

Responses to Anonymous Referee #1:

Comments from Referee:

The new version of the manuscript is clearer. With the additional references explaining where the expression for the refractive index comes from, it is easier to understand the paper. I think the “refractive index” used here needs to be explained more precisely, and more justification needs to be given for the authors' physical interpretation of it. Without such improved justification, the diagnostic presented here seems to be best considered as an ad hoc modification of the “probability of positive refractive index squared” diagnostic that, in the authors' views, better captures the properties of linear Rossby waves. I am not sure how useful this is, but I am also not strongly opposed to the paper being published if the editor believes it is useful.

Author's Response:

We would like to thank the referee for the constructive review and supportive comments that helped us to improve the manuscript.

Comments from Referee:

My most significant comment is that it needs to be explained more precisely what the “refractive index” referred to is and what it means physically. Following Sun et al. (2014), the quantity called “ n^2 ” in this manuscript is not the refractive index squared but the vertical wavenumber squared (called, somewhat confusingly in my opinion, “the vertical component of the refractive index” by Sun et al. (2014)). Sun et al. (2014) use “ m^2 ” to represent this, and the same should be done here, as “ n^2 ” is normally used to refer to the refractive index used to understand the direction of propagation in the latitude-height plane. So when m^2 is positive, vertical propagation is allowed.

Author's Response:

We also agree that using m^2 as vertical wavenumber squared is less confusing than n^2 as refractive index squared. Following Sun et al. (2014) we use m^2 as vertical wavenumber squared. In this way the wording suggested from the referee is applied throughout the paper.

Comments from Referee:

The authors take the view that larger m^2 values for a fixed zonal wavenumber mean that that wavenumber can propagate upwards more easily (e.g. L301-306) and this is used to design their diagnostic. However, the importance of the magnitude of m^2 for a fixed meridional wavenumber is not clear to me, beyond the literal interpretation. A higher m^2 value would indicate that waves with a greater range of meridional wavenumbers are able to propagate, but the dependence of m^2 on the meridional wavenumber (a key part of this paper) is not

interesting as far as this is concerned. The authors could do with giving an explanation or appropriate references to justify their interpretation that higher m^2 values for a given meridional wavenumber indicate that a wave with that specific meridional wavenumber can propagate vertically more easily. This justification is needed to argue that the diagnostic presented here is more than an ad hoc modification of the “probability of positive refractive index squared” diagnostic.

Author's Response:

The proposed diagnostic is also able to distinguish the importance of varying zonal wavenumber for a fixed meridional wavenumber. This fact can be seen clearly in both Fig 8 and Fig 9 where for a fixed meridional wavenumber the higher zonal wavenumber results in higher probabilities for the wave propagation.

Comments from Referee:

L21-22 – it would be useful to say again explicitly what quantity has had its probability increased, for clarity.

Author's Response:

The sentences is modified as:

We also describe how mPDFs change in response to strong vortex regime (SVR) and weak vortex regime (WVR) conditions, with increased probabilities of the wave propagation during WVR than SVR in the stratosphere.

Comments from Referee:

L79-80 – quotation marks should be put around “very large positive” and “very large negative”

Author's Response:

It is now changed accordingly.

Comments from Referee:

L90-134 – it should be made clearer that the “general knowledge about stationary Rossby wave propagation” refers to that about linear waves, and that the degree to which waves in the real atmosphere behave in this way is not addressed in this paper i.e. the work assumes that linear Rossby wave theory provides a good model.

Author's Response:

It was discussed in the paper that our method is based on linear wave theory. For instance in line 53 the following sentence clearly indicates this fact:

According to linear wave theory planetary waves, away from the source regions, tend to propagate toward the region of large positive vertical wavenumber squared.

Comments from Referee:

Table 1 – similarly, it should be made clear here that the “facts” refer only to linear waves.

Author's Response:

It is now changed accordingly. We added a sentence in the caption of Table 1 as follows:

These criteria refer only to the linear waves.

Referee's comment:

L108 – I think it would be better to say that “properties of the tropopause” control wave propagation, not the tropopause.

The Authors response:

It is now changed accordingly.

Referee's comment:

L146-149 – I don't see the statement in Hu and Tung (2007) that there should be a discontinuity in the Rossby wave propagation at the tropopause between 20-40N. What are you referring to here?

The Authors response:

We do not refer to this to Hu and Tung (2002) paper. We only refer to this paper because in this paper the authors have discussed about the importance of subtropical tropopause as gateway controlling vertical propagating of planetary waves.

Referee's comment:

L250 – values of what?

The Authors response:

small values of the zonal wind which is now added in the paper.

Referee's comment:

L252 – “infers” → “implies”

The Authors response:

It is now changed accordingly in the paper.

Referee's comment:

L264-265 – it's unclear to me what “imprecise information (such as very large or very small refractive index)” means. The punctuation here also has a mistake.

The Authors response:

We mean it is not clear what values should be considered as very large or very small numbers.

Referee's comment:

L268-270 – the language is unclear here.

The Authors response:

The basic approach of fuzzy logic is to assign a value between zero and one to describe the area between the upper and lower limit. The upper and lower limits are referring to the maximum and minimum values of any variable that fuzzy logic tries to set various MVF for them.

Referee's comment:

L276 - "final" → "time-mean". Comma before "some".

The Authors response:

It is now changed as suggested.

Referee's comment:

L475-6 - It's not clear to me which feature is being referred to here. It looks like WVR has lower PrRo near the mid-latitude tropopause, which doesn't seem consistent with the statement.

The Authors response:

The feature discussed here is the subtropical waveguide (20-40 N) between 10-100 hPa. The probabilities of the favorable wave propagating is higher in this region for WVR compared to the SVR.

Referee's comment:

L478-480 – this is not clear to me, again since WVR has lower PrRo near the mid-latitude tropopause. It will depend on where the wave sources are exactly.

The Authors response:

We think it is very clear in Figure 11 especially the difference of the probabilities (second row) that the average values of $PrRo(y;z)$ in the stratosphere are greater in WVR than SVR.

Referee's comment:

L494-497 - Fig.11 shows that WVR has a lower PrRo than SVR in the lower stratosphere between 60-75N, whereas the vertical component of EP flux is higher north of 70N, so the locations of these features don't quite seem consistent.

The Authors response:

We agree. The location where the vertical component of EP flux during WVR is smaller than during SVR is about 5 degrees south compared to the PrRo.

Referee's comment:

Fig. 12 – it would be helpful if the axes used were the same as those in fig.11.

The Authors response:

Since our focus here is to demonstrate the difference of PrRo between SVR and WVR, we think the existing figures are more helpful for our purpose.

On the climatological probability of the vertical propagation of stationary planetary waves

Khalil Karami¹, Peter Braesicke¹, Miriam Sinnhuber¹, and Stefan Versick^{1,2}

¹Institute for Meteorology and Climate Research, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany

²Steinbuch Centre for Computing, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany

Correspondence to: Kh. Karami (khalil.karami@kit.edu)

Abstract. We introduce a diagnostic tool to assess a climatological framework of the optimal propagation conditions for stationary planetary waves. Analyzing 50 winters using NCEP/NCAR reanalysis data we derive probability density functions (PDFs) of positive **vertical wavenumber** as a function of zonal and meridional wave numbers. We contrast this quantity with classical climatological means of the **vertical wavenumber**. Introducing a Membership Value Function (MVF) based on fuzzy logic, we objectively generate a modified set of PDFs (mPDFs) and demonstrate their superior performance compared to the climatological mean of **vertical wavenumber** and the original PDFs. We argue that mPDFs allow an even better understanding of how background conditions impact wave propagation in a climatological sense. As expected, probabilities are decreasing with increasing zonal wave numbers. In addition we discuss the meridional wave number dependency of the PDFs which is usually neglected, highlighting the contribution of meridional wave numbers 2 and 3 in the stratosphere. We also describe how mPDFs change in response to strong vortex regime (SVR) and weak vortex regime (WVR) conditions, with **increased probabilities of the wave propagation** during WVR than SVR in the stratosphere. We conclude that the mPDFs are a convenient way to summarize climatological information about planetary wave propagation in reanalysis and climate model data.

of stationary planetary waves can only occur when the zonal mean zonal wind is positive. In addition, a strong stratospheric polar night jet of the Southern hemisphere during winter will block and possibly reflect large scale waves. This implies that the zonal mean zonal wind should be smaller than a critical value for vertical propagation. This theory also suggest that large scale waves (zonal wave number=1, 2, 3) are more likely to propagate upwards because their associated critical wind speeds are higher. Studies by (Matsuno, 1970; Lin, 1982; Huang and Gambo, 2002; Limpasuvan and Hartmann, 2000; Hu and Tung, 2002; Dickinson, 1969) not only confirmed this theory but also stressed the importance of vertical shear of the zonal mean zonal wind as well as the vertical gradient of the buoyancy frequency for vertical propagation of large scale waves.

Matsuno (1970) introduced the refractive index for stationary planetary waves (or alternatively **vertical wavenumber**) as a diagnostic tool for studying the influence of the background zonal flow on planetary wave propagation. According to linear wave theory planetary waves, away from the source regions, tend to propagate toward the region of large positive **vertical wavenumber** squared. The existence of Rossby waves are prohibited where the **vertical wavenumber** squared is small or negative, which can happen if the zonal mean zonal wind is easterly, or westerly exceeding the critical wind speed.

1 Introduction

The impact of the background atmospheric state on planetary wave propagation was first investigated by Charney and Drazin (1961) based on linear wave theory. They showed the importance of the background zonal wind for the vertical propagation of large scale waves from the troposphere into the stratosphere. They found that vertical propagation

The refractive index of Rossby waves as a diagnostic tool provides a framework in which the dynamical forcing of the stratosphere by tropospheric waves can be investigated. However, as shown by Li et al. (2007) the traditional analysis of the refractive index squared makes it difficult, if not impossible, to study the climatological state of the background flow for propagation of planetary waves. In

calculating the climatology of the refractive index squared, the problem arises from averaging a time series that could consist of positive and negative values that may cancel each other and hence makes the interpretation of climatologies of this quantity difficult. Another weakness of the **vertical wavenumber** is that it is somewhat vague. Randel (1988) pointed out that, while using the **vertical wavenumber** as a diagnostic tool one should not overemphasize the details, since it is a qualitative guide. For instance Smith (1983) found that planetary waves can only propagate when and where the **vertical wavenumber** squared is positive and very large or avoid the region of large negative values of the **vertical wavenumber**. The vagueness arises from vague expressions such as "very large positive" and "very large negative" values of the **vertical wavenumber** which demonstrates the arbitrariness of the classic time mean diagnostic.

Here we attempt to address the modeling of such vagueness which has not been previously addressed. We present an algorithm based on fuzzy logic theory which addresses the above-mentioned vagueness and provides an estimate of the favorability of atmospheric background condition for planetary wave propagation as a function of latitude and altitude. Any diagnostic tool should be consistent with the general knowledge about stationary Rossby wave propagation condition (Table 1). The first and second criterion of the Table 1 are the most important findings of the seminal papers of Charney and Drazin (1961) and Matsuno (1970). They made a great contribution on the understanding of the propagation of planetary scale disturbances from the troposphere into the stratosphere. Eliassen and Palm (1961) based on the wave-mean flow interaction theorem showed that the planetary waves also have a strong influence on the zonal mean zonal wind. Matsuno (1970) and Charney and Drazin (1961) argue that only ultra-long waves (wave numbers 1-3) have the capability to propagate from the troposphere into the middle atmosphere. The criterion 3 expresses that the jet maxima blocks the planetary wave propagation and penetration through the jet maxima is prohibited Karoly and Hoskins (1982). The study of Chen and Robinson (1992) shows that the key parameter that controls the planetary wave propagation is the **properties of the tropopause** which acts like a valve for the vertical wave propagation from the troposphere into the stratosphere. Furthermore the study of Hu and Tung (2002) and Li et al. (2007) indicated that the large positive vertical shear of zonal wind at the tropopause height tends to enhance wave propagation (criterion 4).

Chen and Robinson (1992) and Hu and Tung (2002) have discussed the importance of vertical shear of zonal mean zonal wind on the vertical propagation of Rossby waves. Chen and Robinson (1992) showed that penetration of planetary waves from the troposphere into the stratosphere is sensitive to small changes in the vertical shear

of zonal wind near the tropopause height. Hu and Tung (2002) identified that a positive vertical shear of zonal wind enhances wave propagation across the tropopause. Similarly large negative shear of zonal wind tends to trap the planetary waves in the troposphere and hence less is left to penetrate into the stratosphere. Any diagnostic tool that attempts to provide a climatology of stationary Rossby wave propagation conditions should reflect this theory. In fact, we try to develop an algorithm that is capable of demonstrating the enhancing influence of positive vertical shear of zonal wind and impeding influence of negative vertical shear of zonal wind on stationary Rossby wave propagation from the troposphere to the stratosphere.

Figure 1 shows the climatology of the zonal mean zonal wind and the vertical shear of zonal mean zonal wind ($\text{ms}^{-1}\text{km}^{-1}$) for the Northern hemisphere winter months. Northern hemisphere winter months include December, January and February (DJF) and Southern hemisphere winter months include June, July and August (JJA). Due to the larger meridional temperature gradient between the tropics and mid latitudes, the magnitude of the wind shear between 20°N - 40°N is about four times stronger than the vertical shear at higher latitudes. Regardless of magnitude, it is evident that it is positive in the troposphere and negative in the stratosphere in this latitude band. At tropopause heights of these regions, where the sign changes, we expect to see a discontinuity in the Rossby wave propagation as discussed by Hu and Tung (2002). We will show that our new diagnostic is consistent with this theory while both the time mean of **vertical wavenumber** squared and the probability of positive **vertical wavenumber** introduced by Li et al. (2007) cannot capture this characteristic. In this study, we focus on the vertical propagation of the planetary wave, as there are also many studies using **vertical wavenumber** studying the horizontal propagation of the planetary waves.

2 Data and method

In the current study we used daily mean zonal wind and temperature from the National Center for Environmental Prediction-National Centre for Atmospheric Research (NCEP-NCAR) (Kalnay et al., 1996) to calculate the **vertical wavenumber** of Rossby waves for 50 winters (1961-2010) of both Northern and Southern hemispheres. The **vertical wavenumber** for stationary planetary waves is defined as:

$$m_{k,l}^2(y,z) = \left(\frac{N^2}{f^2 \cos^2(\phi)} \right) \left[\frac{\bar{q}_\phi}{\bar{u}} - \left(\frac{k}{a} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{\pi l}{2a} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{f \cos(\phi)}{2NH} \right)^2 \right] \quad (1)$$




Figure 1. Climatology of the zonal mean zonal wind (left) and the vertical shear of zonal mean zonal wind (right) for the Northern hemisphere during DJF. The units are ms^{-1} for zonal mean zonal wind and $\text{ms}^{-1}\text{km}^{-1}$ for the vertical shear of zonal mean zonal wind respectively.

Table 1. A summary of known facts about stationary Rossby wave propagation. Any diagnostic tool that attempts to provide a climatology of stationary Rossby wave propagation conditions should be consistent with these criteria. **These criteria refer only to the linear waves.**

1	For all stationary Rossby waves the most favorable propagation conditions are in the lower troposphere of the mid-latitude region. Upper troposphere and lowermost stratosphere of mid-latitude regions are also favorable for Rossby wave propagation.	Matsuno (1970) and Charney and Drazin (1961)
2	For large scale waves (horizontal and meridional wave numbers 1 to 3) the probability to propagate vertically is highest.	Matsuno (1970) and Charney and Drazin (1961)
3	Rossby waves tend to propagate on the edges of strong westerly winds and avoid penetrating through the jet maxima. Therefore, the strong stratospheric polar night jet of the Southern hemisphere in the winter will block and reflect large scale waves.	Karoly and Hoskins (1982)
4	Strong vertical shear (positive) is likely to enhance the vertical propagation of waves.	Chen and Robinson (1992)

170 where

$$\overline{q_\phi} = \cos(\phi) \left[\frac{2\Omega}{a} \cos(\phi) - \frac{1}{a^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} (\overline{u} \cos(\phi)) \right] - \frac{f^2}{\rho_0} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(\frac{\rho_0}{N^2} \frac{\partial \overline{u}}{\partial z} \right) \right] \right] \quad (2)$$

is the meridional gradient of the zonal mean potential vorticity which is a fundamental quantity in Planetary wave dynamics and the stability of the zonal mean flow (Andrews et al., 1987). Here H , k , l , ρ_0 , f , N^2 , a , Ω and ϕ are the scale height, zonal and meridional wavenumbers, air density, Coriolis parameter, buoyancy frequency, the Earth's radius and rotation frequency and latitude respectively (Andrews et al., 1987; Matsuno, 1970). The definition of the current version of the **vertical wavenumber** of Rossby waves that depends on the two-dimensional wavenumbers (zonal and meridional wavenumbers) can be found in (Sun et al., 2014; Sun and Li, 2012).

Figures 2 and 3 show the time Mean Refractive Index Squared (MRIS, in the plots weighted with the Earth radius squared) of 50 winters for Northern and Southern hemispheres respectively. The dependence of the MRIS on the zonal ($k=1,2,3$) and meridional wavenumbers ($l=1,2,3$) is visible in both figures. It can be seen that the multi-year average of MRIS gives unsatisfactory results. For instance, for $(k,l)=(1,1)$ very high values of the **vertical wavenumber** squared are found in high latitudes of the troposphere and the lower stratosphere. Moreover, in most areas of mid and high latitudes of the troposphere alternating positive and negative values of the **vertical wavenumber** squared leads to a noisy structure and makes the interpretation very difficult. The problem originates from overlapping of positive and negative values in the time-series and results in a reduction of climatological information. Such features of the time mean are also discussed by others (Mukougawa and Hirooka, 2004; Li et al., 2007). Too high values of MRIS northward of 75°N

in the lower stratosphere are not consistent with criterion 3 in Table 1, because the strong jet is expected to block wave penetration from the troposphere to the stratosphere. The MRIS is also not able to capture the meridional wavenumber dependency on the wave propagation conditions (criterion 2 in Table 1). For example in the Southern hemisphere, the difference between time mean of for wave (2,1), (2,2) and (2,3) in the stratosphere (above 100 hPa) is small, suggesting no considerable influence from the meridional wavenumbers on the vertical propagation of planetary waves from the troposphere to the stratosphere. In the current study, the time mean vertical wavenumber squared is calculated by the time mean of the instantaneous vertical wavenumber derived from the daily zonal mean field. As shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 the time mean vertical wavenumber has a noisy structure. One possibility to reduce the noise level is to calculate the vertical wavenumber of the time-mean zonal mean fields instead (Fig. A3). However time-dependent Rossby waves propagate on the instantaneous atmospheric state and not on the time-averaged fields. Therefore we focus on an approach to reduce the level of noise in the time-averaged instantaneous vertical wavenumber.

3 Probability of positive vertical wavenumber squared

Li et al. (2007) introduced the frequency distribution of days with negative vertical wavenumber squared as an alternative metric to describe how planetary waves can propagate. Figure 4 shows the probabilities of positive vertical wavenumber squared for Northern hemisphere winter time expressed as the percentage of days with positive $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ for wave (1,1), (1,2) and (1,3). By comparing to the time mean of the same waves we conclude that this quantity is capable of describing the required wave properties better than the time mean of $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$. However, it results in high values of probability between 20°N–40°N in the lower and middle stratosphere. This might be an over-optimistic result, because it is due to small positive values at these locations that exist throughout the winter season. In this respect the climatology of probability of positive refraction index squared does not meet the criterion 4 in Table 1.

Further evidence to show the importance of $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\bar{u}$ for vertical propagation of Rossby waves can be provided by calculating the normalized vertical component of the Eliassen-Palm (EP) flux. Figure 5 shows that the normalized vertical component of EP flux has a minimum at the tropopause, indicating that upward penetration of waves is suppressed by the negative values above tropopause heights as suggested by Hu and Tung (2002). Sensitivity of $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ to \bar{u} can be studied by comparing the values of $a^2 \frac{q\phi}{\bar{u}}$ and $a^2 \frac{q\phi}{10ms^{-1}}$. Figure 6 shows the climatology of $a^2 \frac{q\phi}{\bar{u}}$ and $a^2 \frac{q\phi}{10ms^{-1}}$ for DJF in the Northern Hemisphere. The subpolar maxima of $a^2 \frac{q\phi}{\bar{u}}$ in

the troposphere are not related to small values of the zonal wind at these regions, since by taking away the \bar{u} , the maxima are shifted to subtropics (25°N–40°N). This implies that small values of \bar{u} rather than $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\bar{u}$ at subpolar regions cause the maxima of $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ at these regions.

4 Probability of Favorable Propagation Condition for Rossby waves

A long standing issue in the interpretation of $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ is its vagueness. As suggested by Matsuno (1970), large waves tend to propagate in regions of positive vertical wavenumber $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ while they may be refracted or absorbed where $m_{k,l}^2(y, z) < 0$. Here (in the light of fuzzy sets and logic), we attempt to address the modeling of such vagueness. Fuzzy logic is a mathematical method for answering questions with imprecise information (such as very large or very small vertical wavenumber), it deals with reasoning that is approximate rather than fixed and precise. The basic approach is to assign a value between zero and one to describe the area between the upper and lower limit. The upper and lower limits are referring to the maximum and minimum values of any variable that fuzzy logics tries to set various MVF for them. In classical logic everything is either true or false. However, in fuzzy logic truth is a matter of degree (Zadeh, 1965; Novak et al., 1999).

Here we assume that instead of each of the individual $m_{k,l}^2(y, z, t)$ contributing equally to the time-mean $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$, some $m_{k,l}^2(y, z, t)$ contribute more than others. In this way, we distinguish between small positive and very large positive values to let very large positive values influence the final result more than small positive values. In this way classes or sets whose boundaries are not sharp will be introduced. We introduce $\mu_{Ro}(y, z, t)$ as the Rossby wave MVF which provides mPDF and estimate the probability of favorable propagation condition of Rossby wave $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$, as a function of latitude and height. We also provide the physical basis of the proposed method. For a detailed discussion of Membership Value Function (MVF), see the Appendix.

The advantage of our analysis over the traditional analysis of the vertical wavenumber is that without any reduction in the information due to cancellation of negative and positive values of the vertical wavenumber squared, we estimate the likeliness for planetary waves to propagate from one region to another at any time, altitude and latitude.

In the Fig. 7 the black curve shows the MVF used in the calculation of favorable propagation condition of Rossby waves. For the negative $m_{k,l}^2(y, z, t)$ region (part a) this function suggests that the rate of attenuation is very high and therefore wave propagation is prohibited in this region.




Figure 2. Climatology of vertical wavenumber squared ($a^2 m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$) of 50 winters (1961-2010) in the Northern hemisphere. Regions with negative $a^2 m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ are shaded with gray color.

Since our method is still based upon the linear wave theory, we assume a linear relationship between the magnitude of the $m_{k,l}^2(y, z, t)$ and the probability of favorable propagation conditions for positive $m_{k,l}^2(y, z, t)$ in a way that the higher the values of the $m_{k,l}^2(y, z, t)$ the chances of propagation for the Rossby waves increases linearly (part b). Large values of the $m_{k,l}^2(y, z, t)$ occur near the critical line where zonal mean zonal wind approaches zero ($\bar{u} < 0.5 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ in this study). This region is also not favorable for Rossby wave propagation since at this region the linear wave theory breaks down and waves start to break and the waves are absorbed (part c). The region where vertical wavenumber squared is larger than 600 is not favorable for wave propagation. At these regions the zonal mean zonal wind approaches zero. This condition often happens in the upper troposphere/lower

stratosphere where westerlies become weak in the winter season near the Arctic. Therefore most of the differences between Fig. 4 and Fig. 8 for Rossby wave (1,1) at the above-mentioned regions can be associated with setting μ_{Ro} to zero for $m_{k,l}^2 > 600$. In the study of Li et al. (2007) the effect of the critical line on Rossby wave propagation is neglected since all the positive values of the $m_{k,l}^2(y, z, t)$ are regarded as though small and very large positive values of the $m_{k,l}^2(y, z, t)$ are equally favorable places for wave propagation. In fact very high values of the $m_{k,l}^2(y, z, t)$ are not necessarily favorable conditions for the Rossby wave propagation. In this study the $m_{k,l}^2(y, z, t)$ higher than 600 is considered as the critical line region, obtained from the climatology of the vertical wavenumber when $\bar{u} < 0.5 \text{ ms}^{-1}$. As we will show, this function gives us an improved picture of planetary




Figure 3. Climatology of vertical wavenumber squared ($a^2 m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$) of 50 winters (1961-2010) in the southern hemisphere. Regions with negative $a^2 m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ are shaded with gray color.




Figure 4. Probability of positive vertical wavenumber squared for Northern hemisphere wintertime for wave (1,1), (1,2) and (1,3).




Figure 5. Climatology of vertical component of EP flux normalized by vertical component of EP flux at 850 hPa for DJF at Northern hemisphere. Discontinuity of this quantity at the tropopause heights indicates the strong suppression of wave penetration from troposphere into the stratosphere at lower stratosphere.




Figure 6. climatology of $a^2 \frac{q_\phi}{u}$ (left) and $a^2 \frac{q_\phi}{10}$ (right) for DJF in the Northern hemisphere.

335 wave propagation condition in climatologies. Higher values
of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ provide a window of opportunity for plane-
340 tary waves to propagate at any latitude and height. Likewise,
smaller values of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ demonstrate the places where
Rossby waves propagate away from these regions. The sensi-
345 tivity of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ values to the shape of the MVF function
is discussed in Appendix A.

5 Results and Discussions:

Figure 8 demonstrates the climatology of probability of
favorable propagation condition of Rossby waves for zonal
345 wavenumbers ($k=1, 2, 3$) and meridional wavenumbers ($l=1, 2, 3$)
for the Northern hemisphere winter season. The most
common feature for all waves are their rather large probabili-
ty to propagate in the troposphere (below 200 hPa) in winter
season. It is also evident that the most favorable propagation
350 condition is in the lower troposphere of the mid-latitude
region. The values of Fig. 8 are independent of Rossby wave
generation and explain how the waves, when generated,
would propagate given the structure of the mean flow.
However the regions of highly favorable Rossby wave prop-
355 agation and source region for wave generation (asymmetries
at the surface, land-sea contrasts, and sea surface tempera-
ture asymmetries) are coincident. It is also clear that longer
waves have more opportunity to penetrate to the stratosphere.

360 Karoly and Hoskins (1982) by using ray tracing technique
from geometrical optics and wave propagation in a slowly
varying medium, showed that wave rays which are parallel to
the group velocity vector tend to refract toward large **vertical**
wavenumber squared. They also found that Rossby waves
365 have a tendency to propagate along great circles and most of
the upward propagation of Rossby waves will be refracted
toward the equator (even if the **vertical wavenumber** squared
were positive at all height in their study). Similar to this
theory, we also found a channel or waveguide of large
370 probability of favorable propagation condition for Rossby
waves. The strong westerlies act as a waveguide of Rossby
waves and direct them vertically through the tropopause
and allow them to penetrate to higher altitudes from their
source region (troposphere). These areas are south of 40°N
375 in winter of the Northern hemisphere for large waves and are
indicated by $Pr_{Ro}(y, z) > 50\%$.

The study of Karoly and Hoskins (1982) also revealed
that Rossby waves tend to propagate on the edges of strong
380 westerlies and avoid penetrating through the jet. This fact is
also clear in our results, where north of 60°N and above 200
hPa, the probability of favorable condition for Rossby waves
show relatively smaller values, comparing to similar altitude
ranges between 30°N and 50°N. The maxima south of 40°N
385 at 100 hPa in the mPDF shows that the region is favorable
for wave propagation. At the same region, the vertical com-

ponent of the EP fluxes have small magnitudes. However as
shown in Li et al. (2007) the horizontal component of EP
fluxes has a large values at this region (Fig. 5 (e) in the study
of Li et al. (2007)). Since the current study concentrates only
on the vertical wave propagation, not all aspects of the Fig.
5 can be directly compared with the Fig. 8. The same cli-
matologies as Fig. 8 are presented in Fig. 9 for the South-
ern hemisphere. Similar to the Northern hemisphere, all large
scale waves have a rather large chance to propagate in the tro-
posphere in winter. It can be seen that the larger the waves,
the probability of favorable condition for them to propagate
upward are larger.

Figure 10 demonstrates the differences between probabili-
ty of positive **vertical wavenumber** (calculated by PDFs) and
probability of favorable propagation condition of Rossby
waves (calculated by mPDFs) for Northern hemisphere
wintertime for wave (1,1), (1,2) and (1,3). The maximum
difference is found at 20°N-40°N of the middle and upper
troposphere which can reach to 50%. This unsatisfactory
result of the probability of positive **vertical wavenumber** is
due to small positive values at these places which is con-
sistent throughout the winter season. The area of maximum
difference between $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ and probability of positive
vertical wavenumber remains the same for all wavenum-
bers at both Northern and Southern hemispheres (not shown).

As Fig. 8 and Fig. 9 show the most important difference
between the Northern and Southern hemisphere occurs in
the high latitudes of the stratosphere, where in the Northern
hemisphere, zonal wavenumber=1 has a good opportunity
to propagate ($Pr_{Ro}(y, z) > 40\%$), while in the Southern
hemisphere it has a rather poorer chance to propagate. This
is consistent with the theoretical explanation of the vertical
propagation of Rossby waves from the troposphere to the
stratosphere by Charney and Drazin (1961). The zonal mean
zonal wind should be weaker than a critical strength for up-
ward propagation of Rossby waves. The strong stratospheric
winter polar vortex of the Southern hemisphere will block
and reflect wave activity. The critical strength depends on
the scale of the wave and is not a function of the background
zonal regime.

A significant piece of information which is lost from the
time mean of $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ is the role of meridional wavenum-
bers on the wave propagation conditions. For instance in
the Southern hemisphere, the difference between the time
mean of $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ for wave (2,1), (2,2) and (2,3) in the
stratosphere (above 100 hPa) is not large which is one of the
unsatisfactory results of time mean of $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$. It is only
in the light of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ values that we can understand the
impact of meridional wavenumbers on the wave propagation
in the stratosphere. Note that, at the same latitude range of
the Southern hemisphere, $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ values are as high as
45% for wave (2,1) in mid-latitudes of stratosphere, while




Figure 7. MVF used in the calculation of favorable propagation condition of Rossby waves (black curve). Red lines show MVF for calculating probability of positive vertical wavenumber which are used by Li et al. (2007). In their study the effect of the critical layer (part c) is not considered.

the $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ values reach to less than 5% for wave (2,3). 465

6 Usefulness and appropriateness of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$

445 In order to test the appropriateness of the $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ in climatological studies of stationary planetary wave propagation, we further investigate the sensitivity of the $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ to different zonal flow regimes in the stratosphere. Following Castanheira and Graf (2003), we constructed two data 475 sets based upon the strength of the westerlies in the lower stratosphere (50 hPa) at 65°N. According to the Charney and Drazin (1961) criterion, if the background flow is westerly and smaller than the latitude and wave number dependent critical Rossby velocity, the planetary waves 480 can penetrate from the troposphere into the stratosphere, otherwise wave reflection occurs and tropospheric flow may be modified. Strong Vortex Regime (SVR) is identified when $\bar{u}_{50}(65N) > 20ms^{-1}$ and Weak Vortex Regime (WVR) is considered when $0 < \bar{u}_{50}(65N) < 10ms^{-1}$, where 485 $\bar{u}_{50}(65N)$ is the 50 hPa zonal mean zonal wind at 65°N. The $20ms^{-1}$ threshold reflects the critical Rossby velocities ($20ms^{-1}$) for ZWN=1 for a climatological Northern hemisphere zonal wind profile. The WVR events do not correspond to the Sudden Stratospheric Warmings (SSWs)

in the current study. Since during SSWs the linear wave theory breaks down and waves start to break and the waves are absorbed, the vertical wavenumber and probability of the favorable wave propagation (both are based on the linear wave theory) have limitations for studying the wave propagation during SSWs. 470

Table 2 demonstrates the periods of different polar vortex regimes that last for at least 30 consecutive days in DJF. Since in DJF the stratospheric flow consists of strong westerlies (in the absence of vertical wave propagation), the number of SVR events are more than WVR events. The results of $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ and $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ for WVR and SVR for wave (1,1) are presented in Fig. 11. It is found that in comparison to climatologies (Fig. 8) both WVR and SVR show similar patterns. However, the waveguide at mid latitudes is much narrower in SVR than WVR. In addition, the average values of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ in the stratosphere are greater in WVR than SVR. These results show that planetary waves have more chance to penetrate and force the stratosphere in WVR than SVR. In other words, values of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ are sensitive to stratospheric westerlies and are consistent with the general knowledge about planetary wave propagation from the troposphere to the stratosphere. An enhancement of wave propagation northward of 70°N in the lower stratosphere and a




Figure 8. Probability of favorable propagation condition for Rossby waves derived from 50 winters (1961-2010) in the Northern hemisphere. The higher the values, it is convenient for planetary waves to propagate to that regions. In contrast, planetary waves tend to propagate away from regions of low values of this quantity.




Figure 9. The same as Fig. 8 but for Southern hemisphere wintertime.




Figure 10. The differences between the probability of positive vertical wavenumber squared and the probability of favorable propagation condition of stationary Rossby waves.

Table 2. Periods of polar vortex regimes lasting for at least 30 consecutive days in DJF; left: Strong Vortex Regime. Right: Weak Vortex Regime.

Strong Vortex Regime (SVR)		Weak Vortex Regime (WVR)	
Starting date	Ending date	Starting date	Ending date
20 Dec 1961	20 Feb 1962	20 Dec 1968	27 Jan 1969
24 Dec 1963	28 Feb 1964	28 Dec 1984	13 Feb 1985
03 Jan 1967	28 Feb 1967	09 Dec 1998	11 Jan 1999
01 Dec 1975	28 Feb 1976	02 Jan 2004	28 Feb 2004
01 Dec 1987	14 Jan 1988		
16 Dec 1988	17 Feb 1989		
17 Dec 1989	28 Feb 1990		
01 Dec 1991	18 Jan 1992		
05 Dec 1992	11 Feb 1993		
01 Dec 1994	18 Jan 1995		
07 Dec 2004	21 Feb 2005		
30 Dec 2006	26 Feb 2007		
23 Dec 2007	13 Feb 2008		

slight reduction in the favorability of wave propagation between 50°N-70°N in the stratosphere are found for WVR. On the other hand it can be seen that due to the high level of noisiness the interpretation of the difference of $m_{k,l}^2(y,z)$ between WVR and SVR is very difficult. Since the highest difference in the favorability of wave propagation between WVR and SVR occurs northward of 50°N in the stratosphere, we further calculate the difference in the vertical component of EP flux between WVR and SVR in this region (Fig. 12). An enhancement of vertical EP flux is obtained northward of 65°N in the lower stratosphere during WVR while a decrease in this quantity is obtained southward of this region in the middle and upper stratosphere. By comparing the differences of $m_{k,l}^2(y,z)$, $Pr_{Ro}(y,z)$ and vertical component of EP flux during WVR and SVR, it can be seen that the pattern of differences between $Pr_{Ro}(y,z)$ and vertical component of EP flux are similar. Therefore, based upon these analyses, we suggest that this diagnostic tool can be useful for studying the propagating properties of the planetary waves.

7 Conclusions

Climatological values of the time mean of the vertical wavenumber squared derived from 50 winters (1961-2010) of both Northern and Southern hemispheres are calculated to show several problematic features of this important quantity in climatologies. In order to improve these unsatisfactory results, we introduced probability density functions (PDFs) of positive refractive indices as a function of zonal and meridional wave numbers. We also compared this quantity with a modified set of PDFs (mPDFs) and demonstrate their superior performance compared to the climatological mean of refractive indices and the original PDFs. Without any reduction in the information, $Pr_{Ro}(y,z)$ estimates the likeliness for stationary Rossby waves to propagate from one region

to another at any time, altitude and latitude in a climatological sense. The higher the $Pr_{Ro}(y,z)$ the easier it is for planetary waves to propagate. Smaller values of $Pr_{Ro}(y,z)$ demonstrate the places where Rossby waves are absorbed or reflected from these regions. It is also found that by using this quantity one can easily study the difference in stationary Rossby wave propagation between different meridional wavenumbers without the difficulty of the interpretation of the noisy structure of the time mean vertical wavenumber. Our diagnostic tool is also capable of demonstrating the enhancing influence of positive vertical shear of zonal wind and impeding influence of negative vertical shear of zonal wind on stationary Rossby wave propagation from the troposphere to the stratosphere. The better performance of the mPDF suggests that relatively small but positive numbers of the vertical wavenumber squared play an important role to offer an favorable propagating condition for planetary waves in the stratosphere. This diagnostic tool successfully shows that for WVR there is more space for the vertical propagation of Rossby waves from the troposphere to the stratosphere. In contrast, SVR tend to block and reflect vertical propagation of stationary Rossby waves. It is also worthwhile mentioning that both the vertical wavenumber and probability of the favorable wave propagation are still qualitative tools to study the vertical propagation of Rossby waves from the troposphere to the stratosphere. Since our diagnostic tool is consistent with the theoretical understanding of vertical propagation of Rossby waves from the troposphere to the stratosphere, we suggest that this diagnostic tool has the capacity to be used in assessing planetary wave propagation conditions in climate models.

Acknowledgements. Khalil Karami and Miriam Sinnhuber gratefully acknowledge funding by the Helmholtz Society within the Helmholtz Young Investigators group: Solar variability, cli-




Figure 11. $a^2 m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ (first row) and $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ (second row) during WVR and SVR.

mate, and the role of the mesosphere/lower thermosphere, project NWG-642. NCEP Reanalysis data provided by the NOAA/OAR/ESRL PSD, Boulder, Colorado, USA, from their Web site at <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd>.

Appendix A

The probability of favorable propagation condition of Rossby waves $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ can be written as:

$$Pr_{Ro}(y, z) = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n \mu_{Ro}(y, z, t)}{\sum_{t=1}^n t} \times 100 \quad (A1)$$

where $\mu_{Ro}(y, z, t)$ as modified set of PDFs (mPDFs) is defined as:

$$\mu_{Ro} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m_{k,l}^2 \leq 0, \\ (8.3 \times 10^{-4} \times m_{k,l}^2(y, z)) + 0.5 & \text{if } 0 < m_{k,l}^2 < 600, \\ 0 & \text{if } m_{k,l}^2 \geq 600 \end{cases} \quad (A3)$$

Here 8.3×10^{-4} is the slope of line b in the Fig. 7. The variable t is the time step and in the current study the daily mean values of the temperature and zonal wind are used in the calculations. In the study of Li et al. (2007) PDFs (red lines in the Fig. 7) are defined as:

$$\mu_{Ro} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m_{k,l}^2 < 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } m_{k,l}^2 > 0, \end{cases} \quad (A3)$$

In order to test the sensitivity of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ to the shape of MVF, we evaluated the values of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ for several potential MVFs. Figure A1 demonstrates the shapes of three MVFs that are used to calculate the values of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$. It can be seen from Fig. A2 (first row) that MVF1 gives unsatisfactory results above 200 hPa, where for wave (3,3) we expect very low values of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ poleward of 40°N. This function (MVF1) neglects the fact that Rossby waves tend to quickly attenuate in low values of vertical wavenumber squared. The values of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ can reach as high as 50% at these latitudes and altitudes. MVF2 and MVF3 also give unrealistic results where the values of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ are




Figure 12. Same as Fig. 11 but for the vertical component of EP flux. The values are divided by 10^5 . Since the highest differences in the $m_{k,l}^2(y, z)$ and $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$ between WVR and SVR are in the high latitude stratosphere the vertical component of EP fluxes are shown in this region.

too low in the stratosphere for all waves. These MVFs block all waves in the troposphere. Furthermore, they do not provide any waveguides in which Rossby waves can penetrate from troposphere to the stratosphere.

References

- Andrews, D. G., Leovy, C. B., and Holton, J. R.: Middle Atmosphere Dynamics, Academic Press, San Diego, 1987.
- Castanheira, J. M. and Graf, H.-F.: North Pacific-North Atlantic relationships under stratospheric control?, *J. Geophys. Res.*, doi:10.1029/2002JD002754, 2003.
- Charney, J. G. and Drazin, P. G.: Propagation of planetary scale disturbances from the lower into the upper atmosphere, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 66, 83–109, 1961.
- Chen, P. C. and Robinson, W. A.: propagation of planetary waves between the troposphere and stratosphere, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 49, 2533–2545, 1992.
- Dickinson, R. E.: Planetary Rossby waves propagating vertically through weak westerly wind wave guides, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 25, 984–1002, 1969.
- Eliassen, A. and Palm, E.: On the transfer of energy in stationary mountain waves, *Geophys. Publ.*, XXII, 1–23, 1961.
- Hu, Y. and Tung, K. K.: Interannual and decadal variations of planetary wave activity, stratospheric cooling, and northern hemisphere annular mode, *J. Climate.*, 15, 1659–1673, 2002.
- Huang, R. and Gambo, K.: The response of a Hemispheric Multi-Level Model Atmosphere to Forcing by Topography and Stationary Heat Sources (I) Forcing by Topography, *J. Meteorol. Soc. Japan*, 60, 78–92, 2002.
- Kalnay, E., Kanamitsu, M., Kistler, R., Collins, W., Deaven, D., Gandin, L., Iredell, M., Saha, S., White, G., Woollen, J., Zhu, Y., Leetmaa, A., Reynolds, R., Chelliah, M., Ebisuzaki, W., Higgins, W., Janowiak, J., Mo, K. C., Ropelewski, C., Wang, J., Jenne, R., and Joseph, D.: The NCEP/NCAR 40-Year Reanalysis Project, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 77, 437–471, 1996.
- Karoly, D. J. and Hoskins, B. J.: Three dimensional propagation of planetary waves, *J. Meteorol. Soc. Jpn.*, 60, 109–122, 1982.
- Li, Q., Graf, H. F., and Giorgetta, M. A.: Stationary planetary wave propagation in Northern Hemisphere winter - climatological analysis of the refractive index, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 183–200, 2007.
- Limpasuvan, V. and Hartmann, D. L.: Wave-maintained annular modes of climate variability, *J. Climate.*, 13, 4414–4429, 2000.
- Lin, B.: The behavior of winter stationary planetary waves forced by topography and diabatic heating, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 39, 1206–1226, 1982.
- Matsuno, T.: Vertical propagation of stationary planetary waves in the winter Northern Hemisphere, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 27, 871–883, 1970.
- Mukougawa, H. and Hirooka, T.: Predictability of stratospheric sudden warming: A case study for 1998/99 winter, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 132, 1764–1776, 2004.




Figure A1. Shape of three MVFs that are used to calculate the values of $Pr_{Ro}(y, z)$.

Novak, V., Perfilieva, I., and Mockor, J.: Mathematical principles of fuzzy logic, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Springer US, 1999.

640 Randel, W. J.: The seasonal evolution of planetary waves in the southern hemisphere stratosphere and troposphere, Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., 114, 1385–1409, 1988.

Smith, A. R.: Stationary waves in the winter stratosphere: Seasonal and interannual variability, J. Atmos. Sci., 40, 245–261, 1983.

645 Sun, C. and Li, J.: Space–Time Spectral Analysis of the Southern Hemisphere Daily 500-hPa Geopotential Height, Mon. Wea. Rev., 140, 3844–3856, 2012.

Sun, C., Li, J., Jin, F., and Xie, F.: Contrasting meridional structures of stratospheric and tropospheric planetary wave variability in the Northern Hemisphere, Tellus, 66, 25 303, 2014.

650 Zadeh, L. A.: Fuzzy sets, Inform, Control., 8, 338–353, 1965.




Figure A2. Probability of favorable propagation condition for Rossby waves derived from 50 winters (1961-2010) in the Northern hemisphere based on different MVF values described in Fig. A1.




Figure A3. On the left the time averaged zonal mean fields are used to calculate the **vertical wavenumber** squared (only for $(k,l)=(1,1)$). On the right the time mean of the refractive index squared is shown. It is clear that the **vertical wavenumber** derived from the time averaged zonal mean fields has less noise than the time mean **vertical wavenumber** squared. We discuss this effect in more detail in the manuscript. Theoretically there are various ways in which one may reduce the level of noise in the time mean of the **vertical wavenumber**. The advantage of our proposed method is that it maps well and in a physical way on the list of criteria formulated in Table 1. Alternatively one can use other statistical methods like truncated means or trimmed means to reduce the noisiness.