On the correct implementation of the ensemble square root Kaing Kai Pavel Sakov and Peter R. Oke

pavel.sakov@csiro.au

CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research and Wealth from Oceans Flagship, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

We compare the performance of mean-preserving and non-meanpreserving solutions for the ensemble transform in the ensemble square root filter (ESRFs) and demonstrate a significant advantage of the former. We argue that only mean-preserving solutions should be



<<Figure I RMSE of different flavours of ESRF and EnKF for the LA

used in practice.

Theory

- ESRF analysis scheme:
 - Given a forecast ensemble \mathbf{X}^{f} , calculate the ensemble mean \mathbf{x}^{f} and the ensemble anomalies \mathbf{A}^{f} :

 $\mathbf{x}^{f} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{f}, \quad \mathbf{A}_{i}^{f} = \mathbf{X}_{i}^{f} - \mathbf{x}.$

Calculate the analysis \mathbf{X}^{a} : $\mathbf{x}^{a} = \mathbf{x}^{f} + \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}^{f}),$ $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{P}^{f} \mathbf{H}^{T} (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^{f} \mathbf{H}^{T} + \mathbf{R})^{-1}.$

Calculate the analysed anomalies: $\mathbf{A}^a = \mathbf{A}^f \mathbf{T},$

 $\mathbf{T}: \mathbf{A}^{f}\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{A}^{f}\mathbf{T})^{T} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{H})\mathbf{A}^{f}\mathbf{A}^{f^{T}}.$

Calculate the analysed ensemble \mathbf{X}^{a} :



model, averaged for the time interval *t* = [900, 1000], and over 50 realisations.

<<Figure 2

Normalised singularvalue spectra of the ensemble anomalies for the LA model, averaged over 50 realisations: (a) m = 30;(b) m = 60.

$\mathbf{X}^{a} = \mathbf{A}^{a} + [\mathbf{x}^{a}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{a}].$

 General mean-preserving solution for the ensemble transform:

$$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}^{s} \mathbf{U}^{p}, \quad \mathbf{U}^{p} \mathbf{U}^{pT} = \mathbf{I}, \quad \mathbf{U}^{p} \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1},$$
$$\mathbf{T}^{s} = \left(\mathbf{I} + \frac{\mathbf{A}^{fT} \mathbf{H}^{T} \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{A}^{f}}{m-1}\right)^{-1/2} = \mathbf{C} \Gamma^{-1/2} \mathbf{C}^{T},$$
where $\mathbf{C} \Gamma \mathbf{C}^{T} = \mathbf{I} + \frac{\mathbf{A}^{fT} \mathbf{H}^{T} \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{A}^{f}}{m-1}.$

• Some particular non-mean-preserving solutions used in practice:

one-sided solution $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{C}\Gamma^{-1/2}$ (Tippett et al., 2003) solution with random rotations $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{C}\Gamma^{-1/2}\mathbf{U}, \ \mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{I}$ (Evensen, 2004)



<< Figure 3 RMSE of different flavours of ESRF and EnKF for the L40 model averaged over a long model run.

<< Figure 4

The best RMSE from Figure 3 for a given ensemble size over all

Numerical experiments

Models:

- Linear advection (LA) model (Evensen, 2004), Figures 1 and 2.
- Lorenz-40 model (Lorenz and Emanuel, 1998; setup as in Whitaker and Hamill, 2002), Figures 3 and 4.

Filters:

- EnKF
- ESRF, symmetric
- ESRF, one-sided
- ESRF, with random rotations
- ESRF, with mean-preserving random rotations



inflation factors.

References:

Evensen, G., 2004: Sampling strategies and square root analysis schemes for the EnKF. Ocean Dynamics, 54, 539–560.

Lorenz, E. N. and K. A. Emanuel, 1998: Optimal sites for suplementary weather observations: Simulation with a small model. J. Atmos. Sci., 55, 399–414.

Tippett, M. K., J. L. Anderson, C. H. Bishop, T. M. Hamill, and J. S. Whitaker, 2003: Ensemble square root filters. Mon. Wea. Rev., 131, 1485–1490.

Whitaker, J. S. and T. M. Hamill, 2002: Ensemble data assimilation without perturbed observations. Mon. Wea. Rev., 130, 1913–1924.

Acknowledgements:

This research is funded by Australia's CSIRO through appropriation funding and through the Wealth from Oceans Flagship; and by the US Office of Naval Research Ocean Modelling Program through Grant N000140410345.

Poster design by Louise Bell, CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research

Wealth from Oceans National Research Flagship

