Liquid fraction in stratiform mixed-phase clouds from in situ observations
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SUMMARY

Liquid fractions in mixed-phase clouds have been analysed using aircraft measurements taken in mid- and high latitude stratiform clouds. The liquid fraction generally increases with temperature but has a minimum at about $-15^\circ$C, where the maximum ice crystal growth based on vapour deposition would be expected. The mean liquid fraction also depends on total water content. This suggests that segregation of cloud phase based on a simple linear relationship of phase fraction (ice or liquid) with temperature, as is used in some climate models, may be unrealistic. Parametrizations of mean liquid fraction in terms of temperature and total water content, and in terms of temperature alone, have been developed based on data averaged at 10 s resolution (1 km). These parametrizations agree reasonably well with the observations.
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1. INTRODUCTION

When supercooled cloud droplets and ice crystals coexist in a given cloud, the ice crystals can grow rapidly to initiate precipitation. This has been theorized by Bergeron (1935). The theory is based on the fact that ice crystals and liquid drops cannot coexist in equilibrium at sub-zero temperatures, due to the fact that the vapour pressure at the surface of ice is smaller than that over liquid drops (Wegener 1911). Observations indicate that supercooled drops may coexist with ice crystals in clouds at temperatures as low as $-40^\circ$C (Zak 1937; Klinov 1959; Borovikov et al. 1963; Sassen 1992; Heymsfield and Miloshevich 1993). The radiative properties of clouds can be altered by the presence of ice crystals (Foot 1988; Sun and Shine 1994). A modelling study by Sun and Shine (1994) shows that the radiative properties of clouds are very sensitive to how the clouds are assumed to be mixed. Generally, a ‘mixed-phase cloud’ is taken to be a cloud with liquid and ice co-existing. However, ice crystals may be embedded in supercooled liquid layers (e.g. Heymsfield et al. 1991), or a glaciated layer may be topped by a supercooled liquid layer (e.g. Cooper and Vali 1981; Hobbs and Rangno 1985). Fu and Hollars (2004) found that mixed-phase clouds on a scale of about 100 m may be composed of liquid droplet and ice particle patches. On a similar scale, Korolev et al. (2003) have shown that stratiform clouds are dominated by either ice or liquid phase for temperatures ranging from 0 to $-35^\circ$C.

Distributions of liquid and glaciated clouds, and the identification of cloud mixing, can be important for parametrization of cloud phase in numerical models, since such sub-scale inhomogeneities are important for the simulation of mixed-phase clouds in models ranging from large-eddy simulations to general circulation models (GCMs). For the scale of a GCM, ensembles of clouds may exist in a mixture of phases at a single grid point. In this study we focus on the liquid water fraction on a scale of $\sim$1 km. The liquid fraction ($f_L$) is defined as:

$$ f_L = \frac{LWC}{IWC + LWC}, $$(1)
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where $LWC$ is the liquid water content and $IWC$ is the ice water content. There have been some studies of $LWC$ and $IWC$ from in situ aircraft measurements (e.g. Cober et al. 2001; Boudala et al. 2002a; Korolev et al. 2003). However, there have been few studies of their ratios in mixed-phase clouds (e.g. Isaac and Shemenaur 1979; Moss and Johnson 1994; Bower et al. 1996; Cober et al. 2001; Korolev et al. 2003).

Smith (1990) developed a parametrization of liquid fraction as a function of temperature for application in the UK Met Office Atmospheric General Circulation Model. In this scheme, it is assumed that all clouds are liquid at temperatures greater than $0 \, ^\circ C$, and are all ice at temperatures lower than $-15 \, ^\circ C$. Bower et al. (1996) have parametrized liquid fraction as a function of temperature for convective and frontal clouds separately, based on limited in situ aircraft measurements. The parametrization of liquid fraction has been difficult, mainly because of large uncertainties in the simultaneous measurement of $IWC$ and $LWC$, and the identification and separation of cloud water phases. Derivation of $IWC$, based on ice particle spectra measured using two-dimensional (2D) optical array probes such as the PMS (Particle Measuring System) 2D-C and 2D-P, is particularly problematic. This is partly because the circular images of cloud particles can be either water droplets or ice crystals, and small particles (diameter $D < 125 \, \mu m$) cannot be reliably identified as ice or liquid on the basis of shape. Another difficulty is how to determine the ice particle mass from 2D images. Tremblay et al. (1996) parametrized ice fraction in terms of temperature, total water content ($TWC$), and vertical velocity for application in the Canadian Global Environmental Multiscale model. Their work indicates that a parametrization of liquid fraction as a function of temperature only may not be appropriate. It is worth noting that in their modelling scheme all clouds are assumed to be glaciated for temperatures less than $-20 \, ^\circ C$, and all are assumed to be liquid for temperatures greater than $0 \, ^\circ C$, which may not always be true. Currently there are some bulk cloud microphysical schemes used in GCMs that can estimate the liquid water fraction in a GCM grid cell (e.g. Rotstayn et al. 2000; Lohmann and Roeckner 1996). However, these models are based on approximations and they should be validated with direct in situ observations. Recent modelling studies by Tremblay et al. (2002) and Morrison et al. (2003) indicate that one of the major problems in simulating a mixed-phase cloud is predicting the liquid fraction, which is invariably underestimated.

The aim of this work is to develop a parametrization of liquid fraction in terms of temperature and cloud water content based on measurements from stratiform clouds containing an ensemble of phases.

2. Measurements

The data used in this paper were collected during the five projects described below; in all of these the National Research Council (NRC) Convair-580 aircraft was used. The FIRE Arctic Cloud Experiment (FIRE.ACE) project began in April and ended in July 1998, with the Convair-580 measurements being made in April (Curry et al. 2000). The First Canadian Freezing Drizzle Experiment (CFDE I) project was conducted in March 1995, and included numerous flights over Newfoundland and the Atlantic Ocean. The Third Canadian Freezing Drizzle Experiment (CFDE III) started in December 1997 and ended in February 1998; during CFDE III, the aircraft flew over Southern Ontario, Quebec, Lake Ontario and Lake Erie (Cober et al. 2001; Isaac et al. 2001a). The Alliance Icing Research Study (AIRS) was conducted between 29 November 1999 and 19 February 2000 (Isaac et al. 2001b). The Beaufort and Arctic Storms Experiment (BASE) field project was conducted in October 1994 over the Canadian Western Arctic (Gultepe et al. 2000).
The types of instrumentation used in these projects are described in Isaac et al. (2001a,b). The instruments used for this work were the King probe which measures LWC, Nevzorov LWC and TWC probes, and the PMS 2D-C and 2D-P probes which measure size, shape and concentration of hydrometers. Temperature was measured with a Rosemount temperature probe.

The 2D-C images were processed following a ‘center-in’ scheme (Heymsfield and Parrish 1978). This scheme includes all partly imaged particles that have their centres within the sampling area. Their sizes are determined by reconstruction of their shapes assuming a circular geometry (Cober et al. 2001). The 2D-P images were processed following an ‘entire-in’ scheme (Knollenberg 1970). This method is based on ignoring any particle that occludes either end element of the photodiode array.

Korolev et al. (1998) describe the Nevzorov TWC/LWC probe. The probe has two separate sensors, one for TWC and the other for LWC measurements. Comparison measurements made with the Nevzorov and similar types of probes in high speed wind-tunnel experiments suggest that the probe can measure LWC and TWC within an accuracy of 15%, and the sensitivity of the instrument is estimated to be in the range of 0.003 to 0.005 gm$^{-3}$. The Nevzorov LWC probe also responds to ice crystals in glaciated or mixed-phase clouds, and this response is estimated to be about 10–15% of the IWC measurements (Cober et al. 2001; Korolev et al. 2003) at the typical speeds of the Convair-580. For the mixed-phase cloud case, the Nevzorov LWC data have been corrected following Korolev et al. (2003). The threshold value for the Nevzorov TWC measurements was assumed to be 0.01 gm$^{-3}$, and only data with TWC > 0.01 gm$^{-3}$ were used for developing the parametrization.

King et al. (1978) describe the King probe. It is a hot wire probe like the Nevzorov probe but with a lower sensitivity of 0.02 gm$^{-3}$. In this study, the King probe measurements were used for comparisons and the Nevzorov probe measurements were used for development of the parametrization.

Figure 1 shows comparisons of LWC measured in mixed-phase clouds using the Nevzorov and King LWC probes during the CFDE I, CFDE III, and AIRS projects. The LWC values measured using the King probe ($LWC_K$) and the Nevzorov probe

![Figure 1. Liquid water content (LWC) measured with the King probe plotted against LWC measured with the Nevzorov LWC probe. The variance ($r^2$) is also shown.](image-url)
Figure 2. Ice water content (IWC) derived from PMS two-dimensional images (IWC\textsubscript{C78}) compared with IWC calculated from the Nevzorov TWC/LWC (total water content/liquid water content) probes. See text for further details. 

(LWC\textsubscript{Nev}) correlate well, with a correlation coefficient (r) near 0.97. A similar comparison based on projects CFDE I and CFDE III in liquid clouds was reported by Cober \textit{et al.} (2001).

Figure 2 shows a comparison of IWC derived from 30 s averaged particle spectra measured in mixed-phase cloud using PMS 2D-C and 2D-P probes during the CFDE I, CFDE III, FIRE.ACE and BASE projects. The IWC referred to here as IWC\textsubscript{Nev} was calculated from the Nevzorov probe as (TWC\textsubscript{Nev} − LWC\textsubscript{Nev}). The IWC\textsubscript{C78} values were derived from PMS 2D-C and 2D-P data using the Cunningham (1978) coefficients as described in Boudala \textit{et al.} (2002a). IWC\textsubscript{C78} and IWC\textsubscript{Nev} generally show a reasonable correlation (coefficient r = 0.84) with a mean ratio (MR) of 0.9. The derived IWC from spectra underestimate the measured IWC on average by about 10%, probably because small particles are not included in the calculation. Boudala \textit{et al.} (2002a) found that IWC\textsubscript{C78} was $\approx 20\%$ lower than IWC\textsubscript{Nev} for cloud regions that were glaciated. In addition to missing small ice crystals, a number of other reasons can affect this percentage in the case of mixed-phase clouds.

3. LIQUID FRACTION

Table 1 shows the average LWC, IWC, TWC, and $f_L$ values for every 2 degC temperature interval for data averaged over 10 s (or approximately 1 km in aircraft path length) for all clouds. The standard deviation (SD) of $f_L$, the number of averaged data points for each temperature interval, and the mean temperature within the temperature interval are also given. Table 1 includes the collective datasets from CFDE I, CFDE III, FIRE.ACE, and AIRS, corrected as described in section 2. The SD for individual points can be smaller or larger than the mean value. The mean SD for each project ranged from 0.21 to 0.39. The lowest value of the mean SD was for FIRE.ACE. The averaged liquid fraction for each individual field project is plotted against temperature in Fig. 3. Generally $f_L$ increases with increasing temperature, except near $−15 ^\circ C$. The most striking similarity among all projects is the minimum in $f_L$ that occurred between about $−20$ and $−10 ^\circ C$. In the case of $f_L$ based on all the data, this minimum is near $−15 ^\circ C$ as shown in Fig. 4(a), which plots the mean and SD values of $f_L$ versus
TABLE 1. AVERAGE WATER CONTENTS AND LIQUID FRACTIONS AVERAGED OVER ALL CLOUDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liquid water content $LWC$ ($g \cdot m^{-3}$)</th>
<th>Ice water content $IWC$ ($g \cdot m^{-3}$)</th>
<th>Liquid fraction $f_L$</th>
<th>Standard deviation of $f_L$</th>
<th>Mean temperature $T$ ($^\circ C$)</th>
<th>Number of data points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>$-1.1$</td>
<td>4247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>$-3.0$</td>
<td>5800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>$-5.0$</td>
<td>5582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>$-7.0$</td>
<td>6218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>$-9.0$</td>
<td>4052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>$-11.0$</td>
<td>3058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>$-13.0$</td>
<td>2306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>$-14.9$</td>
<td>1353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>$-17.0$</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>$-19.0$</td>
<td>1268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>$-20.9$</td>
<td>1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>$-22.8$</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>$-24.9$</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>$-27.1$</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>$-28.9$</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>$-30.6$</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>$-33.2$</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>$-34.9$</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>$-37.2$</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-38.8$</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined CFDE I, CFDE III, FIRE.ACE and AIRS, 10 s averaged data binned at every 2 degC interval. See text for details.

Figure 3. The 10 s averaged liquid fraction for every 2 degC temperature interval plotted against temperature for each project. See text for details.

Figure 4(b) shows the 25, 50 and 75% values of liquid fraction plotted against temperature. The minimum near $-15$ $^\circ C$ in $f_L$ is also clearly evident using this method of presenting the data. Under laboratory conditions, the maximum ice crystal growth rate occurs near $-15$ $^\circ C$ (Fukuta 1969; Takahashi and Fukuta 1988; Pruppacher and Klett 1997; Fukuta and Takahashi 1999) which may partially explain the minimum in liquid fraction around $-15$ $^\circ C$. 
Figure 4. The 10 s averaged liquid fraction for every 2 degC temperature interval plotted against temperature for all data given in Table 1: (a) The mean, standard deviation (SD) bars, and a parametrization using Eq. (2); (b) 75%, 50%, and 25% percentiles. See text for further details.

4. PARAMETRIZATION OF LIQUID FRACTION

As indicated in Fig. 3, there is no systematic dependence of $f_L$ on latitude; therefore, it is both useful and justifiable to develop a parametrization of $f_L$ based on the entire dataset given in Table 1. Figure 5 shows 10 s averaged data binned by temperature and $TWC$ (Fig. 5(a)), and by temperature and $LWC$ (Fig. 5(b)). On average, $f_L$ increases with both increasing temperature and $TWC$ if the minimum near $-15 \, ^\circ\text{C}$ is ignored. For given $TWC$, $f_L$ approximately increases with increasing temperature. When temperature increases, both $TWC$ and $LWC$ increase, but the rate of increase of $LWC$ is faster than the increase in $TWC$. The liquid fraction increases with increasing $LWC$ as expected. It is interesting, however, to note that for a given $LWC$, $f_L$ approximately increases with decreasing temperature for lower $LWC$s, but remains approximately constant for higher $LWC$s. The increasing tendency of $f_L$ at lower $LWC$s may be associated with the fact that generally $TWC$ decreases with decreasing temperature and the ice mass also decreases with decreasing temperature (e.g. Boudala et al. 2002a). Therefore, a parametrization of $f_L$ as a function of both temperature and $TWC$ or $LWC$ seems to be more reasonable as suggested by Tremblay et al. (1996) and Boudala et al. (2002b). Note that Tremblay et al. have included vertical velocity in their parametrization based on some physical arguments. In this work, however, this parameter is not included because of the absence of accurate measurements of vertical velocity. However, vertical velocity is also expected to be correlated with $TWC$ (Srivastava 1967; Heymsfield 1977). A simple parametrization similar to the one proposed by Boudala et al. (2002b), given in the form:

$$f_L(T, TWC) = \beta_1 TWC^{\beta_2} \exp(\beta_3 T) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\beta_1 = 1.0 \\
\beta_2 = 0.141 \\
\beta_3 = 0.037
\end{array} ,$$  \quad (2)
adequately captures the variability of the mean $f_L$ with $r = 0.94$ (see Fig. 6). However, this parametrization does not capture the liquid fraction minimum near $-15 \degree C$, and also slightly overestimates the mean liquid fraction at temperatures near $-38.5 \degree C$ (see Fig. 4(a)). These problems can be resolved by using a more complicated polynomial function in a form:

$$f_L(T, TWC) = \left( c - \frac{0.15IWC(T)}{IWC} \right)^{2.5} (a_{10}T^{10} + a_9T^9 + a_8T^8 + a_7T^7 + a_6T^6 + a_5T^5 + a_4T^4 + a_3T^3 + a_2T^2 + a_1T + a_0),$$

where $T$ is temperature in $\degree C$. As indicated in Fig. 7, the liquid fraction calculated using this function correlated well with observation with $r = 0.99$. The function $IWC(T)$ in Eq. (3) represents the measured IWC based on all projects (see Table 1) and is parametrized using a function in a form (see Fig. 8):

$$IWC(T) = d_8T^8 + d_7T^7 + d_6T^6 + d_5T^5 + d_4T^4 + d_3T^3 + d_2T^2 + d_1T + d_0,$$

where the coefficients $a_n$ and $d_n$ are given in Table 2. The constant, $c$, is given by a relation $c = \max(1, IWC(T)/TWC)$. It is worth noting from Fig. 8 that the mean $IWC$ is a maximum near $-15 \degree C$ where the liquid fraction is minimum. In glaciated ice clouds, in contrast to the mixed-phase clouds of Fig. 8, it has been shown that $IWC$
increases with increasing temperature (Heymsfield and Platt 1984; Stephens et al. 1990; McFarquhar and Heymsfield 1997; Boudala et al. 2002a).

Figure 9 shows the parametrized \( f_L \) based on Eq. (3) plotted against temperature for a given TWC. The parametrization captures well the liquid fraction minimum near \(-15^\circ\text{C}\). For a given temperature, the liquid fraction increases with increasing TWC. Based on the Tremblay et al. (1996) parametrization, for a given TWC the proportion of supercooled liquid water generally decreases with decreasing temperature. However, this is not always true based on the observations shown in Fig. 5. The ice fraction \( 1 - f_L \) generally decreases with increasing TWC, and this is also contrary to the finding of Tremblay et al. (1996).
polynomials can be a significant source of numerical error and instability, thus they should be applied with caution.

Although the parametrizations given in Eqs. (3) and (5) correlated remarkably well with observations, with $r = 0.98$, which is identical to the value shown in Fig. 7.

When the $TWC$ or $IWC$ data are not available, the liquid fraction can be estimated by a polynomial function as

$$f_L(T) = c_8 T^8 + c_7 T^7 + c_6 T^6 + c_5 T^5 + c_4 T^4 + c_3 T^3 + c_2 T^2 + c_1 T + c_0, \quad (5)$$

where the coefficients $c_n$ are given in Table 2. This parametrization correlated quite well with observations, with $r = 0.98$, which is identical to the value shown in Fig. 7.

Although the parametrizations given in Eqs. (3) and (5) correlated remarkably well with the mean liquid fraction, fitting data to high-order polynomials can be a significant source of numerical error and instability, thus they should be applied with caution.
These parametrizations are only applicable for a temperature range $0 > T \geq -38.5 \, ^\circ C$. For $T \geq 0 \, ^\circ C$ and $T < -38.5 \, ^\circ C$ the liquid fraction may be assumed to be unity and zero, respectively. In the presence of falling ice particles at the base of cloud, liquid fraction may not be unity near $0 \, ^\circ C$, but the assumption is not unreasonable. It should be noted here that if any of the parametrizations in this paper are applied to 1 or 10 s averaged datasets without temperature averaging, the correlation coefficients are significantly lower (close to 0.4). Therefore, these parametrizations are applicable for mean atmospheric conditions.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Liquid fractions averaged over 10 s intervals in stratiform clouds were analysed from more than 37,918 *in situ* data points (representing approximately 1 km path lengths) in geographical regions between 72°N and 45°N. The cloud liquid fraction observed ($f_L$) showed no systematic dependence on latitude. The dominant features observed in all field projects were that the mean $f_L$ generally increased with temperature and TWC for temperatures colder and warmer than $-15 \, ^\circ C$, with the existence of a minimum near $-15 \, ^\circ C$ where the maximum ice crystal growth based on vapour deposition would be expected. Parametrizations of $f_L$ as a function of $T$ and TWC, and $T$ alone have been developed based on the observed data. The parametrizations correlate well with the observed $f_L$, and two of them capture the observed minimum in $f_L$ between $-10$ and $-20 \, ^\circ C$. The developed parametrizations based on $T$ and TWC also predict that $f_L$ increases with increasing TWC. Parametrization of mixed-phase cloud processes is a difficult problem. The data analysed and presented in this work can be useful for parametrizing $f_L$ or validating simulations within cloud-resolving models and GCMs.
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