1. INTRODUCTION

The simultaneous transmission and reception of H (horizontal) and V (vertical) polarized waves (called SHV mode) has become a very popular way to achieve dual polarization for weather radar (Doviak et al. 2000). The advantage is that a fast polarization switch is not necessary to achieve dual polarization data. The disadvantages are 1) that the linear depolarization ratio (LDR) is not measured and 2) that there can be cross-coupling of the H and V waves which will lead to biases in the measurement of of H and V reflectivities $Z_H$ and $Z_V$, and the crosscorrelation coefficient $\rho_{hv} = |\rho_{hv}|\exp(\Psi_{dp})$ where $\Psi_{dp} = \phi_{dp} + \delta$. $\phi_{dp}$ is the differential propagation phase while $\delta$ is the differential backscatter phase. The viability of this dual polarization technique is based on 1) non-zero mean canting angle of the propagation medium, and 2) negligible antenna polarization errors. If either condition is not met, cross-coupling between the H and V channels occurs which will cause measurement biases.

Measurement errors in the SHV mode have been investigated. Doviak et al. (2000) evaluated cross-coupling errors of SHV mode and concluded that since the mean canting angle of rain is zero, the errors were acceptable. Wang and Chandrasekar (2006) investigated the measurement errors in $Z_H$, $Z_{dr}$, $\Psi_{hv}$, and $\rho_{hv}$ due to cross-coupling errors caused by the radar system as a function of $\phi_{dp}$. They concluded that system isolation between the H and V channels must be greater than -44 dB in order to insure the $Z_{dr}$ bias is with 0.2 dB for worst case errors. Ryzhkov and Zrnić (2007) examined the effects of non-zero mean canting angle of the precipitation medium on SHV mode measurements. Data gathered in SHV mode with KOUN displayed $Z_{dr}$ radial bias “stripes” after the radar waves passed through the ice phase of either convective cells or stratiform precipitation. They propose that non-zero mean canting angle of the propagation medium causes coupling between the H and V polarized waves that causes the anomalous $Z_{dr}$ signatures.

In this paper, cross-coupling due to non-zero mean canting angle and antenna errors are investigated, first via a radar data model and second with experimental data.

Transmit errors are also included separately in the model by specifying the transmit polarization state that is fed to the antenna.

All reflector type antennas will introduce some distortion to the desired H and V transmit polarization states causing cross coupling between the H and V polarization states. This will bias polarization measurements of precipitation. These errors are analogous to the cross-coupling problem reported in Ryzhkov and Zrnić (2007). This paper investigates the impact of antenna induce cross-coupling errors caused by the non ideal radar antenna. The radar model introduced by Hubbert and Bringi (2003) is used to quantify the impact of polarization errors on $Z_{dr}$ and $\phi_{dp}$. Finally experimental data from S-Pol, NCAR’S S-band polarimetric radar, are used to illustrate the theory. Recently, S-Pol collected data in fast alternating H and V mode (referred to as FHV mode) quickly followed by data collected in simultaneous H and V transmit mode (referred to as SHV mode). These data clearly illustrate the effects of antenna polarization errors. This is the first time that such data has been collected.

2. MODELING POLARIZATION ERRORS AND CROSS-COUPLING

The scattering model used is described in Hubbert and Bringi (2003) but is briefly reviewed here. The particles in the backscatter volume are modeled as an ensemble of precipitation particles with Gamma DSD (drop size distribution) and arbitrary spatial orientation distributions via the T-matrix method (Vivekanandan et al., 1991; Waterman, 1969). The modeled parameters can be independently varied so that the sensitivity of the crosspolar and co-to-cross covariances can be studied. Antenna polarization errors are modeled similar to McCormick (1981). The scattering geometry used is the BSA (backscatter alignment) convention (Bringi and Chandrasekar 2001) Canting angles are measured counterclockwise from the
horizontal in the plane of polarization (i.e., plane containing H and V axes perpendicular to the propagation direction).

Since forward scatter is coherent (van de Hulst, 1957), the propagation medium can be completely described via a $2 \times 2$ scattering matrix, $P$, as

$$P = R(-\theta)P_0 R(\theta)$$

where $R$ is the Cartesian rotation matrix and $P_0$ is the principal plane propagation matrix

$$P_0 = \begin{bmatrix} e^{\lambda_1 z} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\lambda_2 z} \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\lambda_{1,2}$ are the complex propagation constants along the principal planes of the propagation medium and $z$ is the distance along the direction of propagation.

In this paper, the antenna polarization errors and cross coupling caused by non-zero mean canting angle are the focus and the backscatter medium is not considered. The mean tilt angle, $\alpha$, and mean ellipticity angle, $\epsilon$, are of the backscatter medium set to zero and this implies that the co-to-cross covariance terms in the backscatter $3 \times 3$ covariance matrix are zero. The general form of the propagation-modified covariance matrix is (Tragl 1990)

$$\Sigma_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle |S_{aa}|^2 \rangle & \sqrt{2} \langle S_{aa} S^*_{ab} \rangle & \langle S_{aa} S^*_{bb} \rangle \\ \sqrt{2} \langle S_{ab} S^*_{aa} \rangle & 2 \langle |S_{ab}|^2 \rangle & \sqrt{2} \langle S_{ab} S^*_{bb} \rangle \\ \langle S_{bb} S^*_{aa} \rangle & \sqrt{2} \langle S_{bb} S^*_{ab} \rangle & \langle |S_{bb}|^2 \rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\langle \ast \rangle$ denote ensemble average.

### 2.1 Antenna polarization errors

The radar antenna and surrounding microwave circuitry introduce microwave cross-coupling that give rise to polarization errors so that pure H or V polarization are not transmitted. Polarization errors have been covered in detail by McCormick (1981). Some of the sources of polarization error are non-ideal feed horn, non ideal parabolic reflector, antenna support struts and edge effects. These polarization errors are distributed across the radar antenna patterns and thus can vary across the beam especially where the cross-polarized lobes exist (Bringi and Chandrasekar 2001). For distributed precipitation media, the resulting error is an integrated effect and we model these distributed errors with a $2 \times 2$ polarization error matrix.

The polarization errors are easily included in the model by pre- and post-multiplying $S$, the $2 \times 2$ backscatter matrix, by the error matrix $\Upsilon$

$$S_e = \Upsilon^T S \Upsilon$$

where

$$\Upsilon = \begin{bmatrix} i_h & \varepsilon_v \\ \varepsilon_h & i_v \end{bmatrix}$$

with constraints $i_h^2 + |\varepsilon_h|^2 = i_v^2 + |\varepsilon_v|^2 = 1$ with $i_h$, $i_v$, $\varepsilon_h$, and $\varepsilon_v$ real. The polarization errors of the H and V channels are represented by the complex numbers $\varepsilon_h$ and $\varepsilon_v$, respectively. The polarization errors can also be equivalently represented with the geometric ellipse parameters of tilt angle, $\tau$ and ellipticity angle, $\epsilon$. These variables are related by (Azzam and Bashara, 1989)

$$\tan 2\tau = \frac{2R(\chi)}{1 - |\chi|^2}$$

$$\sin 2\epsilon = \frac{2\Im(\chi)}{1 + |\chi|^2}$$

where $\chi$ is the polarization ratio define by $\chi = E_v/E_h$ where $E_v$ and $E_h$ are the vertical and horizon electric field components, and $\Re$ and $\Im$ denote real and imaginary parts, respectively. For H errors, $\chi = \varepsilon_v/i_h$ and for V errors, $\chi = i_v/\varepsilon_v$. As can be seen from the equations, if the $\varepsilon_h$ ($\varepsilon_v$) is real then $\epsilon$ is zero and if $\varepsilon_h$ ($\varepsilon_v$) is imaginary then $\tau$ is zero. If the errors are orthogonal, i.e., $\varepsilon_v = -\varepsilon_h^*$, then $\Upsilon$ is unitary and (4) represents an orthogonal change of polarization basis. Separating the polarization errors into their geometric components gives a convenient and intuitive way to analyze polarization errors.

### 2.2 Modeling Simultaneous H and V transmissions

These model thus far was constructed under the assumption that the radar is operating in FHV (fast alternating H and V) mode. The covariance matrix of Eq.(3) is a convenient form for to express the radar covariances and for polarization bases transformations; however, it does not function as a transmission matrix, i.e., it does not express a transfer relationship between an arbitrary input polarization and the resultant output covariances such as the $4 \times 4$ Mueller matrix does (Bringi and Chandrasekar 2001). In order to model output covariances that result from arbitrary transmit polarizations, a $4 \times 4$ covariance matrix is formed using the feature vector

$$\Omega^T = [S_{HH} S_{VH} S_{HV} S_{VV}]$$

Taking the outer product of of the feature vector gives the covariance matrix in the H-V basis as

$$\Sigma_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \langle |S_{HH}|^2 \rangle & \langle S_{HH} S^*_{VH} \rangle \\ \langle S_{VH} S^*_{HH} \rangle & \langle |S_{VH}|^2 \rangle \\ \langle S_{HV} S^*_{HH} \rangle & \langle S_{HV} S^*_{VH} \rangle \\ \langle S_{VV} S^*_{HH} \rangle & \langle S_{VV} S^*_{VH} \rangle \end{bmatrix}$$
\[ (S_{HH}S_{HV}^*)^T \quad (S_{HH}S_{VV}^*)^T \\
(S_{VV}S_{HV}^*)^T \quad (S_{VV}S_{VV}^*)^T \]

(9)

where \( \langle \cdot \rangle \) denotes spatial or temporal averages. Note that the covariance matrix is Hermitian. It can be shown that the matrix of Eq.(9) is easily transformed to the Mueller matrix and thus the covariance matrix of Eq.(9) can also be used as a transfer function matrix

\[ J_\alpha = \Sigma_0 J_i \]

(10)

where \( J_i \) and \( J_\alpha \) are 1 x 4 input and output coherency matrices. In terms of the desired polarization characteristics of the incident polarization, namely tilt angle (\( \alpha \)) and ellipticity angle (\( \epsilon \)), \( J_i \) becomes

\[ J_i = \begin{bmatrix} J_{i1} \\ J_{i2} \\ J_{i3} \\ J_{i4} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \cos 2\alpha \cos 2\epsilon \\ \sin 2\alpha \cos 2\epsilon - j \sin 2\epsilon \\ \sin 2\alpha \cos 2\epsilon + j \sin 2\epsilon \\ 1 - \cos 2\alpha \cos 2\epsilon \end{bmatrix} \]

(11)

If linear slant 45° incident is desired (i.e. SHV mode), then \( \alpha = 45^\circ \) and \( \epsilon = 0^\circ \). The SHV variables of interest can be calculated as

\[ Z_{dr}^{hy} = 10 \log_{10} |J_{o1}/J_{o4}| \]

(12)

\[ \Psi_{dp}^{hy} = \tan^{-1} (\Re\{J_{o3}\}/\Im\{J_{o3}\}) \]

(13)

\[ \rho_{ho}^{hy} = \frac{|J_{o2}|}{\sqrt{|J_{o1}|^2 + |J_{o4}|^2}} \]

(14)

where the superscript denotes hybrid mode or SHV mode.

3. MODEL RESULTS

Next we examine biases in \( Z_{dr}^{hy} \) caused by 1) transmit errors, and 2) non-zero mean propagation canting angle. Antenna polarization errors are considered later. Again, the radar variables are plotted as a function of principle plane \( \phi_{dp}^{P} \). Since \( \phi_{dp}^{P} \) is the independent variable and since \( K_{dp} \) is of more meteorological interest than \( \phi_{dp} \), normalize hybrid \( K_{dp} \) is expressed as:

\[ K_{dp}^{N\, hy} = \frac{K_{dp}^{hy}}{K_{dp}^{P}} \]

(15)

where \( K_{dp}^{N\, hy} \) is normalize hybrid \( K_{dp} \), \( K_{dp}^{hy} \) is hybrid \( K_{dp} \) and \( K_{dp}^{P} \) is principle plane \( K_{dp} \). Absolute attenuation \( A_h = 0.0165 \) dB/deg. and differential attenuation \( A_{dp} = 0.0035 \) dB/deg. which are typical S-band values.

3.2 Non-zero mean canting angle

The model is now used to illustrate \( Z_{dr} \) bias caused by non-zero mean canting angle of the propagation medium. Antenna errors are zero and the transmit errors are zero, i.e., \( E_{h}^{t} = E_{v}^{t} \). Figure 1 shows \( Z_{dr} \) when \( |E_{h}^{t}| \neq |E_{v}^{t}| \), the mean canting angle of the precipitation medium is zero degrees and the antenna polarization are zero, i.e., \( \epsilon = \epsilon = 0 \). The \( Z_{dr} \) bias is independent of the phase difference between \( E_{h}^{t} \) and \( E_{v}^{t} \). The slope of the curves is caused by \( A_{dp} = 0.0035 \) dB/deg. The red nominal line is considered ideal. As can be seen the biases are constant as compared to the nominal curve and such biases could be corrected via calibration.

4. ESTIMATING ANTENNA POLARIZATION ERRORS

The estimation of the complex error terms, \( \epsilon_{h} \) and \( \epsilon_{v} \), is difficult and they are typically not supplied by the manufacturer. There are ways, however, to estimate the magnitude of the error terms and to generally qualify their character. Two available quantities are, LDR (Linear Depolarization Ratio) and passive sun calibration measurements.

LDR can be expressed as a function of the polarization errors \( \epsilon_{h} \) and \( \epsilon_{v} \). Measured LDR is then an estimate of the radar system isolation be-
Figure 1: $Z_{dr}$ as a function of principal plane $\phi_{dp}$ with unbalanced transmit power as a parameter. For SHV mode, $|E_{th}| = |E_{tv}|$ and this curve is shown as nominal in red. The errors are independent of the phase difference between $E_{th}$ and $E_{tv}$.

Figure 2: $Z_{dr}$ bias as a function of principal plane $\phi_{dp}$ with the mean canting angle of the propagation medium as a parameter. There transmission errors are zero, i.e., $|E_{th}| = |E_{tv}|$. The errors are independent of the phase difference between $E_{th}$ and $E_{tv}$.

Figure 3: $Z_{dr}$ bias as a function of principal plane $\phi_{dp}$ with the mean canting angle of the propagation medium as a parameter. $|E_{th}^i| = |E_{tv}^i|$ but there is a 90° phase difference, i.e., circular polarization is transmitted.

The received electric-fields can be modeled in drizzle as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} E_{rh} \\ E_{rv} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} i_h & \varepsilon_h \\ \varepsilon_h & i_v \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i_h & \varepsilon_v \\ \varepsilon_v & i_v \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} E_{th}^i \\ E_{tv}^i \end{bmatrix}$$  \(16\)

where the identity matrix is the backscatter matrix for drizzle. For transmit state $E_{th}^i = 1$, $E_{tv}^i = 0$, LDR is

$$LDR = \frac{|\langle \varepsilon_v i_h + \varepsilon_h i_v \rangle |^2}{|\langle i_h^* + \varepsilon_v^* \rangle |^2}$$  \(17\)

Using the approximations $|\varepsilon_{h,v}| \ll i_{h,v}$ and $i_h = i_v \approx 1$, it follows that

$$LDR = |\varepsilon_h + \varepsilon_v|^2 = |\varepsilon_h|^2 + |\varepsilon_v|^2 + 2\Re\{\varepsilon_v \varepsilon_h^*\}$$  \(18\)

where $\Re$ stands for the the real part.

The LDR system limit values are typically in the -30 to -34 dB range for well designed radars. If $\varepsilon_h = \varepsilon_v$ and $\varepsilon_h$ and $\varepsilon_v$ are real (or imaginary) then

$$LDR = 10 \log_{10}(2|\varepsilon_h|^2) = -30 \text{ dB},$$

and therefore $\varepsilon_h = \varepsilon_v = 0.0158$. If the the LDR limit is -35 dB, then $\varepsilon_h = \varepsilon_v = 0.00889$. Equivalently, these errors correspond to a tilt and ellipticity angles of the polarization state (polarization ellipse) of the received wave. The angles are 0.91° and 0.51° for LDR limits of -30 dB and -35 dB, respectively. If the $\varepsilon_h$ and $\varepsilon_v$ are real, the angles are tilt angles, and if the $\varepsilon_h$ and $\varepsilon_v$ are imaginary, the angles are ellipticity angles.
4.1 Solar scan measurements

The solar data is collected performing a “box scan” of the sun in passive mode. The sun here is considered as an unpolarized RF source that has a width of about 0.53° (Tapping 2001). The dimension of the box scan is approximately 5° high (elevation angle) by 8° wide (in azimuth). Noise samples are collected while the radar is pointing away from the sun so that the thermal background noise can be estimated and used to correct the measured sun data. The typical scanning rate is 1°s⁻¹. The data is interpolated to a square 2° by 2° in 0.1° intervals. The data is first corrected for sun movement and distortion caused by scanning in elevation and azimuth angle rather than in a rectangular grid. Shown in Fig. 4 are the H and V pseudo antenna patterns obtained from such solar scans. These are termed pseudo antenna patterns since the sun is not a point source and thus the given antenna patterns are a convolution of the antenna beam pattern of S-pol with the 0.53° solar disk. The complex H and V antenna data can be used to create a correlation antenna pattern. The receive voltage time series, \( E_r^h(i) \) and \( E_r^v(i) \) for the H and V patterns, respectively, are correlated in typical fashion as

\[
\omega = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} E_r^h(i) E_r^v(i)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} E_r^h(i) E_r^h(i) \sum_{i=1}^{N} E_r^v(i) E_r^v(i)}}
\] (19)

This data can also be interpolated to a grid. The resulting magnitude and phase of the correlation product of Eq.(19) are given in Fig. 5. Since the sun radiation is unpolarized, the correlation between any two orthogonal polarization states should be zero. The top panel of the figure shows two principal “lobes” in the lower two quadrants where the correlation increases to about 0.07. These large areas of increased correlation coefficient are manifestations of the antenna polarization errors. The cross-correlation is obviously a function of azimuth and elevation angle and is not constant across the 2° by 2° antenna patterns shown. The areas of maximum correlation do, however, fall outside the 3 dB beamwidth of the antenna which is about 1°. The bottom panel of Fig. 5 shows the complex behavior of the phase of the correlation products with the phases being fairly constant in the regions of highest correlation. For the lower left quadrant this phase is -100° while the lower right quadrant phase is about 60°.

The radar model presented above represents the antenna polarization errors as a single complex number for the H and V polarization, i.e., the polarization errors are considered constant across the entire radar antenna pattern. Even though this is not true, it is a useful approximation that simplifies analysis and permits a “first order” evaluation and simulation of polarization errors.
It can be shown that for small polarization errors, $\varepsilon_h$ and $\varepsilon_v$,

$$\Omega = \varepsilon_h^* + \varepsilon_v$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

where $\Omega$ is the pattern integrated correlation coefficient and $\varepsilon_h$ and $\varepsilon_v$ are the antenna polarization errors as given in Eq.(5). Thus, the correlation products are averaged across the entire given $2^\circ$ by $2^\circ$ correlation beam pattern of Fig. 5 to arrive at a single complex number. This would be valid if the radar is scanning a uniform, homogeneous region.

Solving Eqs.(18) and (20) simultaneously yields

$$\Im\{\varepsilon_v\} = \frac{\Im\{\Omega\} \pm \sqrt{\Im^2\{\Omega\} - 4(\Im^2\{\Omega\} - LDR)}}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

$$\Im\{\varepsilon_h\} = \frac{-\Im\{\Omega\} \pm \sqrt{\Im^2\{\Omega\} - 4(\Im^2\{\Omega\} - LDR)}}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

In term of the voltages, the solutions are

$$\Im\{\varepsilon_v\} = \frac{\Im\{ldr\} - \Im\{\Omega\}}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

$$\Im\{\varepsilon_h\} = \frac{\Im\{ldr\} + \Im\{\Omega\}}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

The real parts are not solvable but it can be shown they obey the condition

$$\Re\{ldr\} - \Re\{\Omega\} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

where $ldr$ is the complex number $\varepsilon_h + \varepsilon_v$ (see Eq.(18)).

4.2 Antenna errors

Figure 6 show SHV mode $Z_{dr}$ for one degree polarization tilt errors (upper panel) and one degree polarization ellipticity errors (lower panel). Such errors correspond to an LDR system limit of about -30 dB. The solid straight lines represent non-baised $Z_{dr}$ that would be measured in fast alternating transmit mode. As can be seen, $Z_{dr}$ errors are significant with a maximum error of about 0.6 dB.

Figure 7 shows $Z_{dr}$ bias for mixed tilt and ellipticity angles. The H and V tilt and ellipticity angles are given in Table 1. As can be seen, the character of the $Z_{dr}$ bias is quite different for each curve with the maximum bias is about 0.4 dB for each curve. This antenna errors all correspond to about a -31 dB system LDR limit.

5. EXPERIMENTAL SHV DATA

During May and June 2008, S-Pol was deployed in Southern Taiwan for the field experiment TiMREX (Terrain-influenced Monsoon Rainfall Experiment) where data were collected in the SHV mode. Normally
Figure 6: SHV mode $Z_{dr}$ for one degree antenna polarization errors. The upper panel shows $\pm 1^\circ$ tilt errors while the lower panel shows $\pm 1^\circ$ ellipticity errors.

Figure 7: SHV mode $Z_{dr}$ for mixed tilt and ellipticity antenna error angles which are given in Table 1. These antenna error corespond to a system LDR limit 0s -30 dB.

Table 1: The $H$ and $V$ tilt and ellipticity error angles corresponding to 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$H$ tilt</th>
<th>$H$ ellip.</th>
<th>$V$ tilt</th>
<th>$V$ ellip.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$-0.5^\circ$</td>
<td>$-0.7^\circ$</td>
<td>$89.5^\circ$</td>
<td>$0.7^\circ$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$0.5^\circ$</td>
<td>$-0.7^\circ$</td>
<td>$90.5^\circ$</td>
<td>$0.7^\circ$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$-0.5^\circ$</td>
<td>$0.7^\circ$</td>
<td>$89.5^\circ$</td>
<td>$-0.7^\circ$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$0.5^\circ$</td>
<td>$0.7^\circ$</td>
<td>$90.5^\circ$</td>
<td>$-0.7^\circ$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S-Pol operates in the FHV mode. Thus, SHV and FHV data that were gathered only minutes apart can be compared. Two cases are examined: 1) $8.6^\circ$ elevation data and 2) $2.0^\circ$ elevation data. The first case demonstrates $Z_{dr}$ bias due to non-zero mean canting angle and the second data set demonstrates $Z_{dr}$ bias due to antenna polarization errors.

### 5.1 8.6° elevation data

Figures 8 and 9 show S-Pol FHV mode reflectivity ($Z$) and differential reflectivity ($Z_{dr}$) gathered during TiMREX on 2 June 2008, 6:19:36 UTC at $8.6^\circ$ elev. Figures 10 and 11 show SHV Z and $Z_{dr}$ gathered at 6:13:59 UTC at $8.6^\circ$ elev. A line of convective cells is on the eastern edge with trailing stratiform rain to the west. Storm cells were moving west to east. At about 35 km range, high and noisy $Z_{dr}$ marks the brightband. Note the azimuthal “striping” of $Z_{dr}$ in the SHV mode $Z_{dr}$ data beyond the brightband in Fig. 11. No $Z_{dr}$ striping is evident in the FHV $Z_{dr}$ data of Fig. 8. The $Z_{dr}$ striping in Fig. 11 is likely due to non-zero mean canting angle of the ice particles in the propagation path in agreement with the results presented by Ryzhkov and Zrnić (2007).

### 5.2 2.0° elevation data

Figures 12 and 13 show S-Pol FHV mode reflectivity ($Z$) and differential reflectivity ($Z_{dr}$) gathered during TiMREX on 2 June 2008, 6:17:06 UTC at $2.0^\circ$ elev. Figures 14 and 15 show SHV Z and $Z_{dr}$ gathered at 6:11:28 UTC at $2.0^\circ$ elev. There is no $Z_{dr}$ striping evident in the SHV data of Fig. 15 since the elevation angle is low and most of the data is in rain which has zero mean canting angle. The SHV and FHV $Z_{dr}$ data appear fairly comparable but in fact there is a bias in the SHV data. To show this, we employ the self consistency $Z$ calibration technique of Vivekanandan et al. (2003). The technique is based on the relationship of $Z$, $Z_{dr}$ and $\phi_{dp}$ in rain. Based on the typical range of rain drop size and shape distributions, $\phi_{dp}$ can be estimated based on measured $Z$ and $Z_{dr}$. This estimated $\phi_{dp}$ ($\phi_{dp}^m$) is compared to the measured $\phi_{dp}$ ($\phi_{dp}^m$). A scatter plot is generated and a
straight line fit is calculated. If the calculated mean line differs from the 1-to-1 line, this indicates a reflectivity bias. The technique assumes that $Z_{dr}$ is well calibrated (S-Pol $Z_{dr}$ is calibrated via vertical pointing data in light rain).

Shown in Fig. 16 is a scatter plot of $\phi_{dp}$ versus $\phi_{dp}$ for TiMREX data. The $Z$ bias is about 0.03 dBZ, i.e., negligible. Note the tight scatter about the 1-to-1 line. This indicates that that S-Pol is well calibrated and such self consistency plots are the norm for S-Pol. Fig. 17 is similar to Fig. 16 except the data was gathered in FHV mode. The scatter is rather tight about the 1-to-1 line for $\phi_{dp} < 50^\circ$ but for $\phi_{dp} > 70^\circ$ the computed $\phi_{dp}$ are biased low. We believe that this is due to biased SHV $Z_{dr}$.

To further illustrate this SHV $Z_{dr}$ bias, $Z_{dr}$ is averaged under the constraint 20 dBZ < $Z$, 25 dBZ. These $Z_{dr}$ data are partitioned into three categories: 1) $20^\circ < \phi_{dp} < 40^\circ$, 2) $40^\circ < \phi_{dp} < 70^\circ$, and 3) $70^\circ < \phi_{dp} < 100^\circ$. The results are given in Table 2. For low $\phi_{dp}$ the SHV and FHZ $Z_{dr}$ values are about equal. For $40^\circ < \phi_{dp} < 70^\circ$, the $Z_{dr}$ values differ by 0.11 dB and for $70^\circ < \phi_{dp} < 100^\circ$ the $Z_{dr}$ differ by 0.27 dB. The data is not corrected for differential attenuation. This increasing difference between FHV and SHV $Z_{dr}$ as a function of $\phi_{dp}$ is consistent with the $Z_{dr}$ bias predicted for antenna errors of radar systems with LDR limit in the -30 dB to -35 dBZ range.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Simultaneous transmission of H and V polarization waves (termed SHV mode) is now a popular way to construct dual-polarization radar systems. The technique is based on the assumption of 1) zero-mean canting angle of the precipitation medium and 2) negligible antenna polarization errors. Zero-mean canting angle is a good approximation for rain but not for the ice phase of storms. SHV data from S-Pol during TiMERX showed $Z_{dr}$ biases in the ice phase of storms are are likely due to a non-zero mean canting angle of the the ice particles. This corroborates well with Ryzhkov and Zrnić (2007) similar findings.

Antenna errors were modeled and the $Z_{dr}$ biases were examined when using SHV mode of operation. If a radar has an LDR measurement limit of −30 dB (determined from measurements in drizzle), then this errors corresponds to about 1° of either tilt or ellipticity angle polarization error. The bias in $Z_{dr}$ is significant even for relatively low accumulation of $\phi_{dp}$ depending on the magnitude of the polarization errors and the relative phase of the H and V electric fields delivered to the antenna. To mitigate this problem, the H and V channel isolation need to be made low as possible.
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<thead>
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<td>-0.07</td>
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Table 2: A comparison of $Z_{dr}$ values for HFV and SHV modes as a function of $\phi_{dp}$. Reflectivities are limited to between 20 and 25 dBZ.
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Figure 8: FHV mode reflectivity for 8.6° elev.

Figure 9: FHV mode Z_{dr} for 8.6° elev. corresponding to Fig. 8.

Figure 10: SHV mode reflectivity for 8.6° elev.

Figure 11: SHV mode Z_{dr} for 8.6° elev. corresponding to Fig. 10.
Figure 12: FHV mode reflectivity for 2.0° elev.

Figure 13: FHV mode $Z_{dr}$ for 2.0° elev. corresponding to Fig. 12.

Figure 14: SHV mode reflectivity for 2.0° elev.

Figure 15: SHV mode $Z_{dr}$ for 2.0° elev. corresponding to Fig. 14.
Figure 16: Scatter plot of calculated $\phi_{dp}$ (from $Z$ and $Z_{dr}$) versus measured $\phi_{dp}$ from TiMREX FHV data. The $Z$ bias is about 0.03 dB.

Figure 17: Scatter plot of calculated $\phi_{dp}$ (from measured $Z$ and $Z_{dr}$) versus measured $\phi_{dp}$ from TiMREX SHV data. The $Z$ bias is about -0.37 dB but this is not the cause of the bias of the points for high $\phi_{dp}$. It is bias of $Z_{dr}$ for high $\phi_{dp}$ which is the cause.


