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Testing of WRF parameterizations with X-band radar data in a convective rainfall event
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Abstract: During vegetative season, crops may be damaged by intense rainfall events, such as thunderstorms. In order to limit the risks and to issue thunderstorm warnings, an accurate weather forecast is indispensable. Since the storms occur in limited time and space scales, their forecast is not simple. In this work, the meteorological model WRF was used to simulate convective precipitation associated with an event occurred on 2nd July 2012 in Turin (Italy), and to examine its sensitivity to different schemes of microphysics and clouds parameterization. The precipitation was simulated with 1 km resolution and compared with the observations gathered from a high-resolution X-band radar, operating in the same area during the event.
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Riassunto: Durante la stagione della crescita, le coltivazioni possono essere danneggiate da eventi meteorologici intensi, come i temporali. Per limitare i rischi e fornire avvisi sui temporali, è necessaria una accurata previsione meteorologica. Poiché gli eventi temporaleschi avvengono su scale temporali e spaziali limitate, la loro previsione non è semplice. In questo lavoro, il modello meteorologico WRF è stato usato per simulare la precipitazione associata a un evento convettivo avvenuto il 2 luglio 2012 a Torino, e per esaminare la sua sensibilità a diversi schemi di microfisica e di parametrizzazione delle nuvole. La precipitazione è stata simulata con la risoluzione di 1 km ed è stata confrontata con quella osservata da un radar in banda X ad alta risoluzione, operativo nella stessa area durante l’evento.

Parole chiave: Modello WRF, radar in banda X, evento convettivo, precipitazione.

1. INTRODUCTION

Heavy storms can be accompanied by strong wind, heavy precipitation, floods, hail and landslides, that can have significant economic, social and environmental impacts. Between heavy storms, the thunderstorms are the product of vigorous convection and they may affect a relatively small area during a relatively short time. One of the most relevant effects of severe thunderstorms is the damage to cultivations and human infrastructures. In particular, severe weather conditions can destroy plants or limit their growth and productivity, with damages that can facilitate subsequent pathologies, with the result of degrading the harvest quality and decreasing its quantity. For agricultural activities, it is therefore of great importance to predict with accuracy thunderstorm development and the amount of precipitation.

Convective precipitation at midlatitudes is hard to forecast in detail, due to the rapid evolution of the meteorological situation (some tenth of minutes) and the small geographical area affected (Fritsch and Carbone, 2004). Actually, thunderstorms are characterized by small spatial and temporal scales, and the degree of predictability depends upon the extension and the duration of coherent rainfall events (Carbone et al., 2002). Therefore, the precise prediction and localization of thunderstorms is a challenge in weather prediction, while the utility of weather forecasts depends upon its accuracy.

Numerical weather prediction models are nowadays largely applied on high-resolution grids, with the ambition to capture phenomena at short temporal and spatial scale, like thunderstorms. However, some physical processes, such as the convection, are active at smaller scales that those resolved by the model grid, and require parameterization schemes to be properly described. Another difficulty in simulating thunderstorms is the presence of complex terrain, where the models could overestimate or underestimate rainfall (Orr and Bechtold, 2009).

The aim of this work is to test the ability of a high-resolution model (the Weather Research & Forecasting model -WRF) in predicting a convective event occurred in the town of Turin (Italy) and its surroundings, composed by rural, urban, hilly and mountainous areas. The region has been selected for three main reasons: I) the presence of large areas devoted to agriculture in the area surrounding Turin city, II) the complexity of the zone, in which there are plain and hilly zones, and the Alps not far away; III) the availability of...
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a meteorological radar system. As case study of convective event, the episode occurred over Turin, on 2nd July 2012, was analysed.

The results of the simulations were verified by the intercomparison with precipitation data in the same area evaluated from an X-band rain radar. This is a powerful instrument in convective precipitation nowcasting, and it is particularly useful in monitoring heavy rain in complex orography areas (Bertoldo et al., 2012), on a short range. In particular, X-band radars can be used to monitor in detail small basins, towns and valleys prone to flash floods (Gabella et al., 2012). Recently, some X-band radars have been used to estimate the rainfall in some Mediterranean areas for agricultural management (Notarpietro et al., 2013).

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the WRF model, Section 3 describes the X-band rain radar, Section 4 presents the case study and Section 5 discusses the results of the simulations. Finally, Sections 6 summarizes the conclusions.

2. WRF MODEL

The WRF model is a high-resolution mesoscale meteorological model, developed since 1990. It has been designed to carry out both operational forecasting and atmospheric research. A detailed description of its equations, physics and dynamics is available in Skamarock et al., (2008).

Regional models are becoming relevant for decision support in agriculture and water management and recently, WRF model applications have been investigated to improve real time choice in agriculture (Müller et al., 2016).

The analysis of past events is useful to understand the performance of the model and to find out the best parameterization settings for different orographic conditions, and in particular meteorological situations. The parameterization is necessary to represent the phenomena taking place on smaller scales than the grid dimension. A great amount of parameterization options are available but, considering rain prediction, the most relevant are: Microphysics and Cumulus Parameterization, which affect cloud and raindrop evolution, influence the cloud formation and the amount of rain (Stensrud, 2007; Zhang et al., 2006). The user can choose among many schemes for both options. The microphysics schemes can be divided in two categories, based on single or double moments. The former predict mixing ratios and resolve one prediction equation for mass (kg/kg) per each species, with particle size distribution being diagnostic; the latter predict mixing ratios and number concentrations (number of raindrops per unit volume as a function of size). Double moment schemes are more complex and, usually, more performing than single moments ones (Hong et al., 2010), because they are more accurate in the representation of particle size distribution, but they are computationally more expensive. In fact, they resolve an additional predictive equation for number concentration (number/kg) for each double-moment species. For this reason, single-moment schemes are often preferred for long simulations.

The sensitivity of cloud microphysics in predicting convective storms and precipitation has already been investigated by many researchers (among others: McCumber et al., 1991; Gilmore et al., 2004; Liu and Moncrieff, 2007; Knebl Lowrey and Yang, 2008, Luo et al., 2010, Shih et al., 2012), trying to understand whether the use of more sophisticated cloud microphysics schemes allows for more precise predictions or not, but definitive results seem not been achieved yet (Rajeevan et al., 2010).

Even bigger uncertainties remain on the role played by cumulus parameterization schemes. The cumulus parameterization schemes are used to predict the collective effects of a great number of convective clouds that may exist within a single grid element of the prediction grid, for grid spacing of 10-20 kilometers (Janjic, 1994; Kain, 2004). The majority of these schemes follow the flux-mass theory, and only one of the available schemes, the Betts-Miller-Janjic, is an adjustment scheme: it adjusts the vertical profiles of temperature and moisture towards a predetermined, post-convection reference profile derived from climatology (Janjic, 1994).

The cumulus schemes are mainly applied at the coarser grid size. In fact, for small grid size (e.g. ≤5 km), the convection could be resolved and therefore the cumulus scheme may no longer be needed (Skamarock et al., 2008). In some heavy convective precipitation events, where high resolution grid have been used, the cumulus schemes have been proven to be unnecessary (Yu and Lee, 2010; Fiori et al., 2014).

3. X-BAND RAIN RADAR

X-band rain radars are characterized by high resolution, small physical size and accessible cost. Having a shorter wavelength (frequencies from 8 to 12 GHz) than the S- or C-band radars, they may observe rain events with high space resolution,
and can be used to monitor very localized heavy storms that cannot be observed by conventional rain/weather radars. On the other hand, they can cover more limited areas and, to overcome this limit, they can be organized in networks (Wang and Chandrasekar, 2010).

The main product is the radar reflectivity (Z), a measure of the power backscattered to the radar from targets existing in any radar resolution cell. If targets are absent, power is not reflected back significantly, and there are no echoes. The reflectivity is also a measure for the total cross section of the particles within the instantaneous measurement volume (the radar resolution cell). From the radar reflectivity, the Rainfall Rate (R) can be evaluated using a power law, such as:

\[ Z = a R^b \]  

(1)

where: \( a \) and \( b \) are two coefficients reflecting the type of rainfall and the climatological character of a particular location or season (Uijlenhoet, 2001). In case of solid precipitation, typical of cold climates and/or higher latitudes, or even hail, the Z-R relationship (eq. 1) should be applied with different coefficients with respect to the ones normally adopted for rain monitoring.

One of the biggest uncertainties in the evaluation of cumulated rainfall is that the radar cannot see the rain falling on the ground, but can only estimate it from the reflectivity values, at a certain altitude, using the empirical equation Z-R (eq. 1). This relationship depends on parameters that may vary from case to case. The b-coefficient shows no clear dependency on rainfall type (Amitai et al., 2002) and can be regarded as constant over longer time periods, without causing large errors (Steiner and Smith, 2000), while the a-parameter should be continuously adjusted to reflect the short term variations of the vertical profile of reflectivity.

One of the most common methods to correct the Z-R relationship is the adjustment of \( R \) using gauge measurements of precipitation. The main idea of gauge adjustment is to combine the information taken from these two measurement systems: the information on the spatial distribution of the rain from radar and the high accuracy point measurements from the rain gauges. Obviously, problems connected with gauge-errors and different time and space resolutions of radar and gauges related measurements must also be taken into account. The agreement between radar estimates and gauge point measurements is evaluated using the Bias, defined as the ratio between radar and gauge total precipitation amounts, usually expressed on a logarithmic (decibel) scale (Anagnostou et al., 1998; Gouden-loodt and Delobbe, 2009).

Radar estimates of rainfall are affected by uncertainties, which are both systematic and random in nature. A complete discussion of these errors is reported in the review paper of Villarini and Krajewski (2010). Empirical models have been developed to represent the uncertainties in the form of ensemble (Villarini et al., 2014), for a review: Mandapaka and Germann (2010).

### 3.1 X-band radar main features

In this work, data from the Politechnic of Turin X-band radar were used. This is a pulsed radar, placed on the roof of the university building, at latitude 45.063° N, longitude 7.660° E, and at 25 meters above ground level (at about 249 m a.s.l.). It covers a circular area of 30 km radius, including the city of Turin, some nearby towns (Fig. 1), several cultivated and grassland areas. The radar beam axis at a fixed 1° elevation reaches an altitude of about 5.50 m and the beam width is 3.6°. The resolution of the reflectivity data, covering the overall area, is 60 x 60 m². The technical features of the radar are reported in Tab. 1 (Gabella et al., 2012; Turso et al., 2013). The data are acquired in the polar coordinate system, and then converted into the Cartesian one, where each pixel contains the spatial average of all the values of the polar pixels included in the Cartesian one. The coefficients a and b in eq. (1) have been set to 300 and 1.6, respectively, as estimated in a previous study in the same area (Gabella and Notarpietro, 2004). The interferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSMITTER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak power</td>
<td>10 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse length</td>
<td>400 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmitted frequency</td>
<td>(9410 ± 30) MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>800 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulator</td>
<td>Solid state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECEIVER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiver type</td>
<td>Logarithmic, solid state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic range</td>
<td>From 0 to 10 dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate frequency</td>
<td>60 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver filter bandwidth</td>
<td>(20 ± 2) MHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER SPECIFICATION SHEET</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front end</td>
<td>Microwave integrated circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise figure</td>
<td>&lt; 3.5 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplexer</td>
<td>Ferrite circulator with state solid diode limiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antenna rotation speed</td>
<td>(22 ± 2) r.p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>24 Vdc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 1 - Technical characteristics of the X-band radar.

Tab. 1 - Caratteristiche tecniche del radar in banda X.
with other active radars and the terrain echoes or clutter can cause errors in the radar-data. To reduce these anomalous data, an anti-bang filter and a series of anti-clutter filters are applied, as described in Bertoldo et al. (2012).

The radar used in this work, being placed in a lower position with respect to the neighbor hills and mountains, is subject to beam occultation. In fact, observing an image coming from a data system, we could see dark or shadowed areas of regular form where the radar cannot see any event, such as in Fig. 2. This phenomenon is caused by the presence of urban buildings (urban clutter) or orographic obstacles (ground clutter), which interfere with the radar-beam, causing an occultation of the area behind it. The occultation can be total or partial; in the first case, there is no backscattered signal at all, while in the latter there is a great attenuation of the signal.

Thus, due to the presence of hills and buildings in the area covered by the radar, a portion of the acquired data is not reliable and therefore has been excluded from the analysis. To identify the useful area, in the present work, the radar cumulated precipitation maps during three months (May, June and July 2012) were considered. Only the zones where the measured radar cumulated precipitation was higher than a fixed threshold were considered as unaffected by beam occultation. The threshold is case-dependent: in the studied area and during the three mentioned months some tests with different values have been performed, and the value of 15 mm has been identified as the best choice allowing to distinguish between areas affected or not by beam occultation.
In the selected areas, three raingauges from Weather Underground network were active during the event. Their geographical coordinates (latitude and longitude) are: 45.236°N, 7.507°E; 45.232°N, 7.640°E; 45.236°N, 7.527°E. The evaluated precipitation by the radar and that measured by the raingauges has been compared using a contingency table, as described in Section 6. The comparison has shown a good agreement between the point data from raingauges and the radar data.

4. CASE STUDY

The analyzed case-study is a heavy rainfall event occurred on 2nd July 2012 in Piedmont region (NW Italy). The rainfall occurred during two distinct severe thunderstorms, one in the earlier hours of the morning and the other one in the afternoon. The first event was originated by the progressive rotation of wind direction at the various levels, from ESE near the surface to SSE at 950 and 850 hPa, SE at 700 hPa, and S at 500 hPa. The resulting convergence, amplified by the orographic Alpine reliefs, represented the trigger mechanism that initiated the convection at the lower levels, furtherly amplified by the instability present above the boundary layer. Regarding the afternoon rainfall, the meteorological factor was the irruption of cold air on Piedmont region, caused by a temporary pulsation of one of the secondary branch of a deep 500 hPa through located on Atlantic ocean, extended on France and with its axis tilted from NW to SE. The cold and dry air associated to this through crossed the NW Alps in the early afternoon of 2nd July, first at 850 hPa (Fig. 3) and some hours later also at the soil level, then pushing vertically the preexisting deep layer of warm and humid air, created by southern winds present in the whole northern Italy at all levels (and also over Piedmont till the morning). The flow generated also a temporary minimum over Piedmont region during the afternoon. This large gradient of temperature and moisture over the prealpine regions increased the instability already present on Po valley. The CAPE values at the radiosounding station of

![Fig. 3 - Equivalent potential temperature in the greater WRF domain at 850 hPa, 2nd July 2012 at 12:00 UTC.](image_url)

*Fig. 3 - Temperatura potenziale equivalente nel grigliato più esteso del modello WRF a 850 hPa, 2 luglio 2012 alle ore 12:00 UTC.*
Fig. 4 - The radiosounding at Milano station, Italy, 2nd July 2012 at 12:00 UTC (source: weather.uwyo.edu).
Fig. 4 - Il radiosondaggio della stazione di Milano, Italia, 2 luglio 2012 alle ore 12:00 UTC (fonte: weather.uwyo.edu).

Milano (Fig. 4), the only available in the area at that time, were already large during midnight – up to 800 m$^2$s$^{-2}$, and grew up to 1800 m$^2$s$^{-2}$ in the afternoon. This eruption gave origin to a first line of diffuse thunderstorms that crossed the Piedmont region, due to the instability and the contrast between the two air masses. Other thunderstorms continued to be generated also in the late morning and afternoon, when cold air erupted also at the soil level, destabilizing the air column. Only in the evening, when the new air mass took possess of the whole region, the phenomena ceased.

This dynamics helps to understand why the first rainfall on Turin city was recorded in the earlier hours of the morning (from midnight to 4 a.m.), and then other episodes occurred between late morning and the afternoon (from 11 a.m. to 6 p.m.); all hours here are in UTC time. Several raingauges were active in the area of Torino and its surroundings, but only three of them were located in the radar not-cluttered zone. In the early hours of the morning they measured moderate values of cumulated precipitation (20 mm, 9 mm and 18 mm) and more intense quantities in the afternoon (15 mm, 59 mm and 29 mm).

5. SIMULATIONS
The event of 2nd July 2012 over Turin town and its surroundings was simulated by the WRF model, version 3.6. Ten simulations were executed in order to evaluate the sensibility of cumulus and microphysical parameterizations. The other parametrization schemes, available in WRF, remained unchanged. The list of the common schemes in all simulations is reported in Tab. 2.

Spatial and temporal domains and initial and boundary conditions were unchanged in the ten tests. All simulations were run for three days, from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physics</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longwave radiation</td>
<td>RRTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortwave radiation</td>
<td>Dudhia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Layer</td>
<td>MMS similarity model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Surface</td>
<td>Noah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planet Boundary Layer</td>
<td>YSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 2 - Common schemes in all simulations.
Tab 2. - Schemi comuni a tutte le simulazioni.
30th June 2012 at 00:00 UTC, to 3rd July 2012 at 00:00 UTC. Usually the first simulated 12-24 h are not used because the meteorological model must adjust the fields over the orography and it needs time for the formation of cloud and precipitation, because it starts with zero clouds and precipitation particles. In the present paper, the studied event occurred on 2nd July 2012, but it was part of an intense perturbation that took origin in the NW Europe one day before. Therefore, the simulations started on 30th June 2012, 24 h before the perturbation arrival on the continent and 48 h before the beginning of the precipitation event over the Piedmont region.

As for the spatial domains, starting from a coarser grid of low resolution (27 km), three nests with finer resolutions (9, 3 and 1 km, respectively) were created and centered over the study area (Fig. 5). Details of temporal and spatial domains setting can be found in Tab. 3.

To generate the initial data and boundary conditions for the coarser grid of the simulations, meteorological data from the ECMWF (European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecast) were downloaded. The analyses every 6 hours with 0.5°x0.5° resolution in longitude and latitude respectively (which means about 40 km along x direction and 55 km along y direction, at Turin position) were used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Grid Points (x,y)</th>
<th>Integration time-step [s]</th>
<th>Output time-step [s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st grid</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85x60</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd grid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79x58</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85x73</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109x97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 3 - WRF temporal and spatial domain settings.

Fig. 5 - Nested grids.

Five simulations (1 - 5 in Tab. 4) were devoted to test some of the available cumulus parameterization schemes. Among the cumulus schemes available on WRF, the schemes which take in account both shallow and deep convection, were tested: Kain-Fritsch (Kain, 2004), Betts-Miller-Janjic (Janjic, 1994; Janjic, 2000), SAS (Pan and Wu, 1995), Tiedtke (Tiedtke, 1989; Zhang et al., 2011) and NSAS (Han and Pan, 2011). In all simulations, the cumulus parameterizations were applied to both first and second domains, whose resolution was lower or equal than 9 km, whereas in the third and fourth domains (with resolutions of 3 and 1 km, respectively) the cumulus parameterization was not applied like suggested in the WRF technical note (Skamarock et al., 2008). Furthermore, an additional test was performed (simulation 6) with deep convection explicitly resolved (no cumulus...
parameterization scheme activated in all four domains) to explore the model performance without the cumulus scheme. Regarding the microphysical parameterization selection, actually WRF considers several schemes. To limit the simulation number, a complex and complete scheme has been chosen: a double-moment scheme with more mixing-ratios. This method is not exhaustive, but it permits to test the model schemes. For the experiments, the Morrison double-moment scheme was selected (Morrison and Gettelman, 2008); this is a two-double-moments bulk scheme that considers six mixing ratios (vapor, rain, snow, cloud ice, cloud water and graupel) and four number concentrations (ice, snow, rain and graupel).

A second group of simulations (1 and 7-10) aimed to test the impact of microphysics scheme in rain prediction. A single moment (WSM6) and four different double-moment schemes (Morrison, WDM6, Milbrandt, NSSL) were used (Tab. 4). The single moment WSM6 scheme (Hong and Lim, 2006) is widely used in WRF community, especially for operative applications, because of its computational efficiency. However, due to the difficulty of the convective rain prediction and the short-time covered by the studied precipitation, double-moment models were chosen for the other four simulations (1 and 8-10). WDM6 scheme (Lim and Hong, 2010) is similar to the WSM6, but it also predicts the prognostic number concentration of rain and cloud water and cloud condensation nuclei. Milbrandt scheme (Milbrandt and Yau, 2005) is a double-moment mixed-phase scheme that predicts cloud, rains, ice, snow, graupel and hail mixing ratios. It also predicts the number concentrations for every species. NSSL (Mansell et al., 2010) is a double-moment scheme for water vapor, cloud droplets, rain drops, ice crystals, snow, graupel and hail. In these four simulations, the Kain-Fritsch cumulus scheme was fixed.

6. RESULTS
The comparison between observation and forecast is usually performed building a contingency table (Tab. 5) for dichotomous verification (Wilks, 1995). In the present work three statistical indexes were used: Accuracy, fractional Bias and Heidke Skill Score. The Accuracy (acc) is the averaged degree of correspondence between individual pairs of forecasts and observations

\[
acc = \frac{\text{hits} + \text{correct negative}}{\text{total}}
\]

where

\[
\text{total} = \text{hits} + \text{correct negative} + \text{misses} + \text{false alarms}
\]

The accuracy index can vary from 0 to 1, where 1 represents the perfect match between forecast and observation.

The fractional Bias is defined as the degree of correspondence between the total number of forecasted events and the total number of observed events:

\[
\text{Bias} = \frac{\text{hits} + \text{false alarms}}{\text{hits} + \text{misses}}
\]

The Bias can vary from 0 to infinity, where 1 means a perfect score, and other values can evidence over- or under-estimations.

The Heidke Skill Score (HSS) measures the ability of the model to make correct predictions, after eliminating the correct prediction due to chance:

\[
\text{HSS} = \frac{(\text{hits} + \text{correct negatives}) - \text{expected correct}}{\text{total} - \text{expected correct}}
\]

where:

\[
\text{expected correct} = \frac{1}{\text{total}} \left( (\text{hits} + \text{misses})(\text{hits} + \text{false alarms}) + (\text{correct negatives} + \text{misses})(\text{correct negatives} + \text{false alarms}) \right)
\]

HSS can vary from -1 to 1, where 1 stands for a 100% of correct predictions.

Firstly, the comparison between the radar precipitation data and the measured one by three raingauges has been performed. In this test, the data from raingauges are the observations whereas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed yes</th>
<th>Observed no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forecast yes</td>
<td>hits</td>
<td>false alarms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast no</td>
<td>misses</td>
<td>correct negatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. 5 - Contingency table.** Hits: number of pixels with forecasted and occurred rainfall; misses: number of pixels where rainfall was not forecasted but observed; false alarms: number of pixels in which rainfall was forecasted but not observed; correct negatives: number of pixels in which rain was not forecasted and not observed.

**Tab. 5 - Tabella di contingenza.** Hits: numero di pixel con pioggia prevista ed avvenuta; misses: numero di pixel dove la pioggia non è stata prevista ma è stata osservata; false alarms: numero di pixel nei quali la pioggia è stata prevista ma non osservata; correct negatives: numero di pixel nei quali la pioggia non è stata prevista e non è stata osservata.

The radar data are the forecasts. The computed accuracy is 0.86, the bias is 1.00 and the HSS is 0.72. These values confirm the goodness of radar data and authorize their use in the analysis of the simulation results.

Secondly, radar-derived precipitation and model-simulated one has been compared. The comparison is possible applying several techniques (Rossa et al., 2005). Here, the verification approach with contingency tables was used, where forecast stand for simulation result and observation for radar data. The method involved the couples of observed and simulated rainfall values over each grid cell in the same area and at the same time intervals (Paolella et al., 2011). As the radar pixels were smaller than the model grid size (60 x 60 m² versus 1 x 1 km²), the radar observations were averaged, lowering their resolution to model resolution. At every radar data pixel was assigned a new coordinate value corresponding to the WRF cell, whose center is nearer to the radar pixel center. Then, the average of all the radar rain data contained in a single WRF cell was calculated. The comparison has involved the spatial area with higher simulation resolution and the temporal interval from 2nd July at 00:00 UTC to 3rd July at 00:00 UTC.

Tab. 6 shows the computed indices for all simulations. In this table, the simulations could be grouped in two subsets:

1) Cumulus parameterization study (simulations 1–6).

The simulation results are similar for all schemes. The simulation showing maximum accuracy and HSS indices (respectively 0.70 and 0.40) is the simulation number 6, followed by the number 2 (0.69 and 0.38). As regards Bias index, the best value is obtain by simulation 3, but also the other simulations have comparable values.

In conclusion, slightly better performances are shown by simulations 2 and 6, therefore using Betts-Miller-Janic scheme or the explicit parameterization, respectively. Therefore, the use of a cumulus parameterization scheme did not sensibly influence the results, probably because the microphysics double moment scheme (Morrison) is advanced enough to predict the convective rain.

2) Microphysics study (simulations 1 and 7–10).

The indices clearly show that the single-moment scheme WSM6 is less performing than the others; this result proves that convective rain is better predicted using complex double-moment schemes. Among the double moment schemes tested, WDM6 show the worst skills, giving results similar to the WSM6 scheme, but with a larger bias. In this set of simulations the best microphysics scheme seems to be the Morrison double moment scheme (simulation 1), with a 0.66 of accuracy, 0.94 of Bias and a 0.32 of HSS, followed by the NSSL scheme, with less performing values. Therefore, the choice of microphysics is a critical option for the simulation performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simulation</th>
<th>acc</th>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>HSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kain-Fritsch - Morrison</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Betts-Miller-Janic - Morrison</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SAS - Morrison</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tiedtke - Morrison</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 NSAS - Morrison</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Explicit - Morrison</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kain-Fritsch - WSM6</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kain-Fritsch - WDM6</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kain-Fritsch - Milbrandt</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Kain-Fritsch - NSSL</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. 6 - Comparison between simulated and observed precipitation.**

**Tab. 6 - Confronto tra precipitazione simulata ed osservata.**
7. CONCLUSIONS
Convective events are particularly hard to predict, due to the typical short duration of the showers and to the turbulent nature of the events themselves. Nevertheless, the forecast of this kind of events is very important in the agricultural management, especially in zones like Piedmont region, in which several cultivations are present. The possibility to know which kind of phenomenon could affect some areas may be helpful for farmers to plan their agricultural practices, including also the fight against infections and diseases, frequently affected by humidity and rainfall.
Mesoscale models are now a precious tool to forecast convective rain on crops and to support the decision systems. In this work, the WRF model sensitivity to different parameterizations was studied, allowing to identify the best combination of schemes. The case-study analyzed was a convective rainfall event that took place on 2nd July 2012 in the NW Italy, and was formed by a shorter morning rain event (from 0 to 4 a.m.) and a longer afternoon event (from 11 a.m. to 6 p.m.). Despite the choice and analysis of one specific case study, the authors are confident that this event is widely representative of several thunderstorm events in Piedmont region.
Ten WRF simulations were run, in order to test different cumulus and microphysics parameterization schemes. For each test, the simulated precipitation has been compared with the data derived from a high resolution X-band rain radar located in Turin city.
Among the two parameters tested, the cumulus and the microphysics parameterizations, the most relevant in convective rain prediction is the second one. In fact, the cumulus parameterization schemes tested have little influence on the ability of the WRF model to predict the rain event: similar results were obtained using the five cumulus schemes and the explicit one. In particular, the two best results were computed using the Betts-Miller-Janjic scheme or without the use of any scheme at all. As regards the microphysical parametrization, one single-moment scheme and various double-moment models were tested. As expected, the single-moment scheme turned out to be less performing than the others. In this case-study, the higher accuracy in rain prediction was obtained using the Morrison and the NSSL schemes. Besides, the double-moment appears to be complex enough to predict a convective rain without the application of any cumulus parameterization scheme.

In conclusion, in this convective case-study, the use of a complex microphysics scheme, coupled with explicit parameterization (without cumulus parameterization scheme), seems to be a preferable choice in order to allow a sufficiently detailed and performing prediction. Such result could have profound implications for agricultural areas intensely cultivated, as well as for the protection of civil infrastructures.
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