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ABSTRACT

The existence of extensive precipitating anvil clouds in intense tropical convection suggests that vertical air motions associated with the anvil clouds play a significant role in the mass and heat budgets of these systems. This paper uses three different sets of assumptions about the water budget of an idealized mesoscale convective system to test the sensitivity of diagnostic calculations of vertical transports of mass and heat to the inclusion or exclusion of anvil clouds and their associated mesoscale vertical air motions. The properties of the mesoscale updraft and downdraft are evaluated using observations and the results of modeling studies. When a mesoscale updraft and downdraft are included in the diagnostic calculations, the profiles of vertical transports of mass and moist static energy are both qualitatively and quantitatively different from the results when mesoscale vertical air motions are excluded. Inclusion of mesoscale vertical motions in the diagnostic calculations leads to smaller upward mass transports below 4 km, larger upward mass transports above 4 km, less cooling below 4 km, and more cooling between 4.5 and 6.5 km than are obtained when mesoscale motions are not included in the calculations. These results imply that the effect of mesoscale vertical air motions on cloud mass flux and net heating profiles should be considered when parameterizing the effects of tropical convection on the larger scale environment.

1. Introduction

Abercromby (1887) was perhaps the first to document the anomalously low surface temperatures observed to the rear of an intense squall line and suggest that they were due to the transport downward of cold air with heavy rain. Humphreys (1914) proposed evaporation of falling rain to be the dominant mechanism for the cooling as well as the source of the downdrafts in large thunderstorms. He also noted two distinct rain areas in the thunderstorm: a primary rain area located close to the ascending air, and a less intense secondary rain area well to the rear of the ascending air and the primary rain area. In the tropics, Hamilton and Archbold (1945) described similar phenomena in squall lines, which they called disturbance lines, and associated the light rain area to the rear of the most intense showers with a deep anvil of altocumulus cloud.

Zipser (1969) deduced the presence of an organized mesoscale downdraft driven by the evaporation of falling precipitation beneath the anvil cloud in the rear portion of tropical squall-line systems. He distinguished this mesoscale downdraft, which is several hundred kilometers in horizontal extent, from the convective-scale updrafts and downdrafts (1–10 km in horizontal extent) which occurred at the leading edge of the system. Houze (1977) and Zipser (1977) have shown that similar squall-line systems occurred in the Global Atmospheric Research Program’s Atlantic Tropical Experiment (GATE). Zipser and Gautier (1978) and Leary and Houze (1979b) have found evidence for mesoscale downdrafts below anvil clouds in non-squall as well as squall-line mesoscale systems in GATE. Leary and Houze (1979a) examined the horizontally uniform precipitation associated with the anvil clouds in five cases, including both squall and non-squall mesoscale systems and presented calculations based on these cases, which suggest that cooling resulting from the melting of hydrometeors, in addition to evaporative cooling, plays an important role in the initiation and maintenance of mesoscale downdrafts in intense convective systems.

Motivated by Zipser’s (1969) study, Brown (1979) constructed a two-dimensional, time-dependent numerical model of a precipitating tropical disturbance, using unfiltered hydrostatic equations, together with parameterizations of cloud microphysics and convective-scale motions. In his experiments, an anvil cloud evolved, and a broad mesoscale downdraft developed as a hydrostatic.
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thermally direct circulation feature, when cooling due to the evaporation of rain falling from the anvil cloud was included in the calculations. Above the mesoscale downdraft, which occurred in the lower troposphere below the base of the anvil cloud, Brown's model produced a mesoscale region of hydrostatic uplift in the anvil cloud layer itself. Thus, the region immediately to the rear of the line of cumulonimbus towers was characterized by a mesoscale updraft located aloft, directly above an evaporatively driven mesoscale downdraft.

The importance of the precipitation falling from the anvil clouds of intense convective systems is indicated by the fact that it accounts for \( \sim 40\% \) of the total rainfall observed in GATE (Cheng and Houze, 1979). It seems reasonable, therefore, to believe that the mesoscale updrafts and downdrafts associated with anvil clouds played a significant role in the cloud mass and heat fluxes over the GATE data network. To determine their role quantitatively, diagnostic techniques are needed which can detect the fluxes by the mesoscale drafts. Houze et al. (1980), hereafter referred to as H) developed equations for the diagnosis of cloud mass and heat fluxes either from observations of the precipitation fields associated with the clouds (the radar approach) or from large-scale heat budgets (the synoptic approach). Whichever of the two approaches is used, assumptions about cloud water budgets must be made to determine the amount of mesoscale air motion contributing to the fluxes. Previous diagnostic studies (e.g., Yanai et al., 1973; Ogura and Cho, 1973; Johnson, 1976; Houze and Leary, 1976) have usually assumed water budgets that allow for no mesoscale air motions. The results of such studies are correct only to the extent that they are insensitive to the neglect of the mesoscale anvil air motions.

The purpose of the present paper is to test the sensitivity of diagnostic results to the inclusion or exclusion of anvil clouds and their associated mesoscale updrafts and downdrafts. We carry out this test using the first approach mentioned above by postulating an idealized mesoscale system with a precipitation pattern typical of mesoscale systems observed during GATE. The response of a diagnostic model similar to that of H is examined as various assumptions are made about the water budget of the idealized mesoscale system. Some of these assumptions allow mesoscale updrafts and downdrafts to be associated with the precipitating anvil cloud of the idealized system. From the response of the model in this ideal case, we can anticipate the types of differences that will be obtained in diagnostic studies when the assumptions of the diagnostic models allow for mesoscale motions to contribute to the diagnosed mass and heat transports. Johnson’s (1980) results show that for meso-
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**Fig. 1.** Horizontal dimensions, lifetimes and rainfall for the components of the idealized mesoscale system and its larger scale environment. Symbols are defined in Section 2 of the text.

---

scale downdrafts the types of differences we expect are obtained.

2. The idealized mesoscale system and three sets of assumptions about its water budget

The dimensions, lifetime and other characteristics of the mesoscale precipitation system, shown schematically in Fig. 1, were chosen to resemble most closely the squall-line system studied by Houze (1977), and to be consistent with the other systems described by Leary and Houze (1979a,b). The hypothetical system consists of a convective region of intense, cellular precipitation \( (A_C = 0.5 \times 10^4 \text{ km}^2) \) and a mesoscale region of lighter, horizontally uniform rain \( (A_M = 2.5 \times 10^4 \text{ km}^2) \). We specify a total lifetime \( (\tau) \) of 24 h for this system and assume that, for the first 6 h, only the convective region is present, while for the last 6 h, only the mesoscale region is present. Thus, \( A_C \) and \( A_M \) each have lifetimes \( (\tau_C \) and \( \tau_M \), respectively) of 18 h. The large-scale area \( (A = 20 \times 10^4 \text{ km}^2) \) was chosen to represent the area occupied by the mesoscale system and its environment.

The vertical structure of the idealized mesoscale system is indicated in Fig. 2. In the case studied by Houze (1977), the precipitation in region \( A_C \) fell from cells which reached maximum heights of 10 to 17 km, with the bulk of the convective precipitation from cells of \( \sim 14 \) km. We assume here that all of the convective precipitation in region \( A_C \) fell from cells reaching a maximum height of \( z_T = 14 \) km. That is, our idealized system is assumed for mathe-
matical simplicity to have a spectrum containing convective cells of only one size. This assumption has no substantial effect on the results of this study, which is primarily concerned with how the anvil air motions are represented. Our results can easily be extrapolated to anticipate the results of diagnostic models (such as that of H) which allow for a spectrum of cells of various sizes. We assume further that the anvil cloud also has its top $Z_{TM}$ at 14 km, while its base $Z_{M}$ is at 4.5 km. The convective cloud base $Z_{B}$ is assumed to be at 0.5 km, and the top of the convective downdraft $Z_{D}$ is placed at 5.0 km.

The water budget of the mesoscale system is indicated schematically in Fig. 2. The water budget for the convective region can be expressed mathematically as

$$R_c = C_u - E_{cd} - E_{ce} - C_A$$

(1)

and for the mesoscale region as

$$R_m = C_{mu} - E_{md} - E_{me} + C_A$$

(2)

where $R_c$ and $R_m$ are the total masses of rain (kilograms of water) which fall in regions $A_c$ and $A_M$, respectively; $C_u$ and $C_{mu}$ are the masses of water condensed in convective updrafts in $A_c$ and a mesoscale updraft in $A_M$, respectively; $E_{cd}$ and $E_{md}$ are the masses of water evaporated in convective downdrafts in $A_c$ and a mesoscale downdraft in $A_M$, respectively; and $E_{ce}$ and $E_{me}$ are the amounts of water evaporated into the larger scale environment from $A_c$ and $A_M$, respectively. $C_A$ is the portion of $C_u$ which is incorporated into the mesoscale region covered by the anvil cloud, either by being detrained, that is, advected horizontally into the anvil region by air flowing out of convective cells, or by being left aloft by cells which, upon dying, blend into the anvil cloud while new cells form ahead of the anvil region (Houze, 1977).

We consider three possible water budgets for the mesoscale system by considering three different combinations of the values of the terms in (1) and (2). These values are listed in Table 1 and shown schematically in Fig. 3.

In each of the three water budgets, we assume a total mass of rain which falls from the system [$R = 4.5 \times 10^{12}$ kg], a value chosen to correspond to the squall-line system studied by Houze (1977) with 60% falling in $A_c$ and 40% falling in $A_M$. Thus, $R_c = 0.6R$ and $R_m = 0.4R$. The mesoscale rain $R_m$, which falls in $A_M$, can be generated in two ways. Either water is first condensed in $A_c$ and subsequently incorporated into $A_M$ [term $C_A$ in (1) and (2)], or the mesoscale rain in $A_M$ is generated by mesoscale lifting [term $C_{mu}$ in (2)], as in Brown’s (1979) model. In the three cases examined here, the mesoscale rain in $R_m$ is produced by three different combinations of $C_A$ and $C_{mu}$.

As a further aid in comparing the three water budgets, eight parameters expressing ratios of various terms in (1) and (2) were chosen. Their mathematical definitions and values for each of the three cases are listed in Table 2. As discussed in H, these definitions, together with (1) and (2), imply that

$$\alpha + \beta + \gamma + \nu = 1,$$

(3)
\[ a + b + \nu_m = 1. \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Three parameters of the water budget [\(\alpha, \beta\) and \(b\) (Table 2)] were specified to be the same in each of the three cases, in order not to obscure the purpose of the calculations of mass and heat fluxes, namely, to test their sensitivity to different assumptions about mesoscale vertical air motions.
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**Fig. 3.** Schematic vertical cross sections of the idealized mesoscale system showing vertical values of terms in the water budget (cf. Fig. 2 and Table 1) for three different sets of assumptions: (a) convective-scale updrafts and downdrafts only (Case A); (b) convective-scale updrafts and downdrafts and a mesoscale downdraft (Case B); (c) convective-scale updrafts and downdrafts, a mesoscale updraft and a mesoscale downdraft (Case C).

**Table 2. Definitions and values of water budget parameters.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water budget parameters</th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\nu_c = \frac{R_c}{C_u})</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha = \frac{E_{cd}}{C_u})</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta = \frac{E_{cc}}{C_u})</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\eta = \frac{C_A}{C_u})</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\nu_m = \frac{R_m}{C_{mu} + C_A})</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a = \frac{E_{md}}{C_{mu} + C_A})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b = \frac{E_{me}}{C_{mu} + C_A})</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parameter \(\alpha\) is the fraction of the convective condensate \(C_u\) reevaporated in convective downdrafts. In the controlled experiment of \(H\), a value of \(\alpha = 0.1\) was deduced for large convective clouds such as those assumed to be present in region \(A_C\) of our hypothetical mesoscale system. In the study of Houze and Leary (1976), reasonable diagnostic results were obtained with a value of \(\alpha = 0.13\). In the present study, we again use the value \(\alpha = 0.13\).

We arbitrarily assume that \(\beta = 0.07\) and \(b = 0.10\); i.e., 7% of the convective condensate and 10% of the anvil cloud condensate are reevaporated in the large-scale environment of the hypothetical mesoscale system. Storage of evaporated condensate in the environment undoubtedly occurs because clouds are usually observed in dissipating mesoscale systems after precipitation stops. In the absence of quantitative data, we assign this process a minor role in the water budgets of the convective and mesoscale regions.

**a. Case A**

Case A (Fig. 3a, Tables 1 and 2) assumes that \(R_m\) is accounted for entirely by \(C_A\) and there is no upward motion or condensation in the anvil cloud. Accordingly,

\[ C_{mu} = 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} (5)

It is further assumed that there is no mesoscale downdraft below the anvil, and hence no evaporation of condensate below the anvil. Thus,

\[ E_{md} = 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

Although these assumptions, which neglect mesoscale motions, seem unrealistic in view of the ob-
servations and modeling of mesoscale systems cited in the Introduction, they correspond to the basic assumptions of most convective parameterization schemes and previous diagnostic studies, namely, that all condensation and precipitation results from convective-scale motions alone. In particular, these assumptions were made in the controlled experiment of H, in which agreement was obtained between cloud population properties diagnosed from synoptic and radar data. By comparing the results of Case A with the results of the other two cases considered in this paper, which do take into account the effects of mesoscale as well as convective-scale motions, we can test the sensitivity of diagnostic results to the incorporation of mesoscale motions into diagnostic models.

Eqs. (5) and (6), together with the assumptions common to all three cases, are sufficient to completely define all the terms and parameters of the water budget in Case A. It follows from (6) that \( a = 0 \). Since \( b = 0.1 \), Eq. (4) implies that \( v_m = 0.90 \). From this value of \( v_m \) and the fact that \( C_{mu} \) is zero, \( C_A \) is determined using the expression for \( v_m \) in Table 2. Physically, the value of \( C_A \) thus determined is the amount of condensate that must be incorporated into the anvil region \( A_M \) from the convective region \( A_c \) in order to provide all of the water needed to account for \( R_m \) and \( E_{me} \) without having any condensation in the anvil itself. Since \( C_A \) is so determined and \( R_e \) is given, the ratio \( \eta / \nu_c \) is determined using the expressions for \( \eta \) and \( \nu_c \) in Table 2. Since \( \nu_c, \alpha, \beta \) and \( \eta \) must sum to unity to satisfy (3), and \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are prescribed, the sum of \( \nu_c \) and \( \eta \) must be 0.8. Since both the ratio and the sum of \( \nu_c \) and \( \eta \) are known, both \( \nu_c \) and \( \eta \) are determined.

b. Case B

In Case B (Fig. 3b, Tables 1 and 2), mesoscale lifting in the anvil is again precluded by assuming that \( C_{mu} \) is zero [i.e., Eq. (5) also applies in this case]. However, a mesoscale downdraft below the anvil is included and, consequently, evaporation of condensate occurs below the anvil. Rather than assuming a specific value for \( E_{md} \), we specify that 40\% of the condensate in the anvil (\( C_A \)) is evaporated in the mesoscale downdraft below the anvil. That is, we set \( a = 0.40 \) (Table 2). The choice of 40\% for this assumption is discussed further in Section 3d.

Other details of the Case B water budget, summarized in Tables 1 and 2 and Fig. 3b, follow from the same line of reasoning described above for Case A.

c. Case C

Case C (Fig. 3c, Tables 1 and 2) is the most general case we consider. It has both mesoscale lifting in the anvil and a mesoscale downdraft below the anvil. Consequently, both \( C_{mu} \) and \( E_{md} \) are non-zero. As in Case B, we specify that 40\% of the condensate in the anvil is evaporated in a mesoscale downdraft below the anvil. In Case C, however, anvil condensate has two sources, \( C_{mu} \) and \( C_A \). In the absence of direct measurements to establish their relative contributions to the anvil condensate, we assume that

\[
C_{mu} = C_A. \tag{7}
\]

Physically, we are assuming that half of the condensate in the anvil cloud is condensed in the mesoscale updraft there, and that half of the condensate is transported from region \( A_c \), where it was condensed in convective updrafts.

Using (7) it is possible to evaluate the other terms and parameters in the water budget for Case C (Tables 1, 2) using the same reasoning as for Cases A and B.

While there are no rigorous quantitative water budget studies that verify which of the three cases A–C is most realistic, it is evident that Case C is qualitatively the most reasonable of the three. The studies of Zipser (1969, 1977), Betts et al. (1976), Houze (1977), Zipser and Gautier (1978) and Leary and Houze (1979b) indicate from aircraft and synoptic data that mesoscale downdrafts do indeed occur below the anvil clouds of tropical cloud systems similar to the one considered here and that considerable evaporation occurs in these downdrafts. The large amount of rain from the anvil and the long life of anvil rain after convective cells became inactive further suggests the presence of a mesoscale updraft in the anvil itself. A persistent mesoscale updraft in the anvil cloud occurs in Brown's (1979) numerical simulation of a tropical squall-line system, and Ogura and Liou (1980) have observed both mesoscale updraft and downdraft in an Oklahoma squall line that resembled a tropical squall system. For all these reasons, we consider Case C to be the most realistic of the three postulated cases.

3. Calculations of the vertical fluxes of mass and moist static energy by the idealized mesoscale system

a. General relationships

The vertical mass flux over the large-scale area \( A \) during time \( \tau \) (Fig. 1) can be expressed as

\[
\dot{M} = M_u + M_d + M_{at} + M_m, \tag{8}
\]

where the terms on the right side of the equation are contributions to \( \dot{M} \) of vertical air motions in the large-scale environment (\( M_e \)), convective-scale updrafts (\( M_u \)) and downdrafts (\( M_d \)) in the convective region \( A_c \), and mesoscale vertical air motions (\( M_{at} \)) in the mesoscale region \( A_M \) (Fig. 1). For our idealized case, we are concerned with the cloud contribution to \( \dot{M} \), which may be written as.
where \( M_u \) is the mass of air transported through cloud base and \( f_u(\lambda, z) \), in the notation of H, is the vertical profile of the convective updraft mass flux in convective cells with entrainment rate \( \lambda \). Since the convective clouds in the idealized mesoscale system are all the same size (14 km in height), we assume the constant value

\[
\lambda = 0.01 \text{ km}^{-1},
\]

which is the value used in the controlled experiment of H for clouds with tops at 14 km. This value is quite small. Because of their large size, the convective clouds in the idealized mesoscale system are essentially undilute “hot towers” (Riehl and Malkus, 1958). The profile used for \( f_u(\lambda, z) \) is Cheng and Houze’s (1980) adaptation of the profile used by Austin and Houze (1973) and Houze and Leary (1976).

The quantity \( \mu_B \) is calculated from

\[
\frac{R_c}{v_c} = I_1(\lambda)\mu_B,
\]

where

\[
I_1(\lambda) = \int_{z_B}^{z_T} f_u(\lambda, z) \left[ \lambda(q_e - q_u) - \frac{\partial q_u}{\partial z} \right] dz.\]

Eq. (18) states that the amount of mass transported through cloud base \( \mu_B \) is related to the convective rain \( R_c \). It is a special case of Austin and Houze’s (1973) Eq. (6) and (H36). In the notation of H, \( \mu_B = M_B(\lambda) d\lambda \), \( R_c = R_c(\lambda) d\lambda \) and \( v_e = v_e(\lambda) \) for \( \lambda = 0.01 \text{ km}^{-1} \) [Eq. (17)]. The expression for the integral \( I_1(\lambda) \) given by (19) is a special case of (H37).

The moist static energy in the convective updrafts is calculated from (H11) using the boundary condition that the air at the base of the updraft is saturated at the virtual temperature of the environment (Cheng and Houze, 1980). The temperature \( (T_u) \) and mixing ratio \( (q_u) \) in the convective updrafts are calculated from (H12) and (H13).

c. Convective downdraft properties

The contribution to \( M \) from convective-scale downdrafts is computed using

\[
M_d = \frac{\mu_0 f_d(\lambda, z)}{A_T},
\]

where \( \mu_0 \) is the mass of air transported downward at the top of the downdraft (level \( z_0 \) in Fig. 2) and \( f_d(\lambda, z) \) is the vertical profile of the convective downdraft mass flux in convective cells with entrainment rate \( \lambda \). Following the procedures described in H, we assume the downdrafts have the same entrainment rate as the updrafts [Eq. (17)], and that \( z_0 \) is 5.0 km. The profile used for \( f_d(\lambda, z) \) is Cheng and Houze’s (1980) inverted version of the updraft profile \( f_u(\lambda, z) \).
where \( \mu_{mu}(z) \) and \( \mu_{md}(z) \) are the masses of air transported vertically through level \( z \) in the mesoscale updraft and downdraft, respectively. The following paragraphs explain how \( M_{mu} \) and \( M_{md} \), as well as the moist static energy \( h_m \), are determined for the idealized mesoscale system.

Insight for constructing a mesoscale updraft profile is sought first in the results of Brown’s (1979) model. A profile of the average vertical velocity in the anvil cloud found downslope of his line of convective updrafts is shown by the solid line above 4 km in Fig. 4.

Since the heights of convective clouds are limited by the assumptions of his model, his profile for the mesoscale updraft appears at lower levels than would be realistic in our case, in which convective updrafts reach a height of 14 km. The shape of his profile, and the maximum value of the updraft \( 0.2 \text{ m s}^{-1} \) do, however, provide useful guidance for constructing a plausible profile for our case.

Another estimate of the profile of vertical velocity in a mesoscale updraft was obtained from vertical profiles of the wet-bulb potential temperature \( \theta_w \) obtained from rawinsonde observations 3 h apart in the mesoscale region of the squall-line system described by Houze (1977). This estimate was obtained by substituting \( \theta_w \) for \( \xi \) in (H26). We note that \( \theta_w \) is conserved and assume that there is no storage of \( \theta_w \). Hence, the terms \( S_m \) and \( S_m \) in (H26) disappear. Then, combining (H26) and (H28), we obtain

\[
w_m = -\left( V_R \right)_m \cdot \left( \nabla \theta_w \right)_m, \tag{26}\]

where, in the notation of H, \( V_R \) is the horizontal wind relative to the mesoscale system, and the \( m \) indicates an average over the lifetime and area covered by the mesoscale anvil region. If it is further assumed that the \( \theta_w \) field moving with the system is two-dimensional and steady-state, Eq. (26) becomes

\[
w_{mu} = \frac{U_R}{U_S} \left( \frac{\partial \theta_w}{\partial t} \right)_m, \tag{27}\]

where \( U_R \) is the component of \( V_R \) normal to the squall line, \( \partial \theta_w / \partial t \) is the local time derivative resulting from the passage of the steady-state \( \theta_w \) field over a point fixed to the earth, and \( U_S \) is the speed of the system. The subscript \( mu \) is used to indicate that we are only concerned with the value of the vertical velocity in the mesoscale updraft. The ratio of relative wind velocity to squall-line propagation

\footnote{The sign convention is that \( U_S \) is always positive, but \( U_R \) is negative if it is directed against \( U_S \).}
speed as a function of height was obtained using the analyses of Houze (1977, Figs. 5, 7 and 15) and the Oceanographer sounding taken at 1800 on 4 September 1974. That sounding was also used to estimate \((\partial \theta_w/\partial z)_m\). Values of \((\partial \theta_w/\partial z)_m\) were calculated using the 1800 and 2100 soundings from the Oceanographer. Only the 1800 sounding was used to calculate \(U_R/U_s\) and \((\partial \theta_w/\partial z)_m\). The wind observations at 2100 were noisy and thus not reliable for calculating \(U_R\) and, being taken at the outer edge of the anvil cloud, the thermodynamic data for 2100 did not give a representative value of \((\partial \theta_w/\partial z)\) centered on the mesoscale anvil region.

The vertical velocity profile computed from (27) is shown by the crosses and dashed line in Fig. 4. The shape of the curve for our observed squall-line system is consistent with Brown’s results. The greater height and larger maximum magnitude \((-0.4 \text{ m s}^{-1})\) of our velocity maximum compared to the profile derived from Brown’s (1979) model is in keeping with the greater height and probably greater intensity of the convective cells in our case.

Based on the shapes of the profiles of vertical velocity in the mesoscale updraft shown in Fig. 4, we have chosen a parabolic profile for the vertical velocity within the mesoscale updraft of our hypothetical mesoscale system. The parabolic profile, with its maximum magnitude equal to 1.0 at \(z' = 10 \text{ km}\), is illustrated in Fig. 5 and is referred to as \(f(z)\). The vertical velocity in the mesoscale updraft is then given by

\[
w_{mu}(z) = w_{mu}(z') f(z), \tag{28}
\]

and (24) can be written in the form

\[
M_{mu} = \frac{\rho_{mu}(z) w_{mu}(z') A_{m \tau_{mu}} f(z)}{\tau_{mu}}, \tag{29}
\]

where \(\rho_{mu}(z)\) is the density of the air at height \(z\) in the mesoscale updraft.

The magnitude of \(w_{mu}(z')\) in (29) was calculated for the water budget of Case C (the case described in Section 2 that contains a mesoscale updraft) using the equation for the continuity of water vapor in the mesoscale updraft. This equation is obtained by substituting the water vapor mixing ratio \(q\) for \(\xi\) in (H26) and assuming that the effects of storage \((S_m)\) and horizontal advection \((\bar{E}_m)\) of \(q\) are small compared with sources and sinks \((S_m)\). Then, (H26) becomes

\[
\frac{dq_m}{dz} = S_m. \tag{30}
\]

It is further assumed that condensation is the only significant contribution to \(S_m\). The evaporation of anvil cloud water represented by \(E_{mc}\) is a source of vapor for the large-scale environment, not the anvil. Hence, it does not contribute to \(S_m\). Integration of

\[
\begin{align*}
\int_{x_m}^{x_{14}} dq_m dz & = -C_{mu} \int_{z_m}^{z'} A_{m \tau_{mu}} f(z) \frac{dq_m}{dz} dz
\end{align*}
\]

over the depth of the mesoscale updraft leads to

\[
w_{mu}(z') = \frac{-C_{mu}}{A_{m \tau_{mu}} \int_{z_m}^{z'} \rho_{mu}(z) \frac{dq_m}{dz} dz}, \tag{31}
\]

which is analogous to (H50)

The density \(\rho_{mu}\), \(dq_m/dz\) in (31), and the value of \(h_{mu}\) in the mesoscale updraft heat flux in (14) are all specified for the mesoscale updraft by assuming that the mesoscale updraft is saturated and 1 K higher in temperature than the large-scale environment. This value was chosen on the basis of the results of Brown's (1979) model and is consistent with the observations of Zipser (1969, 1977), Betts et al. (1976) and Houze (1977) who show that the moist-static energy of the air flowing out of the anvils of tropical squall lines is higher than it is at the same levels in the large-scale environment ahead of the lines.

With these assumptions, \(w_{mu}(z')\) for Case C was calculated from (31) to be 0.5 m s\(^{-1}\), and this value was substituted into (29) to obtain \(M_{mu}\). The value of \(w_{mu}(z')\) obtained from (31) is directly proportional to the value of \(C_{mu}\), which for Case C is given by (7). Since the value obtained (0.5 m s\(^{-1}\)) slightly exceeds the other estimates of \(w_{mu}(z')\) (0.2 m s\(^{-1}\) from Brown’s model and 0.4 m s\(^{-1}\) from Houze’s \(\theta_w\), cross section), it appears that the value of \(C_{mu}\) given by (7) is of the right order of magnitude, but is probably

\(^5\) In (H50), the integral \(I_3\) is written in terms of the mass flux profile \(f_{mu}(z)\), while the integral in (31) is written in terms of the vertical velocity profile \(f(z)\).
Table 3. Vertical profiles of temperature, density, moisture and vertical velocity in the mesoscale downdraft (from Leary, 1980, Fig. 4) used for the calculations described in Section 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressure (mb)</th>
<th>Density (kg m(^{-2}))</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Temperature (K)</th>
<th>Water vapor mixing ratio ((\times 10^{-2}))</th>
<th>Relative humidity (%)</th>
<th>Downdraft speed (m s(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>4163</td>
<td>273.16</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>4072</td>
<td>274.03</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>3753</td>
<td>276.51</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>3445</td>
<td>278.68</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>3146</td>
<td>280.51</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>2855</td>
<td>282.16</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>2572</td>
<td>283.70</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>2297</td>
<td>285.16</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>286.56</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>287.92</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>289.27</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>290.64</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>291.92</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>293.15</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>294.34</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>294.58</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leary’s results were used to determine \(M_{md}\) by writing (25) as

\[
M_{md} = \frac{\rho_{md}(z)w_{md}(z)A_{m}r_{m}}{\tau},
\]

(32)

and using her values of the density \(\rho_{md}(z)\) and \(w_{md}(z)\) given in Table 3.

Alternatively, \(M_{md}\) can be expressed as

\[
M_{md} = \frac{\mu_{md}^n f_{md}(z)}{\tau},
\]

(33)

where \(f_{md}(z)\) is the non-dimensional, normalized mass flux profile for the mesoscale downdraft (see Section 2d of H) and \(\mu_{md}\) is the mass transported through the level (or levels) where \(f_{md}(z) = 1\). In Leary’s calculations, it is assumed that there is a constant downward mass flux between the top of the downdraft at 618 mb (4.2 km) and its base at 955 mb (0.5 km). Therefore, in (33)

\[
f_{md}(z) = \begin{cases} 
1, & 0.5 \text{ km} \leq z \leq 4.2 \text{ km} \\
0, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

(34)

The quantity \(\mu_{md}^n\) in (33) is related to the parameters of the water budget of the mesoscale region [Eq. (H56)]. Substituting from (H56), Eq. (33) becomes

\[
M_{md} = \frac{aR_{rn}(z)\nu_{md}(z)}{I_{\nu_{md}}A_{\tau}}.
\]

(35)

\(I_{\nu}\) can be determined from (H55) with \(f_{md}(z)\) given by (34) and \(q_{md}\) by Table 3. Using the value of \(M_{md}\) obtained from (32), two unknowns remain in (35), \(a\) and \(\nu_m\). The same two unknowns are in (4) (since \(b\) is assumed to be 0.1). Simultaneous solution of (4) and (35) leads to the values of \(a = 0.4\) and \(\nu_m = 0.5\). Thus, the value of \(M_{md}\) obtained from (32)
is the same as the value that would be obtained from (35) by assuming the water budgets for Cases B and C given in Tables 1 and 2. Leary's (1980) calculations, however, give a physical basis to these assumptions, which would otherwise have to be made ad hoc.

In addition to the mass flux calculation just described, the heat flux associated with the mesoscale downdraft was computed from (14) using the value of $h_m$ derived from the data in Table 3.

4. Results

Figs. 6 and 7 show contributions to the vertical fluxes of mass and moist static energy, respectively, by cumulus and mesoscale motions for each of the three assumed water budgets. The vertical mass flux in convective-scale updrafts and downdrafts is directly proportional to the total amount of water condensed in region $A_C$. Since Case B (Fig. 6b), with a mesoscale downdraft but no mesoscale updraft, produces the most condensate in $A_C$, it has the greatest convective-scale mass transports. Likewise, Cases A (Fig. 6a) and C (Fig. 6c), with nearly equal but successively smaller amounts of condensation in $A_C$, have nearly equal but successively smaller vertical mass fluxes due to convective-scale updrafts and downdrafts.

The mesoscale downdraft in Case B makes a negative contribution to the vertical mass flux
updrafts are warmer and moister than the mesoscale updraft.

Fig. 8 shows the total vertical flux of mass for Cases A, B, and C, calculated as the total of the contributions from all convective-scale and mesoscale motions. Cases B and C, which include mesoscale as well as convective-scale motions, show larger mass transports in the upper troposphere and smaller mass fluxes in the lower troposphere than does Case A, which assumes that all of the cloud vertical motions are of convective scale. Case C, which has both a mesoscale updraft and a mesoscale downdraft, shows the largest mass flux of all in the upper troposphere (above 5 km), and the smallest in the lower troposphere. In fact, \( M \) is slightly negative below 4 km in Case C. Case A, without a mesoscale downdraft, has the largest \( M \) below 3.8 km. In Case B, the presence of a mesoscale downdraft is partially offset by the larger values of \( M_{cu} \) than in the other two cases. These results imply that calculations which do not include the mesoscale vertical air motions in intense tropical convection might overestimate the cloud mass flux at low levels and underestimate it at upper levels.

In his diagnostic calculations based on heat budgets (i.e., the synoptic approach, in the terminology of H), Johnson (1980) also finds that inclusion of mesoscale downdrafts results in significantly smaller cloud mass fluxes at lower levels than when only convective-scale mass fluxes are included. Our results further show that when mesoscale updrafts as well as mesoscale downdrafts are included (Case C), the cloud mass fluxes at low levels are further reduced. With a mesoscale updraft, a significant portion \( (C_{mu}) \) of the total condensate is produced aloft in the anvil cloud without contributing to the cloud mass flux at low levels.

The total vertical eddy fluxes of moist static energy \( (F) \) for Cases A, B, and C are shown in Fig. 9. Relatively little difference in the three curves can be seen above 10 km. Although the mass transports are greater at these upper levels in Case C (Fig. 8), little effect is produced in the profile of \( F \) since the mesoscale updraft is less effective than the convective-scale updrafts in transporting moist static energy upward. The difference in \( F \) from Case B to Case A above 5.1 km is directly proportional to the difference in \( M_{cu} \) between those cases.

Striking differences in shape and magnitude exist among the three profiles of \( F \) below 10 km. The peak in \( F \) for Case C (Fig. 9) is higher than the peaks for Cases A and B (6.5 km compared to 3.5 km). This reflects the presence of the mesoscale updraft in Case C, as the peak in \( F_{mu} \) occurs \( \sim 3 \) km higher than the peak in \( F_{cu} \) (Fig. 7c). Below 4.5 km, where the mesoscale updraft makes no contribution to \( F \),
Case C exhibits significantly lower values of \( F \) than Case B, which possesses larger heat transports due to convective-scale updrafts than Case C.

In comparing the profiles of \( F \) in Fig. 9 below 10 km, differences in slope among the three cases are of particular interest since the slope of the profile, \( dF/dz \), gives the cooling (positive slope) or heating (negative slope) rate associated with the vertical divergence of the cloud fluxes of moist static energy.

Between cloud base and 4.5 km, Case C exhibits no net heating. At the lowest levels the cooling accomplished by convective updrafts is balanced by heating in the mesoscale and convective downdrafts, while near 4 km, the slopes of \( F_{nd, c} \) and \( F_u \) are almost exactly zero (Fig. 7). Net cooling in the lower troposphere in Case C is restricted to the layer between 4.5 and 5.5 km, with net heating up to 13.5 km. Cases A and B, which lack a mesoscale updraft, show net cooling below 3.5 km and net heating up to 13.5 km. Compared to Case A, Case B exhibits less cooling in the layer between cloud base and 3.5 km because it possesses a mesoscale downdraft which partially compensates for the cooling due to convective updrafts. Since the slope of \( F_u \) is much greater in Case B than in Case C below 3.5 km (Fig. 7), the downdrafts cannot completely compensate for the cooling at low levels as occurs in Case C.

5. Conclusions

We have found, using estimates of the magnitudes of mesoscale vertical air motions, that mesoscale updrafts and downdrafts can make important contributions to the vertical fluxes of mass and moist static energy in intense tropical convection. Assuming three different water budgets for an idealized mesoscale system has enabled us to isolate the contributions to the total fluxes from convective-scale updrafts, convective-scale downdrafts, a mesoscale updraft and a mesoscale downdraft in three cases containing different combinations of these types of vertical motions but the same total amount of precipitation. Mesoscale air motions, where included in the calculations (Cases B and C), make contributions to the vertical transports of mass and moist static energy comparable in magnitude to those of their convective-scale counterparts. Inclusion of the mesoscale air motions, however, changes the vertical distributions of the computed mass and heat transports. Mass transport calculations which do not include the mesoscale motions produce larger mass fluxes in the lower troposphere and smaller mass transports in the upper troposphere than when the mesoscale motions are included. We find further that the heat flux associated with the mesoscale updraft leads to cooling in the layer between 4.5 and 6.5 km. Without the mesoscale updraft, the slope of the vertical flux profile is in the direction of net warming in this layer. Below 4 km, when both a mesoscale updraft and downdraft are included, the net heating is negligible because the mesoscale and convective-scale downdrafts are able to compensate for the cooling produced by the convective-scale updrafts.

The large differences in the mass and heat flux profiles obtained when our model water budget assumptions allowed mesoscale updrafts and downdrafts to contribute to the fluxes (Cases B and C) raises important questions about diagnostic methods and convective cloud parameterizations that make assumptions that suppress the mesoscale motions. Observational (Zipser, 1969, 1977; Betts et al., 1976; Houze, 1977; Zipser and Gautier, 1978; Leary and Houze, 1979a,b; Cheng and Houze, 1979; Ogura and Liou, 1979) and theoretical (Brown, 1979) studies now indicate strongly that mesoscale drafts are significant components of tropical cloud populations. Consequently, if mesoscale vertical motions are suppressed in diagnostic models or parameterization schemes, by making either explicitly or implicitly the assumptions expressed by Eqs. (5) and (6), then convective-scale updrafts and downdrafts are required artificially to account for fluxes actually accomplished by the mesoscale motions. Our calculations in this paper suggest that diagnostic results obtained with models including assumptions allowing for mesoscale motions will be significantly more realistic.

Since the calculations of this paper closely follow the general diagnostic scheme outlined in H, we anticipate that the application of a diagnostic method, with model assumptions allowing for the contribution of mesoscale anvil air motions to mass and heat fluxes, will in fact lead to results qualitatively similar to those of our idealized mesoscale system.
Future studies should make use of synoptic mass, heat and moisture budgets as well as observed precipitation patterns and their radar-detected structure to determine how the mesoscale anvil motions within large cloud ensembles combine in their effects with the convective cells to satisfy large-scale budgets. One study (Johnson, 1980) of this type, dealing particularly with mesoscale downdrafts, has already been completed and is consistent with our results. Through studies of this type we can expect progress to be made toward the larger objective of whether mesoscale as well as convective-scale motions need to be accounted for in parameterization schemes for numerical models of the large-scale flow over the tropical oceans.
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