Dependence of Altimeter Sea-State Bias Coefficient on the Shape of the Wave Spectrum E. J. GUIREY, C.P. GOMMENGINGER, M.A. SROKOSZ



Southampton Oceanography Centre, Southampton, SO14 3ZH, United Kingdom (ejg@soton.ac.uk)

1. Introduction

Altimeter sea-state bias (SSB) is the overestimation in altimeter range measurements caused by nonlinearity of sea surface waves.

Current corrections rely on empirical algorithms:

 $SSB = - \varepsilon SWH$

where the SSB coefficient ε is traditionally parameterised in terms of altimeter SWH and wind speed (U₁₀). Uncertainties remain at around 1% of SWH.

2. Dataset & Method

Directional wave spectra were obtained from National Buoy Data Centre (NDBC) moored buoys, collocated with Topex altimeter data in three geographical regions characterised by very different wave climates (see Table 1).

The directional wave spectra cover a frequency range of 0.04 to 0.4 Hz in 24 directions. For full integration the spectra were extended to higher frequencies using a Phillips (1958) spectrum (Figure 1). For fitting the tail, spectra were integrated over all directions.

Table 1: Geographical location of buoys.LocationBuoy ID# SpectraConditionsGulf of Mexico42002185Enclosed seaVirginia Beach44014134Mixed seas



From the Srokosz (1986) SSB theory in 1D, Janssen (2000) derives a formula for the electromagnetic bias in terms of the Phillip's parameter β :

$\varepsilon \approx -(7/12)\sqrt{(2\beta)}$

This formulation will be tested to see whether the Phillips parameter could be used to better parameterise the SSB coefficient.

Hawaii	51026	64	Open ocean

Dataset was also divided into two subsets:

- 1. 'Simple' spectra well-defined spectral peak and high frequency tail
- 2. 'Complex' spectra multiple peaks and/or no tail
- The tail-fitting method is most consistent for the 'simple' spectra, so that results obtained with these spectra are more reliable that those obtained with the 'complex' spectra.

Figure 1. High frequency tail-fitting method.



3. Results

The prediction by Janssen of a linear relationship between $\sqrt{\beta}$ and the SSB coefficient is correct (Figure 2). However, the 1D Janssen theory overestimates the magnitude of the 2D Srokosz SSB coefficient by almost an order of 2 for high values of β (Figure 3). This is true for all locations and for both sets of spectra.

There is a linear relationship between rms slope and the SSB coefficient, with no difference between buoys in the slope or strength of the relationship (Figure 4).

Figure 5 compares this relationship with that found by Gommenginger *et al.* (2003) and the relationship between rms slope and the SSB coefficient calculated in the no tail case. The amount of scatter and gradient of the relationship differs between tail choices and fitting methods, but the relationship still holds in the no tail case. The tail-fitting method used here is more consistent than that employed by Gommenginger *et al.* (2003), leading to reduced



Figure 2. $\sqrt{(\text{Beta})}$ plotted against Srokosz (1986) SSB coefficient for all spectra fitted with (i) Phillips spectrum high frequency extension (ii) no tail extension.



A linear relationship is evident between $\sqrt{\beta}$ and rms slope (Figure 6). There is no difference between locations in the slope of the relationship or amount of scatter.

Figure 4. SSB coefficient against rms slope for each buoy for 'simple' and 'complex' spectra fitted with Phillips (1958) spectrum tail.

COMPLEX SPECTR

COMPLEX SPECTE

0.025





4. Discussion

SSB coefficient is proportional to $\sqrt{\beta}$:

Phillips spectrum tail. Solid line indicates Janssen theory.

5. Conclusions

Either the Phillips parameter or rms slope could form the basis of

- As predicted by Janssen (2000).
- Magnitude of the SSB coefficient was overestimated by the Janssen theory. Since the SSB coefficient was calculated from the 2D SSB theory of Srokosz (1986), the difference must result from the reduction to the 1D case in the derivation of the Janssen theory.

tail.

SSB coefficient is proportional to rms slope:

- Linear relationship held for all tail choices, probably because the Srokosz (1986) SSB theory is essentially a longwaves theory (Gommenginger *et al.*, 2003), so that changes in energy in the short waves domain have minimal effect.
- The gradient of the relationship is different for each tail choice. This is because the tail choice and fitting method have a large effect on the rms slope calculations, since the k² term in the integration required for rms slope emphasises the contribution from large wave numbers (high frequencies).

The rms slope is proportional to $\sqrt{\beta}$ implying that parameterisation of the SSB coefficient in terms of either would be equivalent.

Greater scatter for the 'complex' than 'simple' spectra. This results from the tail-fitting process being less suitable for the 'complex' spectra and so introducing more noise, rather than because the 'complex' spectra represent some sea state for which the relationships are less valid.

future SSB correction algorithms.

Both parameters capture the bias well over a full range of sea states, whereas U_{10} and SWH, which are used in current corrections, fail to do this.

References

Gommenginger CP, Srokosz MA, Wolf J & Janssen PAEM (2003). An investigation of altimeter sea state bias theories. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 108:3011-3024

Janssen P (2000). ECMWF wave modelling and satellite altimeter wave data. In Halpern D (Ed.). *Satellites, Oceanography and Science*. Elsevier Science B.V.

Srokosz MA (1986). On the joint distribution of sea surface elevation and slopes for a nonlinear random sea, with an application for radar altimetry. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 91:995-1006