Assimilating the martian water cycle
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1 Introduction

• Water ice clouds play a role in the martian water cycle, and through their absorption and emission of infrared radiation, they can produce local heating and cooling effects, which can in turn impact the dynamics of the atmosphere [1,2].

• In order to account correctly for the radiative influence of clouds, and to investigate their effects on both the water cycle and atmospheric dynamics, it is important that we accurately measure their location and properties in the martian atmosphere.

• In this poster we discuss the use of data assimilation in order to better understand the martian water cycle. We are presently assimilating data from the Thermal Emission Spectrometer (TES) aboard Mars Global Surveyor, and will soon move on to assimilate ice, dust and temperature data from Mars Climate Sounder (MCS) aboard Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter.

1 Assimilating the martian water cycle and, through their absorption and emission of infrared radiation, they can produce local heating and cooling effects, which can in turn impact the dynamics of the atmosphere [1,2].

2 The assimilation scheme

• We use a Global Climate Model (GCM) which uses the most recent version of the LMD GCM physical schemes [3] with the UK spectral dynamical core [4]. For these results, the model resolution corresponds to a 5°×5° grid, with 25 vertical levels ranging from the surface to ~100 km.

• The assimilation scheme used is based on the Analysis Correction scheme [5], modified for Mars [6]. Assimilated fields are updated every model time step, and increments are applied to model grid points that lie within a set radius from the observations (see Fig 1). The increments added to the model are weighted by the distance between the observation and model grid point, as well as the difference between the observation time and the current model time. Observations all have local times ±2 h, and each observation affects the model 3 hours before and 1 hour after its valid time.

3 Assimilation results

• The TES temperature retrievals used in the assimilation have vertical profiles, but the water vapour retrievals are from nadir observations, so are of total water vapour column. Thus, there is no information on the vertical vapour profile.

• We take the model’s predicted vapour profile and apply a scaling factor in order to make the model integrated vapour column match the assimilated TES data. An example of this scaling process is shown above in Fig 2.

• Combining assimilation with the ice and vapour transport of the model allows data to be transferred to regions where there are few or no observations. Thus, improvements can be made to the model even in locations between orbit tracks or over the winter poles.

• The assimilation of TES water vapour data enables us to identify regions or times when the model predicted vapour distribution differs from observations, allowing improvements to be made to the model. It allows studies of the vertical profiles of ice and vapour to be made, as well as local and global dynamical processes, which are not available through studying observations alone.

• The middle plots in Fig 4 show the mean vapour column difference between the TES observations and the control run. Red areas are where the control run is too dry compared to observations, and blue areas are where it is too wet. As can be seen, the errors in northern hemisphere summer is mainly due to a lack of sublimation from the north polar cap, and hence a lack of vapour transport to mid latitudes. An improvement will be made to the distribution of surface ice around the north polar cap, which should increase sublimation. While the assimilation has improved the vapour field, Fig 4 shows there are still errors over the Taurus-Tharsis region, which are responsible for the daily peaks in the RMS and mean increments shown in Fig 5. These errors may be due to problems with the modelling of vapour transport in the region, or possibly due to an assimilation error caused by the surface height differences between model and observations.

• The error in southern hemisphere summer is also mainly due to a lack of sublimation at the south pole. As there is no ice cap specified here in the model, the sublimation is of ice that was deposited in the winter, after being transported as vapour from the tropics. Thus, improvements to the north polar cap should lead to increased vapour transport south, and hence a reduction in the model error in southern hemisphere summer. Again, the assimilation has improved the vapour field, but differences still exist, especially east and west of Hellas and around Argyre Patera. These may again be due to problems modelling vapour transport, or due to surface height differences.

4 Discussion and future work

• The temperature assimilation provides evidence of the radiative effects of clouds on the atmospheric temperature.

• The TES vapour assimilation has led to global improvements in the model’s vapour field, and highlighted areas where improvements can be made to the model in order to improve water cycle modelling. Additionally, we will soon be implementing a new LMD cloud microphysics routine, which should further improve model performance.

• Assimilation of MCS temperature, dust and ice data will soon be undertaken. This will enable us to better understand the processes involved in cloud formation and evolution, and will allow further improvements to the model to be made. Detailed investigations will be carried out into the effect of clouds on atmospheric dynamics.
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Fig 1. L30 (March), L60 (NH spring), L90 (NH summer), L120 (NH autumn), L150 (NH winter)

Fig 2. Examples of the scaling of vapour mass mixing ratio profiles due to assimilation. The scaling factors (SF), radiative and transport, for each case are shown in the plot. The symbols are; (triangles) TES values, (squares) original run values, (right) TES values, all baseline year (NH) 2007.

Fig 3. Temperature difference (°C) between the model and observations for two different cases; (upper panels) the first assimilation at 0.75 h; (middle panels) the second assimilation at 7.5 h; (lower panels) the difference between the two assimilations. Cross hatching represents regions where there were no TES observations to assimilate.

Fig 4. Plots for two different seasons of MY 24 showing; (upper panels) assimilated model total vapour column V; (middle panels) the mean vapour column difference for the two seasons and their control runs; (lower panels) the mean vapour column difference for the two seasons and their control runs. The symbols are; (mean) TES values, (control) original run values, (right) TES values, all baseline year (NH) 2007.

Fig 5. Plots for two different seasons of MY 24 showing: (top panel) the mean vapour column difference for the two seasons and their control runs; (middle panel) the mean vapour column difference for the two seasons and their control runs. Cross hatching represents regions where there were no TES observations to assimilate.