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#### Abstract

We point out, that dealiasing of Doppler weather radar velocity measurements is identical to the problem of phase unwrapping encountered in radar and optical interferometry. A technique developed for phase unwrapping in interferometricsynthetic aperture radar is described and successfully applied to weather radar velocity dealiasing.


## 1 Introduction

In pulsed I oppler weather radar systems, the maximum velocity whichcante unambiguously measured $v_{a}$ is limited by the pulse repetition frequency (PRF). Velocities greater than $v_{a}$ arc aliased into the range $\left(-v_{a}, v_{a}\right)$. The true velocity $v$ is related to the measured velocity $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{n}}$, by $\mathrm{v}=v_{m}+2 n v_{a}$, where $n$, the Nyquist number, specifies the aliasing interval. To recover the true wind field, the measured wind field must be dealiased. This can be thought of as a two step process. The first, which we call the relative velocity step, produces a velocity field that is correct in the sense that the velocities in each connected, or spatially continuous, region differ from each other by tbc correct amount. Once complete, the velocities in each region are either correct or are incorrect by the samemultiple of $2 v_{a}$. The second step in dealiasing is determination of the correct multiple of $2 v_{a}$ for cacb connected region. 'This step attempts to produce the correct absolute velocity. Recent, algorithms for the velocity dealiasing problem include Bergen and Albers (1988), Eilts and Smith (1990), aıd Jing and Wiener (1993).

The dealiasing problem has also been considered in field of interferometry in both radar and optical settings. (Goldstein et al. 1988, Muntley 1989, Ghilia and Romero 1990, Cusack et al. 1995). In the interferometric measurement process, the true phase is aliased into the interval ( $-\mathrm{T}, \pi$ ). The true pbasc $\phi$ is related to tbe measured phase $\phi_{m}$ by $\phi=\phi_{m}+2 n \pi$, where $n$, the Nyquist number, specifies the alias interval. Recovery of the true phase requires dealiasing, the measured phase and is identical to the weather radar velocity dealiasing problem, As in velocity dealiasing, the phase dealiasing problem often requires two sleps. The first, called phase unwrapping, creates a consistent, phase field in each connected region. The second, absolute phase determination, finds the correct multiple of $2 \pi$ to add to
each region.
Although dealiasing is common to both Doppler weather radar and interferometry, the methods that have been developed in the two areas are different. It is the purpose of this noteto show how a technique from interferometry phase unwrapping can be applied to weather. radar velocity dealiasing. We first discuss the algorithm itself and then show examples of its application to weather radar measurements. We consider only the problem of relative velocity determination within a comected region. Tbc absolute velocity determination problem often requires environmental wind informationand is not considered here.

## 2 Description of Technique

In both the weather radar and interfcrometry problems, it is assumed that the true field is continuous. Hence, when a sharp jump in the measured field is encountered, it is assumed that aliasing has occured, and the field is adjusted to remove (or minimize) the discontinuity. 'This procedure can be thought of as forming the gradient of the measured field, adjusting the derivative field so that the derivatives are witbin desired limits, and then integrating the result. This simpleprocedure works well in high SNll cases. However, when SNR is low, errors whichpropagate throughout, large areas can occur. In Goldstein et al (1988) it was noted that these problem areas can be identified by a dependence of the result on the direction of dealiasing. Dealiasing along range and thenazimuthproduced different results from dealiasing along azimuth and then range. These results canbe understood by considering the gradient of the measured field. A vector field which is the gradient of a scalar fieldhas a line integral which is independent of the integration path, and the lineintegralaroundany closed path is zero. A problem may occur, however, when the gradient is adjusted to remove a discontinuity. When noise is present, the adjusted gradient may no longer be the gradient of a scalar ficld. in this case the line integral becomes path dependent, explaining the finding by Goldsteir et al (1988).

Several possible approaches to the noise problem have been suggested. In Bergen and Albers (1988) median filtering is applied to the velocity field before dealiasing to remove noise. In Filts and Smith
(1990) various heuristically derived checks and comparisons are used to detect problem areas during dealiasing. The algorithm is fast, generally works well, and is the basis of the WSI2-881) operational algorithm. In Jing and Wiener (1993) the noise problem is handled by using a least squares technique rather than an integration of the corrected gradient. Their approach is somewhat similar to the least squares method of Ghiglia and Romero (1989) in the phase unwrapping literature. An improved least squares phase unwrapping technique was presented in Song et al. (1995) in the context of magnetic resonance imaging.

Here, we use the technique of Goldstein et al. (1988), hereafter referred to as GZW. The method was developed for interferometric synthetic aperture radar and was independently proposed by Huntley (1989) andfurther developed in Cusack et al. (1995). As mentioned previously, the line integral around a closed loop should be zero if the integral of the field is to be path inpendendent. Thus, problem areas can be identified by examining the line integral around each of the smallest possible units of the field, namely, a 4 point square. This quantity can be conveniently calculated directly from the measured field velocity using:

$$
\begin{align*}
& s(m, n)=\left[(v(m+1, n)-\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{~m}, n)) / 2 v_{a}\right]+\left[(v(m+1, n+1)-v(m+1, n)) / 2 v_{a}\right] \\
& +\left[(v(m, n+1)-v(m+1,71-\mathrm{t} 1)) / 2 v_{a}\right]+\left[(v(m, n)-v(m, 71+1)) / 2 v_{a}\right] \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

where [ ] denotes the operation of finding the closest integer. Figure 1 shows velocity data that appeared as an example in Eilts and Smith (1990). The first set of data is the true velocity field. The next set of data is the aliased measurement of the true field, with $v_{a}$ equal to $20 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$. The last column is the result of applying (1) to the aliased data and is non-zero only for the box shown. Jhis same problem area was found by a heuristic check in the Eilts and Smith (1990) algorithm. Here it is identified by a rigorous mathematical test.

The G7,W technique precedes by evaluating (1) for each point in the field. Points with non-zero s are called residues, and their locations are saved. Next, branch cuts are created, connecting residues with opposite sign. These branch cuts are analogous to the branch cuts in complexanalysis, and integration
across them is forbidden. The adjusted gradient is then integrated, taking care to avoid branch cuts. Any integration path which avoids crossing a branch cut may be used; the results are independent of the chosen path. It should be noted that the choice of loranch cuts is not unique and is still the subject of research. The optimum choice appears to be that which minimizes the total cut length. Unfortunately, an exhaustive search is not practical, so othe methods arc used. Gr/W uses a nearest neighbor algorithm, and the problem is discussed in detail in Cusack et al. (1 995).

## 3 Results

We initially applied the algorithm to data acquired by the NASA/J P], ARMA R airborne radar (Durden et al. 1994). 'I'his system operates on the NASA I) C-8 aircraft,. Because ARMAR looks downward and usually has $v_{a}$ of $22 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$, aliasing is rare. However, we were able to find cases where aliasingoccured in measurements of the eyewall in Cyclone Oliver during 10GA COARE in the Western Pacific Ocean in early 1993. The algorithm successfully dealiased the data, although, because of the high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), few residues were found. In this case even a simple algorithm would have worked properly. A more challenging data set was acquired try the WSR-88I) radar in Melbourne, FL on March 13, 1993, as a squall line was approaching from the northwest. Theradar was operated with a 1020 HzPRF , giving a $v_{a}$ of $26.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$. Because of the nearly 200 km distance of the squall line from the radar, the SNR was rather 1ow. Figure 2a shows a portion of the squall line in range angle coordinates. These data have been range dealiased but not velocity dealiased. Regions with sudden velocity changes can be noted in various portions of the image. Because of the low SNR, Fig,ure 2a has 113 residues scattered throughout. Figure 2b shows the same area after dealiasing with the G'/W algorithm. Agreement of Figure 2 b with independent velocity measurements and with the output, of the WSR-88D operational algorithm is generally good, although several small areas appear to be incorrect, including isolated range bins not connected to the main region.

## 4 Conclusions

We have noted that the phase unwrapping and velocity dealiasing problems are identical and that techniques developed for one problem are applicable to the of her. We described one phase unwrapping technique developed for interferometric synthetic aperture radar. Thetechnique is able to locate and handle inconsistencies in the velocity field in a mathematically rigorous manner. The technique was used to successfully dealias both ARMAR andNFX I\{ Al) data in connected regions.
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## Figure Captions

Figure 1. Example velocity data from Eilts and Smith (1990) showing; true and slimed velocity fields $(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s})$ and the results of applying Equation (1) to the aliased field.

Figure 2, illustration of algorithm performance for WSR-88D data. a) Raw (aliased) velocities. b) Dealiased velocities using GZW algorithm. The velocity scale is from $-40 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ (black) to $+40 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ (light gray). Bad or non-existing data is white. The horizontal axis is range, varying from 155 km at left to 230 km at right. Lhe vertical axis is azimuth angle, varying from $240^{\circ}$ at the top of the images to $360^{\circ}$ at the bottom.

|  | True |  | Aliased |  | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -19 | -17 | -19 | -17 | 0 |
|  | -24 | -20 | 16 | -20 | 0 |
| 4 | -23 | -23 | 17 | 17 | 0 |
|  | -22 | -22 | 18 | 18 | 0 |
| \% | -19 | -22 | -19 | 18 | 0 |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{¢}$ | -20 | -21 | -20 | 19 | 1 |
|  | -5 | 2 | -5 | 8 | 0 |
|  | -1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 | -3 | 0 | -3 | 0 |
|  | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
|  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| AZIMUTH |  |  |  |  |  |
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