Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 14, 24623–24666, 2014 www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/14/24623/2014/ doi:10.5194/acpd-14-24623-2014 © Author(s) 2014. CC Attribution 3.0 License.



This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics (ACP). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in ACP if available.

Trends of ozone total columns and vertical distribution from FTIR observations at 8 NDACC stations around the globe

C. Vigouroux¹, T. Blumenstock², M. Coffey³, Q. Errera¹, O. García⁴, N. B. Jones⁵, J. W. Hannigan³, F. Hase², B. Liley⁶, E. Mahieu⁷, J. Mellqvist⁸, J. Notholt⁹, M. Palm⁹, G. Persson⁸, M. Schneider⁴, C. Servais⁷, D. Smale⁶, L. Thölix¹⁰, and M. De Mazière¹

¹Department of Atmospheric Composition, Belgian Institute for Space Aeronomy (BIRA-IASB), Brussels, Belgium

²Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Institute for Meteorology and Climate Research (IMK-ASF), Karlsruhe, Germany

³Atmospheric Chemistry Division, National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), Boulder, Colorado, USA

⁴Izaña Atmospheric Research Centre (IARC), Agencia Estatal de Meteorología (AEMET), Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain

⁵Centre for Atmospheric Chemistry, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia



⁶Department of Atmosphere, National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Ltd (NIWA), Lauder, New Zealand

⁷Institute of Astrophysics and Geophysics, University of Liège (ULg), Liège, Belgium ⁸Department of Earth and Space Science, Chalmers University of Technology, Göteborg, Sweden

⁹Institute of Environmental Physics, University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany ¹⁰Climate Research, Finnish Meteorological Institute (FMI), Helsinki, Finland

Received: 11 July 2014 - Accepted: 29 August 2014 - Published: 25 September 2014

Correspondence to: C. Vigouroux (corinne.vigouroux@aeronomie.be)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Discussion Pa	ACPD 14, 24623–24666, 2014				
aper Discussi	Trends of c columns a distribut FTIR obso C. Vigour	ozone total nd vertical ion from ervations oux et al.			
ion Paper	Title	Page Introduction			
Discussion Pa	Conclusions Tables	References Figures			
per Discu	 ■ Back Full Screet 	Close een / Esc			
ssion Paper	Printer-friendly Version Interactive Discussion				

Abstract

Ground-based Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) measurements of solar absorption spectra can provide ozone total columns with a precision of 2%, but also independent partial column amounts in about four vertical layers, one in the troposphere and three

- in the stratosphere up to about 45 km, with a precision of 5–6%. We use eight of the Network for the Detection of Atmospheric Compososition Change (NDACC) stations having a long-term time series of FTIR ozone measurements to study the total and vertical ozone trends and variability, namely: Ny-Alesund (79° N), Thule (77° N), Kiruna (68° N), Harestua (60° N), Jungfraujoch (47° N), Izaña (28° N), Wollongong (34° S) and (45° N), Use Market Market
- ¹⁰ Lauder (45° S). The length of the FTIR time-series varies by station, but is typically from about 1995 to present. We applied to the monthly means of the ozone total and four partial columns a stepwise multiple regression model including the following proxies: solar cycle, Quasi-Biennial Oscillation (QBO), El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO), Arctic and Antarctic Oscillation (AO/AAO), tropopause pressure (TP), equivalent lati-
- ¹⁵ tude (EL), Eliassen-Palm flux (EPF), and volume of polar stratospheric clouds (VPSC). At the Arctic stations, the trends are found mostly negative in the troposphere and lower stratosphere, very mixed in the middle stratosphere, positive in the upper stratosphere due to a large increase in the 1995–2003 period, and non-significant when considering the total columns. The trends for mid-latitude and subtropical sta-²⁰ tions are all non-significant, except at Lauder in the troposphere and upper stratosphere, and at Wollongong for the total columns and the lower and middle stratospheric columns; at Jungfraujoch, the upper stratospheric trend is close to significance (+0.9 ± 1.0 % decade⁻¹). Therefore, some signs of the onset of ozone mid-latitude recovery are observed only in the Southern Hemisphere, while a few more years seems
- to be needed to observe it at the northern mid-latitude station.



1 Introduction

While the past negative trend in the ozone layer has been successfully attributed to the increase of ozone depleting substances, and reproduced by chemistry-climate models, understanding and predicting the current and future ozone layer, and especially attributing an ozone recovery to the positive effect of the Montreal Protocol and its Amendments and Adjustments, is still a challenge. This results from natural variability, observation uncertainties, and changes in dynamics and temperature induced by the increase of greenhouse gases (WMO, 2010). Long-term measurements of total and vertical ozone are required to understand the ozone response to different natural and anthropogenic forcings. Since the long-term satellite experiments ceased to op-10 erate (i.e. SAGE, HALOE), the satellite community is working on merging the past records to the new measurements performed by a number of satellite instruments launched since 2000 (e.g. Bodeker et al., 2013; Kyrölä et al., 2013; Sioris et al., 2014; Chehade et al., 2014). Ground-based stable data are needed to validate these satellite extended datasets, and to offer an alternative determination of ozone total and vertical changes. Dobson, Umkehr, and ozonesondes are the traditional ground-based data

- for these studies, already reporting trends in the 1985 ozone report (WMO, 1985), followed in 1998 by Lidar and microwave measurements (WMO, 1998). Ground-based FTIR (Fourier Transform Infra-Red) measurements derived from high-resolution solar
- ²⁰ absorption spectra provide an additional ozone data set, and they have been used for trend studies for the first time in Vigouroux et al. (2008) with 10 years of data (1995–2004) at several European stations, then updated in the WMO (2010) report. Additional similar studies have been performed at individual stations (Mikuteit, 2008; García et al., 2012). These measurements have their own advantages: for atmospheric
- gases such as ozone which have very narrow absorption lines, an absolute calibration is not needed; the ozone absorption signatures are self-calibrated with the reference being the surrounding continuum. Furthermore, they can provide not only ozone total columns with a precision of 2 %, but also low vertical resolution profiles, obtained from



the temperature and pressure dependence of the absorption line shapes. This leads to about four independent partial columns, one in the troposphere and three in the stratosphere up to about 45 km, with a precision of about 5-6 %.

- The work discussed in this paper expands the previous study of Vigouroux et al. (2008): it is based on longer time series, it includes FTIR data from stations outside Europe, and it uses a stepwise multiple linear regression model including several explanatory variables for the trend evaluation. It is presented as follows: Sect. 2 provides information about the FTIR ozone observations (retrieval strategies, characterization of the vertical information, time series and seasonality). Section 3 describes the stepwise multiple linear regression model applied to the ozone time series. Section 4 presents
- and discusses the trend results, as well as the explained part of ozone variability. Section 5 summarizes the conclusions.

2 Ground-based FTIR ozone observations

2.1 FTIR monitoring

- Table 1 identifies the ground-based FTIR stations, all part of NDACC (Network for the Detection of Atmospheric Composition Change), that are contributing to the present work. The latitudinal coverage is good: from 79° N to 45° S. These stations perform regular solar absorption measurements, under clear-sky conditions, over a wide spectral range (around 600–4500 cm⁻¹) and the derived time series of total column abun dances of many atmospheric species are available in the NDACC database (http: //www.ndacc.org). While the stations are all currently active, they started their regular monitoring activities at different times. The period of measurement used for ozone trend analysis at each station is summarized in Table 1, together with the instrument
- manufacturer and type. Some of the stations performed measurements even earlier but these older spectra, taken with different spectrometers have to be carefully reanalysed first before being included in a trend study. The instruments currently used



are the high-resolution spectrometers Bruker 120 M, 125 M, 120 HR, and 125 HR which can achieve a spectral resolution of 0.0035 cm^{-1} or better. The Bomem DA8 used in the first years of Wollongong measurements has a spectral resolution of 0.004 cm^{-1} .

2.2 FTIR retrieval strategy

- ⁵ We refer to Vigouroux et al. (2008) for more details on the ozone FTIR inversion principles, which are based on the optimal estimation method (Rodgers, 2000). Two profile retrieval algorithms are widely used, PROFITT9 (Hase, 2000) at Kiruna and Izaña, and SFIT2 (Pougatchev et al., 1995) at the six other stations. It has been demonstrated in Hase et al. (2004) that the profiles and total column amounts retrieved from these two different algorithms under identical conditions are in excellent agreement. In
- Vigouroux et al. (2008), a common retrieval strategy was optimized, within a European FTIR network, to derive ozone trends in four vertical layers. In the present work, the homogenization of the retrieval strategy went one step further. First, a common source for the ozone a priori profiles is used: the model WACCM4 (Garcia et al., 2007) calcu-
- ¹⁵ lated at each NDACC FTIR station, except at Harestua where a climatology based on ozonesondes and HALOE measurements is used. Second, all stations are employing the daily pressure and temperature profiles from NCEP (National Centers for Environmental Predicion). Third, the interfering species fitted in the ozone retrievals, usually with a single scaling of their apriori profile, are the same for all stations, namely, H₂O,
- ²⁰ CO₂, C₂H₄, and the ozone isotopologues ¹⁶O¹⁶O¹⁸O and ¹⁶O¹⁸O¹⁶O. Only Harestua used fixed profiles for C₂H₄, and the ozone isotopologues. The spectroscopic database has been updated to HITRAN 2008 (Rothman et al., 2009).

We report in Table 2 the main remaining parameters that can still differ from station to station. All choices of microwindows lead to the required 4 to 5° of freedom

for signal (DOFS), thanks to the numerous ozone lines with different intensities which give information both in the stratosphere and the troposphere. The main interfering species in this spectral region is water vapor, and it has been dealt with differently depending on the station: at Wollongong and Lauder station, the H₂O profile is retrieved



simultaneously with the ozone profile, adding the microwindow 896.4–896.6 cm⁻¹ for a better H_2O determination. At Kiruna, Izaña and Jungfraujoch, the H_2O a priori profiles are only scaled in the ozone retrieval, but these a priori profiles have been preliminarily retrieved in dedicated H_2O microwindows for each spectrum (Schneider et al. (2006) for

Kiruna and Izaña; Sussmann et al. (2009) for Jungfraujoch). For the very dry Jungfraujoch site, it has been found that preliminary H₂O retrievals do not improve the quality of the ozone retrievals. At Ny-Alesund and Thule, water vapor is treated as the other interfering species: only a scaling of a single a priori profile from WACCM4 is made.

In optimal estimation, the choice of the a priori covariance matrix S_a is also an important parameter of the inversion process, and together with the measurement noise error covariance matrix S_e , it will lead to the following averaging kernel matrix **A** (Rodgers, 2000):

 $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{K}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{S}_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathbf{K} + \mathbf{S}_{a}^{-1})^{-1} \mathbf{K}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{S}_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathbf{K},$ (1)

- ¹⁵ where **K** is the weighting function matrix that links the measurement vector **y** to the state vector **x**: $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}$, with \mathbf{e} representing the measurement error. In our retrievals, we assume \mathbf{S}_{e} to be diagonal, in which case the diagonal elements are the inverse square of the signal to noise ratio (SNR). The diagonal elements of \mathbf{S}_{a} represent the assumed variability of the target gas volume mixing ratio (VMR) at a given altitude, and the non-diagonal elements represent the correlation between the VMR at different altitudes. This \mathbf{S}_{a} matrix can differ from station to station as one can see in Table 2. Except at Harestua, Kiruna and Izaña, the stations are using an a priori covariance matrix with diagonal elements constant with altitude corresponding to 10, 20 or 30 %
- variability, the largest variabilities taking place at the high latitude stations Ny-Alesund and Thule. At Harestua, the diagonal elements of S_a correspond to 11% in the stratosphere, decreasing down to 6% in the troposphere and to 5% above 35 km. Except at Ny-Alesund, the SNR value is not the real one coming from each individual spectrum, but an effective SNR, that is used as a regularization parameter. It is chosen differently from one station to another, together with the S_a matrix, in order to obtain stable



retrievals with reasonable DOFS. This effective SNR is smaller than the value derived from the inherent noise in the spectra, since the residuals in a spectral fit are not only coming from pure measurement noise but also from uncertainties in the model parameters. At Kiruna and Izaña, the regularization is made using the Tikhonov L1 constraint (Tikhonov, 1963).

5

The observed absorption line shapes also depend on the instrument line shape (ILS) which is therefore needed in the forward models of the retrieval codes. At all stations, except Jungfraujoch and Wollongong for the Bomem spectra, the ILS has been retrieved independently from HBr or N₂O absorption measurements in a low-pressure gas cell with the LINEFIT code, as described in Hase et al. (1999). In this approach, the loss of modulation efficiency and the phase error can be described (1) by 40 parameters (20 for each) at equidistant optical path differences (OPDs); (2) or simply by two parameters assuming a linear decline of the modulation efficiency with OPD, and a constant phase error. For the Ny-Alesund, Harestua and Lauder stations, the LIN-

- EFIT results were close to, and thus have been approximated by, the ideal ILS: there is no loss of modulation efficiency vs. OPD and no phase error. At Izaña and Thule, the ILS was not ideal and the 40 parameters obtained from LINEFIT have been used to describe the ILS. At Harestua, the second option of parameters from LINEFIT was used and the phase error, which can lead to asymmetrical ILS but which was close
- to zero, was neglected. At Jungfraujoch, where cell measurements were not available for early years, and at Wollongong for the Bomem spectra, it also has been taken into account that the ILS may not be ideal: the ILS distortions have been approximated by an empirical apodization function that represents only symmetrical distortions (Barret et al., 2002). In the case of an ideal instrument, the apodization function would be constant and equal to 1. In case of a non-ideal ILS, the parameters of the empirical
- function are retrieved together with the VMR profiles, using the ideal ILS as the a priori value. A polynomial fit of order 2 and of order 4 has been used at Jungfraujoch and Wollongong, respectively. The phase error, close to zero, has been neglected.

Discussion Paper ACPD 14, 24623-24666, 2014 Trends of ozone total columns and vertical distribution from **Discussion Paper FTIR** observations C. Vigouroux et al. **Title Page** Introduction Abstract **Discussion** Paper Conclusions References Tables **Figures** Back Close **Discussion** Paper Full Screen / Esc **Printer-friendly Version** Interactive Discussion

2.3 Vertical information in FTIR retrievals

The vertical information contained in the FTIR retrievals can be characterized by the averaging kernel matrix **A** (Eq. 1), as described in detail in Vigouroux et al. (2008). It has been shown in this previous paper that the ozone retrievals provide 4–5 DOFS, depending on the station. Therefore, in addition to total column trends, we provide ozone trends in four independent partial column layers, corresponding to the vertical information. The layer limits have been chosen such that the DOFS is at least 1.0 in each associated partial column. The adopted layers are independent according to the resolution of the averaging kernels, as can be seen in Fig. 1, where the partial column averaging kernels of the four layers in the case of Jungfraujoch are shown. Also shown is the sensitivity which is, at each altitude *k*, the sum of the elements of the corresponding averaging kernel $\sum_i A_{ki}$, and represents the fraction of the retrieval that comes from the measurement rather than from the a priori information. In the present work, small changes have been made in the partial column limits in comparison to

- ¹⁵ Vigouroux et al. (2008): we avoid the tropopause region at each station, in order to have a better separation between the layer that we call the "tropospheric" layer, and the lower stratospheric layer. Due to the high tropopause heights at Izaña (14.9 km) and Wollongong (13.8 km), compared to mid- and high-latitude stations (from 10.1 km at Ny-Alesund to 11.8 km at Jungfraujoch), we use different partial column limits for these
- two stations. The upper limit of the upper layer is here 49 km, the altitude above which the sensitivity goes to zero (see Fig. 1), instead of 42 km in Vigouroux et al. (2008), the altitude above which the sensitivity is below 0.5. We still gain from 0.06 (Jungfraujoch) up to 0.23 (Lauder) DOFS in this 7 km wide range with poorer sensitivity. For Harestua, the chosen layer limits give a DOFS of only 0.9 and 0.75, in the ground 10 km and in the 29–49 km layers, respectively.

We provide in Table 3, the partial column limits for each station. The detailed error budget for ozone FTIR retrievals has been described in Vigouroux et al. (2008) and more recently in García et al. (2012) for Izaña, and we just summarize in Table 3 the



total random uncertainties obtained for the present choice of layers. As obtained in the two previous papers, and not shown here, the smoothing error is the dominant random error source for the tropospheric and lower stratospheric layer, while the temperature dominates the random error budget for the middle and upper stratospheric layers, and for total columns. Also found in these two papers, and not repeated here, is the val-

idation of the FTIR total and partial columns with correlative data (Dobson, Brewer, UV-VIs, ozonesondes, Lidar).

2.4 FTIR ozone time series

Figure 2 displays the time series of ozone total columns at each ground-based FTIR station. Because we consider only solar absorption measurements, the time series at Ny-Alesund, Thule, and Kiruna cover only the Mid-March–September, Late-February– Mid-October and Mid-January–Mid-November periods, respectively. The seasonal variation is isolated in Fig. 3 which shows the monthly mean total columns over the periods of measurements. We clearly see the well-known seasonal cycle of ozone total column baving a maximum in spring at all stations, and the higher amplitude of the seasonal

having a maximum in spring at all stations, and the higher amplitude of the seasonal variation at higher latitudes (Brasseur and Solomon, 1984).

Figure 3 shows also the monthly means of the four partial columns defined in the previous section (Table 3). In the upper stratospheric layer, the ozone maximum occurs in summer (early summer at high latitudes shifting to late summer with decreasing lati-

- tude), in agreement with higher photo-chemical production of ozone during this season. In the lower stratospheric layer, the ozone maximum is in late winter/early spring at all latitudes. The situation is more contrasted for the middle stratospheric layer: still late winter/early spring for Harestua, Jungfraujoch, Lauder and Wollongong, but the latter shows a second maximum in late summer, and a small amplitude of the seasonal cy-
- cle. For the three higher latitude stations Ny-Alesund, Thule and Kiruna, the maximum is still in spring, extending to May for the two latter stations. At Izaña, the maximum is in summer in the middle stratosphere. For the tropospheric column, we observe a maximum in spring at all stations, but at Jungfraujoch it extends also in summer.



3 Multiple regression model

The ozone FTIR total and partial column trends in Vigouroux et al. (2008); WMO (2010); García et al. (2012) were calculated with a bootstrap re-sampling method, applied to the daily means time series. In these studies, only the seasonal cycle and

- ⁵ a linear trend were taken into account, the remaining natural ozone variability was then an additional noise in the ozone trend determination. To reduce the uncertainties on the trends and to better understand what drives ozone variability and trends, we use in the present study a multiple linear regression (MLR) model. To reduce the auto-correlation in the residuals, we use here the monthly means time series.
- The following regression model is applied to the monthly means of ozone total and 10 partial column time series Y(t):

$$Y(t) = A_0 + A_1 \cdot \cos(2\pi t/12) + A_2 \cdot \sin(2\pi t/12) + A_3 \cdot \cos(4\pi t/12) + A_4 \cdot \sin(4\pi t/12) + A_5 \cdot t + \sum_{k=6}^{n} A_k \cdot X_k(t) + \epsilon,$$

15

where the A_1 to A_4 parameters describes the ozone seasonal cycle, A_5 is the annual trend, X_k are the explanatory variables (proxies time series) and A_k their respective coefficient, and ϵ represents the residuals.

To select the final regression model, we have included several proxies, which represent processes that are known to impact ozone, in a stepwise regression procedure 20 that keeps or rejects each proxy: the initial model (seasonal cycle and trend) is fitted first. Second, iteratively, if any proxies, not already in the model, have p values less than an entrance tolerance (0.05) i.e. if it is unlikely that they would have zero coefficient if added to the model, then we add the one with the smallest p value. Otherwise,

if any proxies in the model have p values greater than an exit tolerance (0.10), then 25 we remove the one with the largest p value and we repeat the whole process until no



(2)

single step improves the model. Hence, the final set of parameters can vary with the station and with the partial columns concerned. In this paper, a proxy is called "non-significant" when it has not been retained by the stepwise procedure. This choice of not using a fixed model for all stations and partial columns avoids to over-fit the data, and is justified by the large latitudinal range of the stations (e.g., the VPSC or ENSO

proxies will not impact the stations in the same way), and by the different processes driving ozone variability at different altitudes.

The proxies that have been tested in the stepwise regression procedure are summarized in Table 4. The two most common explanatory variables found in the literature are

- the solar radio flux (F10.7 index) which represents the 11 year solar cycle (following e.g. Newchurch et al., 2003; Randel and Wu, 2007), and the zonal winds measured at Singapore at 30 and 10 hPa (following e.g. Brunner et al., 2006) which represent the quasibiennial oscillation (QBO). The proxy used for the El Niño-Southern Oscillation is the Multivariate ENSO Index (MEI), following Randel et al. (2009). Different time-lags (from the text of text of the text of text of text of text of text of text of the text of tex of text of text of text of tex of text of tex of text o
- ¹⁵ 0 to 4 months) between ENSO and ozone time series have been tested. The other dynamical proxies that have been explored are the tropopause pressure at each station (following e.g. Appenzeller et al., 2000), the equivalent latitude at three altitude levels around each station (ELL, ELM, ELU), the Arctic Oscillation (AO) or the Antarctic Oscillation (AAO) indices depending on the station location (e.g. Appenzeller et al., 2000;
- Frossard et al., 2013), and the vertical component of the Eliassen-Palm flux (EPF) at 100 hPa averaged over 45 to 75° north and south, as a proxy for the Brewer-Dobson circulation (e.g. Brunner et al., 2006). Those proxies are connected (Appenzeller et al., 2000; Weber et al., 2011), but we let the stepwise regression model choose the most adapted proxy for each station and partial column. Concerning the equivalent latitude,
- we did not construct an integrated equivalent proxy valuable for the whole ozone "integrated" total column as in Wohltmann el al. (2005). Here, we simply use the equivalent latitude calculated from ERA Interim reanalysis (Dee et al., 2011) at three altitude levels corresponding approximately to the middle of our three stratospheric layers (ELL for



LowS, ELM for MidS, and ELU for UppS), namely at 370, 550, and 950 K, respectively, for all stations except Izaña and Wollongong (460, 700, and 1040 K, respectively).

Lastly, the volume of polar stratospheric clouds (VPSC) is used as a proxy for polar ozone loss (e.g. Brunner et al., 2006). The VPSC proxy has been multiplied

⁵ by the effective equivalent stratospheric chlorine (EESC) time series calculated with a mean age of air of 5.5 years, in order to take into account the time for the ozone depleting substances to reach the poles (http://acdb-ext.gsfc.nasa.gov/Data_services/ automailer/index.html). To account for the cumulative effect over months of the EPF and the VPSC*EESC proxies on ozone, we have followed the approach of Brunner
 ¹⁰ et al. (2006) (see their Eq. 4).

For the two QBO proxies (30 and 10 hPa), if retained in the stepwise procedure, four seasonal parameters can be added to the model. The $A_k \cdot X_k(t)$ term of Eq. (2) is then replaced by:

 $(A_{k} + A_{k+1} \cdot \cos(2\pi t/12) + A_{k+2} \cdot \sin(2\pi t/12)) + A_{k+3} \cdot \cos(4\pi t/12) + A_{k+4} \cdot \sin(4\pi t/12)) \cdot X_{k}(t).$

20

Depending on the station and on the layer, none, one or both of the two proxies QBO30 and QBO10 will be retained in the model, with or without their additional seasonal parameters. We will call from here "QBO contribution", the sum of all possible contributions of QBO30 and QBO10.

Since the time series involved in the present study start at earliest in 1995, we do not include two commonly used explanatory variables: the aerosol optical thickness needed to represent the effect on ozone of the large volcanic eruptions of El Chichón (1982) and Mount Pinatubo (1991), and the EESC proxy which can be used as di-²⁵ rect proxy for the halogen loading of the stratosphere instead of the piecewise linear trend (PWLT) with a turnaround in 1996/1997 often used in time series starting well before this turnaround point (WMO, 2010). Our linear trend estimates are therefore better comparable to the studies which use the PWLT method. At polar stations, the turnaround is occurring a few years later, so that the use of the EESC proxy could be an



(3)

alternative to the simple linear trend for these stations. However, we preferred to adopt the same approach for all the stations. Probably, when the FTIR record will be longer, one would be able to distinguish between the EESC impact on ozone and a possible additional trend due to process(es) that are not represented in the model.

To account for the auto-correlation in the residuals, a Cochrane-Orcutt transformation is applied (Cochrane and Orcutt, 1949). This gives more reliable confidence intervals for the regression parameters.

4 Results and discussion

5

In Fig. 4, we show the individual contribution C_{frac} of each proxy retained by the step-¹⁰ wise procedure to the coefficient of determination $R^2 = \sum C_{\text{frac}}$, for each station and partial column. The individual contribution C_{frac} of a proxy is the product of the standardized regression coefficient of this proxy with the correlation coefficient between the proxy and the observations (Scherrer, 1984). In Fig. 4, the seasonal parameters contribution (A_1 to A_4 in Eq. 2), which gives in most cases the very dominant part of the explained variability, is not shown for better clarity of the other proxies contribution. But we give it for completeness in Table 5, together with R^2 . In the following discussion, we will highlight some selected features which are visible in the ozone time series and which can be attributed to a specific proxy. The final MLR model is the sum of all the significant proxies, and therefore the effect of a specific proxy can be visible in the plots ²⁰ in some years, but masked in other years.

In Table 6, we give the annual ozone trend at each station for each layer obtained with the stepwise multiple linear regression model. The uncertainties on the trends correspond to the 95 % percent confidence interval. A trend is considered significant if it is larger than the uncertainty.



4.1 High latitude stations

In addition to the three Arctic stations Ny-Alesund, Thule and Kiruna, we will consider Harestua (60° N) as a high latitude station since, in terms of trends, Harestua appears to behave similarly to the Arctic stations.

5 4.1.1 Tropospheric (Trop) columns

In the troposphere, the high latitude stations, except Kiruna, show negative significant ozone trends (Table 6). The spatial and temporal variability in the Arctic and the different sampling at the stations Thule/Nv-Alesund due to polar night (see Fig. 2) makes it difficult to compare the trend results. At Harestua, the negative trend is occuring in the 1995–2007 period. On the contrary, we see in Fig. 5 that at Ny-Alesund the nega-10 tive trend occurs in the second part of the period (2004-2012). We see some similar features with the work of Hess and Zbinden (2013) who provide trends at 500 hPa for Northern Europe from ozonesondes: we also observe more tropospheric ozone in 1998 and 1999 and less in 2005 (their Fig. 1 compared to our middle panel of Fig. 5 where the seasonal signal is removed for emphasizing the interannual variability). We 15 have added in Fig. 5 the VPSC signal, i.e. the VPSC proxy time series multiplied by the corresponding parameter obtained in the MLR process $(A_{k} \cdot X_{k}(t))$ in Eq. 2). We see that the discussed features (1998, 1999, 2005), but also e.g. the lower ozone values in 2011, can be explained by the VPSC proxy, therefore by the influence of lower stratospheric ozone variability on the tropospheric columns. At the three other stations, 20 this VPSC impact was not found to be significant, and the main driver of tropospheric variability is found to be the tropopause pressure TP (Fig. 4).

4.1.2 Lower stratospheric (LowS) columns

The VPSC proxy is found significant at the four high latitude stations for the lower stratospheric columns, being the main driver of ozone variability after TP (Fig. 4). We



give the example of Kiruna in Fig. 5, where the effect of large amount of VPSC in 1996, 2000, 2003, 2005, 2011 is clearly visible in both monthly means and deseasonalized time series, and we give in addition the TP signal in the bottom panel. It can be seen that the TP signal in 2005 also contributed to even lower ozone that particular year. In the lower stratosphere, at all high latitude stations, except Thule, we observe significant negative trends (Table 6). At Thule, the shorter time period associated with the high variability of this layer at high latitude gives a large uncertainty on the trend.

4.1.3 Middle stratospheric (MidS) columns

The results are mixed for the middle stratospheric layers, as noticed previously for the
seasonal cycles. The trend is significantly negative at Ny-Alesund and non-significant at Thule. The trend is non-significant at Kiruna, and significantly positive at Harestua. The EPF proxy explains about 25% of the variability at Ny-Alesund and Thule, and about 5% at Kiruna (Fig. 4). This is illustrated in Fig. 6 for Ny-Alesund and Thule, where we see nicely the same features at both stations in the middle stratospheric
columns (e.g. higher columns in 2009, 2010; lower columns in 2011), associated with the EPF time series.

4.1.4 Upper stratospheric (UppS) columns

In the upper stratosphere, the three stations with similar time periods show a significant positive trend. In the three cases, the increase in ozone partial columns occurs in the 1995–2003 period, after which a leveling off is observed (Fig. 7). If we run the MLR model on the same time period as Thule (October 1999–2012), all the stations show non-significant trends. Since the EESCs were still increasing until about 2000 at polar regions (WMO, 2010), the significant positive trends obtained at high latitude stations in the upper stratosphere cannot be explained by the effect of Montréal Protocol on ozone depleting substances. At present we do not have an explanation for this increase in ozone during the 1995–2003 period. The 11 year solar cycle might contribute to it.



since the increase in solar activity from 1996 to its maximum in 2001–2002 is in phase with the ozone increase during the same period. The solar cycle signal at Ny-Alesund shown in Fig. 7 as an illustration turns out to be non-significant after the Cochrane-Orcutt transformation is applied, and therefore is not included in the final MLR. The solar cycle being non-significant at Kiruna, Harestua and Ny-Alesund, a trend, that would be due to it, would not taken into account in the MLR and would appear in the residual "Trend" parameter. The solar cycle might be found non-significant because the expected decrease of ozone during the declining phase of the solar cycle (2002–2009) is not observed. This could be due to the declining EESCs, but also to the increase of greenhouse gases (WMO, 2010). More years are needed to understand unequivocally the increase in 1995–2003, followed by a leveling off, and distinguish between the

ozone responses due to solar cycle, EESCs and possible proxies not included in the present study.

15 4.1.5 Total columns

Finally, we observe that the total column ozone trends are small and non-significant at all high latitude stations, except at Ny-Alesund $(-3.0 \pm 1.5 \% \text{ decade}^{-1})$. The negative trend at Ny-Alesund occurs in the 2003–2012 period, as for the lowest altitude layers. At all stations, the dominant contributions to the total column variability are the TP, the VPSC, the EL at 950 K, and, except at Harestua, the EPF proxies. We see

²⁰ TP, the VPSC, the EL at 950 K, and, except at Harestua, the EPF proxies. We see nicely in Table 5, how well the proxies explained the additional variability at the Arctic stations, e.g. at Ny-Alesund $R^2 = 0.95$, compared to the contribution of the seasonal cycle $C_{\text{seas}} = 0.68$.

4.2 Mid-latitude and subtropical stations

²⁵ We have two mid-latitude stations in this study (Jungfraujoch, 47° N and Lauder, 45° S), and two subtropical stations (Izaña, 28° N and Wollongong, 34° S).



4.2.1 Tropospheric (Trop) columns

The tropospheric trends are non-significant at Jungfraujoch, Izaña and Wollongong, and significantly positive at Lauder. The trend at Jungfraujoch is -2.5±2.7 % decade⁻¹, but we see in Fig. 8 that the tropospheric columns are increasing up to 1999 and then show a linear decrease, in agreement with aircraft and surface alpine sites in the study of Logan et al. (2012). If we limit our time period to the 1998–2008 period as in Logan et al. (2012), we also find a significant negative trend (-6.3±4.9 % decade⁻¹). But this is largely due to the high ozone values 1998–1999, and for the period 2000– 2012 we obtain still a non-significant trend of -2.9±3.4 % decade⁻¹. At Izaña, the tropospheric trends derived from ozonesondes were found non-significant in García et al. (2012), in agreement with our study, but the uncertainties were large. The situation is more mixed in the Southern Hemisphere: the tropospheric trend at Wollongong is not significant while it is significantly positive at Lauder (+7.7±3.5 % decade⁻¹). The trend at Lauder is in agreement with the study of Oltmans et al. (2013) who obtain about

- +5% decade⁻¹ in the lower and middle troposphere with ozonesondes measurements at Lauder. We find a significant positive impact of the solar cycle at Lauder and it is clearly seen in Fig. 8. This is not in agreement with Chandra et al. (1999), in which the solar cycle shows a strong but negative impact on tropospheric columns for non-polluted region. At Lauder at present only a short time period (2001–2012) is available
 for trend studies, and we hope to have more clarification on this subject with more years of data. However, if we remove the solar cycle proxy from the MLR model, we
- years of data. However, if we remove the solar cycle proxy from the MLR model, we still obtain a significant trend of $+5.0 \pm 4.4$ % decade⁻¹.

4.2.2 Lower stratospheric (LowS) columns

The trends in the lower stratosphere are non-significant at Jungfraujoch, Izaña and Lauder, and significantly positive at Wollongong. The dominant proxy is TP for all stations. At the Jungfraujoch station, the VPSC proxy, which in the case of Jungfraujoch corresponds to the transport of polar ozone loss to mid-latitudes, explains about 8 % of



the variability (Fig. 4). The VPSC proxy is non-significant at the southern hemispheric station Lauder, in agreement with more stable and isolated vortex in the Antarctic compared to the Arctic. The Arctic Oscillation (AO) proxy is found significant at Jungfraujoch while the corresponding AAO proxy is non-significant at Lauder.

- ⁵ We show the time series of the lower stratospheric columns at Jungfraujoch in Fig. 9 together with the AO and QBO signals. We see that in 2010 ozone shows larger values, and that this is explained by the combination of a very negative AO index (the corresponding parameter in the MLR is negative and gives the positive signal in 2010 shown in Fig. 9) and easterly phase of the QBO. This is in agreement with Nair et al.
- (2013), who applied a MLR model to the mean of ozone anomalies at Observatoire de Haute-Provence (OHP) from different instruments (Lidar, ozonesondes and satellites). However, we did not find a significant contribution from the EPF proxy, which according to Nair et al. (2013) also contributed to the high ozone values in 2010. We can state that our vertical and total column ozone trends are in agreement with the Nair et al. (2013)
- results when taking the error bars into account, but the latter study found significant positive trends at OHP while our trends at Jungfraujoch are all non-significant.

As expected, the QBO contribution to ozone variability is more important at the subtropical station Izaña, which is also the only station where the ENSO proxy was found to make a significant, but small, contribution to the variability (Fig. 4). We illustrate the QBO effect at Izaña in Fig. 9, for total columns. The cause of the significant positive

²⁰ QBO effect at Izana in Fig. 9, for total columns. The cause of the significant positive trend at Wollongong is not fully explained at present. A part of it is due to a small negative trend in the ELL proxy. If we remove this proxy from the MLR model, we observe a non-significant positive trend of $+2.4 \pm 2.8$ % decade⁻¹.

4.2.3 Middle stratospheric (MidS) columns

The situation for the middle stratosphere is very similar to that of the lower stratosphere: all trends are found non-significant except at Wollongong where it is positive. It is in this 23–32 km layer for subtropical stations that the solar cycle shows the most important contribution (Fig. 4). This is not what has been reported in Randel and Wu (2007)



and Tourpali et al. (2007), where the ozone response to solar cycle was maximum in the tropical lower and upper stratosphere, and minimum in the middle stratosphere. At Wollongong, the middle stratospheric ozone response is about 6 % between solar minimum and solar maximum (see Fig. 9) while values of 1 % have been reported (Sioris et al., 2014) at about 25 km. However, the recent work of Chiodo et al. (2014) shows that the apparent solar cycle signal in the tropical lower stratosphere for the period

- 1960–2004 is due to the two volcanic eruptions El Chichón in 1982 and Mt. Pinatubo in 1991, and the authors find robust solar cycle signals only in the middle and upper stratosphere. In the upper stratospheric layer at Wollongong, the response to the solar
 cycle is indeed also significant and is about 2.5% between solar minimum and solar
- maximum which is in agreement with previous studies (WMO, 2010). At Izaña, the solar contribution is found negative in the 23–32 km layer, which seems doubtful. Again, this concerned one of the shortest time series of the study (1999–2012), and could be corrected with future measurements.

15 4.2.4 Upper stratospheric (UppS) columns

The trends in the upper stratospheric layer are all positive in these latitudes, but significant only at Lauder ($+2.8 \pm 2.4 \%$ decade⁻¹). Our trend at Jungfraujoch station ($+0.9 \pm 1.0 \%$ decade⁻¹) corresponds well to the observed trend (+1.5 % decade⁻¹) at OHP in Nair et al. (2013) in the 31–39 km range, although it is found significant in this latter study. The MLR model explains 93 % of the variability at Jungfraujoch ($R^2 = 0.93$), namely 77 % of the variability comes from the seasonality and the remaining 16 % from the proxies, mainly the ELU and QBO (see Fig. 4). At Lauder, the trend in the 30–40 km range from Lidar measurements is also found significantly positive for the period 2000–2012 with trend values (+2-3 % decade⁻¹) similar to FTIR (W. Steinbrecht, per-

²⁵ sonal communication, 2013).



4.2.5 Total columns

The total column trends are non-significant at the mid-latitude stations $(-0.4 \pm 1.2 \% \text{ decade}^{-1})$ or -1.4 ± 3.8 DU decade⁻¹ at Junafrauioch. $-0.3 \pm$ 1.8% decade⁻¹ or -1.1 ± 5.9 DU decade⁻¹ at Lauder), non-significant at Izaña $(+0.5 \pm 1.2 \% \text{ decade}^{-1} \text{ or } +1.4 \pm 3.6 \text{ DU decade}^{-1})$, and significantly positive at Wollongong $(+1.9 \pm 1.1 \% \text{ decade}^{-1} \text{ or } +5.8 \pm 3.5 \text{ DU decade}^{-1})$. The total column trend at Jungfraujoch is in agreement within error bars with the result of Nair et al. (2013) at OHP when they use the PWLT method $(+5.5 \pm 3.3 \text{ DU decade}^{-1})$, but again the trend at OHP is found significantly positive. When the EESC proxy is used in their study a trend of $+4.2 \pm 0.8$ DU decade⁻¹ is found. The same behaviour is seen more globally 10 in a recent study using merged satellite data from 1979 to 2012 (Chehade et al., 2014): for the latitude of Jungfraujoch, the trends are about +3-4 DU decade⁻¹ for the 1997-2012 period, and non-significant if the PWLT method is used, while significant when the EESC proxy is used, which decreases the uncertainty on the trends. It seems that at Jungfraujoch, our time series is still too short to observe this positive trend. 15

- At the latitude of Izaña, the merged satellite data set shows a +3–4 DU decade⁻¹ for the 1997–2012 period, with the more recent SBUV/SBUV-2 MOD v8.6, non-significant using the PWLT (in agreement with our study) and significant using the EESC proxy. Since our time series start at best in 1995, the EESC proxy is not really "separable"
- ²⁰ from a linear trend study at our mid-latitude and subtropical stations. When more years of data will become available, the same sensitivity study (PWLT vs EESC) could be tested at least for polar stations where the turnaround point is expected around 2000.

It is also interesting to note that, using the PWLT method, at the latitude of Wollongong, Chehade et al. (2014) found a positive significant trend of about +3 DU decade⁻¹,

while at the latitude of Lauder the trend is decreased to about +1 DU decade⁻¹ (non-significant) in good agreement with what FTIR observed. When they use the EESC proxy, the trend is increasing with latitude, so that at the Lauder latitude, it reaches about 4–5 DU decade⁻¹.



Our non-significant trends at Jungfraujoch, Izaña and Lauder, and positive trend at Wollongong are also in agreement with the recent study of Coldewey-Egbers et al. (2014), which provides trends using a similar period (1995– 2013) of merged satellite data sets. For Wollongong, since the total column positive trend is due to the ozone trends in the lower and middle stratosphere, it cannot be attributed unambiguously to the EESCs decline.

5 Conclusions

10

We have exploited the time series of ozone total and partial columns (Trop, LowS, MidS, UppS) at 8 NDACC FTIR stations (Ny-Alesund, 79°N; Thule, 77°N; Kiruna, 68°N; Harestua, 60°N; Jungfraujoch, 47°N; Izaña, 28°N; Wollongong, 34°S; Lauder, 45°S) to derive vertically resolved trends, using a MLR model including the main proxies well-known for impacting the ozone variability.

After the seasonal variation, the TP proxy is the dominant driver of ozone variability at all stations, mainly for the troposphere, lower stratosphere and total columns, while ¹⁵ the EL proxy is an important contibutor to the middle and upper stratosphere, as well as to the total column variabilities. At the highest latitude stations (68 to 79° N), the EPF proxy contributes substantially to the middle stratospheric and total column variabilities. The VPSC proxy for polar ozone loss contributes to the lower stratosphere and total columns variabilities at the Arctic stations, but also at Jungfraujoch while is

it non-significant at the southern hemispheric station Lauder. At the mid-latitude and subtropical stations, the QBO proxy is a substantial contributor to ozone variability, especially at the lowest latitude station, Izaña. The AO/AAO and ENSO proxies are significant only at Jungfraujoch and Izaña, respectively. At Wollongong, the 2.5% ozone response to solar cycle in the upper layer is in agreement with previous studies, but the
 response in the middle stratosphere (~ 6%) is much larger than previously reported (~ 1%). The 11 year solar cycle effect is still subject of debate (WMO, 2010; Chiodo et al., 2014), so that an additional decade of measurements would help in fixing its real



impact on ozone. This is particularly true for our shortest time series, Lauder, Izaña and Thule.

The trends at the high latitude stations are negative in the troposphere, except at Kiruna where it is non-significant. Except at Thule, the high latitude stations show sig-⁵ nificant negative trends in the lower stratosphere. The situation is mixed in the middle stratosphere, where the trend is significantly negative at Ny-Alesund, non-significant at Thule and Kiruna, and significantly positive at Harestua. The trends of the three high latitude stations with a similar time-period are all positive in the upper stratosphere, but this increase is taking place during the 1995–2003 period, while the EESC were still increasing until about 2000 in the polar region (WMO, 2010). However all four sta-

- tions give non-significant trends in the upper stratosphere for the October 1999–2012 period, which could be the onset of the upper stratospheric ozone recovery at high latitude. The total column trends are non-significant at all high latitude stations, except at Ny-Alesund where it is negative. This is in agreement (except at Ny-Alesund)
- ¹⁵ with model predictions that the Arctic March ozone recovery to 1980 levels will occur around 2026 (WMO, 2010). However, the high year-to-year total column variability at these latitudes, driven mainly by lower stratospheric variability due to the polar temperature variations, does not allow yet to draw conclusions from the current trends for Arctic total ozone in the coming few years.
- ²⁰ The trends for mid-latitude and subtropical stations are all non-significant, except at Lauder in the troposphere and upper stratosphere, and at Wollongong for the total columns and the lower and middle stratospheric columns. Some signs of the onset of ozone mid-latitude recovery are observed only in the Southern Hemisphere, while a few more years seems to be needed to observe it at the northern stations.
- To conclude, among the numerous available satellite and ground-based data sets measuring vertical distributions of ozone that are useful for ozone trend evaluations (Hassler et al., 2014), the NDACC ground-based FTIR measurements have their particular assets: many stations, well distributed around the globe, are now reaching almost 20 years of measurements and will continue measuring ozone in the future. This



provides long time series of ozone that are self-calibrated. This is also the only data set, with Umkehr measurements, that provides simultaneously total columns, tropospheric columns and three stratospheric columns that reach 40–45 km. This data set is suitable for an alternative determination of ozone vertical changes, as proposed in this study, but also for validation of the satellite merged data sets and detection of possible drifts.

Acknowledgements. The National Center for Atmospheric Research is supported by the National Science Foundation. The observation program at Thule, Greenland, is supported under contract by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the site is also supported by the NSF Office of Polar Programs. We wish to thank the Danish Meteorological Institute for

- ¹⁰ by the NSF Onice of Polar Programs. We wish to thank the Danish Meteorological institute for support at the Thule. We would like to thank U. Raffalski and P. Völger for technical support at IRF Kiruna. The University of Liège team acknowledges the support of the F.R.S. – FNRS, the Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles, the International Foundation High Altitude Research Stations Jungfraujoch and Gornergrat (HFSJG, Bern) and Meteoswiss. The NIWA Lauder MIR-FTIR
- ¹⁵ project is core funded through New Zealand's Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. We are grateful to the many colleagues having contributed to FTIR data acquisition at the various sites. We wish to thank S. Godin-Beekmann and M. Pastel (LATMOS) for useful discussion on equivalent latitude proxy, and R. Kivi (KMI) for discussion on ozonesondes trends in the Arctic. This study has been supported by the EU FP7 project NORS, the ESA DRODEX project A2C as well as the ACACC II project within the "Colored to a custometric text".
- ²⁰ PRODEX project A3C, as well as the AGACC-II project within the "Science for a Sustainable Development" research program funded by the Belgian Science Policy Office.

References

- Appenzeller, C., Weiss, A. K., and Staehelin, J.: North Atlantic Oscillation modulates total ozone winter trends, Geophys. Res. Lett., 27, 1131–1134, 2000. 24634
- Barret, B., De Mazière, M., and Demoulin, P.: Retrieval and characterization of ozone profiles from solar infrared spectra at the Jungfraujoch, J. Geophys. Res., 107, 4788, doi:10.1029/2001JD001298, 2002. 24630



- Bodeker, G. E., Hassler, B., Young, P. J., and Portmann, R. W.: A vertically resolved, global, gap-free ozone database for assessing or constraining global climate model simulations, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 5, 31–43, doi:10.5194/essd-5-31-2013, 2013. 24626
- Brasseur, G. and Solomon, S: Aeronomy of the Middle Atmosphere, 441 pp., D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Holland, 1984. 24632
- Brunner, D., Staehelin, J., Maeder, J. A., Wohltmann, I., and Bodeker, G. E.: Variability and trends in total and vertically resolved stratospheric ozone based on the CATO ozone data set, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 4985–5008, doi:10.5194/acp-6-4985-2006, 2006. 24634, 24635 Chandra, S., Ziemke, J. R., and Stewart, R. W.: An 11-year solar cycle in tropospheric ozone
- from TOMS measurements, Geophys. Res. Lett., 26, 185–188, 1999. 24640 Chehade, W., Weber, M., and Burrows, J. P.: Total ozone trends and variability during 1979–

5

- 2012 from merged data sets of various satellites, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 7059–7074, doi:10.5194/acp-14-7059-2014, 2014. 24626, 24643
- Chiodo, G., Marsh, D. R., Garcia-Herrera, R., Calvo, N., and García, J. A.: On the detection of the solar signal in the tropical stratosphere, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 5251–5269, doi:10.5194/acp-14-5251-2014, 2014. 24642, 24644
 - Cochrane, D. and Orcutt, G. H.: Application of least squares regression to relationships containing auto-correlated error terms, J. Am. Stat. Assoc., 44, 32–61, 1949. 24636
- Coldewey-Egbers, M., Loyola, D. G., Braesicke, P., Dameris, M., van Roozendael, M., Lerot, C.,
 and Zimmer, W.: A new health check of the ozone layer at global and regional scales, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41, 4363–4372, doi:10.1002/2014GL060212, 2014. 24644
 - Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., Bauer, P., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A. C. M., van de Berg, L., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Delsol, C., Dragani, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A. J., Haimberger, L.,
- Healy, S. B., Hersbach, H., Hólm, E. V., Isaksen, L., Kållberg, P., Köhler, M., Matricardi, M., McNally, A. P., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Morcrette, J.-J., Park, B.-K., Peubey, C., de Rosnay, P., Tavolato, C., Thépaut, J.-N., and Vitart, F.: The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system, Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 137, 553–597, doi:10.1002/qj.828, 2011. 24634
- Frossard, L., Rieder, H. E., Ribatet, M., Staehelin, J., Maeder, J. A., Di Rocco, S., Davison, A. C., and Peter, T.: On the relationship between total ozone and atmospheric dynamics and chemistry at mid-latitudes – Part 1: Statistical models and spatial fingerprints of atmospheric dy-



namics and chemistry, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13, 147-164, doi:10.5194/acp-13-147-2013, 2013. 24634

- García, O. E., Schneider, M., Redondas, A., González, Y., Hase, F., Blumenstock, T., and Sepúlveda, E.: Investigating the long-term evolution of subtropical ozone profiles applying
- ⁵ ground-based FTIR spectrometry, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 5, 2917–2931, doi:10.5194/amt-5-2917-2012, 2012. 24626, 24631, 24633, 24640
 - Garcia, R. R., Marsh, D. R., Kinnison, D. E., Boville, B. A., and Sassi, F.: Simulation of secular trends in the middle atmosphere, 1950–2003, J. Geophys. Res., 112, D09301, doi:10.1029/2006JD007485, 2007. 24628
- Hase, F., Blumenstock, T., and Paton-Walsh, C.:Analysis of the instrumental line shape of highresolution Fourier transform IR spectrometers with gas cell measurements and new retrieval software, Appl. Optics, 38, 3417–3422, 1999. 24630
 - Hase, F.: Inversion von Spurengasprofilen aus hochaufgelösten bodengebundenen FTIR-Messungen in Absorption, Dissertation, Wissenschaftliche Berichte Forschungszentrum
- ¹⁵ Karlsruhe, FZKA 6512; ISSN 0947–8620, Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, Karlsruhe, Germany, 2000. 24628, 24653
 - Hase, F., Hannigan, J. W., Coffey, M. T., Goldman, A., Höpfner, M., Jones, N. B., Rinsland, C. P., and Wood, S. W.: Intercomparison of retrieval codes used for the analysis of high-resolution, ground-based FTIR measurements, J. Quant. Spectrosc. Ra., 87, 25–52, 2004. 24628
- Hassler, B., Petropavlovskikh, I., Staehelin, J., August, T., Bhartia, P. K., Clerbaux, C., Degenstein, D., Mazière, M. De, Dinelli, B. M., Dudhia, A., Dufour, G., Frith, S. M., Froidevaux, L., Godin-Beekmann, S., Granville, J., Harris, N. R. P., Hoppel, K., Hubert, D., Kasai, Y., Kurylo, M. J., Kyrölä, E., Lambert, J.-C., Levelt, P. F., McElroy, C. T., McPeters, R. D., Munro, R., Nakajima, H., Parrish, A., Raspollini, P., Remsberg, E. E., Rosenlof, K. H., Rozanov, A., Sano, T., Sasano, Y., Shiotani, M., Smit, H. G. J., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Tarrasida, D. W., Ukhen, A. D. A., D. A., D. Martin, D. M., Shiotani, A., Bartin, A., B. M., Shiotani, A., Sano, T., Sasano, Y., Shiotani, M., Smit, H. G. J., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Tarrasida, D. M., Ukhen, A. D. A., D. A., D. Matter, J. D. Matter, J. J. Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Tarrasida, D. M., Ukhen, J., Sasano, Y., Shiotani, M., Smit, H. G. J., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Tarrasida, D. M., Ukhen, J., Sasano, Y., Shiotani, J., D. Matter, J. J., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Tarrasida, D. M., Juther, J., Stiller, A., D., J., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Tarrasida, D. M., Shiotani, A., D., J., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Tarrasida, D. M., Shiotani, A., B., Matter, J., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Tarrasida, D., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Tarrasida, D. M., Shiotani, A., Shiotani, A., B., Matter, J., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Tarrasida, D., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Tarrasida, D., Stiller, G., Tamminen, J., Stiller, G., Tamminen
- Tarasick, D. W., Urban, J., van der A, R. J., Veefkind, J. P., Vigouroux, C., von Clarmann, T., von Savigny, C., Walker, K. A., Weber, M., Wild, J., and Zawodny, J. M.: Past changes in the vertical distribution of ozone Part 1: Measurement techniques, uncertainties and availability, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 7, 1395–1427, doi:10.5194/amt-7-1395-2014, 2014. 24645
- ³⁰ Hess, P. G. and Zbinden, R.: Stratospheric impact on tropospheric ozone variability and trends: 1990–2009, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13, 649–674, doi:10.5194/acp-13-649-2013, 2013. 24637 Kyrölä, E., Laine, M., Sofieva, V., Tamminen, J., Päivärinta, S.-M., Tukiainen, S., Zawodny, J., and Thomason, L.: Combined SAGE II–GOMOS ozone profile data set for 1984–2011 and



trend analysis of the vertical distribution of ozone, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13, 10645–10658, doi:10.5194/acp-13-10645-2013, 2013. 24626

- Logan, J. A., Staehelin, J., Megretskaia, I. A., Cammas, J.-P., Thouret, V., Claude, H., De Backer, H., Steinbacher, M., Scheel, H.-E., Stübi, R., Fröhlich, M., and Derwent, R.:
- Changes in ozone over Europe: Analysis of ozone measurements from sondes, reg-5 ular aircraft (MOZAIC) and alpine surface sites, J. Geophys. Res., 117, D09301, doi:10.1029/2011JD016952, 2012. 24640
 - Mikuteit, S.: Trendbestimmung stratosphärischer Spurengase mit Hilfe bodengebundener FTIR-Messungen, Dissertation, Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, FZK Report No. 7385, Ger-
- many, 2008. 24626 10
 - Nair, P. J., Godin-Beekmann, S., Kuttippurath, J., Ancellet, G., Goutail, F., Pazmiño, A., Froidevaux, L., Zawodny, J. M., Evans, R. D., Wang, H. J., Anderson, J., and Pastel, M.: Ozone trends derived from the total column and vertical profiles at a northern mid-latitude station. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13, 10373–10384, doi:10.5194/acp-13-10373-2013, 2013, 24641,

24642, 24643 15

Newchurch, M. J., Yang, E.-S., Cunnold, D. M., Reinsel, G. C., Zawodny, J. M., and Russell III, J. M.: Evidence for slowdown in stratospheric ozone loss: First stage of ozone recovery, J. Geophys. Res., 108, 4507, doi:10.1029/2003JD003471, 2003. 24634

Oltmans, S. J., Lefohn, A. S., Shadwick, D., Harris, J. M., Scheel, H. E., Galbally, I., Tara-

sick, D. W., Johnson, B. J., Brunke, E.-G., Claude, H., Zeng, G., Nichol, S., Schmidlin, F., 20 Davies, J., Cuevas, E., Redondas, A., Naoe, H., Nakano, T., Kawasato, T.: Recent tropospheric ozone changes - a pattern dominated by slow or no growth, Atmos. Environ., 67, 331-351, 2013. 24640

Pougatchev, N. S., Connor, B. J., and Rinsland, C. P.:Infrared measurements of the ozone vertical distribution above Kitt Peak, J. Geophys. Res., 100, 16689-16697, 1995. 24628,

- 25 24653
 - Randel, W. J., and Wu, F.: A stratospheric ozone profile data set for 1979-2005: Variability, trends, and comparisons with column ozone data, J. Geophys. Res., 112, D06313, doi:10.1029/2006JD007339.2007.24634.24641
- 30 Randel, W. J., Garcia, R. R., Calvo, N., and Marsh, D.: ENSO influence on zonal mean temperature and ozone in the tropical lower stratosphere, Geophys. Res. Lett., 36, L15822, doi:10.1029/2009GL039343.2009.24634



Rodgers, C. D.: Inverse methods for atmospheric sounding: Theory and Practice, Series on Atmospheric, Oceanic and Planetary Physics – Vol. 2, World Scientific Publishing Co., Singapore, 2000. 24628, 24629

Rothman, L. S., Gordon, I. E., Barbe, A., Benner, D. C., Bernath, P. F., Birk, M., Boudon, V.,

- ⁵ Brown, L. R., Campargue, A., Champion, J.-P., Chance, K., Coudert, L. H., Danaj, V., Devi, V. M., Fally, S., Flaud, J.-M., Gamache, R. R., Goldmanm, A., Jacquemart, D., Kleiner, I., Lacome, N., Lafferty, W. J., Mandin, J.-Y., Massie, S. T., Mikhailenko, S. N., Miller, C. E., Moazzen-Ahmadi, N., Naumenko, O. V., Nikitin, A. V., Orphal, J., Perevalov, V. I., Perrin, A., Predoi-Cross, A., Rinsland, C. P., Rotger, M., Šimečková, M., Smith, M. A. H.,
- ¹⁰ Sung, K., Tashkun, S. A., Tennyson, J., Toth, R. A., Vandaele, A. C., and Vander Auwera, J.: The Hitran 2008 molecular spectroscopic database, J. Quant. Spectrosc. Ra., 110, 533–572, 2009. 24628

Scherrer, B.: Biostatistique, Gaëtan Morin, Chicoutimi, 1984. 24636

20

Schneider, M., Hase, F., and Blumenstock, T.: Ground-based remote sensing of HDO/H2O ratio profiles: introduction and validation of an innovative retrieval approach, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 4705–4722, doi:10.5194/acp-6-4705-2006, 2006. 24629

- Sioris, C. E., McLinden, C. A., Fioletov, V. E., Adams, C., Zawodny, J. M., Bourassa, A. E., Roth, C. Z., and Degenstein, D. A.: Trend and variability in ozone in the tropical lower stratosphere over 2.5 solar cycles observed by SAGE II and OSIRIS, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 3479–3496, doi:10.5194/acp-14-3479-2014, 2014. 24626, 24642
- Sussmann, R., Borsdorff, T., Rettinger, M., Camy-Peyret, C., Demoulin, P., Duchatelet, P., Mahieu, E., and Servais, C.: Technical Note: Harmonized retrieval of column-integrated atmospheric water vapor from the FTIR network – first examples for long-term records and station trends, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 8987–8999, doi:10.5194/acp-9-8987-2009, 2009. 24629
- ²⁵ Tikhonov, A.: On the solution of incorrectly stated problems and a method of regularization, Dokl. Acad. Nauk SSSR, 151, 501–504, 1963. 24630
- Tourpali, K., Zerefos, C. S., Balis, D. S., and Bais, A. F.: The 11-year solar cycle in stratospheric ozone: comparison between Umkehr and SBUVv8 and effects on surface erythemal irradiance, J. Geophys. Res., 112, D12306, doi:10.1029/2006JD007760, 2007. 24642
- ³⁰ Vigouroux, C., De Mazière, M., Demoulin, P., Servais, C., Hase, F., Blumenstock, T., Kramer, I., Schneider, M., Mellqvist, J., Strandberg, A., Velazco, V., Notholt, J., Sussmann, R., Stremme, W., Rockmann, A., Gardiner, T., Coleman, M., and Woods, P.: Evaluation of tropospheric and stratospheric ozone trends over Western Europe from ground-based FTIR network obser-



vations, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 8, 6865–6886, doi:10.5194/acp-8-6865-2008, 2008. 24626, 24627, 24628, 24631, 24633

Weber, M., Dikty, S., Burrows, J. P., Garny, H., Dameris, M., Kubin, A., Abalichin, J., and Langematz, U.: The Brewer-Dobson circulation and total ozone from seasonal to decadal

time scales, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 11221–11235, doi:10.5194/acp-11-11221-2011, 2011. 24634

World Meteorological Organization: Atmospheric Ozone: 1985, Global Ozone Research and Monitoring Project – Report No. 16, Geneva, 1998. 24626

World Meteorological Organization: Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 1998, Global Ozone Research and Monitoring Project – Report No. 44, Geneva, 1998. 24626

World Meteorological Organization: Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2010, Global Ozone Research and Monitoring Project – Report No. 52, Geneva, 2011. 24626, 24633, 24635, 24638, 24639, 24642, 24644, 24645

Wohltmann, I., Rex, M., Brunner, D., and Mäder: Integrated equivalent latitude as a proxy for dynamical changes in ozone column. Geophys. Res. Lett., 32, L09811.

15 a proxy for dynamical changes in ozone doi:10.1029/2005GL022497, 2005. 24634

10



Table 1. Characteristics of the FTIR stations that are contributing to the present work: location and altitude (in km a.s.l.), time-period covered by the ozone measurements used in the present trend analysis, and instrument type.

Station	Latitude	Longitude	Altitude (km)	Time-period	Instrument
Ny-Alesund	79° N	12° E	0.02	1995–2012	Bruker 120 HR
Thule	77° N	69° W	0.22	1999–2012	Bruker 120 M
Kiruna	68° N	20° E	0.42	1996–2007	Bruker 120 HR
				2007–2012	Bruker 125 HR
Harestua	60° N	11°E	0.60	1995–2009	Bruker 120 M
				2009–2012	Bruker 125 M
Jungfraujoch	47° N	8° E	3.58	1995–2012	Bruker 120 HR
Izaña	28° N	16° W	2.37	1999–2005	Bruker 120 M
				2005–2012	Bruker 125 HR
Wollongong	34° S	151° E	0.03	1996–2007	Bomem DA8
				2007–2012	Bruker 125 HR
Lauder	45° S	170° E	0.37	2001–2012	Bruker 120 HR



Table 2. Summary of the ozone retrieval parameters. All microwindow (mw) limits are given in cm⁻¹. Ny: Ny-Alesund; Th: Thule; Ha: Harestua; Ju: Jungfraujoch.

Parameters	Ny-Alesund/Thule	Harestua/Jungfraujoch	Kiruna/Izaña	Wollongong/Lauder
Retrieval code	SFIT2 ^ª v3.94	SFIT2 ^ª v3.94	PROFFIT9 ^b	SFIT2 ^ª v3.94
Microwindows	1000–1005 782.56–782.86 (Ny) 788.85–789.37 (Ny) 993.3–993.8 (Ny)	1000–1005	991.25-993.80 1001.47-1003.04 1005.0-1006.9 1007.347-1009.003 1011.147-1013.553	1000–1005 782.56–782.86 788.85–789.37 993.3–993.8 896.4–896.6 (H ₂ O)
H ₂ O treatment – a priori profile	One single profile (Ny) Preliminary retrievals in dedicated H ₂ O mws (Th)	One single profile (Ha) Preliminary retrievals in dedicated H_2O mws (Ju)	Preliminary retrievals in dedicated H ₂ O mws	One single profile
- fit in ozone mw	Scaling retrieval only	Scaling retrieval only	Scaling retrieval only	Profile retrieval
Regularization: – S a	Diagonal: 20 % (Ny) Diagonal: 30 % (Th) No inter-layer correlation	Diagonal: 5 to 11 % (Ha) Diagonal: 10 % (Ju) No inter-layer correlation (Ha) Inter-layer correlation: gaussian decay 4 km (Ju)	Tikhonov regularization L1	Diagonal: 10 % Inter-layer correlation: exponential decay 4 km
– SNR	Real SNR (depending on each spectrum), except ^c regions at: 1000.85-1001.45 1003.16-1004.5 set to SNR = 1 (Ny) Constant = 50 (Th)	Constant = 100 (Ju) Constant = 200 (Ha)	Depending on each spectrum	Constant = 150
Instrument Line Shape	Fixed ideal (Ny) Fixed from LINEFIT (Th)	Fixed from LINEFIT (Ha) 2nd order polynomial fit of EAP (Ju)	Fixed ideal (Kiruna) Fixed from LINEFIT (Izaña)	Fixed ideal except Bomem spectra: 4th order polynomial fit of EAP

^a Pougatchev et al. (1995);

^b Hase (2000);

^c in order to mask strong H₂O absorptions.



Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Table 3. Partial column (PC) limits for the 4 altitude layers containing at least one DOFS. The random uncertainties are given for each partial column. Trop: Troposphere; LowS: Lower Stratosphere; MidS: Middle Stratosphere; UppS: Upper Stratosphere; TotC: Total Columns; Gd: Ground; Err.: Total Random Uncertainties.

Layers	Stations	PC limits	Err.
Trop	Izaña/Wollongong	Gd-13/12 km	6%
	Other stations	Gd-9/10 km	5%
LowS	Izaña/Wollongong	15–23 km	5%
	Other stations	12–20 km	4%
MidS	Izaña/Wollongong	23–32 km	5%
	Other stations	20–29 km	5%
UppS	Izaña/Wollongong	31–49 km	5%
	Other stations	29–49 km	5%
TotC	Izaña/Wollongong Other stations	-	2% 2%



Table 4. Name, short description, and source of the proxies that have been tested in the stepwise regression model.

Name	Description	Source
SOLAR	Solar Radio Flux at 10.7 cm	ftp://ftp.ngdc.noaa.gov/STP/SOLAR_DATA/SOLAR_RADIO /FLUX/Penticton_Adjusted/monthly/MONTHLY.ADJ
QBO30	zonal winds measured at Singapore at 30 hPa	http://www.geo.fu-berlin.de/en/met/ag/strat/produkte/qbo/index.html
QBO10	zonal winds measured at Singapore at 10 hPa	http://www.geo.fu-berlin.de/en/met/ag/strat/produkte/qbo/index.html
ENSO	Multivariate ENSO Index (MEI)	http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/enso/mei/
AO/AAO	Arctic Oscillation	http://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/precip/CWlink/daily_ao_index /monthly.ao.index.b50.current.ascii
	Antarctic Oscillation	http://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/precip/CWlink/daily_ao_index /aao/monthly.aao.index.b79.current.ascii
TP	Tropopause pressure	http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/data/gridded
		/data.ncep.reanalysis.tropopause.html
EL(L/M/U)	Equivalent latitude at three altitude levels:	calculated at BIRA from ERA interim reanalysis
	370, 550, and 950 K: high/mid-latitude stations	
	460, 700, and 1040 K: subtropical stations	
EPF	Vertical component of the EP flux	http://www.awi.de/en/research/research_divisions/climate_science /atmospheric_circulations/projects/candidoz/ep_flux_data/
VPSC	Volume of Polar Stratospheric Clouds	calculated at FMI



Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Table 5. Coefficient of determination R^2 and contribution of the seasonal cycle C_{seas} determined within the final model. See Table 3 for the limits of the layers, different for subtropical stations and mid/high latitude stations.

FTIR station	Trop	LowS	MidS	UppS	Total columns
Ny-Alesund	$R^2 = 0.75$ $C_{seas} = 0.73$	$R^2 = 0.92$ $C_{seas} = 0.82$	$R^2 = 0.72$ $C_{seas} = 0.27$	$R^2 = 0.74$ $C_{seas} = 0.72$	$R^2 = 0.95$ $C_{\text{seas}} = 0.68$
Thule	$R^2 = 0.86$	$R^2 = 0.92$	$R^2 = 0.83$	$R^2 = 0.81$	$R^2 = 0.96$
	$C_{seas} = 0.50$	$C_{seas} = 0.71$	$C_{seas} = 0.41$	$C_{seas} = 0.58$	$C_{seas} = 0.58$
Kiruna	$R^2 = 0.85$	$R^2 = 0.89$	$R^2 = 0.54$	$R^2 = 0.78$	$R^2 = 0.89$
	$C_{seas} = 0.67$	$C_{seas} = 0.82$	$C_{seas} = 0.23$	$C_{seas} = 0.58$	$C_{seas} = 0.69$
Harestua	$R^2 = 0.77$	$R^2 = 0.74$	$R^2 = 0.36$	$R^2 = 0.67$	$R^2 = 0.75$
	$C_{seas} = 0.54$	$C_{seas} = 0.51$	$C_{seas} = 0.25$	$C_{seas} = 0.45$	$C_{seas} = 0.56$
Jungfraujoch	$R^2 = 0.73$	$R^2 = 0.83$	$R^2 = 0.53$	$R^2 = 0.93$	$R^2 = 0.81$
	$C_{seas} = 0.58$	$C_{seas} = 0.66$	$C_{seas} = 0.53$	$C_{seas} = 0.77$	$C_{seas} = 0.67$
Izaña	$R^2 = 0.83$	$R^2 = 0.72$	$R^2 = 0.80$	$R^2 = 0.69$	$R^2 = 0.77$
	$C_{seas} = 0.87$	$C_{seas} = 0.46$	$C_{seas} = 0.45$	$C_{seas} = 0.64$	$C_{seas} = 0.56$
Wollongong	$R^2 = 0.69$	$R^2 = 0.86$	$R^2 = 0.42$	$R^2 = 0.77$	$R^2 = 0.87$
	$C_{seas} = 0.69$	$C_{seas} = 0.52$	$C_{seas} = 0.09$	$C_{seas} = 0.75$	$C_{seas} = 0.63$
Lauder	$R^2 = 0.89$	$R^2 = 0.94$	$R^2 = 0.78$	$R^2 = 0.89$	$R^2 = 0.95$
	$C_{seas} = 0.85$	$C_{seas} = 0.73$	$C_{seas} = 0.70$	$C_{seas} = 0.82$	$C_{seas} = 0.66$



Table 6. Annual trend (in % decade⁻¹) and their 95 % uncertainty ranges. Due to polar night, the measurements at Ny-Alesund, Thule and Kiruna cover only the Mid-March–September, Late-February–Mid-October, and Mid-January–Mid-November periods, respectively. All time series end in September/December 2012 for the present study. The time of start is repeated for each station. See Table 3 for the limits of the layers, different for subtropical stations and mid/high latitude stations. Trends indicated in bold are significant.

FTIR station	Trop	LowS	MidS	UppS	Total columns
Ny-Alesund 1995	-5.8 ± 3.2	-4.2 ± 3.1	-5.5 ± 3.8	$+6.7 \pm 5.3$	-3.0±1.5
Thule 1999 (October)	-5.3 ± 4.4	-0.4 ± 6.3	$+0.2 \pm 4.4$	-2.3 ± 6.5	-2.1 ± 2.6
Kiruna 1996	-0.9 ± 2.5	-3.9 ± 2.6	$+0.4 \pm 2.6$	$+7.4 \pm 3.4$	-0.3 ± 1.6
Harestua 1995	-3.1 ± 2.0	-5.3 ± 4.6	$+4.8 \pm 4.3$	$+7.8 \pm 5.5$	+1.0 ± 2.2
Jungfraujoch 1995	-2.5 ± 2.7	-0.5 ± 3.3	-0.6 ± 1.2	+0.9 ± 1.0	-0.4 ± 1.2
lzaña 1999	+0.7 ± 2.8	-1.7 ± 2.2	-0.1 ± 2.0	$+1.6 \pm 2.6$	+0.5 ± 1.2
Wollongong 1996	-2.2 ± 2.8	+3.1 ± 2.7	$+4.0 \pm 2.0$	+0.2 ± 1.6	+1.9±1.1
Lauder 2001	+7.7 ± 3.5	-3.8 ± 4.1	-0.2 ± 3.5	+2.8 ± 2.4	-0.3 ± 1.8











Figure 2. Time series of monthly means of ozone total columns at each station.





Figure 3. Monthly means of ozone total and partial columns for the whole periods of measurements. See Table 3 for the limits of the partial columns at each station. The seasonal cycle for Southern Hemisphere stations, Wollongong and Lauder, has been shifted by 6 months for better comparison.





Figure 4. Individual contributions C_{fract} of the proxies to the coefficient of determination R^2 . R^2 and the dominant contribution of the seasonal cycle C_{seas} are given in Table 5.





Figure 5. Top panels: monthly means of the tropospheric columns (Trop) at Ny-Alesund (left) and of the lower stratospheric columns (LowS) at Kiruna (right) (blue: FTIR, red: MLR model). Middle panels: same but with the seasonal signal removed. Bottom panels: the VPSC signal obtained in each case from the MLR model, for each month of the period (red line), and at each FTIR observed month (red circle). The tropopause pressure (TP) signal obtained for the LowS at Kiruna is also shown.





Figure 6. Top panels: monthly means of the middle stratospheric columns (MidS) at Ny-Alesund (left) and Thule (right) (blue: FTIR, red: MLR model). Middle panels: same but with the seasonal signal removed. Bottom panels: the EPF signal obtained in each case from the MLR model, for each month of the period (red line), and at each FTIR observed month (red circle).





Figure 7. Monthly means of the upper stratospheric columns (UppS) with the seasonal cycle removed at, from top to bottom: Harestua, Kiruna and Ny-Alesund (blue: FTIR, red: MLR model). Bottom panel: the solar cycle signal obtained at Ny-Alesund from the MLR model, before the Cochrane-Orcutt transformation.





Figure 8. Top panels: monthly means of the tropospheric columns (Trop) at Jungfraujoch (left) and Lauder (right) (blue: FTIR, red: MLR model). Middle panels: same but with the seasonal signal removed. Bottom panel: the solar cycle signal obtained at Lauder from the MLR model.





Figure 9. Top panels: monthly means of the lower stratospheric columns (LowS) at Jungfraujoch (left), total columns (TotC) at Izaña (middle), and middle stratospheric columns (MidS) at Wollongong (right). (blue: FTIR, red: MLR model). Middle panels: same but with the seasonal signal removed. Bottom panels: QBO and AO signals obtained from the MLR model at Jungfraujoch (left), QBO signal at Izaña (middle), and SOLAR signal at Wollongong (right).

