Title
On the existence of characteristic diffuse light in natural waters

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7xc5x628

Author
Preisendorfer,, Rudolph W

Publication Date
1958-08-08

Visibility Laboratory
University of California
Scripps Institution of Oceanography
San Diego 52, California

ON THE EXISTENCE OF CHARACTERISTIC DIFFUSE LIGHT

IN NATURAL WATERS

Rudolph W. Preisendorfer

Approved: Approved for Distribution:

Seibert Q. Duntley, Director   Roger Revelle, Director
Visibility Laboratory   Scripps Institution of Oceanography

On the Existence of Characteristic Diffuse Light in Natural Waters[*]

Rudolph W. Preisendorfer

Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California

La Jolla, California

ABSTRACT

It is shown that the radiance distributions in homogeneous natural waters approach an asymptotic radiance distribution with increasing depth. In this way the conjecture by L. V. Whitney concerning the existence of characteristic diffuse light in natural waters is proved. A brief discussion is included of the equations governing the angular form of the characteristic diffuse light.

INTRODUCTION

Recent experimental evidence (Tyler, 1958) forms the basis for fresh support of the long-standing conjecture that the radiance distribution about a point in an optically deep natural hydrosol approaches, with increasing depth, a characteristic form which is independent of the external lighting conditions and the optical state of the surface of the medium, and which depends only on the inherent optical properties of the medium. This conjecture was apparently given its first definitive formulation by Whitney (1941a), (1941b), who referred

to the asymptotic radiance distribution as the <u>characteristic diffuse</u> <u>light</u>. In this note we complement the experimental evidence in favor of this conjecture by supplying a simple proof of the existence of characteristic diffuse light in all homogeneous optically deep natural waters. The discussion concludes with a derivation of the integral equation governing the angular structure of the characteristic diffuse light and a brief discussion of an interesting and tractable example, for the case of isotropic scattering.

We note in passing that since the time of the formulation of the asymptotic radiance hypothesis by Whitney, its domain of applicability has been widened considerably. The problem of a limiting angular distribution has since been encountered in modern neutron transport theory but basically as an abstract mathematical problem rather than experimental phenomenon. A similar type of problem has long been extant in astrophysical radiative transfer. A general proof of the existence of an asymptotic radiance distribution which covers all these contexts has recently been devised (Preisendorfer, 1958a).

Despite the widening of the domain of applicability of the hypothesis, it still retains its greatest usefulness in the context of geophysical optics. For in this field, unlike the others mentioned above, the trend to a characteristic limiting form is a directly observable phenomenon. Furthermore the existence of such a form is of inestimable importance to all experimental research work dealing with the determination of the optical properties of natural waters.

In many important instances, knowledge that an asymptotic radiance distribution exists will obviate the necessity for experimental probings to extremely large depths; for such knowledge will allow, by means of relatively simple formulas, the accurate prediction of the geometrical structure of the light field in the great-depth ranges. Some of these practical consequences of the asymptotic radiance hypothesis recently have been formulated (Preisendorfer 1958b).

PHYSICAL BACKGROUND OF THE METHOD OF PROOF

The argument used by Whitney in establishing experimental evidence for the asymptotic radiance hypothesis went basically as follows: he showed that when the experimentally obtained plots of radiance distributions at various large depths were all blown up to the same size, they formed a set of nearly congruent figures. Now, an interesting feature of such radiance distributions is that they assume the same _shape_, and decrease in size with increasing depth at very nearly the same exponential rate. This fact can be stated precisely as follows:[*]

$$N(z, \theta, \phi) = g(\theta, \phi) e^{-kz}. \tag{1}$$

---

[*] It is implicit in the definition of radiance that it applies to an arbitrary but fixed wavelength of radiant flux. This is also true of all the other radiometric quantities used in this note.

From this we see that the asymptotic radiance hypothesis is equivalent to the statement that <u>the directional and depth dependence of radiance distributions multiplicatively uncouple at great depths.</u> That is, the radiance function N may be represented as the product of two functions: the function g gives the shape or directional structure common to all the distributions, and the exponential function gives the depth dependence of the distributions.

Each factor on the right hand side of (1) has special physical significance. The function g evidentally defines the angular form of the characteristic diffuse light. The exponent k of the exponential function has the following interesting interpretation: Define the <u>scalar irradiance</u> $h(z)$ at depth z as follows:

$$h(z) = \int_{\phi=0}^{2\pi} \int_{\theta=0}^{\pi} N(z,\theta,\phi) \sin\theta \, d\theta \, d\phi \, . \qquad (2)$$

The quantity $h(z)$ is a measure of the volume density of radiant energy at depth z. Countless measurements of $h(z)$ over the years in many hydrosols have shown that $h(z)$ varies essentially in an exponential manner with depth. That is, semi-log plots of $h(z)$ vs. depth show an unmistakable trend forward to linearity as depth increases. In any event, $h(z)$ may be accurately represented by a formula of the type:

$$h(z) = h(0) \exp\left\{-\int_0^z k(z') \, dz'\right\} , \qquad (3)$$

where $k(z)$ is seen to be the logarithmic derivative of $h(z)$. As depth
increases, the experimental evidence is that $k(z)$ approaches a con-
stant value. Let us denote this limit value by k_∞. Now assuming
that an asymptotic radiance distribution is approached by the radiance
distributions in a particular body of water, we see from (1), (2) and
(3), that

$$h(z) = h(z_0) e^{-k_\infty(z-z_0)} = e^{-kz} \int_{\phi=0}^{2\pi} \int_{\theta=0}^{\pi} g(\theta,\phi) \sin\theta \, d\theta \, d\phi, \quad (4)$$

where z_0 is the depth below which we may assume that $k(z) = k_\infty$.
From this we conclude that

$$k = k_\infty \qquad\qquad (5)$$

Hence under the above assumption (1), we see that at great depths
in the water, the size of the radiance distribution plots decrease
exponentially with increasing depth, and the rate of this decrease is
precisely that of the scalar irradiance (or energy density).

The close connection between the depth dependence of scalar
irradiance and that of the radiance distributions, as summarized in
(5), suggests the following mode of representation of the radiance
distributions for any depth: Define, for each direction (θ,ϕ),

$$K(z,\theta,\phi) = \frac{-1}{N(z,\theta,\phi)} \frac{dN(z,\theta,\phi)}{dz}. \qquad (6)$$

Then, in analogy to (3), $N(z,\theta,\phi)$ at any depth z may be represented exactly by:

$$N(z,\theta,\phi) = N(0,\theta,\phi)\, exp\left\{-\int_0^z K(z',\theta,\phi)\, dz'\right\}. \qquad (7)$$

Now suppose there is some depth z_0 below which we have $K(z,\theta,\phi) = k_\infty$ for all directions (θ,ϕ). Then (7) may be written

$$N(z,\theta,\phi) = N(0,\theta,\phi)\, exp\left\{-\int_0^{z_0} K(z',\theta,\phi)\, dz' - \int_{z_0}^{z} K(z',\theta,\phi)\, dz'\right\}$$

$$= N(z_0,\theta,\phi)\, exp\left\{-k_\infty(z-z_0)\right\}.$$

If we set

$$g(\theta,\phi) = N(z_0,\theta,\phi)\, exp\left\{k_\infty z\right\},$$

then we may write

$$N(z,\theta,\phi) = g(\theta,\phi)\, e^{-k_\infty z}, \qquad (8)$$

for all depths z below z_0.

The similarity between (1) and (8) is unmistakable. This simi-
larity points out a method of attack we may follow in order to prove
the asymptotic radiance hypothesis: we must show that the quantities
$K(z, \theta, \phi)$ approach a limit as depth is increased, and that this
limit is independent of the directions (θ, ϕ) . Furthermore, this
limit, in accordance with the preceding discussion, should be none other
than the limit k_∞ of $k(z)$, as defined in (3).

THE PROOF

We make use of the equation of transfer for radiance:

$$\frac{dN(z, \theta, \phi)}{dr} = -\alpha N(z, \theta, \phi) + N_*(z, \theta, \phi) \tag{9}$$

where

$$N_*(z, \theta, \phi) = \int_{\phi'=0}^{2\pi} \int_{\theta'=0}^{\pi} \sigma(\theta, \phi; \theta', \phi') N(z, \theta', \phi') \sin\theta' d\theta' d\phi' \tag{10}$$

defines the path function N_*; σ is the volume scattering function
(which governs the law of scattering in the water), and α is the
volume attenuation coefficient. The formal solution of (9) is readily
obtained:

$$N(z, \theta, \phi) = N^0(z, \theta, \phi) + \int_0^r N_*(z', \theta, \phi) e^{-\alpha(r-r')} dr'. \tag{11}$$

The first term represents the component of N consisting of unscattered light. The second represents the space light over the path of length r, (Figure 1). This space light has been generated by light scattered into the path of sight all along its extent. The formal solution (11) has been written for a general downward direction of flow of light (see Figure 1), so that. $N^0(z,\theta,\phi)$ is interpreted as the directly transmitted light from the upper boundary of the medium, and is of the form

$$N^0(z,\theta,\phi) = N^0(0,\theta,\phi)\, e^{-\alpha r}$$

where

$$-r\cos\theta = z.$$

We now turn equation (11) into a useful inequality by means of the following three steps:

First, since $N(z,\theta,\phi)$ clearly exceeds its spacelight component at all depths, we can write:

$$N(z,\theta,\phi) > \int_0^r N_*(z',\theta,\phi)\, e^{-\alpha(r-r')}\, dr'.$$

Second, using the definition of N_*, we strengthen the inequality when we write

$$N(z,\theta,\phi) > \sigma_{min} \int_0^r h(z')\, e^{-\alpha(r-r')}\, dr'$$

where σ_{min} is the minimum value of the volume scattering function; that is, we have used (10) to deduce that

$$N_*(z,\theta,\phi) > \sigma_{min} \int_{\phi'=0}^{2\pi} \int_{\theta'=0}^{\pi} N(z,\theta',\phi')\, \sin\theta'\, d\theta' d\phi' = \sigma_{min}\, h(z)$$

Finally, since $h(z)$ decreases with increasing depth, we certainly strengthen the inequality by writing:

$$N(z,\theta,\phi) > \sigma_{min} h(z) \int_0^r e^{-\alpha(r-r')} dr'.$$

That is, we have

$$N(z,\theta,\phi) > \frac{\sigma_{min}}{\alpha} h(z)(1 - e^{-\alpha r}) \tag{12}$$

for all depths z . From this we see that as depth increases indefinitely, the exponential rate of decrease $K(z,\theta,\phi)$ of the radiance cannot eventually exceed, and remain larger by any finite amount, the $k(z)$ of the scalar irradiance (for if it did, the plot of N would eventually fall and remain below that of h). This observation is stated symbolically as follows:

$$\lim_{z \to \infty} K(z,\theta,\phi) \leq \lim_{z \to \infty} k(z) = k_\infty \tag{13}$$

for all downward directions (θ,ϕ) . We now show that strict equality must hold in (13). We achieve this by initially assuming the contrary, that is we assume that there is a non zero solid angle Ξ_0 of directions over which

$$\lim_{z \to \infty} K(z,\theta,\phi) \leq k_\infty - \epsilon$$

where ϵ is <u>any</u> small positive number. Then it is clear that the radiances in this set of directions decreases at a definitely smaller rate than the scalar irradiance, so much smaller, in fact that, by our assumption, it is true that for some depth z_1, we must have

$$\int_{z_0} N(z_1, \theta, \phi) \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\phi > h(z_1).$$

However, this conclusion clearly contradicts (2) (a part cannot exceed the whole). We have reached a contradiction which leaves only one other possibility, namely that

$$\lim_{z \to \infty} k(z, \theta, \phi) = k_\infty \qquad (14)$$

for all downward directions (θ, ϕ). In the light of the preceding discussions (cf (8)) this means that the shape of the radiance distributions impinging on the upper boundaries of deep layers of water eventually assume a fixed form. But it is known that the shape of the <u>reflected</u> radiance distribution at the upper boundary of a scattering layer is determined by the shape of the incident radiance distribution at that boundary. Hence if the incident radiance distribution approaches a fixed shape, so does that of the reflected distribution. This completes the proof.

We observe that the present proof can also be applied in all natural waters which eventually become homogeneous. That is, the

preceding arguments are basically unchanged if the medium is inhomo-
geneous over any initial finite depth range below the surface. Even
more general situations exist which allow asymptotic radiance distribu-
tions, namely media in which the ratio σ/α eventually becomes inde-
pendent of depth (Preisendorfer, 1958a).

THE EQUATION FOR THE CHARACTERISTIC DIFFUSE LIGHT

Using the equation of transfer, the definition (6), and the
relation between z and r , we can write the equation of transfer
in the following general form:

$$N(z,\theta,\phi) = \frac{N_*(z,\theta,\phi)}{\alpha + K(z,\theta,\phi)\cos\theta} \qquad (15)$$

From (14) and (8) we see that the limiting form of (15) (as depth
increases indefinitely) is

$$g(\theta,\phi) = \frac{\int_{\phi'=0}^{2\pi} \int_{\theta'=0}^{\pi} \sigma(\theta,\phi;\theta',\phi')\, g(\theta',\phi')\, \sin\theta'\, d\theta'\, d\phi'}{\alpha + k_\infty \cos\theta} \qquad (16)$$

which is the equation governing the angular form of the characteristic
diffuse light. It is a property of equations of the type shown in (16)
that the function g is independent of ϕ for all real physical situations.

Thus the characteristic diffuse light is always represented by a surface of revolution whose axis of symmetry is vertical.

The theory of the solution of such equations as (16) is fairly well understood (see e.g., Davison, 1957). The present note, therefore, will not discuss in any detail the general solutions of (16). However, there is one simple special case which is immediately solved and which can shed much light on some of the salient details of the structure of the asymptotic radiance distributions. This is the case of isotropic scattering, where the volume scattering function σ is independent of direction and has the form:

$$\sigma(\theta, \phi; \theta', \phi') = \frac{\measuredangle}{4\pi} \qquad (17)$$

where $\measuredangle$ is the total scattering coefficient.

To see what the resulting structure of the asymptotic radiance distribution is, it is convenient in the present case to turn to (15). With the assumption (17) and the definitions (2) and (10), we have

$$N(z, \theta, \phi) = \frac{\measuredangle}{4\pi} \frac{h(z)}{\alpha + K(z, \theta, \phi) \cos\theta},$$

which at great depths approaches the form:

$$N(z, \theta, \phi) = \frac{1}{4\pi}\left(\frac{\measuredangle}{\alpha}\right) \frac{h(z_0) e^{-k_\infty(z-z_0)}}{1 + \left(\frac{k_\infty}{\alpha}\right)\cos\theta}. \qquad (18)$$

Here z_0 is the depth below which $h(z)$ is essentially of exponential behavior. Comparing (18) with (8), we see that for the present case,

$$g(\theta,\phi) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(\frac{\varDelta}{\alpha}\right) \frac{h(z_0)e^{k_\omega z_0}}{1 + \left(\frac{k_\omega}{\alpha}\right)\cos\theta} . \qquad (19)$$

We have written (19) in the indicated form to point up the following geometric fact: A polar plot of $g(\theta,\phi)$ is generally a prolate ellipsoid of revolution with vertical axis, and of eccentricity k_ω/α. It is easy to deduce that when there is no absorption in the medium, then $k_\omega = 0$, and the characteristic diffuse light is represented by a sphere. On the other hand, if there is very little scattering as compared to absorption, the figure assumes a very narrow, pencil-like shape. In the limit of no scattering, k_ω approaches α, and the figure degenerates into a vertical line.

The structure (18) is related to the limiting form for a simple model for the radiance distribution discussed elsewhere (Preisendorfer, 1958), and to a formula derived by Poole (1945). We conclude with the observation that (19) predicts a different limiting ratio of the horizontal to the upward radiance than that derived by Whitney (1941a) under the same circumstances (i.e., isotropic scattering). Instead of the ratio 2:1, as suggested by Whitney, the present formula yields:

$$\frac{g(\pi/2,\phi)}{g(0,\phi)} = 1 + \left(\frac{k_\omega}{\alpha}\right) \leqslant 2 . \qquad (20)$$

In other words, the ratio in (20) is not a fixed magnitude, but depends on the optical properties of the medium in the manner shown.

The distribution (19) can serve as a convenient standard reference distribution against which experimentally determined radiance distribution can be compared. The amount of departure of the experimental distributions from (19) would then serve as a measure of the anisotropy of scattering in the real medium.

REFERENCES

Davison, B.

1957.   Neutron transport theory. Clarenden Press, Oxford.

Poole, H. H.

1945.   The angular distribution of submarine daylight in deep
             water. Sci. Proc. R. Dublin Soc., 24: 29-42.

Preisendorfer, R. W.

1958a.   A proof of the asymptotic radiance hypothesis. SIO Ref.
             58-57. Visibility Laboratory Report, Scripps Institution
             of Oceanography, University of California.

1958b.   Some practical consequences of the asymptotic radiance
             hypothesis. SIO Ref. 58-60. Visibility Laboratory Report,
             Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California.

1958c.   Model for radiance distributions in natural hydrosols.
             SIO Ref. 58-42. Visibility Laboratory Report, Scripps
             Institution of Oceanography, University of California.

Tyler, J. E.

1958   Radiance distribution as a function of depth in the
             submarine environment. SIO Ref. 58-25. Visibility
             Laboratory Report, Scripps Institution of Oceanography,
             University of California.

Whitney, L. V.

1941a.   The angular distribution of characteristic diffuse light
             in natural waters. J. Mar. Res., 4: 122-131.

1941b.   A general law of diminuation of light intensity in natural
             waters and the percent of diffuse light at different
             depths. J. Opt. Soc. Amer., 31: 714-722.

$N^0(0, \theta, \phi)$
Incident light

surface of the water

Z

Light entering
radiance tube

r

θ

Radiance tube measuring $N(Z, \theta, \phi)$;
The plane of the figure is in the
vertical plane defined by ϕ.