

# Modeling of the 1.10- and 1.18- $\mu\text{m}$ nightside windows observed by SPICAV-IR aboard Venus Express

B. Bézard<sup>1</sup>, A. Fedorova<sup>2</sup>, J.-L. Bertaux<sup>3</sup>, A. Rodin<sup>2</sup>, O. Korablev<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> LESIA, Observatoire de Paris, Meudon, France

<sup>2</sup> Space Research Institute (IKI), Moscow, Russia

<sup>3</sup> LATMOS, Verrières-le-Buisson, France

Emission from the surface of Venus can be detected in the 1.10- and 1.18- $\mu\text{m}$  nightside windows. The two windows are limited on one side by strong  $\text{CO}_2$  bands (at 1.05 and 1.21  $\mu\text{m}$ ) and on the other side by a water vapor band centered at 1.13  $\mu\text{m}$ . Analysis of this emission allows us to determine the water vapor abundance profile near the surface of Venus. We present here a first analysis of the 1.10- and 1.18- $\mu\text{m}$  nightside windows observed with the long-wavelength (LW) channel of the SPICAV Vis-IR AOTF spectrometer at a resolution of 5.1  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  (resolving power of  $\sim 1700$  at 1.15  $\mu\text{m}$ ). We used a large weighted average of SPICAV-IR spectra recorded between Orbits 800 and 815, between latitudes 28°S and 57°S. All selected spectra have an emission angle less than 45° and a surface elevation between -1.0 and 0.2 km. The S/N ratio of the SPICAV-IR average spectrum at the peak of the 1.18- $\mu\text{m}$  window is about 300. This spectrum was compared with radiative transfer calculations to constrain the surface  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  mixing ratio and to investigate the uncertainties introduced by the spectroscopic parameters in the model. In particular, we tested various representations of the  $\text{CO}_2$  line opacity (line mixing, theoretical and empirical far-wing models) and the effect of an additional  $\text{CO}_2$  continuum opacity, possibly from collision-induced absorption. We also compared calculations with different spectroscopic databases: HITEMP and CDSD for  $\text{CO}_2$ , GEISA and BT2 for  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ . The whole range 1.05-1.25  $\mu\text{m}$  cannot be fully satisfactorily reproduced with these calculations, which points to incompleteness or inaccuracies in the  $\text{CO}_2$  and possibly  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  databases. Our best fit model suggests an  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  mole fraction between 30 and 45 ppm, with a precision presently limited by these modeling uncertainties.