1 A closer look at boundary layer inversion
2 in large-eddy simulations and bulk models:

3 Buoyancy-driven case

4 Pierre Gentine¹

5 Columbia University

6 New York, New York

7
8 Gilles Bellon

9 Centre National de la Recherche Météorologique

10 Toulouse, France

11
12 Chiel C. van Heerwaarden

13 Max Planck Institute for Meteorology

14 Hamburg, Germany

15

¹ *Corresponding author address:* Pierre Gentine, Earth Institute & Earth and Environmental Engineering,
Columbia University, 500 W 120th St. New York, NY, 10027.

E-mail: pg2328@columbia.edu

Abstract

The inversion layer (IL) of a clear-sky, buoyancy-driven convective boundary layer is investigated using large-eddy simulations covering a wide range of convective Richardson numbers. A new model of the IL is suggested and tested. The model performs better than previous first-order models of the entrainment and provides physical insights into the main controls of the mixed-layer and IL growths. A consistent prognostic equation of the IL growth is derived, with explicit dependence on the position of the minimum buoyancy flux, convective Richardson number and relative stratification across the inversion G . The IL model expresses the interrelationship between the position and magnitude of the minimum buoyancy flux and inversion layer depth. These relationships emphasize why zero-order-jump models of the convective boundary layer perform well under a strong inversion and show that these models miss the additional parameter, G , the relative stratification across the inversion to fully characterize the entrainment process under a weak inversion. Additionally, the position of the minimum buoyancy flux within the new IL model is shown to be a key component of convective boundary layer entrainment. The new IL model is sufficiently simple to be used in numerical weather prediction or general circulation models as a way to resolve the IL in a low vertical resolution model.

36

37

1. Introduction

38 Bulk models of the boundary layer, introduced by Ball (1960), Lilly (1968) and Betts
 39 (1973), have been useful tools to understand the dynamics of the convective boundary
 40 layer (CBL). The so-called zero-order models of the CBL assume a mixed layer of
 41 conserved variables capped by a jump corresponding to a sharp, infinitesimally thin
 42 inversion layer (IL). Even though zero-order models correctly predict the CBL growth in
 43 a linearly stratified fluid, those models cannot diagnose the relationship between the IL
 44 structure and CBL entrainment nor the CBL dynamics under conditions of a deep IL
 45 since, by construction, they assume an infinitesimally thin IL. The tight relationship
 46 between the structure of the IL and the entrainment rate becomes clear when one
 47 investigates the turbulence kinetic energy (TKE) budget (Zilitinkevich 1991, Fedorovich
 48 and Mironov 1995, Fedorovich et al. 2004). The depth of the IL defines the region of
 49 buoyancy consumption (Deardorff 1979; Hägeli et al. 2000) and is related to the CBL
 50 entrainment rate (Zilitinkevich 1991, Fedorovich and Mironov 1995, Fedorovich et al.
 51 2004, Garcia and Mellado 2014).

52 In the IL, rapid vertical variations in the buoyancy fluxes can occur over a very
 53 short distance of a few tens of meters (Deardorff 1976; Randall 1980b; 2000). The IL is
 54 therefore unresolved in current generations of weather and climate models (Teixeira et al.
 55 2008) and still remains a modeling challenge even for large-eddy simulations (LES)
 56 (Stevens and Bretherton 1999; Bretherton et al. 1999; Stevens and Lenschow 2001,
 57 Sullivan and Patton 2011) so that direct numerical simulations (DNS) of the IL may be
 58 needed (Mellado et al. 2010; De Lozar and Mellado 2013, Garcia and Mellado 2014). A

better understanding of the dynamics of the IL is crucial because the IL impacts: i) the convective inhibition and the transition from dry to shallow convection as well as the magnitude of the cloud base mass flux (Bretherton and Park 2009; Park and Bretherton 2009; Hohenegger and Bretherton 2011; Gentine et al. 2013a,b,c), ii) the transition between stratocumulus and shallow cumulus (Randall 1980a), and iii) the dynamics of the entrainment and the heat and moisture budgets of the boundary layer. The IL is therefore at the core of a correct representation of most boundary layer regimes and the transition between them.

To represent the finite depth of the IL, Betts (1974) introduced a first-order model of the dry CBL with a finite IL where the profiles of conserved variables and their fluxes were linear. The entrainment at the mixed layer top was derived assuming a constant potential temperature jump and constant inversion depth. Deardorff (1979) argued that first-order models of the boundary layer were not more useful than zero-order models because in the former models the mixed-layer top z_m is assumed to match the minimum buoyancy flux height z_i . This assumed correspondence between the mixed-layer top and minimum buoyancy flux height generates a singularity for the IL growth rate equation under strong inversions. Van Zanten et al. (1999) reinvestigated Deardorff's (1979) work, but did not share his conclusions. Since Deardorff (1980), the IL depth has generally been parameterized (e.g. defined as a function of the convective Richardson number) to avoid the singularity pointed out by Deardorff (1979).

In existing first-order models, based on Betts (1974), both the conserved variable and heat flux profiles are assumed linear in the inversion. It is clear that these profiles are incompatible: parabolic flux profiles should correspond to linear profiles of conserved

variables. Deardorff (1979), followed by Fedorovich and Mironov (1995) and Fedorovich et al. (2004), proposed a more realistic representation of the IL, the so-called general structure model (GSM). In the GSM, consistent IL profiles and prognostic equations for the IL growth can be derived. Nonetheless the structure of the IL in the GSM needs to be parameterized (Fedorovich and Mironov 1995, Fedorovich et al. 2004), which limits their applicability.

The objectives of the present paper are: 1) to investigate the structure of the IL using LES and 2) to develop a minimal IL structure model, which does not require additional parameterization and can correctly predict the IL growth and structure. The focus is on the dry buoyancy-driven convective boundary layer, however the results are expected to be extended to shear-driven and stratocumulus CBL. The paper is organized as follows: in section 2) we analyze previous bulk models; in section 3) we propose a structure of the IL based on LES results; in section 4) we develop the new inversion model that can resolve the problems of first-order CBL models and we provide a derivation of the IL growth based on the TKE budget; in sections 5) and 6) we present the model results and in section 8) we present conclusions of the study.

2. Discussion of current first-order models

The CBL is assumed dry, i.e. without moisture. Results are therefore presented in terms of potential temperature, θ . The profiles of θ and of the vertical turbulent flux of θ , $\overline{w'\theta'}$, in a first-order CBL model are depicted in Fig. 1 (Betts 1974, Deardorff 1979). In these models the mixed-layer top z_m is collocated with the minimum buoyancy level z_i and the flux is linearly decaying in the mixed layer. In the IL the potential temperature

104 profile and the corresponding flux profile are linear, which is inconsistent as discussed in
 105 the introduction.

106 The ensemble-averaging operator is denoted with an overbar. Neglecting
 107 horizontal advection and the radiation contribution, which are small in the dry CBL, and
 108 assuming a horizontally homogeneous CBL the potential temperature conservation reads
 109 (neglecting overbars for averages for the mean variables) (see e.g. Kim et al. 2006):

$$110 \quad \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = - \frac{\partial \overline{w'\theta'}}{\partial z} - \bar{w} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial z}, \quad (1)$$

111 with $\overline{w'\theta'}$ the turbulent vertical flux of potential temperature and $\bar{w}$ the horizontally-
 112 averaged vertical velocity at height z . Taking the partial derivative in z of the potential
 113 temperature conservation law and inverting the time t and z derivative, we get the simple
 114 relationship (since the vertical gradient of θ vanishes in the mixed layer):

$$115 \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} (\overline{w'\theta'}) = 0. \quad (2)$$

116 The profile of $\overline{w'\theta'}$ is therefore linear in the mixed layer. This is a well-known result of
 117 mixed-layer models (Lilly 1968).

118 In the IL, extending from the mixed layer top z_m to the top of the inversion h , if
 119 we take the second derivative of the conservation equation (1), we obtain that the third-
 120 order derivative of $\overline{w'\theta'}$ vanishes. A linear potential temperature profile therefore
 121 imposes a parabolic $\overline{w'\theta'}$ profile in the IL. With a parabolic flux profile the minimum
 122 buoyancy level z_i could be located above the mixed layer top z_m . We have evaluated the
 123 use of such parabolic flux profile and it generates an ill-defined solution when using the
 124 flux closure, therefore it is not discussed further.

Soon after the introduction of the first-order model by Betts (1973, 1974), Deardorff (1979) pointed out that the representation of the inversion in such model was oversimplified for several reasons:

1) The observed maximum vertical $\bar{\theta}$ gradient is generally much higher in observations than in first-order models. Indeed the $\bar{\theta}$ profile exhibits a strong curvature in the IL with high gradient near the top of the inversion.

2) The minimum buoyancy level z_i is located above the mixed-layer top.

3) The assumption that the mixed-layer top z_m equals the minimum buoyancy level z_i in first-order models generates an ill-defined solution: the prognostic equation of the IL leads to spurious results in the case of a sharp inversion. Deardorff (1979) therefore concluded that first-order models were not any more useful than zero-order models. As a result, in subsequent uses of first-order models, the inversion depth has been parameterized (e.g., Deardorff and Willis 1980; vanZanten et al. 1999; Pino et al. 2006; Kim et al. 2006).

To correct for the above-mentioned shortcomings of first-order models, Deardorff (1979) proposed a more realistic IL parameterization. Fedorovich and Mironov (1995) and Fedorovich et al. (2004) improved Deardorff's general structure model (GSM) by introducing a self-similar representation of the buoyancy profile within the IL and evaluated the model using LES data. One of the issues with the GSM is that in this model the IL profile of buoyancy needs to be parameterized. How additional factors such as shear or radiation will affect such parameterization is unclear. We therefore try to derive an IL model that is sufficiently general so that additional components (i.e. shear, radiation, etc.) can be later added. We start with a simple dry shear-free CBL case,

however the model can easily be extended to include liquid water and radiation. In order to derive the model we first investigate the typical IL structure in the shear-free CBL using LES data.

3. Large-eddy simulation analysis

a. Large-eddy simulation setups

In this analysis we have used three shear-free CBL cases: i) a weak inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998), ii) a strong inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998) and iii) a CBL growing against a linear stratification (Conzemius & Fedorovich 2006). All three simulations have been forced by a time-constant surface buoyancy flux and no-slip boundary conditions for the horizontal velocity and impermeability condition for the vertical component of the velocity. The three initial and final profiles are depicted in Fig. 2.

The cases have been run with the MicroHH (van Heerwaarden et al, in preparation, <http://github.com/microhh>). MicroHH is a three-dimensional computational fluid dynamics code that solves the filtered Navier-Stokes equations with the Boussinesq approximation applied on a staggered grid. The model uses a fully conservative second-order finite difference scheme in space (Morinishi et al. 1998) and a third-order low-storage Runge-Kutta scheme in time. The pressure is solved using fast Fourier transforms in the horizontal dimensions. The subfilter scale diffusion has been modeled using a Smagorinsky scheme (Smagorinsky 1963) with a constant $c_s = 0.21$ and a turbulent Prandtl number of $1/3$. The first vertical level of the model is solved assuming Monin-Obukhov's similarity theory. At the top of the domain a sponge layer is applied that

dampens the propagating gravity waves in order to prevent reflection. The lateral boundary conditions are periodic. The time step of integration is found so that a Courant number of 1 is enforced in order to satisfy the Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (CFL) condition.

The domain size in the case of the strong and weak inversion run was $5120 \times 5120 \times 2048\text{m}$, with a grid spacing of $5.12\text{m} \times 5.12\text{m} \times 5.12\text{m}$, the domain size of the linearly stratified case was $9600\text{m} \times 9600\text{m} \times 3200\text{m}$ with a grid spacing of $12.5\text{m} \times 12.5\text{m} \times 6.25\text{m}$. All cases were started with zero values for the entire velocity vector and small random perturbations in the temperature field in the lowest 300 m that exponentially decay with height. The output time interval is 30 minutes in the strong inversion case because the growth is slow and 180 seconds in the other cases. Average values in the LES are defined as horizontal mean values averaged over the output time step.

b. Mixed and inversion layer in large-eddy simulations

We here investigate the horizontally averaged LES profiles in order to gain insights on the structure of the IL. We especially focus on the following heights:

- 1) The first zero-crossover height of $\overline{w'\theta'}$: z_0 . This height was used as the definition of the top of the mixed-layer model by Deardorff (1979) and Fedorovich and Mironov (1995).
- 2) The minimum buoyancy flux height z_i .
- 3) The intersection of the linear tangent at the maximum gradient of θ in the IL with the linear free-tropospheric profile (as in Garcia and Mellado 2014). This height is called h . This height is similar to – yet less noisy than – the height of minimum second-order vertical derivative of potential temperature (Yamaguchi and Randall

2012), which corresponds to a rapid change in the vertical gradient of $\bar{\theta}$ between
from the IL to the free troposphere value.

4) The height of vanishing buoyancy flux above z_i defining the top of the IL in the
LES, h_{LES} . This height is notoriously difficult to properly retrieve from LES
because of over-diffusion at the top of the inversion, insufficient spatial resolution
and limited domain size. We thus use a threshold for the magnitude of the flux
(10^{-5} K m s⁻¹) for all cases.

Figure 3 depicts the profiles of horizontally-averaged potential temperature (top
left), second vertical derivative of potential temperature (bottom left), sensible heat flux
(top right) and vertical derivative of sensible heat flux (bottom right) for the weak
inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998). The heights of interests are plotted on the
temperature and flux profiles. It should be emphasized that the vertical resolution of the
LES limits the exact retrieval of the heights.

A mixed layer is well defined below z_0 : the curvature is zero in the mixed layer
and increases sharply above z_0 as seen in Fig. 3. Using tank observations, Deardorff
(1979) showed that the zero-crossover height of $\overline{w'\theta'}$ could lie slightly above the mixed
layer, defined as the region of near-constant potential temperature. This is not the case in
our LES. This difference could be due to either the measurement accuracy of Deardorff's
observations or to the limited LES resolution. Our LES experiments suggest that z_0 is a
good approximation of the height of the mixed layer z_m (as pointed out in Deardorff 1979
and Fedorovich and Mironov 1995) and we will thus assume that $z_m = z_0$ in the rest of the
manuscript. Above z_0 the potential temperature increases slightly up to the minimum
buoyancy level z_i . This increase is better seen from the curvature of the potential

temperature profile. No spike is present in the curvature of the potential temperature at z_0 emphasizing the continuity of the vertical gradient of potential temperature at the mixed-layer top z_0 .

In the weak inversion case, $\overline{w'\theta'}$ is only very slowly decaying above h . Above this height the vertical gradient of θ is hardly distinguishable from the free-tropospheric gradient. This is due to the very small portion of the total $\overline{w'\theta'}$ profile present above h . Overall h seems to be a good and reliable indicator of the IL top. We will use this height h as our definition of the LES-diagnosed IL top in the remainder of the manuscript. The advantage of this height is that it is easily diagnosed in the LES outputs contrary to the height of vanishing flux h_{LES} . The noise in the LES data at the top of the inversions limits the exact retrieval of the vanishing flux height h_{LES} (Mason 1989, Sullivan and Patton 2011).

Similar conclusions are reached in the strong inversion case shown in Fig. 4 and in the case of the growth in a constant linear stratification shown in Fig. 5: the mixed-layer is well-defined below z_0 . Above z_0 the potential temperature curvature increases slightly by up to 0.7K in the strong inversion case. Even in the strong inversion case the level h is close to the vanishing flux height h_{LES} located about 30m above. The curvature of potential temperature exhibits a drastic change above h , indicating a near-discontinuity in the vertical gradient of θ at this height. In all cases more than 99% of the TKE production by buoyancy flux $\int_0^{+\infty} \overline{w'\theta'} dz$ is located below h (not shown), emphasizing that h is a physically meaningful definition of the top of the inversion based on the horizontally-averaged profile.

238 4. New inversion layer model

239 *a. Model structure*

240 The new inversion model structure is depicted in Fig. 6 and is based on the above LES
 241 analysis. The mixed layer in the model extends up to level z_0 , corresponding to first zero
 242 crossing of $\overline{w'\theta'}$. As highlighted earlier, in the mixed layer the $\overline{w'\theta'}$ profile is linear for
 243 consistency with the θ profile. The potential temperature and its vertical gradient are
 244 assumed continuous at the mixed-layer top z_0 based on the LES profile analysis (section
 245 3). For consistency, $\overline{w'\theta'}$ and its vertical derivative are continuous in z_0 : the vertical
 246 gradient of θ is thus assumed to be zero at z_0 . At the top of the IL, i.e. at height h , the
 247 vertical derivatives of θ and $\overline{w'\theta'}$ are assumed discontinuous based on the LES
 248 diagnostics, which exhibited sharp gradient change above h . Consequently the boundary
 249 conditions in h are: $\overline{w'\theta'}$ is zero and θ is continuously merging with the free-
 250 tropospheric profile. Those latter conditions are similar to the ones adopted at the upper
 251 IL interface in first-order models. The minimum value of $\overline{w'\theta'}$ occurs within the IL at
 252 height z_i . Like in the GSM parameterizations (Deardorff 1979, Fedorovich and Mironov
 253 1995, Fedorovich et al. 2004), z_i is a model diagnostic and is found as the height of
 254 vanishing vertical derivative of $\overline{w'\theta'}$ (see discussion below).

255 To match the imposed IL boundary conditions we use a minimal polynomial for
 256 the potential temperature profile. A second-order polynomial is thus used for the profile
 257 of θ in the IL. Given the continuity conditions the profile of θ in the IL can be written
 258 as:

$$\theta(z) = \langle \theta \rangle + \Delta\theta \left(\frac{z - z_0}{\delta} \right)^2, \quad (3)$$

with $\langle \theta \rangle$ being the mixed-layer θ value, assumed vertically uniform, $\Delta\theta = \theta(h) - \langle \theta \rangle$ the jump of θ across the inversion and $\delta = h - z_0$ the IL depth. Examples of the model profiles fitted on LES outputs are plotted in Fig. 7; the model is able to correctly characterize the structure of the IL, especially the strongest vertical gradient of θ near the top of the IL.

For consistency with the potential temperature profile in the IL, we use a third-order polynomial for $\overline{w'\theta'}$. The profile can be expressed using the IL boundary conditions and the minimum flux in z_i (see appendix A, equation (A4)):

$$\overline{w'\theta'}(z) = \overline{w'\theta'}(0) \frac{(z - z_0)(z_0 + \delta - z)(z_0 + \alpha\delta - z)}{z_0\delta^2\alpha} + \overline{w'\theta'}(z_i) \frac{(z - z_0)^2(z_0 + \delta - z)}{\delta^3\alpha^2(1 - \alpha)}, \quad (4)$$

with $\alpha = (z_i - z_0)/(h - z_0)$ (i.e. $z_i = z_0 + \alpha\delta$) being the relative position of the minimum buoyancy flux within the inversion.

The new inversion model has several advantages over previous inversion models. Compared to first-order models, the buoyancy flux exhibits a minimum above the mixed-layer top and the maximum gradient of potential temperature is sharper than in first-order models, as observed (Deardorff 1979) and the profiles of θ and $\overline{w'\theta'}$ are mathematically consistent. Compared to general structure models (Deardorff 1979, Fedorovich and Mironov 1995, Fedorovich et al. 2004) the model does not require any added parameterization of the shape of the IL as a function of a stability parameter; only the specification (closure) of the minimum buoyancy flux is sufficient to close the system of equations similarly to first-order models (see section *e* below).

280 In addition to the imposed continuity conditions at the bottom and top of the IL, to
 281 close the system of equations of the mixed layer and IL we need: i) an equation for the
 282 mixed-layer potential temperature budget, ii) an equation for the mixed-layer depth z_0 iii)
 283 an equation for the inversion-layer top h , and iv) a closure for the minimum flux
 284 $\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)$.

285 *b. Mixed-layer budget*

286 The buoyancy conservation (1) is integrated from the surface to the mixed-layer top z_0
 287 using Leibniz rule, so that the mixed-layer conservation reads:

$$288 \quad z_0 \frac{d}{dt} \langle \theta \rangle = \overline{w'\theta'}(0) - \overline{w'\theta'}(z_0) = \overline{w'\theta'}(0). \quad (5)$$

289 This is a classic result of mixed layer heat conservation (Deardorff 1979; Betts 1974;
 290 Lilly 1968; vanZanten et al. 1999) except that the flux at the mixed-layer top is not the
 291 minimum buoyancy flux but a vanishing flux (Fedorovich and Mironov 1995).

292 *c. Entrainment rate at the mixed-layer top z_0*

293 To derive the entrainment rate at the mixed-layer top z_0 we integrate the potential
 294 temperature equation (1) between z_0 and h . Similarly to Deardorff (1979) we introduce
 295 the IL shape factor

$$296 \quad Y = \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{z_0}^h \frac{\theta - \langle \theta \rangle}{\Delta \theta} dz. \quad (6)$$

297 The total heat in the inversion is then simply

$$298 \quad \int_{z_0}^h \theta dz = \langle \theta \rangle \delta + \Delta \theta \delta Y. \quad (7)$$

299 The heat budget in the inversion is (using Leibniz rule):

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{z_0}^h \theta dz - \frac{dh}{dt} (\langle \theta \rangle + \Delta \theta) + \frac{dz_0}{dt} \langle \theta \rangle = - \int_{z_0}^h \bar{w} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial z} dz, \quad (8)$$

which leads to the following expression for the mixed-layer entrainment rate (see appendix A for a full derivation):

$$\frac{w_e(z_0)}{w_*} = \frac{1}{\text{Ri}} \left(\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)\alpha^2} \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)} + \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \frac{\delta}{z_0} \right) + G \frac{\bar{w}(h)}{w_*}, \quad (9)$$

with $\text{Ri} = \frac{gz_0}{w_*^2} \frac{\Delta \theta}{\langle \theta \rangle}$ the convective Richardson number,

$w_* = \left(\frac{g}{\langle \theta \rangle} z_0 \overline{w'\theta'}(0) \right)^{1/3}$ Deardorff's convective velocity (Deardorff 1970) and

$G = \gamma_\theta \delta / \Delta \theta$ the relative stratification across the inversion (Deardorff 1979, Fedorovich and Mironov 1995).

d. Entrainment at the inversion-layer top h

At the CBL top, i.e. at height h , the vertical derivatives of potential temperature and $\overline{w'\theta'}$ are assumed discontinuous based on the LES analysis. The total derivative of θ can be decomposed into its partial derivatives, which can be evaluated either below (left-derivative in h_-) or above the inversion (right-derivative in h_+):

$$\frac{d\theta}{dt} \Big|_{z=h_- \text{ or } h_+} = \frac{dh}{dt} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial z} \Big|_{z=h_- \text{ or } h_+} + \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t}(h). \quad (10)$$

The continuity of the temperature at the inversion top h gives the entrainment rate $w_e(h) = dh/dt - \bar{w}(h)$ (full derivation is provided in appendix A):

$$\left(\Delta \theta - \frac{\gamma_\theta \delta}{2} \right) w_e(h) = - \frac{1}{2(1-\alpha)\alpha^2} \overline{w'\theta'}(z_i) - \frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha} \frac{\delta}{z_0} \overline{w'\theta'}(0), \quad (11)$$

317 with $\Delta\theta = \theta(h) - \langle\theta\rangle$ the potential temperature jump across the inversion,
 318 $\alpha = (z_i - z_0)/(h - z_0)$ the relative position of the minimum buoyancy flux and $\delta = h - z_0$
 319 the inversion depth. This expression shares similarities with the entrainment derivation of
 320 Deardorff (1979) and van Zanten et al. (1999) except that the expression uses a reduced
 321 jump $\Delta\theta - \frac{\gamma_\theta \delta}{2}$, similar to a jump computed half way within the inversion. The
 322 expression also includes a flux divergence with the presence of the surface heating.

323 Using dimensionless scaling, the entrainment rate can be further simplified into:

$$324 \quad \frac{w_e(h)}{w_*} = \frac{1}{2 - G} \frac{1}{\text{Ri}} \left(-\frac{1}{(1 - \alpha)\alpha^2} \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)} - \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha} \frac{\delta}{z_0} \right). \quad (12)$$

325 This expression resembles Sullivan et al.'s (1998): the first term in the bracket
 326 corresponds to the minimum buoyancy flux contribution and the second term corresponds
 327 to the contribution of the heat storage in the inversion. We however point out the
 328 presence of a shape factor (α) in the minimum buoyancy flux and storage term, which
 329 can strongly modify the effect of minimum buoyancy flux and heat storage on the CBL
 330 entrainment rate (see section 6). This term was not present in previously proposed first-
 331 order models (e.g. Betts 1974). This shape factor explains the decrease of the minimum
 332 buoyancy flux contribution growth as well as the decrease of the storage term
 333 contribution at large Richardson number, noticed by Sullivan et al. (1998). Note the
 334 similarity between the mixed-layer and top of the inversion entrainment rates, with the
 335 presence of the minimum buoyancy flux, storage term and shape of the IL profile, α .
 336 The presence of the relative stratification G in the denominator of the inversion top
 337 entrainment rate, (12), shows that two-layer non-stratified fluid ($G=0$) exhibits weaker
 338 entrainment at the PBL top compared to stratified fluid, in agreement with recent

observations (Jonker and Jimenez 2014). The presence of G in the top of the IL entrainment also shows that the mixed-layer scaling parameters (height, convective velocity, Richardson convective numbers) are not sufficient to fully characterize the IL growth. However in the strong inversion cases $G \ll 1$, the IL growth does not depend on the relative stratification anymore and mixed-layer convective scaling is sufficient to fully characterize the IL entrainment.

In the new IL model the position of the minimum buoyancy flux in the IL, α (or similarly z_i), is a diagnostic variable, defined as the height of vanishing vertical flux gradient: $d\overline{w'\theta'}/dz(z_i) = 0$. Differentiating the flux with respect to z_i , using (4), we find

$$\frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)^2}{2-3\alpha} = -\frac{z_0}{\delta} \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)}. \quad (13)$$

Expression (13) emphasizes the tight connection between the position of the minimum buoyancy flux, the magnitude of this flux and the relative depth of the inversion.

Expression (13) also shows the relationship between the relative inversion depth δ/z_0

and the ratio $\beta = -\frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)}$.

Equation (13) can be combined with the mixed layer entrainment rate (9) to eliminate the inversion layer depth:

$$\frac{w_e(z_0)}{w_*} = -\frac{S_{z_0}}{\text{Ri}} \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)} + G \frac{\bar{w}(h)}{w_*}, \quad (14)$$

with $S_{z_0} = \frac{1-3\alpha^2}{(1-\alpha)^2 \alpha^2}$ being the shape factor for the mixed-layer entrainment and

similarly

$$\frac{w_e(h)}{w_*} = -\frac{S_h}{\text{Ri}} \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)}, \quad (15)$$

with $S_h = \frac{1}{2-G} \frac{3\alpha-1}{\alpha^2(1-\alpha)}$ being the shape factor of the entrainment at the IL top.

A point to emphasize is that the minimum buoyancy flux's position z_i (or α) and the relative depth of the inversion are all connected, as emphasized in equation (13). The mixed-layer and top of the IL entrainment equations give two additional constraints on the relationship between the minimum buoyancy flux, α and the relative depth of the inversion. A single closure on the minimum buoyancy flux as done in zero-order CBL models should therefore be sufficient as long as it is described by all parameters of the flow (convective mixed-layer parameters and relative stratification G). Consequently zero-order models include both the direct minimum buoyancy flux effect and the IL storage term without explicitly resolving the IL (Sullivan et al. 1998) but also the shape of the inversion, i.e. the position of the minimum buoyancy flux within the inversion, α . Current first-order CBL models with a parameterized IL depth assume that the IL depth scales only with the mixed-layer convective parameters, our results show that this is not correct and the additional parameter G is needed to fully describe the IL depth and entrainment.

The mixed-layer entrainment rate, equation (14), does not exhibit any dependence on the relative stratification across the inversion G (other than in front of the large-scale vertical velocity) contrary to the top of the IL entrainment rate (term $2-G$ in the denominator). This is consistent with recent findings regarding the IL structure in DNS (Garcia and Mellado 2014), which emphasize that the IL essentially consists of two layers: 1) a lower layer, whose depth scales with the mixed-layer convective parameters

(Ri , w^*) and 2) an upper layer, whose depth does not obey mixed-layer convective scaling and is instead obtained by the distance traveled by an overshooting parcel in the free troposphere. The upper layer depth becomes very small compared to the lower layer in a strong-inversion case. Our theoretical results are in line with Garcia and Mellado (2014): the mixed-layer growth can be characterized by mixed-layer convective parameters (equation 14), in the absence of subsidence, because α is related to the minimum buoyancy flux and relative inversion depth (equation 13). Conversely the top of the IL growth (equation 15) needs the additional parameter G , the relative stratification across the inversion. In a strong inversion case, $G \approx 0$ so that both the mixed layer and IL growths can be described by mixed-layer convective parameters only. It should therefore come to no surprise that zero-order bulk models of the CBL are able to accurately describe the entrainment process under a strong inversion because the IL in this case should scale with mixed-layer convective parameters (in the absence of subsidence, as seen in the mixed-layer entrainment equation 14). In the presence of a weak inversion and large G , zero-order models cannot accurately describe the entrainment process because G is missing from the set of parameters used in the closure.

e. Minimum buoyancy with integrated TKE closure

The only unknown of the new IL model is the minimum buoyancy flux $\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)$. We turn to the TKE budget in order to define the closure. Previous closures have used a local TKE budget at height z_i (Tennekes 1973; Zeman and Tennekes 1977; Tennekes and Driedonks 1981; Driedonks and Tennekes 1984; Driedonks 1982; Pino et al. 2003) or the integral CBL TKE budget (Fedorovich 1995; Fedorovich and Mironov 1995; Fedorovich et al. 2004; Conzemius and Fedorovich 2006, 2007; Kim et al. 2006). Here we use the

403 integral CBL TKE budget since it avoids the need for a parameterization of the transport
 404 and pressure terms: both terms are negligible when integrated over the entire CBL depth
 405 with neglected energy transport by waves above the CBL. Another advantage of the
 406 integral TKE budget is that the contribution of the storage term of TKE is much smaller
 407 than the other terms (Kim et al. 2006) whereas it can be a large contributor of the local
 408 TKE budget at height z_i (Zilitinkevich 1975).

409 In the assumed horizontally-homogeneous CBL, the local TKE budget in the
 410 Boussinesq approximation at any height reads:

$$411 \quad \frac{\partial e}{\partial t} = \underbrace{\frac{g}{\theta_0} \overline{w'\theta'}}_B - \underbrace{\left(\overline{u'w'} \frac{\partial U}{\partial z} + \overline{v'w'} \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \right)}_S - \underbrace{\frac{\partial \overline{w'e'}}{\partial z}}_T - \underbrace{\frac{1}{\rho_0} \frac{\partial \overline{w'p'}}{\partial z}}_P - \epsilon, \quad (16)$$

412 with e the TKE, B the buoyant production of TKE, S the shear production of TKE, T the
 413 turbulent transport of TKE, P the pressure fluctuations induced TKE, ϵ the TKE viscous
 414 dissipation rate, θ_0 the reference potential temperature and ρ_0 the reference hydrostatic
 415 air density. The normalized TKE budget is shown at different time steps of the LES in
 416 Fig. 8. The turbulent transport term vanishes when integrated over the entire CBL. The
 417 vertical integral of the pressure fluctuations P is negligible in the absence of gravity-wave
 418 transport (Fedorovich 1995) as well as the contribution of the storage term of TKE (Kim
 419 et al. 2006). After the initial transient stage, the integral TKE budget thus simplifies to:

$$420 \quad \int_0^h (B + S) dz = \int_0^h \epsilon dz, \quad (17)$$

421 that is the integral TKE production by buoyancy and shear is compensated by the integral
 422 viscous dissipation. In the case of a shear-free CBL, the shear term is zero so that (17)
 423 further simplifies to

$$\int_0^h B dz = \int_0^h \epsilon dz, \quad (18)$$

In the mixed layer the dissipation rate is typically nearly uniform vertically, only slightly decreasing with height in the mixed layer and then almost linearly decreasing to 0 at the PBL top (Fedorovich and Mironov 1995; Kim et al. 2006) as seen in Fig. 8. We therefore assume a uniform dissipation rate in the mixed layer $\langle \epsilon \rangle$ and a linearly decaying dissipation rate in the IL so that the integrated dissipation rate over the entire CBL is

$$\int_0^h \epsilon dz = \langle \epsilon \rangle (z_0 + \delta / 2). \quad (19)$$

We do not take into account the larger TKE dissipation rate in the surface layer because the surface layer is thin and is in quasi-equilibrium (Zilitinkevich 1991) so that one may assume that the TKE is locally dissipated there (Charuchittipan and Wilson 2009). The integral of the TKE buoyancy production in the mixed layer is (see appendix B for a complete derivation):

$$\frac{g}{\theta} \int_0^{z_0} \overline{w'\theta'} dz = \frac{1}{2} \frac{g}{\theta} \overline{w'\theta'}(0) z_0, \quad (20)$$

and in the IL the production integral is

$$\frac{g}{\theta} \int_{z_0}^h \overline{w'\theta'} dz = \frac{1}{12} \frac{g}{\theta} \left(\frac{6\alpha z_0^2 + (1-2\alpha)\delta^2}{\alpha z_0} \overline{w'\theta'}(0) - \frac{\delta}{\alpha^2(1-\alpha)} \overline{w'\theta'}(z_i) \right). \quad (21)$$

The minimum buoyancy flux is then related to the dissipation rate in the mixed layer summing the buoyancy contribution in the mixed layer, (20), and in the IL, (21), and using the equality of the rate of change of TKE (19):

$$\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i) = \alpha(1-\alpha) \frac{-6z_0^2\alpha + \delta^2(2\alpha-1)}{\delta z_0} \overline{w'\theta'}(0) + 6\alpha^2(1-\alpha) \frac{2z_0 + \delta}{\delta} \frac{\langle \theta \rangle}{g} \langle \epsilon \rangle. \quad (22)$$

For the closure we use a CBL scaling of the dissipation rate with the cube of the mixed-layer convective velocity (Zilitinkevich 1991; Garratt 1994; Fedorovich and Mironov 1995) $\epsilon k z_0 / w_*^3$. Fig. 8 depicts the normalized mixed-layer dissipation rate $\epsilon k z_0 / w_*^3$. In this case, after quasi steady-state is reached, the mixed-layer dissipation term is estimated as:

$$\frac{\langle \epsilon \rangle k z_0}{w_*^3} = C_\epsilon = 0.37, \quad (23)$$

which is close to the 0.3 value of Fedorovich and Mironov (1995). Using this closure on $\langle \epsilon \rangle$ we deduce the minimum buoyancy flux using (22) (full derivation is provided in Appendix B):

$$\beta = -\frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)} = -6\alpha^2(1-\alpha)\left(1 + 2\frac{z_0}{\delta}\right)\frac{C_\epsilon}{k} + (1-\alpha)\alpha\left(6\alpha\frac{z_0}{\delta} + \frac{\delta}{z_0}(1-2\alpha)\right). \quad (24)$$

It should be emphasized that this closure, equation (24), gives a relationship between i) the minimum buoyancy flux, ii) its relative position within the IL α , and iii) the relative inversion depth δ/z_0 . Equation (24) together with the diagnostic expression for the minimum flux height, equation (13), gives two independent equations for the relative position α , the relative inversion depth, δ/z_0 , and the minimum buoyancy flux. As described above, this inter-dependence of α , δ/z_0 , and the minimum buoyancy flux is implicitly imposed in zero-order models through the closure on the minimum flux only, since these models do not explicitly resolve the inversion layer. Here we have chosen a closure based on the minimum buoyancy flux but any other closure based on the relative position α or relative inversion depth δ/z_0 as a function of other CBL parameters could have been used in practice.

f. Inversion-layer growth rate

The IL growth rate can be found by subtracting the mixed-layer entrainment rate (9) from entrainment rate at the IL top, (12):

$$\frac{1}{w_*} \frac{d\delta}{dt} = \frac{1}{(2-G)} \frac{1}{\text{Ri}} \left(-\frac{3-G}{(1-\alpha)\alpha^2} \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)} - \frac{2+(1-G)(1+\alpha)}{\alpha} \frac{\delta}{z_0} \right) + (2-G) \frac{\bar{w}(h)}{w_*}. \quad (25)$$

The first term in the largest bracket corresponds to the cooling induced by the negative buoyancy flux in the inversion. This term always increases the inversion depth. The second term corresponds to the change in heat storage in the inversion and is detrimental to the inversion growth. It is also important to stress the presence of a large-scale velocity term. Subsidence, $\bar{w}(h) < 0$, decreases the IL depth as would be expected. Most importantly, the relative stratification G is needed to describe the growth of the IL and is present in neither zero-order models of the CBL nor in parameterized first-order models (since the inversion is parameterized as a function of the mixed-layer convective parameters).

5. Model evaluation

We now evaluate our new IL model in three shear-free CBL cases described above: i) a weak inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998), ii) a strong inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998) and iii) a growth against a linear stratification (Conzemius & Fedorovich 2006). The model is examined against van Zanten's (1999) first-order model in which the IL depth is parameterized as a function of the mixed-layer convective parameters and Deardorff's (1979) first-order model, which has two independent prognostic equations for the growth of the mixed-layer and IL top. We again stress that Deardorff showed that

this model led to spurious behavior in the presence of a strong inversion since the inversion becomes unrealistically thin. The zero-order model results, with closure $\overline{w'\theta_v'}(z_i) = -0.2\overline{w'\theta_v'}(0)$, are plotted as a baseline, even though this model cannot reproduce the IL and is therefore of limited use for our main purpose here: diagnosing the evolution of the IL.

In the weak inversion case depicted in Fig. 9, Deardorff's model correctly predicts the evolution of z_i , yet overestimates the inversion top h . Van Zanten's model strongly underestimates elevations of the mixed layer and IL. The zero-order model accurately predicts the time dependence of z_i , even though it does not take into account the relative stratification G . The new inversion model accurately describes the mixed-layer and IL growths and favorably compares to LES outputs. All models perform well in terms of potential temperature (beside van Zanten's) as would be expected since changes in the entrainment do not drastically impact the mixed-layer potential temperature (Gentine et al. 2013a).

In the strong inversion case depicted in Fig. 10, van Zanten's model strongly underestimates the mixed-layer growth and overestimates the IL depth. The zero-order model performs very well and accurately reproduces the minimum buoyancy level z_i . Deardorff's model compares favorably to the LES in the first 2 hours of the simulation, but the inversion depth is then strongly underestimated. In fact at high Ri the inversion layer represented by this model collapses leading to a singularity, as pointed out by Deardorff (1979). The new inversion model compares very favorably to the LES output. The mixed-layer growth is well captured as well as the growth of the inversion depth.

The models are further evaluated in the case of the growth against a linear stratification in Fig. 11. The zero-order model again performs well. Van Zanten's model underestimates the mixed layer growth: the entrainment flux at the mixed layer top is strongly underestimated in this model: the IL grows too quickly compared to the mixed layer depth. Deardorff's model underestimates the growth of the boundary layer. The new inversion model again performs well compared to the observations and accurately represents the IL growth. The new model offers important improvements compared to first-order models of the PBL as it can accurately represent both the mixed-layer and IL growths in various conditions without any additional parameterization.

6. Inversion layer structure with LES and inversion model

We now investigate the structure of the inversion layer and the relative position of the minimum buoyancy flux within the inversion $\alpha = (z_i - z_0) / (h - z_0)$. As seen in Fig. 12 the relative depth of the inversion $\delta / z_0 = (h - z_0) / z_0$ decreases with the convective Richardson number. Deardorff's (1983) parameterization of the inversion layer depth as a function of the Richardson number, $\frac{\delta}{z_0} = \frac{0.7}{(\text{Ri} + 2.07)^{1/4}}$, overestimates the inversion layer depth. Approaches based on a parcel theory approach (converting updraft buoyancy into kinetic energy consumption) (Stull 1973, Neggers 2007) overestimate the dependence of the inversion depth on the Richardson number. The parameterization of Neggers (2007) correctly performs at high Richardson numbers under a strong inversion. This emphasizes that under a strong inversion a parcel approach correctly represents the entrainment process and IL structure - this may reflect the fact that under a strong inversion the horizontally-averaged IL represents an averaging of a locally varying interface with sharp

edges separating a region of near mixed layer air from the free-tropospheric air (Lilly 2002a,b). Substantial departure from parcel theory is present at low Richardson numbers, showing that a parcel theory does not provide a good representation of the IL depth and entrainment in this regime. This may reflect the fact that under a weak inversion local stratification above the interfacial layer may substantially differ from the free-tropospheric value (Cohn and Angevine 2000). As discussed earlier, Garcia and Mellado (2014) showed, using DNS data, that the inversion layer may be considered as composed of two layers: a lower layer which depth is related to the mixed-layer thickness and an upper layer dominated by the penetrating thermals that are directly affected by the free tropospheric stratification. The depth of this upper layer can be found based on a Lagrangian parcel overshooting in the free troposphere and is related to the Ozmidov length scale. Under a strong inversion, the upper layer becomes much thinner than the lower layer so that the relative stratification G (or Ozmidov length scale) is not needed any more to characterize the IL. Garcia and Mellado (2014) also derived a parameterization of the relative IL depth: $\delta / z_0 = C \text{ Ri}^{-1} \left(1 + \left(1 + \frac{C_1 - 1}{C} \text{ Ri} \right)^{1/2} \right)$ with $C=0.3$ and $C_I=0.76$, plotted on Fig. 12. Our results are consistent with those recent DNS results and emphasize (equations 14 and 25) that the mixed-layer growth can be described by mixed-layer convective parameters but the IL growth needs the additional parameter G , which is not accounted for in typical zero- and first-order CBL models.

The dependence of the relative position of the minimum buoyancy flux within the inversion α on the Richardson number is depicted in Fig. 12 (lower panel). At low Richardson number the minimum buoyancy flux is located at 40% of the IL depth. At

low Richardson number the position of the minimum buoyancy flux depends on the Richardson number. At higher Richardson number, and in the strong inversion case, α asymptotically reaches $2/3$. In addition, in the strong inversion case the IL depth is a near-constant fraction ($1/4$) of the mixed layer depth. The depth of the IL, which is defined as the layer between z_0 and h , is non-negligible as assumed in mixed-layer models. If instead we used the region extending from z_i to h for the IL definition, the IL depth would represent only 8% of the mixed layer depth z_0 or 7% of z_i . Under a weak stratification the IL depth is a substantial fraction of the mixed-layer depth (35 to 45%). The new inversion model can be used to understand how the entrainment modifies the structure of the IL and especially the position of the minimum buoyancy flux. First, the denominator of equation (13) imposes that $\alpha < 2/3$, i.e. the minimum buoyancy flux must be located in the lower $2/3^{\text{rd}}$ portion of the IL. This theoretical asymptotical limit pertains under a strong inversion (i.e. small δ / z_0). Our LES results in Fig. 12 indeed confirm that α is always lower than this theoretical limit ($2/3$). Similarly the equation of the entrainment at the IL top, (15), imposes $\alpha > 1/3$. This result is confirmed by our LES data in Fig. 12.

Based on our LES data, the normalized minimum flux $\beta = -\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i) / \overline{w'\theta'}(0)$ exhibits a high $\text{Ri}^{4/3}$ dependence for $\text{Ri} < 15$ (Fig. 13). For $\text{Ri} > 15$, the normalized flux is nearly constant with a mean value equal to 0.13 in good agreement with previous studies (e.g. Sullivan et al. 1998). The departure from a constant flux ratio and its dependence on the Richardson number has also been pointed out by Fedorovich et al. (2004). At low Ri , the absolute LES minimum buoyancy flux is lower than the DNS value (Garcia and Mellado 2014), plotted in Fig. 13. The relative position of the minimum buoyancy flux

height compared to the mixed layer depth, $(z_i - z_0)/z_0$ is also plotted on Fig. 13. Interestingly this position is relatively constant across Ri values, of the order of 0.17, showing that the mixed layer height provides a good scaling of the position of the minimum buoyancy flux, whereas the total IL depth cannot be characterized by mixed-layer scaling only.

The minimum buoyancy flux, the relative depth of the inversion and the position of the minimum buoyancy are tightly coupled as emphasized and diagnosed in the LES data and with the new inversion model in Fig. 14. The relative position of the minimum buoyancy flux in the inversion α increases with $\beta = -\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)/\overline{w'\theta'}(0)$ as shown in Fig. 14a, even though substantial spread of data is evident. Similarly the relation between the relative inversion depth δ/z_0 and β is relatively loose and no clear trend is seen (Fig. 14b). The relationship between α , δ/z_0 and β , in equation (13), suggests that we should use $\gamma = -(\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)z_0)/(\overline{w'\theta'}(0)\delta)$ instead β to evaluate the dependence between α and δ/z_0 . Indeed using γ in lieu of β substantially reduces the spread in the data (Fig. 14c). The model-inferred α (equation (13)) correctly characterizes the LES-observed dependence of α on γ , as seen in Fig. 14c. This again confirms the quality of the new inversion model predictions in a wide range of conditions. Some spread is present in the weak-inversion case but can be explained by the relative small time step (180s) - and hence noisy output - used in the analysis. δ/z_0 exhibits a tight dependence on γ and decays almost linearly with γ (slope -0.57). The presence of δ/z_0 in γ could expect to reduce the spread in the data, yet the near-linear decay emphasizes that β and δ/z_0 are coevolving. The relative position of the minimum buoyancy flux in the IL α

596 decreases sharply with the relative inversion depth δ/z_0 (Fig. 14d). The modeled
 597 inversion structure is well characterized compared to LES data. It is generally assumed
 598 that the inversion layer is symmetric and that $\alpha=0.5$, but in the weak inversion case and
 599 constant stratification cases, α is smaller than 0.5. In the strong inversion case the
 600 minimum buoyancy flux is located much higher within the IL ($\alpha \approx 0.6$).

601 The dependence of Y on the relative stratification $G = \gamma_\theta \delta / \Delta\theta$ (Deardorff 1979,
 602 Fedorovich and Mironov 1995) is investigated in the LES in Fig. 15. Contrary to
 603 Deardorff (1979) and Fedorovich and Mironov (1995) our LES results exhibit little
 604 dependence on the relative stratification G , beside a slight decrease at high G . We point
 605 out that these differences with Deardorff (1979) and Fedorovich and Mironov (1995) are
 606 certainly explained by our different definition of the IL. Our definition of the base of the
 607 IL (first vanishing buoyancy flux) is similar to Deardorff (1979) and Fedorovich and
 608 Mironov (1995) but our IL top (h) is always lower than theirs: indeed in the LES
 609 diagnostic we have used the intersection of the tangent at the maximum θ vertical
 610 gradient with the free-tropospheric profile (see section 3). We have used this alternate
 611 definition of the CBL top since the exact height of vanishing flux in the LES is highly
 612 variable and erratic in the LES outputs (Conzemius and Fedorovich 2005). As a
 613 consequence our shape factor computation is different from previous studies. The mean
 614 shape factor diagnosed in the LES is 0.325, close to our theoretical value, $Y=1/3$,
 615 assuming a parabolic potential temperature profile (see derivation in appendix A). There
 616 is a decrease of Y with G in the LES data in the weak inversion and constant stratification
 617 cases but the strong inversion case does not seem to support this change of Y with G ; Y is
 618 again close to $1/3$ in this case. Equation (12) emphasizes that G must be less than 2 to

avoid infinite entrainment. This limit is in good agreement with the maximum range of observed G values (0 to 1.8) based on a metadata analysis of LES and laboratory data (Fedorovich and Mironov 1995) and our range of observed values in Fig. 15.

7. Conclusions

We have proposed a new model for the clear-sky shear-free buoyancy driven convective boundary layer that takes into account the curvature of the potential temperature profile in the inversion layer. To comprehend the structure of this layer we have used large-eddy simulations in weak and strong inversion cases. The large-eddy simulations suggest that the following LES results can be applied to build a consistent model of the mixed layer and inversion layer:

- The mixed-layer top corresponds to the lowest height of zero buoyancy flux, as reported by Deardorff (1979) and Fedorovich and Mironov (1995).
- The height of zero buoyancy flux and zero corresponding vertical gradient is not an accurate measure of the top of the inversion layer since it depends on the LES resolution and numerics. Instead we use the position of the intersection of the tangent at the steepest θ vertical gradient with the free tropospheric profile, or similarly the minimum curvature of the potential temperature profile, h .
- At h , the buoyancy-flux and potential-temperature vertical gradients can be considered discontinuous.
- At the mixed-layer top the buoyancy-flux and potential-temperature vertical gradients are continuous.

The proposed model resolves the inconsistencies of first-order models and does not require additional parameterization of the inversion structure such as in the general structure model. The inversion-layer model is based on a second-order polynomial for the potential temperature profile and a third-order polynomial for the buoyancy flux profile.

The main results are:

- The new inversion model can accurately prognosticate the rate of growth of the inversion and of the mixed layer in varying conditions (weak and strong inversions). The position of the minimum buoyancy flux can be deduced from the model and is located between the first and second third of the inversion depth, in agreement with the LES outputs. The minimum buoyancy flux height increases with the magnitude of the minimum buoyancy flux and asymptotically reaches $2/3^{\text{rd}}$ of the inversion layer depth under a strong inversion. In turn the inversion layer depth decreases with increased magnitude of the minimum buoyancy flux.
- Both the inversion depth and the position of the minimum buoyancy flux z_i can be expressed in terms of the minimum buoyancy flux so that the CBL growth can be expressed as a single closure in terms of the minimum buoyancy flux.
- The mixed-layer growth can be described by mixed-layer convective scaling (convective vertical velocity and Richardson number), whereas the inversion layer growth needs the additional parameter G , the relative stratification across the inversion. This emphasizes that the set of parameters used in current zero- and first-order models to describe the entrainment is incomplete. The position of the minimum buoyancy flux z_i seems however to scale well with the mixed-layer height, based on LES observations. When $G \approx 0$, the entrainment process and

663 inversion-layer growth/depth can then be described by mixed-layer convective
 664 parameters only, as in zero-order models.

- 665 • The relative stratification across the inversion, G , is theoretically constrained to
 666 lie within the range 0 to 2, which is consistent with LES and laboratory
 667 observations. Two-layer non-stratified fluid (zero relative stratification G)
 668 exhibits smaller inversion layer growth rate compared to stratified fluid.

669 This latter result emphasizes that zero-order models can correctly simulate the CBL
 670 growth even under weak inversions because they implicitly represent the flux profile
 671 curvature and depth of the inversion layer through their dependence on the minimum
 672 buoyancy flux. A correct closure on the minimum buoyancy flux is thus sufficient to
 673 represent: i) the magnitude of the entrainment flux, ii) the storage term (as already
 674 emphasized by Sullivan et al. (1998) and iii) the shape of the inversion-layer profile. The
 675 shape of the inversion profile is a new component that provides additional insights in the
 676 entrainment process in the CBL.

677 The improved inversion model proposed here addresses and corrects the
 678 inconsistencies of first-order models pointed out by Deardorff (1979) and does not rely
 679 on a parameterization of the inversion layer structure like in general structure models.
 680 These results emphasize the impact of the inversion-layer vertical structure on the rates of
 681 growth of the mixed and inversion layers. The position of the minimum buoyancy flux is
 682 an important factor controlling the magnitude of the minimum buoyancy flux for the
 683 mixed-layer entrainment rate and for the inversion layer growth. In climate models we
 684 suggest that our new inversion layer model can be used to refine the characterization of

685 the inversion layer, avoiding nesting or the definition of an ambiguous layer (as in Park
686 and Bretherton 2009).

687 *Acknowledgments.*

688 The authors would like to thank Fabio D'Andrea and Alan K. Betts for stimulating
689 discussions on the subject and three anonymous reviewers for their thorough comments.

690 P. Gentine acknowledges support from grant NSF-AGS 1035843, DOE-ASR ER65481
691 and NASA-NIP13-0095.

692

APPENDIX A

Derivation of entrainment velocities

We assume a quadratic profile for the potential temperature θ in the IL. To derive the profile, we use the following boundary conditions: i) at the mixed-layer top ($z=z_0$) θ in the inversion matches the mixed-layer value, ii) and the corresponding vertical gradient of θ is null, and iii) θ is continuous at the top of the inversion and matches the free tropospheric value. The θ profile in the inversion is thus:

$$\theta(z) = \langle \theta \rangle + \Delta\theta \left(\frac{z - z_0}{\delta} \right)^2, \quad (\text{A1})$$

with $\langle \theta \rangle$ being the mixed-layer potential temperature, $\Delta\theta = \theta(h) - \langle \theta \rangle$ the jump of θ across the inversion and $\delta = h - z_0$ the IL depth.

The corresponding vertical turbulent flux of θ , $\overline{w'\theta'}$, has to be a third-order polynomial, as discussed in section 4. The following conditions are assumed on the profile: i) the flux vanishes at the mixed-layer top z_0 – this is in fact our definition of the mixed layer as in Deardorff (1979) and Fedorovich (1995), ii) the flux vanishes at the top of the inversion, h , iii) the flux vertical derivative is assumed continuous at the mixed layer top and therefore equal to $\overline{w'\theta'}(0)/z_0$, assuming a linear flux profile in the mixed layer and iv) the flux is minimum at height z_i within the IL, which is a model diagnostic (see below). Based on those assumptions the profile of $\overline{w'\theta'}$ in the inversion can be derived:

$$\overline{w'\theta'}(z) = -\overline{w'\theta'}(0) \frac{(z-z_0)(z_0+\delta-z)(\delta\alpha(2-3\alpha)-(z-z_0)(1-2\alpha))}{z_0\delta^2\alpha(2-3\alpha)}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

with $\alpha = (z_i - z_0)/(h - z_0)$ the relative position of the minimum buoyancy in the inversion layer. It is obvious from the denominator of $\overline{w'\theta'}$, in equation (A2), that the upper bound of α is 2/3 to avoid infinite flux in the inversion layer. Using (A2) we can express the minimum buoyancy flux as

$$\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i) = -\overline{w'\theta'}(0) \frac{\delta}{z_0} \frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)^2}{2-3\alpha}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Equation (A3) emphasizes the relationship between the minimum $\overline{w'\theta'}$, the relative inversion depth and the relative position of the minimum $\overline{w'\theta'}$ in the IL, α . In fact only a single closure assumption is necessary, either on α or on $\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)$ to close the full set of equations since δ is a prognostic variable. We here use a closure on $\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)$, which is based on the vertically integrated TKE budget (see appendix B).

(A2) and (A3) can be combined into an expression describing the flux profile $\overline{w'\theta'}(z)$ as functions of the minimum flux $\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)$:

$$\overline{w'\theta'}(z) = \overline{w'\theta'}(0) \frac{(z-z_0)(z_0+\delta-z)(z_0+\alpha\delta-z)}{z_0\delta^2\alpha} + \overline{w'\theta'}(z_i) \frac{(z-z_0)^2(z_0+\delta-z)}{\delta^3\alpha^2(1-\alpha)}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

The total derivative of θ can be computed just above and below the top of the inversion, where the potential temperature is continuous, using the conservation equation (1), neglecting radiation divergence and variations in the free-tropospheric profile. We use the definition of the total derivative as a function of partial derivatives just below (left derivative h_-) or above the inversion (right derivative h_+):

$$\frac{d\theta}{dt} \Big|_{z=h_- \text{ or } h_+} = \frac{dh}{dt} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial z} \Big|_{z=h_- \text{ or } h_+} + \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t}(h). \quad (\text{A5})$$

The local rate of change of θ , $\partial \theta / \partial t$, is simply given by the conservation equation (1).

Similarly at the PBL top:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\theta(h)}{dt} &= \gamma_\theta \left(\frac{dh}{dt} - \bar{w}(h) \right) \\ &= \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial z} \Big|_{h^-} \left(\frac{dh}{dt} - \bar{w}(h) \right) - \frac{\partial \overline{w'\theta'}}{\partial z} \Big|_{h^-}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

in which $\frac{dh}{dt} - \bar{w}(h)$ is the entrainment velocity, $w_e(h)$, at the top of the boundary layer.

Based on the assumed quadratic profile, (A1), the potential temperature vertical gradient below the inversion top is

$$\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial z} \Big|_{z=h_-} = 2 \frac{\Delta \theta}{\delta}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

and the corresponding flux gradient is, using (A2):

$$\frac{\partial \overline{w'\theta'}}{\partial z} \Big|_{h^-} = - \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\delta} \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)\alpha^2} - \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)}{z_0} \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} = \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)}{z_0} \left(\frac{k}{(1-\alpha)\alpha^2} - \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \right), \quad (\text{A8})$$

with $k = -z_0 / \delta \overline{w'\theta'}(z_i) / \overline{w'\theta'}(0)$. The entrainment rate of the boundary-layer top is

$$\left(\Delta \theta - \frac{\gamma_\theta \delta}{2} \right) w_e(h) = - \frac{1}{2(1-\alpha)\alpha^2} \overline{w'\theta'}(z_i) - \frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha} \frac{\delta}{z_0} \overline{w'\theta'}(0). \quad (\text{A9})$$

Introducing the relative stratification $G = \gamma_\theta \delta / \Delta \theta$ (Deardorff 1979, Fedorovich and

Mironov 1995), the convective Richardson number $\text{Ri} = \frac{gz_0}{w_*^2} \frac{\Delta \theta}{\theta_0}$, w_* Deardorff's

convective velocity (Deardorff 1970) and θ_0 the reference potential temperature under

the Boussinesq approximation:

$$\frac{w_e(h)}{w_*} = \frac{1}{2-G} \frac{1}{\text{Ri}} \left(-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \frac{\delta}{z_0} - \frac{1}{\alpha^2(1-\alpha)} \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)} \right). \quad (\text{A10})$$

We now introduce the integral shape factor like Deardorff (1979)

$$Y = \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{z_0}^h \frac{\theta - \langle \theta \rangle}{\Delta \theta} dz \quad (\text{A11})$$

With our parabolic profile, equation (A1), $Y=1/3$. The integral of the potential temperature in the inversion is thus:

$$\int_{z_0}^h \theta dz = \langle \theta \rangle \delta + \Delta \theta \delta Y. \quad (\text{A12})$$

The heat budget in the inversion layer is (using Leibniz rule):

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{z_0}^h \theta dz - \frac{dh}{dt} (\langle \theta \rangle + \Delta \theta) + \frac{dz_0}{dt} \langle \theta \rangle = - \int_{z_0}^h \bar{w} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial z} dz, \quad (\text{A13})$$

The first term on the left hand side of the equation can be expanded using (A12):

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{z_0}^h \theta dz = \frac{d\langle \theta \rangle}{dt} \delta + \langle \theta \rangle \left(\frac{dh}{dt} - \frac{dz_0}{dt} \right) + \frac{d\Delta \theta}{dt} \delta Y + \Delta \theta \left(\frac{dh}{dt} - \frac{dz_0}{dt} \right) Y + \Delta \theta \delta \frac{dY}{dt}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

The change in the potential temperature increment across the inversion is:

$$\frac{d\Delta \theta}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt} (\theta(h) - \langle \theta \rangle) = \gamma_\theta \frac{dh}{dt} - \frac{d\langle \theta \rangle}{dt}, \quad (\text{A15})$$

assuming a constant free tropospheric profile. Assuming a constant Y and linear large-scale vertical velocity, (A13) then simplifies to:

$$w_e(z_0) = \frac{1-Y}{Y} \frac{\delta}{z_0} \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)}{\Delta \theta} + \left(1+G - \frac{1}{Y} \right) w_e(h) + \left(\frac{1/3-Y}{Y} \right) \frac{\bar{w}(z_0)}{w_*} + \left(1+G - \frac{1}{Y} \right) \frac{\bar{w}(h)}{w_*}, \quad (\text{A16})$$

This can be rewritten, using the convective velocity and Richardson number, as

$$\frac{w_e(z_0)}{w_*} = \frac{1-Y}{Y} \frac{\delta}{z_0} \frac{1}{\text{Ri}} + \left(1+G - \frac{1}{Y} \right) \frac{w_e(h)}{w_*} + \left(\frac{1/3-Y}{Y} \right) \frac{\bar{w}(z_0)}{w_*} + \left(1+G - \frac{1}{Y} \right) \frac{\bar{w}(h)}{w_*}. \quad (\text{A17})$$

765 Using the entrainment velocity at the PBL top, equation (A10), we can simplify this
 766 expression

$$767 \quad \frac{w_e(z_0)}{w_*} = \frac{1}{\text{Ri}} \left(\frac{-\alpha G - \alpha Y + 2YG\alpha + \alpha - Y(G+1) + 1}{\alpha Y(2-G)} \frac{\delta}{z_0} - \frac{Y(G+1)-1}{\alpha^2(1-\alpha)(2-G)Y} \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)} \right) + \frac{1/3 - Y}{Y} \frac{\bar{w}(z_0)}{w_*} + \frac{Y(1+G) - 1/3}{Y} \frac{\bar{w}(h)}{w_*}.$$

768 (A18)

769 With our value of the shape factor $Y=1/3$:

$$770 \quad \frac{w_e(z_0)}{w_*} = \frac{1}{\text{Ri}} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \frac{\delta}{z_0} + \frac{1}{\alpha^2(1-\alpha)} \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)} \right) - (2-G) \frac{\bar{w}(h)}{w_*}.$$

771 (A19)

APPENDIX B

Integration of the TKE budget

We assume that the storage term of the TKE equation is negligible compared to the other terms once the Ozmidov length scale is much smaller than the CBL depth (Dillon 1982). Zilintikevich (1975) showed that the storage term could be an important term of the local TKE budget. In the inversion the storage is typically at least an order of magnitude larger than in the mixed-layer (see Fig. 8). In our case we are considering the vertically-integrated TKE budget over the CBL depth and the storage term is much smaller than other terms, as observed in the LES data. Only the dissipation term has to be parameterized to determine the closure of the TKE budget. Integrating the dissipation over the entire PBL gives, assuming uniform dissipation rate in the mixed layer and linear decay of the dissipation rate in the inversion layer:

$$\int_0^h \epsilon \, dz = \frac{z_0 + h}{2} \langle \epsilon \rangle. \quad (\text{B1})$$

The minimum buoyancy flux can now be expressed using the integrated PBL TKE budget:

$$\frac{z_m + h}{2} \langle \epsilon \rangle = \frac{1}{2} w_*^3 \left(1 + \frac{4}{3} \frac{\delta}{z_m} \frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)} \right) + S_{\text{inversion layer}} + S_g, \quad (\text{B2})$$

with $S_{\text{inversion layer}}$ the vertically-integrated TKE buoyancy consumption (taken as negative) in the IL and S_g the TKE production contribution of waves, which is neglected here.

The integral of the TKE buoyancy production in the inversion is

$$\frac{g}{\theta_v} \int_{z_0}^h \overline{w'\theta'} \, dz = \frac{1}{12} \frac{g}{\theta} \left(\frac{6\alpha z_0^2 + (1-2\alpha)\delta^2}{\alpha z_0} \overline{w'\theta'}(0) - \frac{\delta}{\alpha^2(1-\alpha)} \overline{w'\theta'}(z_i) \right) \quad (\text{B3})$$

792 and in the mixed-layer

$$793 \quad \frac{g}{\theta_v} \int_0^{z_0} \overline{w'\theta'} dz = \frac{1}{2} \frac{g}{\theta} \overline{w'\theta'}(0) z_0. \quad (\text{B4})$$

794 Since the integrated TKE dissipation is $\langle \epsilon \rangle (z_0 + \delta/2)$ then the minimum
795 buoyancy flux can be found as:

$$796 \quad \overline{w'\theta'}(z_i) = \alpha(1-\alpha) \frac{-6z_0^2\alpha + \delta^2(2\alpha-1)}{\delta z_0} \overline{w'\theta'}(0) + 6\alpha^2(1-\alpha) \frac{2z_0 + \delta}{\delta} \frac{\bar{\theta}}{g} \langle \epsilon \rangle. \quad (\text{B5})$$

797 Or in dimensionless form:

$$798 \quad \beta = -\frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)} = \alpha(1-\alpha) \frac{6z_0^2\alpha - \delta^2(2\alpha-1)}{\delta z_0} - 6\alpha^2(1-\alpha) z_0 \frac{2z_0 + \delta}{\delta} \frac{1}{w_*^3} \langle \epsilon \rangle \quad (\text{B6})$$

799 Using the convective scaling for the dissipation rate, $\langle \epsilon \rangle = C_\epsilon \frac{w_*^3}{kz_0}$ (Zilitikevich 1991),

800 gives:

$$801 \quad \beta = -\frac{\overline{w'\theta'}(z_i)}{\overline{w'\theta'}(0)} = \alpha(1-\alpha) \frac{6z_0^2\alpha - \delta^2(2\alpha-1)}{\delta z_0} - \frac{C_\epsilon}{k} 6\alpha^2(1-\alpha) \frac{2z_0 + \delta}{\delta} \quad (\text{B7})$$

802 which simplifies to

$$803 \quad \beta = 6\alpha^2(1-\alpha) \left(1 - 2 \frac{C_\epsilon}{k} \right) \frac{z_0}{\delta} - \frac{C_\epsilon}{k} 6\alpha^2(1-\alpha) - (2\alpha-1) \frac{\delta}{z_0}. \quad (\text{B8})$$

804 The last term in δ/z_0 of (B8) is five orders of magnitude smaller than the other terms so
805 that we can further approximate (B8) as:

$$806 \quad \beta \approx 6\alpha^2(1-\alpha) \left(1 - 2 \frac{C_\epsilon}{k} \right) \frac{z_0}{\delta} - \frac{C_\epsilon}{k} 6\alpha^2(1-\alpha). \quad (\text{B9})$$

807 We can then solve for the IL depth by equating (B9) and (13):

$$\frac{\delta}{z_0} = \frac{3\frac{C_\epsilon}{k}\alpha(1+\alpha)(3\alpha-2) + \sqrt{3\alpha(3\alpha-2)(\alpha+1)^2 - 2(1-\alpha)\left(1-2\frac{C_\epsilon}{k}\right)}}{1-\alpha} \quad (\text{B10})$$

This expression of the IL depth can be used in (13) to find the relationship $\beta(\alpha)$ or conversely $\beta(\delta/z_0)$.

812 8. References

- 813 Ball, F. K., 1960: Control of inversion height by surface heating. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor.*
 814 *Soc.*, 86, 483–494.
- 815 Betts, A. K., 1973: Non-precipitating cumulus convection and its parameterization.
 816 *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 99, 178–196.
- 817 Betts, A. K., 1974: Non-precipitating convection and its parameterization - reply. *Q J Roy*
 818 *Meteor Soc*, 100, 469–471.
- 819 Betts, A. K., and W. Ridgway, 1988: Coupling of the Radiative, Convective, and Surface
 820 Fluxes over the Equatorial Pacific. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 45, 522–536.
- 821 Bony, S. and Coauthors, 2006: How well do we understand and evaluate climate change
 822 feedback processes? *J Climate*, 19, 3445–3482.
- 823 Bony, S., and K. Emanuel, 2005: On the role of moist processes in tropical intraseasonal
 824 variability: Cloud-radiation and moisture-convection feedbacks. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 62,
 825 2770–2789.
- 826 Bony, S., J. L. Dufresne, H. Le Treut, J. J. Morcrette, and C. Senior, 2004: On dynamic
 827 and thermodynamic components of cloud changes. *Clim. Dynam*, 22, 71–86,
 828 doi:10.1007/s00382-003-0369-6.
- 829 Bretherton, C. S. and Coauthors, 1999: An intercomparison of radiatively driven
 830 entrainment and turbulence in a smoke cloud, as simulated by different numerical

- 831 models. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 125, 391–423.
- 832 Bretherton, C. S., and S. Park, 2009: A New Moist Turbulence Parameterization in the
 833 Community Atmosphere Model. *J. Climate*, 22, 3422–3448,
 834 doi:10.1175/2008JCLI2556.1.
- 835 Charuchittipan, D., and J. D. Wilson, 2009: Turbulent Kinetic Energy Dissipation in the
 836 Surface Layer. *Bound-Lay Meteorol*, 132, 193–204, doi:10.1007/s10546-009-9399-x.
- 837 Cohn, S. A., & Angevine, W. M. 2000. Boundary Layer Height and Entrainment Zone
 838 Thickness Measured by Lidars and Wind-Profiling Radars. *J Applied Meteor*, 39,
 839 1233–1247.
- 840 Conzemius, R., and E. Fedorovich, 2006: Dynamics of Sheared Convective Boundary
 841 Layer Entrainment. Part II: Evaluation of Bulk Model Predictions of Entrainment
 842 Flux. *J Atmos Sci*, 63, 1179–1199.
- 843 Conzemius, R., and E. Fedorovich, 2007: Bulk models of the sheared convective
 844 boundary layer: Evaluation through large eddy simulations. *J Atmos Sci*, 64, 786–
 845 807, doi:10.1175/JAS3870.1.
- 846 Deardorff, J. W. 1970, Convective Velocity and Temperature Scales for the Unstable
 847 Planetary Boundary Layer and for Rayleigh Convection, *J Atmos Sci*, 27(8), 1211–
 848 1213.
- 849 Deardorff, J. W., 1976: Entrainment Rate of Stratocumulus-Topped Mixed Layer. *Quart.*
 850 *J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 102, 563–582.

- 851 Deardorff, J. W., 1979: Prediction of convective mixed-layer entrainment for realistic
 852 capping inversion structure. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 36, 424–436.
- 853 Deardorff, J. W., 1981: On the Distribution of Mean Radiative Cooling at the Top of a
 854 Stratocumulus-Capped Mixed Layer. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 107, 191–202.
- 855 Deardorff, J. W., 1983: A Multi-limit Mixed-layer Entrainment Formulation. *J. phys.*
 856 *ocean.*, 13, 988–1002.
- 857 Deardorff, J. W., and G. Willis, 1980: Laboratory studies of the entrainment zone of a
 858 convectively mixed layer. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 100, 41–64.
- 859 Dillon, T. M. (1982), Vertical overturns: A comparison of Thorpe and Ozmidov length
 860 scales, *J. Geo. Res.*, 87(C12), 9601–9613.
- 861 Driedonks, A. G. M., 1982: Models and observations of the growth of the atmospheric
 862 boundary layer. *Bound-Lay Meteorol*, 23, 283–306, doi:10.1007/BF00121117.
- 863 Driedonks, A., and H. Tennekes, 1984: Entrainment Effects in the Well-Mixed
 864 Atmospheric Boundary-Layer. *Bound-Lay Meteorol*, 30, 75–105.
- 865 Fedorovich, E., 1995: Modeling the atmospheric convective boundary layer within a
 866 zero-order jump approach: An extended theoretical framework. *J Appl Meteorol.*, 34,
 867 1916-1928.
- 868 Fedorovich, E., and D. Mironov, 1995: A model for a shear-free convective boundary
 869 layer with parameterized capping inversion structure. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 52, 83–95.
- 870 Fedorovich, E., R. Conzemius, and D. Mironov 2004: Convective Entrainment into a

- 871 Shear-Free, Linearly Stratified Atmosphere: Bulk Models Reevaluated through Large
 872 Eddy Simulations, *J Atmos Sci*, 61(3), 281–295.
- 873 Garcia J., & Mellado, J. P. 2014. The Two-layer Structure of the Entrainment Zone in the
 874 Convective Boundary Layer. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 71, 1935-1955.
- 875 Garratt, J., 1994: The atmospheric boundary layer. *Cambridge University Press*, 336p.
- 876 Gentine, P., A. K. Betts, B. R. Lintner, K. L. Findell, C. C. van Heerwaarden, A. Tzella,
 877 and F. D'Andrea, 2013a: A probabilistic-bulk model of coupled boundary layer and
 878 convection: 1) Clear-sky case. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 70, 1543–1556, doi:10.1175/JAS-D-12-
 879 0145.1.
- 880 Gentine, P., A. K. Betts, B. R. Lintner, K. L. Findell, C. C. van Heerwaarden, and F.
 881 D'Andrea, 2013b: A probabilistic-bulk model of coupled boundary layer and
 882 convection: 2) Shallow convection case. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 70, 1557–1576,
 883 doi:10.1175/JAS-D-12-0146.1.
- 884 Gentine, P., Holtslag, A. A. M., D'Andrea, F., & Ek, M. 2013c: Surface and atmospheric
 885 controls on the onset of moist convection over land. *J. Hydrometeor.*,
 886 doi:10.1175/JHM-D-12-0137.1
- 887 Hägeli, P., D. G. Steyn, and K. B. Strawbridge, 2000: Spatial And Temporal Variability
 888 Of Mixed-Layer Depth And Entrainment Zone Thickness. *Bound-Lay. Meteorol.*, 97,
 889 47–71.
- 890 Hohenegger, C., and C. S. Bretherton, 2011: Simulating deep convection with a shallow

- 891 convection scheme. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 10389–10406, doi:10.5194/acp-11-
 892 10389-2011.
- 893 Jonker, H., and M. A. Jiménez, 2014, Laboratory Experiments on Convective
 894 Entrainment Using a Saline Water Tank, *Bound-Lay. Meteorol.* (in press)
- 895 Kamada, R. F., 1988: A Fractal interfacial entrainment model for dry convective
 896 boundary layers. Part II: Discussion of model behavior and comparison with other
 897 models. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 45, 2375–2383.
- 898 Kim, S.-W., S.-U. Park, D. Pino, and J. V.-G. Arellano, 2006: Parameterization of
 899 Entrainment in a Sheared Convective Boundary Layer Using a First-order Jump
 900 Model. *Bound-Lay Meteorol.*, 120, 455–475, doi:10.1007/s10546-006-9067-3.
- 901 Lilly, D. K., 1968: Models of Cloud-Topped Mixed Layers Under a Strong Inversion.
 902 *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 94, 292–309.
- 903 Lilly, D. K., 2002a. Entrainment into Mixed Layers. Part I: Sharp-Edged and Smoothed
 904 Tops. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 59(23), 3340–3352.
- 905 Lilly, D. K., 2002b. Entrainment into Mixed Layers. Part II: A New Closure. *J. Atmos.*
 906 *Sci.*, 59(23), 3353–3361.
- 907 Mason, P. J., 1989: Large-Eddy Simulation of the Convective Atmospheric Boundary
 908 Layer. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 46, 1492–1516.
- 909 Mellado, J. P., B. Stevens, H. Schmidt, and N. Peters, 2010: Probability density functions
 910 in the cloud-top mixing layer. *New J. Phys.*, 12, 085010.

- 911 Morinishi, Y., Lund, T. S., Vasilyev, O. V., and Moin, P., 1998. Fully conservative
 912 higher order finite difference schemes for incompressible flow. *J. Comput. Physics*,
 913 *143*(1), 90-124.
- 914 Neggers, R. A. J., B. Stevens, and J. D. Neelin, 2007: Variance scaling in shallow-
 915 cumulus-topped mixed layers. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, *133*, 1629–1641,
 916 doi:10.1002/qj.105.
- 917 Nelson, E., R. Stull, and E. Eloranta 1989. A prognostic relationship for entrainment zone
 918 thickness. *J. Appl. Meteor.* *28*. 885–903.
- 919 Park, S., and C. S. Bretherton, 2009: The University of Washington Shallow Convection
 920 and Moist Turbulence Schemes and Their Impact on Climate Simulations with the
 921 Community Atmosphere Model. *J. Climate*, *22*, 3449–3469,
 922 doi:10.1175/2008JCLI2557.1.
- 923 Pino, D., J. V.-G. de Arellano, and P. G. Duynkerke, 2003: The contribution of shear to
 924 the evolution of a convective boundary layer. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, *60*, 1913–1926.
- 925 Pino, D., J. Vila-Guerau de Arellano, and S.-W. Kim, 2006: Representing sheared
 926 convective boundary layer by zeroth- and first-order-jump mixed-layer models:
 927 Large-eddy simulation verification. *J. Applied Meteor. and Climatology*, *45*, 1224–
 928 1243.
- 929 Randall, D. A., 1980a: Conditional instability of the first kind upside-down. *J. Atmos.*
 930 *Sci.*, *37*, 1–6.
- 931 Randall, D. A., 1980b: Entrainment Into a Stratocumulus Layer with Distributed

- 932 Radiative Cooling. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 37, 148–159.
- 933 Randall, D. A., 2000: Buoyant Production and Consumption of Turbulence Kinetic-
934 Energy in Cloud-Topped Mixed Layers. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 41, 402–413.
- 935 Smagorinsky, J., 1963: General circulation experiments with the primitive
936 equations. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **91** (3), 99–164
- 937 Stevens, B., and D. Lenschow, 2001: Observations, experiments, and large eddy
938 simulation. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*
- 939 Stevens, D. E., and C. S. Bretherton, 1999: Effects of resolution on the simulation of
940 stratocumulus entrainment. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 125, 425–439.
- 941 Stull, R. B., 1973: Inversion Rise Model Based on Penetrative Convection. *J. Atmos. Sci.*,
942 30, 1092–1099.
- 943 Sullivan, P., C. Moeng, B. Stevens, D. Lenschow, and S. Mayor, 1998: Structure of the
944 entrainment zone capping the convective atmospheric boundary layer. *J. Atmos. Sci.*
945 55, 3042–3064.
- 946 Sullivan, P. P., & Patton, E. G. 2011. The Effect of Mesh Resolution on Convective
947 Boundary Layer Statistics and Structures Generated by Large-Eddy Simulation. *J.*
948 *Atmos. Sci.*, 68(10), 2395–2415. doi:10.1175/JAS-D-10-05010.1
- 949 Teixeira, J. and Coauthors, 2008: Parameterization of the atmospheric boundary layer.
950 *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 89, 453–458, doi:10.1175/BAMS-89-4-453.
- 951 Tennekes, H., 1973: A model for the dynamics of the inversion above a convective

- 952 boundary layer. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 30, 558–567.
- 953 Tennekes, H., and A. Driedonks, 1981: Basic entrainment equations for the atmospheric
 954 boundary layer. *Bound-Lay Meteorol*, 20, 515–531.
- 955 van Zanten, M. C., P. Duynkerke, and J. Cuijpers, 1999: Entrainment parameterization in
 956 convective boundary layers. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 56, 813–828.
- 957 Yamaguchi, T., and D. A. Randall, 2012: Cooling of Entrained Parcels in a Large-Eddy
 958 Simulation. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 69, 1118–1136, doi:10.1175/JAS-D-11-080.1.
- 959 Zeman, O., and H. Tennekes, 1977: Parameterization of the Turbulent Energy Budget at
 960 the Top of the Daytime Atmospheric Boundary Layer. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 34, 111–123.
- 961 Zilitinkevich, S. S., 1975: Comments on “A Model for the Dynamics of the Inversion
 962 Above a Convective Boundary Layer.” *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 32, 991–992.
- 963 Zilitinkevich, S. S., 1991: *Turbulent Penetrative Convection*, 179p, Avebury Technical,
 964 Aldershot, England.
- 965
- 966

967 Figure caption list

968 Fig. 1: Schematics of a typical first-order model potential temperature profile (left) and
 969 its corresponding vertical turbulent flux profile (right) in a clear-sky convective boundary
 970 layer.

971 Fig. 2: Initial and final LES profiles of the three different cases (weak, strong and growth
 972 against a constant linear stratification) used in the analysis.

973 Fig. 3: LES profiles of horizontally-averaged potential temperature $\bar{\theta}$ (top left),
 974 $d^2\bar{\theta}/dz^2$ (bottom left), vertical turbulent flux of $\bar{\theta}$ (top right) and its vertical derivative
 975 (bottom right) for the weak inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998). z_0 is the zero-crossover
 976 height, z_i the minimum buoyancy flux height, h is the top of the inversion layer diagnosed
 977 as the minimum of the curvature of potential temperature and h_{LES} the level of vanishing
 978 flux on top of the inversion.

979 Fig. 4: Same as Fig. 3 for the strong inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998)

980 Fig. 5: Same as Fig. 3 for the growth in a constant linear stratification (Conzemius and
 981 Fedorovich 2006).

982 Fig. 6: Schematics of the new first-order model potential temperature (left) and its flux
 983 (right) in a clear boundary layer with the improved inversion representation.

984 Fig. 7: Example of potential temperature profile with the new inversion model (dashed
 985 line) against LES outputs in the weak inversion case.

986 Fig. 8: TKE budget for the case of a growth against a linear stratification, each curve
 987 represents a different model time step. The budget is normalized by so that the buoyancy

988 generation at the surface is unity (blue: buoyancy, yellow: shear, cyan: is pressure, green:
 989 transport, red: TKE dissipation). The normalization factor is $\frac{g}{\theta} \overline{w'\theta'}(0)$.

990 Fig. 9: (top) Comparison of the minimum buoyancy flux height (z_i) and top of the
 991 inversion (h) for the weak inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998). Circles are z_i from LES,
 992 diamonds are top of the inversion, h , from LES. (bottom) Mixed-layer potential
 993 temperature. Gray bold line is zero-order model result. Green line is van Zanten's (1999)
 994 model with a parameterized inversion. Blue line is Deardorff (1979) first-order model
 995 with prognostic inversion growth. Black line is the new model presented in this
 996 manuscript.

997 Fig. 10: same as Fig. 9 for the strong inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998).

998 Fig. 11: same as Fig. 9 for the case of a growth against a linear stratification (Conzemius
 999 and Fedorovich 2006).

1000 Fig. 12 (top) Dependence of the relative inversion depth $(h - z_0)/z_0$ on the Richardson
 1001 number, dashed line is Deardorff (1983) parameterization, red circles are Stull's (1973)
 1002 parameterization based on a parcel overshoot, and blue circles are Neggers' (2007)
 1003 parameterization based on a parcel overshoot. (bottom) Relative position of the minimum
 1004 buoyancy flux within the inversion as a function of the Richardson number (open circles).
 1005 Open circles are weak-inversion LES results, gray circles are LES results of a growth
 1006 against a linear stratification (Conzemius and Fedorovich 2006), squares are strong-
 1007 inversion LES results.

1008 Fig. 13: (top) Dependence of the normalized minimum flux $\overline{w'\theta'_v}(z_i)$ on the Richardson
 1009 number. (bottom) Difference between the position of the minimum buoyancy flux and the
 1010 mixed-layer height normalized by the mixed-layer height as a function of the Richardson

1011 number. Dashed gray line is 0.17 line. Open circles are weak-inversion LES results, gray
 1012 circles are LES results of a growth against a linear stratification (Conzemius and
 1013 Fedorovich 2006), squares are strong-inversion LES results.

1014 Fig. 14: (a) Relative position of the minimum buoyancy flux within the inversion vs.
 1015 minimum flux $\overline{w'\theta_v'}(z_i)$ normalized by the surface value $\overline{w'\theta_v'}(0)$. (b) Relative inversion
 1016 depth $(h-z_0)/z_0$ vs. minimum flux $\overline{w'\theta_v'}(z_i)$ normalized by the surface value
 1017 $\overline{w'\theta_v'}(0)$. (c) Same as (a) but using $-\frac{\overline{w'\theta_v'}(z_i) z_0}{\overline{w'\theta_v'}(0) \delta}$ on the x-axis. (d) Same as (b) but with

1018 the relative inversion $(h-z_0)/z_0$ on the x-axis. Open circles are weak-inversion LES
 1019 results, gray circles are LES results of a growth against a linear stratification (Conzemius
 1020 and Fedorovich 2006), squares are strong-inversion LES results, continuous line is results
 1021 from the new inversion model. Continuous gray line describes the IL model results.

1022 Fig. 15: Dependence of the shape factor Y (barycenter of the buoyancy in the inversion
 1023 layer relative to the mixed layer value) on the relative stratification $G = \gamma_{\theta_v} \delta / \Delta\theta_v$.

1024

1025

Figures

Fig. 1: Schematics of a typical first-order model potential temperature profile (left) and its corresponding vertical turbulent flux profile (right) in a clear-sky convective boundary layer.

Fig. 2: Initial and final LES profiles of the three different cases (weak, strong and growth against a constant linear stratification) used in the analysis.

Fig. 3: LES profiles of horizontally-averaged potential temperature $\bar{\theta}$ (top left), $d^2\bar{\theta}/dz^2$ (bottom left), vertical turbulent flux of $\bar{\theta}$ (top right) and its vertical derivative (bottom right) for the weak inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998). z_0 is the zero-crossover height, z_i the minimum buoyancy flux height, h is the top of the inversion layer diagnosed as the minimum of the curvature of potential temperature and h_{LES} the level of vanishing flux on top of the inversion.

1055

1056

1057 Fig. 4: Same as Fig. 3 for the strong inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998).

1058

1059

1060

1061

Fig. 5: Same as Fig. 3 for the growth in a constant linear stratification (Conzemius and Fedorovich 2006).

Fig. 6: Schematics of the new first-order model potential temperature (left) and its flux (right) in a clear boundary layer with the improved inversion representation.

Fig. 7: Example of potential temperature profile with the new inversion model (dashed line) against LES outputs in the weak inversion case.

Fig. 8: TKE budget for the case of a growth against a linear stratification, each curve represents a different model time step. The budget is normalized by so that the buoyancy generation at the surface is unity (blue: buoyancy, yellow: shear, cyan: is pressure, green: transport, red: TKE dissipation). The normalization factor is $\frac{g}{\theta} \overline{w'\theta'}(0)$.

Fig. 9: (top) Comparison of the minimum buoyancy flux height (z_i) and top of the inversion (h) for the weak inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998). Circles are z_i from LES, diamonds are top of the inversion, h , from LES. (bottom) Mixed-layer potential temperature. Gray bold line is zero-order model result. Green line is van Zanten's (1999) model with a parameterized inversion. Blue line is Deardorff (1979) first-order model with prognostic inversion growth. Black line is the new model presented in this manuscript.

1103

1104

1105 Fig. 10: same as Fig. 9 for the strong inversion case (Sullivan et al. 1998).

1106

Fig. 11: same as Fig. 9 for the case of a growth against a linear stratification (Conzemius and Fedorovich 2006).

Fig. 12 (top) Dependence of the relative inversion depth $(h - z_0)/z_0$ on the Richardson number, dashed line is Deardorff (1983) parameterization, red circles are Stull's (1973) parameterization based on a parcel overshoot, and blue circles are Neggers' (2007) parameterization based on a parcel overshoot. (bottom) Relative position of the minimum buoyancy flux within the inversion as a function of the Richardson number (open circles). Open circles are weak-inversion LES results, gray circles are LES results of a growth

1122 against a linear stratification (Conzemius and Fedorovich 2006), squares are strong-
1123 inversion LES results.

1124

1125

1126

Fig. 13: (top) Dependence of the normalized minimum flux $\overline{w'\theta_v'}(z_i)$ on the Richardson number. (bottom) Difference between the position of the minimum buoyancy flux and the mixed-layer height normalized by the mixed-layer height as a function of the Richardson number. Dashed gray line is 0.17 line. Open circles are weak-inversion LES results, gray circles are LES results of a growth against a linear stratification (Conzemius and Fedorovich 2006), squares are strong-inversion LES results.

1136

1137 Fig. 14: (a) Relative position of the minimum buoyancy flux within the inversion vs.

1138 minimum flux $\overline{w'\theta_v'}(z_i)$ normalized by the surface value $\overline{w'\theta_v'}(0)$. (b) Relative inversion1139 depth $(h - z_0)/z_0$ vs. minimum flux $\overline{w'\theta_v'}(z_i)$ normalized by the surface value1140 $\overline{w'\theta_v'}(0)$. (c) Same as (a) but using $-\frac{\overline{w'\theta_v'}(z_i) z_0}{\overline{w'\theta_v'}(0) \delta}$ on the x-axis. (d) Same as (b) but with1141 the relative inversion $(h - z_0)/z_0$ on the x-axis. Open circles are weak-inversion LES

1142 results, gray circles are LES results of a growth against a linear stratification (Conzemius

1143 and Fedorovich 2006), squares are strong-inversion LES results, continuous line is results

1144 from the new inversion model. Continuous gray line describes the IL model results.

1145

1146

1147

1148 Fig. 15: Dependence of the shape factor Y (barycenter of the buoyancy in the inversion1149 layer relative to the mixed layer value) on the relative stratification $G = \gamma_{\theta_v} \delta / \Delta \theta_v$.

1150