (2013), and it is therefore,  
19 representative of naturally-occurring ice crystal mass. Furthermore, use is made of the F07  
20 parameterization as we wish to be consistent with the PSDs assumed in the NWP model cloud  
21 scheme used later in the paper.

### 22 3.1.1 The single-scattering properties

23 Incident unpolarized sunlight is assumed to irradiate a collection of randomly oriented non-  
24 spherical particles, each of which possesses a plane of symmetry. The single-scattering properties  
25 that are applied to the PARASOL measurements are calculated using the Monte-Carlo ray tracing

1 method, which was developed and made generally available by Macke et al. (1996a). Each member  
2 of the ensemble is randomized, using the method of distortion, and maximum randomizations are  
3 achieved using distortion and embedding, within the volume of the ice crystals, spherical air  
4 bubbles (Shcherbakov et al. 2006). The method of distortion involves randomly tilting the normal  
5 vector to the surface of the ice crystal (by assuming a uniform probability distribution, see Macke et  
6 al. 1996a for further details), at the ice-air interface, with respect to its original direction. In this  
7 way, at each refraction-reflection event, the directions of the ray paths are changed with respect to  
8 their original direction, with the result that featureless scattering matrix elements are predicted. The  
9 values of distortion can be between 0 and 1, where 0 represents unperturbed scattering matrix  
10 elements and these retain scattering features, such as halo and ice bows. As the distortion is  
11 increased to higher values, the optical features are removed, to produce featureless scattering matrix  
12 elements. The distortion method attempts to replicate the complex processes that may occur on and  
13 within ice crystals, which could lead to featureless phase functions. Other authors refer to distortion  
14 as “micro-scale surface roughness.” However, this description of surface roughness may not be  
15 accurate as surface roughness can take on different forms (Mason 1971; Pfalzgraff et al., 2010;  
16 Bacon et al., 2003; Malkin et al., 2012). For instance, a theoretical electromagnetic study by Liu et  
17 al. (2013) has shown that at high values of idealized surface roughness, the method of distortion  
18 does not accurately re-produce the scattering phase function. In this study, the method of distortion  
19 is merely used to randomize the ice crystal so that featureless scattering phase functions are  
20 produced.

21 Here the distortion parameter is assumed to have the values of 0, 0.15, 0.25 and 0.4. The  
22 distortion value of 0.4 is also combined with embedding the ice crystal with spherical air bubbles,  
23 to achieve the maximum randomization of the ice crystals to produce featureless phase functions.  
24 The upper distortion value of 0.4 was chosen as this was found to best-fit one day of global  
25 POLDER-2 retrievals of directional spherical albedo and measurements of the linearly polarized

1 **reflectance** (Baran and Labonnote 2006). For the most randomized case of assuming a distortion  
2 value of 0.4 and **embedding** the ice crystal with spherical air bubbles, the phase functions are  
3 calculated using the modifications by Shcherbakov et al. (2006) applied to the ray tracing **code** of  
4 Macke et al. (1996a). The statistics describing the tilt angles were shown by Shcherbakov et al.  
5 (2006) to be best represented by using Weibull statistics, where the Weibull distribution is defined  
6 by the scale (i.e., the distortion as described above) and shape parameters. This finding was based  
7 on cloud chamber measurements of the angular scattered intensity from a collection of ice crystals,  
8 at a visible wavelength, and comparisons between measurements and ray-tracing results showed  
9 that the Weibull statistics were the better match to the measurements. Moreover, the choice of  
10 Weibull statistics is consistent with independent cloud chamber results found by Neshyba et al.  
11 (2013). For the most randomized case considered in this paper, the Weibull statistics are assumed to  
12 have the following scale and shape parameter values of 0.4 and 0.85, respectively, and for the  
13 spherical air bubble inclusions, a mean free path of 200  $\mu\text{m}$  is assumed (Baran and Labonnote  
14 2007). The chosen values describing the Weibull statistics are also consistent with the values  
15 derived from independent cloud chamber measurements reported in Neshyba et al. (2013).

16 To interpret the PARASOL measurements the scattering phase function is required. The bulk-  
17 averaged scattering phase function,  $\langle P_{11}(\theta) \rangle$ , is given by the following equation,

$$\langle P_{11}(\theta) \rangle = \frac{\int C_{\text{sca}}(\bar{q}) P_{11}(\theta, \bar{q}) n(\bar{q}) d\bar{q}}{\int C_{\text{sca}}(\bar{q}) n(\bar{q}) d\bar{q}} \quad (1)$$

19 where the vector  $(\bar{q})$  in Eq. (1) represents the elements of the ensemble model as a function of  
20 maximum dimension,  $n(\bar{q})$  is the F07 parametrized PSD, and  $C_{\text{sca}}(\bar{q})$  is the scattering cross-section  
21 of each of the ensemble model members. To generate the F07 PSDs, the IWC and in-cloud  
22 temperature are assumed to have the values of 0.01  $\text{gm}^{-3}$  and  $-50^\circ\text{C}$ , respectively.

23 The bulk-averaged asymmetry parameter,  $\langle g \rangle$ , is calculated using the following equation,



$$\langle g \rangle = \frac{\int g(\bar{q}) C_{\text{sca}}(\bar{q}) h(\bar{q}) d\bar{q}}{\int C_{\text{sca}}(\bar{q}) h(\bar{q}) d\bar{q}} \quad (2)$$

where the parameters in Eq. (2) have been previously defined. Another parameter of importance in calculating the total cloud reflectance is the single-scattering albedo,  $\omega_0$ , which is the ratio of the scattered radiation to that totally attenuated in the hemisphere of all directions. Here, the wavelength of 0.865  $\mu\text{m}$  is considered, at such a weakly absorbing wavelength, the value of  $\omega_0$  will be close to unity.

The bulk-averaged volume extinction coefficient,  $\langle \beta_{\text{ext}} \rangle$ , is calculated from the following equation,

$$\langle \beta_{\text{ext}} \rangle = \int C_{\text{ext}}(\bar{q}) h(\bar{q}) d\bar{q} \quad (3)$$

where  $C_{\text{ext}}(\bar{q})$  is the extinction cross-section of each member of the ensemble model, calculated as a function of its maximum dimension.

Figure 4 (a) shows the bulk-averaged ensemble model predicted scattering phase functions, calculated at the wavelength of 0.865  $\mu\text{m}$ , assuming distortion values of 0, 0.15 (slightly distorted), 0.25 (moderately distorted), and 0.4 with spherical air bubble inclusions. The complex refractive index of ice at 0.865  $\mu\text{m}$  has the value of  $1.304 + 2.400 \times 10^{-7} I$ , where  $I$  is the imaginary part of the refractive index (Warren and Brandt 2008). The total optical properties (i.e.,  $\langle g \rangle$  and  $\omega_0$ ) are tabulated in Table 1 for each of the assumed ensemble models. Figure 5 shows the maximum contribution to the ice crystal scattering cross-section per particle, as a function of maximum dimension, assuming the IWC and in-cloud temperature values given above. The figure shows that the maximum contribution to the scattering cross-section occurs at a maximum dimension of about 50  $\mu\text{m}$ . Defining the size parameter,  $x$ , as  $\pi D / \lambda$ , where  $\lambda$  is the incident wavelength, gives a value of  $x$  of about 182. This value of  $x$  means that the Monte-Carlo ray-tracing method is within the range of  $x$  where the method is applicable (Yang and Liou 1996). As stated previously, the methods

1 adopted throughout this paper to represent ice crystal complexity have been applied to generate a  
2 range of phase functions that retain and remove optical features that may be exhibited by naturally-  
3 occurring cirrus phase functions. It is not as yet possible to simultaneously fully represent actual ice  
4 crystal complexity (i.e., surface roughening and internal hexagonal cavities) using electromagnetic  
5 methods at the size parameters considered in this paper (Baran 2012). Therefore, approximations to  
6 ice crystal light scattering properties are required at such size parameters. This is achieved,  
7 principally, through the method of geometric optics, and as such, approximations are required to  
8 represent surface roughness and ice crystal complexity. Here, both of these complexities are  
9 represented through the application of distorting ray paths (Macke et al. 1996) and spherical air  
10 bubble inclusions (Macke et al. 1995; Labonnote et al., 2001). When applied to the ice crystal  
11 model, both randomizations lead to featureless phase functions, which are the phase functions that  
12 are generally observed (Baran 2012; Cole et al. 2013; 2014). However, although the methods  
13 applied in this study result in featureless phase functions, this, however, does not necessarily mean  
14 that the resulting asymmetry parameter values shown in Table 1 cover the actual range of those  
15 values. Recent observations by van Diedenhoven et al. (2013) of the asymmetry parameter derived  
16 from global polarimetric space-based remote sensing suggest median values in the range 0.76 to  
17 0.78. Whilst Ulanowski et al. (2006) reported that laboratory estimates of the asymmetry parameter,  
18 assuming highly surface roughened laboratory grown rosette crystal analogues, could be as low as  
19 0.61. On the other hand, the same study reported that smooth aggregate crystal analogues had  
20 asymmetry parameter values of 0.81. It is yet to be determined as to whether the asymmetry  
21 parameter values of actual cirrus ice crystals are as low as 0.61, and the values tabulated in Table 1  
22 are in the upper range of van Diedenhoven et al. (2013) and Ulanowski et al. (2006). Figure 4(a)  
23 shows that as the distortion parameters are gradually increased, the halo and ice bow features  
24 gradually diminish, and for the most randomized case, the scattering phase function becomes  
25 featureless and almost flat at backscattering angles. At the scattering angles of relevance to this

1 study, the figure shows that discrimination between the model phase functions should be possible  
2 using the viewing geometry of PARASOL, especially at the scattering angles between  $100^\circ$  and  
3  $130^\circ$ . To demonstrate the feasibility of PARASOL to discriminate between the different ensemble  
4 model randomizations, Fig. 4 (b) shows the ratio of the randomized to the pristine phase functions  
5 plotted against scattering angle. Figure 4 (b) shows that at scattering angles between about  $80^\circ$  to  
6  $130^\circ$ , the ratio between the most randomized and pristine phase functions can reach values of about  
7 1.1 to 1.5. At the distortion value of 0.15 (slightly distorted) and at scattering angles greater than  
8  $115^\circ$ , the ratio can still reach values of 1.1. However, at scattering angles between about  $80^\circ$  to  
9  $100^\circ$ , the values of the ratio between the pristine and slightly distorted, and moderately distorted  
10 phase functions are only slightly greater than unity, which means that discrimination between those  
11 models may not be possible at those particular scattering angles. However, due to the increasing  
12 values of the ratio at scattering angles between approximately  $100^\circ$  to  $125^\circ$ , it might be possible to  
13 discriminate between models on a pixel-by-pixel basis at those particular scattering angles.

14         Of course, the phase functions derived from the ensemble model shown in Fig. 4 may not  
15 cover the entire range of possible cirrus phase functions as there are many possible cirrus habits that  
16 might occur at particular environmental temperatures (see, for example, Baran (2012) and  
17 references therein). However, in the case of aggregates of hexagonal plates or hexagonal columns, it  
18 was shown by Baran (2009), using the ice aggregation model of Westbrook et al. (2004), that after  
19 three monomers were attached to the ice aggregate the asymmetry parameters and phase functions  
20 asymptote to their limiting values. This asymptote occurs because the ice aggregation model  
21 predicts that the ice monomers making up the ice aggregate are well separated from each other. This  
22 separation is sufficient to reduce the effects of multiple scattering on the phase function, resulting in  
23 only slight modifications to the scattering angle positions of optical features (see, for example, Fig.  
24 5 and Fig. 6 of Baran 2009). This aggregation process is fundamental, and the same behaviour  
25 would be observed independent of the shape of the initial monomer (Westbrook et al. 2004).

1 Therefore, in the case of pristine aggregates, the position of optical features on the phase functions  
2 would not be expected to be fundamentally different to those shown in Fig. 4 (a). If, on the other  
3 hand, the monomers that make up the ice crystal aggregate are sufficiently close to each other, by  
4 arbitrarily attaching them, then multiple scattering between monomers becomes important, as the  
5 scattered energy is increased and so therefore is the phase function. However, the positions of the  
6 optical features exhibited by the ice aggregate phase functions do not significantly change position  
7 with respect to their scattering angles as these are principally determined by the hexagonal  
8 geometry (Um and McFarquhar 2007; 2009). As discussed in the introduction to this paper, the  
9 observational evidence indicates that pristine ice crystals are a rarity in nature and so the phase  
10 functions of highly complex ice crystals exhibiting inclusions, cavities and surface roughness will  
11 produce featureless phase functions and the featureless nature of the phase function is invariant  
12 with respect to ice crystal habit.

13 To retrieve the spectral spherical albedo using PARASOL, a radiative transfer model is required,  
14 here the model developed by de Haan et al. (1986) is used and its application to PARASOL has  
15 been fully described by Labonnote et al. (2001). The radiative transfer model assumes a plane-  
16 parallel cloud, but it is fully inclusive of multiple scattering. Also taken into account are layers of  
17 aerosol below the cloud and Rayleigh scattering above and below the cloud is also taken into  
18 account. The aerosol model assumed in the PARASOL retrieval has been previously described by  
19 Buriez et al. (2005), and so a description will not be repeated here. However, the aerosol is  
20 principally maritime-based and so its optical depth will be much smaller than the cirrus optical  
21 depth, and as such it will not be of any significance for the purposes of this paper. At the  
22 wavelength of 0.865  $\mu\text{m}$ , the PARASOL retrieval algorithm assumes that the sea surface has a  
23 reflectance value of 0.000612 (the foam contribution outside of sun glint) and a wind speed of 7  $\text{ms}^{-1}$ .  
24 <sup>1</sup>. See Appendix A in Buriez et al. (2005) for a detailed derivation of the assumed PARASOL sea  
25 surface reflectance value. The scattering by aerosol and Ocean glint all contribute to the directional

1 variation of the retrieved cloud optical depth, and these effects are taken into account in the  
2 PARASOL retrieval algorithm. In the next section, the retrieval methodology is described.

### 3 **4. Methodology**

4 The methodology of retrieving the spectral spherical albedo using PARASOL multi-directional  
5 measurements of total reflectance has been previously described by (Doutriaux-Boucher et al.,  
6 2000; Buriez et al., 2001; and Labonnote et al., 2001), but a brief description of the retrieval is  
7 given here. The total reflectance of the cloud is specified by the vertical volume extinction  
8 coefficient, the vertical extent of the cloud, and the scattering phase function. The cloud optical  
9 depth is therefore given by the integral of the vertical extinction over the vertical depth of the cloud.  
10 Since the cloud is essentially over a non-reflecting surface, the only directional information, **under**  
11 **the assumption of a plane-parallel homogeneous layer**, is provided by the assumed scattering phase  
12 **function. However, inhomogeneity in the cloud can also affect the directional reflection as shown**  
13 **by Buriez et al. (2001), but this effect is not currently accounted for in the PARASOL retrieval**  
14 **algorithm due to its highly variable nature.** It has been previously shown by Doutriaux-Boucher et  
15 al. (2000) that there is a one-to-one relationship between the cloud optical depth and the cloud  
16 spherical albedo (i.e., integral of the plane albedo over all incoming directions, where the plane  
17 albedo is a function of solar zenith angle alone), if the surface below the cloud is black. The cloud  
18 optical depth is retrieved by matching the simulated cloud reflectance to the measured cloud  
19 reflectance at each scattering angle. If the phase function were a perfect representation of the cloud,  
20 then the retrieved cloud optical depth will be the same at each scattering angle. Therefore, the  
21 retrieved spherical albedo would also be the same at each scattering angle. If the assumed phase  
22 function were a poor representation of the cloud, then this would result in a directional dependence  
23 on the spherical albedo, which would be unphysical. This retrieval methodology forms the basis of  
24 this paper, and it has been applied by other studies that have utilized PARASOL measurements to

1 test ice cloud scattering phase functions, see for example (Doutriaux-Boucher et al., 2000;  
2 Labonnote et al., 2001; Baran et al., 2001; Knapp et al., 2005; Baran and Labonnote 2006).

3 As previously stated, the retrievals of spherical albedo are performed on a pixel-by-pixel basis,  
4 and the data products derived from the PARASOL observations are only used if the following four  
5 conditions are met: (i) for each 6 km × 6 km pixel the cloud fraction is unity, (ii) the total number  
6 of view angles ≥ 7, (iii) the difference between the minimum and maximum sampled scattering  
7 angle is greater than 50°, and (iv) only pixels over the sea are considered. **The total number of**  
8 **PARASOL pixels that are within the area of interest shown in Fig. 1 is 297.** As previously stated,  
9 since, by definition, the true cloud spherical albedo is independent of direction, then for each pixel,  
10 the retrieved averaged directional spherical albedo,  $\langle S \rangle$ , should be identical to the directional  
11 spherical albedo,  $S(\theta)$ , where  $\theta$  is the scattering angle, if the model phase function were a perfect  
12 representation of the cloud. The retrievals of  $S(\theta)$  depend on the assumed scattering phase function,  
13 the vertical volume extinction coefficient and  $\omega_0$ .

14 The averaged spherical albedo,  $\langle S \rangle$ , for each pixel is defined by,

$$\langle S \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{j=N} S_j(\theta) \quad (4)$$

16 where  $N$  is the total number of viewing directions, which for the case considered in this paper is  
17 between 7 and 8. To find the phase function that best minimizes the spherical albedo differences,  
18 the root mean square error (rmse) is found for each pixel, which is given by

$$\text{rmse} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \Delta S_j^2}{N}} \quad (5)$$

20 where in Eq. (5),  $\Delta S_j = \langle S \rangle - S_j(\theta)$ , and the other terms have been previously defined. **The rmse is**  
21 **one general measure for choosing the best-fit model to the observations.** However, once a set of  
22 **rmse-minimisers has been identified, one should assess where the identification is statistically**

1 significant. This is needed to rule-out the possibility that the differences in rmse for the different  
2 distortions could have resulted from chance. To test this, we apply the Levene (1960) test statistic,  
3 as it is less sensitive to the condition that the data must be normally distributed than the usual F  
4 statistic, which is generally used to test whether the variances between two samples are equal,  
5 provided the data follow a normal distribution. In the Levene test, the samples,  $k$ , are tested for  
6 homogeneity of variances between the  $k$  samples. The total number of data points contained in all  
7 samples is given by  $N$ . The Levene null hypothesis is that variances between  $k$  samples are equal.  
8 The Levene null hypothesis is rejected, at some level of significance,  $\alpha$ , if the Levene test statistic,  
9  $W$ , is greater than  $F_{\alpha}(k-1, N-k)$ , where  $F_{\alpha}(k-1, N-k)$  is the upper critical value of some F distribution  
10 with  $k-1$  and  $N-k$  degrees of freedom. We consider pixels for which the derived rmse values do not  
11 exceed 100% to require testing for significance using the W-test. For these pixels, the W-test  
12 statistic is applied, to test whether the model variances in  $\Delta S_j$  are different at the 5% significance  
13 level. If the null hypothesis is rejected, then that pixel is assigned a particular model phase function.  
14 The 5% or  $\alpha=0.05$  significance level is chosen, as this is simply between  $\alpha=0.1$  (10%) and  $\alpha=0.01$   
15 (1%) significance levels, so that the model test is neither too easy or unrealistically too hard,  
16 respectively.

17 In the sections that follow, the model phase functions shown in Fig. 4 and the total optical  
18 properties given in Table 1 are applied to the PARASOL measurements, on a pixel-by-pixel basis,  
19 to retrieve the phase function that best minimises Eq. (5) and satisfies rejection of the Levene null  
20 hypothesis. Results of this analysis are then used to explore possible relationships between the  
21 shape of the scattering phase function and  $RH_i$ .

## 22 **5. Results**

### 23 5.1 Validating the NWP model field of $RH_i$

24 Before exploring the possible relationship between  $RH_i$  and the scattering phase function, it is first  
25 necessary to show that the NWP model predicted field of  $RH_i$  is sufficiently accurate for the

1 purposes of this paper. Firstly, Fig. 6 shows the NWP model predicted field of the water vapour  
2 mixing ratio and the location of the PARASOL pixels, and the position of the aircraft within that  
3 field. The aircraft positions were predominantly located around the areas of semi-transparent cirrus,  
4 with generally no cloud beneath, as shown by Fig. 1. Figure 6 shows that there is considerable  
5 variation in the water vapour field at about the cloud-top, around the North and East of Scotland.  
6 As a consequence of this variation, there will be a sufficient change in the  $RH_i$  field at the cloud-top  
7 as a function of position, to relate retrieval results to the model field. From Fig. 6 we note that the  
8 NWP model predicted the cloud-top to be in the vicinity of 10 km for the region of interest. Figure  
9 7 (a) shows the aircraft-mounted lidar estimate of the volume extinction coefficient as a function of  
10 altitude, and the bottom panel shows the derived lidar optical depth as a function of time. Note that  
11 in Figure 7 (a) only the lidar derived profile of volume extinction coefficient greater than 6 km is  
12 shown. This is because at altitudes less than this, the lidar equation becomes numerically unstable  
13 in clear air, and as such there were no meaningful retrievals of cirrus volume extinction coefficient  
14 below this altitude. Figure 7 (a) shows that the lidar estimated cloud-top altitude was at about 10  
15 km, at approximately 13:33:00 UTC, which is in good agreement with the NWP model prediction,  
16 and the lidar position at that time is marked by the symbol X in Fig. 6.

17 To validate the NWP model prediction of the  $RH_i$  field use is now made of the aircraft-mounted  
18 ARIES measurements, which are applied to obtain retrievals of  $RH_i$ . The retrieval of  $RH_i$  from the  
19 ARIES measurements is achieved using the Havemann-Taylor Fast Radiative Transfer Code  
20 (HTFRTC) (Havemann 2006; Havemann et al., 2009) and the retrieval method of Thelen et al.  
21 (2012). Moreover, the ARIES-based retrieval of  $RH_i$  is validated against the dropsonde  
22 measurements of  $RH_i$ . The HTFRTC is a principal component based radiative transfer model and is  
23 fully inclusive of the atmosphere and exact multiple scattering. The ARIES spectrum was averaged  
24 over 10 spectra and was de-noised using principal components, which act as a low-pass filter. For  
25 this case, European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasting (ECMWF) atmospheric



1 profiles are applied as the background state and the Optimal Estimation (OE) method of Rodgers  
2 (1976), is used, which is a Bayesian method. Here, OE is used to retrieve the most likely  
3 atmospheric state, and the method includes a rigorous treatment of error. The errors arise from the  
4 ARIES instrument itself and from the forward model, as well as from the ECMWF model  
5 background fields. The treatment of error by OE assumes that the errors are described by a  
6 Gaussian distribution. Here the background errors in the temperature, RH and IWC are assumed to  
7 be typically  $\pm 0.4$  K,  $\pm 10\%$ , and  $\pm 50\%$ , respectively. Given the errors, ARIES measurements, and  
8 simulated measurements using HTFRTC, OE uses a minimization procedure to find the most likely  
9 atmospheric state that best describes the measurement set, given the retrieved parameters or state  
10 vector. Currently, the state vector in the HTFRTC retrieval method (Thelen et al., 2012) is  
11 composed of the temperature profile, the relative humidity profile, homogeneous cirrus IWC,  
12 surface temperature, and surface emissivity. The temperature and relative humidity profiles are  
13 retrieved at all 70 levels of the Met Office operational suite of models.

14 The NWP model prediction of the vertical profile of  $RH_i$  is compared against the ARIES  
15 retrievals, dropsonde measurements, and in situ aircraft measurements from the GE and FWVS  
16 instruments. The various comparisons are shown in Fig. 8 (a) and Fig. 8 (b) for two different  
17 locations. The in situ vertical profiles of  $RH_i$  shown in the figures were obtained during an aircraft  
18 ascent from about 350 hPa to about 240 hPa, and the ascent started at 12:45:58 UTC and ended at  
19 13:18:52 UTC. The dropsonde shown in the figure was launched at 13:30:00 UTC. The ARIES  
20 retrievals of  $RH_i$  took place whilst the aircraft was on a straight and level run above the cloud  
21 between the times of 13:19:00 UTC and 13:32:13 UTC.

22 Figure 8 (a) and 8 (b) show that the two in situ  $RH_i$  measurements are in good agreement with  
23 each other, whilst the dropsonde took some time to adjust to the prevailing atmospheric conditions.  
24 After this adjustment time, the infrared retrievals of  $RH_i$ , in the presence of cirrus, are in good  
25 agreement with the dropsonde and are within the range of  $RH_i$  measured by the two in situ

1 instruments. The figure demonstrates that the retrieval of  $RH_i$  using high-resolution passive infrared  
2 measurements is sufficiently accurate and can be obtained, in the presence of cirrus, on a global  
3 scale using space-based high-resolution instruments such as the Infrared Atmospheric Sounding  
4 Interferometer (IASI). Furthermore, below the cloud, the dropsonde and retrievals are in very good  
5 agreement in the drier regions of the atmosphere, down to pressures of about 600 hPa. Moreover,  
6 the retrievals and dropsonde are in good agreement, down to pressures of about 1000 hPa. The two  
7 different retrieval colours represent the retrievals based on the two aircraft runs above the cirrus that  
8 were previously described. Each of the runs was 10 min in length. There were approximately eight  
9 ARIES retrievals per run. Figure 8 demonstrates that the retrievals, dropsonde measurements and in  
10 situ measurements are sufficiently consistent to compare against the NWP model. Figure 8 (a)  
11 shows the various comparisons at the latitude of  $59.14^\circ\text{N}$  and longitude  $3.85^\circ\text{W}$ , which corresponds  
12 to the upper left of Fig. 6. The figure shows that the NWP model prediction of the vertical profile of  
13  $RH_i$  is consistent with the retrievals and measurements. Figure 8 (b) is similar to Fig. 8 (a) but for  
14 the location  $57.97^\circ\text{N}$  and  $3.20^\circ\text{W}$ , which corresponds to the lower left of Fig. 6. In this figure, the  
15 NWP model and retrievals can reach values of  $RH_i$  of up to about 1.20. Figure 8 (a) and (b)  
16 validates the NWP model prediction of  $RH_i$ , and, thus, this model can be used to compare against  
17 the PARASOL estimates of ice crystal randomization. Figure 8 (a) and (b) show that the NWP  
18 model predicted cloud-top is at about 200 hPa ( $\sim 10$  km), and the cloud-base is at about 400 hPa ( $\sim 7$   
19 km), respectively

20 The NWP model predicted cloud depth is therefore about 3 km, which is also in good agreement  
21 with the lidar derived maximum cloud depth shown in Fig. 7 (a) at [approximately 13:33:00 UTC](#),  
22 when the aircraft was above the cloud-top.

### 23 5.1.1. Estimating the shape of the scattering phase function and its relationship to $RH_i$

24 In this section, the methodology described in section 4 is used to estimate the ensemble model  
25 phase function which best minimises the rmse and rejects the Levene null hypothesis at the 5%

1 **significance level.** The ensemble model phase functions used here were previously described in  
2 section 3.1.1, and are shown in Fig. 4. **The results from the phase function estimates for each pixel,**  
3 **showing the phase function model that best minimised rmse, are shown in Fig. 9 (a).** The total  
4 number of retrievals, showing only those retrievals over the sea, in Fig. 9 (a) is 292. However, **130**  
5 **of these retrievals correspond to indeterminate results.** The reason for the **indeterminate results at**  
6 **those pixels is because the retrieved spherical albedo at each of the scattering angles was the same**  
7 **for all ensemble models. The similarity of retrieved results in the indeterminate cases is because the**  
8 **retrieval conditions stated in section 4 were not met.** These **indeterminate results** are shown as black  
9 **squares** in the figure. A comparison between Fig. 9 (a) and Fig. 1 show that the indeterminate  
10 results generally occurred in the presence of multi-layer cloud. **Figure 9 (b) shows the averaged**  
11 **retrieved PARASOL decadal optical thickness (averaged over all available scattering angles) at**  
12 **each of the pixels shown in Fig. 9 (a).** The figure shows that the retrieved PARASOL optical  
13 thickness ranged between less than 1 and up to about 250. The largest optical thicknesses retrieved  
14 by PARASOL are associated with the broken frontal cloud shown in Fig. 1 (right-hand side of the  
15 figure), and the positions of the broken frontal cloud fields are also predominantly associated with  
16 the positions of the **indeterminate results** shown in Fig. 9 (a). Figure 9 (a) and (b) show that even for  
17 PARASOL retrieved optical thicknesses of between about 10 and 30, discrimination between  
18 ensemble models is still possible. The physical reason for this was recently given by Zhang et al.  
19 (2009). In the paper, they physically argued that even if the optical thickness is increased to large  
20 values, the shape of the phase function is still retained at top-of-the-atmosphere. This is because  
21 scattering within the cloud is dominated by forward scattering, which results from strong diffraction  
22 in the forward direction (Macke et al. 1995), and this single-scattering information is still retained  
23 in the presence of strong multiple scattering. However, at the largest retrieved optical thicknesses  
24 shown in Fig. 9 (b), multiple scattering will be so strong that discrimination between models will no  
25 longer be possible, and some of these largest optical thicknesses are associated with the

1 indeterminate results. Figure 9 (c) shows the estimated randomizations at each PARAOL pixel, but  
2 with the indeterminate results removed, again using only the minimised rmse value to select the  
3 best model phase function. The yellow squares in Fig. 9 (c) correspond to the most randomized  
4 phase function (i.e., distortion=0.4 with spherical air bubble inclusions), and the number of pixels  
5 associated with this colour is 150, which from the figure, is clearly the most common. However, 12  
6 of the pixels shown in the top left of the figure are not associated with the most randomized phase  
7 function. Rather, these pixels were found to be associated with the pristine phase function  
8 (distortion=0), or the slightly distorted (distortion=0.15), or moderately distorted (distortion=0.25)  
9 phase functions. The retrievals which best minimised the rmse assuming the pristine phase function  
10 are represented by the blue squares. Whilst the pixels represented by the dark and light brown  
11 squares were found to be associated with the slightly (distortion=0.15) and moderately distorted  
12 (distortion=0.25) ensemble model phase functions, respectively. Therefore, the results shown in  
13 Fig. 9 (c) indicate that on a pixel-by-pixel basis, the most randomized ice crystal model phase  
14 functions may not always be the best-fit to multi-angular spectral albedo measurements, at least if  
15 only the minimised rmse value is used to select the best-fit phase function. Note, however, that we  
16 have so far disregarded whether or not the discrimination of phase function, based on rmse, is  
17 statistically significant. The reliability of the use of minimised rmse values only to select the best  
18 model phase function is further examined in the paragraphs that follow.

19 The estimated randomization for two of the pixels shown in the top left of Fig. 9 (c) are further  
20 examined in Fig. 10 (a) and 10 (b). The figure shows the spherical albedo differences plotted as a  
21 function of scattering angle for each of the two pixels, and in each of the figures, the rmse values  
22 are shown that were derived from the spherical albedo differences assuming the four models. The  
23 first pixel shown in Fig. 10 (a) is located at latitude  $59.03^\circ$  and longitude  $-3.62^\circ$ , and this pixel has  
24 been assigned the fully randomised phase function. It can be seen from the figure, that in this case,  
25 the spherical albedo differences predicted by the fully randomized phase function are closer to the

1 zero line than the other models for all scattering angles considered. In this case, the rmse value  
2 found for the fully randomized model is a factor of 4.6 smaller than the value of the rmse found for  
3 the pristine model. In contrast to Fig. 10 (a), Fig. 10 (b) shows the spherical albedo differences for  
4 the pixel located at latitude  $59.14^\circ$  and longitude  $-3.84^\circ$ , and this pixel has been assigned the  
5 pristine model phase function. In this case, the pristine model phase function is closest to the zero  
6 line at the scattering angles of about  $92^\circ$ ,  $107^\circ$ , and  $123^\circ$ . However, at the scattering angles of about  
7  $99^\circ$  and  $113^\circ$ , the pristine model phase function predicted spherical albedo differences are similar to  
8 the predictions obtained assuming the moderately and fully randomized phase functions,  
9 respectively. The rmse values, shown in the figure, indicate that the pristine model phase function  
10 best minimises the rmse, although this value is only a factor of 1.3 smaller than the rmse value  
11 found assuming the fully randomized phase function. In general, if the spherical albedo differences  
12 are visually examined at all scattering angles, then, one could conclude, that for this pixel, no one  
13 phase function model best describes all seven measurements. The question then arises if this is true  
14 for all the 11 other pixels that are associated with structure in their scattering phase functions at  
15 backscattering angles? To test this quantitatively, the Levene test statistic is now applied to all 12  
16 pixels for which a non-featureless phase function was selected using the minimised rmse value test.

17 From Fig. 9 (c) it can be seen that using minimised rmse test, five of the twelve pixels are  
18 associated with pristine model phase functions (distortion=0), whilst four pixels are associated with  
19 slightly distorted phase functions (distortion=0.15), and the other three pixels are associated with  
20 moderately distorted phase functions (distortion=0.25). All pixels associated with each of the  
21 above 3 distortion values were combined together. For each of the distortions, the W statistic was  
22 obtained in groups of 2, so that  $k=2$ . The variances in the spherical albedo differences obtained with  
23 the rmse determined best-fit phase function were compared against the variances obtained assuming  
24 all other model phase functions. For each group of 2, the test W statistic was computed and then  
25 compared against the tabulated upper critical value of the  $F_{\alpha}(k-1, N-k)$  distribution, to accept or

1 reject the null hypothesis at the 5% significance level. The results of this analysis are presented in  
2 Table 2.

3 In the case of the five pixels associated with pristine phase functions, it can be seen from Table 2  
4 that the Levene null hypothesis must be accepted. Therefore, the variances in the spherical albedo  
5 differences determined using the rmse best-fit model are not sufficiently different from the  
6 variances obtained using all other phase function models. A similar result to the above was found  
7 for the three pixels, which were associated with the moderately distorted phase function  
8 (distortion=0.25). For the four pixels associated with the slightly distorted model phase function  
9 (distortion=0.15), Table 2 shows that the null hypothesis can be rejected, when its variances are  
10 compared against the variances obtained assuming the fully distorted model phase function  
11 (distortion=0.4 with spherical air bubble inclusions). However, for all other assumed models, for  
12 this group of four pixels, the null hypothesis must be accepted. The results contained in Table 2  
13 shows that using minimised rmse values alone may not be sufficient to select model phase functions  
14 on a pixel-by-pixel basis and that some other test statistic is required to compliment the rmse  
15 method.

16 The Levene test statistic was also applied to some pixels associated with the most randomized  
17 phase function, to test if  $W \gg F$  for these pixels. The results of this test are presented in Table 3. In  
18 this case, seven pixels were selected between latitudes  $57.92^\circ$  to  $58.92^\circ$ , and between longitudes -  
19  $3.42^\circ$  to  $-3.71^\circ$ . As before, the seven pixels were combined, and the resulting variances in spherical  
20 albedo differences obtained assuming the most randomized phase function were compared against  
21 the variances obtained assuming model distortion values of 0.15, 0.25 and 0, respectively. The  
22 results from Table 3 shows that the null hypothesis can be very strongly rejected at  $\alpha=0.05$  (5%  
23 significance level). The results of this analysis strongly suggest that the selection of the most  
24 randomized phase function using minimized rmse values is acceptable, as illustrated by the  
25 example case in Figure 10 (a).

1 Since no one model phase function can be uniquely assigned to any of the twelve pixels, which  
2 show small differences in rmse between models, suggests that the model phase functions do not  
3 correctly describe the backscattering properties of the cirrus located at those pixels and/or there  
4 might be underlying water cloud affecting the results. To investigate the possibility that there might  
5 be an underlying water cloud beneath the cirrus contaminating the twelve pixels, the range  
6 corrected lidar images were further investigated under higher resolution to see if there was any  
7 water cloud beneath the cirrus. The aircraft passed over the 12 PARASOL pixels at between about  
8 13:20:00 UTC and 13:30:00 UTC. Between these times, the high-resolution lidar images showed  
9 only reflection from the sea surface with no evidence of underlying water cloud (results not shown  
10 here for reasons of brevity). It is noted here that the averaged retrieved PARASOL optical thickness  
11 (averaged over the 12 pixels) was found to be  $1.81 \pm 0.32$ , assuming model distortion values of  
12 between 0 and 0.25. Furthermore, the retrieved PARASOL averaged optical thickness over the  
13 same 12 pixels, assuming the fully randomized phase function is  $1.52 \pm 0.26$ . Both retrievals are  
14 within the range of the lidar estimates shown in Fig. 7 (b), the average of which is about 1.2. The  
15 lidar vertical profiles of optical depth were obtained when the aircraft was located above the cirrus,  
16 at an altitude of almost 11 km, which occurred during the times shown in the figure. There is a gap  
17 of about three minutes shown in Fig. 7 (b), which is the time required for the aircraft to turn and  
18 commence the second straight and level run. The PARASOL retrievals of cirrus optical thickness  
19 and the lidar retrievals are both consistent with one another. If there was an underlying water cloud  
20 beneath the cirrus at the time of the PARASOL overpass, then the retrievals would not have been  
21 consistent. To examine the issue of underlying water cloud further, at a time nearer to the  
22 PARASOL overpass, generally available space-based cloud products were also examined.

23 The space-based remotely sensed cloud products are available from [http://www-](http://www-pm.larc.nasa.gov/)  
24 [pm.larc.nasa.gov/](http://www-pm.larc.nasa.gov/). The cloud products that were examined were obtained at the time of 13:00:00  
25 UTC, which is the time closest to the PARASOL overpass. The available remotely sensed cloud

1 products from the site include detection of multiple cloud layers and cloud-top pressure. Analysis of  
2 these images indicated that the cloud overlying the 12 pixels was single layer, and the cloud-top  
3 pressure of this single-layer cloud was retrieved to be between 100 to 200 mbar (again not shown  
4 here for reasons of brevity). These independent space-based remote sensing results indicate that  
5 there was no underlying water cloud covering the 12 pixels, and this is consistent with the analysis  
6 of the high resolution range corrected lidar images as well as the PARASOL and lidar retrievals of  
7 cirrus optical depth.

8 Since it is unlikely that underlying water cloud affected the results discussed above indicate that  
9 there might have been some backscattering intensity structure present, which is not currently  
10 represented by any of the four phase function models or more simply. There was insufficient  
11 scattering angle information available to distinguish between models. Interestingly, Baran et al.  
12 (2012) also found that, for a case of mid-latitude, very high IWC anvil cirrus **near to the cloud-top**,  
13 the PN measured averaged scattering phase function **also exhibited unusual** backscattering features.  
14 Clearly, such findings of optical features on the scattering phase function of naturally-occurring ice  
15 crystals indicate the need for radiometric or in-situ observations to sample the scattered angular  
16 intensities over a more complete range of scattering angle than is currently possible. Measuring the  
17 forward and backscattering intensities alone is not sufficiently general (Baran et al., 2012).  
18 However, the most common retrievals shown in Fig 9 (a) are representative of the most randomized  
19 ice crystals and these have featureless phase functions. For the purposes of retrieving cirrus  
20 properties using global radiometric measurements, it is most likely that featureless phase functions  
21 are still generally better at representing cirrus radiative properties than their purely pristine  
22 counterparts (Foot 1988; Baran et al., 1999; Baran et al., 2001; Baran and Labonnote 2006; Baum et  
23 al., 2011; Cole et al., 2013; Ulanowski et al. 2013; **Cole et al. 2014**).

24 **Here**, it is also of interest to note the change in the asymmetry parameter values shown in Table  
25 1. From the pristine ensemble model phase function to the most randomized ensemble model phase



1 function the change in the asymmetry parameter is about 5%. A change in the asymmetry parameter  
2 of 5% is radiatively important as illustrated by the following example. Given that the instantaneous  
3 solar irradiance arriving at the Earth's top-of-atmosphere is about  $1370 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ . Under the  
4 assumptions of conservative scattering and a dark ocean below the cirrus, a change of 5% in the  
5 asymmetry parameter results in a difference of about  $43 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  in the reflected solar irradiance back  
6 to space. However, the difference of  $43 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  could be an under estimate if actual values of the  
7 asymmetry parameter are lower than reported in Table 1 (Ulanowski et al. 2006). Even so, a  
8 difference of  $43 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  is very significant with regard to the energetics of the Earth's atmosphere,  
9 and indicates why it is important to globally constrain values of the asymmetry parameter (Baran  
10 2012; Ulanowski et al. 2006; Ulanowski et al. 2013; van Diedenhoven et al. 2013).

11 The PARASOL estimations of the shape of the scattering phase function, based on applying the  
12 minimised rmse and the Levene tests are shown in Fig. 11 (a). In the figure, the yellow pixels were  
13 assigned the most randomized phase function, the brown pixels are the locations where no one  
14 model phase function could be uniquely assigned. The blue pixels show the locations where either  
15 phase function model, apart from the most randomized phase function, could be assigned. The  
16 results shown in Fig. 11 (a) are now directly compared against the NWP model predicted  $\text{RH}_i$  field  
17 at the cloud-top, which is shown in Fig. 11 (b). The NWP model results are shown at a cloud-top  
18 altitude of 10 km. On comparison with Fig. 11 (a), it can be seen from Fig. 11 (b), that the most  
19 randomized phase functions (i.e, yellow squares) generally correspond to model pixels with  $\text{RH}_i >$   
20 1.0. Conversely, the 12 pixels, where no one model phase function could be assigned, generally  
21 correspond to NWP model pixels with  $\text{RH}_i < 1.0$ . The results for  $\text{RH}_i > 1$  are broadly consistent  
22 with the findings of Gayet et al. (2011) and Ulanowski et al. (2013). The results of the former paper  
23 suggested that featureless phase functions were generally associated with  $\text{RH}_i > 1.0$ . Whilst the  
24 laboratory studies of Ulanowski et al. (2013), on ice crystal analogues, indicate that at higher levels  
25 of ice supersaturation, surface roughness on the ice crystal increased. This increase in surface

1 roughness would naturally lead to featureless phase functions (Yang and Liou, 1998; Ulanowski et  
2 al. 2006; Baran 2012, and references contained therein).

3 The NWP results shown in Fig. 11 (b) are at the cloud-top. However, the PARASOL retrievals  
4 might be based on reflected solar radiation that comes from the extent of the cloud and not just  
5 from the cloud-top. In reality, solar radiation at  $0.865\ \mu\text{m}$  will penetrate to some depth within the  
6 cloud layer, and this depth of penetration needs to be calculated to test whether the assumption of  
7 cloud-top penetration is correct.

8 To calculate the depth of penetrating radiation at  $0.865\ \mu\text{m}$ , a Monte-Carlo radiative transfer  
9 model has been used to represent the cirrus layer of relevance to this study. The Monte-Carlo model  
10 used here is fully described by Cornet al. (2009). A description of the Monte-Carlo model set-up  
11 and definition of the probability of penetration is given in Appendix A. The percent probability of  
12 penetration as a function of cloud depth, and optical depth is shown in Fig. 12 (a) and Fig. 12 (b). In  
13 the figures, the percent probability of penetration at  $0.865\ \mu\text{m}$  is defined as the last position  
14 (distance from the cloud-top) of the photon before leaving the cloud to reach the sensor. Results are  
15 shown in the figure for the backscattered and forward scattered radiation in the solar plane,  
16 respectively.

17 Figures 12 (a) and (b) show that by a depth of 1 km from the cloud-top, the probability of  
18 penetration has been approximately more than halved, for optical depths greater than 0.3. By 1.5 km  
19 from the cloud-top, the probability of penetration is generally less than 5%. The percent probability  
20 of penetration shown in Fig. 12 (a) and (b) is similar. This is because the scattering phase function  
21 used in the Monte-Carlo calculations, at backscattering angles, is largely invariant with respect to  
22 the scattering angle. This is simply because the scattering phase functions representing the most  
23 randomised ice crystals are flat and featureless at backscattering angles.

24 From Fig. 12 (a) and (b), it can be concluded that the PARASOL measurements of the total  
25 reflectance is biased towards the cloud-top, and so therefore, comparison between the NWP model

1 at the cloud-top, and PARASOL estimations of the shape of the scattering phase function is  
2 acceptable.

3 This paper has demonstrated the potential of using space-based remote sensing to investigate  
4 relationships between the scattering properties of ice crystals and atmospheric state parameters.  
5 However, one drawback of current space-based multiple angle measurements is the limited range of  
6 multiple angle samplings, in this paper only seven measurement angles were available. In regions  
7 where generally NWP model values of  $RH_i$  were less than unity it was impossible to assign a model  
8 phase function to the PARASOL observations. Clearly, if more multiple angle samplings were  
9 available, coupled together with a greater range of scattering angle, then discriminating between  
10 different phase function models may become more likely.

11 Climate model parameterizations of the asymmetry parameter are currently assumed to be  
12 invariant with respect to atmospheric state variables. It is desirable, as argued by Baran et al.  
13 (2014), Baran (2012) and by Baran et al. (2009), to relate general circulation model prognostic  
14 variables directly to ice optical properties, so that the prognostic variables can then be directly  
15 related to space-based radiometric measurements. Only through directly relating general circulation  
16 model prognostic variables to radiative measurements can the possibility of error cancellation be  
17 removed from within climate models.

## 18 **6. Conclusions**

19 This paper has explored the relationship between  $RH_i$  and the shape of the scattering phase function  
20 for one case of mid-latitude cirrus that occurred on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2010. This relationship has  
21 been explored by combining high-resolution NWP model  $RH_i$  fields with satellite retrieval of the  
22 directional spherical albedo at  $0.865 \mu\text{m}$ . The satellite observations were obtained from the  
23 PARASOL spherical albedo product at scattering angles between about  $80^\circ$  and  $130^\circ$ . The satellite  
24 observations were analyzed on a pixel-by-pixel basis. It was found that featureless phase functions,  
25 representing significant ice crystal randomization, best minimized differences between the

1 directionally-averaged spherical albedo and the directional spherical albedo for about 90% of the  
2 pixels for which discrimination was possible. However, for about 10% of the pixels, it was found  
3 that discrimination between model phase functions, based on spherical albedo differences, was not  
4 possible. In general, if multi-angular data are not available, given that over 90% of the spherical  
5 albedo differences contained in this study were best described using featureless phase functions,  
6 then featureless phase functions are more likely to be a correct assumption for general application to  
7 the remote sensing of cirrus properties, rather than phase functions containing optical features.

8 It has also been demonstrated in this paper that the Met Office nested high-resolution NWP  
9 model predicted vertical profiles of  $RH_i$  are sufficiently accurate to combine with remote sensing  
10 data to study relationships between atmospheric state variables and the fundamental scattering  
11 properties of cirrus. Independent retrievals of the vertical profile of  $RH_i$ , using aircraft-based high-  
12 resolution infrared data, dropsonde measurements, and in situ measurements of  $RH_i$  showed  
13 excellent agreement with the NWP model predicted vertical profile of  $RH_i$ , for two very different  
14 locations within the cirrus field. Moreover, the NWP model prediction of cloud-top, vertical depth,  
15 and cloud-base were shown to be consistent with lidar measurements of the same quantities.  
16 Assuming that the NWP  $RH_i$  fields are representative of truth, the model fields were directly related  
17 to the remote sensing observations of the shape of the cirrus scattering phase function.

18 For this one cirrus case, it is found that featureless phase function models, representing highly  
19 randomized ice crystals, were shown to be generally associated with NWP model  $RH_i$  values  
20 greater than unity. In the cases where the NWP model  $RH_i$  values were found to be generally less  
21 than unity, no one single scattering phase function model could be assigned to the PARASOL pixel  
22 using a quantitative statistical measure. The possibility of these pixels being affected by the issue of  
23 underlying water cloud below the cirrus was also investigated. Using high-resolution lidar images,  
24 retrievals of cirrus optical depth obtained from PARASOL and the aircraft mounted lidar, as well as  
25 generally available space-based cloud products. It was found that it is unlikely that these pixels

1 were affected by underlying water cloud. Given this finding, the model phase functions did not have  
2 the correct structure in the backscattering part of the phase function, or more simply, there was not  
3 enough scattering angle information to be able to discriminate more clearly between the different  
4 phase function models. Given the latter reason, it would clearly be more desirable if future space-  
5 based instrumentation could resolve more clearly, and over a greater scattering angle range, the  
6 backscattering part of the cirrus phase function. This paper has also demonstrated that high-  
7 resolution interferometer data can be used, in the presence of optically thin cirrus, to retrieve the  
8 vertical profile of  $RH_i$ . This Interferometric capability, which already exists in space through IASI,  
9 could be combined with improved resolution of multiple viewing satellites to explore the  
10 relationship between atmospheric state parameters and shape of the scattering phase function on a  
11 global scale. This paper has demonstrated the potential for obtaining such global space-based  
12 measurements. There already exist aircraft-based instruments that measure the in situ light  
13 scattering properties of atmospheric ice at particular locations, such as those used by Gayet et al.  
14 2011, Ulanowski et al., 2013, and van Diedenhoven et al., 2013. Preferably, new in-situ  
15 instrumentation should be developed that is capable of measuring the scattered intensities over a  
16 larger range of scattering angle than is currently possible (Baran et al., 2012).

17 **Currently, the ice radiation scheme** in climate models does not take into account the changing  
18 atmospheric state as a function of ice crystal complexity. Further research in this area will prove or  
19 disprove whether this climate model assumption needs to change.

## 20 **Appendix A**

21 The radiative transfer model assumes a plane-parallel layer, with a vertical extent of 3 km. This  
22 cloud depth is consistent with the lidar result shown in Fig. 7 (a). The vertical resolution of the  
23 cloud layer is assumed to be 0.1 km, and the cloud-top is situated at an altitude of 10 km, which is  
24 also consistent with the lidar result shown in Fig. 7 (a). The relevant solar-satellite geometry for this  
25 case has been applied to the Monte-Carlo calculations. That is, the solar zenith angle is  $75^\circ$ . The

1 view angle of PARASOL at the time of the overpass has an average value of  $50^\circ$ . The standard  
2 deviation of the PARASOL view angle is generally less than  $2^\circ$ . For the purposes of this study, an  
3 average view angle will suffice. The view angle used in the Monte-Carlo model was set to a value  
4 of  $50^\circ$ . Moreover, the PARASOL azimuth angle did not vary significantly and the standard  
5 deviation of this angle was no more than  $4.5^\circ$ . With little variation in the satellite geometry, the  
6 Monte-Carlo calculations have been performed in the solar plane to obtain the most general results.  
7 This means that  $\phi - \phi_0 = 0$  for forward scattered radiation, and  $\phi - \phi_0 = 180^\circ$  for backscattered radiation,  
8 in the principal plane, where  $\phi$  and  $\phi_0$  are defined as the satellite and solar azimuth angles,  
9 respectively. The cloud microphysical model is assumed to be the most randomized ensemble  
10 model phase function, which was the most common retrieval shown in Figs. 9 (a and c), and the  
11 values of the volume extinction coefficient and single-scattering albedo were taken from Table 1.  
12 The probability of penetration is calculated by computing the total distance the ray travels within  
13 each sub-layer of the cloud. From this analysis, the percent probability of penetration is defined as  
14 the last position (distance from the cloud-top) of the photon before leaving the cloud to reach the  
15 sensor.

## 16 Acknowledgements

17 The BAe-146 aircrew, Direct Flight operations staff, FAAM and FGAM instrument operators are  
18 thanked for their assistance during the flight. The Facility for Airborne Atmospheric Measurements  
19 is owned by the Met Office and the Natural Environment Research Council. Richard Cotton and  
20 Steven Abel are thanked for their processing of the aircraft humidity measurements. The image  
21 shown in Fig. 1 is kindly reproduced with permission from the NERC Satellite Receiving Station,  
22 Dundee University, Scotland ("http://www.sat.dundee.ac.uk/" <http://www.sat.dundee.ac.uk/>). Two  
23 anonymous reviewers are thanked for their argument which led to a substantial improvement in the  
24 paper.

25

1 **References**

2 Bacon N. J., Baker M. B., and Swanson B. D.: Initial stages in the morphological evolution of  
3 vapour-grown ice crystals: A laboratory investigation. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.*,129, 1903-1927,  
4 2003.

5 Bailey M., and Hallett J.: Growth rates and habits of ice crystals between -20°C and -70°C. *J*  
6 *Atmos. Sci.*, 61, 514-554, 2004.

7 Bailey M., and Hallett J. A comprehensive habit diagram for atmospheric ice crystals:  
8 Confirmation from the laboratory, AIRS II, and other field campaigns. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 66, 2888-  
9 2899, 2009.

10 Baran AJ, Watts PD, and Francis PN.: Testing the coherence of cirrus microphysical and bulk  
11 properties retrieved from dual-viewing multispectral satellite radiance measurements. *J.*  
12 *Geophys. Res.*,104, 31673–31684, 1999.

13 Baran A. J., Francis P. N., Labonnote L-C, and Doutriaux-Boucher M.: A scattering phase  
14 function for ice cloud: Tests of applicability using aircraft and satellite multi-angle  
15 multiwavelength radiance measurements of cirrus. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*,127, 2395-2416,  
16 2001.

17 Baran A. J and Labonnote L-C.: On the reflection and polarisation properties of ice cloud. *J.*  
18 *Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer.*, 100, 41–54, 2006.

19 Baran A. J., and Labonnote L.-C.: A self-consistent scattering model for cirrus. 1: The solar  
20 Region. *Q. J. R. Meteorol .Soc.*, 133;1899-1912, 2007.

21 Baran A. J, Connolly P. J, and Lee C.: Testing an ensemble model of cirrus ice crystals using  
22 mid-latitude in situ estimates of ice water content, volume extinction coefficient, and the total  
23 solar optical depth. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiative Transfer.*,110, 1579–1598, 2009.

24

25

1 Baran A. J, Connolly P. J, Heymsfield A. J, Bansemer A.: Using in situ estimates of ice water  
2 content, volume extinction coefficient, and the total solar optical depth obtained during the  
3 tropical ACTIVE campaign to test an ensemble model of cirrus ice crystals. *Q. J. R. Meteorol.*  
4 *Soc.*, 137, 199-218, 2011a.

5 Baran A. J, Bodas-Salcedo A, Cotton R, and Lee C.: Simulating the equivalent radar  
6 reflectivity of cirrus at 94 GHz using an ensemble model of cirrus ice crystals: a test of the  
7 Met office global numerical weather prediction model. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 137, 1547-  
8 1560, 2011b.

9 Baran A. J.: From the single-scattering properties of ice crystals to climate prediction: A way  
10 forward. *Atmos Res.*, 112, 45-69, 2012.

11 Baran A. J., Gayet J-F., Shcherbakov V.: On the interpretation of an unusual in-situ measured  
12 ice crystal scattering phase function. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 9355-9364, 2012.

13 Baran A. J, Cotton R, Furtado K, Havemann S, Labonnote L.-C, Marengo F, Smith A, and  
14 Thelen J.-C. A self-consistent scattering model for cirrus. Part II: The high and low  
15 frequencies. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 140, 1039-1057, 2014.

16 Baran A. J., Hill P., Furtado K., Field P., and Manners J: A coupled cloud physics-radiation  
17 parameterization of the bulk optical properties of cirrus and its impact on the Met Office  
18 unified global atmosphere 5.0 configuration. *J. Climate*, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-13-00700.1, in  
19 press.

20 Barrett J. W., Garcke H., Numberg R.: Numerical computations of faceted pattern formation in  
21 snow crystal growth. *Phys. Rev.*, E86, 011604, doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.86.011604, 2012.

22 Baum BA, Yang P, Heymsfield AJ, Schmitt CG, Xie Y, Bansemer A, Hu Y-X, Zhang Z.:  
23 Improvements in Shortwave Bulk Scattering and Absorption Models for the Remote  
24 Sensing of Ice Clouds. *J Appl Meteor Climatol.*, 50, 1037–56, 2011.

25



1 Buriez J.-C, Doutriaux-Boucher M, Parol F, and Loeb N. J.: Angular Variability of the Liquid  
2 Water Cloud Optical depth Retrieved from ADEOS-POLDER. *J. Atm. Sci.*, 58, 3007-3018,  
3 2001.

4 Buriez J.-C., Parol F., Cornet C., and Doutriaux-Boucher M.: An improved derivation of the top-of-  
5 atmosphere albedo from POLDER/ADEOS-2: Narrowband albedos. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110,  
6 DOI: 10.1029/2004JD005243, 2005.

7 Cole, B. H., Yang P., Baum B. A., Riedi J., Labonnote L.-C., Thieuleux F., Platnick S.:  
8 Comparison of PARASOL Observations with Polarized Reflectances Simulated Using  
9 Different Ice Habit Mixtures. *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.*, 52, 186-196, 2013.

10 Cole, B. H., Yang P., Baum B. A., Riedi J., and Labonnote L.-C.: Ice particle habit and surface  
11 roughness derived from PARASOL polarization measurements. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 14,  
12 3739-3750, 2014.

13 Cornet C., Labonnote L. C., Szczap F.: Three-dimensional Polarized Monte-Carlo Atmospheric  
14 Radiative Transfer Model (3DMCPOL): 3D Effects on Polarized Visible Reflectances of a  
15 Cirrus Cloud. *J. Quantit. Spectros. Radiativ. Trans.*, 111, 174-186, 2009.

16 Cotton R. J, Field P. R, Ulanowski Z, Kaye P. H, Hirst E, Greenaway R. S, Crawford I,  
17 Crosier J, and Dorsey J.: The effective density of small ice particles obtained from in situ  
18 aircraft observations of mid-latitude cirrus. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 139, 1923-1934, 2013.

19 de Haan J. F, Bosma P. B, and Hovenier J. W.: The adding method for multiple scattering  
20 calculations of polarized light. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 183, 371-391, 1986.

21 Doutriaux-Boucher M., Buriez J. C., Brogniez G., Labonnote L.-C., and Baran A. J. :  
22 Sensitivity of retrieved POLDER directional cloud optical depth to various ice particle  
23 models. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 27, 109-112, 2000.

24

1 Fahey, D. W., Gao, R. S., and Möhler, O.: Summary of the AquaVIT Water Vapor  
2 Intercomparison: Static Experiments, AquaVIT White Paper, Institute for Meteorology and  
3 Climate Research, Karlsruhe, available at: [https://aquavit.icg.kfa-  
5 juelich.de/WhitePaper/AquaVITWhitePaper\\_Final\\_23Oct2009\\_6MB.pdf](https://aquavit.icg.kfa-<br/>4 juelich.de/WhitePaper/AquaVITWhitePaper_Final_23Oct2009_6MB.pdf) , 2009.

6 Fernald, F. G.: Analysis of atmospheric lidar observations: Some comments. Appl. Opt., 23, 652–  
7 653, 1984.

8 Field P.R., Baran A. J., Kaye P. H., Hirst E., and Greenway R.: A test of cirrus ice crystal scattering  
9 phase functions. Geophys. Res. Lett., 30, 1752, doi:10.1029/2003GL017482, 2003.

10 Field, P. R., Heymsfield A. J, Bansemmer A.: Shattering and Particle Interarrival Times Measured by  
11 Optical Array Probes in Ice Clouds. J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol., 23, 1357–1371, 2006.

12 Field P. R, Heymsfield A. J, and Bansemmer A.: Snow size distribution parameterization  
13 for midlatitude and tropical ice cloud. J. Atmos. Sci., 64, 4346-4365, 2007.

14 Field P. R., Heymsfield A. J, and Bansemmer A. Determination of the combined ventilation  
15 factor and capacitance for ice crystal aggregates from airborne observations in a tropical anvil  
16 cloud.: J. Atmos. Sci., 65, 376-391, 2008.

17 Foot J. S.: Some observations of the optical properties of clouds.II: Cirrus. Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.,  
18 114, 145-164, 1988.

19 Furtado K, Field P. R., Cotton R., and Baran A. J.: The effects of ice crystal fall speed and particle  
20 size distribution on the simulation of high cloud. Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., DOI:  
21 10.1002/qj.2457, in press, 2014.

22 Garrett, T. J., Gerber, H., Baumgardner, D. G., Thohy, C. H.,and Weinstock, E. M.: Small  
23 highly reflective ice crystals in low-latitude cirrus. Geophys. Res. Lett., 30,10–13, 2003.

24 Gayet, J.- F., Crépel, O., Fournol, J. F., and Oshchepkov, S. A new airborne polar  
25 Nephelometer for the measurements of optical and microphysical cloud properties. Part I:  
Theoretical design.: Ann. Geophys.,15, 451–459, 1997.

1 Gayet, J.-F., Asano, S., Yamazaki, A., Uchiyama, A., Sinyuk, A., Jourdan, O., and Au  
2 roil, F.: Two case studies of winter continental-type water and mixed-phase stratocumuli  
3 over the sea: 1. Microphysical and optical properties. *J. Geophys. Res.*,107, 4569,  
4 doi:10.1029/2001JD001106, 2002.

5 Gayet J.-F., Mioche G., Shcherbakov V., Gourbeyre C., Busen R., and Minikin A.: Optical  
6 properties of pristine ice crystals in mid-latitude cirrus clouds: a case study during CIRCLE-2  
7 experiment. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 2537-2544, 2011.

8 Guignard A., Stubenrauch C. J, Baran A. J., and Armante R.: Bulk microphysical  
9 properties of semi transparent cirrus from AIRS: a six years global climatology and statistical  
10 analysis in synergy with CALIPSO and CloudSat. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 503-525, 2012.

11 Hallett J., and Mason B. J.: The influence of temperature and supersaturation on the habit of ice  
12 crystals grown from the vapor. *Proc Roy Soc Lon.*, A247, 440-453, 1958.

13 Heymsfield A. J. Precipitation development in stratiform ice clouds: A microphysical and  
14 dynamical study.: *J Atmos Sci.*, 34, 367-381, 1977.

15 Heymsfield A. J, and Miloshevich L. M.: Parameterizations for the cross-sectional area and  
16 extinction of cirrus and stratiform ice cloud particles. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 60, 936-956, 2003.

17 Havemann, S. The development of a fast radiative transfer model based on an Empirical  
18 Orthogonal Functions (EOF) technique. In *Proc. SPIE Int. Soc. Opt. Eng.* 6405, 64050.  
19 doi:10.1117/12.693995, 2006.

20 Havemann S. Thelen J. C, Taylor J. P, and Keil A.: The Havemann-Taylor Fast Radiative  
21 Transfer Code: Exact fast radiative transfer for scattering atmospheres using Principal  
22 Components (PCs). In *AIP Conf. Proc.*, 1100, 38–40, doi:10.1063/1.3117000, 2009.

23 **Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Climate Change 2013 - The Physical**  
24 **Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the fifth Assessment Report of the**  
25 **IPCC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1535 pp., 2013.**

1 Jourdan O, Oshchepkov S, Shcherbakov V, Gayet J-F, Isaka H.: Assessment of cloud  
2 optical parameters in the solar region: Retrievals from airborne measurements of scattering  
3 phase functions. *J Geophys Res.*, 108, 4572, doi:10.1029/2003JD003493, 2003.

4 Keramitsoglou, I., Harries, J. E., Colling, D. J., Barker, R. A., and Foot, J. S.: A study of the theory  
5 and operation of a resonance fluorescence water vapour sensor for upper tropospheric  
6 humidity measurements, *Meteorol. Appl.*, 9, 443–453, 2002.

7 Klett, J. D.: Lidar inversion with variable backscatter/extinction ratios. *Appl. Opt.*, 24, 1638–1643,  
8 1985.

9 Knapp, W. H., Labonnote L.-C., Brogniez G, and Stammes P.: Modeling total and polarized  
10 reflectances of ice clouds: Evaluation by means of POLDER and ATSR-2 measurements.  
11 *Appl. Opt.*, 44, 4060–4073, 2005.

12 Korolev A. V, Emery E. F, Strapp J. W, Cober S. G, Isaac G. A, Wasey M, Marcotte D.: Small  
13 ice particles in tropospheric clouds: fact or artefact? Airborne icing instrumentation evaluation  
14 experiment. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 92, 967-973, 2011.

15 Krämer, M., and Coauthors. Ice supersaturations and cirrus cloud crystal numbers. *Atmos. Chem.*  
16 *Phys.*, 9, 3505–3522, 2009.

17 Labonnote L.-C, Brogniez G., Buriez J. C., Doutriaux-Boucher M., Gayet J. F. and Macke A.:  
18 Polarized light scattering by inhomogeneous hexagonal monocrystals: Validation with  
19 ADEOS POLDER measurements. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 12139-12153, 2001.

20 Lean H. W., Clark P. A., Mark D., Dixon, M., Roberts, N. M., Fitch, A., Forbes, A., and Halliwell,  
21 C. .: Characteristics of high-resolution versions of the Met Office Unified Model for  
22 forecasting convection over the United Kingdom. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 136, 3408-3424, 2008.

23 Levene, H. Robust tests for equality of variances. *In Contributions to Probability and Statistics:*  
24 *Essays in Honor of Harold Hotelling*, I. Olkin, S. G. Ghurye, W. Hoeffding, W. G. Madow,  
25 and H. B. Mann eds., Stanford University Press, pp. 278-292. 1960.

1 Liou K. N. Influence of cirrus clouds on weather and climate: A global perspective.: *Mon Wea*  
2 *Rev.*, 114, 1167-1199, 1986.

3 Liu C., Panetta R. L, Yang P.: The effects of surface roughness on the scattering properties of  
4 hexagonal columns with sizes from the Rayleigh to the geometric optics regimes. *J. Quant.*  
5 *Spectrosc. Radiative Transfer.*, 129, 169-185, 2013.

6 Lynch D. K., Sassen K, O’C Starr D, and Stephens G. *Cirrus*, Oxford, Oxford University  
7 Press, 504 pp., 2002.

8 McFarquhar G. M, Um J, Jackson R.: Small cloud particle shapes in mixed-phase clouds. *J.*  
9 *Appl. Meteor. Climat.*, 52, 1277-1293, 2013.

10 Macke, A., Mishchenko, M. I., Muinonen, K., and Carlson, B. E.: Scattering of light by large  
11 nonspherical particles: ray-tracing approximation versus T-matrix method. *Opt. Lett*, 20,  
12 1934–1936, 1995.

13 Macke A, Mueller J, and Raschke E.: Single scattering properties of atmospheric ice crystal. *J.*  
14 *Atmos. Sci.*, 53, 2813-2825, 1996a.

15 Macke A., Mishchenko M. I, Cairns B.: The influence of inclusions on light scattering  
16 by large particles. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101, 23311-23316, 1996b.

17 Magee, N., Miller A., Amaral M., Cumiskey A.: Mesoscopic surface roughness of ice crystals  
18 pervasive across a wide range of ice crystal conditions, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 14,  
19 8393-8418, 2014.

20 Malkin, T. L., Murray, B. J., Brukhno, A. V., Anwar, J., and Salzmann, C. G.: The structure of ice  
21 crystallised from supercooled water, *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 109, 1041–1045, 2012.

22 Marengo F., Johnson B., Turnbull K., Newman S., Haywood J., Webster H., and Ricketts  
23 H.: Airborne lidar observations of the 2010 Eyjafjallajökull volcanic ash plume. *J. Geophys.*  
24 *Res.*, 116, D00U05, doi:10.1029/2011JD016396, 2011.

25

- 1 Marshall J. S. and Langleben M. P.: A theory of snow-crystal habit and growth. *J. Met.*, 11, 254-  
2 256, 1954.
- 3 **Mason B. J. *The physics of clouds*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 671 pp., 1971.**
- 4 **Mauno P., McFarquhar G. M., Räisänen P., Kahnert M., Timlin M. S., Nousiainen T.: *The*  
5 ***influence of observed cirrus microphysical properties on shortwave radiation: A case study***  
6 ***over Oklahoma*. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, D22208, doi:10.1029/2011JD016058, 2011.****
- 7 Muinonen K.: Light scattering by non-spherical particles. San Diego, Academic press, 323-349,  
8 2000.
- 9 Nakaya U. *Snow crystals*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- 10 Neshyba S. P., Lowen B., Benning M., Lawson A., Rowe P. M.: Roughness metrics of  
11 prismatic facets of ice. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 118, 3309-3318, 2013.
- 12 Nousiainen T., Lindqvist H., McFarquhar G. M, and Um J. Small irregular ice crystals in  
13 tropical cirrus. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 68, 2614-2627, 2011.
- 14 Pfalzgraff W. C., Hulscher, R. M., and Neshyba S. P.: Scanning electron microscopy and  
15 molecular dynamics of surfaces of growing and ablating hexagonal ice crystals. *Atmos. Chem.*  
16 *Phy.*, 10, 2927-2935, 2010.
- 17 Platnick S, King M. D, Ackerman S. A, Menzel W. P, Baum B. A, Riedi J. C, Frey R. A.: The  
18 MODIS cloud products: Algorithms and examples from Terra. *IEEE. Trans. Geosci. Rem.*  
19 *Sens.*, 41, 459-473, 2003.
- 20 Rodgers C. D.: Retrieval of Atmospheric Temperature and Composition From Remote  
21 Measurements of Thermal Radiation". *Reviews of Geophysics and Space Physics*, 14, pg.  
22 609, 1976.
- 23 Schmitt C. G. and Heymsfield A. J.: The dimensional characteristics of ice crystal  
24 aggregates from fractal geometry. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 67, 1605-1616, 2010.
- 25

1 Shcherbakov V., Gayet J-F., Baker B., and Lawson P.: Light scattering by single natural ice  
2 crystals. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 63, 1513–1525, 2006.

3 Shcherbakov V.: Why the 46° halo is seen far less often than the 22° halo? *J. Quantit. Spectr.*  
4 *Rad. Transf.*, 124, 37-44, 2013.

5 Stephens G. L., and Webster P. J.: Clouds and Climate: Sensitivity of Simple Systems. *J.*  
6 *Atmos. Sci.*, 38, 235-245, 1981.

7 Thelen, J. C, Havemann S, and Taylor J. P.: Atmospheric correction of short-wave  
8 hyperspectral imagery using a fast, full-scattering 1Dvar retrieval scheme. In *Algorithms and*  
9 *Technologies for Multispectral, Hyperspectral, and Ultraspectral Imagery XVIII*, edited by SS.  
10 Shen, PE. Lewis, *Proc. of SPIE.*, 8390, 839010, doi:10.1117/12.918012, 2012.

11 **Um, J, and McFarquhar G. M.: Single-Scattering Properties of Aggregates of Bullet Rosettes in**  
12 **Cirrus. *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.*, 46, 757–775, 2007.**

13 **Um, J. and McFarquhar, G. M. (2009), Single-scattering properties of aggregates of plates. *Q.J.R.***  
14 ***Meteorol. Soc.*, 135: 291–304, 2009.**

15 Ulanowski Z, Hesse E, Kaye P. H., and Baran A. J.: Light scattering by complex ice-  
16 analogue crystals. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiative Transfer.*, 100, 382-392, 2006.

17 Ulanowski Z., Kaye P. H, Hirst E., Greenaway R. S, Cotton R. J., Hesse E., and Collier C. T:  
18 Incidence of rough and irregular atmospheric ice particles from Small Ice Detector 3  
19 measurements. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 1649-1662, 2014.

20 van Diedenhoven, B., Cairns B., Fridlind A. M, Ackerman A. S, and Garrett T. J.:  
21 Remote sensing of ice crystal asymmetry parameter using multi-directional polarization  
22 measurements – Part 2: Application to the Research Scanning Polarimeter. *Atmos. Chem.*  
23 *Phys.*, 13, 3185–3203, 2013.

24 **van Diedenhoven, B.: The prevalence of the 22° halo in cirrus clouds. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat.***  
25 ***Transfer*, in press, doi:10.1016/j.jqsrt.2014.01.012.**

1 Walden, V.P., Warren S. G., and Tuttle, E.: Atmospheric ice crystals over the Antractic Plateau in  
2 Winter, *J. Appl. Meteor.*, 42, 1391-1405, 2003.

3 Warren S. G and Brandt R. E.: Optical constants of ice from the ultraviolet to the microwave: A  
4 revised compilation. *J. Geophys. Res.*,113, D14220,  
5 doi:10.1029/2007JD009744, 2008.

6 Wilson S. H. S., Atkinson N. C., and Smith J. A.: 1999. The development of an airborne infrared  
7 interferometer for meteorological sounding studies. *J. Atmos. Oceanic. Technol.*, 16, 1912-  
8 1927, 1999.

9 Wylie D. P and Menzel W. P.: Eight years of cloud statistics using HIRS. *J. Climate.*, 12, 170-184,  
10 1999.

11 Xie Y., Yang P., Kattawar G. W., Minnis P., and Hu Y. X.: Effect of the inhomogeneity of ice  
12 crystals on retrieving ice cloud optical depth and effective particle size. *J. Geophys. Res.*,  
13 114, D11203, 2009.

14 Yang P., and Liou K. N. Geometric-Optics-integral-equation method for light scattering by  
15 nonspherical ice crystals. *Appl. Opt.*, 35, 6568-6584, 1996.

16 Yang P, and Liou K. N. Single-scattering properties of complex ice crystals in terrestrial  
17 atmosphere. *Contr Atmos Phys.*, 71, 223-248, 1998.

18 Yang P, Zhang Z, Kattawar G. W., Warren S. G., Baum B. A., Huang H. L., Hu Y. X., Winker  
19 D., and Iaquimta J.: Effect of cavities on the optical properties of bullet rosettes:  
20 Implications for active and passive remote sensing of ice cloud properties. *J Appl Meteor*  
21 *Climatol.*, 47, 2311-2330, 2008.

22 Zhang, Z., Yang P., Kattawar G. W, Reidi J., Labonnote L.-C., Baum B. A, Platnick S., Huang H.-  
23 L.: Influence of ice particle model on satellite ice cloud retrieval: lessons learned from  
24 MODIS and POLDER cloud product comparison. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 7115-7129, 2009.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**Fig. 1.** A high-resolution composite MODIS image of the semi-transparent cirrus case that occurred on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2010 located over north-east Scotland. The latitude and longitude grid is superimposed on the image showing latitude 58° to 60° (left-side) and longitude -8° to 0° (bottom). The composite image was formed by combining the MODIS red, green and blue channels to obtain the closest “true” colour image. The image is from the NERC Satellite Receiving Station, Dundee University, Scotland ("<http://www.sat.dundee.ac.uk/>" <http://www.sat.dundee.ac.uk/>).

**Fig. 2.** The ensemble model as a function of ice crystal maximum dimension,  $D_{max}$ . The first element of the model is the hexagonal ice column of aspect ratio unity (first panel), followed by the six-branched bullet-rosette (second panel), the three-monomer hexagonal ice aggregate (third panel), five-monomer ice aggregate (fourth panel), eight-monomer ice aggregate (fifth panel) and the ten-monomer ice aggregate (sixth panel).

**Fig. 3.** The ensemble model area ratio,  $A_r$ , as a function of ice crystal diameter or  $D_{max}$ . The key is shown in the upper right-hand side of the figure. The members of the ensemble model are represented by the filled cyan circles. The in-situ observations are from Field et al. (2008) (red lines), where the plus and cross signs represent the lower and upper range of those observations and those ranges have an uncertainty of  $\pm 30\%$ . The blue error bar represents the mean and range of observations taken from McFarquhar et al. (2013) and the purple error bars represent the uncertainty in the observations taken from Heymsfield and Miloshevich (2003).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**Fig. 4.** (a) The decadal logarithm of the ensemble model normalised scattering phase function as a function of scattering angle assuming a variety of distortions. The model cases shown are the pristine, black; slightly distorted, red; moderately distorted, dashed blue; and fully distorted with spherical air bubble inclusions, dotted purple. (b) The ratio between the distorted and pristine ensemble model phase functions as a function of scattering angle. Slight distortion, red; moderate distortion, dotted green; and full with spherical air bubble inclusions, dotted blue. The key is shown in each of the figures.

**Fig. 5.** The scattering coefficient per particle ( $m^{-2}$ ) as a function of ice crystal maximum dimension,  $D_{max}$ . The PSD was generated assuming IWC and in-cloud temperature values of  $0.01 \text{ gm}^{-3}$  and  $-50^{\circ}\text{C}$ , respectively.

**Fig. 6.** The UKV model predicted field of the water vapour mixing ratio ( $Q_v$ ) on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2010 at 1300 UTC, between latitudes  $57.8^{\circ}$  and  $59.7^{\circ}$  and longitudes  $-5.3^{\circ}$  and  $-1.8^{\circ}$ . The units of  $Q_v$  are  $\text{Kg Kg}^{-1}$ . The PARASOL pixels are represented by the open circles and the aircraft track is represented by the full line, and X marks the location where the aircraft was directly above the cloud at about 13:33:00 UTC.

**Fig. 7.** (a) The lidar derived cloud volume extinction coefficient as a function of altitude (m) and time in units of hours after midnight (UTC). The colour bar on the right-hand side of the figure indicates values of the cloud volume extinction coefficient in units of  $m^{-1}$ , and the full line represents the aircraft altitude. (b) The lidar derived cloud optical depth from 300 m below the aircraft to the cloud base as a function of time in units of Hrs:min (UTC), and the full line shown in the figure indicates an optical depth value of unity.

1 **Fig. 8.** A comparison between the retrievals, dropsonde measurements, in situ measurements, and  
2 NWP model predictions of  $RH_i$  plotted against the pressure (hPa) for two different locations. (a)  
3 The pixel located at longitude  $-3.84^\circ$  and latitude  $59.14^\circ$  and (b) the pixel located at longitude  $-3.20^\circ$   
4 and latitude  $57.97^\circ$ . Where in (a) and (b) the retrievals are represented by the purple and green plus  
5 signs, dropsonde measurements are the full grey line and filled grey circles, the General Eastern is  
6 the green full line and FWVS is the full red line.

7 **Fig. 9.** The PARASOL estimates of ensemble model randomizations (based on minimised rmse)  
8 and retrievals of optical thickness as a function of latitude and longitude. (a) The estimated ice  
9 crystal randomization, where the null results are the black squares; the most randomized phase  
10 functions (distortion=0.4 with spherical air bubble inclusions), yellow squares; and the pristine  
11 phase functions (distortion=0), purple squares; dark and light brown squares represent the slightly  
12 distorted (distortion=0.15) and moderately distorted (distortion=0.25) phase functions, respectively.  
13 (b) The PARASOL retrieved averaged optical thickness, averaged over all scattering angles, where  
14 the decadal logarithm of the retrieved optical thickness is shown by the colour bar on the right-hand  
15 side of the figure. (c) The same as (a) but with the null results removed.

16 **Fig. 10.** Differences between the directionally averaged ( $\langle S \rangle$ ) and directional ( $S(\theta)$ ) spherical  
17 albedos as a function of scattering angle at two pixel locations. (a) The spherical albedo differences  
18 for the pixel located at  $59.03^\circ$  and longitude  $-3.62^\circ$ , assuming the pristine ensemble model (dist=0),  
19 open red circles; the slightly distorted model (dist=0.15), green filled triangles; the moderately  
20 distorted model (dist=0.25), open blue diamonds; and the fully randomized model (dist=0.4 with  
21 spherical air bubble inclusions), open purple pentagons. (b) The same as (a) but for the pixel  
22 located at latitude  $59.14^\circ$  and longitude  $-3.84^\circ$ . The zero difference line is shown by the full bold  
23 line and the rmse values calculated for each of the models are shown in each of the figures.

24

1 **Fig. 11.** Associating the PARASOL estimations of shape of the scattering phase function at each  
2 pixel to the NWP model predicted field of  $RH_i$ . (a) The estimated shape of the scattering phase  
3 function, where the yellow squares have been previously defined in Fig. 9. The brown squares  
4 represent those PARASOL pixels where no phase function model could be assigned and the blue  
5 squares represent those pixels where phase function models assuming distortion values of between  
6 0 and 0.25 could be assigned. (b) The NWP model predicted cloud-top  $RH_i$  field, where the colour  
7 bar indicates the range in predicted  $RH_i$ .

8 **Fig. 12.** The percent (%) probability of the penetration depth of solar radiation at  $0.865 \mu\text{m}$  as a  
9 function of distance from the cloud-top (km), and cloud optical depth for (a) forward scattered  
10 and (b) backward scattered solar radiation in the principal plane, respectively. The % probability  
11 of penetration is defined as the last position (distance from the cloud-top) of the photon before  
12 leaving the cloud to reach the sensor. The cloud optical depth colour scale is defined by the key  
13 shown in the upper right-hand side of (a).

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1

2 Table 1. The bulk values of  $\langle\beta_{\text{ext}}\rangle$ ,  $\langle\omega_0\rangle$  and  $\langle g\rangle$ , calculated at the wavelength 0.865  $\mu\text{m}$ , for each  
 3 distortion, assumed to have values of 0, 0.15, 0.25, and 0.4 plus spherical air bubble inclusions  
 4 (Full), respectively.

Distortion	$\langle\beta_{\text{ext}}\rangle \text{ km}^{-1}$	$\langle\omega_0\rangle$	$\langle g\rangle$
0.0	0.506	0.99996	0.820
0.15	0.506	0.99990	0.813
0.25	0.506	0.99996	0.808
Full	0.506	0.99996	0.789

5


6 Table 2. The Levene test statistic,  $W$ , applied to test homogeneity of variances in spherical albedo  
 7 differences between two groups of scattering phase function models for each set of pixels. Where in  
 8 the table the two phase function models are represented for each set of pixels by their assumed  
 9 distortion values called model pair, the total number of pixels used in each test is  $n$ . The null  
 10 hypothesis is given by  $H_0$ , which is either rejected or accepted,  $k$  is the number of samples,  $N$  is the  
 11 total number of observations in the two samples, and  $F_{0.05}(k, N-k)$  is the value of the tabulated  
 12 upper critical value at the 5% significance level composed of  $k$  and  $N-k$  degrees of freedom.

Model Pair	$n$	$k$	$N$	$W$	$F_{0.05}(k, N-k)$	$H_0$
Full/0	5	2	70	1.61	3.93	accept
Full/0.25	3	2	42	<1	4.1	accept
0/0.25	3	2	42	<1	4.1	accept
Full/0.15	4	2	56	4.022	4.020	reject
0.25/0.15	4	2	56	<1	4.020	accept
0/0.15	4	2	56	<1	4.020	accept

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

Table 3. Same definitions as Table 2 but the Levene test statistic is applied to a group of 7 pixels, where the fully randomized model phase function was found to best fit spherical albedo differences using minimised rmse values. The model pair tests are between all other scattering phase function models and the fully randomized scattering phase function model.

Model Pair	n	k	N	W	$F_{0.05}(k, N-k)$	$H_0$
0/Full	7	2	98	18.289	3.93	reject
0.15/Full	7	2	98	19.436	4.1	reject
0.25/Full	7	2	98	12.918	4.1	reject




1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

**Fig. 1.** A high-resolution composite MODIS image of the semi-transparent cirrus case that occurred on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2010 located over north-east Scotland. The latitude and longitude grid is superimposed on the image showing latitude 58° to 60° (left-side) and longitude -8° to 0° (bottom). The composite image was formed by combining the MODIS red, green and blue channels to obtain the closest “true” colour image. The image is from the NERC Satellite Receiving Station, Dundee University, Scotland ("<http://www.sat.dundee.ac.uk/>" <http://www.sat.dundee.ac.uk/>).

1

2

3



4

5 **Fig. 2.** The ensemble model as a function of ice crystal maximum dimension,  $D_{max}$ . The first

6 element of the model is the hexagonal ice column of aspect ratio unity (first panel), followed by the

7 six-branched bullet-rosette (second panel), the three-monomer hexagonal ice aggregate (third

8 panel), five-monomer ice aggregate (fourth panel), eight-monomer ice aggregate (fifth panel) and

9 the ten-monomer ice aggregate (sixth panel).

10


11

12

13

14





1

2

3 **Fig. 3.** The ensemble model area ratio,  $A_r$ , as a function of ice crystal diameter or  $D_{max}$ . The key is

4 shown in the upper right-hand side of the figure. The members of the ensemble model are

5 represented by the filled cyan circles. The in-situ observations are from Field et al. (2008) (red

6 lines), where the plus and cross signs represent the lower and upper range of those observations and

7 those ranges have an uncertainty of  $\pm 30\%$ . The blue error bar represents the mean and range of

8 observations taken from McFarquhar et al. (2013) and the purple error bars represent the

9 uncertainty in the observations taken from Heymsfield and Miloshevich (2003).

10


11

12

13

1


(a)



2

3

(b)




4

5 **Fig. 4.** (a) The decadal logarithm of the ensemble model normalised scattering phase function as a  
 6 function of scattering angle assuming a variety of distortions. The model cases shown are the  
 7 pristine, black; slightly distorted, red; moderately distorted, dashed blue; and fully distorted with  
 8 spherical air bubble inclusions, dotted purple. (b) The ratio between the distorted and pristine  
 9 ensemble model phase functions as a function of scattering angle. Slight distortion, red; moderate  
 10 distortion, dotted green; and full with spherical air bubble inclusions, dotted blue. The key is  
 11 shown in each of the figures.

12

13

1



2

3

4 **Fig. 5.** The scattering coefficient per particle ( $m^{-2}$ ) as a function of ice crystal maximum dimension,  
5  $D_{max}$ . The PSD was generated assuming IWC and in-cloud temperature values of  $0.01 \text{ gm}^{-3}$  and -  
6  $50^{\circ}\text{C}$ , respectively.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1

2



3

4


5 **Fig. 6.** The UKV model predicted field of the water vapour mixing ratio ( $Q_v$ ) on the 25<sup>th</sup> January  
6 2010 at 1300 UTC, between latitudes  $57.8^\circ$  and  $59.7^\circ$  and longitudes  $-5.3^\circ$  and  $-1.8^\circ$ . The units of  
7  $Q_v$  are  $\text{Kg Kg}^{-1}$ . The PARASOL pixels are represented by the open circles and the aircraft track is  
8 represented by the full line, and X marks the location where the aircraft was directly above the  
9 cloud at about 13:33:00 UTC.

10

11


12

13



4  
5  
6 **Fig. 7.** (a) The lidar derived cloud volume extinction coefficient as a function of altitude (m) and  
7 time in units of hours after midnight (UTC). The colour bar on the right-hand side of the figure  
8 indicates values of the cloud volume extinction coefficient in units of  $m^{-1}$ , and the full line  
9 represents the aircraft altitude. (b) The lidar derived cloud optical depth from 300 m below the  
10 aircraft to the cloud base as a function of time in units of Hrs:min (UTC), and the full line shown in  
11 the figure indicates an optical depth value of unity.

1  
2




3  
4

5 **Fig. 8.** A comparison between the retrievals, dropsonde measurements, in situ measurements, and  
6 NWP model predictions of RH<sub>i</sub> plotted against the pressure (hPa) for two different locations. (a)  
7 The pixel located at longitude -3.84° and latitude 59.14° and (b) the pixel located at longitude -3.20°  
8 and latitude 57.97°. Where in (a) and (b) the retrievals are represented by the purple and green plus  
9 signs, dropsonde measurements are the full grey line and filled grey circles, the General Eastern is  
10 the green full line and FWVS is the full red line.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

1




2

3

4

5

(c)



6

7

8

**Fig. 9.** The PARASOL estimates of ensemble model randomizations (based on minimised rmse)

9

and retrievals of optical thickness as a function of latitude and longitude. (a) The estimated ice

10

crystal randomization, where the null results are the black squares; the most randomized phase

11

functions (distortion=0.4 with spherical air bubble inclusions), yellow squares; and the pristine

12

phase functions (distortion=0), purple squares; dark and light brown squares represent the slightly

13

distorted (distortion=0.15) and moderately distorted (distortion=0.25) phase functions, respectively.

14

(b) The PARASOL retrieved averaged optical thickness, averaged over all scattering angles, where

15

the decadal logarithm of the retrieved optical thickness is shown by the colour bar on the right-hand


16

side of the figure. (c) The same as (a) but with the null results removed.

17

1


(a)



2

3

(b)



4

5 **Fig. 10.** Differences between the directionally averaged ( $\langle S \rangle$ ) and directional ( $S(\theta)$ ) spherical  
6 albedos as a function of scattering angle at two pixel locations. (a) The spherical albedo differences  
7 for the pixel located at  $59.03^\circ$  and longitude  $-3.62^\circ$ , assuming the pristine ensemble model ( $\text{dist}=0$ ),  
8 open red circles; the slightly distorted model ( $\text{dist}=0.15$ ), green filled triangles; the moderately  
9 distorted model ( $\text{dist}=0.25$ ), open blue diamonds; and the fully randomized model ( $\text{dist}=0.4$  with  
10 spherical air bubble inclusions), open purple pentagons. (b) The same as (a) but for the pixel  
11 located at latitude  $59.14^\circ$  and longitude  $-3.84^\circ$ . The zero difference line is shown by the full bold  
12 line and the rmse values calculated for each of the models are shown in each of the figures.

13




1


2

(a)

(b)



3



4 **Fig. 11.** Associating the PARASOL estimations of shape of the scattering phase function at each  
5 pixel to the NWP model predicted field of  $RH_i$ . (a) The estimated shape of the scattering phase  
6 function, where the yellow squares have been previously defined in Fig. 9. The brown squares  
7 represent those PARASOL pixels where no phase function model could be assigned and the blue  
8 squares represent those pixels where phase function models assuming distortion values of between  
9 0 and 0.25 could be assigned. (b) The NWP model predicted cloud-top  $RH_i$  field, where the colour  
10 bar indicates the range in predicted  $RH_i$ .

11

12


13

14

15

1

2



3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

**Fig. 12.** The percent (%) probability of the penetration depth of solar radiation at  $0.865 \mu\text{m}$  as a function of distance from the cloud-top (km), and cloud optical depth for (a) forward scattered and (b) backward scattered solar radiation in the principal plane, respectively. The % probability of penetration is defined as the last position (distance from the cloud-top) of the photon before leaving the cloud to reach the sensor. The cloud optical depth colour scale is defined by the key shown in the upper right-hand side of (a).