

SPRINGER BRIEFS IN METEOROLOGY

Wayan Suparta
Kemal Maulana Alhasa

Modeling of Tropospheric Delays Using ANFIS

 Springer

SpringerBriefs in Meteorology

SpringerBriefs in Meteorology present concise summaries of cutting-edge research and practical applications. The series focuses on all aspects of meteorology including, but not exclusive to; tornadoes, thunderstorms, lightning, hail, rainfall, fog, extratropical and tropical cyclones, forecasting, snowfalls and blizzards, dust storms, clouds. The series also presents research and information on meteorological technologies, meteorological applications, meteorological forecasting and meteorological impacts (reports of notable worldwide weather events). Featuring compact volumes of 50–125 pages (approx. 20,000–70,000 words), the series covers a range of content from professional to academic such as: a timely reports of state-of-the art analytical techniques, literature reviews, in-depth case studies, bridges between new research results, snapshots of hot and/or emerging topics. Author Benefits: Books in this series will be published as part of Springer’s eBook collection, with millions of users worldwide. In addition, Briefs will be available for individual print and electronic purchase. SpringerBriefs books are characterized by fast, global electronic dissemination and standard publishing contracts. Books in the program will benefit from easy-to-use manuscript preparation and formatting guidelines, and expedited production schedules. Both solicited and unsolicited manuscripts are considered for publication in this series. Projects will be submitted for editorial review by editorial advisory boards and/or publishing editors. For a proposal document please contact your Publisher, Dr. Robert K. Doe (robert.doe@springer.com).

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/13553>

Wayan Suparta · Kemal Maulana Alhasa

Modeling of Tropospheric Delays Using ANFIS

Wayan Suparta
Space Science Centre (ANGKASA)
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
Bangi
Malaysia

Kemal Maulana Alhasa
Space Science Centre (ANGKASA)
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
Bangi
Malaysia

ISSN 2199-9112

SpringerBriefs in Meteorology

ISBN 978-3-319-28435-4

DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-28437-8

ISSN 2199-9120 (electronic)

ISBN 978-3-319-28437-8 (eBook)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015958860

© The Author(s) 2016

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by SpringerNature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland

Preface

The Global Navigation Satellite Systems (GNSS) technology was implemented in the field of meteorology in the early 1990s, where scientists successfully developed a technique for determining water vapor in the troposphere by exploiting the signal errors during propagation from satellite to a receiver. One of the main sources of error in the GNSS and its impact, which are crucial in efforts to improve the accuracy of positioning, is the zenith tropospheric delay (ZTD). If ZTD is produced with fine temporal and spatial resolution, the value and variability can be applied to meteorological studies. In other words, ZTD in this case is the main parameter that plays an important role in determining the parameters of water vapor in the atmosphere.

In the advantages of GNSS such as GPS technology for atmospheric research applications, it was found that this method or other methods do not always excel in all circumstances. For example, GPS data is not always available for a full 24-h period, especially for a remote location or a strategic area where the GPS receiver is not installed, while the accessibility and accurate estimation of this parameter is necessary. Hence, we look at a different approach that is cost-effective and robust in retrieving the value of ZTD by applying a soft computing technique such as adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system (ANFIS) as a new alternative. There are various approaches by other soft computing techniques, such as genetic algorithms (GA), artificial neural network (ANN), fuzzy logic model (FLM), and particle swarm techniques. However, ANFIS was selected as it is emerging as a potential and robust optimization tool in recent years. ANFIS is a method that combines ANNs and a fuzzy inference system. In this technique, a fuzzy clustering algorithm is adopted to enhance the performance of the models, which is able to minimize the number of membership functions and rules for better efficiency of the models.

To investigate the accuracy of the ZTD models developed, a combination of the surface pressure (P), temperature (T), and relative humidity (H) is analyzed to obtain the best estimation of ZTD. The results demonstrate that ANFIS models with three inputs network (P , T , and H) agree very well with the ZTD obtained from GPS. Finally, the three-input network is selected for developing the ZTD predictive

models. To perform the ZTD model, five selected stations over Antarctica and three selected stations in regions of Malaysia and Singapore were used to examine the applicability of ANFIS. The ZTD prediction is performed from one to eight-step ahead for Antarctica region and from one to fifteen-step ahead for the equatorial region. The results demonstrate that ANFIS is capable of predicting ZTD with high accuracy.

This book is prepared to help students, lecturers, engineers, geodesists, meteorologists and climatologists, or practitioners to develop new knowledge in applications of the soft computing technique. The example application of soft computing presented here is for estimation and prediction of tropospheric delays. On the other hand, the ZTD parameter obtained from the models or measurements needs to be converted into precipitable water vapor (PWV) to make it more useful for weather forecasting, analysis of atmospheric hazards such as tropical storms, flash floods, landslides, and earthquakes, as well as for climate change studies.

In this book, readers are presented with a detailed theoretical background of ANN and ANFIS in Chap. 2. Chapter 3 describes the modeling of tropospheric delay and mapping functions from GPS observations. Chapter 4 presents the implementation of ANFIS model for estimation of ZTD. In this chapter, the ZTD value from both ANFIS models and GPS measurements for Antarctica and the equatorial regions is compared. The accuracy of each ZTD model for each input used in the training, testing, and validation is comprehensively elucidated, and finally in Chap. 5 the reader is introduced to the prospect of ZTD estimation using ANFIS, which focuses on how to predict the ZTD value using the surface meteorological data as input. With its simple writing style, it is hoped that this book will provide complete knowledge to readers on application of soft computing, in particular, for meteorological applications and processes involved in the method of observation, data processing, analysis, and methods of data interpretation.

In addition to the content of the book, the authors are particularly grateful to agencies such as Scripps Orbit and Permanent Array Center (SOPAC) for archiving GPS data, Crustal Dynamics Data Information System (CDDIS) NASA for archiving the ZPD data, the Australian Antarctic Division (AAD) and the British Antarctic Survey (BAS) for the surface meteorological data, and ANZ and NIWA for the Scott Base data where some data used in the analysis is their contribution. Finally, the author also expresses his gratitude to the publishers for agreeing to publish this book.

Wayan Suparta

Contents

1 Introduction	1
References	3
2 Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Interference System	5
2.1 Artificial Neural Networks	5
2.1.1 Neuron Modeling	5
2.1.2 Architecture	7
2.1.3 Learning Process	9
2.2 Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Interference System	10
2.2.1 Fuzzy Inference System	10
2.2.2 Adaptive Network	11
2.2.3 ANFIS Architecture	12
2.2.4 Hybrid Learning Algorithm	14
2.3 Linear Regression	17
References	18
3 Tropospheric Modeling from GPS	19
3.1 The Neutral Atmosphere and Its Composition	19
3.2 Tropospheric Delay Modeling	20
3.2.1 Refraction of GPS Signals in the Troposphere	21
3.2.2 Tropospheric Path Delay	24
3.3 Empirical Models of Tropospheric Delay	29
3.3.1 The Saastamoinen Model	29
3.3.2 The Hopfield Model	37
3.3.3 The Modified Hopfield Model	40
3.4 The Mapping Function	43
3.4.1 The Cosecant Mapping Function	44
3.4.2 The Niell Mapping Function	45
References	51

4 Estimation of ZTD Using ANFIS	53
4.1 Estimation of ZTD Model.	53
4.1.1 Network Configuration Input for Estimation Model	54
4.1.2 Formation of a Fuzzy Inference System Using Fuzzy Clustering.	55
4.1.3 Multi-layer Perceptron Network	57
4.1.4 Multiple Linear Regressions	58
4.2 Computation of ZTD from GPS Measurements	59
4.2.1 ZTD Data Processed from <i>TroWav</i>	59
4.2.2 The ZTD Data from IGS	62
4.3 Result of ZTD Estimated from ANFIS and GPS for Antarctica	64
4.4 Analysis Results of ANFIS ZTD in the Equatorial Region	76
4.4.1 Comparison of ZTD from <i>TroWav</i> , IGS, and ANFIS	80
References	83
5 Prediction of ZTD Based on ANFIS Model	85
5.1 Configuration Model for Estimation and Prediction of ZTD	85
5.2 Prediction Results	86
5.2.1 Results from Selected Stations in Antarctica	86
5.2.2 Results from Selected Stations in Equatorial Region	90
5.3 Estimation of ZTD Value from Model Developed	93
5.4 Prediction of ZTD Value from Model Developed.	97
References	106
Index	109

List of Figures

Figure 2.1	Schematic diagrams of biological neurons (Haykin 2009)	6
Figure 2.2	Mathematical modeling of neuron	7
Figure 2.3	Activation function for (a) the fixed restrictor, (b) purelin, (c) log-sigmoid, and (d) bipolar sigmoid	7
Figure 2.4	Taxonomy of neural network architecture of feedforward and feedback neural networks adopted from Jain et al. (1996)	8
Figure 2.5	Fuzzy inference system.	10
Figure 2.6	Adaptive network	11
Figure 2.7	a Sugeno fuzzy interference system “ <i>If-Then</i> ” and fuzzy logic mechanism. b ANFIS architecture (Suparta and Alhasa 2013)	12
Figure 3.1	Possible subdivision schemes of the Earth’s atmosphere adapted from Seeber (1993)	20
Figure 3.2	GPS signals traveling through troposphere and the tropospheric path delay geometry (Suparta 2008).	26
Figure 3.3	Geometry of a ray arriving through a spherical atmosphere	32
Figure 3.4	Thickness of polytropic layers for the troposphere adapted from Hofmann-Wellenhof et al. (2001).	38
Figure 3.5	Geometry for tropospheric path delay based on modified Hopfield model is adapted from Hofmann-Wellenhof et al. (2001).	40
Figure 3.6	Propagation of GPS signals approximated as a planar surface (Suparta 2008)	44
Figure 4.1	The proposed method to determine the ZTD using ANFIS model	54

Figure 4.2 The ANN model with three inputs, one hidden layer with four nodes, and one output (Suparta and Alhasa 2013) 57

Figure 4.3 Flowchart for computation of ZTD using GPS signals and surface meteorological measurements in the *TroWav* program 61

Figure 4.4 The *TroWav* ZTD results from SBA and MCM compared to the IGS ZTD methods. The *solid horizontal line* in the bottom panel is the mean difference between ZTD at SBA and MCM respect to the IGS ZTD from CODE and GFZ, respectively. 63

Figure 4.5 Comparison results of estimated ZTD values through *TroWav* and IGS ZTD for NTUS station for the case of December 2009 64

Figure 4.6 Linear interpolation of ZTD results for SBA station. The ZTD values for DUM1 and MCM4, respectively, are shifted to 0.15 m and -0.15 m to distinguish the ZTD patterns. 65

Figure 4.7 Variation of ZTD estimated from ANFIS FSC and ANFIS FCM models compared with GPS ZTD data at SBA station during the **a** training, **b** testing, and **c** verification for (A) *P*, (B) *T*, (C) *H*, (D) *P* and *H*, (E) *P* and *T*, (F) *T* and *H*, and (G) *P*, *T*, and *H*. 66

Figure 4.8 Cross-correlation between ANFIS ZTD model and GPS ZTD data of Fig. 4.7 during the validation period for **a** ANFIS FSC and **b** ANFIS FCM 67

Figure 4.9 Variation of ZTD estimated from ANFIS FSC and ANFIS FCM models compared with GPS ZTD data at DAV1 station during the **a** training, **b** testing, and **c** verification for (A) *P*, (B) *T*, (C) *H*, (D) *P* and *H*, (E) *P* and *T*, (F) *T* and *H*, and (G) *P*, *T*, and *H*. 68

Figure 4.10 Cross-correlation between ZTD ANFIS model and GPS ZTD data of Fig. 4.9 during the validation period for **a** ANFIS FSC and **b** ANFIS FCM 69

Figure 4.11 Variation of ZTD estimated from ANFIS FSC and ANFIS FCM models compared with GPS ZTD data at SYOG station during the **a** training, **b** testing, and **c** verification for (A) *P*, (B) *T*, (C) *H*, (D) *P* and *H*, (E) *P* and *T*, (F) *T* and *H*, and (G) *P*, *T*, and *H*. 69

Figure 4.12 Cross-correlation between ZTD ANFIS model and GPS ZTD data of Fig. 4.11 during the validation period for **a** ANFIS FSC and **b** ANFIS FCM 70

Figure 4.13 Variation of ZTD estimated from ANFIS FSC and ANFIS FCM models compared with GPS ZTD data at PALM station during the **a** training, **b** testing, and **c** verification for (A) *P*, (B) *T*, (C) *H*, (D) *P* and *H*, (E) *P* and *T*, (F) *T* and *H*, and (G) *P*, *T*, and *H*. 71

Figure 4.14 Cross-correlation between ZTD ANFIS model and GPS ZTD data of Fig. 4.13 during the validation period for **a** ANFIS FSC and **b** ANFIS FCM 71

Figure 4.15 Variation of ZTD estimated from ANFIS FSC and ANFIS FCM models compared with GPS ZTD data at OHI2 station during the **a** training, **b** testing, and **c** verification for (A) *P*, (B) *T*, (C) *H*, (D) *P* and *H*, (E) *P* and *T*, (F) *T* and *H*, and (G) *P*, *T*, and *H*. 72

Figure 4.16 Cross-correlation between ZTD ANFIS model and GPS ZTD data of Fig. 4.15 during the validation period for **a** ANFIS FSC and **b** ANFIS FCM 72

Figure 4.17 Statistical comparison of percentage error (*PE*) between GPS ZTD and ANFIS ZTD model at five selected stations during the **a** training, **b** testing, and **c** validation. 73

Figure 4.18 Variation of ZTD estimated from ANFIS FSC and ANFIS FCM models compared with GPS ZTD data at UKMB station during the **a** training, **b** testing, and **c** verification for (A) *P*, (B) *T*, (C) *H*, (D) *P* and *H*, (E) *P* and *T*, (F) *T* and *H*, and (G) *P*, *T*, and *H*. 77

Figure 4.19 Cross-correlation between ZTD ANFIS model and GPS ZTD data of Fig. 4.18 during the validation period for **a** ANFIS FSC and **b** ANFIS FCM 78

Figure 4.20 Variation of ZTD estimated from ANFIS FSC and ANFIS FCM models compared with GPS ZTD data at NTUS station during the **a** training, **b** testing, and **c** verification for (A) *P*, (B) *T*, (C) *H*, (D) *P* and *H*, (E) *P* and *T*, (F) *T* and *H*, and (G) *P*, *T*, and *H*. 78

Figure 4.21 Cross-correlation between ZTD ANFIS model and GPS ZTD data of Fig. 4.20 during the validation period for **a** ANFIS FSC and **b** ANFIS FCM 79

Figure 4.22 Variation of ZTD estimated from ANFIS FSC and ANFIS FCM models compared with GPS ZTD data at UMSK station during the **a** training, **b** testing, and **c** verification for (A) *P*, (B) *T* (C) *H* (D) *P* and *H*, (E) *P* and *T*, (F) *T* and *H*, and (G) *P*, *T*, and *H*. 79

Figure 4.23 Cross-correlation between ANFIS ZTD model and GPS ZTD from Fig. 4.22 during the validation period for **a** ANFIS FSC and **b** ANFIS FCM 80

Figure 4.24 Statistical comparison of error percentage (*PE*) between GPS ZTD and ANFIS ZTD models at the three selected stations in Equatorial region during the process of **a** training, **b** testing, and **c** validation 82

Figure 4.25 Comparison results of estimated ZTD values through *TroWav* and ANFIS ZTD models with IGS ZTD at NTUS station for the case of December 2009 83

Figure 5.1 Flowchart of prediction of ZTD from ANFIS model. 87

Figure 5.2 Prediction of ZTD trend from one-step to eight-step ahead during the period of November 2010 for Antarctica Coast at **a** SBA, **b** DAV1, and **c** SYOG stations for ANFIS FCM (*I*) and ANFIS FSC (*II*), respectively. 88

Figure 5.3 Prediction of ZTD trend from one-step to eight-step ahead during the period of November 2010 for Antarctica Peninsula: **d** PALM and **e** OHI2 stations. 89

Figure 5.4 The estimation errors of ZTD prediction from one-step until eight-step ahead using the ANFIS models compared to GPS ZTD for **a** SBA, **b** DAV1, **c** SYOG, **d** PALM, and **e** OHI2 stations. 89

Figure 5.5 Prediction of ZTD trend from one-step to fifteen-step ahead during the period of November 2009 for **a** UKMB station in equatorial region 91

Figure 5.6 Prediction of ZTD from one-step to fifteen-step ahead for the period of December 2012 at **b** NTUS, and **c** UMSK stations in for equatorial region 92

Figure 5.7 The estimation errors of ZTD prediction from one-step until fifth teen-step ahead using the ANFIS models compared to GPS ZTD for **a** UKMB, **b** NTUS, and **c** UMSK stations. 92

Figure 5.8 Variation of ZTD estimated from ANFIS FCM and ANFIS FSC models compared with ZTD data from GPS at CAS1 station, Antarctica for the period from July to December 2005, after validation process 95

Figure 5.9 Variation of ZTD estimated from ANFIS FCM and ANFIS FSC models compared with ZTD data from GPS at MCM4 station, Antarctica for the period from July to December 2005, after the validation process. 95

Figure 5.10 Variation of ZTD estimated from ANFIS FCM and ANFIS FSC models compared with ZTD data from GPS at SYOG station, Antarctica for the period from July to December 2005, after the validation process. 96