The Measured Relationship between Ice Water Content and Cloud Radar Reflectivity in Tropical Convective Clouds
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ABSTRACT

In this paper, unprecedented bulk measurements of ice water content (IWC) up to approximately 5 g m$^{-3}$ and 95-GHz radar reflectivities $Z_{95}$ are used to analyze the statistical relationship between these two quantities and its variability. The unique aspect of this study is that these IWC–$Z_{95}$ relationships do not use assumptions on cloud microphysics or backscattering calculations. IWCs greater than 2 g m$^{-3}$ are also included for the first time in such an analysis, owing to improved bulk IWC probe technology and a flight program targeting high ice water content. Using a single IW–$Z_{95}$ relationship allows for the retrieval of IWC from radar reflectivities with less than 30% bias and 40%–70% rms difference. These errors can be reduced further, down to 10%–20% bias over the whole IWC range, using the temperature variability of this relationship. IWC errors largely increase for $Z_{95} > 16$ dBZ, as a result of the distortion of the IWC–$Z_{95}$ relationship by non-Rayleigh scattering effects. A nonlinear relationship is proposed to reduce these errors down to 20% bias and 20%–35% rms differences. This nonlinear relationship also outperforms the temperature-dependent IWC–$Z_{95}$ relationship for convective profiles. The joint frequency distribution of IWC and temperature within and around deep tropical convective cores shows that at the 250–865 Clinton, the cruise altitude of many commercial jet aircraft, IWCs greater than 1.5 g m$^{-3}$ were found exclusively in convective profiles.

1. Introduction

Cloud microphysical properties are major drivers of cloud–radiation interactions, through complex processes that are still a challenge to accurately simulate in large-scale models. The vertical distribution of ice water content (IWC) inside nonprecipitating and deep convective clouds plays a central role in the interaction between clouds and incoming and outgoing radiation (e.g., Stephens et al. 1990). Different climate models still produce a very different ice water path, spanning up to an order of magnitude difference (Waliser et al. 2009; Li et al. 2012). New global datasets (Delanoë and Hogan 2010; Deng et al. 2013) offer new avenues to shed more light on the global and regional properties of nonprecipitating ice cloud microphysics, the cloud–radiation interactions, and the relationship between cloud properties and the large-scale environment (e.g., Su et al. 2008; Protat et al. 2011).

Although the retrieval of IWC in nonprecipitating ice clouds has been found to be reasonably accurate (Mace 2010; Protat et al. 2010a; Deng et al. 2013; Delanoë et al. 2013; Avery et al. 2012), there are reasons to believe this is not the case for convective cloud systems. The CloudSat IWC retrieval techniques currently rely on an assumed single statistical relationship between 95-GHz radar reflectivity (denoted as $Z_{95}$) and IWC, sometimes with temperature $T$ as an additional constraint (e.g., Hogan et al. 2006; Protat et al. 2007, hereinafter referred to as P07). These IWC–$Z_{95}$ and IWC–$Z_{95}$–$T$
relationships were derived from aircraft in situ micro-
physical data collected in nonprecipitating ice clouds at
midlatitude and tropical locations, and did not include
any data collected within and around deep convective
cores. Furthermore, these relationships were not de-
veloped in section 4. These IWC–Z\textsubscript{95} relationships are fi-
nalized in section 5 to derive a statistical representation
of the vertical distribution of IWC in and around
tropical deep convective cores. Further possible
applications of these relationships are discussed in
section 6.

2. The HAIC–HIWC Darwin campaign
measurements

The HAIC–HIWC field campaign took place from
16 January to 7 March 2014 out of Darwin. Details of
the field campaign can be found in Dezitter et al. (2013).
Only information relevant to this study is
given in this section. Large-scale active monsoon
conditions resulting in intense convective activity over
the northern part of Australia were well established
throughout much of the duration of the campaign,
allowing for 23 scientific flights (for a total of 72 flight
hours) to be conducted in very favorable conditions.
The flight strategy was developed in conjunction
with an aviation industry working group and is contained
in the High Ice Water Content Project Science Plan
et al. 2013). The endurance of the Falcon 20 is 3.5 h, (RASTA; Protat et al. 2004; Protat et al. 2009; Delanoë et al. 2013) and its ceiling is at about −50°C in the tropical atmosphere near Darwin.

### a. In situ microphysical measurements

The PSD was measured from 1- to 6400-μm diameter using the Cloud Droplet Probe (CDP, size range 1–50 μm, resolution of 2 μm) from Droplet Measurement Technologies (DMT), the 2D-Stereo Probe [2D-S, size range 10–1280 μm, resolution of 10 μm; Lawson et al. (2006)] from the Stratton Park Engineering Company (SPEC, Inc.), and the Particle Imaging Probe (PIP, size range 100–6400 μm, resolution of 100 μm) from DMT (Baumgardner et al. 2011). These probes were fitted with antishattering tips so as to reduce the shattering of large ice crystals onto the probe tips (e.g., Korolev and Isaac 2005). Remaining shattered particles were then removed by means of software, using the very small interarrival time of shattered particles (e.g., Field et al. 2006; Heymsfield 2007). Both approaches are indeed needed for an efficient mitigation of shattering (e.g., Jackson et al. 2014).

In the present paper, we use composite 2D-S–PIP PSDs, which were derived using a simple weighting technique described in F14.

The reference bulk IWC measurement was obtained using a new isokinetic evaporator TWC probe (IKP) that was originally developed between 2007 and 2011 by the National Research Council of Canada (NRC), Environment Canada (EC, now known as Environment and Climate Change Canada), and Science Engineering Associates (SEA). The device was designed to measure high-IWC conditions up to 10 g m⁻³ at 200 m s⁻¹ true airspeed in summer tropical and subtropical atmospheric conditions from −10°C to −50°C, with a designed accuracy of 20%. A downsized version of the probe (IKP2) was then developed for NASA and the FAA in 2013 by SEA and NRC specifically to fit within the operational constraints of the Falcon 20 for the Darwin-2014 HAIC–HIWC flight measurement program. The operating principles of the IKP have been described by Davison et al. (2009), and are the same for the IKP2. The performance of the IKP2 probe has been assessed in multiple wind tunnel tests at four different facilities, and was found to operate without saturation and within 15% for water contents up to 5 g m⁻³ and airspeeds up to 150 m s⁻¹. More details on this probe can be found in Strapp et al. (2016b) and Davison et al. (2016). Since the IKP2 measures the total water content, in real conditions liquid water and water vapor contributions should be subtracted to obtain IWC. Unfortunately, the hot-wire LWC sensor on the aircraft was unable to measure LWC below about 10% of the IWC in mixed-phase conditions, and LWC levels exceeding this value were very rare. Fortunately, the Goodrich ice detector could be used to detect the presence of liquid water. Two such regions in two very short flight segments were identified at −10°C, and these regions were excluded from the subsequent comparisons. The minimum detectable IWC of the IKP2 is determined by the noise level of the water vapor measurements of the IKP2 and background probes. This resulting noise level of the background humidity from the IKP2 humidity is a function of temperature: it is about 0.1 g m⁻³ at −10°C, dropping rapidly to about 0.005 g m⁻³ at −50°C. Since most data were gathered at temperatures colder than about −25°C, a minimum IWC of 0.05 g m⁻³ was chosen as the threshold to include in our analysis. The IKP2 dataset used in this study is at 1-s resolution and is the official final full dataset.

A second hot-wire bulk IWC probe, the so-called Robust probe developed by SEA for EC and the NRC, was integrated onto the CDP canister. The system provided reliable measurements at high altitude and high IWC during flight tests conducted by Airbus in 2010 and 2011 (Grandin et al. 2014). Based on results from previous hot-wire probes, it was known that the Robust probe’s collection efficiency for ice crystals would be significantly lower than unity. In this paper, we only use the Robust probe measurements to establish that the two very different bulk TWC probes provide highly correlated IWC
measurements. Statistical comparisons using all Darwin 2014 HAIC–HIWC flights (not shown) reveal that these two TWC measurements of quite different operating principles track very closely (correlation coefficient = 0.96, standard deviation of the difference between the two probes ranging from 20% at IWC = 1 g m⁻³ and decreasing roughly linearly down to about 5% at IWC = 4 g m⁻³), and that the overall efficiency factor for the Robust probe is close to 0.45 in this HIWC environment.

b. Airborne cloud radar measurements

The RASTA 95-GHz airborne cloud radar (Protat et al. 2004, 2009; Delanoë et al. 2013) provides the radar reflectivities used in this study. The unique setup of this instrument includes the multibeam antenna system (three noncollinear antennas looking upward and three noncollinear antennas looking downward), allowing for the 3D wind to be retrieved below and above the aircraft flight altitude in a pseudovertical cross section during straight-line flight patterns. The RASTA radar has been carefully calibrated using accurate measurements of gains and losses through each radar component, remote fixed targets of known backscatter cross sections, and the Li et al. (2005) ocean surface backscatter technique (Bouniol et al. 2008). Quantitative comparisons with the CloudSat spaceborne radar (Protat et al. 2009) also showed that the two radar reflectivities agreed to within 1 dB, while the CloudSat radar reflectivities also agreed statistically within 0.4 dB with cloud radar data from five different ground-based sites. These results give confidence that the RASTA cloud radar is well calibrated, within 1 dB. Radar reflectivities in linear units from the nadir and zenith antennas nearest to the aircraft were linearly spatially interpolated, typically over 360 m (since the first nadir and zenith radar bins are at 180-m range), to produce a time series of Z₉₅ at flight level, with a 1.2-s temporal resolution. Deriving the IWC–Z₉₅ relationships from the nadir or zenith reflectivities instead of the interpolated ones did not result in any change in the coefficients of these relationships. It must be acknowledged that since the RASTA radar frequency (W band, around 95 GHz) is much higher than the frequency of the pilot radars on commercial aircraft (X band, around 10 GHz), the IWC–Z₉₅ relationships derived in the present paper cannot be readily used to mitigate the HIWC threat in real time on commercial aircraft. More work will be done in the near future to derive the same relationships at X band and to evaluate the differences with the relationships from this paper, when data become available.

3. The IWC–Z₉₅ relationship in deep tropical convective clouds

As explained in section 1, the dataset collected during the HAIC–HIWC campaign using the IKP2 probe and the RASTA cloud radar allows us the unprecedented opportunity to characterize the IWC–Z₉₅ relationship without any assumption on the PSD or the ice crystal mass–size relationship and including high values of IWC up to 5 g m⁻³. For the sake of comparison with earlier approaches for which direct IWC and/or Z₉₅ measurements were not available, we have also estimated IWC and Z₉₅ using the PSD measurements, the single mass–size relationship used in P07 (which is that from Brown and Francis 1995), and T-matrix calculations using the aspect ratios estimated from the projected aspect ratio measured by raw in situ probes. This will be referred to as the PSD approach in the following. The resulting joint distribution of IWC and Z₉₅ using this technique is shown in Fig. 1, using a Z₉₅ and an IWC bin of 1 dB and 0.05 g m⁻³, respectively. Figure 2 shows the same joint distribution but derived from direct IKP2 IWC and RASTA Z₉₅ measurements. For the sake of comparisons between Figs. 1 and 2, the mean IKP2 IWC in each Z₉₅ bin is also given in both figures. The joint distributions are normalized for each reflectivity bin by the sum of all points in each IWC bin. In other words the sum of IWC frequencies is 1 for each reflectivity bin. Using such normalization allows for changes in the width of the IWC distribution for each Z₉₅ bin to be readily observed.

Figure 2 shows that there is a very well-defined power-law relationship between IWC and Z₉₅, characterized by a narrow IWC distribution width for Z₉₅ of less than 10 dBZ. For Z₉₅ > 10 dBZ the IWC distribution becomes wider, indicating that the retrieval of IWC from radar reflectivity will be characterized by larger errors for larger IWCs. This increase in the variability of IWC as a function of Z₉₅ is consistent with the fact that higher 95-GHz radar reflectivities are more sensitive to the variabilities in the shape and density of the ice particles as non-Rayleigh scattering effects increase. Despite these potential effects though, the relationship is still well defined. It must be noted that there are currently no data available to assess whether this relationship can be applied to other regions of the world. This regional variability will be investigated to some extent in the future by collecting more data in different large-scale environments conducive to deep convection.

Comparison between Figs. 1 and 2 highlights the impact of using a single mass–size relationship and
T-matrix calculations versus direct measurements for the first time. For $Z_{95}$, the widths of the IWC distribution are very similar for any $Z_{95}$ bin. The differences between the two joint distributions are largest for $Z_{95} > 10$ dBZ and IWCs $> 1.5$ g m$^{-3}$, where a bimodal distribution of $Z_{95}$ as a function IWC appears with the PSD approach (Fig. 1; see the two possible values of $Z_{95}$ for a given IWC for IWC $> 1.5$ g m$^{-3}$). The more frequent of the two modes is in good agreement with the distribution obtained with the direct measurements (Fig. 2), with a tendency to slightly overestimate IWC for any $Z_{95}$. The second mode largely overestimates IWC. The IWC distribution is also generally wider when direct measurements are used. This result shows that the natural variability of the mass–size relationship tends to broaden the range of possible IWCs for any $Z_{95}$ greater than 10 dBZ.

A simple power-law fit to the joint frequency distribution of Fig. 2 yields the following IWC–$Z_{95}$ relationship:

$$IWC = 0.108Z_{m95}^{0.770},$$

where $Z_{m95} = 10^{Z_{95}/10.0}$ is the radar reflectivity expressed in linear units (mm$^6$ m$^{-3}$). The solid red line in Fig. 2 shows the mean IKP2 IWC for each $Z_{95}$ bin. The comparison of the power-law fit and the mean IWC values shows that the power-law IWCs tend to slightly but systematically underestimate the mean IWC for $Z_{95} < 17$ dBZ and overestimate IWC for $Z_{95} > 17$ dBZ. This is quantified further in Fig. 3 using the relative bias (hereinafter referred to as the bias) and the relative root-mean-square difference (hereinafter referred to as the rms difference) as a function of IWC and $Z_{95}$. Figure 3a shows that IWCs greater than 0.5 g m$^{-3}$ can be retrieved from (1) with less than 30% bias and less than 40% rms difference. For IWCs lower than 0.5 g m$^{-3}$, the bias is less than 20% but the rms differences increase as IWC decreases, up to 70% for IWC $= 0.05$ g m$^{-3}$. The cumulative frequency of the absolute errors (not shown) indicates that the absolute errors grow linearly as a function of IWC up to IWC $= 1.8$ g m$^{-3}$, above which they tend to be constant at less than 0.5 g m$^{-3}$ for 45% of the time and less than 1 g m$^{-3}$ about 80% of the time.

It is also important to characterize the errors as a function of the reflectivity itself, since that is the way IWC is retrieved from (1). Figures 3c,d show that for $Z_{95} < 15$ dBZ, there is a systematic underestimation of IWC by about 10%–20%, with rms differences decreasing linearly from 70% at $Z_{95} = 0$ dBZ to 30% for $Z_{95} = 15$ dBZ. For $Z_{95} > 15$ dBZ, the bias then sharply increases from $-10\%$ to about $50\%$ between 15 and 21 dBZ, and the rms differences range from 30% to 55% in that reflectivity range. As observed in Fig. 2, these
larger IWC errors for $Z_{95} > 17 \text{ dBZ}$ can be attributed to strong departures from the power-law shape in the joint IWC–$Z_{95}$ distribution.

An important implication of this result is that although the errors are larger for $Z_{95} > 17 \text{ dBZ}$, non-Rayleigh scattering effects at the W band in that reflectivity range do not alter the accuracy of the IWC retrieval to a point that IWC cannot be retrieved. This indicates that ice crystals contributing to producing high IWC are not of a size large enough to induce large non-Rayleigh scattering effects. Matrosov and Heymsfield (2008) suggest that these errors can be reduced by using $Z_{95} > 0 \text{ dBZ}$ data only. Nevertheless, we found that the power-law shape was not suitable to reducing errors at high reflectivities. So we developed a nonlinear fit expressed as $\log(\text{IWC}) = aZ_{95}^{b} + c$ instead. The fit to the data yielded the following relationship:

$$\log(\text{IWC}) = 0.1564Z_{95}^{0.753} - 1.01,$$

with $Z_{95} > 0 \text{ dBZ}$.

This fit is shown in Fig. 2 (dashed line). The error analysis as a function of reflectivity (Fig. 4, dashed red) shows that IWCs retrieved using relationship (2) are slightly overestimated (bias less than 20% over the $[0; 10] \text{ dBZ range}$) $Z_{95} < 10 \text{ dBZ}$, with a similar rms.
difference for the results from relationship (1). The main benefit, as expected, is in the large improvement in the IWC retrieval for $Z_{95}$ when compared to relationship (1) (cf. solid and dashed red lines in Fig. 4). The IWC retrieval bias is less than 10% up to $Z_{95} = 19$ dBZ, and increases up to only 25% at $Z_{95} = 21$ dBZ, which is a factor of 2 lower than when using relationship (1) (Fig. 4b). The rms difference decreases linearly from 65% to 20% between 0 and 20 dBZ, then increases sharply and up to 35% at $Z_{95} = 21$ dBZ (Fig. 4), which is again a large improvement over relationship (1), where the rms difference was up to 55% for $Z_{95} = 21$ dBZ.

When using IWC–$Z_{95}$ relationships to retrieve IWC from $Z_{95}$, it is assumed implicitly that the radar calibration is perfect. As indicated above, we believe from our calibration work that the RASTA cloud radar calibration is accurate to within 1 dB. The effect of a
systematic 1-dB offset on the IWC retrieval can simply be estimated by fitting two power-law relationships such as (1) with 1 dB added or subtracted from the measured reflectivities, resulting in biases of +19% and −16%, respectively, over the whole reflectivity range. If the RASTA radar calibration is off by 1 dB, the IWCs produced using relationship (1) will be subject to this additional bias.

4. The variability of the IWC–Z₉₅ relationship

In this section, we investigate two possible sources of the variability in the IWC–Z₉₅ relationship shown in Fig. 2: the ambient temperature and the location within the convective cloud system (convective versus stratiform region). The underlying motivation for this variability study is to potentially use these parameters as additional constraints to the radar retrieval of IWC to reduce errors. It would have also been interesting to investigate the variability introduced by the underlying surface type (land versus ocean); however, too few cases of pure land-based convection were sampled during the HAIC–HIWC campaign. We also compare in this section the obtained relationships with tropical relationships found elsewhere in the literature.

a. Temperature variability

The IWC–Z₉₅ relationships derived in Hogan et al. (2006) and P07 were found to vary with temperature. In contrast, MH08 did not report a large temperature variability in their dataset. Recently, F14 demonstrated using tropical anvil datasets that this variability could be very different for different m(D) assumptions applied to the same PSD dataset, highlighting that previous studies may have overlooked this potential problem. Using their retrieved m(D) and T-matrix calculations of radar reflectivity employing measured particle size distributions and ice crystal aspect ratios as inputs, F14 showed that errors in IWC could be reduced by 9%–12% with temperature-dependent IWC–Z₉₅ relationships. However, there was no bulk IWC measurement to constrain the F14 datasets. Therefore, the HAIC–HIWC dataset again provides an unprecedented opportunity to directly measure (without any microphysical assumption) and analyze the variability of the IWC–Z₉₅ relationship with temperature. The number of samples collected at each temperature level during the HAIC–HIWC experiment is given in Fig. 5f. This figure shows that over 1000 samples were collected at each temperature level from −50° to −10°C, and the largest number of samples was collected in the [−45°C; −35°C] layer (over 12 000 samples). The variability of the joint IWC–Z₉₅ distribution with temperature is shown in the other panels of Fig. 5, where the HAIC–HIWC data between −55° and −5°C have been reorganized into 10°C bins. The following IWC–Z₉₅ relationship was then derived from the whole HAIC–HIWC dataset:

\[
IWC = 10^{a(T)Z_{95} + b(T)},
\]

\[
a(T) = 1.173 \times 10^{-6} T^3 + 0.000109T^2 + 0.003152T + 0.1075, \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
b(T) = -1.071 \times 10^{-3} T^3 - 0.001127T^2 - 0.04505T - 1.606,
\]

where T is the temperature (°C). A third-order polynomial was required to adequately fit the a(T) and b(T) coefficients. Different possible functional forms of the a(T) and b(T) coefficients were tested, and those above provided the best error statistics. The IWC–Z₉₅ relationship obtained by using (3)–(5) and the central temperature value of each temperature interval are shown in each panel of Fig. 5 (colored lines). The temperature variability of the IWC–Z₉₅ relationship is found to be largest in the 0 dBZ < Z₉₅ < 13 dBZ range, with IWC systematically larger for a given Z₉₅ at lower temperatures in this reflectivity range. In contrast, for IWCs larger than about 2 g m⁻³, Fig. 5 shows that the IWC–Z₉₅ fit does a better or similar job at fitting the joint IWC–Z₉₅ distribution, suggesting that temperature does not add any value for the retrieval of IWCs larger than 2 g m⁻³. In general, as the temperature drops lower, the shape of the joint IWC–Z₉₅ distribution departs more strongly from the power-law shape, especially in the T = −50° ± 5°C interval. Finally, we see that the joint distributions of IWC and Z₉₅ are narrower in each temperature interval (Fig. 5) than when all temperatures are included (Fig. 2). This clearly indicates that a large part of the variability observed in Fig. 2 can indeed be attributed to temperature.

This large variability of the IWC–Z₉₅ relationship with temperature suggests that the ratio of the number of large ice particles to medium/small ice particles changes with temperature, thereby changing the relationship between IWC (less sensitive to the large particles than Z₉₅) and Z₉₅ (very sensitive to the size of the larger ice particles). This is investigated further in Fig. 6, which shows the mean PSD for all HAIC–HIWC flights in the same 10°C temperature intervals as in Fig. 5. The temperature variability of the PSD is characterized by two main signatures. Both signatures are consistent with small ice particle formation and growth through water vapor deposition processes dominating in the upper troposphere, followed by the aggregation process dominating during particle sedimentation at warmer temperatures in convective ice clouds (e.g.,
Fig. 5. As in Fig. 2, but for different temperature slabs: (a) $-50^\circ + \pm 5^\circ$ C, (b) $-40^\circ + \pm 5^\circ$ C, (c) $-30^\circ + \pm 5^\circ$ C, (d) $-20^\circ + \pm 5^\circ$ C, and (e) $-10^\circ + \pm 5^\circ$ C. The solid black line is the overall IWC–$Z_{\text{eff}}$ fit, and the colored lines in each panel are the individual fits in each temperature slab. The solid red line is the mean IWC in each reflectivity bin. (f) The number of samples vs temperature using all profiles (solid), convective profiles (dotted), and stratiform profiles (dashed).

Protat et al. 2010b). The first signature is a strong increase in the number of large ice particles in the 2–8-mm maximum diameter range as temperature increases. The second signature is a decrease of similar magnitude in the number of ice particles smaller than 1 mm, with the exception of the $-10^\circ + \pm 5^\circ$ C temperature interval, where a very interesting increase in the number of particles smaller than 0.1 mm is observed, which may be an important result.
that can help us to understand the formation of high-IWC regions. This enhancement of the number of small particles may be the result of an efficient secondary ice production mechanism, such as that described by Hallett and Mossop (1974), where ice splinters are produced under certain conditions in a temperature window of −8° to −5°C. Ice crystal growth from supercooled liquid water lifted in ice phase by the convective updraft also potentially contributes to this increase in the number concentration of ice crystals of maximum diameter less than 0.1 mm. These processes will be investigated in more detail in a subsequent study, and are outside the scope of this paper. The main finding in Fig. 6 relevant to our understanding of the variability of the IWC–Z\textsubscript{95} relationship with temperature is that the proportion of large to small particles increases with increasing temperature, implying lower IWCs for the same Z\textsubscript{95} at warmer temperatures. This is fully consistent with the observed variability of the IWC–Z\textsubscript{95} relationship with temperature in Fig. 5, as well as early studies (e.g., Heymsfield et al. 2013).

As observed in Fig. 7, where the IWC–Z\textsubscript{95}–T relationship is superimposed every 10°C onto the initial overall joint distribution of Z\textsubscript{95} and IWC, a large part of the variability in the joint frequency distribution is captured by the spread in the IWC–Z\textsubscript{95} relationships for different temperatures. Figures 3a and 3b show that there is indeed a measurable improvement of about 15% in bias for IWC > 1 g m\textsuperscript{−3} and a slight improvement of about 5% in the rms difference for 0.8 g m\textsuperscript{−3} < IWC < 2 g m\textsuperscript{−3} when using temperature as an additional constraint. Overall, Fig. 3 shows that IWC can be retrieved from (1) with a bias of less than 20% and an rms difference of less than 40% for IWC > 0.5 g m\textsuperscript{−3}.

The IWC errors as a function of reflectivity (Figs. 3c,d) show that there is indeed an improvement in the IWC bias when using temperature (biases are less than ±5%), but only up to Z\textsubscript{95} = 16 dBZ (corresponding to a mean IKP2 IWC of about 2 g m\textsuperscript{−3}). For Z\textsubscript{95} > 16 dBZ, the bias and rms difference get slightly larger when using temperature as an additional constraint. As discussed previously, this is due to non-Rayleigh scattering effects altering the relationship between IWC and Z\textsubscript{95} at large Z\textsubscript{95}. Figure 4 also indicates that relationship (2), derived using a nonlinear fit applied to data with Z\textsubscript{95} > 0 dBZ, largely outperforms the IWC–Z\textsubscript{95}–T relationship (3). This result shows that the temperature constraint is actually detrimental to the IWC retrieval for Z\textsubscript{95} > 16 dBZ.

The added value of using temperature as an additional constraint depends on the temperature layer and the reflectivity value (Figs. 8–12). There is a clear difference in the errors for reflectivities lower and larger than about 15–16 dBZ, so we will describe the errors for the two reflectivity ranges [0, 16] dBZ and [16, 21] dBZ separately. As discussed previously, this is due to the growing impact of non-Rayleigh scattering on the shape of the IWC–Z\textsubscript{95} relationship. We will first describe how the errors vary as a function of temperature for the IWC–Z\textsubscript{95} relationship (1) and, then, analyze to what extent temperature helps reduce those errors.

For Z\textsubscript{95} < 15–16 dBZ, relationship (1) produces negative IWC biases for low temperatures and positive biases for warmer temperatures. The IWC bias goes from −40% to −20% at T = −50° ± 5°C (Fig. 8) and to −20% at T = −40° ± 5°C (Fig. 9); it then reaches an overall minimum of ±10% at T = −30° ± 5°C (Fig. 10), before increasing to peak overestimations of 20%–40% for T = −20° ± 5°C in the [0, 5] dBZ and [10, 15] dBZ reflectivity intervals. The IWC bias is then largest at T = −10° ± 5°C, reaching peaks of 60%–80% for Z\textsubscript{95} < 9 dBZ. When using the nonlinear fit (2) between log(IWC) and Z\textsubscript{95}, which was designed to produce a better retrieval for large IWC (dashed red curves in Figs. 8–12), the IWC bias and rms difference at Z\textsubscript{95} < 15–16 dBZ are degraded when compared with results obtained with relationship (1), except for low temperatures, where some improvement is observed (Figs. 8 and 9). In contrast, when using temperature as an additional constraint for Z\textsubscript{95} < 15–16 dBZ (black curves in Figs. 8–12), the IWC bias remains small (<20%) at all temperature intervals, and much smaller than when using the IWC–Z\textsubscript{95} relationship, except for the temperature interval T = −30° ± 5°C, where temperature does not have much impact. In terms of rms differences, Figs. 8–12 show that there is a general improvement of about 5% in all individual temperature bins for Z\textsubscript{95} < 15–16 dBZ.
Figure 4 showed that the use of temperature as an additional constraint was overall slightly detrimental to the IWC retrieval for $Z_{95} > 16$ dBZ. Figures 8–12 further indicate that there is a compensating effect between the largely detrimental effects at low temperatures and the added value at warmer temperatures. The detrimental effect for $Z_{95}$ is indeed only found at lower temperatures [especially $T = -50° \pm 5°C$ (Fig. 8) and $T = -40° \pm 5°C$ (Fig. 9)]. In these two temperature bins, it is therefore recommended to use IWC–$Z_{95}$ relationships (1) or (2), not the temperature-dependent relationship (3). Using temperature has very little impact on the IWC retrieval at $T = -30° \pm 5°C$, while at warmer temperatures ($T = -20° \pm 5°C$ and $T = -10° \pm 5°C$), the use of temperature does improve the IWC bias and rms difference. Relationship (3) even performs at the same level or slightly better than the nonlinear relationship (2), which was designed for better high IWC retrieval.

In conclusion the addition of the temperature constraint in the IWC–$Z_{95}$–$T$ relationship (3) is overall largely beneficial, except when $Z_{95}$ is larger than 16 dBZ for temperatures lower than $-25°C$. It is advised to use the nonlinear relationship (2) between log(IWC) and $Z_{95}$ in that case.

b. Convective–stratiform variability

Convective and stratiform regions of tropical deep convective cloud storms are known to be characterized by different drop size distributions [e.g., Bringi et al. (2009), Thurai et al. (2010), and Penide et al. (2013a) for the Darwin region] and ice particle size distributions.
These convective and stratiform regions can be classified with ground-based weather radars using indices derived from reflectivity [magnitude, texture, presence of so-called radar bright band below the 0°C isotherm altitude; e.g., Steiner et al. (1995)] or from the retrieval of the drop size distribution parameters if the radar has dual-polarization capabilities (e.g., Thurair et al. 2010; Penide et al. 2013). It is therefore of interest to investigate whether some of the variability of the IWC–$Z_{95}$ relationship is due to microphysical differences between convective and stratiform regions. Overall, the convective region is characterized by updrafts and downdrafts routinely exceeding 5–10 m s$^{-1}$ above the melting layer in tropical convective cores (e.g., May and Rajopadhyaya 1999; May et al. 2002; G. M. Heymsfield et al. 2010; Giangrande et al. 2013) while the stratiform region is characterized by a slight updraft in ice phase and slight downdraft in liquid phase, generally not exceeding a few tens of centimeters per second [e.g., Protat and Williams (2011) for the Darwin region; Gamache and Houze 1982; Chong et al. 1987; Nishi et al. 2007]. To separate the RASTA cloud radar profiles into convective and stratiform profiles, we have developed a simple convective index based on the maximum of the drafts. The RASTA cloud radar multibeam measurements allow for the vertical profile of the two horizontal wind components and the sum of the vertical velocity $w$ and reflectivity-weighted terminal velocity $V_T$ to be retrieved using the three noncollinear Doppler velocity measurements as inputs into a multi-Doppler ground-based radar retrieval technique adapted to the airborne configuration [technique described in Protat and Zawadzki (1999); Collis et al. (2013)]. The criterion we use is that if ($V_T + w$) is greater than 1 m s$^{-1}$ or smaller than $-3$ m s$^{-1}$ for at least 1 km in height above the 0°C isotherm altitude (i.e., in ice phase), then the cloud radar profile is classified as convective. Otherwise, it is classified as stratiform.

Joint frequency distributions of $Z_{95}$ and IWC derived using the convective and stratiform profiles from all HAIC–HIWC flights are shown in Figs. 13a and 13b, respectively. Again, power-law relationships are also fitted to the joint frequency distributions to produce IWC–$Z_{95}$ relationships:

$$\text{convective IWC} = 0.152 Z_{95}^{0.715} \quad \text{and} \quad (6)$$

$$\text{stratiform IWC} = 0.103 Z_{95}^{0.749}. \quad (7)$$

From Fig. 13, it is clearly observed that for any given $Z_{95}$, IWC is systematically larger for convective profiles than for stratiform profiles. For instance, for $Z_{95} = 20$ dBZ, the mean IWC is 4.1 g m$^{-3}$ in convective profiles and 3.2 g m$^{-3}$ in stratiform profiles (~25% increase...
in IWC). A much higher frequency of occurrence of IWC >
2 g m⁻³ is also found in the convective profiles. Differences
between convective PSDs and stratiform PSDs (Fig. 6)
provide further insights into the microphysical processes
involved in the large differences observed between the two
IWC–Z₉₅ relationships. Figure 6 shows that convective
profiles are characterized by a much larger number of
particles of maximum diameter up to about 2 mm than
stratiform profiles (an order of magnitude difference for
Dₘ₃ × 0.1 mm), while the number of large particles is
similar. This is consistent with larger IWCs for a given
Z₉₅ in convective profiles. This large difference in the number of
smaller particles in convective profiles suggests again that
the production of small ice in convective updrafts through
secondary ice formation–multiplication has the potential to
generate areas of high IWC with moderate
Z₉₅.

Error analysis of IWC derived from the convective
IWC–Z₉₅ and IWC–Z₉₅–T relationships (Fig. 14)
shows that the bias and rms difference as a function of Z₉₅
are very similar with or without temperature for Z₉₅ >
9 dBZ, and the IWC bias is larger when using temperature
for Z₉₅ < 9 dBZ (Figs. 14a,b). Figures 14a,b show
that the nonlinear relationship (2) between log(IWC)
and Z₉₅ produces the best error statistics overall, with
IWC biases less than ±20% over the [2, 21] dBZ range,
and rms differences decreasing from about 80% at Z₉₅ =
0 dBZ down to 20%–30% for Z₉₅ > 15 dBZ.

Error analysis of IWC derived from the stratiform
IWC–Z₉₅ relationship (7) (Fig. 15) shows that the use
of temperature is beneficial to the IWC retrieval.
Relationship (3) indeed outperforms relationships (1)
and (2), with an IWC bias of less than ±10% over the
whole reflectivity range and rms differences reduced
by about 5%–10%, except for Z₉₅ > 16 dBZ, where
relationships (1) and (2) slightly outperform the
temperature-dependent relationship (3). Using
relationship (3), the rms difference decreases linearly
from 60% at Z₉₅ = 0 dBZ to 30% at Z₉₅ = 15 dBZ,
then, is of about 25%–35% for Z₉₅ > 15 dBZ.

Overall, this analysis shows that the nonlinear re-
relationship (2) between log(IWC) and Z₉₅ should be used
for convective profiles, and the temperature-dependent
relationship (3) should be used for stratiform profiles.
There is a large reduction of errors in stratiform IWC
retrieval when temperature is used as a constraint, ex-
cept for the bias in IWCs

0.8 g m⁻³. The use of tem-
perature yields improvement in bias by about 10% for
IWCs > 0.8 g m⁻³ and in rms difference by about 30%
for stratiform profiles over the whole IWC range.

3. Comparison with published IWC–Z₉₅ relationships

The IWC–Z₉₅ relationships from the HAIC–HIWC
field experiment are for the first time derived from ac-
tual measurements of both IWC (including high values)
and $Z_{95}$. It is therefore appropriate to compare these new relationships with those developed previously in the literature to assess their accuracy, as these earlier relationships have already been extensively used to derive IWC and build cloud climatologies from satellite measurements (e.g., Delanoë and Hogan 2010; Mace 2010; Deng et al. 2013), and to evaluate the representation of cloud microphysics in numerical weather prediction models (e.g., Illingworth et al. 2007; Bouniol et al. 2010; Delanoë et al. 2011). Below, we describe how these earlier tropical relationships were derived and compare them with the new HAIC–HIWC relationships.

The following relationships have been found in the tropical ice cloud literature: from Fontaine et al. (2014),

\begin{align}
\text{IWC} &= 0.098Z_{m95}^{0.305} \quad \text{and} \quad (8) \\
\text{IWC} &= 0.087Z_{m95}^{0.775}, \quad (9)
\end{align}

from A. J. Heymsfield et al. (2010),

\begin{align}
\text{IWC} &= 0.110Z_{m95}^{0.664} \quad \text{and} \quad (10) \\
\text{IWC} &= 0.240Z_{m95}^{0.664}, \quad (11)
\end{align}

from Matrosov and Heymsfield (2008),

\begin{align}
\text{IWC} &= 0.086Z_{m95}^{0.920} \quad , \quad (12)
\end{align}

and, from Protat et al. (2007),

\begin{align}
\text{IWC} &= 0.149Z_{m95}^{0.681} \quad \text{and} \quad (13) \\
\text{IWC} &= 0.198Z_{m95}^{0.701}, \quad (14)
\end{align}

Data used to derive the F14 relationships were collected almost exclusively in the stratiform region of deep tropical convective clouds over land [West Africa; (8)] and over the Indian Ocean [Maldives; (9)]. The same instrumentation and aircraft platform were used during these and the HAIC–HIWC campaigns, except that there was no bulk IWC measurement available for F14. The relationships (8) and (9) were obtained by constraining the power-law $m(D)$ relationship with $Z_{95}$ and in situ microphysical probe PSD measurements.

The H10 relationship (10) was obtained in convectively generated ice clouds during the Cirrus Regional Study of Tropical Anvils and Cirrus Layers–Florida-Area Cirrus Experiment (CRYSTAL-FACE; Jensen et al. 2004) and Tropical Composition, Cloud and Climate Coupling (TC4; Toon et al. 2010) tropical field experiments, which were carried out in Florida and Costa Rica, respectively. From these data a single $m(D)$ relationship was derived using PSD measurements and closure with bulk IWC measurements, and $Z_{95}$ has been simulated from the PSD measurements using Mie calculations. Mostly tropical cirrus clouds generated by deep convection were measured during these experiments. Relationship (12) was also derived in MH08 from the CRYSTAL-FACE dataset and with the same technique as that presented in H10. However, only $Z_{95} > 0$ dBZ data were included in the IWC–$Z_{95}$ power-law fit. Relationship (11) from H10 uses the same technique applied to the NASA African Monsoon Multidisciplinary Analyses (NAMMA; Zipser et al. 2009) dataset. Most data were collected in tropical stratiform clouds and in the vicinity of deep tropical convective cores off the coast of West Africa.

Finally the P07 relationships (13) and (14) were obtained from a very large dataset of PSD measurements compiled from several campaigns conducted in the midlatitudes and in the tropics. This dataset includes a large variety of ice clouds, from thin cirrus to stratiform ice. The Brown and Francis (1995) $m(D)$ relationship was assumed for all clouds. The quantity $Z_{95}$ was calculated from the PSD measurements assuming spherical particles, but with a refractive index corrected following Oguchi (1983). Relationship (13) was obtained from the whole dataset, while relationship (14) was obtained using only the tropical data. These relationships are all displayed in linear (Fig. 16a) and logarithmic (Fig. 16b) scales, together...
with the HAIC–HIWC relationships: in (1) for all profiles, in (6) for convective profiles, and in (7) for stratiform profiles. Each relationship is drawn only within the IWC range that was used to derive them, either simulated from the PSDs or measured by a bulk IWC probe. Interestingly, the convective and stratiform relationships derived from the HAIC–HIWC dataset are bounded by the H10 relationships (10) and (11). For $Z_{95} > 10 \text{ dBZ}$, the lowest IWCs are produced by relationship (10), which indicates that the IWCs in tropical cirrus are much lower for a given $Z_{95}$ than IWCs closer to the convective cores. Using the equivalent-melted diameter $D_{eq}$ as the definition of the diameter of the ice crystals (e.g., Delanoë et al. 2005; Delanoë et al. 2014), $Z_{95}$ is proportional to a higher moment of the PSD (sixth moment under the Rayleigh scattering approximation, slightly lower and variable in non-Rayleigh scattering situations) than IWC (third moment), where the $n$th moment of the PSD is defined as $M_n = \int [N(D_{eq})D_{eq}^n] D_{eq} \, dD_{eq}$. In other words, IWC is less sensitive to size than $Z_{95}$. The observation of larger IWCs closer to the convective cores for a given $Z_{95}$ therefore indicates that the total number of ice particles is much larger near convective cores than in stratiform regions and cirrus layers detrained farther.
away from these convective cores. This has been validated in Fig. 6 for convective and stratiform profiles; however, not enough samples were collected in the cirrus layers to include tropical cirrus results in the present study. This systematically higher total number of small ice particles close to the convective cores for a given $Z_{95}$ is consistent with one of the main hypotheses put forth to explain the apparent lack of pilot awareness of impending ice crystal icing events, namely that a relatively small size of the ice crystals in a high-IWC environment would result in a low pilot X-band radar reflectivity that would be insufficient to warn of high-IWC conditions ahead, given the relatively high minimum threshold of a pilot radar (nominally 20 dBZ) (e.g., Mason et al. 2006).

It is also clearly observed in Fig. 16 that the F14 relationships (8) and (9) produce IWCs that are very similar to the general HAIC–HIWC relationship (1) and the stratiform HAIC–HIWC relationship (7), respectively. The F14 relationships were obtained in tropical stratiform anvils in two very different large-scale environments and over different underlying surfaces (end of the West African monsoon season over land vs weakly forced oceanic convection in the Indian Ocean). In practical terms, this result suggests that the variability of the IWC–$Z_{95}$ relationship in tropical stratiform anvils as a function of the underlying surface (land versus ocean) cannot be neglected and should be studied further. This is consistent with the reported morphological and microphysical differences of these stratiform regions along the tropical belt in Cetrone and Houze (2009).

In contrast, the P07 tropical relationship (14) is found to produce much larger IWCs than the HAIC–HIWC relationships, including the convective HAIC–HIWC relationship (6), although the dataset used in P07 does not include any measurement in convective clouds. This result suggests that the P07 relationship (14) likely overestimates IWC. This may be related to the use of the Brown and Francis (1995) $m(D)$ relationship, which was later found to overestimate the mass of ice crystals and to fail to capture dependences on temperature and particle size that are a result of the complex ice microphysical processes (H10). In contrast, the P07 relationship (13) obtained using the whole dataset including midlatitude stratiform ice clouds produces IWCs closer to the general HAIC–HIWC relationship (1) for $Z_{95} > 10$ dBZ, but produces much larger IWCs for $Z_{95} < 10$ dBZ [similar to the HAIC–HIWC convective relationship (6)]. This overestimation is also probably due to the choice of the Brown and Francis (1995) $m(D)$ relationship.

The only dataset other than HAIC–HIWC that includes data close to the convective cores is the NAMMA

![Fig. 14. As in Fig. 4, but for convective profiles.](image1)

![Fig. 15. As in Fig. 14, but for stratiform profiles.](image2)
dataset, although the maximum values reported in this experiment did not exceed 2 g m\(^{-3}\), possibly because of instrumental limitations. The IWC–\(Z_{95}\) relationship (11) derived from the NAMMA dataset appears to produce IWCs larger than the convective HAIC–HIWC relationship (6) in this IWC range.

MH08 only included reflectivities larger than 0 dBZ in an attempt to mitigate the departures from the power-law shape of the IWC–\(Z_{95}\) relationship when fitting a power law using the whole IWC range. As observed in Fig. 16, the MH08 relationship tends to produce lower IWCs than the general [(1)] and convective [(6)] HAIC–HIWC relationships for \(Z_{95} < 6\) dBZ and \(Z_{95} < 12\) dBZ, and produces consistent results with the HAIC–HIWC convective relationship (6) between 1 and 2 g m\(^{-3}\). However, the MH08 study does not include any IWC values larger than 2 g m\(^{-3}\). Extrapolating the MH08 relationship above 2 g m\(^{-3}\) is not recommended, as it would result in large overestimations of high IWCs. It is a major added
value of the HAIC–HIWC relationships that they are constrained with measured bulk IWC values exceeding 2 g m$^{-3}$.

5. The vertical distribution of IWC within and around tropical convective cores

One of the primary objectives of the HAIC–HIWC campaign is to characterize the microphysical properties of regions of high IWC produced by deep convective systems and the processes responsible for the formation and maintenance of these regions (Strapp et al. 2016a). Quantitative information about the 99th percentile of the IWC as a function of the distance scale will also be derived from the IKP2 reference IWC measurements at flight altitude in coming studies in order to validate a new ice crystal regulatory envelope (Government Printing Office 2010, appendix D; EASA 2011, appendix P) that has recently become law. The radar-derived IWC dataset has the potential to greatly expand the in situ TWC dataset collected by the IKP2 and therefore the amount of data possibly available for the assessment of the regulatory ice crystal envelope. Although the radar dataset has been demonstrated to contain increased uncertainty relative to in situ measurements, it is hoped that the much larger combined radar–in situ dataset may help reduce the statistical uncertainty of the results from an in situ–only analysis, as well as filling in additional altitudes that have been undersampled by in situ measurements as a result of practical limitations. Below, we examine some preliminary results of remotely detected IWCs from the RASTA radar as a demonstration of how such results could be used to augment in situ measurements after a careful analysis of the data suitability.

Vertical profiles of radar-derived IWCs at ~200-m scale from the HAIC–HIWC dataset matched with ambient temperatures from the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) reanalyses were assembled to characterize for the first time the vertical distribution (or temperature dependence) of high IWC in deep tropical convective clouds. Unlike the reference IKP2 probe, the RASTA airborne cloud radar measured radar reflectivity above and below the aircraft at 60-m vertical resolution, which allows for a first analysis of the vertical distribution of IWC in a high-IWC environment in our dataset over the whole troposphere. It must be noted that RASTA reflectivities are not corrected for attenuation to produce Fig. 17. Underestimations of IWC are therefore expected for vertical profiles that include graupel, in which W-band attenuation is expected to be large. However, graupel produce high X-band pilot radar reflectivity (30 dBZ or more), which does not correspond to HIWC conditions thought to cause engine events (e.g., Mason et al. 2006; Strapp et al. 2016a).

Errors associated with the use of ECMWF temperatures have also been estimated by comparing flight-level temperature measurements. The bias is 0.20°C and the rms difference is 0.74°C. When examining only the convective profiles (stratiform profiles), the bias and rms differences are 0.27°C and 0.77°C (0.19°C and 0.74°C), respectively. In light of these results, in order to estimate
the maximum IWC error due to temperature errors when using the IWC–Z<sub>95</sub>–T relationship, we have considered a maximum 1°C systematic overestimation, applied our relationship every 5°C in the interval from −10°C to −50°C with or without the overestimation, and picked the maximum error produced. The maximum IWC error was less than 3% over the [−10, 20] dBZ range. In other words, the ECMWF temperature errors translate into negligible errors on the IWC retrieval using the proposed IWC–Z<sub>95</sub>–T relationship.

The statistical distribution of radar-derived IWC as a function of temperature is shown in Fig. 17a. The results indicate that the probability of encountering large values of IWC increases with decreasing temperature up to −35°C. At −35°C, an IWC value of 4 g m<sup>−3</sup> was found in 1% of the samples. This frequency of occurrence then quickly dropped for temperatures colder than −35°C. Values of IWC exceeding 4 g m<sup>−3</sup> (5 g m<sup>−3</sup>) were not detected at all at temperatures of −50°C (−35°C) or colder in our radar dataset, which suggests that these values may be rare. Separating these probabilities for convective and stratiform profiles (Fig. 17) using the convective–stratiform separation technique described in section 3b, IWC values greater than 4 g m<sup>−3</sup> were exclusively found in convective profiles at all temperatures. IWC values greater than 3 g m<sup>−3</sup> were also almost exclusively found in convective profiles and at temperatures colder than −25°C. Interestingly, an enhanced frequency of high IWC at the level from −10°C to −5°C is also found in these convective profiles (Fig. 17b). This −10°C level is known to be important for microphysical growth processes, including ice particle growth from supercooled liquid water in convective updrafts and potentially ice multiplication–splintering through the Hallett–Mossop process (Hallett and Mossop 1974) and other secondary ice formation mechanisms. As discussed previously, PSDs in the −10°C layer are clearly characterized by a large increase in the number of ice crystals smaller than 0.1 mm (Fig. 6), which is consistent with secondary ice production in that specific layer.

The highest priority temperature interval for the aviation regulatory interests is the −50°C ± 5°C interval (Strapp et al. 2016a), as it corresponds to the typical cruise altitude for many commercial aircraft. At the −50°C level our radar IWC statistics indicate that values greater than approximately 1.5 g m<sup>−3</sup> were only found in convective profiles (according to the radar retrievals) during the Darwin 2014 HAIC–HIWC experiment. Practically, this important result suggests that future research should focus on developing convective–stratiform indices from geostationary satellites to detect high IWC and mitigate the high-IWC threat to civil aviation at this flight level.

The IWC statistics of the −50°C ± 5°C temperature interval derived from the entirety of the radar-derived IWC profiles are next compared to radar-derived IWCs at flight level from only the −50°C ± 5°C temperature interval flight segments, using the same IWC–Z<sub>95</sub> relationship. Assuming that there is no bias in the nature of the flight segments executed at the other levels relative to those at −50°C (i.e., the clouds and cloud regions sampled at other altitudes are similar to those comprising the −50°C in situ dataset), and that there are no unidentified range-dependent errors in the radar IWC estimates, the differences in IWC PDFs are most likely due simply to the number of samples. Figure 18 shows the PDFs of IWC as a function of temperature for this temperature interval. The solid lines in Fig. 18 are the PDFs derived from the whole vertical profiles of IWC, and the dashed lines are the PDFs derived from the radar-derived IWCs at flight altitude. The flight-level PDFs are found to match the reference PDFs well down to the 0.1% frequency level, with a slight overestimation of the frequency of occurrence of IWCs of 2–3 g m<sup>−3</sup> in
the convective profiles, along with an underestimation of the frequency of IWCs larger than 0.7 g m\(^{-3}\) in the stratiform profiles. Figure 18a–c also show that the PDFs at flight level are truncated at frequencies lower than about 0.1%. Since the regulatory objective is to derive 99th percentile values of IWC, this example analysis would suggest that the HAIC–HIWC in situ dataset should be sufficient to achieve this goal.

6. Conclusions

Unprecedented bulk measurements of ice water content up to about 5 g m\(^{-3}\) collocated with 95-GHz radar reflectivities were used in this study to analyze the IWC–Z\(_{95}\) relationship and its variability as a function of temperature and the nature of convection (convective vs stratiform). The unique aspect of this work is that, unlike past studies, these relationships do not include any assumptions about the statistical relationship between crystal mass and maximum dimension or any errors arising from scattering calculations of Z\(_{95}\) from particle size distributions. It is also the first study to include measured IWC values greater than about 2 g m\(^{-3}\) and up to about 5 g m\(^{-3}\).

Our results indicated that using a single power-law IWC–Z\(_{95}\) relationship allows for the radar retrieval of IWC with \((10\%–30\%)\) bias and \(40\%–70\%\) rms difference, depending on IWC. The IWC is also found to be underestimated by about \(10\%–20\%\) for reflectivities lower than 15 dBZ, but is largely overestimated for reflectivities larger than 15 dBZ, which is attributed to non-Rayleigh scattering effects distorting the relationship between IWC and Z\(_{95}\) at large Z\(_{95}\). A nonlinear relationship between log(IWC) and Z\(_{95}\) has therefore been developed, which allows for IWC retrievals with biases less than \(20\%\) and rms differences of \(20\%–35\%\) for Z\(_{95}\) \(>15\) dBZ.

We then showed that the temperature variability of the IWC–Z\(_{95}\) relationship was large and that temperature could be used as an additional constraint to further reduce uncertainties on radar-derived IWCs, except when Z \(>16\) dBZ for temperatures lower than \(-25^\circ\)C, where the nonlinear relationship between log(IWC) and Z\(_{95}\) largely outperforms the temperature-dependent relationship. This variability with temperature has been clearly linked to and is consistent with the natural temperature variability of PSDs measured during the HAIC–HIWC campaign. Our variability study also shows that the nonlinear relationship (2) between log(IWC) and Z\(_{95}\) should be used for convective profiles, and the temperature-dependent relationship (3) should be used for stratiform profiles to minimize IWC retrieval errors.

The radar results will be combined with those from a second just-completed flight program, and then examined for suitability in augmenting in situ IWC data collected for a future assessment of new aircraft certification rules for flight in ice crystals. Some preliminary results from the Darwin flight campaign related to these aviation objectives are reported upon here. Using all profiles collected during the field experiment (72 flight hours), a joint frequency distribution of radar-derived IWC and temperature within and around deep tropical convective cores was constructed. The results showed that IWC values greater than 4 g m\(^{-3}\) on \(\sim200\)-m-distance scales were exclusively found in convective profiles at all temperatures, and IWC values greater than 3 g m\(^{-3}\) were also almost exclusively found in convective profiles and at temperatures colder than \(-25^\circ\)C. At the \(-50^\circ\)C level, which is the cruise level of many commercial jet aircraft, IWC values greater than 1.5 g m\(^{-3}\) were exclusively found in convective profiles during the HAIC–HIWC experiment. This result suggests that future efforts should be directed toward the development of a convective–stratiform index from geostationary satellites in order to detect and mitigate this type of high-IWC threat to civil aviation at this flight level. Nevertheless, it must be noted that recent analyses have highlighted that in-service engine events are most often associated with traverses across large convective anvils, suggesting that long exposures to moderate values of IWC may be as important as short exposures to high IWC. More studies will be needed to address this potentially different type of HIWC environment.
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