1 2	SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION
3	Transport mechanisms for synoptic, seasonal and interannual SF ₆
4	variations in troposphere
5	
6	Prabir K. Patra ¹ , Masayuki Takigawa ¹ , Geoff S. Dutton ² , Karin Uhse ³ , Kentaro
7	Ishijima ¹ , Benjamin Lintner ⁴ , Kazuyuki Miyazaki ¹ and James W. Elkins ²
8	
9	1. Frontier Research Center for Global Change, JAMSTEC, Yokohama 236 001,
10	Japan
11	2. NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory, Boulder, CO 80305, USA
12	3. Umweltbundesamt - Federal Environment Agency, D-63225 Langen, Germany
13	4. AOS/IGPP, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1565,
14	USA
15 16 17 18	Here we show some additional comparisons of SF6 simulations using MOZART (Gloor et al., 2007), this study using ACTM and observed data.
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	In this study we used the latitudinal profiles of SF6 from 6 continuous monitoring sites only, while there are weekly flask samplings from many other sites as discussed in Gloor et al. (2007). Since the focus of this study is not validation of model transport, but to understand the various transport processes contributing to the synoptic, seasonal and inter-hemispheric gradients in SF6, we show these model-data comparison for growing confidence in the SF6 simulation quality by ACTM.
27 28 29 30	Figure S1 shows the comparison of inter-hemispheric gradients at 39 flask sampling sites during the years 1999 & 2000 in addition to the 6 continuous monitoring sites used in this work.
31 32 33	Figure S2 shows comparison SF6 time series at two sites at the PBL height region (0-2 km) and upper troposphere (6-8 km).
34 35	These two comparisons suggest an overall agreement in ACTM simulation and data at different latitude and height regions.



2 3

4 Figure S1: Comparison of inter-hemispheric gradient is SF6 as observed at flask 5 sampling and continuous sites with those obtained using MOZART (Gloor et al.,

6 2007) and ACTM forward transport simulations.



7