

# A Generalized Richardson Number Diagnostic for Turbulence in the Free Atmosphere

Mohamed Foudad,<sup>a</sup> Miguel A.C. Teixeira,<sup>b</sup> Paul D. Williams,<sup>a</sup> and Thorsten Kaluza<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading, United Kingdom*

<sup>b</sup> *LAETA, IDMEC, Instituto Superior Tecnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal*

<sup>c</sup> *Deutscher Wetterdienst, Offenbach, Germany*

arXiv:2602.21770v1 [physics.ao-ph] 25 Feb 2026

*Corresponding author:* Mohamed Foudad, m.foudad@reading.ac.uk

ABSTRACT: A new Richardson number formulation,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ , is introduced to improve the diagnosis of turbulence in the stratified free atmosphere, particularly near jet stream regions. The formulation is derived from the turbulent kinetic energy budget and accounts for both vertical wind shear and horizontal shear (deformation and divergence), weighted by the ratio of horizontal to vertical eddy viscosities ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$ ). This extends the classical Richardson number  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , which includes only vertical shear, and provides a physically based measure of the balance between stratification and three-dimensional shear production. The diagnostics  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ ,  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , and the widely used Turbulence Index 1 (TI1), computed from ERA5 reanalysis, are evaluated using more than 247 million automated turbulence reports from commercial aircraft (2017–2024). Across various turbulence intensity thresholds,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  consistently outperforms the other diagnostics, resulting in higher AUC values and improved probability of detection at operationally relevant false-alarm rates. Sensitivity analyses show that the predictive skill of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  is maximized for  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  values in the range  $10^3$ – $10^4$ , with peak performance near 5000 and weak dependence on horizontal resolution. Seasonal and regional evaluations indicate that the added value of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  is largest where turbulence generation involves both vertical and horizontal shear, such as over the contiguous United States and during summer. Over oceans, performance remains high and  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  still provides the best overall discrimination skill. These results demonstrate that incorporating horizontal wind shear into the Richardson number yields a physically consistent and statistically robust improvement in turbulence diagnostics, with relevance for research and operational applications.

**SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT:** Turbulence at cruising altitudes is a major aviation hazard and is expected to increase as the climate warms. The Richardson number is a classical measure of the balance between turbulence suppression by atmospheric stability and generation by vertical wind shear. Here, we introduce an extension that also accounts for horizontal wind shear, which can be important near jet streams. Using more than 247 million aircraft turbulence reports, we show that this formulation consistently improves turbulence detection compared to the traditional Richardson number and a widely used turbulence index. The improvement is robust across turbulence intensities, seasons, and regions. These findings provide a more physically consistent approach to diagnosing turbulence and may support advances in aviation forecasting and climate impact assessments.

## **1. Introduction**

Turbulence in the free atmosphere remains one of the most significant challenges for both atmospheric research and aviation operations (Wyngaard 2010; Sharman 2016). Clear-air turbulence (CAT), in particular, occurs in cloud-free regions, making it difficult to identify visually or detect with conventional remote sensing instruments. CAT is primarily generated by instabilities within the stably stratified upper troposphere and lower stratosphere, often associated with strong vertical and horizontal wind shear in the vicinity of jet streams, upper-level fronts, and gravity wave breaking (e.g., Dutton and Panofsky 1970; Ellrod and Knapp 1992; Knox 1997; Lane et al. 2004; Sharman et al. 2006, 2012). For aviation, turbulence represents a major operational and safety hazard, causing injuries, aircraft damage, and economic losses due to rerouting and flight delays (Sharman and Lane 2016; Gultepe et al. 2019). This challenge is expected to intensify in the coming decades, as several studies project increases in both the frequency and intensity of clear-air turbulence under climate change, associated with enhanced upper-tropospheric wind shear (e.g., Williams and Joshi 2013; Williams 2017; Foudad et al. 2024).

Despite decades of research, diagnosing and forecasting turbulence from large-scale atmospheric fields remains challenging. Turbulence occurs on spatial and temporal scales much smaller than those resolved by current numerical weather prediction (NWP) models. Direct forecasting of turbulence at these scales is therefore not feasible, now or in the foreseeable future (Sharman and Pearson 2017). Instead, forecasting relies on diagnostics derived from resolved synoptic- and

mesoscale atmospheric fields with grid spacings of tens of kilometers that serve as proxies for the likelihood of subgrid-scale turbulence. The multiscale nature of atmospheric turbulence has long been recognized. Richardson (1922) famously described the cascade of energy across scales, noting that “big whirls have little whirls, which feed on their velocity, and little whirls have lesser whirls, and so on to viscosity.” Following this, many diagnostics have been developed—ranging from empirical to physically based indices—to diagnose regions of high turbulence potential by assuming a downscale energy cascade from the resolved large scales to the aircraft scales (e.g., Brown 1973; Colson and Panofsky 1965; Dutton 1980; Ellrod and Knapp 1992; Kaplan et al. 2006; Knox et al. 2008; McCann et al. 2012).

Among the physically based diagnostics, the gradient Richardson number ( $Ri$ ) is perhaps the most fundamental, as it characterizes the balance between stabilizing buoyancy and destabilizing shear production (Stull 1988), and has become one of the most widely used diagnostics of turbulence in both research and operational forecasting (e.g., Endlich 1964; Dutton and Panofsky 1970). Traditionally,  $Ri$  is derived from a one-dimensional (1D) approximation of the turbulent kinetic energy (TKE) budget under the assumption of horizontal homogeneity. This leads to the classical formulation:

$$Ri = \frac{N^2}{S_v^2}, \quad (1)$$

where  $N^2$  is the static stability and  $S_v^2$  is the vertical wind shear.

Values of  $Ri$  below the theoretical critical threshold of 0.25 are associated with dynamically unstable conditions conducive to Kelvin–Helmholtz instability and turbulence generation (Miles 1961; Miles and Howard 1964). Although  $Ri$  has shown some skill as an indicator of CAT occurrence (e.g., McCann 2001), its predictive performance remains limited in the free atmosphere (e.g., Dutton 1980; Ellrod et al. 2015; Lee et al. 2022; Kaluza et al. 2025). We believe that this limitation arises partly because the classical formulation considers only vertical wind shear and neglects horizontal velocity gradients, such as deformation and divergence, that also contribute to shear production in the full TKE budget. As a result,  $Ri$  may underestimate the likelihood of turbulence generation in flows where three-dimensional shear plays an important role.

This limitation motivates the development of an extended Richardson number diagnostic that accounts for the full three-dimensional structure of the velocity field. In this study, we introduce a

new Richardson number formulation,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ , derived directly from the full TKE budget equation, in which turbulent fluxes are parameterized using a first-order turbulence closure. This formulation explicitly accounts for both vertical and horizontal shear contributions to TKE production. The generalization incorporates the effects of horizontal deformation and divergence, weighted by the ratio of horizontal to vertical eddy viscosities, and therefore provides a more complete measure of the balance between stratification and three-dimensional shear production. The predictive skill of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  is evaluated using ERA5 reanalysis and a large global dataset of in situ aircraft turbulence observations, and compared with the classical Richardson number and a commonly used turbulence index, which is considered one of the best-performing diagnostics of upper-level turbulence.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the derivation of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  from the TKE budget. Section 3 describes the data and verification metrics. Section 4 evaluates the performance of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ , and Section 5 provides a summary and discussion.

## 2. Derivation of the new Richardson number

### a. The TKE budget equation

We start with the turbulent kinetic energy (TKE) budget equation, which is derived from the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations written in a local Cartesian coordinate system under the Boussinesq approximation. Following Reynolds' decomposition, each variable is written as the sum of a mean value ( $\bar{u}$ ) and turbulent (fluctuation) parts ( $u'$ ):

$$u = \bar{u} + u', \quad v = \bar{v} + v', \quad w = \bar{w} + w', \quad p = \bar{p} + p' \quad (2)$$

The governing momentum equations can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + w \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + f v + \nu \left( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z^2} \right) \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} + w \frac{\partial v}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial y} - f u + \nu \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial z^2} \right) \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} + w \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} + b + \nu \left( \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial z^2} \right) \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Here  $u$ ,  $v$ , and  $w$  denote the velocity components in the zonal ( $x$ ), meridional ( $y$ ), and vertical ( $z$ ) directions, respectively,  $p$  is the pressure,  $\rho$  is the density,  $f$  is the Coriolis parameter,  $\nu$  is the kinematic viscosity, and  $b$  is the buoyancy.

Substituting the decomposed variables from (2) into the  $x$ -momentum equation (3), and expanding yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial u'}{\partial t} + \bar{u} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \bar{u} \frac{\partial u'}{\partial x} + u' \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + u' \frac{\partial u'}{\partial x} + \bar{v} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + \bar{v} \frac{\partial u'}{\partial y} + v' \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + v' \frac{\partial u'}{\partial y} \\ & + \bar{w} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z} + \bar{w} \frac{\partial u'}{\partial z} + w' \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z} + w' \frac{\partial u'}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \bar{p}}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p'}{\partial x} - f(\bar{v} + v') \\ & - \nu \left( \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u'}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u'}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u'}{\partial z^2} \right) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Multiplying equation (4) by  $u'$  and rearranging terms gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
& u' \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial u'^2}{\partial t} + u' \bar{u} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \frac{\bar{u}}{2} \frac{\partial u'^2}{\partial x} + u' u' \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \frac{u'}{2} \frac{\partial u'^2}{\partial x} + u' \bar{v} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + \frac{\bar{v}}{2} \frac{\partial u'^2}{\partial y} + u' v' \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + \frac{v'}{2} \frac{\partial u'^2}{\partial y} \\
& + u' \bar{w} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z} + \frac{\bar{w}}{2} \frac{\partial u'^2}{\partial z} + u' w' \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z} + \frac{w'}{2} \frac{\partial u'^2}{\partial z} + \frac{u'}{\rho} \frac{\partial \bar{p}}{\partial x} + \frac{u'}{\rho} \frac{\partial p'}{\partial x} - f(u' \bar{v} + u' v') \\
& - \nu u' \left( \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u'}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u'}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u'}{\partial z^2} \right) = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

By applying Reynolds averages and simplifying, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{u'^2}}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{u' \frac{\partial u'^2}{\partial x}} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{v' \frac{\partial u'^2}{\partial y}} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{w' \frac{\partial u'^2}{\partial z}} + \overline{u' u' \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x}} + \overline{u' v' \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y}} + \overline{u' w' \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z}} + \frac{\bar{u}}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{u'^2}}{\partial x} \\
& + \frac{\bar{v}}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{u'^2}}{\partial y} + \frac{\bar{w}}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{u'^2}}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{\rho} \overline{u' \frac{\partial p'}{\partial x}} - f \overline{u' v'} - \nu \left( \overline{u' \frac{\partial^2 u'}{\partial x^2}} + \overline{u' \frac{\partial^2 u'}{\partial y^2}} + \overline{u' \frac{\partial^2 u'}{\partial z^2}} \right) = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Applying the same steps to the y- and z-momentum equations in (3) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{v'^2}}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{u' \frac{\partial v'^2}{\partial x}} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{v' \frac{\partial v'^2}{\partial y}} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{w' \frac{\partial v'^2}{\partial z}} + \overline{u' v' \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial x}} + \overline{v' v' \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y}} + \overline{v' w' \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial z}} + \frac{\bar{v}}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{v'^2}}{\partial x} \\
& + \frac{\bar{v}}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{v'^2}}{\partial y} + \frac{\bar{w}}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{v'^2}}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{\rho} \overline{v' \frac{\partial p'}{\partial y}} + f \overline{u' v'} - \nu \left( \overline{v' \frac{\partial^2 v'}{\partial x^2}} + \overline{v' \frac{\partial^2 v'}{\partial y^2}} + \overline{v' \frac{\partial^2 v'}{\partial z^2}} \right) = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{w'^2}}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{u' \frac{\partial w'^2}{\partial x}} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{v' \frac{\partial w'^2}{\partial y}} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{w' \frac{\partial w'^2}{\partial z}} + \overline{u' w' \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial x}} + \overline{v' w' \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial y}} + \overline{w' w' \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial z}} + \frac{\bar{w}}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{w'^2}}{\partial x} \\
& + \frac{\bar{v}}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{w'^2}}{\partial y} + \frac{\bar{w}}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{w'^2}}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{\rho} \overline{w' \frac{\partial p'}{\partial z}} - \frac{g}{\theta} \overline{w' \theta'} - \nu \left( \overline{w' \frac{\partial^2 w'}{\partial x^2}} + \overline{w' \frac{\partial^2 w'}{\partial y^2}} + \overline{w' \frac{\partial^2 w'}{\partial z^2}} \right) = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where  $g$  is the acceleration due to gravity and  $\theta$  is potential temperature.

The definition of TKE (Stull 1988) is

$$\bar{e} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \overline{u'^2} + \overline{v'^2} + \overline{w'^2} \right). \tag{9}$$

Adding equations (6)–(8), neglecting molecular diffusion of TKE, gives the full TKE budget equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial \bar{e}}{\partial t} + \bar{u} \frac{\partial \bar{e}}{\partial x} + \bar{v} \frac{\partial \bar{e}}{\partial y} + \bar{w} \frac{\partial \bar{e}}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \overline{u'e} + \frac{1}{\rho} \overline{u'p'} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \overline{v'e} + \frac{1}{\rho} \overline{v'p'} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \overline{w'e} + \frac{1}{\rho} \overline{w'p'} \right) \\
& + \overline{u'u'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \overline{u'v'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + \overline{u'w'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z} + \overline{v'u'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial x} + \overline{v'v'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} + \overline{v'w'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial z} + \overline{w'u'} \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial x} + \overline{w'v'} \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial y} + \overline{w'w'} \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial z} \\
& - \frac{g}{\theta} \overline{w'\theta'} - \nu \left( \overline{\left( \frac{\partial u'}{\partial x} \right)^2} + \overline{\left( \frac{\partial u'}{\partial y} \right)^2} + \overline{\left( \frac{\partial u'}{\partial z} \right)^2} + \overline{\left( \frac{\partial v'}{\partial x} \right)^2} + \overline{\left( \frac{\partial v'}{\partial y} \right)^2} + \overline{\left( \frac{\partial v'}{\partial z} \right)^2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \overline{\left( \frac{\partial w'}{\partial x} \right)^2} + \overline{\left( \frac{\partial w'}{\partial y} \right)^2} + \overline{\left( \frac{\partial w'}{\partial z} \right)^2} \right) = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The most important terms in the TKE budget equation (10) that directly govern the generation or suppression of turbulence—and that will be used in the derivation of the new Richardson number—are the buoyant production (or consumption) term and the mechanical (shear) production terms.

The buoyancy term ( $B$ ) is defined as

$$B = \frac{g}{\theta} \overline{w'\theta'} \tag{11}$$

which represents either the production or suppression of turbulence. It is positive when  $\overline{w'\theta'} > 0$  (unstable stratification, turbulence generation) and negative when  $\overline{w'\theta'} < 0$  (stable stratification, suppression of turbulence, which is typical of the free atmosphere outside regions of deep convection).

The shear production (SP) term is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
SP = & - \left( \overline{u'u'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \overline{u'v'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + \overline{u'w'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z} \right. \\
& + \overline{v'u'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial x} + \overline{v'v'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} + \overline{v'w'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial z} \\
& \left. + \overline{w'u'} \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial x} + \overline{w'v'} \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial y} + \overline{w'w'} \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial z} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The shear-production terms represents the transfer of kinetic energy from the mean flow to the turbulent fluctuations. It is generally positive in the presence of vertical and/or horizontal wind shear and therefore acts as a source of turbulence.

*b. The new Richardson number  $Ri_{new}$*

A common approach to estimate whether turbulence will be generated or suppressed in a stratified flow is to define a dimensionless ratio between the stabilizing and destabilizing mechanisms, known as the Richardson number ( $Ri$ ). This ratio reflects the balance of the TKE budget: stable stratification is associated with a decrease in TKE, whereas instability leads to increased TKE. If the destabilizing effects exceed the stabilizing effects, turbulence is maintained; otherwise, turbulence decays (Stull 1988; Wyngaard 2010).

In a stably stratified atmosphere, the buoyancy term  $B$  in the TKE budget tends to suppress turbulence (stabilizing factor), while the shear-production term  $SP$  tends to generate turbulence (destabilizing factor). The ratio of these two terms defines the flux Richardson number  $Ri_f$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 Ri_f &= -\frac{B}{SP} \\
 &= \frac{\frac{g}{\theta} \overline{w'\theta'}}{\left( \overline{u'u'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \overline{u'v'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + \overline{u'w'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z} + \overline{v'u'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial x} + \overline{v'v'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} + \overline{v'w'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial z} + \overline{w'u'} \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial x} + \overline{w'v'} \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial y} + \overline{w'w'} \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial z} \right)}
 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Here we do not assume horizontal homogeneity, contrary to standard practice, meaning that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$  and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}$  are retained. However, we neglect subsidence by assuming  $\bar{w} = 0$ , since  $\bar{w}$  is typically much smaller than the horizontal wind components  $\bar{u}$  and  $\bar{v}$  in the free atmosphere, and therefore, the contribution of its horizontal gradients to shear production is insignificant.

Under these assumptions, the flux Richardson number in (13) reduces to

$$Ri_f = \frac{\frac{g}{\theta} \overline{w'\theta'}}{\left( \overline{u'w'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z} + \overline{v'w'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial z} + \overline{u'u'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \overline{u'v'} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + \overline{v'u'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial x} + \overline{v'v'} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} \right)} \tag{14}$$

This expression differs from the classical flux Richardson number in that it retains four additional horizontal-shear production terms, in addition to the common vertical-shear terms.

The Richardson number in the form (14) cannot be used operationally because it involves turbulent momentum and heat fluxes, which are not directly known. To close the problem, we apply a first-order turbulence closure (a linear eddy-viscosity approximation) and assume that the turbulent fluxes are proportional to the mean-flow gradients as follows (e.g., Smagorinsky 1963; Wyngaard 2010):

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{w'\theta'} &= -K_H \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}}{\partial z}, & \overline{u'w'} &= -K_{mv} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z}, & \overline{v'w'} &= -K_{mv} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial z}, \\ \overline{u'v'} &= \overline{v'u'} = -K_{mh} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial x} \right), & \overline{u'u'} &= -2K_{mh} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x}, & \overline{v'v'} &= -2K_{mh} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y}\end{aligned}\quad (15)$$

$K_H$  is the heat diffusivity,  $K_{mv}$  and  $K_{mh}$  are the vertical and horizontal eddy viscosities, respectively.

Substituting (15) into (14) yields

$$Ri_f = \frac{-K_H \frac{g}{\theta} \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}}{\partial z}}{-K_{mv} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z} \right)^2 - K_{mv} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial z} \right)^2 - 2K_{mh} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} \right)^2 \right] - K_{mh} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial x} \right)^2}\quad (16)$$

The term  $\left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} \right)^2$  can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} \right)^2 \right].$$

Then (16) can be expressed as

$$Ri_f = \frac{-K_H \frac{g}{\theta} \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}}{\partial z}}{-K_{mv} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z} \right)^2 - K_{mv} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial z} \right)^2 - K_{mh} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right]}\quad (17)$$

Dividing (17) by  $K_{mv}$  gives

$$Ri_f = \frac{1}{Pr_t} \frac{\frac{g}{\theta} \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}}{\partial z}}{\left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial z} \right)^2 + \frac{K_{mh}}{K_{mv}} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right]}\quad (18)$$

where  $Pr_t = K_{mv}/K_H$  is the turbulent Prandtl number.

Equation (18) therefore implies  $Ri_f = \frac{1}{Pr_t} Ri_g$ , where  $Ri_g$  is the generalized gradient Richardson number:

$$Ri_g = \frac{N^2}{S_v^2 + \frac{K_{mh}}{K_{mv}} (Div^2 + D_{ST}^2 + D_{SH}^2)} \quad (19)$$

The terms are defined as follows:

$$N^2 = \frac{g}{\theta} \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}}{\partial z}, \quad \text{static stability,} \quad (20)$$

$$S_v = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial z}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial z}\right)^2}, \quad \text{vertical wind shear,} \quad (21)$$

$$Div = \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y}, \quad \text{horizontal divergence,} \quad (22)$$

$$D_{ST} = \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial y}, \quad \text{stretching deformation,} \quad (23)$$

$$D_{SH} = \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y}, \quad \text{shearing deformation.} \quad (24)$$

The ratio  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  represents the anisotropy of turbulent mixing, i.e., the relative magnitude of the horizontal to vertical eddy viscosities.

Equation (19) can also be written as

$$Ri_g = \frac{N^2}{S_v^2 + \frac{K_{mh}}{K_{mv}} (Div^2 + DEF^2)} \quad (25)$$

where  $DEF = \sqrt{D_{SH}^2 + D_{ST}^2}$  is the total horizontal deformation.

We hereafter refer to the expression in Equation (25) as the new Richardson number,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ . In the following sections,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  is evaluated together with the traditional gradient Richardson number  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  and a well-established turbulence index (TI1) to assess its predictive skill for turbulence in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere.

### 3. Data and Methods

#### *a. Turbulence diagnostics*

In addition to the new Richardson number  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  (Equation (25)), we compute two commonly used turbulence diagnostics for comparison: (1) the traditional gradient Richardson number ( $Ri$ ; Richardson 1922), and (2) the Turbulence Index 1 (TI1) of Ellrod and Knapp (1992).

The traditional Richardson number, hereafter denoted  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , is defined as

$$Ri_{\text{old}} = \frac{N^2}{S_v^2}, \quad (26)$$

which corresponds to the special case of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  with  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 0$ .

In gridded atmospheric fields, the gradient Richardson number is computed as a bulk Richardson number, with spatial derivatives approximated using finite differences. Small values of  $Ri$  indicate that shear production is large compared to static stability, creating favorable conditions for the development of Kelvin–Helmholtz instability and clear-air turbulence (e.g., Dutton and Panofsky 1970). This interpretation applies to both  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  and  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ , with  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  additionally incorporating the effects of horizontal deformation and divergence. Thus, comparing  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  and  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  allows us to assess the added value of including horizontal wind shear in the Richardson number.

The TI1 diagnostic is defined as

$$TI1 = S_v DEF, \quad (27)$$

Large TI1 values indicate a higher likelihood of turbulence occurrence. TI1 is a semi-empirical diagnostic that is widely used in operational forecasting and research studies because it is considered one of the best-performing indicators of upper-level turbulence (Sharman and Pearson 2017). For this reason, we include TI1 for comparison with  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ .

#### *b. ERA5 reanalysis*

To compute the turbulence diagnostics  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ ,  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , and TI1 index, we use atmospheric fields from the ERA5 reanalysis (Hersbach et al. 2020), produced by the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF). ERA5 provides hourly global data on a regular  $0.25^\circ$  grid

( $\sim 31$  km) with 137 hybrid sigma–pressure levels. The variables used in this study include the zonal and meridional wind components, temperature, surface pressure, and the geopotential.

These fields are used to compute the pressure level, altitude, static stability  $N^2$ , and vertical and horizontal wind shears, from which turbulence diagnostics are derived. Spatial gradients are calculated using second-order centered finite differences. To enable direct comparison with *in situ* aircraft turbulence observations, the ERA5-derived diagnostics are interpolated in the horizontal, vertical, and time using linear interpolation.

### *c. EDR turbulence reports*

To evaluate the performance of the turbulence diagnostics, we use automated turbulence reports from commercial aircraft available through the Meteorological Assimilation Data Ingest System (MADIS) database maintained by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). These reports are based on the Aircraft Communications Addressing and Reporting System (ACARS) and provide estimates of the cube root of the eddy dissipation rate,  $\text{EDR} = \epsilon^{1/3}$ , in units of  $\text{m}^{2/3} \text{s}^{-1}$ . EDR has been adopted by the International Civil Aviation Organization as the standard metric for atmospheric turbulence intensity (ICAO 2001). It is particularly useful because it provides an aircraft-independent measure of turbulence intensity (Sharman et al. 2014). The dataset covers the period from 1 January 2017 to 31 December 2024 and contains more than 247 million reports globally above 8 km flight altitude, with the highest densities over North America, the North Pacific, and the North Atlantic flight corridors (Figure 1). The dataset and preprocessing procedures are described in detail in Kaluza et al. (2025). In brief, we exclude reports below 8 km altitude as well as those flagged as questionable or rejected by the MADIS internal consistency checks. Only regularly sampled 1-minute reports along flight tracks are retained (Kaluza et al. 2025). Turbulent intensities are classified using three different EDR thresholds:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{light-or-greater (LOG): } \text{EDR} \geq 0.10 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}, \\
 &\text{moderate-or-greater (MOG): } \text{EDR} \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}, \\
 &\text{severe-or-greater (SOG): } \text{EDR} \geq 0.30 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$




FIG. 1. Spatial distribution of ACARS turbulence reports from the NOAA MADIS archive for the period 1 January 2017 to 31 December 2024. Shading indicates the number of reports on a logarithmic scale, binned onto a  $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$  latitude–longitude grid. Only reports above 8 km flight altitude are included. The total number of observations is 247 730 014.

#### d. Verification metrics

The performance of each turbulence diagnostic is assessed using categorical verification metrics derived from a  $2 \times 2$  contingency table (Table 1; Gill 2016), which compares predicted and observed turbulence events based on EDR measurements from MADIS ACARS reports. For each diagnostic ( $Ri$ ,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ , and the TI1 index), a binary classification—turbulent or non-turbulent—is obtained by applying an EDR threshold, for example  $\text{EDR} \geq 0.2 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , commonly used to identify moderate-or-greater (MOG) turbulence. Each collocated sample is then classified into one of four contingency-table categories depending on whether turbulence was observed and/or predicted.

TABLE 1. Contingency table used to evaluate the performance of the turbulence diagnostics. Each collocated model–observation pair is classified according to whether turbulence was observed ( $\text{EDR} > \text{threshold}$ ) and/or predicted by a given diagnostic ( $Ri$ ,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ , TI1). The four contingency-table categories are used to compute standard verification metrics such as the probability of detection (POD; equation (29)), probability of false detection (POFD; equation (29)), and the true skill statistic (TSS; equation (30)).

	Observed turbulence	No observed turbulence
Predicted turbulence	True positive (TP)	False positive (FP)
No predicted turbulence	False negative (FN)	True negative (TN)

From Table 1, several performance measures are derived. The probability of detection (POD, or true positive rate) quantifies the fraction of observed turbulence events correctly identified by the diagnostic, whereas the probability of false detection (POFD, or false positive rate) represents the fraction of non-turbulent cases incorrectly classified as turbulent. A perfect score for POD is 1 and the worst score is 0, while for POFD a perfect score is 0 and the worst is 1.

$$\text{POD} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FN}}, \quad \text{POFD} = \frac{\text{FP}}{\text{FP} + \text{TN}}. \quad (29)$$

To evaluate performance across all possible thresholds, we construct a sequence of  $2 \times 2$  contingency tables by progressively varying the turbulence threshold applied to each diagnostic. Plotting the corresponding POD against the POFD produces a Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve, which summarizes the trade-off between hits and false alarms across thresholds and provides a visual measure of diagnostic skill (e.g., Sharman et al. 2006; Gill 2016; Sharman and Pearson 2017). A commonly used performance metric is the area under the ROC curve (AUC), a single quantitative measure of discrimination ranging from 0.5 (random performance) to 1.0 (perfect skill). However, AUC values should be interpreted with care, as they can depend on event frequency and sampling characteristics.

In addition to ROC analysis, we compute the True Skill Statistic (TSS), also known as the Hanssen–Kuipers discriminant or Peirce’s Skill Score, which combines the POD and the POFD:

$$\text{TSS} = \text{POD} - \text{POFD} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FN}} - \frac{\text{FP}}{\text{FP} + \text{TN}}. \quad (30)$$

TSS ranges from  $-1$  to  $+1$ , with  $0$  indicating no skill and  $+1$  perfect discrimination. It is a robust measure that balances detection and false alarms, making it particularly interesting for rare-event verification, such as turbulence (e.g., Gill 2016; Sharman and Pearson 2017). In this study, TSS is also used to determine the optimal threshold that maximizes diagnostic performance.

Together, these complementary metrics provide a comprehensive assessment of diagnostic performance and discrimination skill. They are computed for all diagnostics—the classical Richardson number ( $Ri$ ), the new formulation ( $Ri_{\text{new}}$ ), and the turbulence index TI1—using the MADIS

ACARS turbulence reports from 2017 to 2024, allowing for a robust evaluation of the new Richardson number  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ .

## 4. Results

### *a. Evaluation of $Ri_{\text{new}}$*

Figure 2 shows the derived ROC curves and compares the performance of the commonly used TI1 index, the classical Richardson number ( $Ri_{\text{old}}$ ), and the new formulation  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  against MADIS ACARS turbulence reports for three turbulence thresholds: light-or-greater (LOG,  $\text{EDR} \geq 0.10 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ), moderate-or-greater (MOG,  $\text{EDR} \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ), and severe-or-greater (SOG,  $\text{EDR} \geq 0.30 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). Across all thresholds,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  outperforms both  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  and TI1, resulting in consistently higher AUC values. The grey curves illustrate the sensitivity of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  to the mixing-ratio parameter  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$ ; although several values show improvements relative to  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , a ratio of 5000 gives the highest AUC across the three thresholds. This magnitude is consistent with previously reported estimates of  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  ( $10^4$ – $10^5$ ) in strongly stratified geophysical flows, including the free troposphere and the deep ocean (e.g., Pisso et al. 2009; Inall et al. 2013).

For LOG turbulence ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.10$ ),  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  performs slightly better than TI1, with AUC values of 0.82 and 0.80, respectively.  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  with  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$  outperforms both, achieving an AUC of 0.86. For MOG ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.20$ ) and SOG turbulence ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.30$ ), TI1 performs better than  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , but  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  still provides the highest predictive skill among all diagnostics. Additional results with different turbulence thresholds commonly used in the literature ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.15, 0.22, 0.34, \text{ and } 0.45 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) are shown in Figure A1. In general, these results demonstrate that  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  provides a more skillful turbulence discriminator than both  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  and TI1 across the full range of turbulence intensity thresholds.

Although ROC curves and their associated AUC values provide an integrated measure of the ability to discriminate between turbulent and non-turbulent conditions, they do not necessarily indicate how a diagnostic performs at operationally relevant false-alarm rates. In practice, aviation forecasting aims to maximize the Probability of Detection (POD) while keeping the Probability of False Detection (POFD) as low as possible.

Figure 3 therefore shows the PODs of TI1,  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , and  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  at lower-end POFD levels (20%, 30%, 40%, and 50%) for MOG turbulence ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ), evaluated across a range of  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$

ratios to assess sensitivity to this parameter. Across all POFD thresholds,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  yields higher POD values than  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  for any  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  ratio above zero, except when the ratio becomes excessively large ( $\gtrsim 5 \times 10^4$ ), which degrades performance. TII consistently outperforms  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , but  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  with ratios in the range  $10^3$ – $10^4$  exceeds both. For example, at POFD = 30%, the optimal  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  achieves a POD of approximately 83%, compared with about 77.5% for  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ . Although panel (c) in Figure 3 shows the highest POD at  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 10^4$ , the difference relative to  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$  is very small, indicating that the diagnostic skill is largely insensitive within this well-performing range. Similar results are obtained for the LOG and SOG turbulence thresholds (Figs. A2 and A3), demonstrating that the enhanced predictive skill of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  is consistent across turbulence intensities and at operationally relevant POFD levels.

Table 2 summarizes additional performance metrics derived from the  $2 \times 2$  contingency tables—AUC, POD, PODN (= 1 – POFD), and TSS—computed using the optimal index threshold that maximizes TSS along the ROC curve for TII,  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , and  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  for several  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  ratios under MOG turbulence conditions ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). Maximizing  $\text{TSS} = \text{POD} + \text{PODN} - 1$ , provides a balanced measure of performance because it simultaneously reflects the ability to detect turbulence events and limit false alarms. A perfect discriminator yields  $\text{TSS} = 1$ . The highest TSS is obtained with  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$ ), reaching 0.556, compared with 0.507 for  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  and 0.531 for TII.

Although the PODN of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  at this optimal ratio is comparable to that of  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  and slightly lower than TII, the corresponding POD is substantially higher than for either diagnostic. Thus, the combined TSS metric more clearly reflects the improvement provided by  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  by quantifying the trade-off between detection and false alarms. A higher PODN could be achieved by lowering the classification turbulence threshold, but only at the cost of reducing POD, reflecting the strong class imbalance inherent in turbulence occurrence (far more non-turbulent than turbulent reports). Finally, the optimal index threshold—defined as the value that maximizes TSS—for  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$ ) is 1.298, compared with 2.165 for  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ .

To assess whether the results depend on the EDR intensity threshold, the same performance metrics were computed for LOG ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.10$ ) and SOG ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.30$ ) turbulence categories (Tables A1 and A2). Across all thresholds,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  remains the best-performing diagnostic, showing the highest AUC and TSS values, with the optimal ratio of the eddy viscosities consistently

close to  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} \approx 5000$ . The improvement is most pronounced for LOG turbulence and slightly lower for SOG turbulence. The relative performance of TI1 and  $Ri_{old}$  depends on the threshold—TI1 performs worse than  $Ri_{old}$  for LOG turbulence, but better for both MOG and SOG turbulence—whereas  $Ri_{new}$  outperforms both in all cases. It should be noted that the optimal index threshold for  $Ri_{old}$  and  $Ri_{new}$  shows little dependence on the EDR intensity threshold, in contrast to TI1, whose optimal threshold increases substantially from LOG to MOG and SOG turbulence. This is consistent with previous results showing that  $Ri$  primarily discriminates between turbulent and non-turbulent conditions, whereas shear-based diagnostics such as TI1 tend to correlate more strongly with turbulence intensity (Kaluza et al. 2022).

In summary, the evaluation across multiple turbulence thresholds, false-alarm levels, and various statistical performance metrics demonstrates that  $Ri_{new}$  consistently outperforms  $Ri_{old}$  and TI1 index, with a predictive skill that remains robust for LOG, MOG, and SOG turbulence intensities. The following subsections investigate the sensitivity of the optimal  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  ratio to horizontal grid resolution, assess the statistical significance of the improvement, and examine the seasonal and regional variability in diagnostic performance.

TABLE 2. Statistical performance metrics computed from the  $2 \times 2$  contingency tables for TI1,  $Ri_{old}$ , and  $Ri_{new}$  for MOG turbulence ( $EDR \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). Metrics shown are the area under the ROC curve (AUC), the probability of detection (POD), the probability of detection of non-events ( $PODN = 1 - POFD$ ), the True Skill Statistic (TSS), and the optimal index threshold (i.e., the value that maximizes TSS). The total number of observations used was 247 730 014. The best-performing  $Ri_{new}$  obtained with  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$  is highlighted in bold, as it yields the highest AUC and TSS.

Diagnostic	AUC	POD	PODN	TSS	Threshold
TI1	0.834	0.724	0.806	0.531	$5.40 \times 10^{-7}$
$Ri_{old}$	0.823	0.712	0.795	0.507	2.165
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50$ )	0.829	0.713	0.795	0.509	2.145
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100$ )	0.831	0.722	0.789	0.511	2.191
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 500$ )	0.840	0.740	0.784	0.525	2.114
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000$ )	0.846	0.759	0.778	0.539	2.032
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$ )	<b>0.855</b>	<b>0.762</b>	<b>0.793</b>	<b>0.556</b>	<b>1.298</b>
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 10000$ )	0.849	0.778	0.767	0.546	1.019
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50000$ )	0.817	0.767	0.713	0.480	0.345
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100000$ )	0.802	0.758	0.694	0.452	0.234
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000000$ )	0.782	0.719	0.692	0.417	0.025




FIG. 2. ROC curves for TI1 index (blue), the classical Richardson number ( $Ri_{old}$ , black), and the optimal  $Ri_{new}$  formulation (red) for turbulence intensity thresholds of (a)  $EDR = 0.10$ , (b)  $EDR = 0.20$ , and (c)  $EDR = 0.30 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ . Gray curves show  $Ri_{new}$  for different tested  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  ratios. The diagonal dashed line denotes no skill. Values in parentheses give the area under the ROC curve (AUC). The total number of observations used was 247 730 014, with 1 770 543 ( $\approx 0.71\%$ ), 192 447 ( $\approx 0.08\%$ ), and 19 705 ( $\approx 0.01\%$ ) turbulence events for (a)  $EDR \geq 0.10$  (LOG), (b)  $EDR \geq 0.20$  (MOG), and (c)  $EDR \geq 0.30 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$  (SOG), respectively.




FIG. 3. Probability of Detection (POD) as a function of the ratio  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  for the new Richardson number formulation  $Ri_{new}$  (solid grey) evaluated at four fixed values of the Probability of False Detection (POFD): (a) 20%, (b) 30%, (c) 40%, and (d) 50%. Horizontal dashed lines show the skill of TI1 (blue) and  $Ri_{old}$  (black), while the vertical red dashed line shows the optimal ratio  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  that maximizes POD for MOG turbulence ( $EDR \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ).

### b. Sensitivity studies

The first sensitivity study examines whether the optimal value of the eddy viscosities ratio  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  depends on the horizontal grid resolution. In the previous section, we showed that  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  with any value of  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  greater than zero yields better performance relative to  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , except when the ratio becomes excessively large ( $\gtrsim 5 \times 10^4$ ). We also found that  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  with ratios in the range  $10^3$ – $10^4$  substantially exceeds the performance of TI1, and peak skill is obtained for  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} \approx 5000$ . These results were derived using ERA5 at its native  $0.25^\circ$  ( $\sim 31$  km) resolution, which is comparable to the grid spacing of operational NWP models used for aviation turbulence forecasting. However, the optimal  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  may depend on horizontal resolution, because the horizontal spatial gradients appearing in the divergence and deformation terms in Equation. (19) may strengthen at finer resolution and weaken at coarser resolution.

TABLE 3. Optimal  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  values and corresponding AUC for  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  computed using ERA5 at its native  $0.25^\circ$  resolution and after regridding to  $1^\circ$  and  $2^\circ$ . Results are shown for three turbulence intensity thresholds: LOG (EDR  $\geq 0.10$ ), MOG (EDR  $\geq 0.20$ ), and SOG (EDR  $\geq 0.30$ ).

	ERA5 native ( $0.25^\circ$ )	ERA5 regridded ( $1^\circ$ )	ERA5 regridded ( $2^\circ$ )
LOG (EDR $\geq 0.10$ )	7000 (AUC = 0.860)	9000 (AUC = 0.852)	9000 (AUC = 0.848)
MOG (EDR $\geq 0.20$ )	5000 (AUC = 0.855)	7000 (AUC = 0.846)	7000 (AUC = 0.843)
SOG (EDR $\geq 0.30$ )	5000 (AUC = 0.845)	8000 (AUC = 0.831)	8000 (AUC = 0.830)

Table 3 shows the optimal  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  values and the corresponding AUC obtained when  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  is computed using ERA5 at its native  $0.25^\circ$  resolution and after regridding to  $1^\circ$  and  $2^\circ$  grids. The range of tested values  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  in this sensitivity experiment is slightly wider than in Table 2, which explains why the optimal value for LOG turbulence at native resolution is 7000 rather than 5000. However, the differences in AUC are very small, consistent with the weak sensitivity within the well-performing interval identified earlier. For LOG and MOG turbulence, AUC values decrease by about 0.01 when regridding from  $0.25^\circ$  to  $1^\circ$ , and by roughly 0.015 for SOG turbulence. The difference between the  $1^\circ$  and  $2^\circ$  results is minimal ( $\lesssim 0.003\%$  in AUC), indicating that the diagnostic is only weakly sensitive to horizontal grid spacing at these resolutions. The regridding was performed using area-averaging; an alternative approach based on subsampling the grid (i.e.,

retaining every fourth or eighth grid point) showed nearly identical values, confirming that the results are also weakly sensitive to the regriding method.

The optimal  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  increases slightly as the grid is coarsened—from values around 5000–7000 at  $0.25^\circ$  to approximately 7000–9000 at  $1^\circ$  and  $2^\circ$  (and similarly for  $3^\circ$ , not shown). This is physically consistent because horizontal averaging weakens the divergence and deformation terms in Equation (19), requiring a somewhat larger  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  to maintain a correct balance between vertical and horizontal shear effects. It should be noted that the AUC varies by only about  $\pm 0.5\%$  across the entire range of well-performing ratios ( $5 \times 10^3$ – $10^4$ ), indicating that the tuning of  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  is not critical within this interval and that any value in this range yields nearly identical performance and large improvements relative to  $Ri_{old}$ .




FIG. 4. ROC curves and 95% confidence intervals for TI1,  $Ri_{old}$ , and  $Ri_{new}$  (optimal  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$ ), computed from 10 000 000 randomly sampled reports with 1000 bootstrap replications ( $EDR \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). The uncertainty bands are smaller than the line thickness (approximately  $\pm 1\%$ ) and are therefore almost imperceptible.

The second sensitivity study addresses the uncertainty inherent in turbulence reports and how it may affect the evaluation of diagnostic performance. Following the approach of Sharman et al. (2006), the aim is to assess whether the differences in skill between the diagnostics remain robust under resampling of the observations. To quantify this uncertainty, 10 000 000 reports were

TABLE 4. Bootstrap AUC calculation (mean and 95% confidence intervals) for TI1,  $Ri_{old}$ , and  $Ri_{new}$  using  $EDR \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , a subsample of 10 000 000 reports, and 1000 bootstrap replications. The best-performing  $Ri_{new}$  (with  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$ ) is highlighted in bold.

Diagnostic	AUC (mean)	AUC (2.5%)	AUC (97.5%)
TI1	0.833	0.828	0.838
$Ri_{old}$	0.819	0.814	0.823
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50$ )	0.821	0.817	0.826
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100$ )	0.823	0.818	0.828
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 500$ )	0.833	0.829	0.837
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000$ )	0.839	0.835	0.844
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$ )	<b>0.848</b>	<b>0.843</b>	<b>0.852</b>
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 10000$ )	0.842	0.838	0.846
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50000$ )	0.810	0.805	0.814
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100000$ )	0.796	0.791	0.801
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000000$ )	0.775	0.770	0.780

randomly selected from the full MADIS dataset, and 1000 bootstrap replications were performed to estimate the resampling distribution of the AUC for TI1,  $Ri_{old}$ , and  $Ri_{new}$  across several values of  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  (Table 4). The resulting ensemble of ROC curves forms an “uncertainty envelope” around the mean (Fig. 4). The uncertainty bands are very tight (approximately  $\pm 0.01$  in AUC), but become slightly wider (about  $\pm 0.03$ ) when a smaller number of reports is used (1 000 000; Fig. A4 and Table A3 in the Appendix).

Across all bootstrap realizations,  $Ri_{new}$  with  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$  consistently yields the highest AUC (mean = 0.848; 95% CI = 0.843–0.852), TI1 performs slightly lower (AUC = 0.833), and  $Ri_{old}$  exhibits the lowest skill (AUC = 0.819). The confidence intervals for  $Ri_{new}$  at well-performing ratios ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} \in [10^3, 10^4]$ ) do not overlap with those of  $Ri_{old}$ : the lower bound of the  $Ri_{new}$  AUC distribution exceeds the upper bounds of both the  $Ri_{old}$  distribution and the TI1 index distribution. This confirms that the improvement provided by  $Ri_{new}$  is statistically robust.

### c. Seasonal variability

Seasonal verification for MOG turbulence using an EDR threshold of  $0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3}\text{s}^{-1}$  (Fig. 5) reveals a clear annual cycle in the predictive skill of the diagnostics. The highest AUC values occur during Northern Hemisphere winter (December–January–February, DJF), when wind shear is more frequent due to the enhanced jet stream and storm-track activity, conditions typically associated with increased clear-air turbulence occurrence. In contrast, the lowest skill is found in summer (June–July–August, JJA), with AUC values reduced by approximately 0.04 for  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ , 0.06 for  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , and 0.05 for TI1 relative to winter. Spring (March–April–May, MAM) and autumn (September–October–November, SON) exhibit intermediate and nearly identical skill, remaining closer to winter than to summer. Sensitivity analyses using different EDR thresholds indicate that the predictive skill of the diagnostics during winter remains similar, whereas larger variations are observed in summer as the EDR threshold increases (Figs. A5 and A6). Despite these seasonal variations in atmospheric conditions, the relative ranking of the diagnostics remains unchanged:  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  consistently provides the highest predictive skill, followed by TI1 and then  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ .

In all seasons,  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$  yields the highest AUC and TSS values and remains the best-performing choice (Table 5). The magnitude of improvement relative to  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  varies slightly with season, with the largest increase in TSS occurring in summer, when the overall diagnostic skill is weakest, and smaller increases in winter, spring, and autumn. This seasonal dependence is physically consistent. In winter, strong vertical wind shear associated with the jet stream is likely the dominant driver of upper-level turbulence, so the added horizontal-shear terms in  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  may provide a more modest benefit. In summer, gravity waves associated with deep convection and other sources may contribute to turbulence through the generation of large spatial gradients, potentially increasing the relevance of the horizontal-shear component. Consequently, the improvement provided by  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  is more pronounced in summer than in other seasons. Seasonal variations in the optimal index thresholds are also evident: the TI1 threshold increases from summer to winter, while those for  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  and  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  decrease, with larger variability observed for TI1 index (Table 5).

Overall, this seasonal analysis shows that (i) the predictive skill of all diagnostics decreases from winter to summer, consistent with known seasonal variations in turbulence environments, and (ii) the improvement achieved by  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  is robust throughout the year. Across all seasons,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  outperforms both  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  and TI1 index.




FIG. 5. As in Figure 2, but for (a) winter DJF; (b) spring MAM; (c) summer JJA; (d) autumn SON, for MOG turbulence ( $EDR \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^2/3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ )

TABLE 5. As in Table 2, but presented separately for each season: winter (DJF), spring (MAM), summer (JJA), and autumn (SON).

<b>DJF</b>					
Diagnostic	AUC	POD	PODN	TSS	Threshold
TI1	0.849	0.743	0.804	0.548	$6.04 \times 10^{-7}$
$Ri_{old}$	0.843	0.734	0.799	0.533	1.847
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50)$	0.845	0.732	0.802	0.534	1.814
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100)$	0.846	0.737	0.798	0.536	1.833
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 500)$	0.853	0.759	0.788	0.547	1.839
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000)$	0.858	0.769	0.787	0.556	1.753
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000)$	<b>0.865</b>	<b>0.785</b>	<b>0.791</b>	<b>0.576</b>	<b>1.256</b>
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 10000)$	0.861	0.799	0.771	0.570	1.026

<b>MAM</b>					
Diagnostic	AUC	POD	PODN	TSS	Threshold
TI1	0.843	0.746	0.786	0.533	$5.35 \times 10^{-7}$
$Ri_{old}$	0.832	0.730	0.784	0.514	2.154
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50)$	0.835	0.733	0.784	0.517	2.139
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100)$	0.837	0.735	0.785	0.519	2.124
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 500)$	0.846	0.750	0.783	0.533	2.034
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000)$	0.852	0.760	0.786	0.546	1.895
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000)$	<b>0.862</b>	<b>0.796</b>	<b>0.774</b>	<b>0.570</b>	<b>1.363</b>
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 10000)$	0.857	0.793	0.768	0.562	1.020

<b>JJA</b>					
Diagnostic	AUC	POD	PODN	TSS	Threshold
TI1	0.802	0.691	0.775	0.467	$4.14 \times 10^{-7}$
$Ri_{old}$	0.785	0.668	0.767	0.436	2.771
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50)$	0.789	0.671	0.768	0.439	2.744
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 500)$	0.804	0.705	0.755	0.460	2.660
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000)$	0.812	0.698	0.777	0.475	2.263
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000)$	<b>0.822</b>	<b>0.732</b>	<b>0.762</b>	<b>0.495</b>	<b>1.461</b>
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 10000)$	0.815	0.726	0.757	0.483	1.019

<b>SON</b>					
Diagnostic	AUC	POD	PODN	TSS	Threshold
TI1	0.845	0.718	0.830	0.548	$5.78 \times 10^{-7}$
$Ri_{old}$	0.830	0.718	0.795	0.514	2.229
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50)$	0.833	0.723	0.793	0.517	2.237
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 500)$	0.845	0.752	0.782	0.534	2.201
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000)$	0.851	0.761	0.786	0.547	2.028
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000)$	<b>0.859</b>	<b>0.776</b>	0.788	<b>0.564</b>	<b>1.341</b>
$Ri_{new} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 10000)$	0.853	0.782	0.772	0.554	1.018

#### *d. Regional variability*

Figure 6 shows the three regions used for the regional verification—CONUS (the contiguous United States), the North Atlantic, and the North Pacific—that together represent more than 75% of all available turbulence reports in the NOAA MADIS archive. About 50% of these reports are associated with flights over CONUS, meaning that the global performance metrics presented in the previous sections are strongly influenced by atmospheric conditions over CONUS. It is therefore important to evaluate the diagnostics regionally to assess whether predictive skill and ROC characteristics vary across different flow environments.

The regional ROC curves for MOG turbulence ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3}, \text{s}^{-1}$ ; Fig. 7) indicate that the relative performance of the TII index is higher than that of  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  over CONUS, whereas their performance is similar over the oceans (North Atlantic and North Pacific). Again,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  outperforms both TII and  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  in all regions as measured by the AUC metric. AUC values are highest over the North Atlantic and North Pacific (Figs. 7b,c) for all diagnostics, consistent with the dominant role of vertical wind shear in turbulence generation over oceans. In these regions, the increase in AUC value for  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  relative to  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  is approximately 0.02, and about 0.01–0.02 relative to TII. Over CONUS (Fig. 7a), AUC values are about 0.04–0.06 lower than over the oceans, while the increase for  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  relative to  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  is approximately 0.03–0.04, indicating the relevance of including horizontal wind shear in environments where turbulence is generated by a mix of mechanisms rather than purely jet-related vertical shear.

Seasonal verification performed separately for CONUS (Figure 8), the North Atlantic (Figure 9), and the North Pacific (Figure 10) shows again that  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  outperforms both TII and  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  across all seasons and regions. The seasonal cycle in diagnostic skill is strongest over CONUS, where AUC values exhibit a pronounced decrease from winter to summer. For  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , the reduction in AUC value between winter and summer is approximately 0.09–0.10, while the decrease is smaller for  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  (about 0.05–0.06). The enhanced performance of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  is also most pronounced over CONUS in summer, with AUC increases of approximately 0.05 relative to  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  and about 0.01–0.02 relative to TII index, consistent with the presence of multiple turbulence-generation mechanisms, including gravity waves generated by deep convection during warm seasons. Over the oceans, the seasonal cycle is much weaker. In the North Pacific, the AUC values of all diagnostics remain high throughout the year, with low variability and  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  reaching an AUC of about 0.89. Over the




FIG. 6. Regions used for the statistical evaluation of the turbulence diagnostics. The three analyzed regions are defined as follows: (1) **CONUS** (30–50°N, 120–75°W; *purple*), (2) **North Atlantic** (30–65°N, 70–0°W; *red*), (3) **North Pacific** (20–60°N, 140°E–125°W; *green*). For the 2017–2024 period, the number of ACARS turbulence reports from the NOAA MADIS archive above 8 km flight altitude within each region is: CONUS: 120 752 371 (48.7%), North Atlantic: 41 663 600 (16.8%), and North Pacific: 27 791 310 (11.2%), relative to the total number of 247 730 014 reports.

North Atlantic, the seasonality is slightly more pronounced than in the Pacific, consistent with the strong seasonal variability of the jet stream in this region (e.g., Woollings et al. 2010); here, the diagnostics decrease by approximately 0.05 in AUC from winter to summer. In winter, the AUC of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  over the North Atlantic reaches approximately 0.91, and its POD exceeds 80% for a POFD of 20%. Overall, regional analysis confirms that while the magnitude of seasonality varies between regions,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  remains the best-performing diagnostic in all regions and seasons.




FIG. 7. As in Figure 2, but for (a) CONUS; (b) North Atlantic; (c) North Pacific, for MOG turbulence ( $EDR \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ )




FIG. 8. As in Figure 5, but for CONUS region.




FIG. 9. As in Figure 5, but for the North Atlantic.




FIG. 10. As in Figure 5, but for the North Pacific.

## 5. Summary and discussion

A new Richardson number formulation,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$ , has been developed based on the turbulent kinetic energy budget, explicitly incorporating the contributions of vertical and horizontal wind shear to TKE production. Unlike the classical gradient Richardson number  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , which accounts only for vertical wind shear,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  includes horizontal deformation and divergence, weighted by the ratio of horizontal to vertical eddy viscosities ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$ ). This new formulation provides a physically based diagnostic for flow regimes in which three-dimensional shear contributes to turbulence production.

The predictive skill of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  was evaluated using more than 247 million turbulence reports from 2017–2024. Across a wide range of turbulence intensity thresholds, including light-, moderate-, and severe-or-greater turbulence,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  consistently outperforms both  $Ri_{\text{old}}$  and the widely used Turbulence Index 1 (TI1). These improvements are robust across various statistical performance metrics, including ROC-based AUC, probability of detection at operationally relevant false-alarm rates, and the true skill statistic (TSS). On average,  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  increases AUC by approximately 0.03–0.05 relative to  $Ri_{\text{old}}$ , and by about 0.02–0.04 relative to the TI1 index.

Sensitivity studies show that the diagnostic skill of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  is robust to the choice of the ratio of horizontal to vertical eddy viscosities  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$ . The highest skill is obtained for values in the range  $10^3$ – $10^4$ , with peak performance near 5000. This magnitude is consistent with previously reported estimates of  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  ( $10^4$ – $10^5$ ) in strongly stratified geophysical flows, including the free troposphere and the deep ocean (e.g., Pisso et al. 2009; Inall et al. 2013). Within this range, diagnostic performance varies only weakly with the parameter value. Additional tests indicate that both predictive skill and the optimal value of  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  are only marginally affected by horizontal grid resolution and by the regridding method, with AUC varying by less than about  $\pm 0.01$  across resolutions typical of current numerical weather prediction (NWP) and climate models.

Seasonal and regional analyses reveal differences in diagnostic performance across regions and seasons. Over the oceans, where upper-tropospheric turbulence is mainly associated with strong jet-related vertical wind shear, all diagnostics perform well and exhibit weak seasonal variability. In contrast, over CONUS, where turbulence can be generated by different mechanisms, including 3D shear induced by convection and gravity-wave activity, the added value of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  is more pronounced. The seasonal cycle in diagnostic skill is strongest over CONUS, with AUC values decreasing from

winter to summer, particularly for  $Ri_{old}$ , by approximately 0.09–0.10. The reduced seasonal sensitivity of  $Ri_{new}$ , together with its improved performance, is consistent with the presence of multiple turbulence-generation mechanisms that can produce large horizontal gradients of velocity not fully captured by diagnostics based solely on vertical wind shear, such as  $Ri_{old}$ . Although the magnitude of seasonality varies between regions,  $Ri_{new}$  is the best-performing diagnostic in all regions and seasons.

These results highlight the importance of accounting for horizontal wind shear when diagnosing turbulence in the free atmosphere. Although TI1 is a good empirical discriminator of turbulence, its formulation lacks a direct connection to the stabilizing role of stratification. In contrast,  $Ri_{new}$  preserves the physical interpretation of the Richardson number as a balance between stabilizing stratification and shear production, while extending it to explicitly represent three-dimensional shear production.

The optimal value of  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$ —approximately 5000—quantifies the relative contributions of horizontal and vertical shear to turbulence generation in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere at the spatial scales resolved by the ERA5 reanalysis. Because ERA5 has a horizontal resolution comparable to operational NWP models, this value is probably directly applicable to reanalysis-based studies, turbulence forecasting, and climate-model applications. At finer resolutions, the balance of horizontal and vertical gradients may differ, suggesting the need for future evaluations at convective-scale model resolutions. In principle,  $K_{mh}$  and  $K_{mv}$  could be diagnosed directly within NWP models, opening the possibility of spatially and temporally varying  $K_{mh}/K_{mv}$  values.

This study compared  $Ri_{new}$  with  $Ri_{old}$  and TI1 to evaluate its added value relative to commonly used turbulence diagnostics. Extending the evaluation to a broader suite of turbulence diagnostics, including those used in the current version of the Graphical Turbulence Guidance (GTG; Sharman and Pearson (2017)), represents an important next step. Because several GTG diagnostics are normalized by  $Ri_{old}$ , replacing it with  $Ri_{new}$  within the GTG framework may lead to additional improvements in predictive skill. Furthermore, the performance of  $Ri_{new}$  for mid- and low-level turbulence, as well as mountain-wave turbulence, could be investigated.

In summary, this study shows that including horizontal wind shear in the Richardson number yields a physically consistent and statistically robust improvement in diagnosing turbulence in

the free atmosphere, relevant to both research and operational aviation applications. The new formulation provides a unified framework for representing the effects of vertical and horizontal wind shear in the stratified atmosphere and for improving turbulence diagnostics in environments where both vertical and horizontal shear are important.

*Acknowledgments.* This work was funded by the Leverhulme Trust (Grant RPG-2023-138). The turbulence observations used in this study were made available to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) through contributions from several commercial airlines, including American, Delta, Federal Express, Northwest, United, and United Parcel Service. This research used JASMIN, the UK's collaborative data analysis infrastructure (<https://jasmin.ac.uk>).

*Data availability statement.* ECMWF's ERA5 data were accessed and processed from the NERC CEDA archive and are freely available at <https://www.ecmwf.int/en/forecasts/datasets/reanalysis-datasets/era5>. ACARS EDR turbulence reports were obtained from the public NOAA MADIS archive and are available at <https://madis.ncep.noaa.gov>. The processed data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

TABLE A1. As in Table 2, but for LOG turbulence ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.10 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). Metrics shown are the area under the ROC curve (AUC), the probability of detection (POD), the probability of detection of non-events (PODN =  $1 - \text{POFD}$ ), the True Skill Statistic (TSS), and the optimal index threshold (i.e., the value that maximizes TSS). The total number of observations used was 247 730 014. The best-performing  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  obtained with  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$  is highlighted in bold, as it yields the highest AUC and TSS.

Diagnostic	AUC	POD	PODN	TSS	Threshold
TI1	0.799	0.711	0.744	0.455	$4.33 \times 10^{-7}$
$Ri_{\text{old}}$	0.820	0.721	0.786	0.507	2.282
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50)$	0.832	0.725	0.785	0.509	2.273
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100)$	0.834	0.731	0.780	0.511	2.298
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000)$	0.844	0.750	0.778	0.528	2.204
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 10000)$	0.851	0.761	0.781	0.540	2.038
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50000)$	<b>0.860</b>	<b>0.763</b>	<b>0.782</b>	<b>0.563</b>	<b>1.358</b>
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100000)$	0.856	0.785	0.770	0.555	1.024
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 500000)$	0.825	0.757	0.717	0.495	0.399
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000000)$	0.812	0.761	0.698	0.467	0.233
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 10000000)$	0.792	0.727	0.706	0.432	0.025

## APPENDIX

### Additional Results and Sensitivity Analyses

This section provides additional results that support and extend the main analysis, which focuses primarily on MOG turbulence ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.20 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). Figures A2–A6 and Tables A1–A2 present the results for LOG ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.10$ ) and SOG ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.30$ ) turbulence intensity thresholds, demonstrating that the performance characteristics of  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  are broadly consistent across intensity categories. Additional sensitivity tests are also included, such as analyses using other commonly used EDR thresholds (Fig. A1) and bootstrap resampling experiments to assess statistical robustness (Fig. A4 and Table A3).




FIG. A1. As in Figure 2, but for (a)  $EDR = 0.15$ ; (b)  $EDR = 0.22$ ; (c)  $EDR = 0.34$ ; (d)  $EDR = 0.45 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ . The total number of observations used was 247 730 014, with 481 922, 118 343, 8 782, and 930 turbulence events for (a)  $EDR \geq 0.15$ , (b)  $EDR \geq 0.22$ , (c)  $EDR \geq 0.34$ , and (d)  $EDR \geq 0.45 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , respectively.




FIG. A2. As in Figure 3, but for LOG turbulence ( $EDR \geq 0.10 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ )

TABLE A2. As in Table 2, but for SOG turbulence ( $EDR \geq 0.30 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). Metrics shown are the area under the ROC curve (AUC), the probability of detection (POD), the probability of detection of non-events (PODN =  $1 - \text{POFD}$ ), the True Skill Statistic (TSS), and the optimal index threshold (i.e., the value that maximizes TSS). The total number of observations used was 247 730 014. The best-performing  $Ri_{\text{new}}$  obtained with  $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$  is highlighted in bold, as it yields the highest AUC and TSS.

Diagnostic	AUC	POD	PODN	TSS	Threshold
TI1	0.826	0.676	0.847	0.523	$6.36 \times 10^{-7}$
$Ri_{\text{old}}$	0.811	0.669	0.815	0.484	1.978
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50)$	0.813	0.672	0.816	0.486	1.964
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100)$	0.816	0.672	0.816	0.489	1.943
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 500)$	0.826	0.694	0.811	0.504	1.901
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000)$	0.833	0.720	0.798	0.518	1.881
<b><math>Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000)</math></b>	<b>0.845</b>	<b>0.752</b>	<b>0.789</b>	<b>0.540</b>	<b>1.307</b>
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 10000)$	0.842	0.769	0.766	0.535	1.024
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50000)$	0.815	0.765	0.713	0.479	0.399
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100000)$	0.803	0.763	0.689	0.453	0.238
$Ri_{\text{new}} (K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000000)$	0.785	0.730	0.692	0.422	0.026




FIG. A3. As in Figure 3, but for SOG turbulence ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.30 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ )




FIG. A4. As in Figure 4, but using a subsample of 1 000 000 reports, and 1000 bootstrap replications.




FIG. A5. As in Figure 5, but for LOG turbulence ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.10 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ )




FIG. A6. As in Figure 5, but for SOG turbulence ( $\text{EDR} \geq 0.30 \text{ m}^{2/3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ )

TABLE A3. As in Table 4, but using a subsample of 1 000 000 reports, and 1000 bootstrap replications.

Diagnostic	AUC (mean)	AUC (2.5%)	AUC (97.5%)
TII	0.826	0.810	0.842
$Ri_{old}$	0.813	0.797	0.829
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50$ )	0.818	0.802	0.832
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100$ )	0.820	0.803	0.835
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 500$ )	0.830	0.816	0.846
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000$ )	0.837	0.821	0.852
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 5000$ )	<b>0.846</b>	<b>0.832</b>	<b>0.860</b>
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 10000$ )	0.842	0.828	0.855
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 50000$ )	0.810	0.796	0.824
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 100000$ )	0.798	0.783	0.812
$Ri_{new}$ ( $K_{mh}/K_{mv} = 1000000$ )	0.778	0.760	0.794

## References

- Brown, R., 1973: New indices to locate clear-air turbulence. *Meteor. Mag*, **102**, 347–361.
- Colson, D., and H. Panofsky, 1965: An index of clear air turbulence. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, **91 (390)**, 507–513.
- Dutton, J. A., and H. A. Panofsky, 1970: Clear air turbulence: A mystery may be unfolding: High altitude turbulence poses serious problems for aviation and atmospheric science. *Science*, **167 (3920)**, 937–944, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1126/science.167.3920.937>.
- Dutton, M., 1980: Probability forecasts of clear-air turbulence based on numerical model output.
- Ellrod, G. P., and D. I. Knapp, 1992: An Objective Clear-Air Turbulence Forecasting Technique: Verification and Operational Use. *Weather and Forecasting*, **7 (1)**, 150–165.
- Ellrod, G. P., J. A. Knox, P. F. Lester, and L. J. Ehernberger, 2015: Clear air turbulence. *Encyclopedia of Atmospheric Science, 2nd edn*, G. R. North, J. Pyle, and F. Zhang, Eds., Elsevier, 177–186, URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-382225-3.00104-3>.
- Endlich, R. M., 1964: The mesoscale structure of some regions of clear-air turbulence. *Journal of Applied Meteorology*, **3**, 261–276.
- Foudad, M., E. Sanchez-Gomez, T. Jaravel, M. C. Rochoux, and L. Terray, 2024: Past and future trends in clear-air turbulence over the northern hemisphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, **129 (13)**, e2023JD040 261, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JD040261>.
- Gill, P. G., 2016: Aviation turbulence forecast verification. *Aviation turbulence: Processes, detection, prediction*, Springer, 261–283.
- Gultepe, I., and Coauthors, 2019: A review of high impact weather for aviation meteorology. *Pure and applied geophysics*, **176 (5)**, 1869–1921.
- Hersbach, H., and Coauthors, 2020: The ERA5 global reanalysis. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, **146 (730)**, 1999–2049.
- ICAO, 2001: Meteorological service for international air navigation. Annex 3 to the convention on international civil aviation, International Civil Aviation Organization, 128 pp.

- Inall, M. E., D. Aleynik, and C. Neil, 2013: Horizontal advection and dispersion in a stratified shelf sea: The role of inertial oscillations. *Progress in Oceanography*, **117**, 25–36.
- Kaluza, T., D. Kunkel, and P. Hoor, 2022: Analysis of turbulence reports and era5 turbulence diagnostics in a tropopause-based vertical framework. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **49 (20)**, e2022GL100036.
- Kaluza, T., P. D. Williams, D. M. Schultz, and T. P. Banyard, 2025: Climatology of upper-tropospheric turbulence: Capabilities and limitations of aircraft reports and era5 reanalysis diagnostics. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, e70073.
- Kaplan, M. L., and Coauthors, 2006: Characterizing the severe turbulence environments associated with commercial aviation accidents. a real-time turbulence model (rttm) designed for the operational prediction of hazardous aviation turbulence environments. *Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics*, **94 (1)**, 235–270.
- Knox, J. A., 1997: Possible mechanisms of clear-air turbulence in strongly anticyclonic flows. *Monthly weather review*, **125 (6)**, 1251–1259.
- Knox, J. A., D. W. McCann, and P. D. Williams, 2008: Application of the lighthill–ford theory of spontaneous imbalance to clear-air turbulence forecasting. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, **65 (10)**, 3292–3304.
- Lane, T. P., J. D. Doyle, R. Plougonven, M. A. Shapiro, and R. D. Sharman, 2004: Observations and numerical simulations of inertia–gravity waves and shearing instabilities in the vicinity of a jet stream. *Journal of the atmospheric sciences*, **61 (22)**, 2692–2706.
- Lee, D.-B., H.-Y. Chun, S.-H. Kim, R. D. Sharman, and J.-H. Kim, 2022: Development and evaluation of global korean aviation turbulence forecast systems based on an operational numerical weather prediction model and in situ flight turbulence observation data. *Weather and forecasting*, **37 (3)**, 371–392.
- McCann, D. W., 2001: Gravity waves, unbalanced flow, and aircraft clear air turbulence. *National Weather Digest*, **25 (1/2)**, 3–14.

- McCann, D. W., J. A. Knox, and P. D. Williams, 2012: An improvement in clear-air turbulence forecasting based on spontaneous imbalance theory: the ulturb algorithm. *Meteorological Applications*, **19** (1), 71–78.
- Miles, J. W., 1961: On the stability of heterogeneous shear flows. *Journal of fluid Mechanics*, **10** (4), 496–508.
- Miles, J. W., and L. N. Howard, 1964: Note on a heterogeneous shear flow. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **20** (2), 331–336.
- Pisso, I., E. Real, K. S. Law, B. Legras, N. Bousserez, J.-L. Attié, and H. Schlager, 2009: Estimation of mixing in the troposphere from lagrangian trace gas reconstructions during long-range pollution plume transport. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, **114** (D19), D19 301.
- Richardson, L. F., 1922: *Weather prediction by numerical process*. Franklin Classics.
- Sharman, R., 2016: Nature of aviation turbulence. *Aviation turbulence: Processes, detection, prediction*, 3–30.
- Sharman, R., L. Cornman, G. Meymaris, J. Pearson, and T. Farrar, 2014: Description and derived climatologies of automated in situ eddy-dissipation-rate reports of atmospheric turbulence. *Journal of applied meteorology and climatology*, **53** (6), 1416–1432.
- Sharman, R., and T. Lane, 2016: *Aviation Turbulence: Processes, Detection, and Prediction*. Springer, Berlin, URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-23630-8>.
- Sharman, R., and J. Pearson, 2017: Prediction of Energy Dissipation Rates for Aviation Turbulence. Part I: Forecasting Nonconvective Turbulence. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, **56** (2), 317–337.
- Sharman, R., C. Tebaldi, G. Wiener, and J. Wolff, 2006: An Integrated Approach to Mid- and Upper-Level Turbulence Forecasting. *Weather and Forecasting*, **21** (3), 268–287.
- Sharman, R., S. Trier, T. Lane, and J. Doyle, 2012: Sources and dynamics of turbulence in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere: A review. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **39** (12), L12 803.

- Smagorinsky, J., 1963: General circulation experiments with the primitive equations: I. the basic experiment. *Monthly weather review*, **91** (3), 99–164.
- Stull, R. B., 1988: *An Introduction to Boundary Layer Meteorology*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Williams, P. D., 2017: Increased light, moderate, and severe clear-air turbulence in response to climate change. *Advances in Atmospheric Sciences*, **34** (5), 576–586.
- Williams, P. D., and M. M. Joshi, 2013: Intensification of winter transatlantic aviation turbulence in response to climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, **3** (7), 644–648, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1866>.
- Woollings, T., A. Hannachi, and B. Hoskins, 2010: Variability of the North Atlantic eddy-driven jet stream. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, **136** (649), 856–868.
- Wyngaard, J. C., 2010: *Turbulence in the Atmosphere*. Cambridge university press.