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Abstract

Among those which parameterize cumulus convection, the "penetrative moist convection (PMC) scheme" and the "convective adjustment (CA) scheme" are compared with each other by applying them to a simple numerical model. A main difference between them appears in the vertical distribution of warming. The warming in the PMC scheme has characteristics of penetrative convection, whereas that in the CA scheme hardly penetrate into a stable layer. Features found in precipitations and stabilities for perturbations of different wavelengths are discussed as well as for each of the schemes. Some variations of these two schemes are also examined.

1. Introduction

It is well known that a number of tall convective clouds which are frequently called "hot towers" play the most important role in developing and maintaining a tropical cyclone (e.g., Riehl and Malkus [1961]). The latent heat release due to condensation of water vapor which depends primarily on cumulus convection must be taken into account in energy balance of the global atmosphere, especially in the tropics (e.g., Palmén and Newton [1969]). It is needless to say that the effect of cumulus convection cannot be neglected in most severe meso-scale phenomena.

For better understanding of the physical processes in the phenomena mentioned above, attempts to incorporate a total effect of cumulus convection in the dynamics of large-scale motion have been made by many investigators (e.g., Ooyama [1963], Charney and Eliassen [1964], Manabe et al. [1965], Asai and Kasahara [1967] and Arakawa et al. [1968]).

The purpose of the present study is to compare characteristics of the schemes parameterizing cumulus convection with one another by applying them to a simple numerical model.

2. Basic equations

2.1 Governing equations

Governing equations are described in the $x$-, $y$- and $p$- (pressure) coordinate system, where $x$-, $y$- and $p$-coordinates are directed eastward, northward and downward
respectively. The model atmosphere is divided into six layers and the physical quantities are defined in a manner shown in Fig. 1. Consider a small amplitude perturbation superimposed on a still atmosphere in a hydrostatic equilibrium. Assuming the perturbation independent of the $y$-coordinate, we may write the perturbation equations as follows.

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - fu = - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}, \tag{2.1}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + fu = 0, \tag{2.2}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial p} = - \frac{R \pi^*}{p} \theta, \tag{2.3}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial p} = 0, \tag{2.4}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + \omega \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial p} = \frac{1}{c_p \pi^*} (\dot{Q} + \dot{Q}_e), \tag{2.5}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q}{\partial t} + \omega \frac{\partial \bar{q}}{\partial p} = - \frac{\dot{Q}}{L} + \dot{q}_e, \tag{2.6}
\]

where $\pi^* = (p/p_0)^{\kappa/\kappa}$, $u$, $v$ and $\omega$ are the perturbation velocity components in the $x$-, $y$- and $p$-directions respectively, $\phi$ the geopotential, $\theta$ the potential temperature and $q$ the specific humidity of the perturbations. The potential temperature and the specific humidity of the basic field are denoted by $\theta$ and $\bar{q}$ respectively. $f$, $R$, $c_p$, $L$ and $p_0$ are the Coriolis parameter, the specific gas constant of dry air, the specific heat at constant pressure, the latent heat of condensation of water vapor and the reference pressure respectively. In Eqs. (2.5) and (2.6) $\dot{Q}$ is the heating term due to release of latent heat by the perturbation, while $\dot{Q}_e$ and $\dot{q}_e$ indicate the effects of
condensation of the water vapor through cumulus convection on the temperature and the moisture fields respectively. The condensed water vapor is assumed to precipitate out of the system instantaneously, and the cooling due to the re-evaporation of water droplets which may be suspended in the air is not taken into account.

In this study we investigate characteristics of each scheme to be shown in the tropical region where no strong baroclinicity exists. Two types of basic states are selected. In Case A the mean soundings of the West Indies during hurricane seasons (Jul.–Oct.) analysed by Jordan [1958] are employed for the basic state of \( \theta \) and \( \tilde{q} \), and in Case B more destabilized basic state is assumed as drawn in Fig. 2. The reason for taking these two basic states is given in Section 4.

![Fig. 2: Basic states of the potential temperature (\( \theta \)), the relative humidity (\( \tilde{r} \)) and the equivalent potential temperature (\( \tilde{\theta}_e \)) in Case A (solid lines) and Case B (dashed lines). Arrows indicate \( \theta_c \) of the cloud. Temperature of environmental air (\( T \)) and cloud air (\( T_c \)) are drawn for Case A.](image)

2.2 Boundary conditions and initial conditions

The upper boundary of the atmospheric layer concerned is assumed to be at 100-mb level and the lower boundary is at 900-mb level which is assumed to be the
top of the planetary boundary layer. The boundary conditions for $\omega$ are

$$\omega_T = 0, \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\omega_B = -A_z B, \quad (2.8)$$

where $A = \rho g / (K/2f \sin 2\alpha)$. $\zeta$, $\rho$, $g$, $K$, and $\alpha$ are the perturbation vorticity, the air density, the acceleration of gravity, the coefficient of vertical eddy viscosity and the angle between isobar and wind direction at the anemometer level respectively. Subscripts $T$ and $B$ indicate the values at the upper and the lower boundaries respectively. Eq. (2.8) gives the frictionally induced vertical velocity at the top of the Ekman layer (Brunt [1941], Charney and Eliassen [1949]). The lateral boundary conditions are assumed to be cyclic.

The sinusoidal perturbations of $u$ and $v$ which are expressed as

$$u = U_0 \sin \left( \frac{2\pi x}{L_0} + \varphi_u \right), \quad (2.9)$$

$$v = V_0 \sin \left( \frac{2\pi x}{L_0} + \varphi_v \right), \quad (2.10)$$

are superimposed on the basic state initially, where $U_0$ and $V_0$, $\varphi_u$ and $\varphi_v$ are the amplitudes and the phase angles of $u$ and $v$ respectively. They satisfy the relation,

$$\int_{pr} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} dp = A \frac{\partial v_B}{\partial x}, \quad (2.11)$$

which can be derived from Eqs. (2.4), (2.7) and (2.8).

### 3. Parameterization of cumulus convection

Two schemes parameterizing cumulus convection, i.e. "penetrative moist convection" and "convective adjustment" are compared with each other by applying them to the model atmosphere.

#### 3.1 Penetrative moist convection (PMC)

This hypothesis originally developed by Ooyama [1963, 1969] in the study of tropical cyclone is based on the idea that a) cumulus convection develops wherever there is a conditionally unstable deep layer with horizontal convergence in the planetary boundary layer associated with a large-scale motion, and b) an effect of cumulus convection penetrates to the level where the cloud air loses the buoyancy.

1. **PMC**

Yamasaki [1968a, b] investigated the dependence of tropical cyclone development on the vertical distribution of heating in the PMC scheme. A total amount of heat released in a vertical air column with unit cross section per unit time was assumed
to be equal to the upward flux of water vapor at the top of the boundary layer and to
be distributed to each level following the heating ratio, \( h \),

\[
\dot{Q}_e = -hL\bar{q} \omega_B, \tag{3.1}
\]

where \( \bar{q} \) is the specific humidity at the cloud base which is assumed to be equal to the
saturation specific humidity at 900-mb. Yamasaki [1968c] assumed the following
heating ratio:

\[
h = \begin{cases} 
(T_c - T)/\int_{p_T}^{p_B} (T_c - T) \, dp, & \text{if } \omega_B < 0 \text{ and } T_c > T \\
0, & \text{if } \omega_B \geq 0 \text{ or } T_c \leq T,
\end{cases} \tag{3.2}
\]

where \( T_c \) is the temperature in the cloud in which the moist adiabatic process takes
place. His model did not include the moisture explicitly. Therefore,

\[
\dot{Q} = \dot{q}_e = 0. \tag{3.3}
\]

We abbreviate this scheme as PMC1.

(2) PMC2

Only the released latent heat due to condensation through cumulus convection
is taken into account in PMC1. Actually convective clouds, however, have a function
proposed a model which includes moisture accumulation due to cumulus convection
as well as to large-scale motion. In this scheme the moisture flux through the top
of the boundary layer gives rise to heating and moisture accumulation. Formulations
similar to that in PMC1 are used concerning vertical distribution of heating
and moistening, i.e.,

\[
\dot{Q}_e = -h_\theta L\bar{q} \omega_B, \tag{3.4}
\]

\[
\dot{q}_e = -h_\theta \bar{q} \omega_B, \tag{3.5}
\]

\[
h_\theta = \begin{cases} 
\frac{c_p(T_c - T)}{\int_{p_T}^{p_B} c_p(T_c - T) + L(q_c - q) \, dp}, & \text{if } \omega_B < 0 \text{ and } T_c > T \\
0, & \text{if } \omega_B \geq 0 \text{ or } T_c \leq T,
\end{cases} \tag{3.6}
\]

\[
h_q = \begin{cases} 
\frac{L(q_c - q)}{\int_{p_T}^{p_B} c_p(T_c - T) + L(q_c - q) \, dp}, & \text{if } \omega_B < 0 \text{ and } q_c > q \\
0, & \text{if } \omega_B \geq 0 \text{ or } q_c \leq q,
\end{cases} \tag{3.7}
\]

where \( h_\theta \) and \( h_q \) are the parameters which indicate the vertical distribution of the
rates of heating and moistening respectively, and \( q_c \) is the saturation specific humidity
in the cloud. This scheme is called PMC2.

3.2 Convective adjustment (CA)

The concept of convective adjustment was introduced into the general circulation
model of GFDL (Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory) by Manabe et al. [1964,
1965]. It is based on the assumptions: a) when the lapse rate \( \Gamma' \) and the relative humidity \( r \) exceeds certain critical values \( \Gamma_c \) and \( r_c \), respectively, cumulus convection develops and adjusts the lapse rate and humidity to the neutral value, and if \( r \) is less than \( r_c \), dry convection occurs only when \( \Gamma' \) is super-adiabatic, and b) the kinetic energy of convection is converted to the thermal energy instantaneously by frictional dissipation and then the static energy is conserved throughout the process.

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. 3.** Relation between relative humidity \( r \) and critical lapse rate \( \Gamma_c' \) for CAMS (a) and CAGK (b). An example of adjustment: initial state (cross mark) and adjusted state (top of arrow)

(1) **CAMS (CA100, CA80 and CA60)**

The relation between \( r \) and \( \Gamma_c \) in the convective adjustment scheme of the GFDL group is shown in Fig. 3a. When \( r \) is less than \( r_c \), \( \Gamma_c \) is the dry adiabatic lapse rate \( \Gamma_d \) and when \( r \) is greater than or equal to \( r_c \), \( \Gamma_c \) is the moist adiabatic lapse rate \( \Gamma_m \). The former adjustment is called "dry convective adjustment" and the latter "moist convective adjustment". The relative humidity is adjusted to \( r \) in moist convective adjustment.

Convective clouds may be observed in a certain section of the atmosphere where the mean relative humidity does not reach 100% because of the presence of cloud-free regions. This reason that \( r \) had better be selected less than 100%, and Miyakoda et al. [1969] tested the case when \( r_c \) is 80%. We examine three cases of \( r_c = 100\% \), \( r_c = 80\% \) and \( r_c = 60\% \) which are denoted by CA100, CA80 and CA60 respectively. All of these three schemes are called CAMS.

(2) **CAGK**

The adjustment scheme of GFDL involves a sort of discontinuity in the relation between \( r \) and \( \Gamma_c \) at \( r = r_c \) as shown in Fig. 3a. Gadd and Kréers [1970] pointed out that this scheme had the disadvantage that unrealistically rapid changes in \( \Gamma' \) might be implied and that sudden changes could produce serious defects in computed forecasts. They used a following relation between \( r \) and \( \Gamma_c \) as indicated in Fig. 3b.

\[
\Gamma_c = \begin{cases} 
\Gamma_d & \text{for } 0 \leq r < r_c \\
\Gamma_d \left( \frac{1-r}{1-r_c} \right) + \Gamma_m \left( \frac{r-r_c}{1-r_c} \right) & \text{for } r_c \leq r \leq 1, 
\end{cases}
\] (3.8)
where \( r_c \) is assumed to be 50'. The relative humidity is kept constant through the procedure of adjustment. Details of this scheme is described by Benwell et al. [1971].

An example is illustrated in Fig. 3, indicating that the initial state (cross marked) is converted to the neutral state (the top of the arrow) through the adjustment.

4. Results of numerical experiments

A linear analysis of the governing equations (2.1)–(2.5) yields the solution of a stationary wave and a set of two propagating waves when the PMC scheme is used for a two-layer model. Both the stationary and the propagating waves decay in the model atmosphere of Case A. Case B represents one of the atmosphere in which the stationary wave amplifies with the \( e \)-folding time of several days and the propagating waves diminish.

In the first place the dry adiabatic motion (\( \dot{Q}, \dot{Q}_x \) and \( \dot{q}_z = 0 \)) is examined for a reference. Fig. 4 shows variations of the kinetic energy in the \( k \)-th layer (\( \bar{K}_k \)), the total kinetic energy (\( \langle K \rangle \)) and the total energy which is the sum of the total kinetic energy and the total available potential energy (\( \langle K + P_A \rangle \)) with time for DRY·A900. Here DRY·A900 denotes the dry adiabatic motion for the atmosphere of Case A on which a perturbation of the wavelength of 900 km is superimposed. Similar abbreviations will be used in the following. For instance, PMC1·B300 denotes the case for which the PMC1 scheme, the model atmosphere of Case B and the perturbation of wavelength of 300 km are used. \( \bar{K}_k \), \( \langle K \rangle \) and \( \langle K + P_A \rangle \) are defined as follows.

\[
\bar{K}_k = \frac{1}{g} \sum_i \frac{1}{2} (u_{i,k}^2 + v_{i,k}^2) dx dp,
\]

\[
\langle K \rangle = \sum_k \bar{K}_k,
\]

\[
\langle P_A \rangle = \frac{1}{g} \sum_k \sum_i \left( -\frac{1}{2} \frac{R \pi^{*} \theta_i^{2} k}{\partial \theta \partial p} \right) dx dp,
\]

\[
\langle K + P_A \rangle = \langle K \rangle + \langle P_A \rangle,
\]

where

\[
\theta_i^{*} = \theta_i - \sum_{i=1}^{I} \theta_i / I,
\]

and subscripts \( i \) and \( k \) indicate the \( i \)-th grid point in the \( x \)-direction and the \( k \)-th grid point in the \( p \)-direction respectively, \( I \) is the total number of grid points in the \( x \)-direction and \( dx \) and \( dp \) are the grid distances in the \( x \)- and \( p \)-directions respectively.
In the dry adiabatic case an inertia-gravity wave whose period coincides with that obtained by the linear analysis of the governing equations is predominant as shown in Fig. 4. The following discussions are made primarily on deviations of the energies defined above from those for the dry adiabatic cases which are denoted by $J<K>$, $J<K+P_A>$ and so forth.

4.1 Comparison of the PMC and CA schemes

Variations of the amount of one-hour precipitation with time are shown in Fig. 5 for the different schemes. The amount of convective precipitation, $P_c$, is indicated in the upper side of the abscissa and the amount of non-convective precipitation, $P_{nc}$, in the lower side. $P_c$ is produced from the term $\dot{Q}_c/L$ in Eq. (2.5), while $P_{nc}$ is derived from the term $\dot{Q}/L$. A distinct difference between both the PMC and CA schemes will be observed in $P_c$. A remarkable feature of the PMC scheme, which appears typically in PMC1, is continuous precipitation without large fluctuation. On the other hand precipitation is intermittent and fluctuates considerably in the CA scheme.

Fig. 6 shows the time changes of $\Delta<K>$ and $J<K+P_A>$ for the same cases as in Fig. 5. In all the schemes the kinetic energies gradually decrease oscillating with a period of the inertia-gravity wave. The total energy in CA decreases like a step function. It is seen that the time when the total energy suddenly decreases coincides with the time when the precipitation occurs. A discussion of these characteristics is made in Section 5. Variations of $\Delta<K>$ and $\Delta<K+P_A>$ with time in
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Fig. 5. Amount of one-hour convective precipitation (upper side of abscissa) and non-convective precipitation (lower side of abscissa). The dashed boxes in PMC2 indicate the amount of water vapor supplied from the boundary layer.

Fig. 6. Variation of $J_{<K>}$ (solid lines) and $J_{<K+P_d>}$ (dash-dotted lines) with time for the case A900.

Case B for each of the schemes are shown in Fig. 7. For the case of PMC1 a stationary wave denoted by the dashed line amplifies with almost the same growth rate as expected by the linear stability analysis. In the other schemes stationary waves amplify with the $\epsilon$-folding time of several hours which is much shorter than that of the stationary wave in PMC1. These unstable waves with the short $\epsilon$-folding time are characterized by a narrow and intensive ascending region compared with the associated descending region so that they may be regarded as thermal convections rather than meso-scale disturbances.
The vertical distributions of heating in the cases of A900 and B900 are shown in Figs. 8a and 8b respectively. As anticipated from the definition of heating ratio by Eq. (3.2) and the difference between $\bar{T}$ and $T_e$ shown in Fig. 2, a maximum of the warming appears at a middle or an upper level and the warming expands even into the uppermost layer with stable stratification, while in the CA scheme it is located at a level lower than that in PMC because the mechanism of adjustment acts only in an unstable lower half of the layer and the warming hardly penetrates into upper

Fig. 7. The same as Fig. 6 except the case B900. J of stationary waves are indicated by dashed lines.

Fig. 8. The deviation of level-mean temperature from the initial state for the cases A900 (upper) and B900 (lower). PMC1 (thick solid lines), PMC2 (thin solid lines) and CAMS (dashed lines) are drawn.
levels as far as during a period of tens of hours which are regarded as time-scale of intermediate-scale perturbations. Note that a maximum warming stays in a low level owing to the non-convective condensation in PMC2-B900.

Fig. 9 shows the time variations of $J<K>$ of perturbations of different wavelengths. An amplifying or damping rate of a perturbation increases as a wavelength decreases for PMC as far as wavelengths are between 150 km and 2000 km. This feature can be found for CA as well, but the dependence of amplifying or damping rate on the wavelength of perturbation is not so much as that for PMC. As is shown in Figs. 5 and 10, the amount of precipitation decreases with time for the CA scheme. This is because there is no net water vapor flux through the top of the boundary layer for the CA scheme and the atmosphere concerned gets dryer by precipitation. It is feasible that the growth rate of perturbations for the CA scheme is reduced by the effect that humidity of the atmosphere is lowered.

4.2 Effect of critical relative humidity in CAMS

The amounts of one-hour precipitation are shown in Fig. 10 for CA100, CA80 and CA60 in the case of A900. The convective precipitation increases and the non-convective one decreases as the critical relative humidity, $r_c$, becomes lower. More amount of water vapor precipitates out from the system as $r_c$ is lowered. The levels of maximum warming are the same for all the CAMS schemes.

4.3 Production of numerical noises in the CA scheme

As mentioned in Section 3 the CAMS scheme gives rise to a sudden change of the lapse rate and is likely to make a "shock noise". We investigate to what extent
this defect is mitigated by introducing a continuous function such as Eq. (3.8) proposed by Gadd and Keers. Fig. 11 shows the deviations of the $x$-component of the velocity at the lowest level from the sine function after 12 hours from the initial for B900. A noise of wavelength of $2\lambda$ appears in the CA100 scheme, while the noise developed in CA100 is mitigated to some extent by using the CAGK scheme. Disturbances of short wavelengths are not observed for the PMC1 scheme.

![Fig. 10. Time variations of one-hour precipitation for CA100, CA80 and CA60.](image1)

![Fig. 11. Deviation of $u_{12}$ from sine function at the time of 12th hour for B900.](image2)

5. Remarks

As is seen in Fig. 6, a sudden decrease of total energy coincides with an occurrence of precipitation in both the schemes of PMC2 and CA. The non-convective con-
densation of water vapor takes place in the ascending regions where the temperature is lower through adiabatic expansion and the air is saturated with water vapor. The heating in the lower temperature region reduces the horizontal temperature gradient and then decreases the available potential energy. The convective condensation by the CA scheme indicates similar features. Whether the available potential energy is decreased by the non-convective condensation in the actual atmosphere or not remains to be examined for intermediate-scale disturbances concerned here.

Fig. 5 indicates that only about 20% of the amount of water vapor supplied through the top of the boundary layer is converted to heat energy and the rest is accumulated in the free atmosphere, whereas all of the supplied water vapor is used for heat source in the PMCl scheme. It will be important to analyze how much percentage of supplied water vapor is converted to heat by cumulus convection.

In the CAMS scheme \( r_a \) has a significant influence on an evolution of perturbation, especially on the amount of condensation. However, the most reasonable value of \( r_a \) is expected to vary with the grid distance employed as well as with the height and the sort of clouds as mentioned by Smagorinsky [1960]. However, little is known concerning this problem. The relation between \( r \) and \( r_a \) such as Eq. (3.8) in the CAGK scheme is less sensitive to the value of \( r_a \) than the CAMS scheme.

From a viewpoint of calculation technique the CAGK scheme seems to be better than the CAMS scheme because of reducing noises which may be produced by numerical processes. It should be mentioned, however, that noises of short wavelengths are unavoidable by the CAGK scheme. Noises thus produced may be suppressed considerably by lateral mixing and by a non-instantaneous adjustment taking account of the life time of the clouds.
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