



The Limb Adjustment of the TROPICS Microwave Sounder Constellation and MORE!!

Mitch Goldberg, CCNY D.Li (CCNY), P. Heidary (CCNY), S. Kalluri (NESDIS), Lihang Zhou (NESDIS) May 8, 2025

Many thanks to Joe Munchak (Tomorrow.IO) and Bill Blackwell (MIT/LL)

25th International TOVS Study Conference (ITSC-25) 8th - 14th May 2025 Goa, India Wednesday 7th May 2025

AP NORTH AND A DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY OF T





The MORE: Retrieval Comparisons between



Figures >>Courtesy of Ben Johnson and Isaac Moradi





Motivation

- The proliferation of smallsat microwave constellation is now.
- How well do these constellations compare with ATMS?
- How many do we need for weather forecasting vs nowcasting?
- What noise performance is needed for weather forecasting (NWP)?
- For nowcasting applications, we need to limb adjust.
- For NWP, we need impact studies
- Can we compare different sensor performance using retrievals, if the retrieval methodology is identical?





Microwave imagery is widely used by forecasters



New GCOM AMSR2's large swath and excellent spatial resolution aids JTWC in monitoring Typhoon Fitow near Okinawa and Taiwan straits via 89 GHz brightness temperature imagery

1330 LTAN greatly augments existing constellation TEMPORAL sampling, but much more needed to have sampling similar to geostationary imagery





👬 tomorrow.

Recent Progress in CubeSat Microwave Sounding





From Joe Munchak 4/23/2025



All GPM + TMS Observations 2025-04-23 0300Z-0400Z





TROPICS S3





TROPICS Limb Adjustment is based on Goldberg, M.D., D.S. Crosby, and L. Zhou, 2001: The limb adjustment of AMSU-A observations: methodology and validation , Journal Appl. Meteor, 40, 70-83. https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/apme/40/1/1520-0450_2001_040_0070_tlaoaa_2.0.co_2.xml





Original Brightness Temperature

Limb Adjusted Brightness Temperature















TROPICS S3









TROPICS S6 minus S3 – Double Difference



ch 10 - 186.51 GHz S6 minus S3 Double Difference Brightness Temperature July 21-31,2023



ch 12 - 204.8 GHz S6 minus S3 Double Difference Brightness Temperature July 21-31,2023





Channel 18: SNPP ATMS Limb Adjusted Antenna Temperature - Sept 4 2024 Descending

Typhoon Yagi

TMS S2

Typhoon Yagi

The City College Typhoon Yagi- September 4, 2025

9 GMT



of New York





Channel 12, 204.8 GHz: Hour 14 TROPICS 56 Original Antenna Temperature - Sept 5 2024 Typhoon Yaqi





NOAA20

Channel 12, 204.8 GHz: Hour 23 TROPICS S6 Original Antenna Temperature - Sept 5 20







204.8 GHz: TMS S2 Limb Adjusted Antenna Temperature - Sept 4 2024 Ascend Typhoon Yagi



nel 12, 204.8 GHz: Hour 2 TROPICS S3 Limb Adjusted Antenna Ter erature - Sept 4 Channel 12, 204.8 GHz: Hour 10 TROPICS S3 Limb Adjusted Antenna Temperature - Sept 4 2024 Typhoon Yaqi









220 5 200

280 260

240 😰 220 🗟

200





3 GMT

9 GMT







With a large constellation, imagine every 30 minutes instead of these daily animations





of New York Sensor comparisons

- For this experiment we compare ATMS, TMS, AWS/PFM
- Compare weighting functions and instrumental noise
- Developed an independent method to estimate instrumental noise
- For all sensors we use the same time period. We use 3/21 to 3/30/2025
- We use the data collection period to generate limb adjustments, similar to the methodology first developed by Goldberg et al.(2000) for AMSU and updated by Zhang et al (2017) for ATMS.
 - <u>https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/2017JD02</u> 6820
- Note AWS has 145 fovs per scanline. We skipped every other one (72), we ran one experiment averaging a 3x3 center for each primary 72 fov to reduce noise and assess the impact
- Retrievals are based on polynomial regression.



Example of ATMS\TMS Limb Adjustment – Temperature Channel

- 245

240

235

- 225

- 220

250

245

240

230

225

235 8



The City College

of New York

LC NOAA20 ATMS Channel 7 March 28, 2025



Tomorrow.IO TMS2 Original BT March 2025 (Ascending, Day 28) - Channel 4 - 270 60 N 260 30 N 250 🕎 € ₂₃₀ € EQ В 240 30S 230 60S 905 - 200 180W 120W 60W 60E 120E 0 180E

Tomorrow.IO TMS2 LC (real) BT March 2025 (Ascending, Day 28) - Channel 4





Example of ATMS/AWS Limb Adjustment - Temperature Channel

250

245

240

230

225

235 2



The City College

of New York

LC NOAA20 ATMS Channel 7 March 28, 2025



AWS PFM Brightness Temperature March 2025 (Ascending, Day 28) - Channel 5 - 245 60N 240 - 240 30N 235 235 Ξ 230 8 EQ 230 亩 305 225 225 60S 220 - 220 120W 60W 60E 120E 180E 0

AWS PFM Limb Corrected BT March 2025 (Ascending, Day 28) - Channel 5







Example of ATMS\TMS Limb Adjustment – Water Vapor Channel







Example of ATMS\AWS Limb Adjustment – Water Vapor channel









Courtesy of Ben Johnson and Isaac Moradi







Noise estimation

- Independently estimated noise, by only selecting data over ocean, total column rain water (tcrw) =0 and total cloud cover < 0.2 and within latitude range of -30 to 30. And computing the square root of the sum of the squared differences between adjacent scanlines as a function of spot (fov) number and then divide by square root of 2.
- Notice ATMS noise is so much better than the specification.











Temperature channels



The AWS channels similar to ATMS channels have higher noise







Water Vapor Channels







Retrieval Methodology

- Trained against ECMWF Reanalysis for period of March 21 to 27, and apply to March 28, 2025
- Polynomial regression, 2nd order for temperature and 3rd order for water vapor works extremely well – compares to unsupervised neural nets with 3 hidden layers (64,128,64) learning rate .0001 and 50 epochs iterations.
- Polynomial regression is much faster to run different experiments.
- For temperature we found using limb adjusted data is much better.







NO LIMB ADJ.

With LIMB ADJ.





NO LIMB ADJ.



Water Vapor With LIMB ADJ.







ERA5 Level 16, 500.0 hPa Pol3rd LC Sine/LSM/SFCP/ NOAA20 ATMS March 2025 (obs time.day == 28) (asc flag == 1) & (Ism == 0/1) (abs(lat) < 90) ;training2127 90 N 270 ERA5 60 N 265 260 30 N 255 - ²⁵⁰ 😪 EQ 245 30S - 240 235 60S 230 90S 120W 120E 180W 60W 0 60E 180E

Retrieval Level 16, 500.0 hPa



180W 120W 60W 60E 120E Ó 180E

Retrieval Level 16, 500.0 hPa Pol3rd LC Sine/LSM/SFCP/ NOAA20 ATMS March 2025 (obs time.day == 28) (asc flag == 1) & (lsm == 0/1) (abs(lat) < 90) ;training2127 90N - 270 ATMS 60N 30N EQ



Retrieval Level 16, 500.0 hPa Pol2nd Sine/LSM/SFCP TO.TMS2 March 2025 (obs time.day == 28) (asc flag == 0) & (lsm == 0/1) (abs(lat) < 90) ;training2127







ATMS, TMS, AWS Temperature Statistics







AWS 3x3 averaging



































ATMS information content stands out







TPW



Retrieval TPW ATMS Pol3rd LC Sine/LSM/SFCP/ NOAA20 ATMS March 2025 (obs_time.day == 28) (asc_flag == 0) & (Ism == 0/1) (abs(lat) < 90) ;training2127



Retrieval TPW Pol3rd Sine/LSM/SFCP TO.TMS2 March 2025 (obs_time.day == 28) (asc flag == 0) & (lsm == 0/1) (abs(lat) < 90) ;training2127



TMS S2





ATMS, TMS, AWS



 $\widehat{\text{TPW}} = a_0 - a_1 \times \ln(285 - bl\,1) + a_2 \times \ln(285 - bl\,2),$

ATMS channel 23.8, 31.4 GHz channels are highly correlated to TPW





TPW Errors

(mm)



Retrieval minus ERA5 TPW Min: -75.74000, Max: 128.43909, Bias: 0.11013, Std Dev: 3.58887 Pol3rd LC Sine/LSM/SFCP (73 fovs) AWS PFM March 2025 (obs_time.day == 28) (asc flag == 1) (lsm == 0/1) (abs(lat) < 60);training2127



Retrieval minus ERA5 TPW Min: -60.96638, Max: 115.19005, Bias: -0.02270, Std Dev: 2.76346 Pol3rd LC without BT1, BT2 Sine/LSM/SFCP/ NOAA20 ATMS March 2025 (obs_time.day == 28) (asc_flag == 0) & (lsm == 0/1) (abs(lat) < 90) ;training2127



Retrieval minus ERA5 TPW Min: -68.36647, Max: 1408.71891, Bias: 0.11859, Std Dev: 3.85173 Pol3rd Sine/LSM/SFCP TO.TMS2 March 2025 (obs_time.day == 28) (asc flag == 0) & (lsm == 0/1) (abs(lat) < 90) ;training2127









































Information content similar for water vapor







Ocean only +-60 lat, Cloud liquid water < 0.01 Super easy cases







Ocean only +-60 lat, Cloud liquid water < 0.01



Now TMS (118 GHz) and AWS (50 GHz) are more similar





Ocean only +-60 lat, Cloud liquid water < 0.01







Summary

- ATMS channels 1 and 2 significantly improve total precipitable water retrievals (but profiles are similar)
- ATMS low noise and additional channels produce higher accuracy temperature retrievals
- Comparing to ATMS, equivalent AWS 50 GHz temperature channels have much larger noise
- TMS and AWS temperature retrievals are similar in troposphere, more so for clear skies (low cloud liquid water).
- ATMS, TMS and AWS water vapor retrievals are similar.
- Polynomial regression works really well!!





BONUS -- What about Hyperspectral Infrared Sounders?











Retrieval minus ERA5 at Lever 1, 1000.0 nPa Min: -30.60266, Max: 27.20443, Bias: -0.21047, Std Dev: 2.57226 Pol2nd LC Sine/LSM NOAA20 September 2024 (obs_time.day == 17) (asc_flag == 1) & (BT_limb[:,20] > 138) & (Ism == 0/1) (abs(lat) < 90) ;training1116





90N 60N 30N EQ 30S 60S 90S

0

60E

120E

180E

120W

60W











IR Summary

- Hyperspectral IR is particularly important for resolving vertical structure in the lower troposphere.
- Consider a constellation of IR sounders too!! But geostationary is preferable because its achievable – unlike microwave geostationary.





Backup



The City College of New York



ATMS

AWS

Channel		Control	Develoption				
Name	index	frequency (GHz)	(MHz)	ΝΕΔΤ	Polarisation	Resolution	
Sterna-11	1	50.3	180	< 0.6 K	QV	≤ 40 km	
Sterna-12	2	52.8	400	< 0.4 K	QV	≤ 40 km	
Sterna-13	3	53.246	300	< 0.4 K	QV	\leq 40 km	
Sterna-14	4	53.596	370	< 0.4 K	QV	≤ 40 km	
Sterna-15	5	54.4	400	< 0.4 K	QV	≤ 40 km	
Sterna-16	6	54.94	400	< 0.4 K	QV	≤ 40 km	
Sterna-17	7	55.5	330	< 0.5 K	QV	≤ 40 km	
Sterna-18	8	57.290344	330	< 0.6 K	QV	≤ 40 km	
Sterna-21	9	89	4000	< 0.3 K	QV	≤ 20 km	
Sterna-31	10	165.5	2800	< 0.6 K	QV	≤ 10 km	
Sterna-32	11	176.311	2000	< 0.7 K	QV	≤ 10 km	
Sterna-33	12	178.811	2000	< 0.7 K	QV	≤ 10 km	
Sterna-34	13	180.311	1000	<1 K	QV	≤ 10 km	
Sterna-35	14	181.511	1000	<1 K	QV	≤ 10 km	
Sterna-36	15	182.311	500	< 1.3 K	QV	≤ 10 km	
Sterna-41	16	325.15±1.2	2*800	< 1.7 K	QV	≤ 10 km	
Sterna-42	17	325.15±2.4	2*1200	< 1.4 K	QV	≤ 10 km	
Sterna-43	18	325.15±4.1	2*1800	< 1.2 K	QV	≤ 10 km	
Sterna-44	19	325.15±6.6	2*2800	< 1 K	QV	≤ 10 km	

ATMS TDR/SDR Specifications

Channel	Center Frequency (GHz)	Total Bandpass (GHz)	Accuracy (K)	NEDT (K)	EFOV Cross-Track (deg)	EFOV Along-Track (deg)	Polarization
1	23.8	0.27	1	0.7	6.3	5.2	QV
2	31.4	0.18	1	0.8	6.3	5.2	QV
3	50.3	0.18	0.75	0.9	3.3	2.2	QH
4	51.76	0.4	0.75	0.7	3.3	2.2	QH
5	52.8	0.4	0.75	0.7	3.3	2.2	QH
6	53.596±0.115	0.17	0.75	0.7	3.3	2.2	QH
7	54.4	0.4	0.75	0.7	3.3	2.2	QH
8	54.94	0.4	0.75	0.7	3.3	2.2	QH
9	55.5	0.33	0.75	0.7	3.3	2.2	QH
10	57.290344	0.33	0.75	0.75	3.3	2.2	QH
11	57.290344±0.217	0.078	0.75	1.2	3.3	2.2	QH
12	57.290344±0.3222±0.048	0.036	0.75	1.2	3.3	2.2	QH
13	57.290344±0.3222±0.022	0.016	0.75	1.5	3.3	2.2	QH
14	57.290344±0.3222±0.010	0.008	0.75	2.4	3.3	2.2	QH
15	57.290344±0.3222±0.0045	0.003	0.75	3.6	3.3	2.2	QH
16	88.2	2	1	0.5	3.3	2.2	QV
17	165.5	3	1	0.6	2.2	1.1	QH
18	183.31±7	2	1	0.8	2.2	1.1	QH
19	183.31±4.5	2	1	0.8	2.2	1.1	QH
20	183.31±3	1	1	0.8	2.2	1.1	QH
21	183.31±1.8	1	1	0.8	2.2	1.1	QH
22	183.31±1	0.5	1	0.9	2.2	1.1	QH

Table 2: EPS-Sterna channel list and characteristics applicable this study

QV = Quasi-Vertical QH = Quasi-Horizontal Dynamic Range are 0-330 (K) for all channels

The 50 GHz channels are similar, one would expect similar retrieval performance in the troposphere.



The City College of New York



Tomorrow IO TMS

No.	Central frequency	Bandwidth	ΝΕΔΤ	Nadir IFOV
1	91.655 ± 1.4 GHz	2000 MHz	0.55 K	30 km
2	118.75 ± 3.5 GHz	1000 MHz	0.93 K	25 km
3	118.75 ± 2.625 GHz	750 MHz	0.95 K	25 km
4	118.75 ± 1.875 GHz	750 MHz	0.88 K	25 km
5	118.75 ± 1.25 GHz	500 MHz	0.95 K	25 km
6	118.75 ± 0.75 GHz	500 MHz	0.95 K	25 km
7	118.75 ± 0.375 GHz	250 MHz	1.21 K	25 km
8	118.75 ± 0.125 GHz	250 MHz	1.16 K	25 km
9	184.41 GHz	2000 MHz	0.79 K	15 km
10	186.51 GHz	2000 MHz	0.73 K	15 km
11	190.31 GHz	2000 MHz	0.69 K	15 km
12	204.8 GHz	2000 MHz	0.75 K	15 km



of New York Temperature channels 3x3 averaged AWS

The City College



AWS PFM tropospheric sounding channels noise is significantly higher than ATMS. Remember ATMS channel #+2 is similar to AWS channel #





WV Channels 3x3



For water vapor channels, the methodology does not compare well with actual instrumental noise because water vapor is very variable – much more so than temperature











1,2



With and without channels



No Impact





Original Brightness Temperature

Limb Adjusted Brightness Temperature









Original Brightness Temperature

Limb Adjusted Brightness Temperature







TROPICS have occasional hiccups





We developed a technique to detect outliers using eigenvectors





Generate eigenvectors from the brightness temperatures each day, and compare to the day before







BAD



GOOD

