

Overview

This manuscript connects properties of tropical cirrus anvils to properties of “convective cores” producing them using AIRS observations. Convective cores are defined as having emissivity values greater than 0.98 based on correlations with AMSR-E rain rate retrievals. Systems with convective cores cover 15% of the area between 30S and 30N, while isolated cirrus without cores cover another 5%. Multi-core systems account for 1% of all cirrus systems, but account for 65% of cirrus coverage. Single core system life cycle is estimated using convective area fraction as a proxy for system age. Although land systems produce colder cloud tops and higher rain rates than ocean systems, system size and average emissivity increase similarly as the system ages. Thin cirrus coverage increases as a fraction of total cirrus coverage (thick + thin) as the system ages. Some differences are apparent for early afternoon and early morning satellite overpasses, presumably because of differences in the probability of life cycle stages at these discrete times. Convective intensity is defined using the minimum retrieved cloud top temperature. As it increases (cloud tops become colder) in mature systems (convective core area fraction between 0.1 and 0.3), system size increases and the thin cirrus area fraction increases as well. This manuscript presents interesting findings that are worthy of publication, but many of the findings rely on key assumptions that bypass deficiencies of the observations used without exploring their impact on the results and conclusions. The potential impact of these assumptions and deficiencies need to be better assessed, as described further in the major comments below. Satisfactorily addressing the comments will require major revisions, but most of them should be straightforward and hopefully clarify interpretation of the results.

First of all we thank the reviewer for his thoughtful comments which helped immensely to improve the manuscript. Before addressing one by one the comments, we would like for the sake of clarification to summarize why we intended to build this data base of UT cloud systems using AIRS cloud properties. One should keep in mind these points when reading the answers to the questions. This short introduction also provides partial answers to questions 2, 6 and 9.

Our AIRS cloud retrieval makes use of eight spectral channels sounding along the 15 micron CO₂ absorption band, providing cloud pressure p_{cld} and emissivity ϵ_{cld} of a single cloud layer which corresponds to the uppermost cloud layer in the case of multi-layer clouds (Stubenrauch et al. 2010). The method takes into account the vertical weighting of the different channels, the growing uncertainty in the computation of ϵ_{cld} with increasing p and uncertainties in atmospheric profiles. The main advantage of IR sounders is their reliable determination of p_{cld} and ϵ_{cld} for cirrus clouds down to an IR emissivity of 0.1 (corresponding to a visible optical depth of 0.2), day and night. Once p_{cld} , and ϵ_{cld} are retrieved by a χ^2 method (Stubenrauch et al. 1999), cloud temperature T_{cld} is determined from p_{cld} , by using the AIRS temperature profile. The construction of the UT cloud systems is undertaken in two steps: first adjacent measurements with similar p_{cld} (up to 250 hPa underneath the tropopause) are used to compose these systems, and then we use ϵ_{cld} to distinguish between convective cores, thick anvil and thin anvil.

Compared to methods which use cold IR brightness temperature T_b to track convective cores, as is done using geostationary satellite imagery, our method has the key advantage that we can reliably distinguish between semi-transparent cirrus and opaque high clouds and deduce for both cloud types a reliable height. This allows for the first time to account for semi-transparent cirrus in the convective cloud systems, the latter are very important to understand radiative effects.

The motivation of this article is to present this data base, which, coupled with other data, will provide observational metric for a better understanding of the interconnection between tropical convection and the heating induced by the

outflowing anvils.

Indeed, there are also drawbacks to this data set, like the fact that AIRS data are only available twice daily and with AIRS alone we can explore only a proxy for convective depth which is not identical to convective intensity, the latter identified by the dynamics, and therefore we will complete this data base in the future with complementary available data. However, already with the AIRS data alone we are able to explore the anvil properties in relation to the convective depth.

We have added these explanations in the introduction and methodology sections of our manuscript and hope that this is now much more understandable for readers who are not so familiar with IR sounder data.

Major Comments

1. Some of the dataset and methodology deficiencies and caveats of the results need to be explained in more detail. For example:

- a. A major deficiency of AIRS and AMSR-E is that they only make observations at 2 times of day (? 0130 and 1330 LT). This particularly biases results over land as the average tropical diurnal cycle in deep convection has a strong peak in the late afternoon (1600 LT), which is well known from TRMM observations. Furthermore, this diurnal cycle varies by geographical location, so more intense or larger systems are likely favored more in some regions at 0130 or 1330 LT and in others at different times that are not captured by AIRS and AMSR-E.
- b. That convective core area fraction is correlated with system life cycle stages is a major assumption.

Indeed, we have only two measurements per day and temporal (and geographical) variabilities exist. It is known that the large-scale atmospheric dynamics and radiative processes strongly affect the life cycle of deep convective systems in the tropics. While over land a maximum of precipitation is expected in the late afternoon, over ocean tropical convection occurs a few hours before sunrise (with a very broad peak) as has been shown for example by Liu and Zipser (2008) or by Yamamoto et al. (2007). This means that the AIRS data are collected a few hours earlier than the respective day and night maxima in tropical convection. Therefore the analyzed convective cloud systems might be somewhat weaker than what would have been observed a few hours later in the local day.

However, in particular organized convection has often a life time longer than 24 hours which makes it possible to explore statistically these convective systems; it has already been demonstrated in previous studies using satellite data with better temporal resolution (geostationary imagery data, Machado et al 1998 and 2003, Futyán and Del Genio 2007) or with varying observation time (TRMM, Fiolleau and Roca 2013 etc) that the largest systems have the longest life cycle, up to 30h. Therefore even with only two measurements per day we should be able to observe systems in different phases of their life cycle.

Our article is not focused on studying the life cycle, but we use as proxy of maturity stage the **fraction of convective core horizontal extent with respect to the horizontal extent of the whole cloud system** to find a way to isolate relatively mature convective systems, so that we can explore their relationship between convective depth and anvil properties. **This variable has been proven to be an indicator of convective cloud maturity (and hence for following the life cycle when the temporal resolution is good enough) in studies using IR imagery of geostationary satellites (Machado et al 1998), TRMM (Fiolleau and Roca 2013), as well as using CloudSat radar (Bacmeister and Stephens 2011).** When using this proxy, one observes in figure 8, as expected, slightly more 'developing' systems over land at PM while more dissipating systems over ocean at the same time, and vice versa.

When exploring further this proxy with our data, we observed that, statistically the evolution of the properties of the convective systems seem to be consistent with what one would be expect: like decreasing ε_{cld} , increasing of convective core size until maturity and then decrease (Fig. 9). In particular, the average rain rate in the convective core decreases as the system gets older, in agreement with (Fig. 5 of Fiolleau et Roca 2013). Therefore we felt confident to select relatively mature convective systems with a convective core fraction of about 0.1 – 0.3. It is true that our definition of convective core, through ε_{cld} close to 1, might include a stratiform rain fraction (as in studies using T_{B} as in Machado et al. 1998), but again this selection is used just to choose convective systems with similar maturity in order to study anvil properties as function of convective depth. The cloud system size increases with decreasing convective function, something expected as the detrained anvil increases as the system gets older, it should be stressed that we do not capture the anvil shrinking as shown in Fig. 9a of (Machado et al 1998), most likely, because Machado et al. studied only the thicker anvils and we see that the thinner anvil part increases towards dissipation. We also consider systems having at least 1 convective grid with emissivity above 0.98 and therefore the system is not captured in its advanced dissipation. This is a weakness of our analysis for the life-cycle exploration which has been **explained in the text**.

To study land/ocean differences we perform the analysis separately. In the present paper we did not foresee a further division of the statistics per region because we are first interested in ‘global’ behaviors and relationships, and we think that differences in regions can be probably explained by differences in additional dynamical variables which we foresee to add when ERA5 data (with a better horizontal and temporal resolution) are getting available.




Figure 1. Key relations in latitudinal bands of 20° for DJF and JJA for mature single core systems (top panel) and in particular regions (bottom panel). Right: thin cirrus over anvil versus convective core minimum temperature. Left: total convective system size versus convective core minimum temperature.

Still, for addressing the question on the geographical and seasonal variability, and to prove that our findings do not depend on these variabilities, we present here, in Fig.1, the main correlation plots of the paper for mature single-core systems, in the top panel separately for DJF and JJA over three latitudinal bands ($-30 < \text{lat} < -10$, $-10 < \text{lat} < 10$ and $10 < \text{lat} < 30$), and in the bottom panel for regions define as in Liu and Zipser 2008. These plots show that the fraction of thin cirrus over the total anvil area as well as the horizontal extent of the convective systems increase with decreasing minimum convective core temperature for all configurations even though the slope might slightly differ. Therefore, the main findings of this article are robust as well reproduced for all latitudinal-band, seasonal and regional configurations : a) larger systems penetrate deeper into the troposphere (in agreement with other publications, like Rossow and Pearl 2007), b) the ratio of thin cirrus over total anvil is higher for colder mature systems.

Although single core systems are isolated for analysis, there is no reason to think that some of these systems did not evolve from or into multi-core systems. If this is the case for a significant fraction of convective systems, then the life cycle stages shown are not representative of typical system evolution, which should not be constrained to single core or multi-core categories for the entire life cycle. It may be the case that this does not heavily impact the statistics shown in Figure 7, but this should be proven to be the case, for example by examining actual life cycles using geostationary satellite data.

Indeed, this 'transition' between cloud system types might happen. However, a single core which evolves as multi-core due to the emergence of a new 'tower' in its vicinity is not be considered in the determination of maturity; the other way around (multi-core to single core) is more complicated to completely exclude these events. One motivation for this article was to find an observational metric which can be used for the evaluation of the simulation of detrainment processes. Therefore we wanted first to study the cleanest single-core sample possible: all single-core systems having a second opaque area ($0.9 < \text{eps} < 0.98$) are excluded for making the plots, **this information has been added to the paper text.**

To asses the potential bias in the life cycle study due to this 'migration', we included in the statistics also multicore systems. It should be stressed, that, as can be seen from figure 7 in our article, the majority of multi-core systems has a convective fraction between 1% and 40% and therefore only maturity steps between step 5 to 10 intervals will be affected. Figure 2 presents the results if single and multi-core systems are put together; the behaviour is very similar.




Figure 2. Median cloud system size (left), ratio of thin cirrus versus cirrus anvil (middle) and convective core average rain rate (right) as a function of maturity steps, including single and multi-core systems.

2. It is difficult to formulate physical interpretations of “thin” and “thick” anvil cirrus. The distinction seems fairly arbitrary (emissivity greater than or less than 0.5). Since CloudSat and Calipso are also flown in the A-Train satellite constellation, why not show a CloudSat/Calipso cross-section that shows how a typical convective system would be split up into convective core, thick cirrus, and thin cirrus so that the readers can better understand the physical differences between these cloud categories?

There are mainly three reasons why we selected 0.5: a) below this threshold no rain is observed at all b) this threshold has already been used to define thin cirrus in earlier Infrared sounder analyses, c) as shown in section 2.2 all studies using IR brightness temperatures exclude clouds with an emissivity below 0.6, meaning about 30% of the horizontal extent. Therefore we wanted to use a threshold indicative of the difference between IR brightness temperature analysis and our analysis. For illustration, Fig.3 shows a geographical map of a day scene of AIRS UT cloud systems, distinguishing 5 classes in emissivity.




Figure 3. Geographical map of AIRS UT cloud emissivity for the 1st of July 2007 AM, with each color indicating an emissivity class: $\epsilon > 0.98$, $\epsilon: 0.92-0.98$, $\epsilon: 0.80-0.92$, $\epsilon: 0.60-0.80$, $\epsilon: 0.10-0.60$.

A recent collaboration with H. Takahashi at JPL has led to combine our AIRS convective cloud systems with those determined from CloudSat (Takahashi and Luo 2014). The Figure 4 presents recent results which have been presented at the last GEWEX Cloud and Assessment Panel meeting. So far it was shown that there is a good correlation between AIRS and CloudSat cloud height; AIRS adds to the horizontal

dimension and AIRS extends the convective systems beyond an emissivity of 0.5. In a next step we will compare the relationships between the different proxies of convective intensity and depth, which will be published in a separate paper.

AIRS – CloudSat synergy on convective cloud systems

collaboration with Hanii Takahashi, JPL




Figure 4. Slide presented in the GEWEX Cloud and Assessment Panel meeting (November 2016) showing the preliminary results of the ongoing collaboration with H. Takahashi for collocating our AIRS objects with CloudSat Objects. First row: two examples of the horizontal view of the AIRS convective cloud systems, with colors showing the grid emissivity and the corresponding CloudSat track in purple (upper panel) and the CloudSat radar reflectivity profile (bottom panel). Second row left: correlation of AIRS temperature with CloudSat height. Second row right: distribution of cloud emissivities of AIRS cloud systems when collocated with CloudSat (upper panel), distribution of all cloud emissivities of AIRS cloud systems.

3. The definition of “convective core” is different than in most studies of deep convective systems. Typically, this refers to the region with buoyancy driven vertical motions over a relatively deep layer that produces net latent heating throughout most of the troposphere or the region with denser hydrometeors and higher condensates produced via convective motions. The definition used in this manuscript is really just a deep raining region that could be either convective or stratiform. The average AMSR-E rain rates for emissivities between 0.98 and 1 that define convective cores are ≈ 1 -3.5 mm/h, which are more consistent with stratiform rain rates than convective rain rates. At the very least, a significant fraction of convective core areas, as they are defined in this study, likely contain

stratiform rather than convective precipitation and vertical motions. This should be clarified in the revised manuscript perhaps by renaming the convective cores as deep precipitation cores.

Indeed, in our statistical analysis we assumed that the probability that an opaque core within an UT cloud system is linked to convection is high. Our comparison with precipitation showed a positive correlation between cloud emissivity and precipitation. The latter might still be of stratiform origin, as it can be seen from the updated figure 3 in the manuscript of the average rain rate (RR) and Max RR (within 0.5° grid) versus emissivity where the quartile bands have been added: there is a probability that even with an emissivity of 1, average rain in the 50 km grid is below 1 mm/h, but the maximum RR quartile is at 6mm/h. The link with convection can only be shown through vertical updraft. Vertical winds from ERA Interim data are only available at a spatial resolution of 0.75° and temporal resolution of 6h, this is why we didn't include them in the analysis as 2 interpolations (temporal and spatial) are needed and therefore dilute the information for their estimation. Though, we included now in Figure 3 also the median vertical wind (at 500 hPa) and its quartiles. The figure shows that UT opaque clouds are in general also linked to stronger updrafts.

We did not rename 'convective cores' to 'deep precipitation cores', since this is also not true in all cases. However, we added a discussion of the reliability of the opacity proxy for convective cores in the article. Moreover, for consistency, we have replaced in figure 10 average rain rate inside the convective core with the maximum rain rate, as this quantity is more representative of the convection while the average value might also consider the stratiform rain. One observes that over land the slope of the Maximum rain rate with the convective depth is significantly steeper when the system is colder.

4. In addition to convective intensity, the level of neutral buoyancy for ascending, buoyant air strongly impacts the minimum cloud top temperature. The level of neutral buoyancy is likely to be related to the properties of the tropical tropopause transition layer and the cold point tropopause. The tropical tropopause temperature varies significantly by latitude and season (e.g., Seidel et al. 2010, JGR-Atmospheres, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2000JD900837/full>; Fueglistaler et al. 2009, Rev. Geophys., <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2008RG000267/full>), which means that using minimum cloud top temperature as a proxy for convective intensity across the entire tropics may introduce time and location biases. In other words, different convective intensities as they are defined in this manuscript may be correlated with specific geographical locations and seasons. This should be fairly straightforward to explore by comparing different latitude bands and seasons with one another.

The plots shown for addressing question 1a are also the answer for question 4: we see that even though there are seasonal and geographical variabilities, i. e. T_{Cbmin} is slightly shifted towards higher values (lower systems) for regions outside the ITCZ and vice versa, in all configurations the 'pattern' is the same for mature systems: larger systems have penetrated deeper in the troposphere.

5. Many of the large cirrus systems will cover a piece of land and ocean. How are these systems assigned to land or ocean categories?

In order to categorize a system as 'land' or 'ocean' we use the fraction of 'land'

convective grids (if $\geq 0.5 \rightarrow$ land system, if $< 0.5 \rightarrow$ ocean system). It should be stressed that less than 5% of the total single-core statistics has a land fraction between 0.2 and 0.8 and thus we expect the separation between land and ocean systems to be accurate. For multi-core systems land fraction is computed the same way, however, as systems are large, this is just an approximation.

6. The reason that AIRS and AMSR-E are used over other satellite datasets needs to be better explained. How does AIRS improve on what can be retrieved by geostationary satellites regarding convective system cloud properties? It is suggested that it can better distinguish optically thin cirrus clouds from warmer, mid level clouds by decoupling cloud altitude and emissivity, but how is this done?

Are the results of this manuscript any different than what has already been learned from geostationary datasets such as ISCCP and active sensors such as CloudSat and Calipso? Briefly putting the results of this manuscript in the context of previous studies in the conclusions would be useful.

We have given an explanation at the beginning of our replies and have also improved the introduction and section 2 of the article. To address this question we have also added a figure in section 2 where we relate AIRS cloud temperature, the IR brightness temperature and the cloud emissivity. We also have written more details in comparison with other studies in a discussion session at the end of the paper.

7. Just because the cloud top temperature is correlated with the rain rate does not mean that it is a good proxy for convective strength or intensity. In fact, a recent study has shown that the highest rain rates in the tropics may not be associated with the most intense convection based on radar reflectivity echo tops (Hamada et al. 2015, Nature Communications, http://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms7213?WT.ec_id=NCOMMS-20150225). Of course, this is using the traditional definition of convective intensity, which typically refers to the updraft vertical velocity magnitude. It has been known for some time though that convection need not be intense to reach the tropopause (e.g., Zipser 2003, Meteorological Monographs, http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-878220-63-9_5). Therefore, I recommend removal of the "convective intensity" terminology because it is being very loosely, which leads to confusion. Why not simply refer to the "convective depth" instead? It could still be pointed out that it is positively correlated with rain rate.

We have added a discussion on the terms convective intensity / strength and depth in the introduction and in the discussion of the results of the relationships, section 4. Indeed, for our proxy TCbmin it is more appropriate to use the term convective depth, and therefore we have replaced it in the manuscript.

8. On page 8, line 1-2, it is stated that minimum brightness temperature has been shown to be a more skillful proxy to describe convective intensity compared to the radar echo height based on Jiang (2012), but this is not what is concluded in Jiang (2012). Jiang (2012) states that minimum infrared brightness temperature in the inner core of tropical cyclones is a better indicator of tropical cyclone rapid intensification than other proxies for convective intensity. It is also problematic that this study, which focuses on tropical cyclones, is being used in the manuscript as representative of all tropical MCSs. In fact, it is well known that for a given minimum infrared brightness temperature, convective

intensity is far stronger over land than ocean, which is reflected in far different reflectivity profiles, microwave brightness temperatures, and lightning flash rates, which are the traditional measures of convective intensity (e.g., Zipser et al. 2006, BAMS, <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/pdf/10.1175/BAMS-87-8-1057>; Liu et al. 2007, J. Climate, <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/full/10.1175/JCLI4023.1>; many others). Minimum infrared brightness temperature is assuredly not the most skillful proxy for convective intensity when used across the entire tropics.

This has been rectified in the manuscript as written for comment 7.

9. Is Figure 1 just one example of many possibilities or is it an average relationship? Does a pair of given brightness temperature and emissivity values always produce the same retrieved cloud top temperature? For example, will a brightness temperature of 260 K and emissivity of 0.6 always produce a cloud top temperature of 230 K? More information on how cloud top temperature is retrieved and limitations of the retrieval would be helpful.

As written before, we have improved the description of the AIRS cloud retrieval. Figure 1 provides a statistical study; to make it clearer we have A) added quartile bands and **added text** to better explain the distinction between AIRS temperature and TB. B) Added a new 3d plot, Fig. 2 in the manuscript, with T_b and T_{cloud} in x and y axis, respectively, and in the z axis the average emissivity in each (T, T_b) bin.

10. Possible inconsistencies between Figure 7 and Figures 10 and 12 need to be explained. For example, in Figure 7a, cloud system size increases from stage 6 to stage 9, but in Figure 7e, the minimum cloud top temperature increases from stage 6 to stage 9 (during system maturity when convective area fraction is between 0.1 and 0.3), so as minimum cloud top temperature increases, system size increases. However, Figure 10 shows system size decreasing with increasing minimum cloud top temperature, which is the opposite relationship. Similarly, Figure 12 shows that the thin cirrus anvil area fraction decreases with increasing minimum cloud top temperature, but Figure 7c and 7e show that thin cirrus anvil area fraction increases with increasing minimum cloud top temperature, which is the opposite relationship.

Fig. 9 was used to determine convective systems which are relatively mature, corresponding to a plateau in convective core size, after it has increased during maturing. From Fig. 9b we select cloud systems corresponding to maturity steps 7 -9 (Cb fraction 10 - 30%). For these intervals we have on average similar average cloud system properties. All following analyses in which we explore a relationship between convective depth and anvil properties are done for these mature systems (Figs. 11 - 15), for which the average properties are similar, but for which we see an increase in cloud system size, precipitation and ratio of thin cirrus/total anvil when the convective depth increases.

A better choice would have been probably CB fraction between 15%-25%, but this would shrink the statistics. We have however redone the analyses with this definition of maturity and the results are very similar (see Fig. 6 below).

11. Are the results in Figure 14 a result of different life cycle stages of the single core systems or do these differences also exist for a given life cycle stage (indicating differences in the life cycles of systems of varying convective depth)? Clarification here would provide valuable insight into the results.

Fig. 15 was performed for **mature** single core systems. We have clarified this in the manuscript. To assess if the threshold of Cb fraction between 10% and 30% is

not too broad, we have analyzed the relationships separately for 4 smaller intervals of convective fraction inside the maturity range, and the results are very similar for all 4 bins in all 3 in TCbmin, see Fig.6.




Figure 6. Emissivity within single core mature cloud systems as a function of the normalized distance to the convective core for four subintervals of convective fraction, separated in three groups wrt to convective intensity; Left: systems with $T_{cb}^{min} \leq 200K$, middle: $200 < T_{cb}^{min} \leq 230K$ and right: $T_{cb}^{min} > 230K$.

Minor Comments

1. I suggest changing “build” on page 1, line 23 to “are part of” since the clouds are primarily a function of the convection rather than the other way around. OK
2. On page 2, line 5, there appears to be a missing word after “MCS’s”. added word 'anvil'
3. The data is gridded at a resolution of 0.5 , but it seems that the distribution of cloud types defined at the native measurement resolution in each grid box is used for all of the figures. Is this correct? Added a phrase explaining that indeed the information on the individual occurrence of each cloud type in each grid is used to compute cloud type fractions. However, when it comes to physical properties, the average values over the grid are used.
4. The gap between orbits is largest at the equator. Please state the width of the gap and scan at the equator on page 4, line 19. Added these numbers in the parenthesis
5. Which latitude band is used for most of the figures? This should be mentioned in Section 2. Added this information in the abstract, and made it clear in section 2
6. Please capitalize “south” on page 5, line 26. OK
7. Remove “s” from “includes” on page 6, line 9. OK
8. Insert “do” after “dissipation” on page 6, line 24. OK
9. Change “is” to “are” on page 7, line 18. OK
10. Change “on” to “in” on page 7, line 22. OK
11. Remove “or” on page 7, lines 24 and 25. OK
12. Change “signal” to “reflectivity” and “or brightness temperature” to “and microwave or infrared temperatures” on page 7, line 25. OK
13. Insert “cloud top” before “temperature” on page 7, line 31. OK
14. Does the resolution of the minimum retrieved cloud top temperature used in analyses change based on distance from nadir?

pcld and therefore Tcld should not depend on viewing angle, since the clear sky and cloudy radiances used to determine cld emissivity in the chi2 method are simulated for the corresponding viewing angles. To determine the minimum temperature within a convective core we use the average Tcld per grid so it is a conservative estimation.

15. Please clarify what is meant by "rain detection offset over land" on page 8, line 8. [we removed this phrase](#)

16. Change "is" to "it" on page 8, line 31. [OK](#)

17. A citation is needed for the statement that convective intensity will increase in a warming climate on page 8, lines 32-34. [Added reference to: Tan et al. 2015, Bony et al. 2016](#)

18. Insert "of" after "years" on page 9, line 2. [OK](#)

19. Why do the distributions in Figure 6 go less than 0 and greater than 1 when convective fraction cannot be less than 0 or greater than 1?

[It is a smoothen kernel density estimate. We have added the histogram beneath so that there is not confusion.](#)

20. Are the bars in Figures 7 and 9-13 standard errors of the mean? If so, please state that and include the sample sizes used to make the figures.

[Yes these are standard errors and the statistics for single core systems is the one shown in figure 8 i.e about 130K systems while about 17K systems after the filtering for multi-core systems are used in plots 9 to 13.](#)

Bony, S. B. Stevens, D. Coppin, T. Becker, K. A. Reed, A. Voigt, and B. Medeiros, Thermodynamic control of anvil cloud amount, *PNAS*, **113**, 8927-8932, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1601472113 (2016)

Tan, J., C. Jakob, W.B. Rossow and G. Tselioudis, The role of organized deep convection in explaining observed tropical rainfall changes. *Nature*, **519**, 451-454. doi:10.1038/nature14339 (2015)

Upper Tropospheric Cloud Systems Derived from IR Sounders: Properties of Cirrus Anvils in the Tropics

Sofia E. Protopapadaki¹, Claudia J. Stubenrauch¹, and Artem G. Feofilov¹

¹Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique, IPSL/CNRS, UMR8539, Ecole Polytechnique, France

Correspondence to: S. Protopapadaki (sprotopap@lmd.polytechnique.fr)

Abstract. Representing about 30% of the Earth's total cloud cover, upper tropospheric clouds play a crucial role in the climate system by modulating the Earth's energy budget and heat transport. When originating from convection, they often form organized systems. The high spectral resolution of the Atmospheric InfraRed Sounder (AIRS) allows reliable cirrus identification, both from day and night-time observations. ~~In this work,~~ Tropical upper tropospheric cloud systems have been ~~analysed~~ analyzed by using a spatial composite technique on the retrieved cloud pressure of AIRS data. ~~Convective-Cloud emissivity is used to distinguish convective~~ is used to distinguish convective core, cirrus, and thin cirrus anvil within these systems ~~are distinguished by cloud emissivity~~. ~~A comparison with simultaneous precipitation data from the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer - Earth Observing System (AMSRE) shows that for tropical upper tropospheric clouds, a cloud emissivity close to 1 is strongly linked to a high rain rate, leading to a proxy to identify convective cores.~~ A comparison with simultaneous precipitation data from the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer - Earth Observing System (AMSRE) shows that for tropical upper tropospheric clouds, a cloud emissivity close to 1 is strongly linked to a high rain rate, leading to a proxy to identify convective cores. Combining AIRS cloud data with this cloud system approach, using physical variables, provides a new opportunity to relate the properties of the anvils, including also the thinner cirrus, to the convective cores. It also distinguishes convective cloud systems from isolated cirrus systems. ~~A comparison with simultaneous precipitation data from the microwave sounder AMSRE shows that large cloud emissivity is strongly correlated with rain rate, leading to a threshold of 0.98 in cloud emissivity to identify convective cores.~~ Deep convective cloud systems, covering 15% of the tropics, are further distinguished into single-core and multi-core systems. Though AIRS samples the tropics only twice per day, ~~we could show that,~~ the evolution of longer living convective systems can be still statistically captured, and we were able to select relatively mature single-core convective systems by using the fraction of convective core area within the cloud systems ~~to stratify the properties of these systems, their life cycle can be statistically captured. This allows selecting mature convective cloud systems as a proxy for maturity.~~ For these systems, ~~relationships between we have demonstrated that~~ the physical properties of the anvils ~~have been~~ are related to convective ~~intensity. The latter has been identified~~ depth, indicated by the minimum retrieved cloud temperature within the convective core. Our analyses show that the size of the systems ~~do~~ does in general increase with convective ~~intensity as expected. Furthermore, it was revealed~~ depth, though for similar convective depth oceanic convective cloud systems are slightly larger than continental ones, in agreement with other observations. In addition, our data reveal for the first time that the fraction of thin cirrus over the total anvil area increases with ~~increasing convective intensity~~ the convective depth, similarly for oceanic and continental convective systems. This has implications for the radiative feedbacks of anvils on convection which will be more closely studied in the future.

1 Introduction

High clouds cover about 30% of the Earth (e.g. Stubenrauch et al., 2013) and are of fundamental importance to climate as they modulate the ~~Earth1000~~Earth's energy budget and the heat transport in the upper troposphere, thus potentially influencing earth's atmospheric circulation and water cycle. Their feedbacks still lack ~~of~~ scientific understanding and heretofore represent a major uncertainty in predicting climate variability and ~~climate~~ change in climate models (Boucher et al., 2013).

In the tropics, where these high clouds are most abundant, they ~~often build are part of~~ large mesoscale systems of a characteristic size of tens of thousands ~~of~~ km^2 . They either form from organized deep convection or are directly formed *in situ* ~~;~~ when cold air is supersaturated with water. This article focuses on the former in the tropics.

Within the last decade, numerous studies focused on these mesoscale convective cloud systems (MCS). Their structure and life cycle were studied by using composite techniques applied to satellite imagery and radar (e.g. Machado and Rossow, 1993; Machado et al., 1998; Del Genio and Kovari, 2002; Schumacher and Houze, 2003; Houze, 2004; Lin et al., 2006; Liu et al., 2007; Rossow et al., 2007; Yuan and Houze, 2010; Roca et al., 2014; Virts et al., 2015; Bouniol et al., 2016). These studies concentrated mainly on the thick cirrus anvils, because radar and visible-infrared imagery either miss or misidentify thin cirrus ~~;-The (Stubenrauch et al., 2013). However, the~~ thinner cirrus are thought to be a part of the ~~MCS's and MCS's anvil that~~ have a significant radiative impact which might regulate convection itself (Stephens et al., 2004; Lebsock et al., 2010). Their radiative forcing depends primarily on their horizontal extent, emissivity distribution, and the temperature difference with the underlying surface.

In addition, organized convection was studied by statistical analysis of cloud regimes defined by similar cloud pressure and optical depth within grid cells (Tselioudis and Rossow, 2011; Rossow et al., 2013; Stachnik et al., 2013; Tan et al., 2015; Oreopoulos et al., 2016). Though this approach proved to be very useful for advancing our knowledge on tropical convection, it does not provide information of the horizontal extent and structure of the systems. Recent studies ~~performed using which used~~ the space-borne active instruments, lidar and radar, of the A-Train mission ~~Stephens et al. (2002) (Stephens et al., 2002)~~ revealed the vertical structure of these systems (e.g. ~~Luo et al., 2010; Igel et al., 2014; Takahashi and Luo, 2014; Deng et al., 2016 Luo et al.,~~ Luo et al., 2016). They ~~were~~are, however, hampered by the very narrow track and thus are missing the horizontal extent of the system.

The good-In this article we use infrared (IR) sounder data to study mesoscale deep convective systems, and more specifically their horizontal extent and IR emissivity distribution. The high spectral resolution of ~~infrared-IR~~ sounders, in particular the Atmospheric InfraRed Sounder (AIRS) aboard Aqua since 2002 ~~;~~ and the Infrared Atmospheric Sounding Interferometers (IASI) ~~;~~ aboard Metop since ~~2007, allows-2006, allow~~ reliable cirrus identification, both from day and ~~nighttime-night time~~ observations (e.g. Stubenrauch et al., 2010, 2013). ~~Combining AIRS cloud data with a new cloud system approach, using physical cloud variables~~ Using the AIRS physical variables of pressure and emissivity, ~~provides a new we reconstruct cloud systems. This approach distinguishes isolated cirrus from systems having convective core(s), using the IR emissivity as a proxy; an IR emissivity close to 1 has been verified to be closely related to larger rain rate and vertical updraft (2.2). This provides a unique opportunity to relate the properties of the anvils, including also the thinner cirrus, to those of the convective cores. This approach also distinguishes convective-~~

One of the World Climate Research Programme grand challenges is to determine the role of convection in cloud feedbacks (Bony et al., 2015). Compared to data bases of tropical mesoscale convective systems from radar and visible-infrared satellite imagery, this data base of upper tropospheric (UT) cloud systems from ~~isolated-cirrus~~ systems. AIRS cloud properties includes cirrus, reliably identified down to an IR emissivity of 0.1 (corresponding to a visible optical depth of 0.2). The motivation of this article is to present this data base, which, coupled with other data, will provide observational metric for a better understanding of the interconnection between tropical convection and the heating induced by the outflowing anvils.

Proxies of convective intensity/strength or convective depth may be given by vertical updraft (e.g. Liu et al., 2007; Takahashi and Luo, 2007), lightning flash rate (e.g. Zipser et al., 2006), level of neutral buoyancy (e.g. Takahashi and Luo, 2014), area of heavy rainfall (e.g. Yuan and Houze, 2010), width of convective core (e.g. Igel et al., 2014), cold cloud top temperature or height (e.g. Machado and Ross, 2007) and mass flux (e.g. Tissier et al., 2016; Masunaga and Luo, 2016). While the level of neutral buoyancy describes the convective environment, the convective intensity is given by the strength of the vertical updraft, and the cloud top height can be considered as a proxy of convective depth. Therefore, these proxies might give insight into different aspects of convection. With AIRS alone, we are able to determine cloud top height temperature and, therefore, to explore the anvil properties in relation to the convective depth.

Details on the ~~methodology~~ AIRS cloud retrieval and the construction of UT cloud systems are given in section 2. Results on the statistical properties of ~~these~~ tropical upper tropospheric cloud systems, ~~their life-cycle, and the relationships between convective intensity including maturity stage with respect to the convective core fraction, are given in section 3. Relationships between convective depth and anvil properties are of tropical mature convective cloud systems are then discussed in section ??.~~ ~~Conclusions~~ 4. Conclusions and an outlook are presented in section 5.

2 Methodology

2.1 Cloud properties derived from AIRS observations

~~The Atmospheric Infrared Sounder (AIRS) is an ultra-high~~ AIRS is a high spectral resolution infrared spectrometer, aboard the polar orbiting EOS Aqua satellite with an equatorial crossing at 1:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. local time (Chahine et al., 2006). AIRS completes approximately 14.5 orbits per day with each orbit ~~‘swath’~~ “swath” being of 48.95° , divided by 90 footprints for each scan line. The spatial resolution of a footprint varies from about 13.5 km x 21 km at nadir to 41 km x 21 km at the scan extremes. ~~Level 2 cloud properties, such as emissivity, pressure, temperature and height have been produced over the whole globe and from 2003 to 2015 using the modular LMD-CIRS methodology (?). It employs a weighted~~

The LMD cloud property retrieval is based on a weighted χ^2 method using eight channels along the method and uses eight spectral channels sounding along the $15 \mu\text{m}$ CO_2 absorption band, from 11 to 14 micron and an *a posteriori* cloud detection based on the coherence of retrieved cloud emissivity between 10 and 12 micron (Stubenrauch et al., 2010; ?). Cloud types are defined according to cloud pressure and cloud emissivity absorption band (Stubenrauch et al., 2010), providing cloud pressure p_{cld} and emissivity ϵ_{cld} of a single cloud layer (of the uppermost cloud layer in the case of multi-layer clouds). By introducing empirical weights, the method takes into account the vertical weighting of the different channels, the growing uncertainty

in the computation of ϵ_{cld} with increasing pressure and uncertainties in atmospheric profiles (Stubenrauch et al., 1999). A crucial consideration in the cloud retrieval is the determination of clear sky and opaque cloud radiances I_{clr} and I_{cld} , since ϵ_{cld} is defined as $\epsilon_{cld} = (I_{meas} - I_{clr}) / (I_{cld}(p_{cld}) - I_{clr})$. For their computation we need temperature profiles and surface skin temperature as well as atmospheric transmissivity profiles at the corresponding wavelengths for the atmospheric situation of the measurements. The atmospheric spectral transmissivity profiles have been simulated by the 4A radiative transfer model (Scott and Chédin, 1981 ; operational version available at <http://www.noveltis.net/4AOP>), separately for each satellite viewing zenith angle and for about 2000 representative clear sky atmospheric temperature and humidity profiles of the Thermodynamic Initial Guess Retrieval (TIGR) data base (Chevallier et al., 1998; Chédin et al., 2003). Since IR sounders, in combination with microwave sounders, were originally designed for the retrieval of atmospheric temperature and humidity profiles, the atmospheric clear sky situation can then be directly described by simultaneously retrieved AIRS L2 atmospheric profiles (Susskind et al., 2014) of good quality (when the situation is not too cloudy), provided by NASA (Version 6 available at Goddard Earth Sciences Data and Information Services Center). In the other case, the instantaneous profiles and surface skin temperature are replaced by those of good quality, averaged over 1° latitude x 1° longitude, or interpolated in time. The proximity recognition between these AIRS L2 atmospheric profiles and the TIGR atmospheric profiles is described in detail in Stubenrauch et al. (2008). Once p_{cld} and ϵ_{cld} are retrieved by the χ^2 method, cloud temperature T_{cld} is determined from p_{cld} , by using the AIRS temperature profile.

Recently, we have developed a modular cloud retrieval code (CIRS, Clouds from IR Sounders, Feofilov and Stubenrauch, 2017), which can be applied to any IR sounder data. To derive a 13-year global climatology of cloud properties from AIRS (2003-2015), we used the latest ancillary data (atmospheric profiles, surface emissivities and atmospheric transmissivities). Compared to the version which is distributed at the French data center ICARE and which has participated in the GEWEX been evaluated in the Global Energy and Water Exchanges (GEWEX) cloud assessment (Stubenrauch et al., 2013), these cloud data are very similar for high-level clouds and with a detection slightly improved for low-level clouds (?). (Feofilov and Stubenrauch, 2017). Cloud types can then be defined according to p_{cld} and ϵ_{cld} .

To In this analysis, to facilitate the reconstruction of the UT cloud systems from the L2-AIRS cloud properties, it is convenient to grid the data, keeping the statistics and occurrence of the individual cloud types inside the grid, while the physical parameters (T , p , ϵ) are averaged inside the grid cell. The grid cell size should not be greater than the average size of the smallest cloud system. A good compromise was found by introducing grid cells of 0.5° in latitude and longitude.

2.2 Construction of Upper-Tropospheric-upper tropospheric cloud systems

Before reconstructing the horizontal extent of the UT cloud systems, a critical question has to be addressed: how to define UT clouds? Most studies on tropical MCS's life cycle and structure, used the brightness temperature used the IR brightness temperature (T_B) to define cold clouds. Yuan and Houze (2010) merge: Yuan and Houze (2010) merged adjacent footprints containing cold clouds defined as those with $T_B < 260$ K, while Machado et al. (1998) used $T_B < 245$ K and, Fiolleau and Roca (2013) and Roca et al. (2014) have considered only footprints with $T_B < 233$ K. Brightness-temperature depends on both However, T_B depends both on cloud altitude and opacity; opaque clouds have a brightness-temperature which indeed coincides

with their actual temperature as shown in Fig. 1. However, for $(\epsilon \approx 1)$ have an IR brightness temperature close to the cloud top temperature T_{cld} , though it can happen to be a few degrees lower (Sherwood et al., 2004; Stubenrauch et al., 2010). For optically thinner clouds the radiation reaching the instrument includes, in addition to the cloud's emission, also a fraction of the emission from the warmer earth's surface and atmosphere radiation passing through them.

5 The present cloud system approach has the advantage of employing data in which the cloud altitude (temperature, pressure) and opacity (emissivity) are decoupled. Therefore, a clear distinction between high and low clouds is possible based on cloud pressure the atmosphere passing through these semi-transparent clouds. Figure 1 presents the cloud brightness temperature median value and the quartiles of T_B as well as the retrieved cloud temperature T_{cld} as a function of the cloud emissivity ϵ_{cld} for high clouds, with a pressure < 440 hPa (corresponding to a height of about 7 km in the tropics). This definition of high clouds is, a definition generally found in the literature (e.g. Rossow et al., 1999; Stubenrauch et al., 2012). Indeed, T_B One observes that indeed T_B increases with decreasing cloud emissivity, ϵ_{cld} while T_{cld} does not show a particular relationship, except that the most opaque clouds in the tropics seem to be on average also colder. The relation between T_B , T_{cld} and ϵ_{cld} is further explored in Fig. 2; T_B corresponds to T_{cld} only for opaque clouds, whereas for a given T_B the associated cloud might also be optically thin and colder. This means that for instance, an upper threshold on the T_B of 260 K will exclude from the analysis all high clouds of 245 K on T_B will include higher clouds ($T_{cld} < 245$ K approx. 8 km) with an emissivity below 0.6. As down to 0.7, but their cloud temperature might then be underestimated by several 10's of °C. This only allows relating the thickest anvil properties to convection.

The present cloud system approach, employing cloud altitude (temperature, pressure) and opacity (emissivity) has the advantage of a clear distinction between high and low clouds based on cloud pressure, and of thin and thick cirrus, based on cloud emissivity. This is important, since, as discussed in the introduction this new, this new UT cloud system approach aims to understand-explore the horizontal structure of the UT cloud systems, including thin cirrus.

Since the AIRS initial spatial resolution is more adapted to study organized convection rather than small scale shallow convection, we revise the definition of upper tropospheric clouds i) towards slightly higher clouds and ii) by using a tropopause dependent definition. Hereafter, UT clouds will be considered as those being at most 250 hPa below the tropopause corresponding to a maximum cloud pressure of about 350 hPa and a height of about 8 km in the tropics. It should be stressed that the $P < 440$ hPa standard high cloud definition has been also of $p_{cld} < 440$ hPa high has also been tested and the obtained results are compatible to these reported in section ??, results are coherent with those reported in sections 3 and 4.

Typically, a convective system is composed of an opaque precipitating core which detrains cirrus in the form of an anvil at the height of neutral buoyancy (e.g. Luo et al., 2010; Takahashi and Luo, 2014). To investigate whether cloud emissivity can be used as a proxy to define the convective core identify convective cores, AIRS cloud data have been collocated with simultaneous AMSR-E precipitation data (Kummerow and Ferraro, 2006). Figure 3 presents median values and quartiles of the maximum and average rain rate from the AMSR-E measurements (of spatial resolution of about 5 km at nadir) and the vertical wind at 500 hPa from the meteorological reanalysis ERA Interim (Dee et al., 2011), within a grid cell, as a function of cloud emissivity averaged from AIRS UT clouds within the same grid cell. Based on the previous plot The vertical wind data are interpolated, spatially from 0.75° to 0.5° grid cells, and temporally from 6 hourly universal time to 1:30 AM and PM local time. A strong

positive correlation between cloud emissivity and precipitation is observed for high ϵ_{cld} . The rain rate might be of stratiform origin even when ϵ_{cld} is close to 1, as according to the quartile bands there is a probability that the average rain in the 0.5° grid is below 1 mm h^{-1} , while the maximum RR quartile is at 6 mm h^{-1} . The link with convection can only be shown through vertical updraft. Though the ERA Interim vertical wind has a low horizontal spatial resolution and is therefore quite diluted, Figure 3 shows that opaque clouds are in general linked to stronger updrafts. Based on figure 3, hereafter, convective cores are defined as those with $\epsilon_{cta} > 0.98$, since precipitation is significant, while cirrus and thin cirrus are defined by $\epsilon_{cld} > 0.98 > \epsilon_{cta} > 0.5$ and $\epsilon_{cta} > 0.5$. The emissivity threshold for distinguishing cirrus from thin cirrus was set to $0.5 > \epsilon_{cta} > 0.1$, respectively as i) below this threshold no rain occurs at all (not shown), ii) this threshold has already been used to define thin cirrus in earlier IR sounder analyses, iii) the studies exploring tropical convective cloud systems using IR brightness temperatures exclude all high clouds with an emissivity below this value (Fig. 2).

To study the horizontal extent of cloud systems, a full spatial coverage is required. However, in the tropical region (where the cloud systems will be explored, $30^\circ \text{N} - 30^\circ \text{S}$), AIRS measurements only cover about 70% of the surface due to gaps between orbits (e.g Fig.1 of Feofilov et al., 2015). Thus, the missing data have to be extrapolated from the properties of the cloud types determined around the gaps. It should be stressed that days with missing orbits are completely excluded from the analysis; only scenes with coverage above 68%, representing more than 85% of the total statistics, are considered. In the following we describe the method developed to fill the missing data gaps. In each grid cell of $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ the distribution of the number of measurements per cloud type is known. Cloud type distributions in empty grid cells are obtained from the probability density function (PDF) of the neighbouring grid cells. The PDF of an empty grid cell is built as the sum of the neighbouring PDFs, normalized to 1, weighted by the inverse squared root of the distance between the grid cells. Similarly, the physical properties of each cloud type in the interpolated grid, such as temperature, pressure and emissivity, are computed using the same weighted average method.

In the course of the study several questions emerged, such as how many neighbours to use, and what should be the shape of the region for the neighbors-neighbours to be included in the interpolation. The reason we draw readers' attention on these details is due to the irregular gap area shape and size which varies with latitude. The optimal filling configuration was deduced by statistically comparing the fractions of each of the UT cloud types in the grid cells with real data and those with interpolated data, but also by visually examining geographical maps of cloud types such as Fig. 4 top panel-the top panel of Figure 4. We found that the most appropriate way to get an UT cloud amount in the gaps consistent with the one in the data grid cells, while preserving cloud system shapes, was to choose a number of neighbours proportional to the distance between the grid cells-to-be-filled and the closest non-empty-grid cell. By doing so, an empty grid cell surrounded by non-empty grid cells is filled using only a small number of the proximity data neighbours, while a cell located at the center of a gap near the equator (gap with maximum horizontal width reaching 700 km) is filled using a larger number of data (up to 100 grid cells) since the uncertainty is higher. The filling algorithm first scans eastward and westward of a grid cell to-be-filled to count the number of empty grid cells in both directions until a non-empty grid cell is found; the closest distance being the gap reference distance. Then, a spiral scan over the neighbours is performed for a number of cycles which increases linearly with the gap distance. From case studies we observed that obtaining realistic cloud system shapes requires the scan to be bound vertically

to ± 3 grid cells, while allowing the horizontal scan free. As an example, the top panel in Fig. Figure 4 presents a geographic map of cloud types for one day in July at 1:30 AM LT, with after the data gaps filled filling.

Once the gaps are filled, we apply a composite technique to reconstruct the upper tropospheric cloud systems; adjacent grid cells containing UT clouds and sharing a common side are grouped. The grid cells must contain more than 70% of UT cloud types within all AIRS measurements in order to be considered in the procedure. For interpolated grid cells the threshold is set slightly lower, to 65%, as this 5% difference corrects for an observed bias in the UT cloud amount of the interpolated areas. To ensure the spatial continuity of cloud systems, the average cloud pressure difference between two adjacent grid cells must be lower than 50 hPa; this is a legitimate value as it is slightly above the uncertainty of retrieved ~~cloud pressure~~ p_{cld} , which is of the order of 30 - 40 hPa (~~Stubenrauch et al., 2012; ?~~). (Stubenrauch et al., 2012; Feofilov and Stubenrauch, 2017) .

To identify opaque areas inside the built UT cloud systems, which potentially enclose convective core(s), a second grouping is performed. The emissivity limit for the opaque area definition is set to 0.9. The cloud system is then considered as a "convective" one when containing at least one grid cell with $\epsilon_{cld} > 0.98$ within the opaque area. The above core identification procedure provides the number of convective cores in a cloud system and thus allows its classification as ~~non-convective~~ non-convective, if no convective core is found, or as convective if at least one core is found. The latter are further classified, with respect to the number of cores, to single-core and multi-core systems.

~~The bottom panel in Fig. 4 presents the UT cloud systems. Figure 4 bottom panel present for the same day as in the top panel. Each cloud system has a different color, and the , the tropical cloud systems including opaque and convective core areas are marked with magenta and deep red, respectively.~~

3 Results on Tropical Upper Tropospheric cloud systems

Middle panel presents a more detailed horizontal structure of the UT cloud systems, illustrating the anvil amount not taken into account in the various analyses which use IR T_B mentioned in section 2.2.

3 Exploration of Tropical Upper Tropospheric cloud systems

3.1 Statistical properties

We find that upper tropospheric cloud systems cover about 20% (25%) of the tropical band, defined as 30° N-30° S (15° N-15° S). Their horizontal extent varies significantly, starting from a single grid cell with a size of about 2500 km², reaching ~~to~~ several 10⁸ km². These UT cloud systems may be distinguished as convective or non-convective (isolated cirrus) systems. More specifically, convective (single and multi-core) systems cover 15% (20%) while isolated cirrus systems cover 5% (5%) of the tropical band 30° N-30° S (15° N-15° S). The latter might originate from convection or formed by *in situ* freezing. Studies using Lagrangian transport performed by Luo et al. (2004) and Riihimaki et al. (2012) have shown that about 50% of these isolated cirrus systems form *in situ* while the other half corresponds to dissipating convective systems. Table 1 summarizes the statistical repartition of tropical isolated cirrus systems, single-core and multi-core convective systems in the 30° N-30°

S band along with their average sizes. ~~As it can be seen, though~~ Though isolated cirrus systems significantly outnumber the convective systems, their average horizontal extent is a factor of 10 smaller than the one of single-core convective systems. Multi-core convective systems are significantly larger than the other categories, compared to single-core by a factor of 20, while representing only 1% of the population. Among convective cloud systems, those having ~~an~~ horizontal extent larger than $3 \times 10^8 \text{ km}^2$ represent about 10% and are mainly located over the western Pacific during the monsoon period (Liu et al., 2007); a region with warm surface temperatures, large convective mass fluxes (Tissier et al., 2016), and large UT humidity (Virts et al., 2015; Houze et al., 2016). This region is also known for building mesoscale convective complexes (e.g. Mapes and Houze, 1993; Deng et al., 2016), including several convective systems, often in different phases of development and connected by ubiquitous thin cirrus.

Figure 5 presents ~~the geographical distribution of~~ geographical maps of occurrence a) isolated cirrus and b) all convective cores ($\epsilon_{cta} > 0.98$) ~~of, together for~~ single and multi-core systems. ~~The white areas contain less than five objects, also separately for c) boreal winter and d) boreal summer, and e) of single core convective systems.~~ The convective activity pattern clearly follows the Intertropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) with maxima observed over the warm pool, north west ~~south~~ South America and central Africa. ~~The pattern is, and over the summer hemisphere. The patterns are~~ in agreement with previous findings obtained from the International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project (Tan et al., 2015), the CloudSat mission (Igel et al., 2014) ~~and~~ the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (Houze et al., 2015) and from geostationary satellites Fiolleau and Roca (2013). As expected, isolated cirrus are abundant and are found to cover ~~much wider~~ wide areas in the vicinity of the convective active regions.

3.2 System composition and life-cycle stages

As discussed in the introduction, the impact of UT cloud systems on the Earth's energy budget depends on their horizontal extent, their emissivity distribution, and the temperature difference between the cloud and its underlying surface (lower clouds or earth surface). The latter has been explored by Haladay and Stephens (2009). In this work, the first two points will be studied.

Hereafter, ~~as we have enough statistics and as~~ we are primarily interested ~~on studying individual cloud systems in the horizontal cloud system emissivity~~ structure, rather than ~~on in~~ the total coverage ~~of over~~ the tropical band, and to keep the uncertainties low, we consider only convective cloud systems which are composed ~~with of~~ more than 80% of ~~data will be considered in the analyses~~ real data.

Figure 6 presents the average proportion of convective core, thick and thin anvils as a function of the UT cloud system horizontal extent, separately for single and multi-core convective systems. The statistics ~~includes~~ include convective systems at different phases of their life cycle (in development and mature). As the systems get larger, the fraction of the convective core decreases to 10% and that of thin cirrus anvil increases up to about 30%. The same tendencies are observed for both single and multi-core systems, with the only difference that the latter have slightly smaller fractions of convective core area and slightly larger fractions of thin cirrus area.

The composition of a convective system (convective part, thick and thin anvil) depends on the system life-cycle stage ~~With increasing size, the life-cycle of these systems varies from a couple of hours up to several days, as shown by Machado et al. (1998) and Fiolle~~

with the maximum horizontal extent of the thicker anvil attained at the mature stage (Machado and Rossow, 1993; Futyán and Del Genio, 2007).

~~In this (as illustrated in Fig. 9d of Machado et al. (1998)). Our~~ analysis, using snapshots which are available only every twelve hours, ~~cannot directly track~~ the life cycles of the convective systems ~~cannot be directly tracked. Nevertheless, we will use the fraction of the convective area, as defined in section 2.2, to get an indirect insight on.~~ However, in particular organized convection often has life time longer than 24 hours; it has already been demonstrated in previous studies using satellite data with better temporal resolution (Machado et al., 1998 and Futyán and Del Genio, 2007) or with varying observation time (Fiolleau and Roca, 2013) that the largest systems have the longest life cycle, up to several days. Therefore, even with only two measurements per day we should be able to observe systems in different phases of their life cycle and explore them statistically. Our article is not focused on studying the life cycle ~~stage of convective systems~~, itself, but aims to select relatively mature convective systems, for which one can then explore the relationship between anvil properties and convective depth. We use as proxy of maturity stage the fraction of convective core horizontal extent with respect to the total cloud system horizontal extent. This variable has been proven to be an indicator of convective cloud maturity as it follows the life cycle in high temporal resolution studies using IR imagery of geostationary satellites (Machado et al., 1998), Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM) (Fiolleau and Roca, 2013), as well as using CloudSat radar (Bacmeister and Stephens, 2011), the latter taking data at the same observation time as AIRS.

Figure 7 shows the normalized distribution of convective core fraction, separately for single and multi-core systems. In general, this fraction has a wider distribution and peaks at a larger value for single-core systems compared to multi-core convective systems (at 0.25 and 0.1, respectively). A small fraction of single-core convective systems ~~consist~~ consists only of the convective core itself; these are systems ~~probably~~ in the development phase. Only during maturity and dissipation do convective systems include increasing upper tropospheric stratiform cirrus anvils, while the fraction of the convective area decreases (e.g. Leary and Houze, 1979; Machado and Rossow, 1993). Multi-core convective systems, agglomerating ~~convective~~ systems probably in different stages of development, are not suitable for exploring the system's life cycle, and therefore will not be considered in this study. Moreover, in order to ensure a purified sample of single-core systems we exclude single-core systems which have more than one opaque area ($0.9 < \epsilon_{cld} < 0.98$).

By stratifying ~~the physical properties of the~~ single-core convective systems according to their fraction of convective area within the cloud system, we explore whether ~~they~~ their physical properties follow an evolution pattern which corresponds to different life cycle stages. To do so, taking in account the convective fraction distribution of single core systems of Fig. 7, we consider eleven intervals of equal statistics with respect to the convective fraction: [1, 0.78, 0.65, 0.55, 0.47, 0.40, 0.34, 0.29, 0.24, 0.19, 0.13, 0.01] ~~-, indicated as 11 “maturity steps” in Figures 8 and 9.~~

Single core systems over land and ocean are further separated to early afternoon (PM) and night (AM), since diurnal variations are expected. The statistics at each “maturity step” is shown in Fig. 8. One observes slightly more “developing” systems over land and more dissipating systems over ocean in the early afternoon. During night the statistics are more equally distributed, with twice as many oceanic single-core convective systems than in the afternoon. These findings are in agreement with studies on tropical precipitation which show a peak in the late afternoon over land and a few hours before sunrise over

ocean (e.g. Liu and Zipser, 2008). One has to keep in mind that our specific observation times might not capture the peak of convection.

Figure 9 presents the median values of the physical properties of single-core convective systems for successive life cycle stages, separately in the early afternoon (PM) and at night (AM), over land and over ocean. While the total cloud system horizontal extent (Fig. 9a) increases during the whole life cycle stage with a maximum at the dissipating stage (convective fraction lower than 10), the something expected as the detrained anvil increases as the system gets older. We do not capture the anvil shrinking as shown in Fig. 9a of Machado et al. (1998) , most likely, because Machado et al. studied only the thicker anvils when using the IR T_B (Fig. 2) and the thinner anvil part increases towards dissipation (Fig. 9c). Moreover, our convective system definition requires at least one convective grid cell and therefore the system is not captured in its advanced dissipation. The horizontal extent of the convective core (Fig. 9b) increases until it reaches a plateau around life cycle stage 5-9, which corresponds to a convective fraction between about 0.1 and 0.3. The behaviour is similar over land and ocean, except for ocean in the early afternoon, where the increase in convective core size is stronger with a peak for cloud systems with a convective fractional area of about 0.2. Compared to earlier studies using brightness temperature to define cold clouds (e.g. Machado and Rossow, 1993), these figures show that it is the thicker part of the cloud system which increases in size while reaching maturity and then decreases towards dissipation, whereas including the thin cirrus anvil leads to a continuous increase until dissipation. When considering the evolution of the emissivity distribution within the convective system (Fig. 9c) and the ratio of thin cirrus over cirrus within the anvil (Fig. 9d), the average emissivity of the cloud system decreases and moreover the fraction of thin anvil increases along the system's life cycle in agreement with expectations. It is interesting to note that the behaviour is similar over ocean and over land. Rain rate is maximum at the developing phase and decreases successively until dissipation (Fig. 7e 9e), with twice higher rates over land than over ocean. This finding is in agreement with Fig. 5 of Fiolleau and Roca (2013) .

The minimum temperature of the convective core is the only variable which has not does not have a clear behaviour for all scenes: only over land we observe a decrease in temperature, corresponding to an increase in height, during the phase of development, with colder temperatures in the afternoon than during night. Over ocean the temperature of the systems is constant and colder during night whereas during day the temperature decreases slowly until dissipation. All minimum temperatures are similar for. When considering specific regions, like the three land regions and three ocean regions discussed in (Liu and Zipser, 2008) , the behaviour is similar as in Figure 9, with similar T_{min}^{cb} over all maturity steps in the less convective ocean regions and with slightly colder T_{min}^{cb} values when the convective fraction is larger for the other regions (see Fig. 1 of the supplement). However, all minimum temperatures of the convective cores seem to converge towards a plateau for the mature and dissipating convective systems. Considering the statistics of the cloud systems for the different 'life cycle stages' in We are interested to study the relationships between anvil properties and convection when the systems are mature. Therefore we are confident to isolate these systems according to Fig. 8, one observes that in the early afternoon convective systems over ocean are mostly in the dissipating phase whereas those over land are more in the developing stage. During night the statistics is more equally distributed, with twice as many oceanic single-core convective systems than in the afternoon. These findings are in agreement with studies on tropical precipitation which show a peak in the late afternoon over land and a few hours

5 ~~before sunrise over ocean (e.g. Liu et al., 2007).~~ 9b) by requiring a convective fraction within the system between 10 and 30%,
leading to averages in thin cirrus over cirrus anvil of about 30%.

3.3 Relationships between convective intensity and cirrus anvil properties

The horizontal extent of the UT cloud systems directly impacts the Earth's energy budget. Since we are interested on how the
properties of the cirrus anvils are related to convection itself, we have first to find proxies for convective intensity. Previous
10 studies used as a convective intensity indicator the precipitation area (Yuan and Houze, 2010), or the width of the convective
tower (Igel et al., 2015), or the radar signal (Liu et al., 2007; Takahashi and Luo, 2014), or brightness temperature (Machado et al., 1998;,
While cloud emissivity is a good indicator for the convective core definition (Fig. 3), it saturates at 1 and thus can not be used

4 Relationships between convective depth and cirrus anvil properties

As discussed in the introduction, there are different proxies describing the convective intensity/strength or convective depth,
15 which might give an insight into different aspects of convection. The level of neutral buoyancy (LNB), which can be computed
from atmospheric soundings, describes the convective environment and sets the potential vertical extent for convective development (Takahashi and Luo, 2014).
The altitude of cirrus anvil outflow from deep convection is a manifestation of where convection loses buoyancy. The difference
between both gives an indication of the entrainment rate. Takahashi and Luo (2014) have shown that while LNB is very similar
between land and ocean, the altitude of convective outflow is higher over land than over ocean. This difference may be attributed
20 to the size difference of convective cores: land convection tends to have larger convective cores, which provide better protection
from entrainment dilution (Lucas et al., 1994). In general, convective intensity is given by the strength of the vertical updraft.
A strong updraft should produce a large radar echo top height (ETH) and therefore a smaller difference between cloud top
height (CTH) and ETH, i.e. large particles are lofted to greater altitude. CTH itself can be considered as a proxy ~~for convective~~
~~intensity. However, as one can see in Fig. 9,~~ of convective depth. Using CloudSat radar data, Takahashi and Luo (2014) have
25 shown that for deep convective systems CTH correlates well with LNB. CTH and ETH are also positively correlated, though
with smaller correlation coefficients, especially when using ETH of larger echo, corresponding to larger particles. This still
suggests that convective intensity and convective depth are related. Unlike the relationship between CTH and LNB, larger
correlations between CTH and ETH are found over land than over ocean. These differences may reflect different dynamical
and microphysical processes controlling cloud-size particles (CTH) and precipitation-size particles (represented by ETH).
30 CTH is linked to cloud top temperature T_{cld} through the atmospheric temperature profile. With AIRS data alone we are able
to explore the anvil properties with respect to the CTH or T_{cld} of the ~~fraction of convective core area might be used as a proxy~~
~~for the maturity stage of convection.~~

In the following, we will investigate convective ~~intensity depth~~ only for mature convective systems ~~which are defined from,~~
~~defined according to~~ Fig. 9 as systems for which the fraction of convective core area varies between 0.1 and 0.3.

~~A proxy for convective intensity might be the height of the convective system which is indicated by the~~ It should be stressed
that all the correlations obtained in this section are very well reproduced if a tighter convective fraction interval is used as

maturity proxy. The convective depth of a mature cloud system can be deduced by its height, and therefore by the cloud top temperature of the convective core. ~~On the other hand, by defining~~; the latter being directly linked to the height through the atmospheric temperature profile. Since the convective core by $\epsilon_{ctd} > 0.98$, it might also include parts of the rainy anvil. ~~Therefore, a better~~, we use as a proxy for convective ~~intensity should be~~ depth the minimum temperature within the convective core (T_{min}^{cb}). ~~A similar variable, the minimum brightness temperature within instead of the average T_{ctd} of the convective core,~~ has been shown to be a more skillful proxy to describe convective intensity, compared to the echo radar height (Jiang, 2012).

To test this hypothesis, we consider in Fig. 10 presents the relation between T_{min}^{cb} and the average maximum rain rate within the convective core (at a spatial resolution of 5 km), separately over land and ocean; ~~all convective cores are included, both of single and multi-core convective systems~~ for mature single-core systems. By using the maximum rain rate at such a spatial resolution the probability should be higher to correspond to convective rain. From Fig. 10 we deduce that the colder (higher) the convective core, the higher is its rain rate, indicating that the minimum temperature within the convective core is indeed a good proxy for convective strength or intensity the maximum rain rate. The relationship is similar over ocean and over land, with the difference that the average rain rate is higher over land than over ocean for the same coldest core temperature. This can be explained by stronger convective activity over land and by a rain detection offset for T_{min}^{cb} values larger than about 210 K, whereas for cloud systems with the lowest T_{min}^{cb} values the maximum rain rate inside the convective core gets significantly higher over land. This suggests that our proxy is a good qualitative indicator of convective intensity, but for the same T_{min}^{cb} , strongly related to the height of the convective tower, the oceanic convective cores produce less rain than the continental convective cores. is in agreement with earlier findings of Schumacher and Houze (2003) and Liu et al. (2007).

Figure ??-11 top panel, presents the size of the mature convective systems as a function of the minimum temperature within the convective core, separately for oceanic and for continental systems. We observe an increase of the size of the systems with increasing convective intensity depth, represented by decreasing T_{min}^{cb} . This is in agreement with the expectation that more intense convection will lead to larger anvils (e.g. Igel et al., 2014, 2015). Similar results are obtained if the analysis is performed in regions (Fig 2a of supplement), indicating the robustness of this finding.

Whereas it is straightforward to determine the minimum temperature within a single-core convective system, it is more difficult to consider this proxy for multi-core convective systems. The latter might be composed of several convective sub-systems in different phases of development. Nevertheless, we build for those systems the average T_{min}^{cb} over all convective cores of the system. Considering the bottom panel of Fig. ??-11, one observes that multi-core convective systems behavior behaviour is analogous to single-core systems.

From Fig. 10, ??-?? and ??-11, we conclude that for both single and multi-core systems, oceanic convective systems of a similar convective intensity depth as continental systems have a larger size with less intense convective rain, a behavior significantly enhanced for systems with an important convective depth. This difference in structure was already pointed out in earlier studies (e.g. Liu et al., 2007).

The next question is Furthermore, Liu et al. (2007) have shown that tropical continental mesoscale convective cloud systems are in general smaller in size than oceanic systems, though the vertical updraft and horizontal extent of the convective cores are in general larger, while their convective depth is similar. Their ice water path is also larger than the one of oceanic systems,

which is caused by different microphysics between land and ocean (Sohn et al., 2015). Findings by Zipser et al. (2006) and Hamada et al. (2014) demonstrate that extreme convective events correspond to cloud systems with a smaller size than those of extreme rainfall events. This demonstrates that different variables give insight into different aspects of convection. One has also to keep in mind that the development of a convective system into maturity spans a certain time interval: one expects that a large updraft leads to a convective system of large height (low T_{min}^{cb}) which then develops horizontally. Aerosols and humidity also play a role in invigorating convection (e.g. Altaratz et al., 2014). It has been shown that the rain rate decreases during the development and most probably also the strength of the vertical updraft. This means that one needs to undergo time-lag studies or Lagrangian transport studies which follow closely the convective systems and their atmospheric environment to advance further. While these detailed studies will be subject of a follow-on study, which will include additional variables from other data sets, such as ERA5, we can still go one step further with AIRS data alone, by investigating the next question: will there also be a difference in the anvil horizontal structure with increasing convective intensitydepth?

Figure ??-12 top panel shows the ratio of thin cirrus anvil area over total anvil size as a function of T_{min}^{cb} for mature single-core convective systems, separately over land and over ocean. With increasing convective intensitydepth (decreasing T_{min}^{cb}) the fraction of thin cirrus anvil increases, and this in the same manner for oceanic convective systems as for continental systems. Figure-Again, regional analysis produce very similar correlations between the fraction of thin cirrus over cirrus as a function of the convective depth (Fig. 2b of supplement). Bottom panel in Fig. 12 presents the same quantities, this-time for land and oceanic systems are mergedtogether, separately for single and multi-core systems. We also-observe a very similar behaviorbehaviour for single-core convective systems and multi-core systems. These results indicate a clearrobust relationship between convective intensity-and-the-properties-depth and the horizontal emissivity structure of the detrained cirrus anvils. To go one step further in our investigation, Fig. 13 shows how the cirrus anvil emissivity varies with increasing distance to the convective core, normalized by dividing with the square root of the size, for mature single-core systems. Three intervals of T_{min}^{cb} are considered, representing systems with-different-convective-intensityof-different-convective-depth. For all systems the cirrus anvil emissivity decreases with increasing distance, as one would expect. While the decrease in emissivity is comparable for all systems within the first quarter of the horizontal extent, is-it continues to decrease more rapidly for systems with strong convective intensity-depth compared to those originating-from-less-intense-convectionreaching lower altitudes. This might have important implications for the radiative impact of these systems in relation to increasing convective intensity in a warming climate (Tan et al., 2015; Bony et al., 2016).

5 Conclusions and Outlook

~~We have build UT cloud systems from InfraRed Sounder cloud data.~~

We have built Upper Tropospheric cloud systems, using cloud pressure and emissivity retrieved from 13 years AIRS cloud climate data, retrieved at LMD, of AIRS observations. These data have been used to investigate the relations-properties of tropical UT cloud systems, and in particular relationships between the convective intensity-of-tropical-mesoseale-convective

~~systems depth, given by cloud top temperature in the mature stage of a convective cloud system,~~ and the properties of the surrounding cirrus anvils.

The benefits of the present ~~cloud-system approach~~ UT cloud system data base compared to other ~~studies, data and methods~~ are that 1) IR sounder data have a large instantaneous coverage and are sensitive to thin cirrus down to an emissivity of 0.1 (0.2 in visible optical depth), day and night, and 2) ~~the our~~ cloud retrieval provides the physical properties of altitude and emissivity decoupled, allowing to reconstruct the horizontal extent of the UT cloud systems and then to distinguish between ~~isolated cirrus and deep convective cloud systems and isolated systems and to resolve their emissivity structure, essential to determine the radiative feedback of the anvils on convection. For our investigation we first needed to establish proxies to identify 1) convective cores, 2) mature deep convective systems .For the latter,~~ and 3) the convective depth of a mature convective system. It was demonstrated, using rain rate and large-scale vertical winds, that in the tropics UT opaque clouds with an emissivity close to 1, have a large probability to stem from convection, even though they include probably a part of stratiform rain. Therefore the cloud emissivity permits to differentiate convective cores, cirrus and thin cirrus anvils as well as to identify single-core and multi-core convective systems. UT cloud systems cover about 20%-25% of the tropics. While the frequency strongly decreases from isolated cirrus towards multi-core convective systems, the ~~latter1000latter~~'s coverage is the largest.

~~By using the~~ The fractional area of the convective core ~~as a proxy for the stage of the cloud system development, the within a cloud system has already been proven to be a maturity stage proxy. Though considering only two measurements per day, the evolution of~~ properties of single-core convective systems could still be statistically followed ~~during their life-cycle. We observed that with decreasing convective core fraction , which means moving towards maturity and dissipation, the rain rate within the convective core decreases while the horizontal extent and emissivity of the UT cloud systems decrease, as expected by using convective fraction within a cloud system as a proxy for maturity, since our results are compatible with findings using a better temporal resolution.~~ The size of the convective core reaches a plateau and then decreases during the stage of dissipation, guiding us to define mature convective systems as those with a convective core fraction between 0.1 and 0.3. ~~Convective intensity has then been studied for mature convective systems, and it could be shown that the minimum temperature within the convective core is a good proxy. Colder-~~

Several proxies of convective intensity/strength or depth exist, giving insight into different aspects of convection. With our data, we could probe mature convective cloud system's characteristics with respect to the convective core minimum temperature, a variable indicative of the convective depth. It could be shown that colder convective systems (meaning also those rising higher) have a larger larger values of maximum rain rate within the convective core and lead to-, a tendency more marked over land, as well as larger cirrus anvils, a tendency more marked over ocean. Both findings are in agreement with earlier studies. Since our approach also allows to study the previous studies. Compared to other methods, our approach provides the unique opportunity to study also the horizontal emissivity structure within the anvils, we investigated it in relation with convective intensity. It was revealed that the fraction of thin cirrus over the total anvil area increases with increasing convective ~~intensity depth~~, similarly for oceanic and continental mature convective systems and both for single and multi-core systems. We also demonstrated that with increasing convective ~~intensity of the system depth~~, the emissivity of the anvil de-

creases in general more sharply with increasing distance to the convective core. This might have important implications for the radiative effects of these systems, in relation to a convection intensity increase in a warming climate.

- 5 The above findings are very promising ~~As a future perspective, the developed cloud system approach could be the basis to address the question of what are UT cloud feedbacks in modulation atmospheric circulation and how they will evolve with climate change. To do so, the main components which have to be added to the presented dataset are the vertical structure of and the observed relationships might provide observational metrics for studying detrainment processes with Cloud Resolving models or even climate models, if their spatial resolution is similar to the cloud systems and information on their atmospheric~~
- 5 ~~environment~~one of our data base, and for constraining parameterizations related to convection and detrainment. Combined with variables derived from other data sets, such as vertical cloud structure and corresponding heating rates, atmospheric humidity, surface temperature, level of neutral buoyancy, vertical and horizontal winds, his data bas will be the basis to address questions on feedbacks between anvils and convection and on their modulation of the atmospheric circulation, in particular in respect to climate change. Furthermore, Lagrangian transport analysis could be used to indicate the origin of the isolated cirrus systems
- 10 and to assess the link between convective sources and the air entering the stratosphere. ~~This new cloud system approach can also be used to evaluate cloud resolving models and climate models and to constrain parameterizations related to convection and anvil detrainment processes by examining relationships as those presented here. Moreover, when meteorological reanalyses are available at higher spatial and temporal resolution, exploration of lag correlations between variables such as vertical winds, size of convective core, rain rate, and other atmospheric condition variables, could give a better understanding of convection~~
- 15 ~~mechanisms.~~

Acknowledgements. This research was supported by the Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales (CNES), the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) and the European Space Agency (ESA), within its framework of ESA Climate Change Initiative. The authors also thank the Earth Observing System AIRS and AMSR-E teams for providing the data. The calculations have been performed at the ClimServ IPSL centre. The authors also thank two anonymous reviewers who helped to improve this manuscript through their thoughtful

20 comments.

References

- Altaratz, O., Koren, I., Remer, L. A., and Hirsch, E., Review: cloud invigoration by aerosols-coupling between microphysics and dynamics, *Atmos. Res.*, 140, 38-60, 2014.
- Bacmeister, J. T. and Stephens, G. L., Spatial statistics of likely convective clouds in CloudSat data, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 116, D4, 2156-2202, 2011.
- Bony, S., B. Stevens, D. M. W. Frierson, C. Jakob, M. Kageyama, R. Pincus, T. G. Shepherd, S. C. Sherwood, A. P. Siebesma, A. H. Sobel, M. Watanabe, and M. J. Webb, Clouds, Circulation and Climate Sensitivity., *Nature Geoscience*, 8, 261-268, 2015.
- Bony, S. B. Stevens, D. Coppin, T. Becker, K. A. Reed, A. Voigt, and B. Medeiros, Thermodynamic control of anvil cloud amount, *PNAS*, 113, 8927-8932, 2016.
- 30 Boucher, O., D. Randall, P. Artaxo, C. Bretherton, G. Feingold, P. Forster, V.-M. Kerminen, Y. Kondo, H. Liao, U. Lohmann, P. Rasch, S.K. Satheesh, S. Sherwood, B. Stevens, and X.Y. Zhang, Clouds and aerosols. In *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. T.F. Stocker, D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Doschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, and P.M. Midgley, Eds. Cambridge University Press, 571-657, 2013.
- 35 Bouniol, D., R. Roca, Thomas Fiolleau, and D. Emmanuel Poan, Macrophysical, Microphysical, and Radiative Properties of Tropical Mesoscale Convective Systems over Their Life Cycle., *J.Climate*, 29, 3353-3371, 2016.
- Chahine, Moustafa T. Chahine, Thomas S. Pagano, Hartmut H. Aumann, Robert Atlas, Christopher Barnet, John Blaisdell, Luke Chen, Murty Divakarla, Eric J. Fetzer, Mitch Goldberg, Catherine Gautier, Stephanie Granger, Scott Hannon, Fredrick W. Irion, Ramesh Kakar, Eugenia Kalnay, Bjorn H. Lambrigtsen, Sung-Yung Lee, John Le Marshall, W. Wallace McMillan, Larry McMillin, Edward T. Olsen, Henry Revercomb, Philip Rosenkranz, William L. Smith, David Staelin, L. Larrabee Strow, Joel Susskind, David Tobin, Walter Wolf, and Lihang Zhou, AIRS: Improving Weather Forecasting and Providing New Data on Greenhouse Gases., *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 87, 911-926, 2006.
- Chédin, A., Serrar, S., Scott, N.A., Crevoisier, C. and Armante, R. (2003). First global measurement of midtropospheric CO₂ from NOAA polar satellites: Tropical zone., *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 108, 2003.
- Chevallier, F., F. Cheruy, N. A. Scott, and A. Chédin, A neural network approach for a fast and accurate computation of longwave radiative budget, *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 37, 1385-139, 1998.
- 10 Dee, D.P., et al., The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system. *Q.J.R. Meteor. Soc.* 137 : 553-597
- Del Genio, A.D., and W. Kovari, Climatic properties of tropical precipitating convection under varying environmental conditions., *J. Climate*, 15, 2597-2615, 2002.
- 15 Deng Q, Khouider B, Majda AJ, Ajayamohan RS, Effect of stratiform heating on the planetary-scale organization of tropical convection., *J Atmos Sci* 73:371-392, 2016.
- Feofilov, A. G., C. J. Stubenrauch, and J. Delanoë, Ice water content vertical profiles of high-level clouds: classification and impact on radiative fluxes, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 12327-12344, 2015.
- Feofilov, A. and Stubenrauch, C., LMD Cloud Retrieval using IR sounders, Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document, CIRS-LMD software package V2 19 pp., available at LMD, DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.15812.63361, 2016.
- 20

- Fiolleau, T. and Roca, R., Composite life cycle of tropical mesoscale convective systems from geostationary and low Earth orbit satellite observations: method and sampling considerations, Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc., 139: 941-953, 2013.
- Futyan, J., and A. Del Genio, Deep convective system evolution over Africa and the tropical Atlantic, J. Climate, 20, 5041-5060, 2007.
- Haladay T, Stephens G., Characteristics of tropical thin cirrus clouds deduced from joint CloudSat and CALIPSO observations, Journal of Geophysical Research, 114, 2009.
- [Hamada, Atsushi, Yukari N. Takayabu, Chuntao Liu and Edward J. Zipser, Weak linkage between the heaviest rainfall and tallest storms, Nature Communications 6, 6213, 2015](#)
- Houze, Robert A., Mesoscale convective systems, Reviews of Geophysics, 42 ,4 , 1944-9208, 2004.
- Houze, Robert A. and Rasmussen, Kristen L. and Zuluaga, Manuel D. and Brodzik, Stella R., The variable nature of convection in the tropics and subtropics: A legacy of 16 years of the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission satellite, Reviews of Geophysics, 53, 3, 1944-9208, 2015.
- Houze, R. A. Jr., K. L. Rasmussen, L. McMurdie, M. M. Chaplin, and A. Kumar, Synoptic and mesoscale aspects of the June 2013 flooding in Uttarakhand, India, Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., submitted, 2016.
- ~~Matthew R-Igel~~[Igel, M. R.](#) and Aryeh J Drager and Susan C Van Den Heever, A CloudSat cloud object partitioning technique and assessment and integration of deep convective anvil sensitivities to sea surface temperature, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 119, 17, 2169-8996, 2014.
- Igel, M. R. and van den Heever, S. C., Tropical, oceanic, deep convective cloud morphology as observed by CloudSat, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 15, 2015.
- Jiang Haiyan, The Relationship between Tropical Cyclone Intensity Change and the Strength of Inner-Core Convection, Monthly Weather Review, 140, 4, 1164-1176, 2012.
- Kummerow, C., and R. Ferraro, EOS/AMSR-E Level-2 Rainfall: Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA: Colorado State University, (PDF file, 245 KB) http://nsidc.org/sites/nsidc.org/files/files/amsl_atbd_supp06_L2_rain.pdf, 2006.
- Leary, C. A., and R. A. Houze, Jr., Melting and evaporation of hydrometeors in precipitation from the anvil clouds of deep tropical convection, J. Atmos. Sci., 36, 669-679, 1979.
- [Lebsock](#), Matthew D. ~~Lebsock~~ and Christian Kummerow and Graeme L. Stephens, An Observed Tropical Oceanic ~~Radiative~~[Radiative-Convective](#) Cloud Feedback, Journal of Climate, 23, 8, 2065-2078, 2010.
- Lin, J.-L., G.N. Kiladis, B.E. Mapes, K.M. Weickmann, K.R. Sperber, W. Lin, M.C. Wheeler, S.D. Schubert, A. Del Genio, L.J. Donner, S. Emori, J.-F. Guérémy, F. Hourdin, P.J. Rasch, E. Roeckner, and J.F. Scinocca, Tropical intraseasonal variability in 14 IPCC AR4 climate models. Part I: Convective signals, J. Climate, 19, 2665-2690, 2006.
- Liu, C., E. J. Zipser, and S. W. Nesbitt, Global Distribution of Tropical Deep Convection: Different Perspectives from TRMM Infrared and Radar Data, J. Climate, 20, 489-503, 2007.
- [Liu, C., and E.J. Zipser, Diurnal cycles of precipitation, clouds, and lightning in the tropics from 9 years of TRMM observations. Geophys. Res. Letters, 35, L04819, 2008.](#)
- [Lucas, C., E. Zipser, and M. A. Le Mone, Vertical velocity in oceanic convection off tropical Australia, J. Atmos. Sci., 51, 3183-3193, 1994.](#)
- Luo Z. and Rossow W. B., Characterizing Tropical Cirrus Life Cycle, Evolution, and Interaction with Upper-Tropospheric Water Vapor Using Lagrangian Trajectory Analysis of Satellite Observations, J. Climate, 17, 4541-4563, 2004.
- Luo, Z. J. , G. Y. Liu, and G. L. Stephens, Use of A-Train data to estimate convective buoyancy and entrainment rate, Geophys. Res. Lett. 37, L09804, 2010.

- Machado, L. A. T. and Rossow, W. B., Structural characteristics and radiative properties of tropical cloud clusters, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 121, 3234-3260., 1993.
- Machado, L.A.T., W.B. Rossow, R.L. Guedes, and A.W. Walker, Life cycle variations of mesoscale convective systems over the Americas, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 126, 1630-1654, 1998.
- 25 Mapes, B. E., and R. A. Houze, Jr., Cloud clusters and superclusters over the oceanic warm pool, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 121, 1398-1415, 1993.
- [Masunaga, H., and Z. J. Luo, Convective and large-scale mass flux profiles over tropical oceans determined from synergistic analysis of a suite of satellite observations, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 121, 2016](#)
- Oreopoulos, L., N. Cho, D. Lee, and S. Kato, Radiative effects of global MODIS cloud regimes, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 121, 2299-2317, 2016.
- Roca, R., J. Aublanc, P. Chambon, T. Fiolleau, and N. Viltard, Robust Observational Quantification of the Contribution of Mesoscale Convective Systems to Rainfall in the Tropics, *J. Climate*, 27, 4952-4958, 2014.
- 30 William B. Rossow and Robert A. Schiffer, Advances in Understanding Clouds from ISCCP, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 80,11,2261-2287, 1999.
- Rossow, W.B., and C. Pearl, 22-yr survey of tropical convection penetrating into the lower stratosphere, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L04803, 2007.
- 35 Rossow, W. B., A. Mekonnen, C. Pearl, and W. Goncalves, Tropical Precipitation Extremes, *J. Climate*, 26, 1457-1466, 2013.
- [Scott and Chédin, *J. Appl. Meteor.*, 20, pp. 802-812, 1981.](#)
- Schumacher, C., and R. A. Houze, Jr., Stratiform rain in the tropics as seen by the TRMM Precipitation Radar, *J. Climate*, 16, 1739-1756, 2003.
- [Sherwood, Steven C. and Chae, Jung-Hyo and Minnis, Patrick and McGill, Matthew, Underestimation of deep convective cloud tops by thermal imagery, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, 11, 1944-8007, 2004.](#)
- [Sohn, B.-J. and Choi, M.-J. and Ryu, J., Explaining darker deep convective clouds over the western Pacific than over tropical continental convective regions, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 8, 11, 4573-4585, 2015.](#)
- 5 Stachnik, J. P., C. Schumacher, and P. E. Ciesielski, Total Heating Characteristics of the ISCCP Tropical and Subtropical Cloud Regimes, *J. Climate*, 26, 7097-7116, 2013.
- Stephens, G.L., D.G. Vane, R.J. Boain, G.G. Mace, K. Sassen, Z. Wang, A.J. Illingworth, E.J. O'Connor, W.B. Rossow, S.L. Durden, S.D. Miller, R.T. Austin, A. Benedetti, C. Mitrescu, and CloudSat Science Team, The CloudSat mission and the A-Train: A new dimension of
- 10 space-based observations of clouds and precipitation, *Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc.*, 83, 1771-1790, 2002.
- Stephens, G. L., P. J. Webster, R. H. Johnson, R. Engelen, and T. L'Ecuyer, Observational Evidence for the Mutual Regulation of the Tropical Hydrological Cycle and Tropical Sea Surface Temperatures, *J. Climate* 17, 2213-2224, 2004.
- Stephens, G. L. and Ellis, T. D., Controls of Global-Mean Precipitation Increases in Global Warming GCM Experiments, *Journal of Climate*, 21, 23, 6141-6155, 2008.
- 15 Stubenrauch, C. J., A. Chédin, R. Armante, and N. A. Scott, Clouds as seen by Infrared Sounders (3I) and Imagers (ISCCP): Part I Evaluation of Cloud Parameters, *J. Climate*, 12, 2189-2213, 1999.
- ~~Stubenrauch C. J.~~
- [Stubenrauch, C. J., S. Cros, N. Lamquin, R. Armante, A. Chédin, C. Crevoisier, and N. A. Scott Cloud properties from Atmospheric Infrared Sounder and evaluation with Cloud-Aerosol Lidar and Infrared Pathfinder Satellite Observations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D8, 2156-2202, 2008.](#)
- 20

- [Stubenrauch, C. J., S. Cros, A. Guignard, and N. Lamquin, A six-year global cloud climatology from the Atmospheric InfraRed Sounder aboard the Aqua Satellite: statistical analysis in synergy with CALIPSO and CloudSat, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 7197-7214, 2010.](#)
- Stubenrauch, C. J., W. B. Rossow, and S. Kinne, Assessment of global cloud datasets from satellites: A project of the World Climate Research Programme Global Energy and Water Cycle Experiment (GEWEX) Radiation Panel, WCRP Rep. 23/2012, 176 pp., 2012.
- 25 Stubenrauch, C. J. and W. B. Rossow and S. Kinne and S. Ackerman and G. Cesana and H. Chepfer and L. Di Girolamo and B. Getzewich and A. Guignard and A. Heidinger and B. C. Maddux and W. P. Menzel and P. Minnis and C. Pearl and S. Platnick and C. Poulsen and J. Riedi and S. Sun-Mack and A. Walther and D. Winker and S. Zeng and G. Zhao, Assessment of Global Cloud Datasets from Satellites: Project and Database Initiated by the GEWEX Radiation Panel, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 94, 7, 1031-1049, 2013.
- Stubenrauch, C. J., A. G. Feofilov, S. Protopapadaki, and R. Armante, Cloud climatologies from InfraRed Sounders (AIRS and IASI) using the LMD cloud retrieval: sensitivity studies, statistical analysis and vertical structure in synergy with CALIPSO and CloudSat, to be
30 submitted to Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss, ~~2016~~-2017.
- [Susskind, J., J. M. Blaisdell, and L. Iredell, Improved methodology for surface and atmospheric soundings, error estimates and quality control procedures: the atmospheric infrared sounder science team version-6 retrieval algorithm. J. Applied Rem. Sensing, 8, \(1\), 084994, 2014.](#)
- Riihimaki, Laura D. and McFarlane, Sally A. and Liang, Calvin and Massie, Steven T. and Beagley, Nathaniel and Toth, Travis D., Comparison of methods to determine Tropical Tropopause Layer cirrus formation mechanisms, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 117,D6,2156-2202, 2012.
- Takahashi, H., and Z. Luo, Where is the level of neutral buoyancy for deep convection?, Geophys. Res. Lett., 39, L15809, 2012.
- 615 Takahashi, H. and Z. J. Luo, Characterizing Tropical Overshooting Convection from Joint Analysis of CloudSat and Geostationary Satellite Observations., J. Geophys. Res., 119, 112-121, 2014.
- Tan, J., C. Jakob, W.B. Rossow, and G. Tselioudis, Increases in tropical rainfall driven by changes in frequency of organized deep convection, Nature, 519, 451-454, 2015.
- Tissier, A.-S. and Legras, B., Convective sources of trajectories traversing the tropical tropopause layer, Atmospheric Chemistry and
620 Physics, 16, 5, 3383-3398, 2016.
- Tselioudis, G., and W.B. Rossow, Time scales of variability of the tropical atmosphere derived from cloud-defined weather states, J. Climate, 24, 602-608, 2011.
- Virts, K. S., and R. A. Houze Jr, Clouds and Water Vapor in the Tropical Tropopause Transition Layer over Mesoscale Convective Systems, J. Atmos. Sci., 72, 4739-4753, 2015.
- 625 [Yamamoto, Muneisa K. and Fumie A. Furuzawa and Atsushi Higuchi and Kenji Nakamura, Comparison of Diurnal Variations in Precipitation Systems Observed by TRMM PR, TMI, and VIRS, Journal of Climate, 21, 16, 4011-4028, 2008.](#)
- Yuan, J., and R. A. Houze, Jr., Global variability of mesoscale convective system anvil structure from A-train satellite data, J. Climate, 23, 5864-5888, 2010.
- [Zipser, E. J. and Chuntao Liu and Daniel J. Cecil and Stephen W. Nesbitt and David P. Yorty, WHERE ARE THE MOST INTENSE THUNDERSTORMS ON EARTH?, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 87, 8, 1057-1071, 2006.](#)
- 630




Figure 1. Median and quartiles of cloud IR brightness temperature (red) and retrieved cloud temperature (blue) as a function of cloud emissivity for high clouds ($p_{cld} < 440$ hPa) identified from AIRS observations in the tropics, at a spatial resolution of 0.5° . Statistics for January and July 2006-2007.




Figure 2. Maximum (circle) and average (x) rain rate from AMSR-E as a function of cloud emissivity for AIRS bins of T_{cld} and T_B for high clouds ($p_{cld} < 440$ hPa) identified from AIRS observations in the tropics, at a spatial resolution of 0.5° . Statistics for January and July 2006-2007.




Figure 3. Median and quartiles of maximum (dashed black) and average (solid black) rain rate from AMSR-E, and average vertical winds (solid red) from ERAI, as a function of cloud emissivity for high clouds ($p_{cld} < 440$ hPa) identified from AIRS observations in the tropics, at a spatial resolution of 0.5° . Statistics for January and July 2006-2007.




Figure 4. Geographic map of AIRS cloud data for 1 July 2007, 1:30 h local time. Top: cloud types, with blue → upper tropospheric clouds (more opaque deeper blue), yellow → ~~midlevel~~-mid-level and low clouds and orange → clear sky. Middle: UT clouds for five emissivity classes 0.1, 0.6, 0.8, 0.92, 0.98, 1, represented respectively by yellow, green, blue, magenta, red. Bottom: UT cloud systems, ~~the~~-different ~~colors~~-colours indicate different systems, opaque and convective areas marked with magenta and deep red, respectively.




Figure 5. Geographic maps of (a) isolated cirrus systems, (topb) and all convective cores, also separately for (bottomc) boreal winter and (d) boreal summer, and (e) single core convective systems, for the 2003-2015 period of the LMD AIRS cloud climatology. AIRS data, 2003-2015.




Figure 6. [Fraction—Median values and standard errors of fraction](#) of convective core (green), thick (magenta) and thin (cyan) anvil as a function of cloud system size. In red, cloud system size density function distribution. Top: single-core, bottom: multi-core systems. [AIRS data, 2003-2015.](#)

Figure 7. Convective core fraction kernel density function estimate (solid line) and histogram for single (red) and multi (blue) core systems.
AIRS data, 2003-2015.




Figure 8. Number of single-core cloud systems in each maturity step, separately over ocean and over land and during night (AM) and early afternoon (PM). AIRS data, 2003-2015.





Figure 9. Physical-Median values and standard errors of physical properties of single-core convective systems for the eleven maturity steps defined by fraction of convective area [1, 0.78, 0.65, 0.55, 0.47, 0.40, 0.34, 0.29, 0.24, 0.19, 0.13, 0.01] , separately over ocean and over land and during night (AM) and early afternoon (PM): a) cloud system size, b) convective core size, c) thin cirrus over cirrus area, d) cloud system average emissivity, e) minimum temperature within convective core, f) average convective core rain rate. a) to e) AIRS data, 2003-2015, f) AIRS and AMSR-E data, 2003-2009.



Number of cloud systems in each maturity step, separately over ocean and over land and during night (AM) and early afternoon (PM):




Figure 10. ~~Rain rate~~ Median and standard error of maximum convective core rain rate as a function of minimum temperature within the convective core for mature single-core systems, separately over land (red) and ocean (blue). AIRS and AMSR-E data, 2003-2009.




Figure 11. Single-core system Median and standard error of horizontal extent versus minimum temperature within convective core for mature single core (top) and multi-core (bottom) systems, separately over land (red) and ocean (blue). AIRS data, 2003-2015.

Multi-core-system horizontal extent versus average of minimal temperature within convective cores, separately over land (red) and ocean (blue). Thin cirrus over total anvil area as a function of minimum temperature within convective core for single-core systems, separately over land (red) and ocean (blue).




Figure 12. Thin-Median and standard error of thin cirrus over total anvil area for mature systems as a function of minimum temperature within convective core(s), for single-core systems, separately over land and ocean (top), and separately for single-core (blue) and multi-core (red) systems (bottom).




Figure 13. ~~Emissivity~~ Median and standard error emissivity within cloud system as a function of the normalized distance to the convective core. ~~Single-core-system~~ Mature single-core systems are considered for three classes of convective ~~intensity~~ depth represented by intervals in T_{min}^{cb} .

	isolated cirrus	single core	multi-core
Numb.of systems	>95%	3%	1%
Coverage	25%	10%	65%
Median size	10^4Km^2	$10 \cdot 10^4 \text{ Km}^2$	$200 \cdot 10^4 \text{ Km}^2$

Table 1. Fraction of occurrence, coverage and median size for isolated cirrus systems, systems with one convective core and with multiple convective cores, over the latitude band 30° N - 30° S , annual average over the period 2003-2015.

Upper Tropospheric Cloud Systems Derived from IR Sounders: Properties of Cirrus Anvils in the Tropics

Sofia E. Protopapadaki¹, Claudia J. Stubenrauch¹, and Artem G. Feofilov¹

¹Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique, IPSL/CNRS, UMR8539, Ecole Polytechnique, France

Correspondence to: S. Protopapadaki (sprotopap@lmd.polytechnique.fr)

Abstract. Representing about 30% of the Earth’s total cloud cover, upper tropospheric clouds play a crucial role in the climate system by modulating the Earth’s energy budget and heat transport. When originating from convection, they often form organized systems. The high spectral resolution of the Atmospheric InfraRed Sounder (AIRS) allows reliable cirrus identification, both from day and night-time observations. Tropical upper tropospheric cloud systems have been analyzed by using a spatial composite technique on the retrieved cloud pressure of AIRS data. Cloud emissivity is used to distinguish convective core, cirrus, and thin cirrus anvil within these systems. A comparison with simultaneous precipitation data from the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer - Earth Observing System (AMSR-E) shows that for tropical upper tropospheric clouds, a cloud emissivity close to 1 is strongly linked to a high rain rate, leading to a proxy to identify convective cores. Combining AIRS cloud data with this cloud system approach, using physical variables, provides a new opportunity to relate the properties of the anvils, including also the thinner cirrus, to the convective cores. It also distinguishes convective cloud systems from isolated cirrus systems. Deep convective cloud systems, covering 15% of the tropics, are further distinguished into single-core and multi-core systems. Though AIRS samples the tropics only twice per day, the evolution of longer living convective systems can be still statistically captured, and we were able to select relatively mature single-core convective systems by using the fraction of convective core area within the cloud systems as a proxy for maturity. For these systems, we have demonstrated that the physical properties of the anvils are related to convective depth, indicated by the minimum retrieved cloud temperature within the convective core. Our analyses show that the size of the systems does in general increase with convective depth, though for similar convective depth oceanic convective cloud systems are slightly larger than continental ones, in agreement with other observations. In addition, our data reveal for the first time that the fraction of thin cirrus over the total anvil area increases with the convective depth, similarly for oceanic and continental convective systems. This has implications for the radiative feedbacks of anvils on convection which will be more closely studied in the future.

1 Introduction

High clouds cover about 30% of the Earth (e.g Stubenrauch et al., 2013) and are of fundamental importance to climate as they modulate the Earth’s energy budget and the heat transport in the upper troposphere, thus potentially influencing earth’s atmospheric circulation and water cycle. Their feedbacks still lack scientific understanding and heretofore represent a major uncertainty in predicting climate variability and change in climate models (Boucher et al., 2013).

In the tropics, where these high clouds are most abundant, they are part of large mesoscale systems of a characteristic size of tens of thousands km^2 . They either form from organized deep convection or are directly formed *in situ* when cold air is supersaturated with water. This article focuses on the former in the tropics.

Within the last decade, numerous studies focused on these mesoscale convective cloud systems (MCS). Their structure and life cycle were studied by using composite techniques applied to satellite imagery and radar (e.g. Machado and Rossow, 1993; Machado et al., 1998; Del Genio and Kovari, 2002; Schumacher and Houze, 2003; Houze, 2004; Lin et al., 2006; Liu et al., 2007; Rossow et al., 2007; Yuan and Houze, 2010; Roca et al., 2014; Virts et al., 2015; Bouniol et al., 2016). These studies concentrated mainly on the thick cirrus anvils, because radar and visible-infrared imagery either miss or misidentify thin cirrus (Stubenrauch et al., 2013). However, the thinner cirrus are thought to be a part of the MCS's anvil that have a significant radiative impact which might regulate convection itself (Stephens et al., 2004; Lebsock et al., 2010). Their radiative forcing depends primarily on their horizontal extent, emissivity distribution, and the temperature difference with the underlying surface.

In addition, organized convection was studied by statistical analysis of cloud regimes defined by similar cloud pressure and optical depth within grid cells (Tselioudis and Rossow, 2011; Rossow et al., 2013; Stachnik et al., 2013; Tan et al., 2015; Oreopoulos et al., 2016). Though this approach proved to be very useful for advancing our knowledge on tropical convection, it does not provide information of the horizontal extent and structure of the systems. Recent studies which used the space-borne active instruments, lidar and radar, of the A-Train mission (Stephens et al., 2002) revealed the vertical structure of these systems (e.g. Luo et al., 2010; Yuan and Houze, 2010; Igel et al., 2014; Takahashi and Luo, 2014; Deng et al., 2016). They are, however, hampered by the very narrow track and thus are missing the horizontal extent of the system.

In this article we use infrared (IR) sounder data to study mesoscale deep convective systems, and more specifically their horizontal extent and IR emissivity distribution. The high spectral resolution of IR sounders, in particular the Atmospheric InfraRed Sounder (AIRS) aboard Aqua since 2002 and the Infrared Atmospheric Sounding Interferometers (IASI) aboard Metop since 2006, allow reliable cirrus identification, both from day and night time observations (e.g. Stubenrauch et al., 2010, 2013). Using the AIRS physical variables of pressure and emissivity, we reconstruct cloud systems. This approach distinguishes isolated cirrus from systems having convective core(s), using the IR emissivity as a proxy; an IR emissivity close to 1 has been verified to be closely related to larger rain rate and vertical updraft (2.2). This provides a unique opportunity to relate the properties of the anvils, including also the thinner cirrus, to those of the convective cores.

One of the World Climate Research Programme grand challenges is to determine the role of convection in cloud feedbacks (Bony et al., 2015). Compared to data bases of tropical mesoscale convective systems from radar and visible-infrared satellite imagery, this data base of upper tropospheric (UT) cloud systems from AIRS cloud properties includes cirrus, reliably identified down to an IR emissivity of 0.1 (corresponding to a visible optical depth of 0.2). The motivation of this article is to present this data base, which, coupled with other data, will provide observational metric for a better understanding of the interconnection between tropical convection and the heating induced by the outflowing anvils.

Proxies of convective intensity/strength or convective depth may be given by vertical updraft (e.g. Liu et al., 2007; Takahashi and Luo, 2014), lightning flash rate (e.g. Zipser et al., 2006), level of neutral buoyancy (e.g. Takahashi and Luo, 2014), area

of heavy rainfall (e.g. Yuan and Houze, 2010), width of convective core (e.g. Igel et al., 2014), cold cloud top temperature or height (e.g. Machado and Rossow, 1993; Fiolleau and Roca, 2013) and mass flux (e.g. Tissier et al., 2016; Masunaga and Luo, 2016). While the level of neutral buoyancy describes the convective environment, the convective intensity is given by the strength of the vertical updraft, and the cloud top height can be considered as a proxy of convective depth. Therefore, these
5 proxies might give insight into different aspects of convection. With AIRS alone, we are able to determine cloud top height temperature and, therefore, to explore the anvil properties in relation to the convective depth.

Details on the AIRS cloud retrieval and the construction of UT cloud systems are given in section 2. Results on the statistical properties of tropical upper tropospheric cloud systems, including maturity stage with respect to the convective core fraction, are given in section 3. Relationships between convective depth and anvil properties of tropical mature convective cloud systems
10 are then discussed in section 4. Conclusions and an outlook are presented in section 5.

2 Methodology

2.1 Cloud properties derived from AIRS observations

AIRS is a high spectral resolution infrared spectrometer, aboard the polar orbiting EOS Aqua satellite with an equatorial crossing at 1:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. local time (Chahine et al., 2006). AIRS completes approximately 14.5 orbits per day with
15 each orbit “swath” being of 48.95° , divided by 90 footprints for each scan line. The spatial resolution of a footprint varies from about $13.5 \text{ km} \times 21 \text{ km}$ at nadir to $41 \text{ km} \times 21 \text{ km}$ at the scan extremes.

The LMD cloud property retrieval is based on a weighted χ^2 method and uses eight spectral channels sounding along the $15 \mu\text{m}$ CO_2 absorption band (Stubenrauch et al., 2010), providing cloud pressure p_{cld} and emissivity ϵ_{cld} of a single cloud layer (of the uppermost cloud layer in the case of multi-layer clouds). By introducing empirical weights, the
20 method takes into account the vertical weighting of the different channels, the growing uncertainty in the computation of ϵ_{cld} with increasing pressure and uncertainties in atmospheric profiles (Stubenrauch et al., 1999). A crucial consideration in the cloud retrieval is the determination of clear sky and opaque cloud radiances I_{clr} and I_{cld} , since ϵ_{cld} is defined as $\epsilon_{\text{cld}} = (I_{\text{meas}} - I_{\text{clr}}) / (I_{\text{cld}}(p_{\text{cld}}) - I_{\text{clr}})$. For their computation we need temperature profiles and surface skin temperature as well as atmospheric transmissivity profiles at the corresponding wavelengths for the atmospheric situation of the measurements.
25 The atmospheric spectral transmissivity profiles have been simulated by the 4A radiative transfer model (Scott and Chédin, 1981; operational version available at <http://www.noveltis.net/4AOP>), separately for each satellite viewing zenith angle and for about 2000 representative clear sky atmospheric temperature and humidity profiles of the Thermodynamic Initial Guess Retrieval (TIGR) data base (Chevallier et al., 1998; Chédin et al., 2003). Since IR sounders, in combination with microwave sounders, were originally designed for the retrieval of atmospheric temperature and humidity profiles, the atmospheric clear
30 sky situation can then be directly described by simultaneously retrieved AIRS L2 atmospheric profiles (Susskind et al., 2014) of good quality (when the situation is not too cloudy), provided by NASA (Version 6 available at Goddard Earth Sciences Data and Information Services Center). In the other case, the instantaneous profiles and surface skin temperature are replaced by those of good quality, averaged over 1° latitude \times 1° longitude, or interpolated in time. The proximity recognition between

these AIRS L2 atmospheric profiles and the TIGR atmospheric profiles is described in detail in Stubenrauch et al. (2008). Once p_{cld} and ϵ_{cld} are retrieved by the χ^2 method, cloud temperature T_{cld} is determined from p_{cld} , by using the AIRS temperature profile.

Recently, we have developed a modular cloud retrieval code (CIRS, Clouds from IR Sounders, Feofilov and Stubenrauch, 2017), which can be applied to any IR sounder data. To derive a 13-year global climatology of cloud properties from AIRS (2003-2015), we used the latest ancillary data (atmospheric profiles, surface emissivities and atmospheric transmissivities). Compared to the version which is distributed at the French data center ICARE and which has been evaluated in the Global Energy and Water Exchanges (GEWEX) cloud assessment (Stubenrauch et al., 2013), these cloud data are very similar for high-level clouds and slightly improved for low-level clouds (Feofilov and Stubenrauch, 2017). Cloud types can then be defined according to p_{cld} and ϵ_{cld} .

In this analysis, to facilitate the reconstruction of the UT cloud systems from the AIRS cloud properties, it is convenient to grid the data, keeping the statistics and occurrence of the individual cloud types inside the grid, while the physical parameters (T , p , ϵ) are averaged inside the grid cell. The grid cell size should not be greater than the average size of the smallest cloud system. A good compromise was found by introducing grid cells of 0.5° in latitude and longitude.

2.2 Construction of upper tropospheric cloud systems

Before reconstructing the horizontal extent of the UT cloud systems, a critical question has to be addressed: how to define UT clouds? Most studies on tropical MCS's life cycle and structure used the IR brightness temperature (T_B) to define cold clouds: Yuan and Houze (2010) merged adjacent footprints containing cold clouds defined as those with $T_B < 260$ K, while Machado et al. (1998) used $T_B < 245$ K and, Fiolleau and Roca (2013) and Roca et al. (2014) have considered only footprints with $T_B < 233$ K. However, T_B depends both on cloud altitude and opacity; opaque clouds ($\epsilon \approx 1$) have an IR brightness temperature close to the cloud top temperature T_{cld} , though it can happen to be a few degrees lower (Sherwood et al., 2004; Stubenrauch et al., 2010). For optically thinner clouds the radiation reaching the satellite instrument includes, in addition to the cloud's emission, also a fraction of the emission from the warmer earth's surface and the atmosphere passing through these semi-transparent clouds. Figure 1 presents the median value and the quartiles of T_B as well as T_{cld} as a function of ϵ_{cld} for high clouds in the tropics, with $p_{cld} < 440$ hPa (corresponding to a height of about 7 km), a definition generally found in the literature (e.g. Rossow et al., 1999; Stubenrauch et al., 2012). One observes that indeed T_B increases with decreasing ϵ_{cld} while T_{cld} does not show a particular relationship, except that the most opaque clouds in the tropics seem to be on average also colder. The relation between T_B , T_{cld} and ϵ_{cld} is further explored in Fig. 2; T_B corresponds to T_{cld} only for opaque clouds, whereas for a given T_B the associated cloud might also be optically thin and colder. This means that for instance, an upper threshold of 245 K on T_B will include higher clouds ($T_{cld} < 245$ K approx. 8 km) with an emissivity down to 0.7, but their cloud temperature might then be underestimated by several 10's of $^\circ\text{C}$. This only allows relating the thickest anvil properties to convection.

The present cloud system approach, employing cloud altitude (temperature, pressure) and opacity (emissivity) has the advantage of a clear distinction between high and low clouds based on cloud pressure, and of thin and thick cirrus, based on cloud

emissivity. This is important, since, as discussed in the introduction, this new UT cloud system approach aims to explore the horizontal structure of the UT cloud systems, including thin cirrus.

Since the AIRS initial spatial resolution is more adapted to study organized convection rather than small scale shallow convection, we revise the definition of upper tropospheric clouds i) towards slightly higher clouds and ii) by using a tropopause dependent definition. Hereafter, UT clouds will be considered as those being at most 250 hPa below the tropopause corresponding to a maximum cloud pressure of about 350 hPa and a height of about 8 km in the tropics. It should be stressed that the standard high cloud definition of $p_{cld} < 440$ hPa high has also been tested and the results are coherent with those reported in sections 3 and 4.

Typically, a convective system is composed of an opaque precipitating core which detrains cirrus in the form of an anvil at the height of neutral buoyancy (e.g. Luo et al., 2010; Takahashi and Luo, 2014). To investigate whether cloud emissivity can be used as a proxy to identify convective cores, AIRS cloud data have been collocated with simultaneous AMSR-E precipitation data (Kummerow and Ferraro, 2006). Figure 3 presents median values and quartiles of the maximum and average rain rate from the AMSR-E measurements (of spatial resolution of about 5 km at nadir) and the vertical wind at 500 hPa from the meteorological reanalysis ERA Interim (Dee et al. , 2011), within a grid cell, as a function of cloud emissivity averaged from AIRS UT clouds within the same grid cell. The vertical wind data are interpolated, spatially from 0.75° to 0.5° grid cells, and temporally from 6 hourly universal time to 1:30 AM and PM local time. A strong positive correlation between cloud emissivity and precipitation is observed for high ϵ_{cld} . The rain rate might be of stratiform origin even when ϵ_{cld} is close to 1, as according to the quartile bands there is a probability that the average rain in the 0.5° grid is below 1 mm h^{-1} , while the maximum RR quartile is at 6 mm h^{-1} . The link with convection can only be shown through vertical updraft. Though the ERA Interim vertical wind has a low horizontal spatial resolution and is therefore quite diluted, Figure 3 shows that opaque clouds are in general linked to stronger updrafts. Based on figure 3, hereafter, convective cores are defined as those with $\epsilon_{cld} > 0.98$. The emissivity threshold for distinguishing cirrus from thin cirrus was set to 0.5 as i) below this threshold no rain occurs at all (not shown), ii) this threshold has already been used to define thin cirrus in earlier IR sounder analyses, iii) the studies exploring tropical convective cloud systems using IR brightness temperatures exclude all high clouds with an emissivity below this value (Fig. 2).

To study the horizontal extent of cloud systems, a full spatial coverage is required. However, in the tropical region where the cloud systems will be explored, $30^\circ N - 30^\circ S$, AIRS measurements only cover about 70% of the surface due to gaps between orbits (e.g Fig.1 of Feofilov et al., 2015). Thus, the missing data have to be extrapolated from the properties of the cloud types determined around the gaps. It should be stressed that days with missing orbits are completely excluded from the analysis; only scenes with coverage above 68%, representing more than 85% of the total statistics, are considered. In the following we describe the method developed to fill the missing data gaps. In each grid cell of $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ the distribution of the number of measurements per cloud type is known. Cloud type distributions in empty grid cells are obtained from the probability density function (PDF) of the neighbouring grid cells. The PDF of an empty grid cell is built as the sum of the neighbouring PDFs, normalized to 1, weighted by the inverse squared root of the distance between the grid cells. Similarly, the physical properties of each cloud type in the interpolated grid, such as temperature, pressure and emissivity, are computed using the same weighted average method.

In the course of the study several questions emerged, such as how many neighbours to use, and what should be the shape of the region for the neighbours to be included in the interpolation. The reason we draw readers' attention to these details is due to the irregular gap area shape and size which varies with latitude. The optimal filling configuration was deduced by statistically comparing the fractions of each of the UT cloud types in the grid cells with real data and those with interpolated data, but also by visually examining geographical maps of cloud types such as the top panel of Figure 4. We found that the most appropriate way to get an UT cloud amount in the gaps consistent with the one in the data grid cells, while preserving cloud system shapes, was to choose a number of neighbours proportional to the distance between the grid cells-to-be-filled and the closest non-empty-grid cell. By doing so, an empty grid cell surrounded by non-empty grid cells is filled using only a small number of the proximity data neighbours, while a cell located at the center of a gap near the equator (gap with maximum horizontal width reaching 700 km) is filled using a larger number of data (up to 100 grid cells) since the uncertainty is higher. The filling algorithm first scans eastward and westward of a grid cell to-be-filled to count the number of empty grid cells in both directions until a non-empty grid cell is found; the closest distance being the gap reference distance. Then, a spiral scan over the neighbours is performed for a number of cycles which increases linearly with the gap distance. From case studies we observed that obtaining realistic cloud system shapes requires the scan to be bound vertically to ± 3 grid cells, while allowing the horizontal scan free. As an example, the top panel in Figure 4 presents a geographic map of cloud types for one day in July after the data gaps filling.

Once the gaps are filled, we apply a composite technique to reconstruct the upper tropospheric cloud systems; adjacent grid cells containing UT clouds and sharing a common side are grouped. The grid cells must contain more than 70% of UT cloud types within all AIRS measurements in order to be considered in the procedure. For interpolated grid cells the threshold is set slightly lower, to 65%, as this 5% difference corrects for an observed bias in the UT cloud amount of the interpolated areas. To ensure the spatial continuity of cloud systems, the average cloud pressure difference between two adjacent grid cells must be lower than 50 hPa; this is a legitimate value as it is slightly above the uncertainty of retrieved p_{cld} , which is of the order of 30 - 40 hPa (Stubenrauch et al., 2012; Feofilov and Stubenrauch, 2017).

To identify opaque areas inside the built UT cloud systems, which potentially enclose convective core(s), a second grouping is performed. The emissivity limit for the opaque area definition is set to 0.9. The cloud system is then considered as a "convective" one when containing at least one grid cell with $\epsilon_{cld} > 0.98$ within the opaque area. The above core identification procedure provides the number of convective cores in a cloud system and thus allows its classification as non-convective, if no convective core is found, or as convective if at least one core is found. The latter are further classified, with respect to the number of cores, to single-core and multi-core systems.

Figure 4 bottom panel present for the same day as in the top panel, the tropical cloud systems including opaque and convective core areas. Middle panel presents a more detailed horizontal structure of the UT cloud systems, illustrating the anvil amount not taken into account in the various analyses which use IR T_B mentioned in section 2.2.

3 Exploration of Tropical Upper Tropospheric cloud systems

3.1 Statistical properties

We find that upper tropospheric cloud systems cover about 20% (25%) of the tropical band, defined as 30° N-30° S (15° N-15° S). Their horizontal extent varies significantly, starting from a single grid cell with a size of about 2500 km², reaching several 10⁸ km². These UT cloud systems may be distinguished as convective or non-convective (isolated cirrus) systems. More specifically, convective (single and multi-core) systems cover 15% (20%) while isolated cirrus systems cover 5% (5%) of the tropical band 30° N-30° S (15° N-15° S). The latter might originate from convection or formed by *in situ* freezing. Studies using Lagrangian transport performed by Luo et al. (2004) and Riihimaki et al. (2012) have shown that about 50% of these isolated cirrus systems form *in situ* while the other half corresponds to dissipating convective systems. Table 1 summarizes the statistical repartition of tropical isolated cirrus systems, single-core and multi-core convective systems in the 30° N-30° S band along with their average sizes. Though isolated cirrus systems significantly outnumber the convective systems, their average horizontal extent is a factor of 10 smaller than the one of single-core convective systems. Multi-core convective systems are significantly larger than the other categories, compared to single-core by a factor of 20, while representing only 1% of the population. Among convective cloud systems, those having horizontal extent larger than 3*10⁸ km² represent about 10% and are mainly located over the western Pacific during the monsoon period (Liu et al., 2007); a region with warm surface temperatures, large convective mass fluxes (Tissier et al., 2016), and large UT humidity (Virts et al., 2015; Houze et al., 2016). This region is also known for building mesoscale convective complexes (e.g. Mapes and Houze, 1993; Deng et al., 2016), including several convective systems, often in different phases of development and connected by ubiquitous thin cirrus.

Figure 5 presents geographical maps of occurrence a) isolated cirrus and b) all convective cores, together for single and multi-core systems, also separately for c) boreal winter and d) boreal summer, and e) of single core convective systems. The convective activity pattern clearly follows the Intertropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) with maxima observed over the warm pool, north west South America and central Africa, and over the summer hemisphere. The patterns are in agreement with previous findings obtained from the International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project (Tan et al., 2015), the CloudSat mission (Igel et al., 2014), the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (Houze et al., 2015) and from geostationary satellites Fiolleau and Roca (2013). As expected, isolated cirrus are abundant and are found to cover wide areas in the vicinity of the convective active regions.

3.2 System composition and life-cycle stages

As discussed in the introduction, the impact of UT cloud systems on the Earth's energy budget depends on their horizontal extent, their emissivity distribution, and the temperature difference between the cloud and its underlying surface (lower clouds or earth surface). The latter has been explored by Haladay and Stephens (2009). In this work, the first two points will be studied.

Hereafter, we are primarily interested in the horizontal cloud system emissivity structure, rather than in the total coverage over the tropical band, and to keep the uncertainties low, we consider only convective cloud systems which are composed of more than 80% of real data.

Figure 6 presents the average proportion of convective core, thick and thin anvils as a function of the UT cloud system horizontal extent, separately for single and multi-core convective systems. The statistics include convective systems at different phases of their life cycle (in development and mature). As the systems get larger, the fraction of the convective core decreases to 10% and that of thin cirrus anvil increases up to about 30%. The same tendencies are observed for both single and multi-core systems, with the only difference that the latter have slightly smaller fractions of convective core area and slightly larger fractions of thin cirrus area.

The composition of a convective system (convective part, thick and thin anvil) depends on the system life-cycle stage (as illustrated in Fig. 9d of Machado et al. (1998)). Our analysis, using snapshots which are available only every twelve hours, cannot directly track the life cycles of the convective systems. However, in particular organized convection often has life time longer than 24 hours; it has already been demonstrated in previous studies using satellite data with better temporal resolution (Machado et al., 1998 and Futyan and Del Genio, 2007) or with varying observation time (Fiolleau and Roca, 2013) that the largest systems have the longest life cycle, up to several days. Therefore, even with only two measurements per day we should be able to observe systems in different phases of their life cycle and explore them statistically. Our article is not focused on studying the life cycle itself, but aims to select relatively mature convective systems, for which one can then explore the relationship between anvil properties and convective depth. We use as proxy of maturity stage the fraction of convective core horizontal extent with respect to the total cloud system horizontal extent. This variable has been proven to be an indicator of convective cloud maturity as it follows the life cycle in high temporal resolution studies using IR imagery of geostationary satellites (Machado et al., 1998), Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM) (Fiolleau and Roca, 2013), as well as using CloudSat radar (Bacmeister and Stephens, 2011), the latter taking data at the same observation time as AIRS.

Figure 7 shows the normalized distribution of convective core fraction, separately for single and multi-core systems. In general, this fraction has a wider distribution and peaks at a larger value for single-core systems compared to multi-core convective systems (at 0.25 and 0.1, respectively). A small fraction of single-core convective systems consists only of the convective core itself; these are systems in the development phase. Only during maturity and dissipation do convective systems include increasing upper tropospheric stratiform cirrus anvils, while the fraction of the convective area decreases (e.g Leary and Houze, 1979; Machado and Rossow, 1993). Multi-core convective systems, agglomerating systems probably in different stages of development, are not suitable for exploring the system’s life cycle, and therefore will not be considered in this study. Moreover, in order to ensure a purified sample of single-core systems we exclude single-core systems which have more than one opaque area ($0.9 < \epsilon_{cld} < 0.98$).

By stratifying single-core convective systems according to their fraction of convective area within the cloud system, we explore whether their physical properties follow an evolution pattern which corresponds to different life cycle stages. To do so, taking in account the convective fraction distribution of single core systems of Fig 7, we consider eleven intervals of equal statistics with respect to the convective fraction: [1, 0.78, 0.65, 0.55, 0.47, 0.40, 0.34, 0.29, 0.24, 0.19, 0.13, 0.01], indicated as 11 “maturity steps” in Figures 8 and 9.

Single core systems over land and ocean are further separated to early afternoon (PM) and night (AM), since diurnal variations are expected. The statistics at each “maturity step” is shown in Fig. 8. One observes slightly more “developing” systems

over land and more dissipating systems over ocean in the early afternoon. During night the statistics are more equally distributed, with twice as many oceanic single-core convective systems than in the afternoon. These findings are in agreement with studies on tropical precipitation which show a peak in the late afternoon over land and a few hours before sunrise over ocean (e.g. Liu and Zipser, 2008). One has to keep in mind that our specific observation times might not capture the peak of convection.

Figure 9 presents the median values of the physical properties of single-core convective systems for successive life cycle stages, separately in the early afternoon and at night, over land and over ocean. The total cloud system horizontal extent (Fig. 9a) increases during the whole life cycle, something expected as the detrained anvil increases as the system gets older. We do not capture the anvil shrinking as shown in Fig. 9a of Machado et al. (1998), most likely, because Machado et al. studied only the thicker anvils when using the IR T_B (Fig. 2) and the thinner anvil part increases towards dissipation (Fig. 9c). Moreover, our convective system definition requires at least one convective grid cell and therefore the system is not captured in its advanced dissipation. The horizontal extent of the convective core (Fig. 9b) increases until it reaches a plateau around life cycle stage 5-9, which corresponds to a convective fraction between about 0.1 and 0.3. The behaviour is similar over land and ocean, except for ocean in the early afternoon, where the increase in convective core size is stronger with a peak for cloud systems with a convective fractional area of about 0.2. When considering the evolution of the emissivity distribution within the convective system (Fig. 9c) and the ratio of thin cirrus over cirrus within the anvil (Fig. 9d), the average emissivity of the cloud system decreases and moreover the fraction of thin anvil increases along the system's life cycle in agreement with expectations. It is interesting to note that the behaviour is similar over ocean and over land. Rain rate is maximum at the developing phase and decreases successively until dissipation (Fig. 9e), with twice higher rates over land than over ocean. This finding is in agreement with Fig. 5 of Fiolleau and Roca (2013).

The minimum temperature of the convective core is the only variable which does not have a clear behaviour. When considering specific regions, like the three land regions and three ocean regions discussed in (Liu and Zipser, 2008), the behaviour is similar as in Figure 9, with similar T_{min}^{cb} over all maturity steps in the less convective ocean regions and with slightly colder T_{min}^{cb} values when the convective fraction is larger for the other regions (see Fig. 1 of the supplement). However, all minimum temperatures of the convective cores seem to converge towards a plateau for the mature and dissipating convective systems. We are interested to study the relationships between anvil properties and convection when the systems are mature. Therefore we are confident to isolate these systems according to Fig. 9b) by requiring a convective fraction within the system between 10 and 30%, leading to averages in thin cirrus over cirrus anvil of about 30%.

4 Relationships between convective depth and cirrus anvil properties

As discussed in the introduction, there are different proxies describing the convective intensity/strength or convective depth, which might give an insight into different aspects of convection. The level of neutral buoyancy (LNB), which can be computed from atmospheric soundings, describes the convective environment and sets the potential vertical extent for convective development (Takahashi and Luo, 2014). The altitude of cirrus anvil outflow from deep convection is a manifestation of where

convection loses buoyancy. The difference between both gives an indication of the entrainment rate. Takahashi and Luo (2014) have shown that while LNB is very similar between land and ocean, the altitude of convective outflow is higher over land than over ocean. This difference may be attributed to the size difference of convective cores: land convection tends to have larger convective cores, which provide better protection from entrainment dilution (Lucas et al., 1994). In general, convective intensity is given by the strength of the vertical updraft. A strong updraft should produce a large radar echo top height (ETH) and therefore a smaller difference between cloud top height (CTH) and ETH, i.e. large particles are lofted to greater altitude. CTH itself can be considered as a proxy of convective depth. Using CloudSat radar data, Takahashi and Luo (2014) have shown that for deep convective systems CTH correlates well with LNB. CTH and ETH are also positively correlated, though with smaller correlation coefficients, especially when using ETH of larger echo, corresponding to larger particles. This still suggests that convective intensity and convective depth are related. Unlike the relationship between CTH and LNB, larger correlations between CTH and ETH are found over land than over ocean. These differences may reflect different dynamical and microphysical processes controlling cloud-size particles (CTH) and precipitation-size particles (represented by ETH). CTH is linked to cloud top temperature T_{cld} through the atmospheric temperature profile. With AIRS data alone we are able to explore the anvil properties with respect to the CTH or T_{cld} of the convection.

In the following, we will investigate convective depth only for mature convective systems, defined according to Fig. 9 as systems for which the fraction of convective core area varies between 0.1 and 0.3. It should be stressed that all the correlations obtained in this section are very well reproduced if a tighter convective fraction interval is used as maturity proxy. The convective depth of a mature cloud system can be deduced by its height, and therefore by the cloud top temperature of the convective core; the latter being directly linked to the height through the atmospheric temperature profile. Since the convective core might also include parts of the rainy anvil, we use as a proxy for convective depth the minimum temperature within the convective core (T_{min}^{cb}) instead of the average T_{cld} of the convective core. Fig. 10 presents the relation between T_{min}^{cb} and the maximum rain rate within the convective core (at a spatial resolution of 5 km), separately over land and ocean for mature single-core systems. By using the maximum rain rate at such a spatial resolution the probability should be higher to correspond to convective rain. From Fig. 10 we deduce that the colder (higher) the convective core, the higher is the maximum rain rate. The relationship is similar over ocean and over land for T_{min}^{cb} values larger than about 210 K, whereas for cloud systems with the lowest T_{min}^{cb} values the maximum rain rate inside the convective core gets significantly higher over land. This is in agreement with earlier findings of Schumacher and Houze (2003) and Liu et al. (2007).

Figure 11 top panel, presents the size of the mature convective systems as a function of the minimum temperature within the convective core, separately for oceanic and for continental systems. We observe an increase of the size of the systems with increasing convective depth, represented by decreasing T_{min}^{cb} . Similar results are obtained if the analysis is performed in regions (Fig 2a of supplement), indicating the robustness of this finding.

Whereas it is straightforward to determine the minimum temperature within a single-core convective system, it is more difficult to consider this proxy for multi-core convective systems. The latter might be composed of several convective sub-systems in different phases of development. Nevertheless, we build for those systems the average T_{min}^{cb} over all convective

cores of the system. Considering the bottom panel of Fig. 11, one observes that multi-core convective systems behaviour is analogous to single-core systems.

From Fig. 10 and 11, we conclude that for both single and multi-core systems, oceanic convective systems of a similar convective depth as continental systems have a larger size with less intense convective rain, a behavior significantly enhanced for systems with an important convective depth. This difference in structure was already pointed out in earlier studies (e.g. Liu et al., 2007). Furthermore, Liu et al. (2007) have shown that tropical continental mesoscale convective cloud systems are in general smaller in size than oceanic systems, though the vertical updraft and horizontal extent of the convective cores are in general larger, while their convective depth is similar. Their ice water path is also larger than the one of oceanic systems, which is caused by different microphysics between land and ocean (Sohn et al., 2015). Findings by Zipser et al. (2006) and Hamada et al. (2015) suggest that extreme convective events correspond to cloud systems with a smaller size than those of extreme rainfall events. This demonstrates that different variables give insight into different aspects of convection. One has also to keep in mind that the development of a convective system into maturity spans a certain time interval: one expects that a large updraft leads to a convective system of large height (low T_{min}^{cb}) which then develops horizontally. Aerosols and humidity also play a role in invigorating convection (e.g. Altaratz et al., 2014). It has been shown that the rain rate decreases during the development and most probably also the strength of the vertical updraft. This means that one needs to undergo time-lag studies or Lagrangian transport studies which follow closely the convective systems and their atmospheric environment to advance further. While these detailed studies will be subject of a follow-on study, which will include additional variables from other data sets, such as ERA5, we can still go one step further with AIRS data alone, by investigating the next question: will there also be a difference in the anvil horizontal structure with increasing convective depth?

Figure 12 top panel shows the ratio of thin cirrus anvil area over total anvil size as a function of T_{min}^{cb} for mature single-core convective systems, separately over land and over ocean. With increasing convective depth (decreasing T_{min}^{cb}) the fraction of thin cirrus anvil increases, and this in the same manner for oceanic convective systems as for continental systems. Again, regional analysis produce very similar correlations between the fraction of thin cirrus over cirrus as a function of the convective depth (Fig. 2b of supplement). Bottom panel in Fig. 12 presents the same quantities, for land and oceanic systems together, separately for single and multi-core systems. We observe a very similar behaviour for single-core convective systems and multi-core systems. These results indicate a robust relationship between convective depth and the horizontal emissivity structure of the detrained cirrus anvils. To go one step further in our investigation, Fig. 13 shows how the cirrus anvil emissivity varies with increasing distance to the convective core, normalized by dividing with the square root of the size, for mature single-core systems. Three intervals of T_{min}^{cb} are considered, representing systems of different convective depth. For all systems the cirrus anvil emissivity decreases with increasing distance, as one would expect. While the decrease in emissivity is comparable for all systems within the first quarter of the horizontal extent, it continues to decrease more rapidly for systems with strong convective depth compared to those reaching lower altitudes. This might have important implications for the radiative impact of these systems in relation to increasing convective intensity in a warming climate (Tan et al., 2015; Bony et al., 2016).

5 Conclusions and Outlook

We have built Upper Tropospheric cloud systems, using cloud pressure and emissivity retrieved from 13 years of AIRS observations. These data have been used to investigate the properties of tropical UT cloud systems, and in particular relationships between the convective depth, given by cloud top temperature in the mature stage of a convective cloud system, and the properties of the surrounding cirrus anvils.

The benefits of the present UT cloud system data base compared to other data and methods are that 1) IR sounder data have a large instantaneous coverage and are sensitive to thin cirrus down to an emissivity of 0.1 (0.2 in visible optical depth), day and night, and 2) our cloud retrieval provides the physical properties of altitude and emissivity decoupled, allowing to reconstruct the horizontal extent of the UT cloud systems and then to distinguish between deep convective cloud systems and isolated systems and to resolve their emissivity structure, essential to determine the radiative feedback of the anvils on convection. For our investigation we first needed to establish proxies to identify 1) convective cores, 2) mature deep convective systems and 3) the convective depth of a mature convective system. It was demonstrated, using rain rate and large-scale vertical winds, that in the tropics UT opaque clouds with an emissivity close to 1, have a large probability to stem from convection, even though they include probably a part of stratiform rain. Therefore the cloud emissivity permits to differentiate convective cores, cirrus and thin cirrus anvils as well as to identify single-core and multi-core convective systems. UT cloud systems cover about 20%-25% of the tropics. While the frequency strongly decreases from isolated cirrus towards multi-core convective systems, the latter's coverage is the largest. The fractional area of the convective core within a cloud system has already been proven to be a maturity stage proxy. Though considering only two measurements per day, the evolution of properties of single-core convective systems could still be statistically followed by using convective fraction within a cloud system as a proxy for maturity, since our results are compatible with findings using a better temporal resolution. The size of the convective core reaches a plateau and then decreases during the stage of dissipation, guiding us to define mature convective systems as those with a convective core fraction between 0.1 and 0.3.

Several proxies of convective intensity/strength or depth exist, giving insight into different aspects of convection. With our data, we could probe mature convective cloud system's characteristics with respect to the convective core minimum temperature, a variable indicative of the convective depth. It could be shown that colder convective systems (meaning those rising higher) have larger values of maximum rain rate within the convective core, a tendency more marked over land, as well as larger cirrus anvils, a tendency more marked over ocean. Both findings are in agreement with previous studies. Compared to other methods, our approach provides the unique opportunity to study also the horizontal emissivity structure within the anvils. It was revealed that the fraction of thin cirrus over the total anvil area increases with increasing convective depth, similarly for oceanic and continental mature convective systems and both for single and multi-core systems. We also demonstrated that with increasing convective depth, the emissivity of the anvil decreases in general more sharply with increasing distance to the convective core. This might have important implications for the radiative effects of these systems, in relation to a convection intensity increase in a warming climate.

The above findings are very promising and the observed relationships might provide observational metrics for studying detrainment processes with Cloud Resolving models or even climate models, if their spatial resolution is similar to the one of our data base, and for constraining parameterizations related to convection and detrainment. Combined with variables derived from other data sets, such as vertical cloud structure and corresponding heating rates, atmospheric humidity, surface temperature, level of neutral buoyancy, vertical and horizontal winds, his data bas will be the basis to address questions on feedbacks between anvils and convection and on their modulation of the atmospheric circulation, in particular in respect to climate change. Furthermore, Lagrangian transport analysis could be used to indicate the origin of the isolated cirrus systems and to assess the link between convective sources and the air entering the stratosphere. Moreover, when meteorological reanalyses are available at higher spatial and temporal resolution, exploration of lag correlations between variables such as vertical winds, size of convective core, rain rate, and other atmospheric condition variables, could give a better understanding of convection mechanisms.

Acknowledgements. This research was supported by the Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales (CNES), the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) and the European Space Agency (ESA), within its framework of ESA Climate Change Initiative. The authors thank the Earth Observing System AIRS and AMSR-E teams for providing the data. The calculations have been performed at the ClimServ IPSL centre. The authors also thank two anonymous reviewers who helped to improve this manuscript through their thoughtful comments.

References

- Altaratz, O., Koren, I., Remer, L. A., and Hirsch, E., Review: cloud invigoration by aerosols-coupling between microphysics and dynamics, *Atmos. Res.*, 140, 38-60, 2014.
- Bacmeister, J. T. and Stephens, G. L., Spatial statistics of likely convective clouds in CloudSat data, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 116, D4, 2156-2202, 2011.
- Bony, S., B. Stevens, D. M. W. Frierson, C. Jakob, M. Kageyama, R. Pincus, T. G. Shepherd, S. C. Sherwood, A. P. Siebesma, A. H. Sobel, M. Watanabe, and M. J. Webb, Clouds, Circulation and Climate Sensitivity., *Nature Geoscience*, 8, 261-268, 2015.
- Bony, S. B. Stevens, D. Coppin, T. Becker, K. A. Reed, A. Voigt, and B. Medeiros, Thermodynamic control of anvil cloud amount, *PNAS*, 113, 8927-8932, 2016.
- Boucher, O., D. Randall, P. Artaxo, C. Bretherton, G. Feingold, P. Forster, V.-M. Kerminen, Y. Kondo, H. Liao, U. Lohmann, P. Rasch, S.K. Satheesh, S. Sherwood, B. Stevens, and X.Y. Zhang, Clouds and aerosols. In *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. T.F. Stocker, D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Doschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, and P.M. Midgley, Eds. Cambridge University Press, 571-657, 2013.
- Bouniol, D., R. Roca, Thomas Fiolleau, and D. Emmanuel Poan, Macrophysical, Microphysical, and Radiative Properties of Tropical Mesoscale Convective Systems over Their Life Cycle., *J.Climate*, 29, 3353-3371, 2016.
- Chahine, Moustafa T., Thomas S. Pagano, Hartmut H. Aumann, Robert Atlas, Christopher Barnet, John Blaisdell, Luke Chen, Murty Divakarla, Eric J. Fetzer, Mitch Goldberg, Catherine Gautier, Stephanie Granger, Scott Hannon, Fredrick W. Irion, Ramesh Kakar, Eugenia Kalnay, Bjorn H. Lambrigtsen, Sung-Yung Lee, John Le Marshall, W. Wallace McMillan, Larry McMillin, Edward T. Olsen, Henry Revercomb, Philip Rosenkranz, William L. Smith, David Staelin, L. Larrabee Strow, Joel Susskind, David Tobin, Walter Wolf, and Lihang Zhou, AIRS: Improving Weather Forecasting and Providing New Data on Greenhouse Gases., *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 87, 911-926, 2006.
- Chédin, A., Serrar, S., Scott, N.A., Crevoisier, C. and Armante, R. (2003). First global measurement of midtropospheric CO₂ from NOAA polar satellites: Tropical zone., *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 108, 2003.
- Chevallier, F., F. Cheruy, N. A. Scott, and A. Chédin, A neural network approach for a fast and accurate computation of longwave radiative budget, *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 37, 1385-139, 1998.
- Dee, D.P., et al., The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system. *Q.J.R. Meteor. Soc.* 137 : 553-597
- Del Genio, A.D., and W. Kovari, Climatic properties of tropical precipitating convection under varying environmental conditions., *J. Climate*, 15, 2597-2615, 2002.
- Deng Q, Khouider B, Majda AJ, Ajayamohan RS, Effect of stratiform heating on the planetary-scale organization of tropical convection., *J Atmos Sci* 73:371-392, 2016.
- Feofilov, A. G., C. J. Stubenrauch, and J. Delanoe, Ice water content vertical profiles of high-level clouds: classification and impact on radiative fluxes, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 12327-12344, 2015.
- Feofilov, A. and Stubenrauch, C., LMD Cloud Retrieval using IR sounders. Algorithm Theoretical Basis, CIRS-LMD software package V2 19 pp., available at LMD, DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.15812.63361, 2016.
- Fiolleau, T. and Roca, R., Composite life cycle of tropical mesoscale convective systems from geostationary and low Earth orbit satellite observations: method and sampling considerations, *Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 139: 941-953, 2013.

- Futyan, J., and A. Del Genio, Deep convective system evolution over Africa and the tropical Atlantic, *J. Climate*, 20, 5041-5060, 2007.
- Haladay T, Stephens G., Characteristics of tropical thin cirrus clouds deduced from joint CloudSat and CALIPSO observations, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 114, 2009.
- Hamada, Atsushi, Yukari N. Takayabu, Chuntao Liu and Edward J. Zipser, Weak linkage between the heaviest rainfall and tallest storms, *Nature Communications* 6, 6213, 2015
- Houze, Robert A., Mesoscale convective systems, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 42 ,4 , 1944-9208, 2004.
- Houze, Robert A. and Rasmussen, Kristen L. and Zuluaga, Manuel D. and Brodzik, Stella R., The variable nature of convection in the tropics and subtropics: A legacy of 16 years of the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission satellite, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 53,3,3,1944-9208, 2015.
- Houze, R. A. Jr., K. L. Rasmussen, L. McMurdie, M. M. Chaplin, and A. Kumar, Synoptic and mesoscale aspects of the June 2013 flooding in Uttarakhand, India, *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, submitted, 2016.
- Igel, M. R. and Aryeh J Drager and Susan C Van Den Heever, A CloudSat cloud object partitioning technique and assessment and integration of deep convective anvil sensitivities to sea surface temperature, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119, 17,2169-8996, 2014.
- Igel, M. R. and van den Heever, S. C., Tropical, oceanic, deep convective cloud morphology as observed by CloudSat, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 15, 2015.
- Jiang Haiyan, The Relationship between Tropical Cyclone Intensity Change and the Strength of Inner-Core Convection, *Monthly Weather Review*, 140, 4, 1164-1176, 2012.
- Kummerow, C., and R. Ferraro, EOS/AMSR-E Level-2 Rainfall: Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA: Colorado State University,(PDF file, 245 KB)http://nsidc.org/sites/nsidc.org/files/files/amr_atbd_supp06_L2_rain.pdf, 2006.
- Leary, C. A., and R. A. Houze, Jr., Melting and evaporation of hydrometeors in precipitation from the anvil clouds of deep tropical convection, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 36, 669-679, 1979.
- Lebsock, Matthew D. and Christian Kummerow and Graeme L. Stephens, An Observed Tropical Oceanic Radiative-Convective Cloud Feedback, *Journal of Climate*, 23, 8, 2065-2078, 2010.
- Lin, J.-L., G.N. Kiladis, B.E. Mapes, K.M. Weickmann, K.R. Sperber, W. Lin, M.C. Wheeler, S.D. Schubert, A. Del Genio, L.J. Donner, S. Emori, J.-F. Guérémy, F. Hourdin, P.J. Rasch, E. Roeckner, and J.F. Scinocca, Tropical intraseasonal variability in 14 IPCC AR4 climate models. Part I: Convective signals, *J. Climate*, 19, 2665-2690, 2006.
- Liu, C., E. J. Zipser, and S. W. Nesbitt, Global Distribution of Tropical Deep Convection: Different Perspectives from TRMM Infrared and Radar Data, *J. Climate*, 20, 489-503, 2007.
- Liu, C., and E.J.Zipser, Diurnal cycles of precipitation, clouds, and lightning in the triopics from 9 years of TRMM observations. *Geophys. Res. Letters*, 35, L04819, 2008.
- Lucas, C., E. Zipser, and M. A. Le Mone, Vertical velocity in oceanic convection off tropical Australia, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 51, 3183-3193, 1994.
- Luo Z. and Rossow W. B., Characterizing Tropical Cirrus Life Cycle, Evolution, and Interaction with Upper-Tropospheric Water Vapor Using Lagrangian Trajectory Analysis of Satellite Observations, *J. Climate*, 17, 4541-4563, 2004.
- Luo, Z. J. , G. Y. Liu, and G. L. Stephens, Use of A-Train data to estimate convective buoyancy and entrainment rate, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 37, L09804, 2010.
- Machado, L. A. T. and Rossow, W. B., Structural characteristics and radiative properties of tropical cloud clusters, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 121, 3234-3260., 1993.

- Machado, L.A.T., W.B. Rossow, R.L. Guedes, and A.W. Walker, Life cycle variations of mesoscale convective systems over the Americas, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 126, 1630-1654, 1998.
- Mapes, B. E., and R. A. Houze, Jr., Cloud clusters and superclusters over the oceanic warm pool, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 121, 1398-1415, 1993.
- Masunaga, H., and Z. J. Luo, Convective and large-scale mass flux profiles over tropical oceans determined from synergistic analysis of a
5 suite of satellite observations, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 121, 2016
- Oreopoulos, L., N. Cho, D. Lee, and S. Kato, Radiative effects of global MODIS cloud regimes, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 121, 2299-2317, 2016.
- Roca, R., J. Aublanc, P. Chambon, T. Fiolleau, and N. Viltard, Robust Observational Quantification of the Contribution of Mesoscale Convective Systems to Rainfall in the Tropics, *J. Climate*, 27, 4952-4958, 2014.
- William B. Rossow and Robert A. Schiffer, Advances in Understanding Clouds from ISCCP, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological
10 Society*, 80,11,2261-2287, 1999.
- Rossow, W.B., and C. Pearl, 22-yr survey of tropical convection penetrating into the lower stratosphere, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L04803, 2007.
- Rossow, W. B., A. Mekonnen, C. Pearl, and W. Goncalves, Tropical Precipitation Extremes, *J. Climate*, 26, 1457-1466, 2013.
- Scott and Chédin, *J. Appl. Meteor.*, 20, pp. 802-812, 1981.
- 15 Schumacher, C., and R. A. Houze, Jr., Stratiform rain in the tropics as seen by the TRMM Precipitation Radar, *J. Climate*, 16, 1739-1756, 2003.
- Sherwood, Steven C. and Chae, Jung-Hyo and Minnis, Patrick and McGill, Matthew, Underestimation of deep convective cloud tops by thermal imagery, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, 11, 1944-8007, 2004.
- Sohn, B.-J. and Choi, M.-J. and Ryu, J., Explaining darker deep convective clouds over the western Pacific than over tropical continental
20 convective regions, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 8, 11, 4573-4585, 2015.
- Stachnik, J. P., C. Schumacher, and P. E. Ciesielski, Total Heating Characteristics of the ISCCP Tropical and Subtropical Cloud Regimes, *J. Climate*, 26, 7097-7116, 2013.
- Stephens, G.L., D.G. Vane, R.J. Boain, G.G. Mace, K. Sassen, Z. Wang, A.J. Illingworth, E.J. O'Connor, W.B. Rossow, S.L. Durden, S.D. Miller, R.T. Austin, A. Benedetti, C. Mitrescu, and CloudSat Science Team, The CloudSat mission and the A-Train: A new dimension of
25 space-based observations of clouds and precipitation, *Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc.*, 83, 1771-1790, 2002.
- Stephens, G. L., P. J. Webster, R. H. Johnson, R. Engelen, and T. L'Ecuyer, Observational Evidence for the Mutual Regulation of the Tropical Hydrological Cycle and Tropical Sea Surface Temperatures, *J. Climate* 17, 2213-2224, 2004.
- Stephens, G. L. and Ellis, T. D., Controls of Global-Mean Precipitation Increases in Global Warming GCM Experiments, *Journal of Climate*, 21, 23, 6141-6155, 2008.
- 30 Stubenrauch, C. J., A. Chédin, R. Armante, and N. A. Scott, Clouds as seen by Infrared Sounders (3I) and Imagers (ISCCP): Part I Evaluation of Cloud Parameters, *J. Climate*, 12, 2189-2213, 1999.
- Stubenrauch, C. J., S. Cros, N. Lamquin, R. Armante, A. Chédin, C. Crevoisier, and N. A. Scott Cloud properties from Atmospheric Infrared Sounder and evaluation with Cloud-Aerosol Lidar and Infrared Pathfinder Satellite Observations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D8, 2156-2202, 2008.
- 35 Stubenrauch C. J. S. Cros. A. Guignard, and N. Lamquin, A six-year global cloud climatology from the Atmospheric InfraRed Sounder aboard the Aqua Satellite: statistical analysis in synergy with CALIPSO and CloudSat, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 7197-7214, 2010.
- Stubenrauch, C. J., W. B. Rossow, and S. Kinne, Assessment of global cloud datasets from satellites: A project of the World Climate Research Programme Global Energy and Water Cycle Experiment (GEWEX) Radiation Panel, *WCRP Rep.* 23/2012, 176 pp., 2012.

- Stubenrauch, C. J. and W. B. Rossow and S. Kinne and S. Ackerman and G. Cesana and H. Chepfer and L. Di Girolamo and B. Getzewich and A. Guignard and A. Heidinger and B. C. Maddux and W. P. Menzel and P. Minnis and C. Pearl and S. Platnick and C. Poulsen and J. Riedi and S. Sun-Mack and A. Walther and D. Winker and S. Zeng and G. Zhao, Assessment of Global Cloud Datasets from Satellites: Project and Database Initiated by the GEWEX Radiation Panel, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 94, 7, 1031-1049, 2013.
- 5 Stubenrauch, C. J., A. G. Feofilov, S. Protopapadaki, and R. Armante, Cloud climatologies from InfraRed Sounders (AIRS and IASI) using the LMD cloud retrieval: sensitivity studies, statistical analysis and vertical structure in synergy with CALIPSO and CloudSat, to be submitted to *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss*, 2017.
- Susskind, J., J. M. Blaisdell, and L. Iredell, Improved methodology for surface and atmospheric soundings, error estimates and quality control procedures: the atmospheric infrared sounder science team version-6 retrieval algorithm., *J. Applied Rem. Sensing*, 8, (1), 084994, 2014.
- 10 Riihimaki, Laura D. and McFarlane, Sally A. and Liang, Calvin and Massie, Steven T. and Beagley, Nathaniel and Toth, Travis D., Comparison of methods to determine Tropical Tropopause Layer cirrus formation mechanisms, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 117,D6,2156-2202, 2012.
- Takahashi, H., and Z. Luo, Where is the level of neutral buoyancy for deep convection?, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39, L15809, 2012.
- Takahashi, H. and Z. J. Luo, Characterizing Tropical Overshooting Convection from Joint Analysis of CloudSat and Geostationary Satellite
15 Observations., *J. Geophys. Res.*, 119, 112-121, 2014.
- Tan, J., C. Jakob, W.B. Rossow, and G. Tselioudis, Increases in tropical rainfall driven by changes in frequency of organized deep convection, *Nature*, 519, 451-454, 2015.
- Tissier, A.-S. and Legras, B., Convective sources of trajectories traversing the tropical tropopause layer, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16,5,3383-3398, 2016.
- 20 Tselioudis, G., and W.B. Rossow, Time scales of variability of the tropical atmosphere derived from cloud-defined weather states, *J. Climate*, 24, 602-608, 2011.
- Virts, K. S., and R. A. Houze Jr, Clouds and Water Vapor in the Tropical Tropopause Transition Layer over Mesoscale Convective Systems, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 72, 4739-4753, 2015.
- Yamamoto, Munehisa K. and Fumie A. Furuzawa and Atsushi Higuchi and Kenji Nakamura, Comparison of Diurnal Variations in Precipitation Systems Observed by TRMM PR, TMI, and VIRS, *Journal of Climate*, 21, 16, 4011-4028, 2008.
- 25 Yuan, J., and R. A. Houze, Jr., Global variability of mesoscale convective system anvil structure from A-train satellite data, *J. Climate*, 23, 5864-5888, 2010.
- Zipser, E. J. and Chuntao Liu and Daniel J. Cecil and Stephen W. Nesbitt and David P. Yorty, WHERE ARE THE MOST INTENSE THUNDERSTORMS ON EARTH?, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 87, 8, 1057-1071, 2006.




Figure 1. Median and quartiles of cloud IR brightness temperature (red) and retrieved cloud temperature (blue) as a function of cloud emissivity for high clouds ($p_{cld} < 440$ hPa) identified from AIRS observations in the tropics, at a spatial resolution of 0.5° . Statistics for January and July 2006-2007.




Figure 2. Average value of cloud emissivity for bins of T_{cld} and T_B for high clouds ($p_{cld} < 440$ hPa) identified from AIRS observations in the tropics, at a spatial resolution of 0.5° . Statistics for January and July 2006-2007.




Figure 3. Median and quartiles of maximum (dashed black) and average (solid black) rain rate from AMSR-E, and average vertical winds (solid red) from ERAI, as a function of cloud emissivity for high clouds ($p_{cld} < 440$ hPa) identified from AIRS observations in the tropics, at a spatial resolution of 0.5° . Statistics for January and July 2006-2007.




Figure 4. Geographic map of AIRS cloud data for 1 July 2007, 1:30 h local time. Top: cloud types, with blue → upper tropospheric clouds (more opaque deeper blue), yellow → mid-level and low clouds and orange → clear sky. Middle: UT clouds for five emissivity classes 0.1, 0.6, 0.8, 0.92, 0.98, 1, represented respectively by yellow, green, blue, magenta, red. Bottom: UT cloud systems, different colours indicate different systems, opaque and convective areas marked with magenta and deep red, respectively.




Figure 5. Geographic maps of (a) isolated cirrus systems, (b) all convective cores, also separately for (c) boreal winter and (d) boreal summer, and (e) single core convective systems, for the 2003-2015 period of the LMD AIRS cloud climatology. AIRS data, 2003-2015.




Figure 6. Median values and standard errors of fraction of convective core (green), thick (magenta) and thin (cyan) anvil as a function of cloud system size. In red, cloud system size density function distribution. Top: single-core, bottom: multi-core systems. AIRS data, 2003-2015.

Figure 7. Convective core fraction kernel density estimate (solid line) and histogram for single (red) and multi (blue) core systems. AIRS data, 2003-2015.




Figure 8. Number of single-core cloud systems in each maturity step, separately over ocean and over land and during night (AM) and early afternoon (PM). AIRS data, 2003-2015.





Figure 9. Median values and standard errors of physical properties of single-core convective systems for the eleven maturity steps defined by fraction of convective area [1, 0.78, 0.65, 0.55, 0.47, 0.40, 0.34, 0.29, 0.24, 0.19, 0.13, 0.01] , separately over ocean and over land and during night (AM) and early afternoon (PM): a) cloud system size, b) convective core size, c) thin cirrus over cirrus area, d) cloud system average emissivity, e) minimum temperature within convective core, f) average convective core rain rate. a) to e) AIRS data, 2003-2015, f) AIRS and AMSR-E data, 2003-2009.






Figure 10. Median and standard error of maximum convective core rain rate as a function of minimum temperature within the convective core for mature single-core systems, separately over land (red) and ocean (blue). AIRS and AMSR-E data, 2003-2009.




Figure 11. Median and standard error of horizontal extent versus minimum temperature within convective core for mature single core (top) and multi-core (bottom) systems, separately over land (red) and ocean (blue). AIRS data, 2003-2015.




Figure 12. Median and standard error of thin cirrus over total anvil area for mature systems as a function of minimum temperature within convective core(s), for single-core systems, separately over land and ocean (top), and separately for single-core (blue) and multi-core (red) systems (bottom).




Figure 13. Median and standard error emissivity within cloud system as a function of the normalized distance to the convective core. Mature single-core systems are considered for three classes of convective depth represented by intervals in T_{min}^{cb} .

	isolated cirrus	single core	multi-core
Numb.of systems	>95%	3%	1%
Coverage	25%	10%	65%
Median size	10^4Km^2	$10*10^4 \text{ Km}^2$	$200*10^4 \text{ Km}^2$

Table 1. Fraction of occurrence, coverage and median size for isolated cirrus systems, systems with one convective core and with multiple convective cores, over the latitude band 30° N-30° S, annual average over the period 2003-2015.

Supplement on regional analysis




Illustration 1: Median values and standard errors of physical properties for single-core convective systems for eleven maturity steps defined by the fraction of convective area, separately over ocean and over six regions: a) cloud system size, b) convective core size, c) thin cirrus over cirrus area, d) cloud system average emissivity, e) minimum temperature within convective core, f) average convective core




Illustration 1: Median values and standard errors of horizontal extent (left) and ratio of thin cirrus over total anvil (right) versus minimum temperature within convective core, separately over six regions, for mature single core systems.