A Combined Active and Passive Method for the Remote Sensing of Ice Sheet Temperature Profiles
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Abstract — The Ultra-Wideband Software defined microwave radiometer (UWBRAD) was developed to probe internal ice sheet temperatures using 0.5–2 GHz microwave radiometry. The airborne brightness temperature data of UWBRAD show a significant reduction due to reflections of surface layering of density fluctuations making difficult the retrieval of subsurface temperature in the kilometer range of depth. Such reflections can be measured by the ultra-wideband radar in the same frequency range suggesting a combined active and passive remote sensing of polar ice sheets. In this paper, we develop a coherent reflectivity model for both ice sheet thermal emission and backscattering. Maxwell equations are used to calculate the coherent reflections from the cap layers, and the WKB approximation is used to calculate the transmission for the slowly varying profile below the cap layers. Results are then shown to demonstrate the use of radar measurements to compensate reflection effects on brightness temperatures. It is shown that the reflections corrected brightness temperature is directly related to the physical temperature and absorption profile making possible the retrieval of subsurface temperature profile with multi-frequency measurements.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cryosphere is a critical component of the earth system that continues to experience rapid changes [1, 2]. Mass loss from the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets is a major contributor to sea level rise [3–7], but ice dynamics and evolution remain incompletely understood and therefore challenging to predict accurately [8, 9]. Recent studies have shown the important impact of ice sheet internal temperatures [10–15], providing new impetus for the development of methods to remotely sense internal ice temperatures. Ice internal temperature contributes to ice stiffness and therefore evolution, but at present remains a quantity that is difficult to measure without in-situ borehole information.

The Ultra-Wideband Software Defined Radiometer (UWBRAD) [16] was developed for sensing internal ice sheet temperature profiles using 0.5–2 GHz microwave radiometry. In principle, the lower UWBRAD frequencies near 0.5 GHz can be impacted by temperatures at depths even greater than 2 kilometers while higher frequencies near 2 GHz respond only to temperatures at shallower depth. UWBRAD has completed airborne campaigns in Greenland in September 2016 and 2017, as well as a deployment to Antarctica in 2018, and has achieved successful measurements of internal ice temperatures under dry snow conditions. However these experiments have shown that firn density fluctuations within the top 100 meters can cause reflections that impact observed brightness temperatures. These effects required UWBRAD temperature profile retrievals to incorporate ancillary information of density fluctuations.
fluctuations. This was accomplished through the use of in-situ borehole measured temperature profiles at location bracketing the flight path, with UWBRAD measurements at these sites used to constrain firn density parameters [17, 18]. Because a-priori information on density fluctuations may not be available for other locations, the development of methods to compensate the impact of firn density variations on brightness temperatures is of interests.

Recent insights into emission physics suggest a means for combining active and passive measurements to reduce or eliminate firn density effects. In this paper, we develop a combined active and passive coherent model for both emission and scattering. The model considers the multiple length scales of density fluctuations in the firn “cap region”; these fluctuations can occur on length scales that are shorter than, comparable to, or greater than the electromagnetic wavelength, so that coherent interactions can be appreciable. We assume that the most impactful density fluctuations occur within the upper 100 m of the ice sheet which is consistent with the in situ measurements. We also approximate the firn “cap region” as having a uniform temperature, given its limited spatial extent. The “cap region” is further resolved into a large number of layers having different densities as shown in Figure 1. Beneath the cap region, the ice sheet is also assumed inhomogeneous but in this case the permittivity and temperature profiles both vary only on large length scales compared to the electromagnetic wavelength. Rytov’s fluctuation dissipation theorem [19, 20] is applicable for computing thermal emission from the lower ice sheet region.

![Figure 1. Ice sheet structure.](image)

Due to reciprocity, we solve the active problem first to model radar backscattering at normal incidence by considering plane wave incidence onto the medium of Figure 1, then the passive problem is solved based on the solution of active problem for the thermal emission. Both formulations use a layered medium approach for the cap layers and the WKB approximation for the lower region below the cap layers. Instead of using the explicit form of the dyadic Green’s function for a layered medium as in [19, 21], we use only the symmetry properties of the dyadic Green’s function. These symmetries allow the solution of passive problem to be expressed entirely in terms of the electromagnetic fields of the active problem. This approach ultimately allows observed brightness temperatures to be expressed in terms of the reflectivity and transmissivity of the cap layers and the microwave emission from the inhomogeneous lower half space. In the retrievals, radar measurements provide information on the reflectivity of the cap layers. Taking advantage of the measurements, the cap layer effects in the measured brightness temperature data are compensated. The compensated data, as shown in the model, is directly related to the ice sheet physical temperature and absorption profiles.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we consider problem A, representing active remote sensing using a wave radiated from a source above the ice sheet that is far from the observation area. The result is a plane wave incident upon the observation area, and the electric field inside the inhomogeneous layered medium is expressed in terms of the dyadic Green’s function with a source in the free space region and an observation point within the ice sheet layered medium. In Section 3, we consider problem B representing passive microwave remote sensing, with microwave thermal emission expressed
in terms of sources obtained from Rytov’s fluctuation dissipation theorem. Brightness temperatures are then expressed in terms of the dyadic Green’s function for sources within the layered medium. Using the symmetry properties of the dyadic Green’s function (see Appendix), the brightness temperatures of problem B are then expressed in terms of the electric fields of Problem A. In Section 5, we then derive the solution of Problem A using Maxwell equations and the WKB approximation for the lower half space under vertically polarized incidence (TM) and then shows that the brightness temperature can then be expressed in terms of the reflectivity and transmissivity from problem A and the microwave thermal emission from the lower half space. Numerical results for both cases are provided in Section 6 followed by concluding remarks.

2. ACTIVE PROBLEM A

Consider a short electric dipole antenna having dipole moment \( \hat{\alpha} \text{Id} \ell \) located at position \( \vec{r}_0 \) with \( \vec{r}_0 \) a unit vector from the origin to the dipole location (Figure 2). The distance \( r_0 \) is far away from the observation area. The resulting incident electric field at position \( \vec{r} \) in Region 0 is:

\[
\vec{E}^{(A)}_{\text{inc}} = i\omega \mu \text{Id} \ell \vec{G}_0 (\vec{r}, \vec{r}_0) \cdot \hat{\alpha}
\]

(1)

where \( \vec{G}_0 \) is the free space dyadic Green’s function which can be approximated locally about the origin as a plane wave having polarization \( \hat{\alpha} \):

\[
\vec{E}^{(A)}_{\text{inc}} = i\omega \mu \frac{\exp (ikr_0)}{4\pi r_0} \text{Id} \ell \hat{\alpha} \exp (i\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{r})
\]

(2)

where \( \vec{k}_i = -\vec{k}_0 \) and \( \vec{k}_i = k\vec{k}_i \), we choose \( \text{Id} \ell \) such that

\[
i\omega \mu \frac{\exp (ikr_0)}{4\pi r_0} \text{Id} \ell = 1
\]

(3)

so that the incident wave is of unit amplitude:

\[
\vec{E}^{(A)}_{\text{inc}} = \hat{\alpha} \exp (i\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{r})
\]

(4)

Now \( \vec{E}_1^{(A)} \), the electric field in region 1 that results, can be expressed in terms of the layered medium dyadic Green’s function \( \vec{G}_{10} \):

\[
\vec{E}_1^{(A)} (\vec{r}) = i\omega \mu \text{Id} \ell \vec{G}_{10} (\vec{r}, \vec{r}_0) \cdot \hat{\alpha}
\]

(5)

where the subscript 10 denotes an observation point in region 1 and a source in region 0. Using the amplitude of \( \text{Id} \ell \) we have

\[
\left| \vec{E}_1^{(A)} (\vec{r}) \right|^2 = (4\pi r_0)^2 \left| \vec{G}_{10} (\vec{r}, \vec{r}_0) \cdot \hat{\alpha} \right|^2
\]

(6)

![Figure 2. Problem A.](image-url)
Similar Green’s functions also exist to determine the resulting fields in any other layer within the modeled ice sheet.

3. PASSIVE PROBLEM

The passive problem is shown in Figure 3. The antenna in \( \theta_0 \) direction receives the thermal emission from region 0 with brightness temperature \( T_B \). For passive remote sensing, thermal emission can be modeled as arising from noise current sources in the layered medium whose covariance is related to the medium physical temperature \( T \) modeled as arising from noise current sources in the layered medium whose covariance is related to the medium permittivity; \( \epsilon'' \) represents the imaginary part of the medium permittivity; \( \mathbf{I} \) is the unit tensor so that vector current components are uncorrelated. The quantity of interest in problem B is the covariance of the electric field emitted into region 0 and its integration over the observed bandwidth:

\[
\int_{\Delta \omega} d\omega \left\langle \mathbf{E}_0^B (\vartheta_0, \omega) \cdot \mathbf{E}^B_0^* (\vartheta_0, \omega) \right\rangle_{th}
\]

Note that we put the “radiometer receiver” at the same place as the transmitter antenna of problem (A). Then the electric field in region 0 in \( \hat{\alpha} \) polarization is:

\[
\hat{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{E}_0^B (\vartheta_0, \omega) = i \omega \mu \int d\vartheta' \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{G}_{01} (\vartheta_0, \vartheta', \omega) \right) \cdot \mathbf{J}_{1B} (\vartheta', \omega)
\]

where \( \mathbf{G}_{01} \) is the dyadic Green’s function with the source in region 1 and observation point in region 0. Using this expression and taking the ensemble average yields [19]:

\[
\left\langle \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{E}_0^B (\vartheta, \omega) \right) \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{E}_0^B^* (\vartheta, \omega') \right) \right\rangle
\]

\[
= \omega \mu i \int d\vartheta'' \int d\vartheta' \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{G}_{01} (\vartheta_0, \vartheta', \omega) \right) \cdot \left( \mathbf{J}_{1B} (\vartheta', \omega) \mathbf{J}_{1B}^* (\vartheta'', \omega) \right) \cdot \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{G}_{01}^* (\vartheta_0, \vartheta'', \omega') \right)
\]

Note that the correlation of noise currents gives a \( \delta (\omega - \omega') \), and we integrate over a small bandwidth for the value field correlation at frequency \( \omega \):

\[
\int_{\Delta \omega} d\omega \left\langle \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{E}_0^B (\vartheta_0, \omega) \right) \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{E}_0^B^* (\vartheta_0, \omega') \right) \right\rangle
\]

\[
= \omega^2 \mu^2 \int d\vartheta' \left\vert \hat{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{G}_{01} (\vartheta_0, \vartheta', \omega) \right\vert^2 \frac{4}{\pi \omega} \epsilon''_1 (\vartheta') K_B T (\vartheta')
\]

![Figure 3. Problem B.](image)
Appendix A shows that,

$$
\overline{G}_{01}(\mathbf{r}_a, \mathbf{r}_b) = \overline{G}^t_{10}(\mathbf{r}_b, \mathbf{r}_a)
$$

so that

$$
\int_{\Delta \omega} d\omega \left\langle \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \overline{E}_0^{(B)}(\mathbf{r}, \omega) \right) \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \overline{E}_0^{(B)*}(\mathbf{r}, \omega') \right) \right\rangle
$$

$$
= \omega^2 \mu^2 \int d\mathbf{r}' \left| \left( \overline{G}_{10}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}_0, \omega) \cdot \hat{\alpha} \right) \right|^2 \frac{4}{\pi} \omega \varepsilon''_1(\mathbf{r}') K_B T(\mathbf{r}')
$$

From problem A, we have

$$
\left| \overline{E}_1^{(A)}(\mathbf{r}) \right|^2 = \left( 4\pi r_0 \right)^2 \left| \overline{G}_{10}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_0) \cdot \hat{\alpha} \right|^2
$$

so that

$$
\int_{\Delta \omega} d\omega \left\langle \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \overline{E}_0^{(B)}(\mathbf{r}, \omega) \right) \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \overline{E}_0^{(B)*}(\mathbf{r}, \omega') \right) \right\rangle
$$

$$
= \omega^2 \mu^2 \frac{1}{\left( 4\pi r_0 \right)^2} \int d\mathbf{r}' \left| \overline{E}_1^{(A)}(\mathbf{r}') \right|^2 \frac{4}{\pi} \omega \varepsilon''_1(\mathbf{r}') K_B T_B(\mathbf{r}')
$$

The power received in polarization $\alpha$ is also

$$
P_\alpha = \lim_{r_0 \to \infty} r_0^2 d\Omega \int_{\Delta \omega} d\omega \int_{\Delta \omega} d\omega' \left\langle \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \overline{E}_0^{(B)}(\mathbf{r}_0, \omega) \right) \left( \hat{\alpha} \cdot \overline{E}_0^{(B)*}(\mathbf{r}_0, \omega') \right) \right\rangle
$$

which can be rewritten as [19]:

$$
P_\alpha = \Delta \omega d\Omega \mu \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{2\eta} \int d\mathbf{r}' \left| \overline{E}_1^{(A)}(\mathbf{r}') \right|^2 \frac{\varepsilon''(\mathbf{r}')}{\varepsilon_0} K_B T(\mathbf{r}')
$$

This received power can be re-scaled into the observed brightness temperature through:

$$
P_\alpha = \frac{K_B T_B \Delta \omega}{\lambda^2} d\Omega \frac{1}{\pi} A_0 \cos \theta_0
$$

where $\theta_0$ is the observation angle, and $T_{B\alpha}$ is the brightness temperature in $\alpha$ polarization.

The final brightness temperature in direction $\hat{r}_0 = -\hat{k}_i$ is then

$$
T_{B\alpha}(\hat{r}_0) = \frac{1}{A_0 \cos \theta_0} \int d\mathbf{r}' \left| \overline{E}_1^{(A)}(\mathbf{r}') \right|^2 \frac{\varepsilon''(\mathbf{r}')}{\varepsilon_0} K_B T(\mathbf{r}')
$$

The above expression gives the brightness temperature of problem B in terms of the electric field in region 1 of problem A. Note that this eliminates the use of an explicit form of the dyadic Green’s functions as used in previous papers [20, 22]. A similar approach can be used to relate the fields within other layers of the layered medium to their brightness temperature contributions.

4. EMISSION FROM LAYERED MEDIUM OVER AN INHOMOGENEOUS HALF SPACE

As shown in Figure 1, we model the firn cap layer as $N$ regions with reflective boundaries, with Region 0 corresponding to the free space region. The regions are labelled as $\ell = 1, 2, ..., N$, with the number of layers $N$ on the order of hundreds with each region thickness on the order of centimeters or finer.

The layer boundaries are located at $z = 0, -d_1, ..., -d_N$, and for each region $\ell$, the permittivity is written as $\varepsilon_{\ell}$. Within the cap region, the temperature $T$ is modeled as uniform. For the region $\ell = N + 1$, below $z = -d_N$, the permittivity $\varepsilon_{\ell}(z)$ is a slowly varying function of $z$ and the temperature profile $T(z)$ is a slowly varying function of $z$. In this region, we use the WKB method for analyzing the
internal fields under the assumption that there are no further reflections. Now we define:

\[ T_{Ba}^{\mu} (\tilde{r}_0) = T_{Ba}^{\mu} (\tilde{r}_0) + T_{Ba}^{\mu} (\tilde{r}_0) \]

\[ T_{Ba}^{\nu} (\tilde{r}_0) = \text{contribution from the cap region} \]

\[ T_{Ba}^{\nu} (\tilde{r}_0) = \text{contribution from region 0, the inhomogeneous lower half space} \]

\begin{equation}
T_{Ba}^{\mu} (\tilde{r}_0) = \frac{k}{A_0 \cos \theta_0} \int_{z \leq -d_N} d\tilde{\tau} \left[ \tilde{E}_{1r}^{\nu} (\tilde{\tau}) T (\tilde{\tau}) \left| \tilde{E}_1^{(A)} (\tilde{\tau}') \right| \right]^2
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
T_{Ba}^{\nu} (\tilde{r}_0) = \frac{k}{A_0 \cos \theta_0} \int_{z \geq -d_N} d\tilde{\tau} \left[ \tilde{E}_{1r}^{\nu} (\tilde{\tau}) T (\tilde{\tau}) \left| \tilde{E}_1^{(A)} (\tilde{\tau}') \right| \right]^2
\end{equation}

The reflected wave in region 0 is then

\[ \tilde{E}_1^{(A)} = \tilde{y} \exp \left( \frac{1}{\eta} (ik_x x - ik_z z) \right) \]

The reflected wave in region 0 is

\[ \tilde{H}_r^{(A)} = \tilde{y} R_{cap}^{TM} \exp (ik_x x + ik_z z) \]

and the Poynting vector \( \tilde{S}^{(A)} \) in medium 0 is

\[ -\tilde{z} \cdot \left( \tilde{S}^{(A)} \right) = \frac{\cos \theta_0}{2\eta} \left[ 1 - |R_{cap}^{TM}|^2 \right] \]

Using \( \int_{S_h} dS = A_0 \), we have

\begin{equation}
T_{Ba}^{\mu} (\tilde{r}_0) = T \left[ 1 - |R_{cap}^{TM}|^2 \right] + \frac{T}{A_0 \cos \theta_0} \frac{2\eta}{2} \int_{S_1} dS \tilde{n} \cdot \left( \tilde{S}_1^{(A)} \right)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
T_{Ba}^{\nu} (\tilde{r}_0) = \frac{k}{A_0 \cos \theta_0} \int_{z \leq -d_N} d\tilde{r} \tilde{E}_{1r}^{\nu} (\tilde{\tau}) T (\tilde{\tau}) \left| \tilde{E}_1^{(A)} (\tilde{\tau}') \right|^2
\end{equation}

where Equation (26) is the thermal emission from cap region from Equation (21), and Equation (26) is the thermal emission from the bulk ice region by applying Equation (18).
5.1. Fields within the Cap Region

For region $\ell$, $H_{ty}$ and $E_{tx}$ have the form:

$$H_{ty} = \frac{1}{\eta} [C_\ell \exp (ik_{\ell}z) + D_\ell \exp (-ik_{\ell}z)] \exp (ik_x x)$$

$$E_{tx} = \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \frac{k_{lz}}{k_{\ell}} [C_\ell \exp (ik_{\ell}z) - D_\ell \exp (-ik_{\ell}z)] \exp (ik_x x)$$

The coefficients $C_\ell$ and $D_\ell$ can be determined by matching the boundary conditions at each interface:

$$[C_\ell \exp (-ik_{\ell}d_\ell) + D_\ell \exp (ik_{\ell}d_\ell)] = [C_{\ell+1} \exp (-ik_{(\ell+1)}d_\ell) + D_{\ell+1} \exp (ik_{(\ell+1)}d_\ell)]$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

$$\frac{k_{lz}}{k_{\ell}} [C_\ell \exp (-ik_{\ell}d_\ell) - D_\ell \exp (ik_{\ell}d_\ell)] = \frac{k_{(\ell+1)z}}{\varepsilon(\ell+1)} [C_{\ell+1} \exp (-ik_{\ell+1}d_\ell) - D_{\ell+1} \exp (ik_{\ell+1}d_{\ell+1})]$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

with $d_0 = 0$

$$D_0 = 1$$

$$C_0 = R_{TM}^{cap}$$

Here $R_{TM}^{cap}$ is the reflection coefficient of the cap region, which includes multiple boundaries. The boundary $z = -d_N$ separates regions $N$ and $t = N + 1$. At the interface of the cap and lower regions, we let

$$\varepsilon_{t0} = \varepsilon_t (z = -d_N)$$

$$k_{lz0} = \sqrt{k^2 \varepsilon_{t0} - k_x^2}$$

so that near $z = -d_N$

$$H_{ty} = \frac{1}{\eta} [T_{TM}^{cap} \exp (-ik_{lz0}z)] \exp (ik_x x)$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)

$$E_{tx} = \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \frac{k_{lz}}{k_{lz0}} [-T_{TM}^{cap} \exp (-ik_{lz}z)] \exp (ik_x x)$$  \hspace{1cm} (30)

where

$$D_\ell = T_{TM}^{cap}$$

$$C_\ell = 0$$

Here $T_{TM}^{cap}$ is the transmission coefficient of the cap region. Matching at $z = -d_N$ then yields

$$[C_N \exp (-ik_Nz d_N) + D_N \exp (ik_Nz d_N)] = [T_{TM}^{cap} \exp (ik_{lz0}d_N)]$$  \hspace{1cm} (31)

$$\frac{k_{Nz}}{\varepsilon_N} [C_N \exp (-ik_Nz d_N) - D_N \exp (ik_Nz d_N)] = \frac{k_{lz0}}{\varepsilon_{t0}} [-T_{TM}^{cap} \exp (ik_{lz0}d_N)]$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

The reflection coefficient in each layer can now be calculated by recurrence using

$$R_{TM}^{ell(\ell+1)} = \frac{\varepsilon_{(\ell+1)} k_{lz} - \varepsilon_{\ell} k_{(\ell+1)z}}{\varepsilon_{(\ell+1)} k_{lz} + \varepsilon_{\ell} k_{(\ell+1)z}}$$

where $\ell = 0, 1, ..., N - 1$ with $R_{TM}^{N_0t} = \frac{\varepsilon a k_{Nz} - \varepsilon_N k_{lz0}}{\varepsilon_{t0} k_{Nz} + \varepsilon_N k_{lz0}}$.

Finally defining $q_\ell = \frac{C_\ell}{D_\ell} \exp (-2ik_{\ell}d_\ell)$ the recurrence relation is

$$q_\ell = \frac{q_{\ell+1} \exp (2ik_{(\ell+1)z} (d_{\ell+1} - d_\ell)) + R_{TM}^{ell(\ell+1)}}{R_{TM}^{ell(\ell+1)} q_{\ell+1} \exp (2ik_{(\ell+1)z} (d_{\ell+1} - d_\ell)) + 1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)
Starting with \( q_N = R_{Nt}^{TM} \) we move up until we get \( q_0 = R_{cap}^{TM} \). We then propagate down to determine \( T_{cap}^{TM} \) for \( \ell = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, N \)

\[
C_{\ell+1} \exp (-ik_{(\ell+1)}z_\ell) = \frac{1}{2} C_\ell \exp (-ik_\ell z_\ell) \left[ 1 + \frac{\epsilon_{\ell+1}k_{\ell+1}}{k_{(\ell+1)}z_\ell} \right] + \frac{1}{2} D_\ell \exp (ik_\ell z_\ell) \left[ 1 - \frac{\epsilon_{\ell+1}k_{\ell+1}}{k_{(\ell+1)}z_\ell} \right]
\]

\[
D_{\ell+1} \exp (ik_{(\ell+1)}z_\ell) = \frac{1}{2} C_\ell \exp (-ik_\ell z_\ell) \left[ 1 - \frac{\epsilon_{\ell+1}k_{\ell+1}}{k_{(\ell+1)}z_\ell} \right] + \frac{1}{2} D_\ell \exp (ik_\ell z_\ell) \left[ 1 + \frac{\epsilon_{\ell+1}k_{\ell+1}}{k_{(\ell+1)}z_\ell} \right]
\]

until we get to

\[
D_\ell = T_{cap}^{TM}
C_\ell = 0
\]

Just below \( z = -d_N \), the Poynting vector \( \mathbf{S}_1^{(A)} \) is

\[
\mathbf{S}_1^{(A)} = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \frac{1}{\eta} |T_{cap}^{TM}|^2 \exp (-2k_{l=0}''d_N) \right)
\]

After solving the Poynting’s vector at \( z = -d_N \), we apply Equation (25) for the thermal emission of cap region.

\[
T_{B\alpha}^u (\mathbf{S}_0) = T \left[ 1 - |R_{cap}^{TM}|^2 \right] - T \frac{1}{k \cos \theta_0} \text{Re} \left( \frac{\epsilon_{kz=0}}{\epsilon_{z=0}} |T_{cap}^{TM}|^2 \exp (-2k_{l=0}''d_N) \right)
\]

Let

\[
t_{cap}^{TM} = \frac{1}{k \cos \theta_0} \text{Re} \left( \frac{\epsilon_{kz=0}}{\epsilon_{z=0}} |T_{cap}^{TM}|^2 \exp (-2k_{l=0}''d_N) \right)
\]

\[
r_{cap}^{TM} = |R_{cap}^{TM}|^2
\]

Then the contribution from cap region is given by:

\[
T_{B\alpha}^u (\mathbf{S}_0) = T \left[ 1 - r_{cap}^{TM} - t_{cap}^{TM} \right]
\]

5.2. WKB for Region \( t \)

Region \( t \) has the permittivity profile \( \epsilon_t(z) \). For the TM case, the \( y \) component of the magnetic field in region \( t \) obeys the equation:

\[
\epsilon_t(z) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \frac{1}{\epsilon_t(z)} \frac{\partial H_{ty}}{\partial z} - k_z^2 H_{ty} = -k^2 \frac{\epsilon_t(z)}{\epsilon} H_{ty}
\]

(36)

with \( k_z \) fixed according to phase matching. Defining \( k_t(z) = k \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_t(z)}{\epsilon}} \) we have a differential equation for \( H_{ty} \):

\[
\frac{\partial^2 H_{ty}}{\partial z^2} - \frac{1}{\epsilon_t(z)} \left( \frac{\partial \epsilon_t(z)}{\partial z} \right) \left( \frac{\partial H_{ty}}{\partial z} \right) + \frac{1}{\delta^2} k_{tz}(z) H_{ty} = 0
\]

(37)

In the above equation, we have inserted the ordering “\( \delta \)” parameter which is a small number. In the WKB method, we assume that \( H_{ty} \) is of the form:

\[
H_{ty} = \exp \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \delta^n S_n(z) \right)
\]

(38)

Substituting in, we obtain

\[
\left( \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \delta^m S_m''(z) \right) + \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \delta^m S_m'(z) \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\delta^2} k_{tz}(z) - \frac{1}{\epsilon_t(z)} \left( \frac{\partial \epsilon_t(z)}{\partial z} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \delta^m S_m'(z) \right) = 0
\]

(39)
First, we balance the equation to the order of \( \frac{1}{\eta^2} \)

\[
(S_0'(z))^2 + k_{tz}^2(z) = 0
\]  

(40)

and determine the solution at this order for a wave propagating downward

\[
S_0(z) = i \int_z^{-d_N} dz' k_{tz}(z')
\]  

(41)

Next, we balance to order \( \frac{1}{\eta} \):

\[
2S_0'(z)S_0'(z) = -S_0''(z) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_t(z)} \left( \frac{\partial \varepsilon_t(z)}{\partial z} \right) (S_0'(z))
\]  

(42)

and match the coefficient to the magnetic field at \( z = -d_N \). Then

\[
H_{ty}(z) = \frac{T^{TM} \exp(ik_{t0}dz_N)}{\eta \left( \left( \frac{\varepsilon_t^2}{\varepsilon_{t0}} \right) - k_{tzo}^2 \right)^{1/4}} \left( \frac{1}{\left( \frac{-k_{t0}^2(z)}{\varepsilon_t^2(z)} \right)} \right)^{1/4} \exp \left( i \int_z^{-d_N} dz' k_{tz}(z') \right)
\]  

(43)

To calculate \( T_{Ba}^l(\tilde{r}_0) = \frac{k}{\cos \theta_0} \int_{\tilde{r}_0}^{-d_N} dz \varepsilon''_{1r}(z) T(z) \) we use \( |E_1^A(\tau)|^2 = |E_{t0}|^2 + |E_{tz}|^2 \). The thermal emission from the inhomogeneous half space is then given by:

\[
T_{Ba}^l(\tilde{r}_0) = \frac{k}{\cos \theta_0} \int_{\tilde{r}_0}^{-d_N} dz \varepsilon''_{1r}(z) T(z)
\]  

Note that

\[
t^{TM}_{cap} = \frac{1}{k \cos \theta} \text{Re} \left( \frac{e^{ik_{t0}dz_N}}{\varepsilon_{t0}} |T_{cap}^{TM}|^2 \exp(-2k_{t0}dz_N) \right)
\]

The equation becomes:

\[
T_{Ba}^l(\tilde{r}_0) = k^2 t_{cap}^{TM} \int_{\tilde{r}_0}^{-d_N} dz \varepsilon''_{1r}(z) T(z)
\]  

Using the fact that \( |k_{t0}(z)|^2 + k_z^2 = k_t^2 \) and \( \omega^2 \mu_0 \varepsilon(z) = k_t^2 \). The equation is further simplified into:

\[
T_{Ba}^l(\tilde{r}_0) = \frac{k^2 t_{cap}^{TM}}{k_{t0} \cos \theta_0} \int_{\tilde{r}_0}^{-d_N} dz \varepsilon''_{1r}(z) T(z)
\]  

Using the relationship \( k_{t0}(z) = k_t = k_{t0}(z) \cos \theta_0 \). The equation is simplified into:

\[
T_{Ba}^l(\tilde{r}_0) = t^{TM} \int_{-\infty}^{-d_N} dz T(z) 2k_t''(z) \sec \theta(z) \exp \left( - \int_z^{-d_N} dz' k_t''(z') \right)
\]  

(44)
Finally, we have $k''_l(tz) = k''_l \sec \theta_l(z)$ and $k''_l = \frac{\kappa_l(z)}{2}$. Then brightness temperature given by the lower half space is:

$$T_{BA}^{1}(\bar{r}_0) = t^{TM} \int_{-\infty}^{-d_N} dz T(z) \kappa_a(z) \sec \theta_l(z) \exp \left( - \int_{z}^{d_N} dz' \kappa_a(z') \sec \theta_l(z') \right)$$

(45)

Summing the contributions from the cap layers and the lower half space we have:

$$T_{BA}^{1} (\bar{s}_0) = T \left[ 1 - r^{TM} - t^{TM} \right] + t^{TM} \int_{-\infty}^{-d_N} dz \kappa_a(z) \sec \theta_l(z) T_l(z) \exp \left( - \int_{z}^{d_N} dz' \kappa_a(z') \sec \theta_l(z') \right)$$

(46)

The above gives the expression of the coherent model in terms of Eq. (1) the reflectivity and transmissivity of the cap layers and Eq. (2) the absorption and temperature profile of the lower half space. In general $r^{TM}$ and $t^{TM}$ are complicated and are dependent on the density fluctuations. However, if they are measured by a radar, then the above formula can be used to retrieve the temperature profile in the second term from the brightness temperature measurements.

If it is assumed that the absorption in cap layers is weak, we can further approximate: $1 - r^{TM} - t^{TM} = 0$ to obtain

$$T_{BA}^{1} (\bar{s}_0) = T \int_{-\infty}^{-d_N} dz \kappa_a(z) \sec \theta_l(z) T_l(z) \exp \left( - \int_{z}^{d_N} dz' \kappa_a(z') \sec \theta_l(z') \right)$$

(47)

Obviously, the brightness temperature from the ice body is reduced by the cap layer reflections. If we compensate these reflection effects, the brightness temperature is related only to the ice sheet physical temperature and absorption profiles.

The solution for horizontal polarization (TE) can be obtained similarly and yields a solution identical to that of Eqs. (46)–(47) if the TE polarized reflection and transmission coefficients are used.

6. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

Numerical results for ice sheet thermal emission are presented in this section. The density profile $\rho(z)$ of the ice sheet is simulated using the density model of [20, 22], in which:

$$\rho(z) = \overline{\rho}(z) + \rho_n(z)$$

$$\rho_n(z) = \rho_n^{(1)}(z) \exp \left( \frac{z}{\alpha_1} \right)$$

$$\left( \rho_n^{(1)}(z) \rho_n^{(1)}(z') \right) = \Delta_1^{(1)} \exp \left( - \frac{(z - z')^2}{\ell_1^2} \right)$$

where $\overline{\rho}(z)$ is the mean density profile described by $\overline{\rho}(z) = 0.922 - 0.564 \exp(0.0165z)$ while the fluctuating part $\rho_n(z)$ is a stationary Gaussian random process characterized by 3 parameters $\Delta_1$, the variance, $\ell_1$, the correlation length, and $\alpha_1$ the damping factor for the fluctuations. Figure 4 illustrates an example of simulated density profile. The fluctuations in density over a range of length scales is evident. The physical temperature profile of the ice sheet is described by the Robin temperature model [23]:

$$T(z) = T_s + C \cdot \text{erf} \left( \frac{H}{L} \right) - C \cdot \text{erf} \left( \frac{z + H}{L} \right), \quad -H \leq z \leq 0$$

(48)

where $C = \frac{L G \Delta_1}{2 k_e}$, and erf is the error function. Here $k_e = 2.7 \text{ W/m}$ is the ice thermal conductivity $k_d = 45 \text{ sqm/year}$ is the ice thermal diffusivity, and $T_s$ is the surface temperature of the ice sheet. Also, $M$ is the mass accumulation rate, $G$ the geothermal heat flux, and $H$ the total thickness of the ice sheet. We choose $T_s = 216 \text{ K}$, $M = 0.01 \text{ m/year}$, $G = 0.047 \text{ W/sqm}$ and $H = 3700 \text{ m}$ in what follows. The simulated temperature profile with the given parameters are shown in Figure 5. The parameters for generating density profiles are the same as in Figure 4. The permittivity of the ice sheet is calculated using the Matzler [24, 25] and Thuri [26] formulas for the real part and imaginary part, respectively.

Figure 6 plots the simulated brightness temperature from 0.5 to 2 GHz for both the standard coherent model and the coherent reflectivity model derived in this paper following an average over 1000
realizations of the density random process. The results show that the coherent model and coherent reflectivity model agree well.

The results for 1 density profile realization and a 1000 profile realization average are compared further in Figure 7(a). It is shown that the random profile causes strong fluctuations which is much different from the averaged curve. Figure 7(b) plots the results of Figure 7(a) divided by \((1 - r)\) as would be recommended for canceling cap layer effects in Equation (46). The reflectivity \(r\) is simulated here. In the real measurement, it is obtained by radar. The results show that both the single realization and averaged cases recover a smooth lower region brightness temperature that is a function only of the lower region ice temperature and attenuation profiles. To account for the density fluctuations in the passive only approach, a large number of density profiles need to be generated to average out the

**Figure 4.** Example ice sheet density profile using \(\Delta_1 = 0.04 \text{ g/cc, } \ell = 11 \text{ cm, } \alpha = 30 \text{ m.}\)

**Figure 5.** Temperature profile from Robin model with \(T_s = 216 \text{ K, } M = 0.01 \text{ m/year, } G = 0.047 \text{ W/sqm and } H = 3700 \text{ m.}\)
Figure 6. Brightness temperature as a function of frequency, 1000 realization averaging results are shown for coherent model and coherent reflectivity model. The results have shown a good match between the 2 models.

Figure 7. (a) Simulated Brightness temperature as a function of frequency. Results for 1 realization of cap region profiles and 1000 realizations are shown. (b) Simulated brightness temperature with cap region effects compensated. To make the brightness temperature profile stable, we need to use monte carlo averaging to smooth out the fluctuations. With the compensation, the brightness temperature profiles match well with each other for 1 realization and 1000 realizations.

fluctuations as in Figure 7(a). In the combine active and passive method, there is no need to generated profiles since the cap region reflectivity is measured by radar.

Figure 8 again investigates the compensation of cap region effects using a single realization of the brightness temperatures with varying cap layer properties. The results again confirm the applicability of the proposed approach for compensating these effects. In practice for nadiral radiometric measurements, the reflectivity as a function of frequency should be measurable by a nadir pointed radar operating over the same frequency range, indicating the potential for improving temperature profile retrievals using combined active/passive measurements.

Figure 9 shows the case where Equation (47) is not applicable. We use a 1300 m thick ice body with physical temperature profile generated by robin model and $T_s = 250$, $M = 0.32$, $G = 0.1$ are used.
Figure 8. (a) Brightness temperature profile with different cap region properties. (b) Brightness temperature with cap region effect compensation. The results show that for cap regions with different statistical properties, the compensated brightness temperature profiles are the same. In the retrieval process, we do not need a-priori information on the cap region density profiles if we have radar measurements.

Figure 9. (a) Temperature profile used for the simulation of brightness temperature profile of (b). In this case, the bottom of ice body is water, and the thickness of the ice sheet is not thick enough to be treated as half space. The assumption for the coherent reflectivity model to work is not valid in this case. And as a result, the coherent model predicts a brightness temperature about 10 K higher than the results of Equation (51) at the low frequency end due to the reflection from bottom.

as input. We set water below the ice body with 80 + 10i as the permittivity. A correlation length of 15 cm is used to generate the top region density fluctuations while the other parameters are the same in the previous case. We only consider the emission from ice body in the coherent model and the coherent reflectivity model as shown in Figure 9(b). In the reflectivity model, we assumed that there is no abrupt change in the profile, which means that the power due to the emission from bottom or reflected from bottom is negligible. Due to the strong reflection at the bottom, the assumption for Equation (47) to work is no longer valid. We may also insert a layer of material into any position in the ice body to break the assumption. Thus the 2 models no longer agree with each other.
7. CONCLUSION

Near surface ice sheet density fluctuations cause reflections that modulate thermal emissions from deeper portions of the ice sheet. In this paper, a coherent reflectivity model for combined active and passive sensing of polar ice sheets was developed. The approximation in the model was shown to characterize the cap region influence in terms of its reflection and transmission coefficients and characterize the emission from ice sheet by it physical temperature profile and absorption profiles. Numerical results show a good agreement with coherent model. The brightness temperature compensated with cap region emission from ice sheet by it physical temperature profile and absorption profiles. The model may fail if the condition of “slowly varying profile” is not valid in the large ice body. With the help of radar measurements, the a-priori information of cap region density is not required in the retrieval of ice sheet temperature profiles. The UWBRAD flight path shall extended to the regions without borehole sites. In future work, we shall use the co-located UWBRAD measurement and OIB GPR data to validate this concept.

APPENDIX A. SYMMETRY RELATION OF DYADIC GREEN’S FUNCTION

Let region 0 be homogeneous with permittivity $\varepsilon$ and region 1 is inhomogeneous with relative permittivity $\varepsilon_{1r}(r)$.

First consider a source in region 0. Let $\bar{r}$ be an arbitrary constant vector located at $\bar{r}_a$. Then the dyadic Green’s functions obey the equations

$$\nabla \times \nabla \times \overline{G}_{00}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a} - k_0^2 \overline{G}_{00}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a} = \overline{\sigma} \delta(\bar{r} - \bar{r}_a) \quad (A1)$$

$$\nabla \times \nabla \times \overline{G}_{10}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a} - k_0^2 \varepsilon_{1r}(\bar{r}) \overline{G}_{10}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a} = 0 \quad (A2)$$

where $\overline{G}_{00}$ denotes a source in region 0 and field point in region 0, and $\overline{G}_{10}$ denotes a source in region 0 and field point in region 1.

Boundary conditions on the boundary separating region 0 and region 1 are

$$\hat{n} \times \overline{G}_{00}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a} = \hat{n} \times \overline{G}_{10}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a} \quad (A3)$$

$$\hat{n} \times \nabla \times \overline{G}_{00}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a} = \hat{n} \times \nabla \times \overline{G}_{10}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a} \quad (A4)$$

For a source in region 1, let $\bar{b}$ be an arbitrary constant vector located at $\bar{r}_b$

$$\nabla \times \nabla \times \overline{G}_{01}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b} - k_0^2 \overline{G}_{01}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b} = 0 \quad (A5)$$

$$\nabla \times \nabla \times \overline{G}_{11}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b} - k_0^2 \varepsilon_{1r}(\bar{r}) \overline{G}_{11}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b} = \overline{\sigma} \delta(\bar{r} - \bar{r}_b) \quad (A6)$$

The boundary conditions are

$$\hat{n} \times \overline{G}_{01}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b} = \hat{n} \times \overline{G}_{11}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b} \quad (A7)$$

$$\hat{n} \times \nabla \times \overline{G}_{01}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b} = \hat{n} \times \nabla \times \overline{G}_{11}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b} \quad (A8)$$

Applying the vector Green’s theorem and integrating over region 0 with $\hat{n}$ pointing up yields:

$$\int_{\text{region}0} dV \left[ (\overline{G}_{01}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b}) \cdot \nabla \times \nabla \times (\overline{G}_{00}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a}) - (\overline{G}_{00}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a}) \cdot \nabla \times \nabla \times (\overline{G}_{01}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b}) \right]$$

$$= -\int dS \hat{n} \cdot \left[ (\overline{G}_{00}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a}) \times \nabla \times (\overline{G}_{01}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b}) - (\overline{G}_{01}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b}) \times \nabla \times (\overline{G}_{00}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a}) \right]$$

Then we have

$$\bar{a} \cdot \overline{G}_{01}(\bar{r}_a,\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b} = -\int dS \hat{n} \cdot \left[ (\overline{G}_{00}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a}) \times \nabla \times (\overline{G}_{01}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b}) - (\overline{G}_{01}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_b) \cdot \bar{b}) \times \nabla \times (\overline{G}_{00}(\bar{r},\bar{r}_a) \cdot \bar{a}) \right] \quad (A9)$$
Next applying vector Green’s theorem with a source in region 1 and integrating over region 1 yields:

\[
\int_{\text{region 1}} dV \left[ \left( \overrightarrow{G}_{11} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_b) \cdot \overrightarrow{b} \right) \cdot \left[ k_0^2 \varepsilon_{1r} (\overrightarrow{r}) \overrightarrow{G}_{10} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_a) \cdot \overrightarrow{a} \right] 
- \left( \overrightarrow{G}_{10} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_a) \cdot \overrightarrow{a} \right) \cdot \left[ k_0^2 \varepsilon_{1r} (\overrightarrow{r}) \overrightarrow{G}_{11} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_b) \cdot \overrightarrow{b} + b_0 (\overrightarrow{r} - \overrightarrow{r}_b) \right] \right] 
= \int dS\overrightarrow{n} \cdot \left[ \left( \overrightarrow{G}_{10} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_a) \cdot \overrightarrow{a} \right) \times \nabla \times \left( \overrightarrow{G}_{11} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_b) \cdot \overrightarrow{b} \right) - \left( \overrightarrow{G}_{11} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_b) \cdot \overrightarrow{b} \right) \times \nabla \times \left( \overrightarrow{G}_{10} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_a) \cdot \overrightarrow{a} \right) \right]
\]

Note that

\[
\left( \overrightarrow{G}_{11} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_b) \cdot \overrightarrow{b} \right) \cdot \left[ k_0^2 \varepsilon_{1r} (\overrightarrow{r}) \overrightarrow{G}_{10} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_a) \cdot \overrightarrow{a} \right] 
= \left[ \overrightarrow{G}_{10} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{a}) \cdot \overrightarrow{a} \right] \cdot \left[ k_0^2 \varepsilon_{1r} (\overrightarrow{r}) \overrightarrow{G}_{11} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_b) \cdot \overrightarrow{b} \right] - \left( \overrightarrow{G}_{10} (\overrightarrow{r}_b, \overrightarrow{r}_a) \cdot \overrightarrow{a} \right) \cdot \overrightarrow{b} 
= \int dS\overrightarrow{n} \cdot \left[ \left( \overrightarrow{G}_{10} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{a}) \cdot \overrightarrow{a} \right) \times \nabla \times \left( \overrightarrow{G}_{11} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_b) \cdot \overrightarrow{b} \right) - \left( \overrightarrow{G}_{11} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{r}_b) \cdot \overrightarrow{b} \right) \times \nabla \times \left( \overrightarrow{G}_{10} (\overrightarrow{r}, \overrightarrow{a}) \cdot \overrightarrow{a} \right) \right]
\]

Applying the boundary conditions, the right hand sides of Equations (1) and (2) are equal and opposite, so that

\[
\overrightarrow{a} \cdot \overrightarrow{G}_{01} (\overrightarrow{r}_a, \overrightarrow{r}_b) \cdot \overrightarrow{b} = \overrightarrow{b} \cdot \overrightarrow{G}_{10} (\overrightarrow{r}_b, \overrightarrow{r}_a) \cdot \overrightarrow{a} \quad (A10)
\]

Since they are scalar, we take transpose and since \( \overrightarrow{a} \) and \( \overrightarrow{b} \) are arbitrary

\[
G_{01} (\overrightarrow{r}_a, \overrightarrow{r}_b) = G_{10}^t (\overrightarrow{r}_b, \overrightarrow{r}_a) \quad (A11)
\]
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