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The performance and measurement accuracy of Na narrowband wind–temperature lidar systems are characterized. Error budgets are derived that include several effects not previously reported, such as power-dependent spectral characteristics in the frequency reference, magnetic-field-dependent oscillator line strengths (Hanle effect, saturation, and optical pumping. It is shown that the overall system uncertainty is dependent on the power, pulse temporal characteristics, and beam divergence of the laser transmitter. Results indicate that even systems with significant saturation can produce accurate measurements, which implies the prospect of continuous daytime wind and temperature measurements on semidiurnal and diurnal time periods.

1. Introduction
Na narrowband-lidar techniques have been used to measure the fine-scale structure of both temperatures1–3 and winds4 near the mesopause region of the atmosphere (~80–105 km). Currently, Na resonance–fluorescence lidars5 are the only instruments that provide measurements with high spatial and temporal resolution of the wind and temperature structure in this region of the atmosphere, which has historically been one of the most difficult to study experimentally. These data are vital to understanding overall global energy transport and upper-atmospheric chemistry.6

Much of the past research has focused on system development as a consequence of the demanding requirements on the laser source. For routine achievement of accurate wind and temperature measurements, the laser transmitter must produce high-energy pulses (tens of millijoules) that are transform limited and have extremely stable spectral characteristics (~1 part in 10^9). The present work expands on the initial error budget for a Na narrowband wind–temperature lidar system7 and includes other significant error sources not discussed in that previous study. The key aspect of the current analysis is the development of a comprehensive model for the absorption spectrum of Na that includes power-dependent spectral characteristics, magnetic-field-dependent oscillator line strengths (the Hanle effect, saturation, and optical pumping. The model provides estimates of the sensitivity of the wind and temperature measurements to various system parameters, including the power, pulse temporal characteristics, and beam divergence of the laser transmitter.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents a review of the narrowband-lidar technique. Sections 3 and 4 discuss the physical sources of error and show how the system uncertainty is characterized. Section 5 discusses the results and provides general design considerations for narrowband resonance–fluorescence systems.

2. Na Narrowband-Lidar Technique
Narrowband Doppler lidar techniques with Na resonance fluorescence have been described in several references.7,8 We extend the previous works by starting with the lidar equation for resonance lidar,5 which describes the atmospheric response to the probing laser beam:

\[ N(z, t) = \frac{C}{Z^2} \sigma_{\text{eff}}(f, T, v_R, g, l | p_{\text{Na}} z, t) + N_B, \]  

where

\[ C = \frac{T_a^2 P_0 \Delta \lambda \Delta t A_R}{(h \nu / \lambda) 4\pi}. \]
In Eq. (1), $N(z,t)$ is the total number of photons detected (photocounts) from the volume element, with thickness $\Delta z$ that is centered at altitude $z$, summed over the time interval $t$ to $t + \Delta t$. The average Na density is $\rho_{\text{Na}}(z,t)$, and the total background noise in the signal in this time interval is $N_B$. $C$ is a constant that depends on the one-way atmospheric transmittance $T_a$ and the average power of the laser $P_l$, with photon energy $hc/\lambda$, where $h$ is Plank’s constant, $c$ is the speed of light, and $\lambda$ is the laser wavelength. Backscattered photons are detected by a telescope with area $A_T$ and efficiency $\eta$. Because the concentration of absorbing atoms is low in the mesopause, the effects of extinction are ignored.

The effective-backscatter cross section, $\sigma_{\text{eff}}(f, T, v_R, g, l)$ in Eq. (1), provides all the information about the photon–atom scattering process. In resonance fluorescence it is the integrated product of the atmospheric–Na cross section $\sigma_{\text{Na}}(f', T, v_R, l)$ and the line shape of the laser pulse $g(f' - f_1)$ with center frequency $f_1$:

$$\sigma_{\text{eff}}(f_1, T, v_R, g, l) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(f' - f_1) \sigma_{\text{Na}}(f', T, v_R, l) df', \quad (2)$$

where $T$ is the temperature, $v_R$ is the wind velocity, and $l$ is the laser intensity.

The dependence of $\sigma_{\text{Na}}$ and thus $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ on $T$ and $v_R$ provides the fundamental physical reference used in the narrowband-lidar technique. Measurements of $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ at three different laser frequencies are necessary to determine $\rho_{\text{Na}}(z,t)$, $T$, and $v_R$ completely. However, because $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ also depends on the spectral and temporal characteristics of the laser pulse, the lidar system must be carefully designed to minimize errors that are introduced by these sources. The goal of this work is to characterize accurately the dependence of $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ on each narrowband-lidar system parameter and to show how errors in these parameters affect temperature and wind measurements.

The University of Illinois wind temperature lidar (W/TL) measures $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ at four different frequencies to permit nearly independent determinations of $T$ and $v_R$. For each measurement, the narrow-bandwidth laser is tuned to excite only a small portion of the Na absorption spectrum. Backscattered fluorescence is collected through a telescope with a bandwidth large enough to detect the entire Na spectrum. From the time delay between the laser pulse and the fluorescence signal, a range-resolved profile of the backscatter is generated. Summation of this range-resolved signal over multiple laser pulses increases the signal-to-noise ratio, which generates a vertical profile of the average Na-fluorescence response. Profiles are grouped in pairs by the laser tuning frequency, as determined by the parameter to be extracted ($T$ or $v_R$). The background noise $N_B$ term is then subtracted from each profile, and the ratio for each pair is formed by

$$R(z, t, \tau) = \frac{N_{f_1}(z, t + \tau)}{N_{f_2}(z, t)}$$

where $N_{f_1}(z, t + \tau)$ and $N_{f_2}(z, t)$ are the signal counts at frequencies $f_1$ and $f_2$ that were recorded at times $t$ and $t + \tau$. Because of the finite laser-tuning time, the interval between successive measurements $\tau$ will always be greater than the integration time at each frequency $\Delta t$. If the time between measurements is small relative to perturbations in the Na density $\rho_{\text{Na}}(t) = \rho_{\text{Na}}(t + \tau)$ and if the response is linear

$$\sigma_{\text{eff}}(f_1, T, v_R, g, l) = \sigma_{\text{eff}}(f_1, T, v_R, g), \quad (3)$$

Equation (4) is the starting point for most analyses of Na narrowband lidars because it is no longer necessary to know the absolute value of any parameter, just its relative contribution.

Of the mesospheric metals, Na is preferred because of its high concentration, large backscatter coefficient, and relatively long chemical lifetime. In addition, the spectroscopy of the Na D2 lines is well known, with the locations of the underlying hyperfine lines known to within 500 kHz (an overview of Na spectroscopy is given in Appendix A). Because Zeeman splitting of the hyperfine states of Na (which is due to the geomagnetic field) is small compared with the linewidth of the laser pulse, we may approximate the true Na cross section by a sum of six Doppler-broadened transitions, each is weighted by the strength of the corresponding hyperfine transition:

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{Na}}(f', T, v_R) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_D^2} \sum_{i} A_i \exp \left[ -\frac{(f' - f_i + v_R/\lambda)^2}{2\sigma_D^2} \right], \quad (5)$$

where $f_i$ is the center frequency of the hyperfine transition with strength $A_i$. The Doppler-broadened linewidth is $\sigma_D^2 = k_B T/m_{\text{Na}}\lambda^2$, where $k_B$ is Boltzmann’s constant and $m_{\text{Na}}$ is the mass of a Na atom. The term $v_R/\lambda$ is the Doppler shift associated with the radial-wind velocity. The cross section $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{Na}}(f', T, v_R)$, given by Eq. (5), provides the physical reference for both temperature and wind measurements and is plotted as a function of $T$ and $v_R$ in Figs. 1 and 2.

An analytic expression for the effective-backscatter cross section may be obtained if the laser line shape $g(f)$ is approximated by a Gaussian with rms line-
suitable for the analytical determination of the relative temperature variations. Ignoring the contribution of the $D_{2\alpha}$ feature and using the analytic expression for the absorption cross section [Eq. (7)], we find that the optimal frequencies are $f_\pm = f_0 \pm \sqrt{2} \sigma_D$. The actual frequencies used for the $W/TL$ system are $f_+ = f_0 \pm 600$ MHz. These were chosen because they can be generated with a commercial Fabry–Perot interferometer.

As previously mentioned, measurement of the cross section at only three frequencies ($f_0$, $f_\pm$, and $f_\|$, $f_\perp$) is sufficient to determine both the radial-wind velocity and the temperature. For a system based on this three-frequency technique ($W_2$), the wind ratio is $R_{W_2} = N_{f_\|} / N_{f_\perp}$. $W_2$ is more sensitive to temperature errors than the first wind measurement ($W_1$) technique, i.e., $\partial R_{W_2} / \partial T \mid_{Q_W} > \partial R_{W_1} / \partial T \mid_{Q_W}$, where $Q_W$ and $Q_{W_1}$ are the operating points, but $W_2$ is being investigated because fewer measurements are required for each wind–temperature sequence and because frequency tuning may be done on a shot-to-shot basis with an acousto-optic cell, which reduces the errors caused by density fluctuations.

Although the frequencies for the measurements have been determined with an approximate line shape, the ratio $R$ in Eq. (4) that is used in data analysis is
calculated with the measured line shape $gf$ and becomes a function of only $T$ and $v_R$. A look-up table, which is generated with $R(T, v_R)$, provides the inverse functions $T(R_T, v_R)$ and $v_R(R_W, T)$. Because these inverse functions are coupled, an initial guess $v_{R_0}$ is made for $v_R$, and the temperature is calculated from $T(R_T, v_R = v_{R_0})$. This temperature $T_0$ is then used to determine $v_R$, from the other look-up table, $v_R(R_W, T = T_0)$. Multiple iterations may have to be performed until $v_R$ and $T$ converge.

3. Determination of $\sigma_{Na}$

Accurate measurements with the narrowband technique require exact knowledge of the Na-backscatter cross section. In general, $\sigma_{Na}$ must be determined from the solution to the density matrix that includes all 24 Zeeman states. However, we may use the approximate cross section of Eq. (5) if we carefully choose the strengths of the six transitions. In this section, we discuss two physical mechanisms: the Hanle effect and saturation. They determine the coefficients $A_i$ in Eq. (5). Their contribution to the overall measurement uncertainty will be discussed in Section 4.

A. Hanle Effect

When an atom is placed in a magnetic field, $B$, it is convenient to represent all electronic wave functions with respect to an axis along the magnetic field. Atoms then absorb radiation in one of three polarizations defined with respect to $B$. A $\pi$ photon (which indicates linear polarization along the magnetic field) excites transitions between Zeeman substrates with the same magnetic quantum number $m$ (see Appendix A for a description of the Na eigenstates), while a $\sigma^+$ photon circularly polarized perpendicular to $B$, where the minus sign denotes right-circular polarization and the plus sign denotes left circular polarization, excites transitions in which $\Delta m = \pm 1$. Thus the $\pi$ and $\sigma^\pm$ polarizations form a basis set to describe the polarization of the absorbed and the emitted radiation.

During the resonance–fluorescence process, the magnetic field interacts with occupied atomic states to change their states of polarization. This interaction takes place by means of $a \times \mathbf{v}$ term where $\mathbf{v}$ is the velocity of the electron and causes a precession of the harmonic oscillator and a change of polarization of each Zeeman–substate transition. This results in a change in the emitted-radiation pattern from its zero-magnetic-field value. Because we are interested only in backscattered radiation, these changes in radiation patterns can be represented as changes in the relative oscillator strengths of the six hyperfine lines, for which we define each $A_i$ as a sum over the corresponding Zeeman transitions. In the mesopause region above the Urbana Atmospheric Observatory (UAO), the declination of the Earth's magnetic field is nearly zero and the inclination is $70^\circ$ (declination is defined as the clockwise angle between geographic north and the projection of the magnetic field onto the horizontal plane; inclination is defined as the downward angle between the projection of the magnetic field onto the horizontal plane and the magnetic field. Computations discussed in Appendix A yield the relative oscillator-strength ratios for the case of vertical transmission and reception at UAO as $5:5.49:2:15.64:5:0.98$ as opposed to $5:5.5:2:15.68:5:0.98$ for the zero-magnetic-field case. Ignoring the Hanle effect through the use of the spatially averaged oscillator strengths $5:5.2:14:5:1$, in data analysis introduces a temperature bias of 1.4 K and a radial-wind-velocity bias of 0.7 m/s.

B. Saturation and Optical Pumping

For large pulse intensities, the intensity dependence of $\sigma_{Na}$ becomes important because single atoms no longer respond in the linear fashion that is assumed for the calculation of the transition strengths described above. Saturation and optical-pumping effects must be included to determine the true $A_i$ for use in Eq. (5).

In the low-intensity limit, the laser pulse excites one of the six hyperfine transitions and causes electrons from one of the ground states to populate the corresponding upper state. The upper state then decays back to one of the ground states in an average period that is determined by the upper-state lifetime. Saturation occurs when another photon causes stimulated emission of the electron in the upper state and thus removes the stimulated photon from natural decay, which effectively reduces the upper-state lifetime. This stimulated emission occurs along the outgoing beam and decreases the backscatter cross section. In addition, occupation of an upper state decreases further absorption into that state and results in a reduced effective-backscatter cross section. As the laser intensity increases, these two effects can cause a systematic measurement error, because each of the six transitions that compose the Doppler-broadened line shape saturates at a different intensity. In addition, saturation is more pronounced for narrowlinewidth pulses because the energy of the laser is distributed over fewer transitions.

Finally, if the linewidth of the outgoing pulse (~125 MHz FWHM for the W/TL system is smaller than the separation of the two ground-state manifolds (~1.8 GHz), the pulse can induce transitions from each individual ground state. Optical pumping occurs when the excited atoms relax to the opposite ground state (see Appendix A). As direct equalization between the two ground states in the atmosphere is negligible, optical pumping reduces the density of atoms available to absorb the incoming laser radiation, which reduces the effective-backscatter cross section. For example, when the pulse is tuned to the $D_2a$ peak, atoms excited from the $f = 1$ state can relax back to the $f = 2$ state (see Fig. 7 in Appendix A). Once in the $f = 2$ state, atoms cannot return to the $f = 1$ state (the direct transition is negligible on the time scale of the interaction and the pulse is spectrally too narrow for excitation back out of the $f = 2$ state.
Therefore, these atoms are removed from further absorption. In the limit in which almost all the atoms exist in the $f = 2$ state, the $f = 1$ state is completely bleached and no further absorption can occur from the $f = 1$ ground state. Laser pulse lengths that are shorter than the lifetimes of the excited states do not suffer from optical-pumping effects because no significant shift in the ground-state population can occur. As the laser pulse length increases, the error induced by optical pumping becomes more significant.

Saturation effects have been considered by several groups. A rate-equation simulation of atomic Na is discussed in Appendix B; it uses a realistic temporal pulse envelope and a Gaussian transverse spatial distribution to compare the true Na response with an extrapolation of the low-intensity, linear response. To simplify computations, one may replace the actual temporal and spatial functions with rms quantities, although this method was not employed in this analysis.

Figures 3 and 4 show the general trends for saturation- and pumping-induced errors as functions of the outgoing beam characteristics. Figure 3(a) shows the percent saturation at the backscatter peak $f_a$ as a function of the pulse energy for a fixed pulse duration of 7 ns (rms). Figure 3(b) shows the effects of a change in the pulse duration for a fixed energy [100 mJ/pulse]. Note that a 100-mJ pulse that produces 5% saturation if the pulse is 7 ns long will only produce 0.5% saturation if the pulse length is 100 ns long, which emphasizes the importance of the use of low peak power systems. However, saturation cannot be reduced to zero with an increasing pulse length because of the increased importance of optical pumping. Minimum saturation is approximately 0.3% for 100-mJ pulses with a duration greater than 600 ns.

Figure 4(a) plots the percent saturation for a 7-ns (rms) pulse at both $f_a$ and $f_c$ for two pulse energies (35 mJ and 100 mJ) as a function of the outgoing beam divergence. The relative errors at $f_a$ and $f_c$ increase concurrently, which indicates that the ratio $R_T$ may be relatively insensitive to saturation. To confirm this, Figs. 4(b) and 4(c) show the effect of saturation on the relative error in the ratio $\Delta R/R$ and on the absolute error for the same parameters used in Fig. 3. On the left-side vertical axis in Figs. 4(b) and 4(c) is $\Delta R/R$, the relative error from saturation. On the right-side vertical axis is the absolute error if we derive temperatures and wind velocities using the low-intensity cross section (the calculation of absolute error is discussed in the next section). It is important to remember that, although individual profiles can have large relative errors that are due to saturation effects (as shown in Fig. 4(a)), the overall relative error in the ratio and the absolute error (Figs. 4(b) and 4(c)) are significantly diminished because
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both terms in the ratio have approximately the same functional dependence on the intensity.

4. System Characterization

Whereas the previous section discussed errors that are due to imprecise calibration of $\sigma_{Na}$, this section presents the properties of the measurement process that reduce the accuracy of derived temperatures and wind velocities. These errors can result in both systematic errors which are due to incorrect absolute frequency calibration or incorrect laser line shape and random errors which are due to laser frequency jitter, shot noise, and atmospheric-density fluctuations. These system errors are then converted to temperature and wind errors by the use of differentials of the corresponding ratio. Although the analysis quotes specific numbers for the W/TL system, the procedures are general and can be applied to a variety of resonance-fluorescence systems.

A. Systematic Error

1. Absolute Frequency Calibration

Accurate knowledge of the absolute laser frequency is essential to both temperature and wind-velocity measurements. For example, a frequency-calibration offset of 5 MHz will introduce a 0.5-K error in derived temperatures and a 3-m/s error in derived wind velocities for the W/TL system. Of all the independent system parameters, the error associated with the absolute frequency of the outgoing beam is the hardest to ascertain. The absolute frequency reference in the W/TL system uses the Doppler-free features of a Na-vapor cell to control the frequency of

Fig. 4. (a) Percent saturation as a function of divergence at $f_a$ and $f_c$ for two pulse energies (35 mJ and 100 mJ) for a 7-ns rms pulse. (b) Temperature error for the same parameters as given for Fig. 3. The y axis on the left-hand side of the figure shows the relative error in the ratio $\Delta R_1/R_1$. The right-hand-side y axis shows the temperature error determined with the values in Table 2. (c) Wind-velocity error for both wind-measurement techniques $W_1$ and $W_2$ for the same parameters given for Fig. 3.
a cw ring dye laser. Because the pulsed dye amplifier that generates the outgoing pulse is seeded by the dye laser, the frequency accuracy of the vapor-cell response is transferred to the pulse.

With nonlinear Doppler-free spectroscopy, the doublet nature of Na provides two convenient frequency markers at $f_a$ and $f_b$ with frequency discriminants much greater than those obtainable with linear absorption spectroscopy (see Appendix B). For accurate measurements, these markers must be referenced to the linear backscatter cross section $\sigma_{Na}$, which is measured in the atmosphere.

The Doppler-free cross section of Na differs considerably from its linear counterpart for several reasons. First, Doppler broadening is greater in the vapor cell because the Na-vapor density and temperature are considerably larger than in the atmosphere. Second, the $D_{2a}$ and $D_{2b}$ resonances show Lamb dips owing to saturation effects, and a resonance enhancement (called the crossover) occurs midway between the $D_{2a}$ and $D_{2b}$ lines as a result of concurrent excitation from both ground states. Because the Lamb dips and crossover are caused by nonlinear effects, they change shape as the laser intensity varies. These intensity-dependent spectral features of the vapor cell can be a significant source of frequency error.

To assess the error associated with improper absolute frequency calibration, a rate-equation simulation of the nonlinear vapor-cell response that incorporates the six hyperfine states is used to model the Doppler-free frequency response from which absolute frequencies can be determined. A full description of the simulation is provided in Appendix B. Correlation between measured and simulated Doppler-free responses provides an absolute frequency-calibration estimate within $\pm 2$ MHz. It is shown in Subsection 4.C that the laser’s frequency-calibration error does not dominate the total system error.

2. Line-shape Measurement

The outgoing laser line shape $g(f)$ influences the derived temperature and wind velocities because the effective-backscatter cross section $\sigma_{eff}$ is the integrated product of the Na cross section $\sigma_{Na}$ and the line shape $g(f)$. Therefore, discrepancies between the line shape used in data reduction and the true line shape introduce temperature and wind-velocity errors. In addition, as the spectral width of $g(f)$ increases, the sensitivity of the technique $\frac{\partial R_T}{\partial T}$ decreases from convolutional averaging; this result stresses the importance of the use of narrow-bandwidth pulses for the transmitter.

The line shape of the outgoing laser pulse is determined by measurement of the spectral content of the pulse with a narrowband étalon (with a free spectral range of 2 GHz and a finesse of 200) and a boxcar integrator. As the étalon is scanned through the pulse line shape, the boxcar provides samples of the pulse spectral content that are integrated over multiple laser shots. After deconvolving the transmission characteristics of the étalon [10 MHz FWHM], the measured line shape $g(f)$ is used to calculate $\sigma_{eff}$, and the lookup tables for the inverse functions $RT(R_T, v_R)$ and $W(R_W, T)$ are generated. For error analysis, $g(f)$ is fitted by a Gaussian with rms width, $\sigma_{rms}$. This fitted rms width $\pm 60$ MHz for the W/TL system is then used in Eq. (7) to determine $\sigma_{eff}$.

It has been noted that the pulse line shape must be measured on a regular basis because the outgoing spectral characteristics can change significantly with laser alignment. The rms line width uncertainty, which is caused by routine realignment of the amplifier between line-shape measurements, is estimated to be $\pm 4$ MHz.

B. Random Error

1. Jitter

The random uncertainty associated with laser and electronic jitter will vary from system to system. To quantify the laser and electronic jitter for the current system, tuning feedback data are accumulated from the vapor cell and the Fabry–Perot interferometer that produces $f_a$ for the wind measurements. After they have been converted to frequencies with the calibrated vapor-cell and interferometer responses, the mean and variance of these data determine laser jitter for each profile and over the entire night. Figure 5 shows a typical trace for the stability of the peak frequency $f_a$ for the W/TL system over the night of 17 January 1993 at UAO (other nights are similar). Table 1 shows the standard deviation $\sigma_j$ for each tuning location taken from the data. Over the whole night, the standard deviation is less than 2.2 MHz for each tuning location.

2. Density Fluctuations

One of the key assumptions to the use of Eq. (4) for the determination of $R$ is that the density variations over a measurement interval are small $|\rho_j(t) - \rho_j(t + \tau)|$. In practice, density variations introduce errors into the temperature and wind measurements because the apparent backscatter coefficient changes between profiles. The resulting relative error is a function of the integration time $\Delta t$ and the distance $z$ from the centroid of the Na layer and may

![Fig. 5. Measurement of the jitter at $f_a$ for the night of 17 January 1993 at the UAO in Urbana, Illinois.](image)
be written as\(^{15}\)
\[
\frac{\Delta R[z, \tau]}{R} = \frac{1}{\text{rms} (\gamma - 1)} \left| 1 - \left( z - z_0 \right) \gamma H / \alpha_0^2 \right| \left( r_s^2 \right)^{1/2},
\]
where \(\alpha_0\) is the rms thickness of the unperturbed Na layer (~4.2 km), \(H\) is the atmospheric scale height (~6 km), \(z_0\) is the layer centroid height (~92 km), \(\gamma\) is the ratio of specific heats \(\{1,4\}\), and \(\text{rms}\) is the wave-field correlation time, and \((r_s^2)\) is the variance of the relative atmospheric perturbations. We note that weighted averaging can significantly reduce the density fluctuations given by Eq. \(8\).\(^{16}\) We present both the derivation of Eq. \(8\) and the forms for reducing the error by averaging in Appendix C.

3. Shot Noise
Shot noise ultimately limits the measurement accuracy of any photon-counting system because no amount of system design can remove the statistical nature of the photon-detection processes. The physics of the photon-counting process are well known, and for the ratio-calculation technique that we used, \(\Delta R_T / R_T\), the change in the ratio as a function of the number of photons at the peak \(N_{s0}\) is given by\(^{7}\)
\[
\frac{\Delta R_T}{R_T} = - \frac{1}{\text{rms} N_{s0}^{1/2}} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{R_T} \right)^{1/2},
\]
where \(R_T = 0.28\) at the operating point \(Q_T\).

Through a similar technique, the shot-noise error for the two wind measurements can also be expressed in terms of \(N_{s0}\):
\[
\frac{\Delta R_{W1}}{R_{W1}} = \frac{1}{\text{rms} N_{s0}^{1/2}} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{R_{W1}} \right)^{1/2} = \frac{1}{\text{rms} N_{s0}^{1/2}} \left( \frac{R_{W1}}{R_{W2}} \right)^{1/2},
\]
\[
\frac{\Delta R_{W2}}{R_{W2}} = \frac{1}{\text{rms} N_{s0}^{1/2}} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{R_{W2}} \right)^{1/2},
\]
where \(R_{W1} = 1\) is used in Eq. \(9b\) to facilitate comparison of the techniques.

C. Error Calculations
Through the use of differentials of the ratios and Eq. \(7\), uncertainties in system parameters can be converted into uncertainties in derived temperatures and radial-wind velocities.

The backscatter ratio used to derive temperature errors is
\[
\hat{R}_T[f_s, f_c, T, v_R, \sigma_{rms}] = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_s, T, v_R, \sigma_{rms}]}{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_c, T, v_R, \sigma_{rms}]},
\]
and the two ratios for wind-velocity errors are
\[
\hat{R}_{W1}[f_s, f_c, T, v_R, \sigma_{rms}] = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_s, T, v_R, \sigma_{rms}]}{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_c, T, v_R, \sigma_{rms}]},
\]
\[
\hat{R}_{W2}[f_s, f_c, T, v_R, \sigma_{rms}] = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_s, T, v_R, \sigma_{rms}]}{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_c, T, v_R, \sigma_{rms}]},
\]
The derivatives of each of these ratios with respect to each of the system parameters are
\[
\frac{\partial \hat{R}}{\partial \chi} = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_s]}{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_c]} - \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_c]}{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_s]},
\]
where the prime denotes the derivative with respect to \(\chi\) and \(\chi\) is one of the following: \(f_s, f_c, T, v_R, \sigma_{rms}\).
Note that to determine analytic expressions for these ratios, we have used the approximate expression for the effective-backscatter cross section, \(\sigma_{eff}\).

By evaluation of the differential at the operating point, errors that are introduced by shot noise, density variations, and saturation can be calculated. For example, the temperature error \(\Delta T\) that is associated with an error in the ratio \(\Delta R\) is given by
\[
\Delta T = \Delta R_T \frac{\partial T}{\partial R_T} \left|_{Q_T} \right. \frac{\Delta R_T}{R_T} \left( \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_c]}{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_s]} - \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_s]}{\hat{\sigma}_{eff}[f_c]} \right)^{-1}.
\]
Similar expressions can be derived for wind-velocity errors.

Uncertainties that are due to other system parameters can be calculated by ratios of partial derivatives at \(Q\). For example, the variation in derived temperature \(\Delta T\) with respect to a change in the wind velocity \(\Delta v_R\) is
\[
\Delta T = \frac{\partial \hat{R}_T}{\partial v_R} \left|_{Q_T} \right. \Delta v_R,
\]
and the variation in derived wind velocity \(\Delta v_R\) with respect to a change in the temperature \(\Delta T\) is
\[
\Delta v_R = \frac{\partial \hat{R}_W}{\partial T} \left|_{Q_T} \right. \Delta T.
\]
The derivatives and their magnitudes have been evaluated for an operating point \(Q\): \(T = 200 K, v_R = 0\) m/s, \(f_s = -638 MHz, f_c = 232 MHz, f_c = -1238\) MHz, \(v_R = 38 MHz\), and \(\sigma_{rms} = 60 MHz\) and are

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Location} & f \text{MHz} & \sigma \text{MHz} \\
\text{f}_1 & -1238 & 1.22 \\
\text{f}_2 & -538 & 1.48 \\
\text{f}_3 & -38 & 1.45 \\
\text{f}_c & 232 & 1.41 \\
\end{array}
\]
summarized in Table 2. Note that these derivatives depend on the operating point and thus must be recalculated for each system. For example, a 20% increase in these values will yield an ~40% increase in the estimated number of photons required (from shot-noise error calculations) to maintain the same signal-to-noise ratio.

Table 3 shows the effect of frequency, linewidth, density variation, and saturation on temperature and wind measurements for the W/TL operating point. From Tables 2 and 3, temperature and wind errors are plotted as a function of beam divergence on the right-hand-side axis of Figs. 4b and 4c.

If all error sources are independent, the total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Parameter</th>
<th>Source Uncertainty</th>
<th>Temperature Uncertainty</th>
<th>Wind Uncertainty</th>
<th>Wind-Velocity Uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>Wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δf</td>
<td>2.36 MHz</td>
<td>2.36 MHz</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔT</td>
<td>2.49 MHz</td>
<td>2.49 MHz</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔV</td>
<td>2.47 MHz</td>
<td>2.47 MHz</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔT</td>
<td>2.45 MHz</td>
<td>2.45 MHz</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linewidth</td>
<td>4 MHz</td>
<td>4 MHz</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density at altitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 km</td>
<td>0.122%</td>
<td>0.122%</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 km</td>
<td>0.025%</td>
<td>0.025%</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 km</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 mJ pulse and beam divergence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 mrad</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.005%</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 mrad</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1 mrad</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 mJ pulse and beam divergence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 mrad</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 mrad</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1 mrad</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind error for temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp error for wind</td>
<td>1 m/s</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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system uncertainty without shot noise $\sigma_{\text{total}}$ is the rms sum of all the individual uncertainty sources $\sigma_i$.

$$\sigma_{\text{total}} = \left( \sum_{i} \sigma_i^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where $\sigma_i^2$ are the variances of the individual error sources. The results for the W/TL system are summarized in Table 4. Using Eqs. (9a–9c), we can then determine the total number of photons $N_{fa}$ that must be detected at frequency $f_a$ such that the shot-noise error is no larger than the rest of the system error. These values are also given in Table 4. For temperature measurements, the large signal required for the shot-noise uncertainty to be comparable to the rest of the system uncertainty indicates that the current system is shot-noise limited for temperatures and nearly shot-noise limited for winds.

5. Discussion

The most remarkable feature illustrated by the data in Table 3 is the insensitivity of the temperature and wind measurements to saturation effects. Although each of the individual lines can have significant saturation [shown in Fig. 4a], the overall error that is due to saturation is smaller than one might expect. This relative insensitivity has one very important implication: Present systems are limited to nighttime operation because of large daytime background counts. To reduce the daytime noise counts, beam expanders are typically used to reduce the divergence of the outgoing beam, which allows the receiver to use a smaller field of view and thus reduces the background counts. However, decreasing the divergence increases the beam intensity at the Na layer, and, to date, daytime measurements have not been attempted because of concerns about saturation. Examination of Fig. (4) and Table 3 shows that a 0.5-mrad divergence (an $\sim 2 \times$ beam expansion for a 1-mr beam) produces almost no added error in the measurements, yet it will decrease the background counts by a factor of $\sim 4$. The saturation-induced error for a $10 \times$ beam expansion of a 100-mj beam produces a temperature error of only 1 K and a wind error of less than 1 m/s depending on wind technique used, which is comparable to the rest of the system error. These results imply that semidiurnal and diurnal wind and temperature measurements are possible without a significant increase in the overall measurement error. Note, however, that measurements of the Na density (which use the absolute strength of the cross section) will be in error when saturation occurs.

A comparison of the errors for the two wind techniques shows that the present wind technique (W1) is a nearly symmetric measurement about $f_a$ and is much less sensitive to frequency and temperature errors than the second technique (W2), which relies on a nonsymmetric measurement. This is particularly evident in the sensitivity of W2 to temperature errors $\sim 1.3$ m/s/K. This strong dependence of the wind velocity on the temperature implies that several iterations between the two lookup tables $T(R, v_R)$ and $v_R(R_{W_2}, T)$ would need to be performed for self-consistent results.

The W2 technique does have a distinct advantage over W1 because one can significantly reduce density variations without averaging if the laser can be tuned on a shot-to-shot basis. Thus, although W2 is not as accurate as W1 at the peak of the Na layer, it has the potential to be insensitive to density variations and thus can provide a more accurate measurement over the entire layer with a greater temporal resolution. These errors can be significantly reduced if the data are postprocessed, but they cannot be eliminated. In addition, no effort was made to optimize the frequency used for the wind measurement for the W2 technique. Optimizing this frequency should decrease the measurement sensitivity to temperature that is the major component of the overall error.

6. Conclusion

A systematic method for the determination of the accuracy of resonance–fluorescence lidar systems has been presented. Furthermore, a general procedure to determine the backscatter cross section that incorporates intensity, divergence, and magnetic-field effects was developed and applied to a specific system. For Na narrowband resonance–fluorescence lidar systems, significant saturation can occur, but the system will still yield accurate measurements, which leads to the prospect of daytime wind and temperature measurements to detect semidiurnal and diurnal effects. The sensitivity of the W/TL system to errors is critically dependent on the choice of the operating point and can vary widely for the same system at differing operating points. Current operational systems are nearly shot-noise limited for both tempera-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pulse Characteristics</th>
<th>Temperature Uncertainty</th>
<th>Wind Uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error in $T$ (K)</td>
<td>$N_{fa}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 mJ and 1 mrad</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>$-226,000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 mJ and 0.5 mrad</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$-226,000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 mJ and 1 mrad</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>$-226,000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 mJ and 0.1 mrad</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>$-43,000$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated for 7-ns pulses at 92 km with $\Delta t = 60$ s.
tures and winds when weighted-averaging techniques are used to minimize errors from density fluctuations. Acousto-optic techniques are being developed that can reduce these errors without one's having to resort to averaging; such developments should provide the potential for better temporal resolution.

Appendix A: Summary of Na Spectroscopy
To understand saturation and optical-pumping effects in Na, it is necessary to understand the electron eigenstates and allowed transitions that form the Na D₂ line. The D₂ line of the Na emission has a nominal wavelength of 589.158 nm and is formed by transitions from the ⁴P₃/₂ excited state to the ³S₁/₂ ground state. It has a natural lifetime t נ of 16.40 ± 0.03 ns and an oscillator strength of 0.6357 ± 0.0011.¹⁷ When hyperfine interactions from nuclear–electron spin coupling are included, each of these two states is split. The ³S₁/₂ ground state splits into two levels separated by 1771 MHz, with total angular momentum quantum numbers of f = 1, 2 (see Fig. 6). Because the ⁴P₃/₂ upper state has higher angular momentum, it splits into four hyperfine states, with total angular momentum quantum numbers of F = 0, 1, 2, 3. Finally, the geomagnetic field will Zeeman-split each hyperfine state into 2F + 1 substates. Each Zeeman substate is designated by its magnetic quantum number m_F, where -F ≤ m_F ≤ F. For the magnitude of the Earth's magnetic field over Urbana, Illinois, the Zeeman separation is at most 1.6 MHz.

Of the 1431 possible transitions, only 54 satisfy the selection rules for dipole radiation: ΔF < 2, Δm_F < 2, and if ΔF = 0 then Δm_F ≠ 0.¹⁸ Although transitions of higher order are possible, the strengths of these transitions are negligible compared with the dipole terms.¹⁹

The geomagnetic field provides each atom with a preferred axis of orientation along the field lines, and this leads to a definite polarization structure for the atoms. Transitions for which Δm_F = 0 emit along the axis of orientation (τ); transitions for Δm_F = ±1 emit clockwise circular polarization along the axis (σ⁺); transitions for Δm_F = ±1 emit counterclockwise circular polarization along the axis (σ⁻).

Exact treatment for arbitrary excitation, detection, and polarization must include all 24 states and 54 transitions through a density-matrix approach. Often, assumptions can be made that reduce the complexity of this approach. In the atmosphere, the excitation beam is spectrally broad with respect to the spread of the Zeeman states. In addition, it contains a nearly uniform combination of all three polarization states. Under these conditions, Zeeman levels may be grouped by their total angular momentum quantum numbers, F or F. Transition strengths for each group are determined by summation over the individual Zeeman transition strengths which are determined by the Hanle effect. The states and transitions defined under this approximation are shown in Fig. 7.

1. Doppler-Free Features in Na Vapor
The Na-vapor cell was fabricated by placement of solid Na into an evacuated glass tube. After the cell was sealed, a temperature-dependent equilibrium forms between Na in the solid phase and that in the vapor phase. The concentration of Na vapor in the cell at equilibrium is determined by the temperature of the cell and the vapor pressure of Na: higher temperatures increase the concentration of sodium vapor. For low levels of laser excitation, this vapor is in thermal equilibrium with the walls of the cell.

To understand the spectroscopy of this vapor, it is convenient to discuss the response for each individual velocity ensemble within the Boltzmann distribution. First, examine the excitation for a general ensemble with nonzero velocity in the positive z direction. As the frequency of the counterpropagating laser beams is swept through the Na resonance, the beam traveling in the positive z direction will interact with each of the six hyperfine transitions of this ensemble, but, because the ensemble is moving with velocity vz in the direction of light propagation, the fluorescence in the laboratory (rest) frame is downshifted from the zero-velocity fluorescence by vz/λ. The response of this velocity ensemble that results from the other beam is similar, except that the response is now upshifted by vz/λ. Thus, each velocity ensemble will, in general, generate 12 narrow spikes of fluorescence, with ensembles of higher velocity responding farther away from the zero-velocity transition frequencies. Because we have no way of distinguishing the response from individual velocity ensembles, we detect the sum of the fluorescence of all velocity ensembles, weighted by the Boltzmann distribution of each ensemble.

---

Fig. 6. Energy levels that compose the Na D₂ transition. Numbers preceded by 'X' indicate the magnifications of the energy difference.
Except for the factor of 2 that results from two beams instead of one, this sum would generate the usual linear cross section described by Eq. 5.

The above description is true for most velocity ensembles in the vapor cell. However, some velocity ensembles will have special excitations. For the stationary velocity ensemble, no Doppler shift will occur, and, if properly tuned, both probing laser beams excite transitions from the same ground state. If the intensity of each of these two beams is strong enough, the ground state will be depleted, and the fluorescence response for this velocity ensemble will be reduced from the linear value. This effect will appear as Lamb dips in the linear fluorescence spectrum that are centered around the zero-velocity transition frequencies (both beams excite the same transition) and around the midpoints between these transitions (the beams excite different transitions from the same ground state). Finite transition and laser linewidths serve to blend these dips, which forms the Doppler-free features at $f_a$ and $f_c$. Our description is further complicated by the fact that each transition saturates according to its strength, which implies that a numerical simulation is necessary to fully describe the Doppler-free features.

One more special excitation exists. Some ensembles of atoms will have a z velocity such that atoms interacting with that beam are upshifted to one of the D$_{2a}$ transitions, while the same set of atoms interacts with the other beam downshifted to a D$_{2b}$ transition (and vice versa). For this ensemble, atoms are simultaneously excited from both ground-state manifolds. Hence, optical pumping cannot occur and the fluorescence is increased. This process generates the crossover feature around the midpoint between the D$_{2a}$ and D$_{2b}$ resonances.

2. Hanle Effect

The Hanle effect is the depolarization of the radiation characteristics of an atom in the presence of an external magnetic field. An external magnetic field $B$ creates an axis of symmetry for the atom $z$ axis in a spherical coordinate system. Propagation of the outgoing laser field is denoted by $k$, and the general elliptic polarization state is then described with respect to a set of polarization axes $i_0$ and $d_0$, as shown in Fig. 8, where $i_0$ is confined to the x-y plane. This special coordinate system will be referred to as the natural coordinate system to differentiate it from the laboratory system in which the measurements are defined.

For an accurate representation of the Na fluorescence, one must solve a rate equation for the density matrix of the excited states $\rho_{mm'}$ of the scattering process given by

$$\frac{d\rho_{mm'}}{dt} = -i[V, \rho_{mm'}] - \sum_{m'm'} G_{mm'm'm'} \rho_{m'm'} + F_{mm'},$$

where $V$ is the energy operator of the interaction between the atom and the external magnetic field, $\Gamma$ describes the relaxation (emission) process, and $F_{mm'}$ describes the excitation (absorption) of the atoms by the external light source. This equation may be cast into a more useful form (separating the geometry, symmetry, and selection rules from the dynamics of the density matrix) if we expand the equation in terms of spherical irreducible tensor operators. The resulting rate equation for each component of the density matrix is

$$\frac{d\rho_k^k}{dt} = i\mu_B g q B \rho_k^k - \gamma_k \rho_k^k + F_k^k,$$

where $\mu_B$ is the Bohr magneton, $g$ is the Landé g factor for the excited state, and $B$ is the geomagnetic-field strength. The term $\rho_0^0$ is proportional to the population of the excited level, $\rho_0^2$ are dipole terms and are proportional to the average value of the qth circular component (defined in the same manner as the spherical polarization vectors given below) of the total angular momentum of the excited atoms, and $\rho_0^2$...
are quadrupole terms. The indices have the ranges \( 0 \leq k \leq 2 \) and \(-k \leq q \leq k\) such that higher-order terms are neglected. We obtain the solution to Eq. (A2) by using the following assumptions:

1. The incident light bandwidth is much broader than the Zeeman splitting of the excited state or magnetic Zeeman splitting for the \( F = 3 \) state is 1.6 MHz.
2. Excitation occurs only from the various ground-state sublevels.
3. Interference terms between sublevels of the excited state and non-diagonal elements of the ground-state sublevels.
4. The magnetic field is weak.
5. The sublevels of the ground state are equally populated.
6. The receiver response is broad with respect to the full sodium resonance.

With these assumptions, the scattered field for each hyperfine transition is given by\(^{22}\)

\[
R_{\text{RF}}[\hat{e}, \hat{u}, B] = R_0(-1)^{l-f-j} \hat{A}_F |f|^2 \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( -1 \right)^{k-q} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & k \\ f & j & j' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & k \\ j & j' & j'' \end{pmatrix} \right] \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & k \\ f & j & j' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & k \\ j & j' & j'' \end{pmatrix} \times \hat{\Phi}_k(\hat{e} \hat{q}_u \hat{u}) |1 + i q g \mu_B B / \hbar |^{-1},
\]

where \( R_0 \) is a constant proportional to the reduced matrix elements \( |j l d l|_0 |j l d l|_0' \), \( \hat{A}_F \) accounts for different excitation rates for each hyperfine transition, \( |f| = 2f + 1 \), and \( j' \) are the total spin quantum numbers of the upper and lower states \( 3/2 \) and \( 1/2 \) respectively, \( l \) is the nuclear spin quantum number \( 3/2 \), \( \cdots \) denotes the Wigner 6j symbol, \( \hat{e} \) and \( \hat{u} \) are the polarization unit vectors of the exciting and detected light, respectively, \( g_0 \) is the Landé g factor for the excited state \( 2/3 \), \( \tau = 16.40 \pm 0.03 \) ns is the lifetime of the Na atom, \( B \) is the geomagnetic-field strength in tesla, \( \mu_B \) is the Bohr magneton and is \( 9.27408 \times 10^{-24} \) J T\(^{-1} \), and \( \hbar = 1.054589 \times 10^{-34} \) J s. The \( \Phi \) terms in Eq. (A3) are a modified version of those given by D’Yakonov\(^{20}\):

\[
\Phi_{k}^{1/2} \hat{e} = (-1)^k 2k + 1 \sum_{q_1 q_2} (-2)^{q_1} e_{q_1} e_{q_2}^* \times \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & k \\ q_1 & -q_2 & -k \end{pmatrix}, -1 \leq q_1, q_2 \leq 1,
\]

where \( \hat{e} \) is the expansion of the polarization vector in terms of the spherical polarization basis vectors given by

\[
\hat{e}_{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (x + i y), \quad \sigma^z \text{ polarizations},
\]

\[
\hat{e}_{0} = \hat{z}, \quad \pi \text{ polarization}.
\]

For the general elliptic polarization shown in Fig. 8 we have

\[
\hat{e} = \cos \gamma \hat{x}' + \sin \gamma \hat{y}', \quad -\pi/4 \leq \gamma \leq \pi/4,
\]

\[
\hat{x}' = \cos \beta \hat{e}_0 + \sin \beta \hat{e}_0^*, \quad 0 \leq \beta \leq \pi,
\]

\[
\hat{y}' = \sin \beta \hat{e}_0 + \cos \beta \hat{e}_0^*.
\]

where \( \gamma = 0 \) corresponds to linear polarization and \( \gamma = \pm \pi/4 \) corresponds to circular polarization. For a wave propagating in the direction \( \theta, \phi \), as defined above,

\[
\hat{\theta}_0 = \cos \phi \cos \theta \hat{x} + \sin \phi \cos \theta \hat{y} - \sin \theta \hat{z},
\]

\[
\hat{\phi}_0 = \sin \phi \hat{x} + \cos \phi \hat{y}.
\]

Finding the projection of \( \hat{e} \) on the basis vectors that are defined in Eqs. (A5) we obtain

\[
\hat{e}_{-1} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\cos \beta \cos \gamma \cos \theta \mp \sin \gamma - i \sin \beta \sin \gamma \cos \theta \mp \cos \gamma \exp(\pm i \phi)),
\]

\[
\hat{e}_0 = -\cos \gamma \cos \beta - i \sin \gamma \sin \beta \sin \theta.
\]

Thus \( \Phi \) can be written as

\[
\Phi_{k}^{1/2} \hat{e} = -1/\sqrt{3},
\]

\[
\Phi_{k}^{3/2} \hat{e} = 1/\sqrt{2} \sin 2\gamma \cos \theta,
\]

\[
\Phi_{\pm 1/2} \hat{e} = -1/2 \sin 2\gamma \sin \theta \exp(\pm i \phi),
\]

\[
\Phi_{2/1} \hat{e} = -1/\sqrt{6} (1 - \frac{1}{2} (1 + \cos 2\beta \cos 2\gamma \sin^2 \theta))|
\]

\[
\pm i \sin 2\beta \cos 2\gamma \sin \theta \exp(\pm i \phi),
\]

\[
\Phi_{2/1} \hat{e} = 1/2 \cos 2\beta \cos 2\gamma |\frac{1}{2} (1 + \cos 2\beta \cos 2\gamma)|
\]

\[
\times \sin^2 \theta \pm \sin 2\beta \cos 2\gamma \theta \exp(\pm i \phi).
\]

Fig. 8. Geometry for the coordinate transformation required to determine the Hanle effect.
Normally lidar receivers are unpolarized. An unpolarized receiver is the sum of two orthogonal polarizations. Taking the sum of Eq. (A8) for $\beta, \gamma$ and for $|\beta + \pi/2, \gamma|$ gives the following solution for the receiver-geometry dependence in the natural system:

\[
\Phi_{0}^{1} b = -2/\sqrt{3}, \quad \Phi_{0,1}^{1} b = 0,
\]
\[
\Phi_{0}^{2} b = -2/\sqrt{6} (1 - 3/2 \sin^{2} \theta_{r}),
\]
\[
\Phi_{0,1}^{2} b = \pm \sin \phi_{r} \cos \theta_{r} \exp \pm i \phi_{r},
\]
\[
\Phi_{0,2}^{2} b = -1/2 \sin^{2} \theta_{r} \exp \pm i 2 \phi_{r}.
\]

Thus the polarization terms in the solution for a linearly polarized transmitter and an unpolarized receiver are

\[
\Phi_{0}^{0} \Phi_{0}^{0} b = \gamma,
\]
\[
\Phi_{0,1}^{0} \Phi_{0,1}^{0} b = 0,
\]
\[
\Phi_{0,2}^{0} \Phi_{0,2}^{0} b = |\gamma| (1 - (\gamma \sin^{2} \theta_{r}) |1 - (\gamma)|)
\times [1 + \cos 2 \beta] \sin^{2} (\theta_{r}),
\]
\[
\Phi_{0,1}^{1} \Phi_{0,2}^{1} b = -|\gamma| \sin \theta_{r} \cos \theta_{r} \sin (\theta_{r})
\times [1 + \cos 2 \beta] \sin \theta_{r} \exp [\pm i \phi_{r} - \phi_{0}],
\]
\[
\Phi_{0,2}^{2} \Phi_{0,2}^{2} b = -|\gamma| \sin^{2} \theta_{r} \exp \pm i 2 \phi_{r}.
\]

We must now obtain the angles $\theta, \phi$, and $\beta$ that were defined for the natural coordinate system of Fig. 9 in terms of the corresponding angles in the laboratory coordinate system. Referring to Fig. 9, we take a geographical east, north, and vertical system and define the magnetic unit vector $\hat{b}$ to make an angle $l + \pi/2$ with the vertical axis $\hat{y}$ and an angle $D$ with the north axis $\hat{n}$. The propagation vector $\hat{k}$ makes an angle $\gamma$ with the vertical axis and an angle $\psi$ with the east axis. In a manner completely analogous to the definition of the polarization-vector rotation angle in the natural coordinate system we define the corresponding angle $\alpha$. Then we can rotate the coordinates through the Euler angles $[-D, -|l + \pi/2|, 0]$ to put $\hat{b}$ on the $z$ axis. This gives a rotation matrix

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\cos D & -\sin D & 0 \\
\sin D \sin l & -\cos D \sin l & -\cos l \\
\sin D \cos l & \cos D \cos l & -\sin l
\end{bmatrix}
\]

which is to be applied to the vectors $\hat{k}, \hat{b},$ and $\hat{\phi}$.

We can now use vector relations to obtain expressions for the desired angles. The angle $\theta$ is found from $\cos \theta = \hat{k} \cdot \hat{b}$. $\phi_{0}$ is given by $\phi_{0} = k \times b \sin \theta$. Because $\phi_{0}$ is perpendicular to $\hat{b}$, it is easy to show that $\sin \phi_{0} = \hat{\phi} \cdot \hat{b}$. Finally, because $\phi_{0}$ is perpendicular to $\hat{k}$, we can show that $\sin \beta = \hat{\phi} \cdot b$.

At the University of Illinois laser radar installation, the magnetic field in the vicinity of the vapor cell has a declination of $-40^\circ$ (measured at the location of the vapor cell), an estimated inclination of $70^\circ$, and an estimated field strength of 56.6 $\mu$T. If we normalize the oscillator strengths to the $f = 1, F = 0$ transition with a value of 2 as this transition does not depend on the magnetic field, the relative oscillator strengths are obtained with the ratios $5.5:5.2:15.6:5:0.98$, when the magnetic field is zero. The results of the above analysis for the west-going beam into the Na-vapor cell for vertical and horizontal polarizations gives the relative oscillator strengths shown in Table 5. It is important to note that these values will vary from location to location, including locations in the atmosphere. With these same computations, the atmospheric oscillator-strength ratios over Urbana have been determined to be $5.5:48:2:15.6:5:0.98$. If ignored, these changes result in a derived temperature bias of $1.4 ~K$ and a derived wind-velocity bias of $0.7 ~m/s$. The computations shown in this section must be recomputed for each lidar site, beam direction, and polarization for which this technique is used because of the large variations in magnetic-field direction around the globe.

### Appendix B: Simulations

To properly calibrate the vapor cell and assess the effects of saturation and optical pumping in the atmosphere, one must use a model for the sodium $D_{2}$ line. A rate-equation approach is valid for pulse lengths of the order of the transition lifetime ($\sim 16 \text{ ns}$).

#### Table 5. Relative Oscillator Strengths for a Beam Traveling West through the Vapor Cell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Horizontal</th>
<th>Vertical</th>
<th>Ratio $H/V$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>14.62</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A. The rate equations that describe a vapor cell. The degeneracy of state $x$ is $g_x$, and $\xi_{y/t}$, which is the excitation for this ensemble, is given by

\[
\xi_{y/t}(v_R, r) = \frac{1}{\hbar f} \int d\sigma_{y/t} f \, d \Omega(f, t, v_R, r). \tag{B2}
\]

The lifetime of each transition $\tau_y$ is related to the strength of transition $y$, $S_y$, to the lifetime of the $D_2$ resonance by

\[
\tau_y = \tau_{Na} \frac{S_y}{\sum S_y}. \tag{B3}
\]

The single fitted parameter $\tau_C$ is related to the rate at which atoms cross the area of the beam. It represents a replenishing rate of atoms entering the beam from the surrounding equilibrium. In the atmosphere, the beam radius is large compared with expected horizontal wind velocities, and $\tau_C \rightarrow \infty$.

The line shape of each transition, $\sigma_{y/f}$, is Lorentzian:

\[
\sigma_{y/f} = \frac{1}{4 \pi c \sigma_0^2} \frac{S_y}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\left(f - f_y\right)^2 + \left(\Delta f_y/2\right)^2}, \tag{B4}
\]

where $f_y$ is the center frequency of transition $y$ and $S_0$ is the fraction of the unit oscillator strength for the entire $D_2$ line. The spectral FWHM of each transition is determined by

\[
\Delta f_y = \frac{\Delta \omega_{FWHM}}{2\pi} = \frac{1}{\tau_y \pi}. \tag{B5}
\]

The excitation intensity $I_{y/f}(t, v_R, r)$ will vary with different excitations but is assumed to be Gaussian both spectrally and spatially with a time dependence $\phi(t)$. For a single beam, the excitation intensity will be

\[
I_{y/f}(t, v_R, r) = \frac{1}{2\pi \sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2} e^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{r^2}{2\sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2\pi \sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2}\right) \exp \left(-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2}\right) \phi(t). \tag{B6}
\]

The lateral beam width $\sigma_1^2(z)$ is defined in terms of the full angle divergence $\phi$ by

\[
\sigma_1^2(z) = \sigma_0 + \frac{z}{2}. \tag{B7}
\]

In the vapor cell, the second term in Eq. (B7) is ignored. Spectrally, the excitation has rms width $\sigma_1$
centered at the laser tuning frequency \( f \), which is Doppler shifted by \(-v_n \lambda \). For cw excitation, the intensity time dependence \( \phi(t) \) is only the spatially integrated beam intensity. The pulse excitation is the total energy in the pulse \( E \) multiplied by a normalized temporal function that represents the temporal pulse shape. For the pulse shape assumed in this work, the pulse-intensity time dependence is\(^{13}\)

\[
\phi(t) = E \frac{t}{2\tau^2} \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{4\tau^2}\right), \tag{B8}\]

where \( \tau \) is defined in terms of the rms pulse length as

\[
\tau = \frac{\Delta t_{\text{rms}}}{(2 - \pi/2)^{1/2}}. \tag{B9}\]

These rate equations are used to simulate both saturation and optical-pumping effects in the atmosphere, as well as the Doppler-free spectroscopy of the vapor cell. We note that, although a specific temporal envelope is used, the results are relatively independent of the pulse shape as long as rms values are used.\(^{13}\)

2. Saturation and Optical Pumping in the Six-Level Model

Typically, saturation effects are described with atoms that have only two energy levels. When an atom that is originally in the ground state is excited at the transition frequency, the probability of the atom being in the ground state is reduced while the probability of the atom being in the upper state is increased. This reduces the probability for the atom to absorb another photon and causes a bleaching of the absorption. Moreover, the finite probability of the atom being in the upper state increases the probability of stimulated emission. This is particularly deleterious to resonance lidars because the stimulated photon travels along the excitation beam, i.e., travels opposite to the direction of the detector. These nonlinear effects depend on the intensity of the beam at the Na layer. Because atmospheric transmittance may vary, it is difficult to ascertain the exact intensity of the beam at the layer, which in turn makes determination of the layer saturation difficult.

When an atom with multiple ground states is excited with a narrow-bandwidth source, optical pumping can also serve to reduce the effective-fluorescence cross section (see Subsection 3.B). To determine the percent saturation for a given pulse in the atmosphere, Eq. (B1) is solved for each velocity ensemble and each location in the beam under the assumption of isolated conditions \( \tau_C \rightarrow \infty \). The excitation intensity is computed with Eqs. (B6–B9). The total saturated response is computed from the results of all ensembles as

\[
R_{\text{sat}}(f_1) = \int dv_r \int dr \int dt \sum_x N_{E_x} \phi_{\text{exc}}(t, v_R, r) \frac{1}{\tau_{E_x}}, \tag{B10}\]

where \( \tau_{E_x} \) is the parallel combination of all decay from state \( E_x \). The linear response is determined in similar fashion except that the lower-state populations, \( N_{E_1} \) and \( N_{E_2} \), are held constant at a Boltzmann distribution for the duration of the simulation. Saturation is defined as the percent decrease in the saturated response compared with the linear response.

3. Vapor-Cell Simulation and Absolute Frequency Calibration

The Doppler-free fluorescence response of Na vapor is produced by simultaneous excitation of the vapor with two counterpropagating beams, which produces the Doppler-free features shown in Fig. 10. This introduces two terms into the excitation intensity, one for the leftward-traveling beam, the other for the rightward-traveling beam. The driving excitation then becomes

\[
\epsilon_1(f, v_R, r) = \frac{1}{\hbar\omega} \int df_{\text{a}1} \int f \left| I_{\text{a}1}(f, v_R, r) + I_{\text{a}2}(f, -v_R, r) \right|. \tag{B11}\]

The vapor-cell fluorescence response may be determined from the steady-state solutions of Eqs. (B1). Solutions are computed for all positions and velocity.
The only free parameter in the simulation is and the crossover transitions, from which the absorption meter. The frequency vapor cell and a 0.5-m confocal Fabry–Perot interferometer. The frequencies from the Doppler-free features of the vapor cell. Without this term, the simulation tends between the two ground-state manifolds that is caused by the collisional and boundary effects within the vapor cell. Without this term, the simulation tends to overestimate the effects of optical pumping for the D2b peak, which decreases the overall fluorescence relative to what is experimentally measured. Discrepancies also exist within the Doppler-free features relative to what is experimentally measured. Discrepancies also exist within the Doppler-free features. Figure 10 shows the comparison between the experimental fluorescence response and the response determined from the simulation through the use of Eqs. (B1–B11). Figure 10a shows the entire fit. Figures 10b and 10c show the detail within the peak and the crossover transitions, from which the absolute laser frequency can be determined to ±2 MHz. The only free parameter in the simulation is , the beam traversal rate, which was chosen to minimize the difference between the vapor-cell simulation and its measurements.

The difference in the background fluorescence near the D2b, peak is from the lack of an equilization term between the two ground-state manifolds that is caused by the collisional and boundary effects within the vapor cell. Without this term, the simulation tends to overestimate the effects of optical pumping for the D2b peak, which decreases the overall fluorescence relative to what is experimentally measured. Discrepancies also exist within the Doppler-free features shown in Figs. 10b and 10c. These differences are probably due to the relatively broadband excitation that is assumed in the six-state model. The cw laser that excites the vapor cell has an rms linewidth of approximately 500 kHz. This linewidth is narrower than the separation of the individual Zeeman splittings of the hyperfine transitions and leads to the necessity of a more accurate model of the vapor-cell response that uses the full 24-state description of the Na atoms. Finally, the best-fit result for was approximately 1 order of magnitude larger than was expected for the cell temperature and beam diameter; this result reflects that several effects that are not included in this model are important for exact agreement. However, the six-level rate-equation simulation is sufficient because the absolute laser frequency error does not dominate the total system error.

Once the absolute laser frequency is known, an automated tuning algorithm defines the four lock frequencies from the Doppler-free features of the vapor cell and a 0.5-m confocal Fabry–Perot interferometer. The frequency is defined to be the point at which the vapor-cell response rises above the minimum of the D2b Lamb dip on the high-frequency side by 15% of the depth of the dip (see Fig. 10b). The frequency is defined to be the point at which the vapor-cell response drops to 85% of its maximum value on the high-frequency side of the crossover feature (see Fig. 10c). Each time a wind measurement is made, a Fabry–Perot interferometer with a spectral range of 150 MHz is tuned through four resonance peaks to produce the 600-MHz shift from to generate and . The fitted data yield absolute frequencies for the tuning algorithm of , , and . The fitted data yield absolute frequencies for the tuning algorithm of , , and .

**Appendix C: Derivation of Density Variations**

Here we present a derivation of the effects of density variations on temperature and wind measurements. We start with a modified form of Eq. (3)

\[
R(z, t, \Delta t) = \frac{N_f(z, t + \Delta t)}{N_f(z, t)} = \frac{\sigma_{ef}(f_1)\rho_u(z, t + \Delta t)}{\sigma_{ef}(f_2)\rho_u(z, t)},
\]

that suppresses the functional dependence of on the various system parameters and replaces the measurement interval by the integration time . This approximation is valid as long as the dead time that is required between profiles to write the data and to tune the laser is much less than the integration time , as it is in our WTL system. The density profile , , may be written as

\[
\rho_u(z, t + \Delta t) = \bar{\rho}_s + \rho_u',
\]

where is the mean density profile and is a perturbation from the mean over the time interval . The functional dependence of both terms has been suppressed for clarity. Using Eq. (C2) in Eq. (C1), we can write the ratio as

\[
R = R\left(1 + \frac{\rho_u'}{\bar{\rho}_s}\right),
\]

where is the mean ratio and the variation from the mean is

\[
\frac{\Delta R}{R} = \frac{\rho_u'}{\bar{\rho}_s},
\]

or

\[
R' = r_s,
\]

where is the relative perturbation in the ratio caused by density fluctuations and is used to be consistent with Ref. 15. Equations (C4a) and (C4b) are equivalent to Eq. (20) of Ref. 1.

The relative perturbations in the Na density can be related to the relative atmospheric perturbations with

\[
r_s = \frac{1}{(\gamma - 1)}[1 - (z - z_0)\gamma H/\sigma_0^2]r_a,
\]

where is the rms thickness of the unperturbed Na layer (~4.2 km), is the atmospheric scale height (~6 km), is the centroid height (~92 km), and is the ratio of specific heats (1.4). With Eqs. (C4) and (C5), the relative change in the ratio is given by

\[
R' = \frac{1}{(\gamma - 1)}[1 - (z - z_0)\gamma H/\sigma_0^2]r_a.
\]
The temporal dependence of the relative perturbation in the ratio \( R^\prime \) is determined through the use of differentials. For example, the perturbation in a time interval \( \Delta t \) is given by

\[
\Delta R^\prime(z, \Delta t) = \frac{1}{1 - |1 - (z - z_0)yH/\sigma_0^2|} \frac{\partial ra}{\partial t} \Delta t.
\]  

(C7)

To find the variance of these perturbations, we square both sides of Eq. (C7), take the expectation, and multiply and divide by the expectation of the square of \( r_a, |r_a|^2 \):

\[
|\Delta R^\prime(z, \Delta t)|^2 = r_a^2 \frac{\Delta t^2}{|1 - |1 - (z - z_0)yH/\sigma_0^2|^2} \left[ 1 - |z - z_0|yH/\sigma_0^2 \right] \times \left( \left[ \frac{\partial r_a}{\partial t} \right]^2 / |r_a|^2 \right).
\]  

(C8)

The last term in square brackets on the right-hand side of Eq. (C8) is \( \omega_{rms}^2 \), the rms temporal frequency [see Eq. (38) of Ref. 15]. It is related to the rms temporal period \( T_{rms} \) by \( T_{rms} = 2\pi / \omega_{rms} \). The rms temporal period \( T_{rms} \) represents the time over which the random wave field is correlated. For times less than \( T_{rms} \), the random fluctuations are small.

Rewriting Eq. (C8) in terms of \( T_{rms} \) and taking the square root of each side we obtain

\[
|\Delta R^\prime(z, \Delta t)| = \frac{1}{T_{rms}} \frac{2\pi \Delta t}{|1 - |1 - (z - z_0)yH/\sigma_0^2|^2} \times \left( \left[ \frac{\partial r_a}{\partial t} \right]^2 / |r_a|^2 \right).
\]  

(C9)

The correlation time \( T_{rms} \) and variance of the relative atmospheric perturbations \( |r_a|^2 \) have been experimentally measured and the yearly mean values are \( T_{rms} = 44 \) min, and \( |r_a|^2 \) = 5.6%. Note that there is a significant seasonal dependence of these values. Table 6 shows the relative error as a function of integration time \( \Delta t \) and the altitude when the yearly mean values are used. Relative errors as large as 10% occur for 1-min integrations at the bottom side of the layer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Magnitude of the Percent Relative Density Error as a Function of z and the Time Between Profiles ( \Delta t )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optimal averaging can significantly reduce the density fluctuations for both temperature and wind measurements that are calculated with Eq. (C9). Using a temperature measurement as an example, we write \( R^\prime \) in terms of weighted density profiles:

\[
R^\prime(\Delta t) = r_{sp} - r_{sc},
\]  

(C10)

where

\[
r_{sp} = \frac{\alpha r_a t - 2\Delta t + r_s t + \alpha r_a t + 2\Delta t}{1 + 2\alpha},
\]  

(C11)

\[
r_{sc} = \frac{\beta r_a t - 3\Delta t + r_s t - \Delta t + r_s t + \Delta t + \beta r_a t + 3\Delta t}{2 + \beta}.
\]  

(C12)

The coefficients \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are determined by integration in the ratio \( R^\prime \) over the integration time over which the random wave field is correlated. For times less than \( T_{rms} \), the random fluctuations are small.

We now rewrite Eq. (C13) in terms of the relative atmospheric perturbations using Eq. (C5):

\[
R^\prime(\Delta t) = \left[ \frac{\Delta t^6}{32} \frac{\partial r_s^6}{\partial t^6} \right].
\]  

(C13)

To estimate the derivative of the atmospheric density fluctuations, we square both sides of Eq. (C14), take the expectation, and rewrite the temporal derivative in terms of the temporal power spectral density \( F_a(\omega) \) as

\[
|\Delta R^\prime(z, \Delta t)| = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty \omega^2 F_a(\omega) d\omega,
\]  

(C15)

where the lower limit of integration on the power spectral density corresponds to the inertial frequency \( f \sim 35 \) h, and the upper limit \( \omega_c \) corresponds to the filter cutoff used during data processing, which takes on a maximum value of \( N \), the buoyancy frequency. Using a model temporal power spectral density of the form:

\[
F_a(\omega) = \frac{2\pi}{\omega_c^2} (r_a^2),
\]  

(C16)
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we find that the relative error in the ratio after averaging is

$$\left( \left| R/\Delta t \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} = \left( \left| r/\Delta t \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{4}{\Omega_0} \frac{f}{\Omega_0} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{\omega_0 \Delta t}{2} \right)^{1/2} \times \frac{1}{|\gamma| - 1} \left[ 1 - |z - z_0| \gamma H / \omega_0^2 \right] \right).$$

A comparison of Eq. (C17) with Eq. (C9) shows that the reduction in the density error for a temperature measurement that used the weighted-averaging procedure is

$$\frac{2\pi \Delta t}{T_{\text{rms}}} \left( \frac{4}{\Omega_0} \frac{f}{\Omega_0} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{\omega_0 \Delta t}{2} \right)^{1/2} \times \frac{1}{|\gamma| - 1} \left[ 1 - |z - z_0| \gamma H / \omega_0^2 \right] \right).$$

If $\omega_0 = N = 2\pi/5 \text{ min}$ (the buoyancy frequency) is used, then $f = 2\pi/35 \text{ h}$ (the inertial frequency), and the parameters from Table 6 are used, the reduction in the density error varies from $-75$ for $\Delta t = 1 \text{ min}$ to $>2000$ for $\Delta t < 30 \text{ s}$. Similar expressions can be derived for wind measurements. The values calculated in Table 6 are scaled by the factor given in Eq. (C18) and listed in Table 3.
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