

Bridging physics and statistical learning methodologies for the accurate modeling of the radiative properties of non-uniform atmospheric paths

F. André, C. Delage, Loic Guilmard, Mathieu Galtier, Céline Cornet

► To cite this version:

F. André, C. Delage, Loic Guilmard, Mathieu Galtier, Céline Cornet. Bridging physics and statistical learning methodologies for the accurate modeling of the radiative properties of non-uniform atmospheric paths. Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer, 2024, 320, pp.108961. 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2024.108961 . hal-04740722

HAL Id: hal-04740722 https://hal.science/hal-04740722v1

Submitted on 21 Oct 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

BRIDGING PHYSICS AND STATISTICAL LEARNING METHODOLOGIES
FOR THE ACCURATE MODELING OF THE RADIATIVE PROPERTIES
OF NON-UNIFORM ATMOSPHERIC PATHS
F. André ^{1,2*} , C. Delage ¹ , L. Guilmard ¹ , M. Galtier ¹ , C. Cornet ²
¹ Univ. Lyon, CNRS, UMR 5008 – CETHIL, Lyon, France
² Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 8518 – LOA, Lille, France

^{*} Corresponding Author: <u>frederic.andre@insa-lyon.fr, frederic.andre@univ-lille.fr</u>.

22	ABSTRACT. The objective of the present work is to describe a technique to approximate atmospheric
23	path transmissivities using a recurrent structure, following a method proposed recently but limited to
24	date to high temperature applications. The physical model together with its underlying statistical
25	assumptions is detailed. It is found to involve a rather simple analytical formula that applies both to
26	two-layers systems and to more general multi-layers non-uniform configurations. This treatment of
27	path non-uniformities uses several unknown parameters that are first trained on LBL reference data in
28	two-layers configurations to illustrate the relevance of the proposed approximate model. Then, in a
29	second time, model's parameters are trained on non-uniform path transmission curves representative
30	of multi-layers atmospheres. The corresponding recurrent formulation is shown to provide accurate
31	estimates of transmissivities of non-uniform atmospheric paths (maximum relative errors are below
32	0.35% in all the considered test cases) at a very low CPU cost.
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	

1. INTRODUCTION

48

49

50 Satellite remote sensing is a widely spread method to characterize the state of the atmosphere and to 51 monitor atmospheric components such as water vapor, clouds and aerosols. Atmospheric instruments 52 measure radiances averaged over more or less narrow spectral bands. The most recent generations of 53 satellites produce large amounts of data that need to be converted into geophysical parameters. This 54 requires the developments of fast though accurate numerical methods to infer profiles of temperature, 55 species concentrations, etc, from satellite measurements. In most cases, when modeling a radiative 56 intensity in an atmospheric configuration, one needs to account for the contribution of the absorption 57 and / or emission of radiative energy by the gaseous components of the atmosphere. Due to the large 58 amount of data to analyze, the use of high-resolution Line-By-Line (LBL) calculations cannot be 59 considered for this purpose, even if the amount of computational power available has increased 60 significantly in the past years.

61

62 Gas radiation modeling has always been intimately connected with statistical sciences [1].

Statistical Narrow Band (SNB) models, for instance, are founded on assumptions about the locations of line centers (randomly spread over the spectral interval) and about the distribution of linestrengths. Combined with some realistic additional hypothesis (spectral lines are assumed entirely contained in the narrow spectral interval, for instance), SNB model theory allows constructing simple though accurate analytical models based on a few parameters (two, for example, in the case of the widely spread SNB model for Lorentz lines based on Malkmus' distribution of linestrengths [2]).

69 *k*-distribution methods are constructed, both over narrow spectral intervals [1] or over the full spectrum 70 [3], with the help of the distribution function of absorption coefficients over the spectral interval. In the 71 Correlated K-Distribution (CKD) method, statistical assumptions about the relationship between 72 spectra in distinct thermophysical states are made to extend the method from uniform to non-uniform 73 configurations: the so-called "correlation" assumption [1,3]. In this context, it is not surprising to see the appearance, in the recent years, of new strategies based on statistical learning methods [4] for fast though accurate modeling of non-uniform gaseous paths. Principle Component Analysis (PCA) based models [5,6] or techniques founded on unsupervised learning / cluster analysis [7] are two examples of such approaches. More recently, several attempts have been reported in the literature to apply methods based on neural networks to model band averaged gas transmittance [8,9] or to treat more general radiative transfer problems [10].

80

81 One of them, Ref. [9], proposes to apply Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) structures to model non-82 uniform path transmissivities. The main originalities and advantages of this approach compared to brute 83 force machine learning methodologies are:

1/ to suggest an RNN-like model mostly built on physical arguments. Indeed, the method consists of the reformulation of a physical model into a recurrent scheme using statistical assumptions on the relationship between gas spectra in distinct states. The resulting network topology avoids the black box disadvantage of most brute force Neural Network models, as all parameters have a clear physical meaning. The proof of concept was given in Ref. [9]. This reference was however restricted to high temperature applications.

90 2/ to propose the use of Exponential Linear Units - ELU [11] - as activation functions. It is well 91 known [12] that the choice of activation functions can have a significant impact both on the 92 computational effort required for the training process and on the extrapolation capability of Neural 93 Network models. The selection of activation functions based on physical arguments is sometimes 94 recommended for use in Physics Informed Neural Networks (PINN) [13]. This strategy consists of 95 selecting activation functions closely related to known solutions of the governing Ordinary / Partial 96 Differential Equations of the physical problem studied instead of generic ones. This approach cannot 97 be applied directly in the case of gas radiation modeling because the problem of path non-98 uniformities cannot be fully formulated, to the best of our knowledge, using ODEs / PDEs, even if 99 some physical constraints can be expressed in terms of derivatives of the transmissivity (see Appendix III for details). The strategy proposed in Ref. [9], and explored further in the present paper, mostly consists of finding the general form of the solution of implicit equations to treat nonuniform paths (based on the quasi-scaling approximation described in section 2.2) and then use this functional form to select appropriate activation functions. The proposed method thus replaces solutions of ODEs / PDEs in PINN by implicit equations, but the main logic to incorporate physical constraints in a statistical learning framework is the same in both approaches. As will be seen later in this paper, ELUs are then natural choices.

107 3/ to embed physical constraints directly inside the structure of the recurrent network. This can be 108 considered as a type of mathematical induction approach, following the classification proposed in 109 Ref. [14]. Indeed, constraints on the derivative of the transmissivity are directly included in the 110 structure of the model without modifications of the loss function, as often done in Machine Learning 111 studies (called learning bias in Ref. [14]): only the raw data (set of non-uniform path 112 transmissivities) are used in the training process. This fact is discussed in Appendix III.

113

114 The application of recurrent networks to model non-uniform path transmissivities is explored in the 115 present work by treating the general case instead of the simplified model of Ref. [9]. For this purpose, 116 a generalization of the theoretical foundation of the model detailed in [9] is first proposed in section 2. 117 Both the physical model and the statistical assumptions needed to construct the recurrent approximation 118 are described. This section is rather technical but all the necessary details to fully understand the method 119 and follow the steps of the derivation are given. In section 3, a validation of the results of section 2 in 120 cases of two-layers systems (couples of successive layers along a non-uniform atmosphere) is first 121 provided to illustrate the relevance of the proposed approximation. Then, in a second time, the 122 functional form of section 2 is used as a prior knowledge to model non-uniform path transmissivities 123 in multi-layers configurations, using the same recurrent scheme as in Ref. [9]. The role of the functional 124 form of section 2 (that takes the form of a Lévy-Khintchine formula) combined with the recurrent 125 scheme is thus, in a statistical learning context, to reduce the size of the space of possible solutions with

the aim of both simplifying the training process and increasing the quality of the transmissivity model.
Several application cases are studied in which the present method is assessed against reference LBL
calculations for realistic atmospheres.

129

Many elements used in the present paper are closely related to results already discussed within the development of the *t*-distribution approach in Refs. [15-17]. However, no detailed knowledge about this modeling strategy is required to fully understand the present developments, even if some of them use exactly the same mathematical formalism for convenience. When needed, the elements of *t*distribution modeling required to understand the present paper are reminded.

135

2. GENERAL THEORY

138

Let us consider a non-uniform atmosphere divided into *n* uniform layers. A path in the atmosphere can be represented by a sequence of lengths $L_1, ..., L_n$ where each L_i , i = 1, ..., n is the total distance traveled by the radiative energy in the *i*-th layer where the thermophysical state of the gas has index *i* and where its spectral absorption coefficient at wavenumber ν is $\kappa_{\nu,i}$. The band averaged transmissivity of the total path represents the fraction of radiative intensity, averaged over the spectral interval written $\Delta \nu$, that travels in the atmosphere without being absorbed. It is given by:

146
$$\tau_{1..n}^{\Delta \nu} \left(L_{1}, ..., L_{n} \right) = \frac{1}{\Delta \nu} \cdot \int_{\Delta \nu} \exp\left(-\kappa_{\nu,1} \cdot L_{1} - ... - \kappa_{\nu,n} \cdot L_{n} \right) d\nu \tag{1}$$

147

In the present work, as well as in the *l*-distribution approach, we seek an approximation of this nonuniform path transmissivity as:

- 150
- 151 $\tau_{1..n}^{\Delta\nu}(L_1,..,L_n) = \tau_1^{\Delta\nu}(L_{1..n})$ (2)
- 152

where $L_{1...n}$ is an effective absorption length defined in such a way that the transmissivity of the nonuniform path is the same as the transmissivity of an equivalent path of length $L_{1...n}$ in the gas in state 1. Values of $L_{1...n}$ depend on the *n* lengths $L_1,...,L_n$.

156 In the *l*-distribution approach, the effective absorption length $L_{1...n}$ is constructed through a recurrent

157 process defined by the following set of relationships (identical to Eq. (23) of Ref. [9]):

159
$$\begin{cases} L_{nn} = L_{n} \\ L_{i..n} = L_{i} + \ell_{i} \circ \tau_{i+1}^{\Delta \nu} \left(L_{i+1..n} \right) \end{cases}$$
(3)

In this method, the treatment of non-uniformities thus starts from one side of the radiation path, where the state of the gas has index *n*, and propagates (index *i* varies from *n* to 1) until state 1. The process involves the set of functions ℓ_i , i = 1,..,N defined as the inverses of the band averaged transmissivities $\tau_i^{\Delta \nu}$. These inverse functions obviously exist because band averaged transmissivities are strictly decreasing functions of the geometrical lengths. The notation " \circ " is used to represent the functional composition, *i.e.* $\ell_i \circ \tau_{i+1}^{\Delta \nu} (L) = \ell_i [\tau_{i+1}^{\Delta \nu} (L)]$.

166 The physical interpretation of the recurrent scheme is relatively straightforward. Indeed, it consists 167 of an iterative homogenization process as explained in depth in Ref. [15]. Interested readers should 168 consult this reference for more details.

169

Application of the recurrent method set by Eq. (3) to generate $L_{1..n}$ requires evaluating the 170 "coupling" terms involved at each step of the propagative scheme, *i.e.*, the set of functions 171 $\ell_i \circ \tau_{i+1}^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ over the full collection of layers. We derive in this section an analytical formula to calculate 172 these functions. In order to simplify the notations, we focus on $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ only (coupling between 173 174 states 1 and 2) but the same functional form applies to any other couple of states i and i+1. Several 175 preliminary results are needed for the derivation. They are given in subsection 2.1 (physical model for $-\partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta \nu}(L)/\partial L$) and 2.2 (statistical method used to represent the relationship between gas spectra in 176 177 distinct states). Section 2.3 and 2.4 provide the derivation of the coupling functions, first in a simplified 178 case (2.3) and then in the general situation (2.4).

179

180 **2.1. Physical model for** $-\partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta \nu}(L)/\partial L$

181 The derivation described in section 2.3, that focuses on the development of an approximation of the 182 quantity $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ of Eq. (3), has strong connections with mathematical properties of 183 $-\partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta \nu}(L)/\partial L$. The present section is devoted to the building of an approximate model for this 184 quantity from which some important and useful properties can be derived.

185

We consider a gas spectrum in state 1 made of N overlapping spectral lines. We approximate the transmissivity of the array of N lines as the product of the transmissivities of the N spectral lines considered separately, as done in Statistical Narrow Band model theory [1]. We thus consider that absorption by a single spectral line is statistically independent from all other spectral lines. This provides:

191

192
$$\tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}(L) = \frac{1}{\Delta\nu} \cdot \int_{\Delta\nu} \exp\left(-L \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{N} \kappa_{\nu,1,i}\right) d\nu = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \tau_{1,i}^{\Delta\nu}(L)$$
(4)

193

- 194 where:
- 195

196
$$\tau_{1,i}^{\Delta\nu}(L) = \frac{1}{\Delta\nu} \cdot \int_{\Delta\nu} \exp\left(-L \cdot \kappa_{\nu,1,i}\right) d\nu$$
(5)

197

is the band averaged transmissivity of the *i*-th spectral line of the gas in the thermophysical state of
layer 1 for a gas path length *L*.

Let ε be a small and positive real number. We define a "useful" range of lengths, written $\begin{bmatrix} L_{\min}(\varepsilon), L_{\max}(\varepsilon) \end{bmatrix}$, as the set of lengths such that the value of $\tau_1^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ lies in the interval $[\varepsilon, 1-\varepsilon]$, where most of the dynamics of the transmission curve occurs. This means that the minimum and maximum lengths are defined as solutions of the implicit equations:

205
$$\begin{cases} \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left[L_{\min} \left(\varepsilon \right) \right] = 1 - \varepsilon \\ \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left[L_{\max} \left(\varepsilon \right) \right] = \varepsilon \end{cases}$$
(6)

Over $[L_{\min}(\varepsilon), L_{\max}(\varepsilon)]$, the array of N spectral lines absorbs a significant quantity of radiation but each single line alone only absorbs a small amount of radiation: band averaged transmissivities of single lines are thus close to 1. This is because, if we assume for simplification that all spectral lines are identical and statistically independent, the transmissivity of a single line over $\left[L_{\min}(\varepsilon), L_{\max}(\varepsilon)\right]$ takes a value higher than $\mathcal{E}^{1/N}$ which is thus close to 1 for large N (for instance, values $\mathcal{E} = 0.001$ and N =1,000 provide $\mathcal{E}^{1/N} \approx 0.993$ – this means that if we have 1,000 identical lines such that the transmissivity of the set of lines is 0.001, then each spectral line alone has a band averaged transmissivity of 0.993, which is clearly close to 1). This allows writing:

215
$$-\ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta \nu}(L) = -\ln \left[\prod_{i=1}^{N} \tau_{1,i}^{\Delta \nu}(L)\right] = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln \tau_{1,i}^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[1 - \tau_{1,i}^{\Delta \nu}(L)\right]$$
(7)

Taking the derivative of the previous equation with respect to the gas path length *L* then provides thefollowing approximation:

220
$$-\frac{\partial \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta \nu}(L)}{\partial L} \approx \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[-\frac{\partial \tau_{1,i}^{\Delta \nu}(L)}{\partial L} \right]$$
(8)

As shown in Appendix I,
$$-\partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta \nu}(L)/\partial L$$
 can then be approximated as:

224
$$-\partial \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta \nu}(L) / \partial L \approx k_{P,1} \cdot \int_{0}^{1} \exp\left[-k^{*}(\xi) \cdot L\right] d\xi$$
(9)

where
$$k^*(\xi)$$
, $\xi \in [0,1]$ plays the role of an absorption rate (the unit of k^* is cm⁻¹) that governs the
behavior of $-1/k_{P,1} \cdot \partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta \nu}(L)/\partial L$ with respect to the gas path length L .
Following Eq. (9), $-1/k_{P,1} \cdot \partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta \nu}(L)/\partial L$ is thus a Laplace transform.
In a neighborhood of a length L_0 chosen in the range $[L_{\min}(\varepsilon), L_{\max}(\varepsilon)]$, application of the mean
value theorem to the integral of Eq. (9) ensures the existence of a real $X(L_0) \in [0,1]$ such that:
 $-\frac{1}{k_{P,1}} \frac{\partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta \nu}(L_0)}{\partial L} = \exp(-k^* [X(L_0)] \cdot L_0)$ (10)

For a small positive increment δL_0 , using again the mean value theorem and limiting the analysis to a first order expansion in δL_0 , we receive the following approximation:

238

$$-\frac{1}{k_{P,1}}\frac{\partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta \nu} (L_0 + \delta L_0)}{\partial L} = \exp\left(-k^* \left[X \left(L_0 + \delta L_0 \right) \right] \cdot \left(L_0 + \delta L_0 \right) \right)$$

$$\approx -\frac{1}{k_{P,1}}\frac{\partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta \nu} (L_0)}{\partial L} \cdot \exp\left[-s_1 \left(L_0 \right) \cdot \delta L_0 \right]$$
(11)

240 where, by reorganizing Eq. (11) and taking the limit $\delta L_0 \rightarrow 0$:

242
$$s_{1}(L_{0}) = \frac{\partial \ln}{\partial L} \left[-\frac{1}{k_{P,1}} \frac{\partial \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta \nu} (L = L_{0})}{\partial L} \right] = -\frac{\partial^{2} \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta \nu} (L_{0}) / \partial L^{2}}{\partial \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta \nu} (L_{0}) / \partial L}$$
(12)

Moreover, one can notice that as $-1/k_{P,1} \cdot \partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta \nu}(L)/\partial L$ is a Laplace transform, it is log-convex [18]. This provides, following the definition Eq. (12), that $s_1(L_0)$ is a positive and decreasing function of L_0 :

247

248
$$0 \le s_1(L_0) \le s_1(0)$$
 (13)

249

The derivation provided in this section shares many similarities with SNB models, as the two 250 251 approaches are founded on the same starting point (a spectrum is assumed to be the superposition 252 of N statistically independent overlapping spectral lines). However, as our objective here is to 253 provide proofs of Eqs. (11) and (13), that are the only results needed for our development, all 254 additional assumptions required by SNB models [1] (choice of a distribution of linestrengths and of 255 a line profile, assumption that spectral lines are fully included in Δv and that the number of spectral 256 line N tends towards infinity) are not needed. It can be checked easily that the property " $-1/k_{P,1} \cdot \partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta \nu}(L)/\partial L$ is a Laplace transform" applies to standard SNB model formulations, as 257 258 particular cases of the present derivation.

259

260 **2.2. The concept of quasi-scaled spectra**

261 This section is devoted to a description of the concept of quasi-scaled spectra, used in the present 262 work to construct an approximation of $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ as described in section 2.3.

The concept of quasi-scaled spectra is among the most important ones in the *t*-distribution approach, at least as essential as that of "correlated" spectra in non-uniform *k*-distribution modeling, as they both consist of statistical models of relationship between gas spectra in distinct thermophysical states. We say that two spectra represented respectively by an index 1 and 2 are quasi-scaled if, by writing $\kappa_{v,2} = \kappa_{v,1} \cdot u_v$ where u_v is the non-constant scaling coefficient between the two gas spectra, 268 $\kappa_{\nu,1}$ and u_{ν} are statistically independent. In this case, we obtain the following relationship between 269 the transmissivities in the two states averaged over the spectral interval $\Delta \nu$:

271
$$\tau_{2}^{\Delta\nu}(L) = \frac{1}{\Delta\nu} \int_{\Delta\nu} \exp(-\kappa_{\nu,2}L) d\nu = \int_{0}^{1} \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left[u(\xi)L \right] d\xi$$
(14)

272

where $u(\xi)$, $\xi \in [0,1]$, is the inverse of the distribution function F(u) of the spectral variable u_v . The concept of quasi-scaling was studied in depth in Ref. [19]. In this reference, it was verified that within the assumption of quasi-scaled spectra, an approximation of the transmissivity of a nonuniform path involving both states 1 and 2 can be obtained as:

277

278
$$\tau_{12}^{\Delta\nu}(L_1, L_2) = \int_{0}^{1} \tau_1^{\Delta\nu} \left[L_1 + u(\xi) L_2 \right] d\xi \approx \tau_1^{\Delta\nu} \left[L_1 + \ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta\nu}(L_2) \right]$$
(15)

279

where ℓ_1 is the inverse of the transmissivity function $\tau_1^{\Delta \nu}$ defined as $\ell_1 \circ \tau_1^{\Delta \nu} (L) = L$ for any gas path length *L*. This formalism is almost the same as a technique proposed by Godson in the 50s [20] but, due to the quasi-scaling assumption, the present approach is more restrictive as explained in Refs. [16,17]. A theoretical justification of the approximation set by Eq. (15) is provided later in this paper.

285

286 **2.3.** Lévy-Khintchine representation of $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2(L)$ in the case of weakly non-constant scaling 287 coefficients $u(\xi) \in [u_{\min}, u_{\max}], \ \xi \in [0,1]$ where $|u_{\max} - u_{\min}| << u_{\min}$.

288 Several analytical functional forms for $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ were studied recently [9,19]. They were however 289 restricted to rather simple cases (gas spectrum in state 1 was gray, for instance, in Ref. [19]). In the 290 next two sections we consider the general situation. For this purpose, we first treat an intermediate

problem for which the non-constant scaling coefficient $u(\xi)$, $\xi \in [0,1]$ takes values inside a small interval $[u_{\min}, u_{\max}], |u_{\max} - u_{\min}| \ll u_{\min}$. The corresponding result is then generalized to arbitrary situations.

We consider a value ξ inside the interval [0,1]. The transmissivity $\tau_1^{\Delta \nu} \left[u(\xi) L \right]$ can be written as:

297
$$\tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left[u(\xi) L \right] = \exp \left[\int_{0}^{u(\xi)L} \frac{\partial \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}(L')}{\partial L'} dL' \right] = \exp \left[\int_{0}^{u_{\min}L} \frac{\partial \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}(L')}{\partial L'} dL' \right] \cdot \exp \left[\int_{u_{\min}L}^{u(\xi)L} \frac{\partial \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}(L')}{\partial L'} dL' \right]$$
298 (16)

or equivalently:

301
$$\tau_1^{\Delta\nu} \left[u(\xi) L \right] = \tau_1^{\Delta\nu} \left(u_{\min} L \right) \cdot \exp \left[\int_{u_{\min} L}^{u(\xi)L} \frac{\partial \ln \tau_1^{\Delta\nu} \left(L' \right)}{\partial L'} dL' \right]$$
(17)

The change of variable $v(\xi) = u(\xi) - u_{\min}$ (notice from this definition that $v(\xi) \ge 0$) together with Eq. (11) then provides (function s_1 is defined in Section 2.2):

306
$$\tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left[u(\xi)L \right] \approx \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left(u_{\min}L \right) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\partial \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left(u_{\min}L \right)}{\partial L'} \cdot \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_{1} \left(u_{\min}L \right) \cdot \nu(\xi)L \right]}{s_{1} \left(u_{\min}L \right)} \right)$$
(18)

308 As the width of the interval
$$[u_{\min}, u_{\max}]$$
 is assumed small, one can write:

310
$$\tau_1^{\Delta\nu}(u_{\min}L) \ge \tau_1^{\Delta\nu}\left[u(\xi)L\right] \ge \tau_1^{\Delta\nu}(u_{\max}L) \approx \tau_1^{\Delta\nu}(u_{\min}L)$$
(19)

312 that allows using the following approximation:

313
$$\ln\left(\frac{\tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}\left[u(\xi)L\right]}{\tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}\left(u_{\min}L\right)}\right) \approx -1 + \frac{\tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}\left[u(\xi)L\right]}{\tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}\left(u_{\min}L\right)}$$
(20)

314

315 Eq. (20) provides, when combined with Eq. (18):

316

317
$$\tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left[u(\xi)L \right] \approx \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left(u_{\min}L \right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\partial \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left(u_{\min}L \right)}{\partial L'} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_{1} \left(u_{\min}L \right) \cdot \nu(\xi)L \right]}{s_{1} \left(u_{\min}L \right)} \right)$$
(21)

318

This estimate of the transmissivity $\tau_1^{\Delta \nu} \left[u(\xi) L \right]$ can then be plugged into Eq. (14) to yield: 320

321
$$\tau_{2}^{\Delta\nu}(L) \approx \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}(u_{\min}L) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\partial \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}(u_{\min}L)}{\partial L'} \cdot \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_{1}\left(u_{\min}L\right) \cdot \nu\left(\xi\right)L\right]}{s_{1}\left(u_{\min}L\right)} d\xi\right)$$
(22)

322

323 This result can be equivalently written in terms of the inverse of the band averaged transmissivity 324 $\tau_1^{\Delta\nu}$ as:

325
$$\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx u_{\min}L + \int_0^1 \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_1\left(u_{\min}L\right) \cdot \nu\left(\xi\right)L\right]}{s_1\left(u_{\min}L\right)} d\xi$$
(23)

326

Using Eq. (23) directly is not convenient because it involves the quantity $s_1(u_{\min}L)$ that depends on the gas path length *L*. No simple model for $s_1(u_{\min}L)$ seems to be available in the general frame (see its definition, Eq. (12)). Consequently, in order to simplify the model, we rewrite Eq. (23) as: 330

331
$$\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx u_{\min} L \cdot \left[1 + \varphi(L)\right] + \int_0^1 \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_1(0) \cdot \nu(\xi)L\right]}{s_1(0)} d\xi$$
(24)

332 where:

333
$$\varphi(L) = \frac{1}{u_{\min}L} \cdot \left\{ \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_{1}\left(u_{\min}L\right) \cdot v(\xi)L\right]}{s_{1}\left(u_{\min}L\right)} d\xi - \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_{1}\left(0\right) \cdot v(\xi)L\right]}{s_{1}\left(0\right)} d\xi \right\}$$
(25)

334

335 The difference between the two integrals inside the brackets in Eq. (25) can be written as a double336 integral to yield:

337

$$338 \qquad 0 \le \varphi(L) = \frac{1}{u_{\min}} \cdot \int_{0}^{1} v(\xi) \cdot \left[\int_{0}^{1} \left(\exp\left[-s_{1}\left(u_{\min}L\right) \cdot v(\xi)Lt \right] - \exp\left[-s_{1}\left(0\right) \cdot v(\xi)Lt \right] \right) dt \right] d\xi \le \frac{\overline{u} - u_{\min}}{u_{\min}} <<1$$

(26)

339

340

The first inequality (on the left, viz. positivity) arises directly from application of the relationship Eq. (13) that provides, for any (obviously positive value) of the product $v(\xi)Lt$, $exp\left[-s_1(L_0 = u_{min}L) \cdot v(\xi)Lt\right] \ge exp\left[-s_1(0) \cdot v(\xi)Lt\right]$. In Eq. (26), $\overline{u} = \int_0^1 u(\xi) d\xi$ is the mean scaling coefficient equal to the ratio of the Planck mean absorption coefficients in states 1 and 2 (value at the optically thin limit).

346

347 Eq. (26) proves that Eq. (24) can be reasonably approximated as:

348

349
$$\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx u_{\min}L + \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_{1}(0) \cdot \nu(\xi)L\right]}{s_{1}(0)} d\xi$$
(27)

350

that does not depend anymore on $s_1(u_{\min}L)$. The parameter $s_1(0)$ that appears in Eq. (27) can be estimated directly from LBL data following its definition:

354
$$s_{1}(0) = -\frac{\partial^{2} \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta \nu}(0) / \partial L^{2}}{\partial \ln \tau_{1}^{\Delta \nu}(0) / \partial L} = \frac{k_{SP,1}}{k_{P,1}} - k_{P,1}, \ k_{P,1} = \frac{1}{\Delta \nu} \cdot \int_{\Delta \nu} \kappa_{\nu,1} \, d\nu, \ k_{SP,1} = \frac{1}{\Delta \nu} \cdot \int_{\Delta \nu} \left(\kappa_{\nu,1} \right)^{2} d\nu$$
355 (28)

In Eq. (28), k_p is the Planck mean absorption coefficient, whereas k_{sp} denotes Super Planck mean absorption coefficient [1]. These two mean absorption coefficients are both calculated in state 1 in Eq. (28).

One can notice here that if the same assumptions and steps as used in this section are used to evaluate $\ell_1 \circ \tau_{12}(L_1, L_2)$, where $\tau_{12}(L_1, L_2)$ is defined as the first term at the RHS in Eq. (15), one obtains:

364
$$\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{12}^{\Delta \nu} \left(L_{1}, L_{2} \right) \approx L_{1} + u_{\min} L_{2} + \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_{1}\left(0 \right) \cdot \nu\left(\xi \right) L_{2} \right]}{s_{1}\left(0 \right)} d\xi = L_{1} + \ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu} \left(L_{2} \right)$$
(29)

Proving this statement mostly requires changing all the occurrences $u_{min}L$ (resp. $u(\xi)L$) by $L_1 + u_{min}L_2$ (resp. $L_1 + u(\xi)L_2$) in Eqs. (16-26). This modification only affects the definition of function φ . This function remains however small compared to 1, yielding Eq. (29). This provides, a posteriori, a theoretical justification of the approximation set by the second part of Eq. (15).

Eq. (27) also shows that $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ is a Bernstein function [21] (also called Laplace exponent of a Lévy subordinator in statistical science), viz. a function whose derivative is a Laplace transform. Formula (27) is the Lévy-Khintchine representation of this Bernstein function. It has the same mathematical form in the general case as in the previously treated simpler situations of Refs. [9,19].

This appurtenance of $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ to the family of Bernstein functions is central in the extension of the case treated in this section, that implicitly assumes that the two states 1 and 2 are close to each other, to more general scenarios. This generalization is discussed in the next section.

378

379 2.4. General case

It was shown in Ref. [19] that the quasi-scaling assumption is reasonable when the thermophysical states 1 and 2 are close to each other. This constraint is not verified in general radiative transfer calculations for which large gradients of temperature, pressure and species concentrations may be encountered along a radiation path. However, for any given couple of states 1 and 2, we can assume that there exists a sequence of *N* (finite) close intermediate states $\{1\}=1, \{2\},..\{N-1\},\{N\}=2$ such that gas spectra between any couple of states $\{i\}$ and $\{i+1\}$ follow the assumptions of section 2.3. In this case, using these intermediate states, one can write:

387

$$\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu} \left(L \right) = \ell_{\{1\}} \circ \tau_{\{N\}}^{\Delta \nu} \left(L \right) = \ell_{\{1\}} \circ \tau_{\{2\}}^{\Delta \nu} \left[\ell_{\{2\}} \circ \tau_{\{3\}}^{\Delta \nu} \left(\dots \left[\ell_{\{N-1\}} \circ \tau_{\{N\}}^{\Delta \nu} \left(L \right) \right] \right) \right]$$
(30)

389

i.e., function $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ can be constructed as the composition of N-1 intermediate functions. As 390 391 gas spectra between any couple of states $\{i\}$ and $\{i+1\}$ follow the assumptions of section 2.3, by construction, all functions $\ell_{\{i\}} \circ \tau_{\{i+1\}}^{\Delta \nu}$, i = 1, ..., N - 1 in Eq. (30) are of the Bernstein type. Their 392 393 combination is thus also a Bernstein function [21], viz. of the form of Eq. (27). This property on 394 combinations of Bernstein functions thus allows generalizing very straightforwardly our physical 395 model of section 2.3 to more general situations. Notice that if the functional form of the solution is 396 known at this level, the set of states $\{2\}, .., \{N-1\}$ is unknown. Its specification can be avoided by 397 using tools from statistical learning, as explained in the next section. The method proposed to derive 398 the model parameters from high resolution LBL data is adapted from Ref. [9] and is first described 399 in this specific application context. The model set by Eqs. (15,27) is then applied to atmospheric

- 400 calculations. Comparisons with reference LBL calculations over non-uniform atmospheric paths are
- 401 then provided.
- 402
- 403

3. APPLICATION

405

In this section, we compare non-uniform atmospheric transmissivities obtained by application of 406 Eq. (27), combined with the propagative scheme of Eq. (3), with simulations obtained by the ℓ -407 408 distribution method based on mapping functions, as used for instance in Ref. [17]. These two 409 methods are assessed against reference LBL calculations. Results of CKD models for various 410 numbers of gray gases are also provided for completeness. All model parameters are constructed 411 with the help of the same high resolution LBL data. Water vapor was chosen for the present analysis 412 and the Mid Latitude Summer profile was selected. This profile is discretized in 49 uniform layers 413 between 0 km (ground) and 120 km (top of the atmosphere). The METimage / EPS-SG channel 414 VII-20 optical filter (that defines a spectral range that extends from 10579.7715 cm⁻¹ up to 11312.2172 cm⁻¹) is considered in the calculations. The spectral resolution of the LBL calculation 415 is 0.01 cm⁻¹ (the spectral band thus contains 73,245 values of wavenumbers). Section 3.1 is devoted 416 417 to the analysis of two-layers systems. Its main objective is to demonstrate the relevance of Eq. (27) for the calculation of $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ and to show how the unknown quantities in the model can be 418 419 obtained by regression using a standard algorithm from the machine learning community. Section 420 3.2 describes preliminary results of a prototype code used to extend the results of section 3.1. to real 421 non-uniform atmospheres made of *n* higher than 2 uniform sub-layers. In the same section 3.2, 422 additional test cases related to oxygen in the A-band as well as a mixture of CO₂, H₂O and O₃ are 423 also treated. For these supplementary cases, the optical filters of METimage / EPS-SG channel VII-424 16 and METimage / EPS-SG channel VII-39 were selected respectively for O₂ and the CO₂-H₂O-425 O₃ mixture. The test cases considered are limited to purely absorbing atmospheres but extension of 426 the method to scattering atmospheres can be made in exactly the same way as described in Ref. [17]. 427

428

430 **3.1. Analysis of two-layers configurations**

The objective of the present section is to study the validity of the functional form set by Eq. (27) to treat two-layers configurations. For this purpose, the estimation of the unknown coefficients of the model in the case of two-layers systems, that is to say the parameters u_{\min} and $v^*(\xi)$, is first made by applying the following steps:

435 Step 1/ for regression purpose, we select the following approximation of $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ derived in 436 Appendix II (Eq. (II.4)) and rigorously equivalent to Eq. (27):

437

438
$$\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx u_{\min}L + (\overline{u} - u_{\min}) \cdot \int_0^1 \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_1(0) \cdot v^*(\xi)L\right]}{s_1(0) \cdot v^*(\xi)} d\xi$$
(31)

439

that we approximate, using a Gauss Legendre quadrature to calculate the integral that appears at the
RHS (see Eq. (II.5)), as:

442

443
$$\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx \ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu} \left[u_{\min}, v^{*}(x_{i}); L \right] = u_{\min}L + \left(\overline{u} - u_{\min}\right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_{i} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s(0) \cdot v^{*}(x_{i}) L \right]}{s(0) \cdot v^{*}(x_{i})}$$
(32)

444

The order of the Gauss Legendre quadrature (whose weights and nodes are written ω_i and x_i respectively) was set to 16, as suggested in Ref. [9]. The main interest of this choice of functional form for $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$ is that the initialization of the parameters to adjust is straightforward, as discussed in Appendix II.

449 Step 2/a loss function \mathcal{L} is defined:

451

$$\mathcal{L}\left[u_{\min}, v^{*}(x_{i})\right] = \int_{0}^{+\infty} \left[\tau_{2}^{\Delta\nu}(L) - \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}\left(\ell_{1}\circ\tau_{2}^{\Delta\nu}\left[u_{\min}, v^{*}(x_{i}); L\right]\right)\right]^{2} d\tau_{2}^{\Delta\nu}(L)$$

$$= \int_{0}^{1} \left[\xi - \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}\left(\ell_{1}\circ\tau_{2}^{\Delta\nu}\left[u_{\min}, v^{*}(x_{i}); \ell_{2}(\xi)\right]\right)\right]^{2} d\xi$$
(33)

453 The integral from 0 to 1 is calculated, using a uniform discretization of the unit interval, as:

454

455
$$\mathcal{L}\left[u_{\min}, v^{*}(x_{i})\right] = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left[\xi_{j} - \tau_{1}^{\Delta \nu} \left(\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu} \left[u_{\min}, v^{*}(x_{i}); \ell_{2}\left(\xi_{j}\right)\right]\right)\right]^{2}, \ \xi_{j} = \frac{j}{J}$$
(34)

456

457 Application of the previous definition of the loss function requires evaluating the set of lengths 458 $\ell_2(\xi_j) = \ell_2(j/J), \ j = 1, J$. These quantities are calculated using high resolution (200,000 points) 459 mapping functions together with the "standard" ℓ -distribution model formulation (see Ref. [15] for 460 details). Mapping functions at the same high resolution are also used to calculate the transmissivity 461 functions in state 1, *i.e.*, $\tau_1^{\Delta v}$, as required by Eq. (34). In our calculations, the total number of lengths 462 along the transmission curves was set to J=20,000.

463 Step 3/ the loss function is minimized using ADAM's [22] method. ADAM is a first-order gradient 464 optimization method based on adaptative estimates of lower-order moments. An ADAM code using 465 explicit gradients (simple to evaluate analytically using the definitions of Eqs. (32,34)) was written 466 in Fortran 90. The learning rate was set to 0.5 (rather standard value used in ADAM) and a simple 467 learning decay rate strategy was applied (for every step along the learning process where the loss 468 function increases, the learning rate is decreased by 0.05 percent – this simple strategy was found 469 to accelerate the convergence of the optimization process). The solution is attained when the loss function between two successive iterations does not change from more than 10^{-4} %. In general, this 470 471 level of convergence is attained after a few dozen of thousands of iterations. Notice that in this section, our objective is to validate Eq. (27), reason why such a strong convergence criterion was 472

473 selected. In the optimization code, the following constraints are set to follow the definition of this 474 variable: $v^*(x_i) > 0$, i = 1, N.

475

476 Results of the model after optimization of its parameters are depicted in Figures 1, 2 and 3 for layers 477 between 0 (ground surface) and 16 km. Preliminary numerical tests (not depicted here) have shown 478 that, in these cases, errors of more than a few percent of the full transmission scale can be observed 479 if a single scaling coefficient (either based on the optically thin limit, viz. defined as the ratio of 480 Planck mean absorption coefficients, or at the optically thick limit, for which the minimum value of 481 scaling coefficient over the band is obtained) is used: gas spectra are thus not rigorously scaled in 482 the configurations treated. However, in all cases of Figure 1-3, the residual defined as the difference $r\left[\tau_{2}^{\Delta\nu}(L)\right] = \tau_{2}^{\Delta\nu}(L) - \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu}\left(\ell_{1}\circ\tau_{2}^{\Delta\nu}\left[u_{\min},\nu^{*}(x_{i});L\right]\right)$ is lower than 10⁻⁴ indicating the relevance of 483 484 the functional form set by Eq. (II.5), and thus as an extension of the model of Eq. (27), to calculate $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$. The quality of the approximation shows, indirectly, that if all the assumptions made to 485 486 construct Eq. (27) are probably not rigorously verified, they are sufficiently realistic to provide relevant and accurate estimates of $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$. 487

488





491 Figure 1. Residuals at the end of the fitting process for two-layers systems (for layers 1 to 5) – loss



function given by Eq. (33).



496 Figure 2. Residuals at the end of the fitting process for two-layers systems (for layers 6 to 10) –
497 loss function given by Eq. (33).





Figure 3. Residuals at the end of the fitting process for two-layers systems (for layers 11 to 15) –
loss function given by Eq. (33).

503 It is important to notice that at some locations along the non-uniform atmosphere, especially at high altitudes where the gaseous absorption is small, the set of input lengths $\ell_2(\xi_j) = \ell_2(j/J), j = 1, J$ 504 505 required for the optimization may take rather unrealistic values (for instance, for layer 20 which is 506 20 km above the ground surface, the length required in the selected case of water vapor to absorb 507 1% of the incident radiation, *i.e.*, the length to reach a value of transmissivity of 0.99, is higher than 508 3000 km which is rather unrealistic for standard Earth remote sensing applications). In this case, the loss function is adapted to restrict the range of values of $\tau_2^{\Delta\nu}(L)$ to the Optically Thin Limit 509 (exponent OTL): 510

511

512
$$\mathcal{L}^{OTL}\left[u_{\min}, v^{*}\left(x_{i}\right)\right] = \int_{\tau_{\min}}^{1} \left[\xi - \tau_{1}^{\Delta v}\left(\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta v}\left[u_{\min}, v^{*}\left(x_{i}\right); \ell_{2}\left(\xi\right)\right]\right)\right]^{2} d\xi$$
(35)

For the construction of Figure 4, that considers layers at altitudes located between 16 and 21 km, the value τ_{\min} was set to 0.9. This choice means that in the regression process, only the values of gas path lengths such that $\tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L) \ge \tau_{\min} = 0.9$ are considered to evaluate the model's coefficients u_{\min} and $v^*(\xi)$. With this new loss function, very low residuals (absolute value of maximum is below 1.1×10^{-6}) are obtained at high altitudes as shown in Figure 4: the model set by Eq. (27) thus remains valid.



520

Figure 4. Residuals at the end of the fitting process for two-layers systems (for layers 16 to 20) –
Adjustment of the coefficients at the *OTL* (loss function defined by Eq. (35)).

523

524 **3.2.** Generalization to *n*-layer configurations

In the previous section, we have restricted our analysis to two-layers systems. We have shown that the proposed functional form Eq. (27) provides, after an appropriate adjustment of the models' coefficients, an accurate approximation of $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L)$. In the present section, we treat the more general case of non-uniform atmospheres made of *n* (higher than 2) layers. For this purpose, we have combined the iterative scheme of Eq (3) with Eq. (27). This allows constructing a function of the *n* lengths encountered along a non-uniform atmosphere made of *n* distinct uniform layers. This

function can be trained over non-uniform path transmissivities following a logic similar to the one described in the two-layers configurations of Section 3.1. But, in this case, the total number of parameters to optimize is not 17 anymore but 17 (n-1) (the value n-1 arises from the fact that in the recurrent process, only n-1 functions of the form of Eq. (27) are used as shown in Eq. (3)). The prototype code to generate the model's coefficients was written in Python using the PyTorch library. The construction of the set of parameters for the n-layer system was done applying the following steps (we provide here the main logic, as a proof of concept):

538 Step #1: a rough analysis of two-layers systems is first performed. ADAM method as provided in 539 PyTorch is used to improve the initial set (constructed in exactly the same way as in 3.1) but the full 540 convergence is not sought out in order to reduce the CPU cost. ADAM method is run for each couple 541 of layers for 500 iterations. This process is parallelized on 48 processors (one processor for each 542 couple of layers).

Step #2: at this level, we have a rough estimate of the model parameters. The full set of coefficients is re-adjusted on non-uniform path transmissivities calculated with the help of the ℓ -distribution method based on mapping functions. For this purpose, approximations of non-uniform path transmissivities using the ℓ -distribution method are selected every 500 m (the full atmosphere has a length of 120 km) and several relative air mass (1, 2, 4, 8, 16 and 24) are considered. The total number of input data (values of non-uniform path transmissivities) used for the training process is thus 1,440.

Step #3: non-uniform path transmissivities based on the ℓ -distribution method, as used in Step #2 to train the full model, are replaced by transmissivities evaluated LBL. The training set is constructed using the same method as for the ℓ -distribution training of Step #2 and also contains 1,440 values of non-uniform path transmissivities. The main difference between Step #2 and Step #3 is that Step #2 uses non-uniform path transmissivities evaluated with the help of the ℓ -distribution model whereas in Step #3 reference LBL calculations are used.

Step #4: once the set of parameters is considered sufficiently close to the optimal solution, the Bernstein functions Eq. (27) are used to update the mapping functions required by the *t*-distribution method. This allows constructing a model that has the same accuracy as after Step #3 but with a minimal CPU cost. The model at this level is called Augmented *t*-distribution. Additional details on the transition between Steps #3 and #4 are provided in Appendix III. A diagram that summarizes the various steps of the process is given in Figure 5.

562



564

Figure 5. The several steps of the regression process. Input data (LBL spectra and optical filter)
are on the top left – output data (coefficients of the Lévy-Khintchine (LK) formula all along the
atmosphere) are on the bottom right. Step #4 is not depicted on the figure.

Figure 6 depicts results of comparisons for several values of Relative Air Mass, from 1 (single path
in the non-uniform atmosphere) up to 24 (relationships between RAM values and angles between

illustrates how the quality of the model (measured in terms of the relative error of the modelcompared with reference LBL calculations) evolves after each step of the process.

574



575

576 Figure 6. Evolution of the relative errors of the model at various stages of the training process.577

578 In Figure 6, the top layer shows LBL transmission curves over the non-uniform atmospheres. At a
579 given distance from the ground surface (abscissa), it depicts the transmissivity of the path between
580 the top of the atmosphere and this location / abscissa.

The second layer (starting again from the top) displays results of the "standard" *t*-distribution model based on mapping functions, as described in Refs. [15,17]. The accuracy of the method is rather satisfying, with relative differences lower than 0.8% when compared with reference LBL calculations.

The third layer was constructed using directly the outputs of Step #1 (parameters adjustments on two-layers systems) combined with the iterative scheme of Eq. (3). Results are very close to those of the ℓ -distribution model based on mapping functions (second layer), but not rigorously the same. 588 After Step #2 (fourth curve), the outputs of the "standard" *l*-distribution model and the combination 589 of Eqs. (3,27) are virtually undistinguishable. This results can be explained by two factors: 1/ the 590 second training stage of Step #2 improves the initial learning stage of Step #1, which was probably 591 not pursued long enough to reach a full convergence, 2/ very likely, as only the set of lengths actually 592 used in the radiative transfer calculation are considered in the training, local adjustments are made 593 that allow improving further the model's accuracy (in the same way, local adjustments at the OTL 594 were found to provide a slightly higher accuracy than if the full range of Eq. (33) was used in Section 595 3.1).

596 The fifth layer depicts results after Steps #3 and #4 (notice that when high resolution mapping 597 functions are constructed, as is the case here where 20,000 points are used for each updated mapping 598 function, results of Steps #3 and #4 are virtually identical). The gain in terms of accuracy compared 599 to the "standard" *l*-distribution model is significant (a factor of about 2) but the two models used to 600 construct the second and fifth layers share the same CPU cost (after Step #4). This figure illustrates 601 the importance of the results described in the present work. Indeed, the use of the functional form 602 Eq. (27) derived on the present paper together with the iterative scheme of Eq. (3) allows 603 constructing a model of non-uniform path transmissivity that can reach a very high accuracy (of 604 about 0.35 % when compared with LBL data) at a very low CPU cost (the CPU time to generate a 605 full transmission curve, made of 1,200 values of non-uniform path transmissivities, is 0.1 ms on a 606 single core of an Intel Xeon Silver 4214R 2.4 GHz processor).

607

Eventually, one can notice that Figure 6 depicts results associated with the training set, obtained by considering the values of relative air mass of 1, 2, 4, 8, 16 and 24. In order to evaluate how the method extends to more general radiative transfer scenarios, we have generated model parameters (using steps from #1 to #4) over 6 standard atmospheric profiles (Mid-Latitude Summer and Winter, US standard, Tropical, Sub-Arctic Summer and Winter). Then, for a given value of relative air mass between 1 and 24 by unit step, we have searched over the full transmission curve (as already said,

1,200 values of non-uniform path transmissivities are estimated for a given RAM) the maximum relative error of the model when compared with reference LBL calculations. For comparison purpose, we have made the same calculations for two CKD models based on Gauss-Legendre quadratures at orders 64 and 256. Results are depicted in Figure 7 for H₂O (same case as for Figure 6), Figure 8 for O₂ and Figure 9 for the mixture (treated as a single gas). The set of RAMs used for the training is depicted by small vertical rectangles (connected to the RAM axis) in Figures 7-9.



Figure 7. Maximum relative errors / LBL for 6 standard atmospheres and values of relative air
mass between 1 and 24 (case of water vapor).

- 624
- 625
- 626



628 Figure 8. Maximum relative errors / LBL for 6 standard atmospheres and values of relative air

mass between 1 and 24 (case of oxygen A-band).



633 Figure 9. Maximum relative errors / LBL for 6 standard atmospheres and values of relative air



636 From Figures 7 to 9, several conclusions and comments can be drawn:

637 The level of accuracy observed over the full set of RAMs indicates that the coefficients of 638 the sequence of Bernstein functions generalize well, even when applied to cases outside the 639 training set. The Augmented *l*-distribution model provides an accuracy higher than 0.35% 640 for water vapor when assessed against reference LBL calculations, over the 6 standard 641 atmospheres. It is below 0.35% for O_2 and 0.20% for the mixture over the same set of cases. 642 In most cases, for water vapor (Figure 7), the accuracy of the Augmented *l*-distribution 643 method is lower than a CKD model with 256 gray gases but higher than a CKD model with 644 64 gray gases. This result cannot be considered as general (as illustrated by Figures 8 and 9) 645 because the CKD model performs particularly well for H₂O, as absorption by water vapor 646 only occurs in the first gaseous layers close to the ground where almost no gradient of 647 pressure and species concentrations is found (see the top layer of Figure 6: all the dynamics 648 of the transmission curves is below 10 km).

649 Even if the Augmented *l*-distribution model provides a slightly lower accuracy for H₂O than _ 650 the CKD model with 256 gray gases, it outperforms this method in terms of calculation cost. 651 Indeed, as shown in Ref. [17] where the "standard" *l*-distribution method was compared with 652 CKD-256 k in realistic cloudy atmospheres, the CPU cost of Augmented ℓ -distribution 653 (which is the same as the *l*-distribution model of Ref. [15,17] as only the mapping functions 654 differ between the two techniques) is about ten times lower than CKD-256 k. In many 655 applications, the 0.35% accuracy of Augmented *l*-distribution method may be sufficient, 656 considering the significant gain in terms of CPU cost of this technique compared with the 657 more widely spread CKD model.

For the oxygen and mixture cases (Figures 8 and 9), the Augmented *l*-distribution model
provides a higher accuracy than both CKD-64 *k* and CKD-256 *k* methods at a lower
computational cost.

6. CONCLUSION

661

662

663 This paper is the continuation and generalization of a recent paper dedicated to the use of recurrent 664 methods to approximate non-uniform path transmissivities. A general formula was derived and 665 found to yield exactly the same recurrent structure as in our previous work. This formula involves 666 coefficients that have a clear physical meaning. However, they cannot be specified directly. A 667 training process using as input LBL transmission curves was thus developed to allow the 668 identification of the unknown coefficients of the proposed model. The non-uniform path 669 transmissivity approximation was then assessed against reference LBL calculations and found to 670 provide the same level of accuracy as the ℓ -distribution model with high-resolution (20,000 values) 671 mapping functions after a first training stage limited to the analysis of two-layers systems. A second 672 regression scheme was then added in which LBL data were used directly for the training of the 673 model's coefficients. After this second step, the model was found to provide very accurate 674 approximations of non-uniform path transmissivities, with errors lower than 0.35 % compared to 675 LBL in all the cases considered. Adding this second learning stage was shown to have no impact on 676 the CPU cost of the method, leading to an approximate technique that is among the most accurate 677 and fastest in the field.

678

679 Implications of the present results are numerous. From a practical perspective, the present technique 680 allows reducing significantly the memory cost of the *l*-distribution method: indeed, look-up tables 681 of Gr functions using 20,000 points can be condensed into 17 parameters which can be useful in 682 terms of delivery of the model's parameters. Moreover, it also increases significantly its level of 683 accuracy (a factor of about 2 in terms of relative errors was obtained in this work). From a theoretical 684 perspective, the present developments show that the copula model used in the *l*-distribution method 685 is of the Levy Subordinated type. The method developed here can be, a priori, extended to any other 686 LS-HAC copula models. The fact that a LS-HAC is obtained proves that the model embeds in its

687	structure some physical constraints about the derivatives of the transmissivity. Eventually, the
688	present work shows that the use of recurrent network structures to model non-uniform path
689	transmissivities is not limited to the simplified <i>l</i> -distribution model treated in our previous paper but
690	that this property extends to LBL input data as considered here. Additionally, this result is not
691	limited to high temperature applications but it is shown to apply to atmospheric configurations too.
692	
693	

696	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
697	
698	This work was supported by the French National Research Agency under the grant ANR-20-CE04-
699	0005 ASGARD.
700	
701	REFERENCES
702	
703	[1] S. J. Young, Band Model Theory of Radiation Transport, The Aerospace Press, 2013.
704	[2] W. Malkmus, "Random Lorentz band model with exponential tailed S-1 line-intensity distribution
705	function", J. Opt. Soc. Am., vol. 57, pp. 323-329, 1967.
706	[3] B.W. Webb, V.P. Solovjov, and F. André, "The spectral line based weighted-sum-of-gray-gases
707	(SLW) model for prediction of radiative transfer in molecucular gases", Advances in Heat
708	Transfer, vol. 51, pp. 207-298, 2019.
709	[4] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, J. Friedman, The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data mining, Inference
710	and Prediction, Second Edition, Springer Series in Statistics, 2017.
711	[5] A. del Aguila, D.S. Efremenko, T. Trautmann, "A review of dimensionality reduction techniques
712	for processing hyper-spectral optical signal", Light and Engineering, vol. 27, pp. 85-98, 2019.
713	[6] X. Liu, W.L. Smith, D.K. Zhou, A. Larar, "Principal component-based radiative transfer model for
714	hyperspectral sensors: theoretical concept", Applied Optics, vol. 45, pp. 201-208, 2006.
715	[7] F. André, C. Delage, C. Cornet, L. Croizé, Ph. Dubuisson, M. Galtier, "Computationally efficient
716	and accurate modelling of transmissivities of non-uniform paths through the mixture L-distribution
717	(MLD) approach", in: Proceedings of the International Radiation Symposium, Thessaloniki, July
718	4-8, 2022.
719	[8] P.G. Stegmann, B. Johnson, L. Moradi, B. Karpowicz, W. Mc Carty, "A deep learning approach
720	to fast radiative transfer", J. Quant. Spectr. Rad. Transfer, vol. 280, 108088, 2022.

- [9] F. André, C. Cornet, C. Delage, Ph. Dubuisson, M. Galtier, "On the use of recurrent neural networks for fast and accurate non-uniform gas radiation modeling", *J. Quant. Spectr. Rad. Transfer*, vol. 293, 108371, 2022.
- [10] A. Royer, O. Farges, P. Boulet, D. Burot, "A new method for modeling radiative heat transfer
 based on Bayesian artificial neural networks and Monte Carlo method in participating media", *Int.*
- 726 J. Heat Mass Transfer, vol. 201, 123610, 2023.
- [11] D.-A. Clevert, T. Unterthiner, S. Hochreiter, "Fast and accurate deep network learning by
 exponential liner unit 'ELUs)", *in*: Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning
 Representation ICLR'16, 2016.
- 730 [12] A. D. Jagtap, G. E. Karniadakis, "How important are activation functions in regression and
- classification? A survey, performance comparison, and future directions", *arXiv*, 2209.02681,
 2022.
- [13] J. Abbasi, P. O. Andersen, "Physical Activation Functions (PAFs): an approach for more efficient
 induction of physics into Physics-Informed Neural Networks (PINNs)", *arXiv*, 2205.14630, 2022.
- 735 [14] G. E. Karniadakis, I. G. Kevrekidis, L. Gu, P. Perdikaris, S. Wang, L. Yang, "Physics-informed
- machine learning", *Nature Review Physics*, vol. 3, pp. 422-440, 2021.
- [15] F. André, "The *t*-distribution method for modeling non-gray absorption in uniform and non-uniform gaseous media", *J. Quant. Spectr. Rad. Transfer*, vol. 179, pp. 19-32, 2016.
- [16] F. André, "An analysis of the symmetry issue in the *l*-distribution method of gas radiation in nonuniform gaseous media", *J. Quant. Spectr. Rad. Transfer*, vol. 190, pp. 78-87, 2017.
- [17] F. André, C. Cornet, M. Galtier, Ph. Dubuisson, "Radiative transfer in the O₂ A-band a fast and
- 742 accurate forward model based on the *l*-distribution approach", J. Quant. Spectr. Rad. Transfer, vol.
- 743 260, 107470, 2021.
- [18] M. Merkle, "Completely Monotone Functions: A Digest", *Analytic Number Theory*, *Approximation Theory and Special Functions*, pp. 347-364, 2014.

- [19] F. André, "Effective scaling factors in non-uniform gas radiation modeling", *J. Quant. Spectr. Rad. Transfer*, vol. 206, pp. 105-116, 2018.
- 748 [20] W.L. Godson, "The evaluation of infra-red radiative fluxes due to atmospheric water vapour",

749 *Q. Journal Royal Meteorological Society*, vol. 79, pp. 367-379, 1953.

- [21] R.L. Schilling, R. Song, Z. Vondraček, *Bernstein Functions: Theory and Applications*, Second
 Edition, De Gruyter, 2012.
- [22] D. P. Kingma, J. L. Ba, "Adam: a method for stochastic optimization", *in*: Proceedings of the 3rd
 International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR'15, 2015.
- [23] G. R. Schorack, *Probability for statisticians*, Springer text in statistics, Springer, 2000.
- 755 [24] C. Hering, M. Hofert, J.-F. Mai, M. Scherer, "Constructing hierarchical Archimedean copulas with
- Levy subordinators", J. Multivariate Analysis, vol. 101, pp. 1428-1433, 2010.
- [25] R. B. Nelsen, *An introduction to copulas*, Second Edition, Springer series in statistics, Springer,
 2006.
- [26] H. Joe, *Multivariate models and dependence concepts*, Monograph on statistics and applied
 probability 73, Springer Science+Business Media Dorbrecht, 1997.
- 761 [27] M. Abramowitz, I. A. Stegun, Handbook of Mathematical Functions, Dover, 1965.
- 762 [28] F. André, R. Vaillon, "The k-moment method for modeling the blackbody weighted transmission
- function for narrow and wide band radiative properties of gases", J. Quant. Spectr. Rad. Transfer,
- vol. 108, pp. 1-16, 2007.
- 765
- 766

APPENDIX I. Proof of Eq. (9)

The objective of this appendix is to provide a proof of Eq. (9). For this purpose, we first consider a single spectral line (index *i*) of the gas in state 1. The derivative of the transmissivity of this single line with respect to the gas path length L is (following a mathematical treatment similar to the one used in *k*-distribution methods):

$$774 \qquad -\frac{\partial \tau_{1,i}^{\Delta \nu}}{\partial L} = \frac{1}{\Delta \nu} \cdot \int_{\Delta \nu} \kappa_{\nu,1,i} \exp\left(-\kappa_{\nu,1,i}L\right) d\nu = \int_{0}^{+\infty} \exp\left(-k^* \cdot L\right) \cdot \left[\frac{1}{\Delta \nu} \int_{\Delta \nu} \frac{\partial H\left(k^* - \kappa_{\nu,1,i}\right)}{\partial k^*} \kappa_{\nu,1,i} d\nu\right] dk^*$$

$$775 \qquad (I.1)$$

where H is the Heaviside step function.

The sum over all spectral lines, *i.e.* over all indices *i*, then provides:

780
$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[-\frac{\partial \tau_{1,i}^{\Delta \nu} \left(L \right)}{\partial L} \right] = \int_{0}^{+\infty} \exp\left(-k^* \cdot L \right) \cdot \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[\frac{1}{\Delta \nu} \int_{\Delta \nu} \frac{\partial H \left(k^* - \kappa_{\nu,i} \right)}{\partial k^*} \kappa_{\nu,i} \, d\nu \right] \right\} \, dk^* \tag{I.2}$$

Dividing both sides of Eq. (I.2) by the Planck mean absorption coefficient of the gas in state 1 yields:

$$\frac{1}{k_{P,1}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[-\frac{\partial\tau_{1,i}^{\Delta\nu}(L)}{\partial L}\right] = \int_{0}^{+\infty} \exp\left(-k^{*}\cdot L\right) \cdot \left\{\frac{1}{k_{P,1}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[\frac{1}{\Delta\nu}\int_{\Delta\nu}\frac{\partial H\left(k^{*}-\kappa_{\nu,i}\right)}{\partial k^{*}} \kappa_{\nu,i} d\nu\right]\right\} dk^{*}$$

$$= \int_{0}^{+\infty} \exp\left(-k^{*}\cdot L\right) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial k^{*}}\left\{\frac{1}{k_{P,1}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[\frac{1}{\Delta\nu}\int_{\Delta\nu}H\left(k^{*}-\kappa_{\nu,i}\right) \kappa_{\nu,i} d\nu\right]\right\} dk^{*}$$
(I.3)

It can be readily checked that $F(k^*)$: 1/ is a strictly increasing function of the variables k^* , 2/ takes value 0 for $k^* = 0$ and 1 for $k^* = +\infty$. $F(k^*)$ is thus a distribution [23]. This allows rewriting (using the inverse $k^*(\xi)$ of $F(k^*)$ defined as $F[k^*(\xi)] = \xi$, $\xi \in [0,1]$):

790
$$\frac{1}{k_{P,1}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[-\frac{\partial \tau_{1,i}^{\Delta \nu}(L)}{\partial L} \right] = \int_{0}^{1} \exp\left[-k^{*}(\xi) \cdot L \right] d\xi$$
(I.4)

791

Figure 792 Eq. (I.4) provides Eq. (9) when combined with Eq. (8).

793

794

APPENDIX II. Reformulations of Eq. (27) and their properties

797

798 The objective of this second appendix is to derive two equivalent formulations of Eq. (27). It is 799 motivated by the observation that even if Eq. (27) has strong implications in terms of the statistical 800 analysis of the model (indeed, as the combinations of successive inverses of transmissivities and 801 transmissivities are Bernstein functions, application of the recurrent scheme of Eq. (3) is equivalent to 802 the construction of a Lévy Subordinated Hierarchical Archimedean Copula LS-HAC [24], for which 803 the so-called sufficient nesting condition [25,26] is naturally fulfilled - this "copula" view is not 804 analyzed further in the present work but additional details can be found in Ref. [17]), Eq. (27) is neither 805 the most convenient for regression purpose nor for a physical analysis of the model. Consequently, we 806 derive here two equivalent formulations of Eq. (27) and illustrate how they can be used to provide an 807 initialization of the regression scheme described in Section 3.1 and to a better understanding of the 808 physical model described in this work.

809

810 For this purpose, we first modify Eq. (27) into:

811

812
$$\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx u_{\min}L + \int_0^1 \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_1(0) \cdot \nu(\xi)L\right]}{s_1(0) \cdot \nu(\xi)} \cdot \nu(\xi) d\xi \qquad (\text{II.1})$$

813

814 Eq. (II.1) can be equivalently rewritten as:

815

816
$$\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx u_{\min}L + \int_0^1 \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_1(0) \cdot \nu(\xi)L\right]}{s_1(0) \cdot \nu(\xi)} d\left[\int_0^{\xi} \nu(\xi')d\xi'\right]$$
(II.2)

818 that is to say, as
$$\int_{0}^{1} v(\xi') d\xi' = \frac{1}{\Delta v} \cdot \int_{\Delta v} (u_{v} - u_{\min}) dv = \overline{u} - u_{\min}$$
:

819
$$\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx u_{\min}L + (\overline{u} - u_{\min}) \cdot \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_{1}(0) \cdot \nu(\xi)L\right]}{s_{1}(0) \cdot \nu(\xi)} d\left[\underbrace{\frac{1}{\overline{u} - u_{\min}} \cdot \int_{0}^{\xi} \nu(\xi')d\xi'}_{F^{*}(\xi)}\right]$$
(II.3)

821 The quantity $F^*(\xi)$ is a distribution over the unit interval. This provides:

822

823
$$\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx u_{\min}L + (\overline{u} - u_{\min}) \cdot \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_{1}(0) \cdot v^{*}(\xi)L\right]}{s_{1}(0) \cdot v^{*}(\xi)} d\xi$$
(II.4)

824

825 where
$$v^*(\xi) = v \circ (F^*)^{-1}(\xi), \ \xi \in [0,1].$$

826 Using a Gauss Legendre quadrature at order N to approximate the integral over [0,1] that appears 827 in Eq. (II.4), we obtain:

828

829
$$\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx u_{\min}L + (\overline{u} - u_{\min}) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_{i} \cdot \frac{1 - \exp[-s_{1}(0) \cdot v^{*}(x_{i})L]}{s_{1}(0) \cdot v^{*}(x_{i})}$$
(II.5)

830

831 where ω_i , i = 1, N and x_i , i = 1, N are respectively the weights and nodes of the Gauss Legendre 832 quadrature.

Eq. (II.5) can be compared with Eqs. (19,29) from Ref. [9] that yields, in the case of gas spectra that follow rigorously the assumptions of the SNB model for Lorentz lines with Malkmus' distribution of linestrengths:

836

837
$$\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx \frac{k_{P,2}\beta_{2}}{k_{P,1}\beta_{1}}L + \left(\overline{u} - \frac{k_{P,2}\beta_{2}}{k_{P,1}\beta_{1}}\right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_{i} \cdot \frac{1 - \exp\left[-u(x_{i}) \cdot 2\pi k_{P,2}/\beta_{2} \cdot L\right]}{u(x_{i}) \cdot 2\pi k_{P,2}/\beta_{2}}$$
(II.6)

839 where (see Ref. [9]) parameters $u(x_i)$, i = 1, N are obtained as solutions of the implicit equations (*P* 840 is the incomplete gamma function [27]):

841

842
$$P[1/2; u(x_i)] = x_i, \ P(a; u) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(a)} \cdot \int_0^u t^{a-1} \exp(-t) \ dt$$
(II.7)

843

Based on this result, we can use the formal analogy between Eqs. (II.5) and (II.6) to initialize the regression scheme by setting, at the first step of the minimization process: $1/u_{\min} \leftarrow Min(\kappa_{\nu,2}/\kappa_{\nu,1})$,

846 and 2/
$$v^*(x_i) \leftarrow \frac{\alpha \cdot \pi k_{P,2}}{\beta_2} \cdot \frac{1}{s_1(0)} \cdot u(x_i)$$
 with $\alpha = 2$ at the OTL (in this case the model of Eq. (II.6) is

almost exact [1,16,28]) and $\alpha = 4$ when the full range of lengths is used (this value of $\alpha = 4$ was found in practice to provide slightly more accurate results than $\alpha = 2$ when the loss function is defined

849 by Eq. (33)). Selecting the value
$$u_{\min} \leftarrow \frac{k_{P,2}\beta_2}{k_{P,1}\beta_1}$$
 as suggested by Eq. (II.6) was not found to yield, in

the treated cases, significant differences with $u_{\min} \leftarrow Min(\kappa_{\nu,2}/\kappa_{\nu,1})$. Additional details about the regression method are given in Section 3.1.

852

853 Moreover, Eq. (II.4) can be written as:

854

855
$$\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx u_{\min}L + (\overline{u} - u_{\min})L \cdot \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s_{1}(0) \cdot v^{*}(\xi)L\right]}{s_{1}(0) \cdot v^{*}(\xi)L} d\xi$$
(II.8)

856

857 The quantity inside the integral at the RHS can be itself written as an integral to yield:

859
$$\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu} \left(L \right) \approx u_{\min} L + \left(\overline{u} - u_{\min} \right) L \cdot \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \exp\left[-s_1(0) \cdot v^*(\xi) Lt \right] d\xi dt$$
(II.9)

860 Introducing the path dependent / effective scaling coefficient u(L) such that $\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu}(L) = u(L) \cdot L$, 861 we eventually obtain (in the next equation as well as in Eq. (II.9), variable *t* is a dummy variable 862 only required to reformulate the integral. It has no physical meaning and no unit):

863

864
$$u(L) \approx u_{\min} + (\overline{u} - u_{\min}) \cdot \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{1} \exp\left[-s_{1}(0) \cdot v^{*}(\xi) Lt\right] d\xi dt$$
(II.10)

865

This relationship shows that the effective scaling coefficient is a decreasing function of the gas path length. It provides the proper asymptotic limits of the quasi-scaled model at the optically thin (\overline{u} for small values of *L*) and thick (u_{\min} for large values of *L*) limits. Moreover, as the double integral decreases with respect to *L*, we have $u(L) \leq \overline{u}$ and thus:

870

871
$$\tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu}(L) = \tau_{1}^{\Delta \nu} \left[u(L) \cdot L \right] \ge \tau_{1}^{\Delta \nu} \left(\overline{u}L \right)$$
(II.11)

872

873 This result is consistent with the following inequality (application of Jensen's inequality to the 874 transmissivity function $\tau_1^{\Delta\nu}$):

875

876
$$\tau_{2}^{\Delta\nu}(L) = \int_{0}^{1} \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left[u(\xi) \cdot L \right] d\xi \ge \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left[\int_{0}^{1} u(\xi) d\xi \cdot L \right] = \tau_{1}^{\Delta\nu} \left(\overline{u}L \right)$$
(II.12)

APPENDIX III. Analysis of the transition from Step #2 up to #4 of section 3.2

The objective of this appendix is to provide details about the transition between the regression scheme

879

880

881 of Step #2 described in section 3.2 (based on adjustment of the parameters on solution of a "standard" *l*-distribution model), Step #3 (regression on non-uniform path LBL transmissivities) and Step #4 882 883 (update of the mapping functions used in the "standard" *l*-distribution formulation). 884 885 As can be seen on the fourth layer of Figure 6, the "standard" & distribution model provides an estimate 886 of the non-uniform path transmissivity as: 887 $\tau_{1..n}^{\Delta V}(L_1,..,L_n) \approx \tau_1^{\Delta V}(L_{1..n})$ 888 (III.1) 889 where $L_{1,n}$ is obtained by the following recurrent process: 890 891 $\begin{cases} L_{nn} = L_n \\ L_{i..n} = L_i + \ell_i \circ \tau_{i+1}^{\Delta \nu} \left(L_{i+1..n} \right) \end{cases}$ 892 (III.2)893 894 in which (for instance for the couple of layers 1 and 2):

895

896
$$\ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu}(L) \approx \ell_{1} \circ \tau_{2}^{\Delta \nu} \left[u_{\min}, v^{*}(x_{i}); L \right] = u_{\min}L + \left(\overline{u} - u_{\min}\right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_{i} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s\left(0\right) \cdot v^{*}(x_{i})L\right]}{s\left(0\right) \cdot v^{*}(x_{i})}$$
897 (III.3)

898

899 The third step of section 3.2 consists of an adjustment of all the parameters involved in the recurrent 900 scheme on non-uniform LBL data. This produces a new estimate:

902
$$\tau_{1..n}^{\Delta\nu} \left(L_1, ..., L_n \right) \approx \tau_1^{\Delta\nu} \left(L_{1..n}^+ \right)$$
(III.4)

904 where $L_{1..n}^+$ is obtained by the following recurrent process:

906
$$\begin{cases} L_{nn}^{+} = L_{n} \\ L_{i.n}^{+} = L_{i} + \lambda_{i} \left(L_{i+1..n}^{+} \right) \end{cases}$$
(III.5)

908 in which (for instance for the couple of layers 1 and 2):

910
$$\lambda_{1}(L) \approx \lambda_{1}\left[u_{\min}^{+}, v^{+}(x_{i}); L\right] = u_{\min}^{+}L + \left(\overline{u} - u_{\min}^{+}\right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_{i} \frac{1 - \exp\left[-s(0) \cdot v^{+}(x_{i})L\right]}{s(0) \cdot v^{+}(x_{i})} \quad \text{(III.6)}$$

912 In general, as can be seen by comparing the fourth and fifth layers of Figure 6:

- $\tau_1^{\Delta \nu} \left(L_{1..n} \right) \neq \tau_1^{\Delta \nu} \left(L_{1..n}^+ \right)$ (III.7)

916 Let us now consider the case for which all lengths are set to 0 except in layer *i* chosen arbitrarily in 917 $\{2, N\}$. We have:

919
$$L_{1..n} = L_{1..n} \left(L_1 = 0, \ L_2 = 0, ..., L_i, ..., L_n = 0 \right) = \left[\ell_1 \circ \tau_2^{\Delta \nu} \right] \circ \left[\ell_2 \circ \tau_3^{\Delta \nu} \right] \circ ... \circ \left[\ell_{i-1} \circ \tau_i^{\Delta \nu} \right] \left(L_i \right)$$
(III.8)

921 and thus:

$$\tau_1^{\Delta\nu} \left(L_{1..n} \right) = \tau_i^{\Delta\nu} \left(L_i \right) \tag{III.9}$$

925 For the same set of lengths, we have:

926

927
$$L_{1..n}^{+} = L_{1..n}^{+} \left(L_{1} = 0, \ L_{2} = 0, .., L_{i}, .., L_{n} = 0 \right) = \lambda_{1} \circ \lambda_{2} \circ .. \circ \lambda_{i-1} \left(L_{i} \right)$$
(III.10)

928

929 that leads to:

930

931
$$\tau_1^{\Delta\nu} \left(L_{1..n}^+ \right) = \tau_1^{\Delta\nu} \circ \lambda_1 \circ \lambda_2 \circ ... \circ \lambda_{i-1} \left(L_i \right) = \tau_i^+ \left(L_i \right) \neq \tau_i^{\Delta\nu} \left(L_i \right)$$
(III.11)

932

The use of the propagative scheme set by Eq. (III.5) instead of Eq. (III.2) does not allow recovering the transmission curves encountered along the non-uniform path but generates a new set of functions τ_i^+ of the gas path lengths L_i , i=2,...,n. These functions are obtained as the combination of Bernstein functions (that also provides a Bernstein function [21]) and of a Laplace transform (the true transmissivity in the first layer, as seen in Eq. (III.11)): τ_i^+ are consequently Laplace transforms too. These new functions are strictly decreasing and thus invertible. Let us write ℓ_i^+ these inverses. From the definition of functions τ_i^+ we have:

941
$$\tau_i^+(L_i) = \tau_1^{\Delta_V} \circ \lambda_1 \circ \lambda_2 \circ \dots \circ \lambda_{i-1}(L_i) = \tau_{i-1}^+ \circ \lambda_{i-1}(L_i)$$
(III.12)

- 942
- 943 and thus:
- 944

945
$$\lambda_{i-1}(L_i) = \ell_{i-1}^+ \circ \tau_i^+(L_i)$$
(III.13)

This shows that the recurrent scheme of Eq. (III.5) takes exactly the same form as the one given by Eq. (III.2). The same optimized code as used for the "standard" ℓ -distribution method can thus be used to apply the Augmented version, by simply replacing the look-up tables based on $\tau_i^{\Delta\nu}$, i = 1..nby look-up tables based on $\{\tau_1^{\Delta\nu}, \tau_2^+, ..., \tau_n^+\}$. Calculation of these new look-up tables can be made by applying the definition of functions τ_i^+ given by Eq. (III.11).

951

952 One can eventually check without difficulty that the corresponding model (based on the set 953 $\{\tau_1^{\Delta\nu}, \tau_2^+, ..., \tau_n^+\}$) follows the following constraints on the derivative of the non-uniform path 954 transmissivity:

955

956
$$-\frac{\partial \tau_1^{\Delta \nu} \left(L_{1..n}^+\right)}{\partial L_i} \le k_{P,i} \cdot \tau_1^{\Delta \nu} \left(L_{1..n}^+\right), \ i = 1,..,n$$
(III.14)

957

958 and:

959

960
$$\frac{\partial^2 \tau_1^{\Delta \nu} \left(L_{1..n}^+ \right)}{\partial L_i \, \partial L_j} \ge 0, \ i = 1, ..., n, \ j = 1, ..., n \tag{III.15}$$

961

Eq. (III.14), that follows here from the convexity property of Bernstein functions (see also Ref. [17] for additional details), has a long history in the development of band model theory. Indeed, in some configurations, the widely spread Curtis-Godson approximation was shown to fail to ensure this inequality. This led to the development of the Lindquist-Simmons approximation [1]. Eq. (III.15), that follows directly from the LS-HAC copula model, ensures the proper sign of the method when used for the calculation of net exchange rates, as discussed in Ref. [17].