

**Reply to acp-2017-167-referee-report-1,
a review by Anonymous Referee #2 of the manuscript
ACP-2017-167 “Winds and temperatures of the Arctic middle
atmosphere during January measured by Doppler lidar”**

Jens Hildebrand et al.

September 22, 2017

- In my major comment #1 I asked the authors to formulate a clear scientific question of their paper. As far as I am concerned, this was neither done, nor did the authors argument against my case. It seems to me as if the authors mostly ignored my comment. Furthermore, to me a mere quantification of a variability without a scientific conclusion does not make a full scientific paper. This is a technical note, which could be published for example in a journal such as “Annales Geophysicae” which encourages such formats.

We are sorry that the reviewer did not find our modifications of the manuscript to be sufficient. We had expanded the introduction to highlight the scientific relevance of the manuscript. The scientific conclusions are mentioned in the respective section of the manuscript. Regarding the scope of ACP, we find the criteria for publication are fulfilled, reviewers and readers of the manuscript in the open discussion phase are supporting that the work is relevant for ACP.

- In reply to my major comment #3, the authors reformulated that their derived $2\pi\omega^{-1}$ is not the intrinsic frequency. If this is not the case, why not name it differently? By naming it $2\pi\omega^{-1}$ you imply that it is a frequency and most of the readers will believe it to be such. In fact in the caption of their Figure 6 the authors also name it as “the intrinsic period ($2\pi\omega^{-1}$) a monochromat gravity wave with the given kinetic-to-potential GWED ratio would have”.

In the manuscript we discuss only energy ratios. In Fig. 6 we show energy ratios. Only on a secondary axis we have added ticks in terms of $2\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1}$ as some readers found it helpful. The assumptions made to add this scale are clearly listed in the manuscript.

- In my major comment #6, I asked the authors to thoroughly investigate the effect of switching from one ECMWF run to another around 00 UTC. The authors replied to this with “we do not think that by using data of two different ECMWF runs per night the results might be corrupted”. This is not a thorough investigation!

At least some proof to back the authors statement is necessary here. As it is right now, it is mere speculation.

Comment #6 contained several points that we addressed in the revision of the manuscript.

We try to clarify one of those points that appeared unclear: The reviewer asked for the influence of the switching of ECMWF runs every 12 hours on the $E_{\text{kin}}/E_{\text{pot}}$ ratio on larger scales (referring to page 10, line 9 of the manuscript at that time). As nightly mean profiles are calculated before the variation of these nightly mean profiles is investigated, we are sure that the switching is smoothed out before further processing.

- Furthermore the authors state concerning their methodology that “Probably all of these methods have their advantages and drawbacks, and it is simply not possible to take all of them into account in every study about gravity waves.” While I agree with this statement, I still do not understand why the authors then hold on to a method for which it has been shown (Ehard et al., 2015) that it should not be used! The authors even state that “the approach applied in this study was the only one of the three approaches tested that allowed to quantify the underestimation of GWED in ECMWF data”. If the nightly-mean method is the only method which yields this result, but it is known that it has major drawbacks, it makes me very suspicious, that what the authors show here is a mere artifact of their methodology.

We tested three different methods of background estimation (namely nightly mean, Butterworth, and two-dimensional spline) with our lidar data and have not found significant differences in the resulting gravity wave energy densities. Therefore, we do not think that the nightly mean method yields basically wrong results. Furthermore, our procedure accommodates some of the drawbacks of the nightly mean method.

We would like to clarify why we choose the nightly mean method:

We applied three different methods of background estimation (namely nightly mean, Butterworth, and two-dimensional spline) to the lidar data and to the ECMWF data for the whole data set.

Regarding the lidar data we have not found significant differences in the resulting gravity wave energy densities, especially not in the energy ratios. This may be a speciality of our data set and might indicate that stationary waves are not dominating in our data.

We have selected the nightly mean method instead of the Butterworth only due to the results when applying the method to the ECMWF data. As the ECMWF data are not on a uniform altitude grid we have to interpolate these to a new grid before applying the Butterworth filter. When comparing the different methods and their altitude dependence we came to the conclusion that the uncertainties in the interpolation lead to erroneous filtered data. Using the nightly mean method the interpolation errors are suppressed.

So in summary: 1. For the lidar data Butterworth and nightly mean method lead to the same results. 2. For ECMWF data a vertical interpolation needed to apply the Butterworth filter leads to erroneous results.

References

Ehard, B., B. Kaifler, N. Kaifler, and M. Rapp, Evaluation of methods for gravity wave extraction from middle-atmospheric lidar temperature measurements, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 8(11), 4645–4655, doi:10.5194/amt-8-4645-2015, 2015.

**Reply to acp-2017-167-referee-report-2,
a review by Anonymous Referee #3 of the revised manuscript
ACP-2017-167 “Winds and temperatures of the Arctic middle
atmosphere during January measured by Doppler lidar”**

Jens Hildebrand et al.

September 22, 2017

This paper presents solid, well-referenced work, with interesting and potentially important science through both its direct input and modifications it is likely to stimulate on existing models of wave energy content in the middle atmosphere. The authors are clearly careful about their work. This should also motivate others to make similar measurements. I look forward to it being published soon. That said, the paper can be greatly improved rhetorically, as it is often hard to follow and it contains much clumsy or incorrect English. I will make a number of editorial suggestions.

General comments

- You say that “large year-to-year variations of monthly mean temperatures and winds, which in 2012 are caused by a sudden stratospheric warming.” That sounds like the SSW is the only player needed to explain this anomaly. Is that what you want to say, or is it one of perhaps a number of contributors, in which you might say “affected” rather than “caused”.

[As we cannot rule out other contributions we changed this as suggested.](#)

- You say that the lidar and ECMWF winds show excellent agreement below ≈ 55 km. I wouldn't have said “excellent”, as this implies to me that they are always within the measurement error of one another, which does not appear to be the case from the plots. They are certainly more consistently in agreement than above that altitude, but as your text states: there are “differences of up to . . . 20 m/s and 5 m/s, and of up to 30 m/s”. By the way, this last “of up to 30 m/s” is confusing. Is it 5 m/s or 30 m/s?

[We changed “excellent” to “good”.](#)

[The last “of up to 30 ms⁻¹” refers to the differences between lidar data and HWM07 data. We rephrased this sentence to make this more clear.](#)

- In the review of mesosphere wind measurements the authors should also include meteor radar.

Done.

- On page 6, in comparing HWM07 meridional winds with the lidar and ECMWF, you say it is too strong in the entire altitude range. It is also sometimes of the opposite sign. It seems one thing to under/over estimate the magnitude, but something quite different to get the direction wrong. The former may be a result of averaging or mis-parameterizing, but the latter could be having the wrong physics. I wonder if you shouldn't point out something along this line?

We now explicitly mention this issue.

As mentioned in the manuscript, HWM07 takes only a limited number of observations into account for this location and altitude range. Unfortunately we found no information to decide if the differing wind direction is caused by sparse sampling or wrong physics.

- Figure 5 supposedly shows individual 1-h integration profiles. My 600 dpi color printer did not reproduce them. Hopefully, the journal will help you to make sure the graphics are visible.

I now increased the linewidth.

- At the top of page 8, it is not clear what you mean by “down to only one tenth”. From the following clause, it seems that you are saying that ECMWF reproduces only about 1/10 of the variability observed. But that is not what the sentence says.

We now rephrased this sentence.

- When discussing the GWED in figure 6, you state that the GWED slightly decreases between 53 and 67 km. It seems to me that any mean slope along this range is well within the measurement-induced computational uncertainty, and you should probably state that it is as near as you can tell constant in that range.

We now rephrased this sentence.

- On page 10, you state that the calculated GWEDs depend on ... data analysis procedures. Is this about averaging and filtering? Because if using a different procedure, however legitimate, gives a different result, that is not very comforting. Can you please elaborate?

Yes, this is also about averaging and filtering, both in time and altitude, but not only. *Ehard et al.* (2015) presented an overview of different filtering methods and compared the results when applied on synthetic and measured data. *Baumgarten et al.* (2017) presented seasonal cycles of GWPED derived using different filtering methods, i.e., filtering in time or altitude.

Without going into details, it is obvious that different methods are sensitive to different parts of the gravity wave spectrum. Similarly, spectral filters in altitude will yield different results than spectral filters in time. And even when applying the same procedure, the results depend on sampling, averaging, and filtering of the data.

We have listed the relevant parameters in the manuscript, so the results are reproducible. We have made sure that we apply the same methodology to the ECMWF data, so the comparison of lidar and ECMWF is robust.

Editing comments

- next-to-last sentence: "... ECMWF data show similar results as the lidar data."
Suggest: "... ECMWF data show results similar to the lidar data." [done](#)
- Last sentence: "... GWED and LWED follows that ..."
Suggest: "... GWED and LWED, it follows that ..."
[done](#)
- page 2, line 6... [done](#)
- page 2, line 11... [done](#)
- page 2, line 20... [done](#)
- page 3, line 7–8... [done](#)
- page 4, line 30... [done](#)
- page 5, line 2... [done](#)
- page 5, lines 16–17... [done](#)
- page 5, line 18... [done](#)
- page 5, line 21... [done](#)
- page 5, line 23... [done](#)
- page 5, line 24... [done](#)
- page 5, line 27... [done](#)
- page 5, lines 27–28... [done](#)
- page 5, lines 32–34... [done](#)
- page 5, line 34 and page 6, line 1... [done](#)
- page 6, lines 3–4... [done](#)
- page 6, line 6... [done](#)

- page 6, line 10... [adopted partially](#)
- page 6, line 18... [done](#)
- page 6, line 19... [done](#)
- page 6, line 20... [We now changed this phrase to “we compare...”.](#)
- page 6, line 28... [done](#)
- page 6, line 29... [done](#)
- page 7, lines 6–8... [done](#)
- page 7, line 9... [done](#)
- page 7, line 11... [done](#)
- page 7, line 13... [done](#)
- page 7, line 15... [done](#)
- page 7, line 16... [done](#)
- page 7, lines 21–22... [done](#)
- page 7, line 35... [done](#)
- page 8, line 4... [done](#)
- page 8, line 10... [done](#)
- page 8, lines 11–13... [done](#)
- page 8, line 15... [done](#)
- page 8, lines 16–17... [done](#)
- page 9, line 2... [done](#)
- page 9, line 23... [done](#)
- page 9, line 33... [done](#)
- page 10, line 1... [done](#)
- page 10, line 2... [done](#)
- page 10, lines 12–14... [done](#)
- page 10, line 21... [done](#)
- caption of Fig. 5... [Done](#). We changed other occurrences of “exemplary” too.

References

- Baumgarten, K., M. Gerding, and F.-J. Lübken, Seasonal variation of gravity wave parameters using different filter methods with daylight lidar measurements at mid-latitudes, *J. Geophys. Res.*, accepted, 2017.
- Ehard, B., B. Kaifler, N. Kaifler, and M. Rapp, Evaluation of methods for gravity wave extraction from middle-atmospheric lidar temperature measurements, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 8(11), 4645–4655, doi:10.5194/amt-8-4645-2015, 2015.

Winds and temperatures of the Arctic middle atmosphere during January measured by Doppler lidar

Jens Hildebrand¹, Gerd Baumgarten¹, Jens Fiedler¹, and Franz-Josef Lübken¹

¹Leibniz-Institute of Atmospheric Physics at the Rostock University, Kühlungsborn, Germany

Correspondence to: G. Baumgarten (baumgarten@iap-kborn.de)

Abstract. We present an extensive data set of simultaneous temperature and wind measurements in the Arctic middle atmosphere. It consists of more than 300 h of Doppler Rayleigh lidar observations obtained during three January seasons 2012, 2014, and 2015, and covers the altitude range from 30 km up to about 85 km. The data set reveals large year-to-year variations of monthly mean temperatures and winds, which in 2012 are ~~caused~~affected by a sudden stratospheric warming. The temporal evolution of winds and temperatures after that warming are studied over a period of two weeks, showing an elevated stratopause and the reformation of the polar vortex. The monthly mean temperatures and winds are compared to data extracted from the Integrated Forecast System of the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) and the Horizontal Wind Model (HWM07). Lidar and ECMWF data show ~~excellent~~good agreement of mean zonal and meridional winds below ≈ 55 km altitude, but we also find mean temperature, zonal wind, and meridional wind differences of up to 20 K, 20 m s^{-1} , and 5 m s^{-1} , respectively, ~~and of~~. Differences between lidar observations and HWM07 data are up to 30 m s^{-1} ~~between lidar observations and HWM07 data~~. From the fluctuations of temperatures and winds within single nights we extract the potential and kinetic gravity wave energy density (GWED) per unit mass. It shows that the kinetic GWED is typically 5 to 10 times larger than the potential GWED, the total GWED increases with altitude with a scale height of ≈ 16 km. Since temporal fluctuations of winds and temperatures are underestimated in ECMWF, the total GWED is underestimated as well by a factor of 3 to 10 above 50 km altitude. Similarly, we estimate the energy density per unit mass for large-scale waves (LWED) from the fluctuations of nightly mean temperatures and winds. The total LWED is roughly constant with altitude. The ratio of kinetic to potential LWED varies with altitude over two orders of magnitude. LWEDs from ECMWF data show ~~similar results~~results similar as the lidar data. From the comparison of GWED and LWED, it follows that large-scale waves carry about 2 to 5 times more energy than gravity waves.

1 Introduction

Winds in the middle atmosphere play an important role for atmospheric dynamics; e.g., filtering of gravity waves is controlled by the background wind field (e.g., Lindzen, 1981; Gill, 1982; Nappo, 2002). As these gravity waves transport energy and momentum over long distances, winds indirectly affect large-scale circulations (e.g., Geller, 1983; Holton, 1983). Therefore, wind measurements in the middle atmosphere with reasonable temporal and vertical resolution are of special interest (Meriwether and Gerrard, 2004; Drob et al., 2008). ~~But not~~ Not only do wind measurements provide additional information about atmospheric stability, together with temperature observations they also offer more sophisticated studies of gravity waves (e.g., Eckermann et al., 1995; Zink and Vincent, 2001; Placke et al., 2013; Bossert et al., 2014; Baumgarten et al., 2015) than studying gravity waves solely from temperature measurements (e.g., Chanin and Hauchecorne, 1981; Whiteway and Carswell, 1995; Alexander et al., 2011). In a recent study, Dörnbrack et al. (2017) point out that information about background wind is essential to correctly interpret ground-based gravity wave observations, specifically regarding identified phase lines and the vertical propagation direction. However, simultaneous wind and temperature measurements covering a wider altitude range of the middle atmosphere are rare (e.g., Goldberg et al., 2004). The main reason is the technical challenge of wind measurements in these altitudes. Radars-MST and MF radars do not cover the altitude range between 20 and 60 km due to the absence of free electrons; whereas the altitude range of meteor radars starts at ≈ 80 km altitude (see, e.g., Fig. 1 in Baumgarten, 2010). Balloons reach only top altitudes of 30–40 km. Meteorological rockets, equipped with chaff, falling spheres or starutes, are able to measure winds in the entire middle atmosphere between about 20 and 100 km (e.g., Widdel, 1987, 1990; Schmidlin et al., 1991; Lübken and Müllemann, 2003; Müllemann and Lübken, 2005). Such rocket soundings yield a reasonable vertical resolution, but are conducted only sporadically. Data from several campaigns at Arctic sites, which cover longer periods, have been published by, e.g., Meyer et al. (1987), Lübken and Müllemann (2003), and Müllemann and Lübken (2005). Microwave radiation is used to measure the Doppler shift of thermally excited molecules. This technique is used, e.g., by MLS-the MLS instrument onboard the Aura satellite (Wu et al., 2008) and the ground-based WIRA instrument (Rüfenacht et al., 2012, 2014), and had been used by the SMILES instrument onboard the ISS (Baron et al., 2013). Another approach is to measure the Doppler shift of airglow lines. This was done by the instruments HRDI and WINDII onboard UARS (Hays et al., 1993; Shepherd et al., 1993); TIDI onboard the TIMED satellite (Killeen et al., 2006) still employs this technique. A ground-based instrument which measures wind speeds by analyzing airglow is ERWIN II (Kristoffersen et al., 2013); since it relies on three dedicated airglow emissions only, its height range is limited to layers between 87 and 97 km altitude. An indirect approach to estimate wind speeds from satellite observations is to retrieve geostrophic winds from geopotential heights on fixed pressure levels (e.g., Randel, 1987). The lidar technique allows to derive wind speeds directly from measuring the Doppler shift of light backscattered at moving particles. Resolving the Doppler shift is technically challenging and wind lidars are therefore sophisticated instruments. While sodium resonance lidars yield wind speeds in the sodium layer between about 80 km and 105 km altitude (e.g., Liu et al., 2002; She et al., 2002; Franke et al., 2005; Yuan et al., 2012), Rayleigh lidars cover mainly altitudes below 50 km (e.g., Tepley, 1994; Friedman et al., 1997; Souprayen et al., 1999; Huang et al., 2009; Xia et al., 2012). Reports about regular wind measurements by lidar are scarce: Tepley (1994) presents winds between 10 and 60 km altitude, derived during 43 nights at the tropical site

Arecibo; Souprayen et al. (1999) derived horizontal winds during 170 nights in the altitude range 8–50 km at mid latitudes; regular observations of horizontal winds with sodium resonance lidars (80–105 km) were presented by Franke et al. (2005) and Yuan et al. (2012) for tropical and mid latitudes, respectively.

The ALOMAR Rayleigh/Mie/Raman (RMR) lidar is the only instrument that derives both horizontal wind components and temperature simultaneously from the upper stratosphere up to the mesosphere. In this study, we present horizontal winds and temperatures obtained by DoRIS, the Doppler Rayleigh Iodine Spectrometer of the ALOMAR RMR lidar, during the three January seasons 2012, 2014, and 2015, in total more than 300 h of observations. They provide the most extensive data set of simultaneous wind and temperature measurements in the middle atmosphere, and allow us to study the interannual variability of temperatures and winds ~~regarding year-to-year variations~~, the temporal evolution on time scales of days, e.g., after the stratospheric warming in January 2012, and during single nights. This study also analyzes the representation of temperatures and winds by the Integrated Forecast System (IFS) of the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) and the Horizontal Wind Model (HWM07) regarding the comparison to observational data. Subsequently, potential and kinetic energy densities of gravity waves and large-scale waves are calculated and analyzed.

2 Instrument

The ALOMAR RMR lidar (69.3°N, 16.0°E) is a twin lidar with two identical transmitting lasers, two identical receiving telescopes and one detection system. It measures temperatures and aerosols in the middle atmosphere on routine basis since 1997 (von Zahn et al., 2000; Schöch et al., 2008). Since 2009 the lidar measures wind speeds as well, using the Doppler Rayleigh Iodine Spectrometer DoRIS (Baumgarten, 2010). Detailed descriptions of the instrumental setup and the wind retrieval as well as initial results for the altitude range 30–85 km were presented by Baumgarten (2010), Hildebrand et al. (2012), and Lübken et al. (2016). Basically, the wind retrieval relies on measuring the Doppler shift of the backscattered light using iodine absorption spectroscopy; temperatures are retrieved by hydrostatic integration of altitude profiles of relative air density (Kent and Wright, 1970; Hauchecorne and Chanin, 1980). The two individually derived temperature profiles for both lasers/telescopes are averaged to one temperature profile; this reduces the measurement uncertainty, but the amplitudes of gravity waves are not affected significantly (since the distance of both sounding volumes is much shorter than typical horizontal wavelengths of the inertia gravity waves which are most prominent in the 1 h averaged profiles: 40 km distance at 80 km altitude compared to wavelengths of several hundred kilometers (e.g., Baumgarten et al., 2015)).

3 Data and processing

3.1 Data

The data set used for this study was acquired during nights in January 2012, 2014, and 2015. January 2013 is excluded since there exist only about 10 h of nighttime horizontal wind observations. The data were integrated over 1 h. The vertical resolution is 150 m, but data were smoothed with a running window with a size of 3 km. Typical uncertainties are 0.5 K and 3 m s⁻¹

at 50 km altitude but increase with altitude (due to less received backscattered light from higher altitudes, mainly due to decreasing air density). The retrieved temperature and wind speed profiles considered in this study are limited to measurement uncertainties of $\Delta T \leq 5$ K and $\Delta u = \Delta v \leq 20$ m s⁻¹, respectively. Due to technical issues the lower altitude limit in January 2014 and January 2015 is about 40 km instead of 30 km. As lidar operations depend on weather conditions, the observations are unequally distributed over the years: 65 h during seven nights between 19 and 30 January 2012, 170 h during 16 nights between 10 and 31 January 2014, and 78 h during five nights between 19 and 24 January 2015. Table 1 lists the nights and the respective duration of the lidar observations. Note that although the sampling is quite sparse in January 2012 and 2015, these are the only available simultaneous wind and temperature observations in the Arctic stratosphere and mesosphere. For the analysis of wave phenomena in Sect. 4.4 and 4.5 we restrict the data set to nights with observations of at least 10 h; this reduces the number of observations taken into account to two thirds of the entire data set, but the fraction of data taken into account is reduced by only one tenth. Table 2 gives an overview of the observations taken into account for analyses based on all nights and long observations only.

Additionally, model data are used for the location of ALOMAR: The European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts provides the Integrated Forecast System IFS. We extracted data with horizontal resolution T1279 at the location 69.28° N, 16.01° E (the data are available with horizontal resolution of 0.25°, we interpolated these horizontally on pressure levels to our location). We use data from the forecast system with a temporal resolution of 1 h; hence, lidar data and ECMWF data have the same temporal sampling. Profiles between midnight and noon were taken from the model run initialized at 00 UTC, profiles between noon and midnight were taken from the 12 UTC run. For January 2012 we used cycle Cy37r3, and for January 2014 and 2015 we used cycle Cy40r1. Both cycles differ, amongst others, in their vertical resolution, especially at higher altitudes: Cy37r3 has 91 model levels, Cy40r1 has 137 model levels. For each single 1 h profile the pressure coordinate is converted into geometric altitude; the profile is then interpolated to the vertical resolution of the lidar data. The Horizontal Wind Model HWM07 is an empirical model that accumulates data from different instruments obtained over fifty years (Drob et al., 2008). Therefore, the model does not contain any year-to-year variation, but has more character of a climatology. We extracted data on an hourly basis (corresponding to the temporal sampling of the lidar) for the location 69.3° N, 16.0° E.

3.2 Gravity wave energy density

We used the following equations (e.g., Geller and Gong, 2010) to derive potential and kinetic gravity wave energy density (GWED) per unit mass from temperature and wind speed fluctuations (T' , u' , and v' , respectively):

$$E_{\text{pot}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{g^2}{N^2} \left(\frac{T'}{\bar{T}} \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad E_{\text{kin}} = \frac{1}{2} (u'^2 + v'^2), \quad (1)$$

with g as gravitational acceleration, N as Brunt–Väisälä frequency, and \bar{T} as background temperature. The fluctuations are derived by subtracting the respective nightly mean profile. As stated by Ehard et al. (2015), applying this method might include tidal signatures in the resulting gravity wave energy densities; furthermore, the resolved GW spectrum depends on the length of an observation, which hinders comparison of GWEDs. Although Ehard et al. (2015) proposed applying a Butterworth filter

to extract GWs, we use the nightly mean method since we tested different approaches for background estimation with our lidar data and found no significant differences in the resulting GWEDs. To accommodate the mentioned drawbacks of the nightly mean method, we apply the following procedure: We take only measurements with at least 10 h duration into account (since the nightly mean profiles of shorter measurements would include wave-like features); within one night we then select the first ten 1 h profiles to calculate GWEDs for this time span (therefore, the covered GW spectrum is relatively wide and constant for all observations, although it might contain some short-scale tidal components); we shift the 10 h window by 1 h and repeat the GWED calculation as often as the window fits into the observation period of that night (therefore, different phases of possibly included tides are sampled); finally we calculate the mean and the standard deviation of all the GWED profiles of one night (therefore, we can estimate the GWED variability during single nights).

4 Results

4.1 January variability

For a first descriptive presentation of the data set, Fig. 1 shows mean altitude profiles of temperatures and horizontal winds for Januaries 2012, 2014, and 2015. It is evident that the mean profiles for the three years differ remarkably. While in 2012 highest temperatures of 245 K occur at 38 km altitude, highest temperatures in 2014 are 270 K and occur at 50 km altitude; the temperatures in 2012 and 2015 show enhanced variability around 70 and 60 km altitude, respectively, but there is no such enhanced variability in 2014. The strength of the eastward zonal winds varies, too: In 2014 and 2015 highest wind speeds of 50–70 m s⁻¹ occur around 45 km altitude, while zonal wind in 2012 the zonal wind is weak at this height; but in 2012, and the highest zonal wind speeds occur between 62 and 72 km, with enhanced variability. Mean meridional winds even have different directions in different years: In 2012 it is mainly northward, in 2014 it has no predominant direction, and in 2015 it is mainly southward.

Besides this noticeable year-to-year variations we find large variability within the Januaries of the different years. The standard deviations of temperature data at 50 km respectively and 70 km altitude are 6 K and 21 K in January 2012, 8 K and 7 K in January 2014, and 4 K and 9 K in January 2015; noteworthy is the increased standard deviation of 18 K at 60 km altitude in January 2015. The standard deviations of zonal and meridional wind data are of nearly same size (± 2 m s⁻¹), namely at 50 km respectively 70 km altitude: 18 m s⁻¹ and 29 m s⁻¹ in January 2012, 24 m s⁻¹ and 26 m s⁻¹ in January 2014, and 20 m s⁻¹ and 30 m s⁻¹ in January 2015.

Concluding from the remarkable year-to-year variations and variabilities within Januaries of different years: The polar middle atmosphere in January cannot be described by one single “winter state”, and it is not appropriate to infer a general statement or even a climatology from observations of only a few seasons. To investigate the variations in one single month an example is shown in the next section.

4.2 Elevated stratopause and polar-vortex reformation after minor SSW in January 2012

During winters, variability in the polar middle atmosphere is mainly caused by planetary waves and sudden stratospheric warmings (SSW): Depending on their type and strength, the polar vortex may be weakened, displaced, or even split; warmer air from mid-latitudes may intrude into the polar region (e.g., Matsuno, 1971; Labitzke, 1972). The number of SSWs during one season and the time at which they appear vary from year to year (e.g., Labitzke and Kunze, 2012). Around 15 January 2012 a minor SSW, which was a vortex displacement event, occurred (Chandran et al., 2013; Matthias et al., 2013). The ALOMAR RMR lidar ~~has taken~~ took data during the following days and weeks, i.e., in the aftermath of the SSW. Figure 2 shows the temporal evolution of temperature and zonal and meridional wind after the SSW, starting on 19 January until 4 February. Except ~~of~~ for the double-stratopause structure, the temperature profiles from 19 January do not look unusual; the temperature increase between 70 and 80 km altitude indicates a mesospheric inversion layer, whose investigation is, however, beyond the scope of this study. ~~Though~~ In contrast, the westward zonal winds are exceptional for winter, which is probably a result of the vortex displacement. The strength and relative position of the polar vortex can be inferred from the potential vorticity: Rex et al. (1998) define 36 PVU at the 475 K potential temperature level as the edge of the polar vortex. ~~Basing~~ Based on this definition and using potential vorticity and potential temperature from ECMWF data, we find that ALOMAR is situated inside the polar vortex during that night. It has to be kept in mind that the polar vortex might bend and twist and therefore the vortex location as defined at 475 K (≈ 19 km altitude) may not always represent the situation in the upper strato- and mesosphere. Only a few days later (21/22 and 22/23 January) the stratopause ~~is~~ was ≈ 15 to 20 K colder and the upper mesosphere around 70 km altitude ~~is~~ was ≈ 15 to 20 K warmer; zonal winds ~~are now~~ were weakly eastward over the entire altitude range and meridional winds ~~are developing~~ developed from weakly southward toward weakly northward with only small variations in altitude. In the first of these two nights the polar vortex edge was above ALOMAR, while in the second night ALOMAR was situated outside the vortex. Baumgarten et al. (2015) show time-altitude sections of temperature and wind data of this period, which exhibit very pronounced gravity wave structures. During the following week, the thermal and dynamic structure over ALOMAR changed remarkably: ~~The~~ On 28/29 and 29/30 January, the temperature maximum around 40 km altitude vanished ~~, highest temperatures occur now (28/29 and 29/30 January)~~ and the highest temperatures shifted upward to around 70 km altitude; at roughly the same altitude where maxima of zonal and meridional wind ~~occur~~ occurred. ALOMAR was again situated inside the polar vortex. During the beginning of February, the maxima in temperature, zonal wind, and meridional wind ~~even intensify and descend further down~~ intensified and descended further. These phenomena are closely connected to the preceding SSW: They are referred to as elevated stratopause and reformation of the polar vortex, which sometimes occur after stratospheric warmings (e.g., Labitzke, 1972; Manney et al., 2009). In contrast to ~~the present study, these~~ this work, those two studies analyzed vortex split events with a complete breakdown of the polar vortex.

Concluding, the minor SSW of 2012 is peculiar: It is followed by an elevated stratopause event, although it is neither a major warming nor a vortex split event. Thus, this ~~SSW is an example~~ observation is evidence that elevated stratopause events can occur even after minor SSW, as previously stated by de la Torre et al. (2012) and Chandran et al. (2013). Although the basic mechanisms of elevated stratopauses and the polar vortex reformation are known (e.g., Tomikawa et al., 2012) and

temperatures and zonal mean zonal winds were derived previously (winds only indirectly from geopotential-height observations by satellites (e.g., Manney et al., 2009)), this is the first time to our knowledge that an elevated stratopause together with the reformation of the polar vortex ~~were~~ have been observed with a direct temperature and wind measurement technique. These unique observations reveal features which are not represented in ECMWF data, which highlights the need for observations of such peculiar events to broaden the data basis against which models can be compared to test their fidelity. The differences, which are present in temperature and wind data as well, highlight the importance of local observations with adequate spatial and temporal resolution, and will be discussed in detail in the following section.

4.3 Comparison to models

Figure 2 includes data extracted from ECMWF. Especially above 50 km altitude the comparison between lidar and ECMWF is dissatisfying, particularly for the end of January and beginning of February: The elevated stratopause and the reformation of the polar vortex are not captured ~~sufficiently~~ in ECMWF. This yields to differences of up to 40 K and 20 m s⁻¹, respectively. One explanation for the poor comparison might be that this period was affected by an SSW. Therefore, we ~~study the comparison of~~ compare lidar data with ECMWF and HWM07 data for the whole data set, which is shown in Fig. 3: It depicts the same lidar profiles as Fig. 1 and mean profiles taken from ECMWF for January 2012 (panel a), January 2014 (b), and January 2015 (c), and data cumulated over all three seasons, including HWM07 (d). Note that all three data sets have the same temporal sampling. The standard deviation is calculated as the deviation of all 1 h profiles of one month from the monthly mean profile, which is calculated from these 1 h profiles.

We first concentrate on HWM07 data (panel d, winds only). Although HWM07 is more like a climatology without any year-to-year variation, some studies use it as representation of mean or background wind fields, even for single case studies, (e.g., Assink et al., 2012; Hedlin and Walker, 2012; Fee et al., 2013). However, HWM07 describes the actual winds ~~insufficiently:~~ Zonal inadequately: The zonal wind is too weak in the upper stratosphere (compared to ECMWF) and too strong in the upper mesosphere (compared to lidar), with differences are up to 20 m s⁻¹; in between mean zonal wind matches quite well. HWM07's meridional wind is ~~too strong northward~~ in the entire altitude range covered, while the mean observed meridional wind is weakly southward below 60 km altitude and weakly northward above; differences are on the order of 30 m s⁻¹. It is remarkable that the meridional wind in HWM07 is not only of different magnitude than the observed winds but also of different direction. The temporal variability (indicated by the standard deviation) is much smaller than for the lidar data. One reason for this discrepancy, aside from the missing year-to-year variations in HWM07, is the limited number of observations taken into account in HWM07 for this location and altitude range (see Tab. 1 in Drob et al. (2008)).

Comparison with ECMWF data: The data of 2014 and 2015 were not affected by SSWs, but still the temperature comparison between lidar and ECMWF is not good: The stratopause is too cold (up to 10 K) and too low (up to 4 km) in ECMWF; at higher altitudes temperatures from ECMWF are much too low, namely up to 25 K. This can also be seen in panel (a) of Fig. 4, which shows altitude profiles of the mean of the hourly differences ($\Delta x = \frac{1}{N} \sum (x_{\text{ECMWF}} - x_{\text{lidar}})$), including the respective standard deviation and the standard error of the mean for the lidar data. Regarding zonal winds, the comparison between ECMWF and lidar is nonuniform for the three years: In 2012 and 2014 it is very good below 60 km altitude with mean differences

of ~~only around~~ 2 m s^{-1} or ~~even smaller below~~ less, while above 60 km altitude ~~;-above-~~ mean differences are up to 20 m s^{-1} ~~;-respectively and~~ 15 m s^{-1} , respectively; in 2015 mean differences between 10 and 20 m s^{-1} occur ~~in the entire altitude range between throughout the altitude range of~~ 45 ~~and to~~ 70 km. For meridional winds the comparison is much better: Mean differences are mostly smaller than or around 5 m s^{-1} only, hence on the same order as the standard error of the mean of
5 the lidar data. Similar results concerning ECMWF temperatures in the middle and upper mesosphere were reported by, e.g., Le Pichon et al. (2015). They state that the wave-like pattern of the ~~differences~~ difference profile might be caused by a quasi-stationary planetary wave structure. A study by Rüfenacht et al. (2014) applying wind radiometry found good agreement of observed winds and ECMWF wind data in the stratosphere, but deviations in the mesosphere ~~of~~ up to 50% of the true wind speeds. Please note that the ECMWF IFS cycles used in these studies differ from the ones used in this study.

10 Figure 4(b) shows distributions of differences on between ECMWF and lidar on an hourly basis for different altitude ranges. The distributions of differences are ~~getting~~ broader for higher altitudes; some distributions are not symmetrical, indicating systematic under- or overestimations for the respective measure. This is especially true for temperatures and zonal winds above 50 km altitude; but does not appear for meridional winds in the entire altitude range covered.

This leads to studying the comparison of lidar and ECMWF data on shorter time scales: Figure 5 shows all 1 h profiles of
15 temperature, zonal, and meridional wind speed, derived by lidar during the night 20/21 January 2015 (between 14:40 UTC and 07:30 UTC) and extracted from ECMWF corresponding to the temporal and altitude sampling of the lidar ~~(and interpolated to the vertical resolution of the lidar data)~~. Despite the differences between the mean lidar and ECMWF profiles, it is obvious that the lidar data show a larger variability in altitude and time. These differences on smaller scales are the reason for the width of the distribution of differences shown in Fig. 4(b). Despite the differences of single 1 h profiles or nightly mean profiles in principle,
20 the smaller temporal and vertical variability in ECMWF data might indicate that the amount of energy and momentum which is transported by waves is underestimated in ECMWF, which might cause part of the discrepancies of the mean state as shown in Fig. 4(a).

To study the comparison of the variability of each data set in more detail, the dashed lines in Fig. 5 show the root mean square (RMS) of the fluctuations of the 1 h profiles, hence their variability. The RMS of the lidar data increases with altitude,
25 indicating an increase of the amplitudes of the temperature and wind fluctuations (note that the RMS increases faster and is always larger than the mean measurement uncertainty of the lidar data). This is what is expected for the effect of gravity waves, as their amplitudes increase with altitude due to the decreasing air density. In contrast, the RMS profiles of the ECMWF data do not show a general increase with altitude and in large part of the altitude range the RMS of the ECMWF data is smaller than the RMS of the lidar data. This is also true for the whole data set, as can be seen in Fig. 4(c): For each night with at least
30 ten hours of data the RMS of the lidar data and the RMS of the ECMWF data are calculated, ~~then~~. Then the monthly average of the ratio of both is calculated and drawn. In general, the higher in altitude the worse is the actual variability represented in ECMWF, ~~down to~~. Above $\approx 75 \text{ km}$ altitude the ECMWF variability is only one tenth of the variability observed by lidar; one exception is the temperature in January 2012, when the ECMWF variability even at high altitudes is about one third of the lidar variability. Similar results regarding the height-dependent underestimation of gravity wave amplitudes were also reported
35 by Schroeder et al. (2009) ~~;-~~. From a comparison of model data with global satellite observations they infer that temperature

amplitudes in ECMWF are underestimated by a factor of 2 at 28 km altitude and more than five times above 40 km altitude. The reason for the underestimation of the variability at higher altitudes are likely damping mechanisms that are applied in the ECMWF model; an extensive overview of several such approaches is given by Jablonowski and Williamson (2011).

Concluding, ECMWF and especially HWM07 do not represent the thermal and dynamic state of the middle atmosphere sufficiently, ~~regarding January-mean profiles and neither regarding January mean profiles nor~~ the variability within ~~single individual~~ nights, which ~~is-are~~ underestimated in ECMWF data. This distinct underestimation of the temporal variability of temperatures and winds affects the ~~calculated~~ energy budget of gravity waves, which are the main source of fluctuations on the scale of a few hours. Resulting gravity wave energy densities ~~will-be-are~~ discussed in the next section.

4.4 Gravity wave energy density

The combination of simultaneous wind and temperature measurements allows ~~us~~ to perform wave studies in more detail. For instance, the energy budget of gravity waves consists of potential and kinetic gravity wave energy; ~~while~~. ~~While~~ the former depends on the temperature fluctuations, the latter is based on the wind speed fluctuations. ~~We used the following equations (e.g., Geller and Gong, 2010) to derive potential and kinetic gravity wave energy density (GWED) per unit mass from temperature and wind speed fluctuations (T' , u' , and v' , respectively):-~~

$$E_{\text{pot}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{g^2}{N^2} \left(\frac{T'}{\bar{T}} \right)^2 \text{ and } E_{\text{kin}} = \frac{1}{2} (u'^2 + v'^2),$$

~~with g as gravitational acceleration, N as Brunt-Väisälä frequency, and \bar{T} as background temperature. The fluctuations are derived by subtracting the respective nightly mean profile. As stated by Ehard et al. (2015), applying this method might include tidal signatures in the resulting gravity wave energy densities; furthermore, the resolved GW spectrum depends on the length of an observation, which hinders comparison of GWEDs. Although Ehard et al. (2015) proposed applying a Butterworth filter to extract GWs, we use the nightly mean method since we tested different approaches for background estimation with our lidar data and found no significant differences in the resulting GWEDs. To accommodate the mentioned drawbacks of the nightly mean method, we apply the following procedure: We take only measurements with at least 10 h duration into account (since the nightly mean profiles of shorter measurements would include wave-like features); within one night we then select the first ten 1 h profiles to calculate GWEDs for this time span (therefore, the covered GW spectrum is relatively wide and constant for all observations, although it might contain some short-scale tidal components); we shift the 10 h window by 1 h and repeat the GWED calculation as often as the window fits into the observation period of that night (therefore, different phases of possibly included tides are sampled); finally we calculate the mean and the standard deviation of all the GWED profiles of one night (therefore, we can estimate the GWED variability during single nights). As an ~~As an~~ example, the left panel of Fig. 6 shows vertical profiles of potential and kinetic GWED for the night 20/21 January 2015. Except at around 47 km and 52 km altitude, the kinetic GWED is larger than the potential GWED, mostly ~~by~~ four to five times (shown in the right panel of Fig. 6). As expected from Eq. (1) the potential GWED shows minima and maxima at the same altitudes as the minima and~~

maxima of the temperature fluctuations (cf. Fig. 5); while the kinetic GWED correlates to features of zonal and meridional wind fluctuations (e.g., the minimum of kinetic GWED at 67 km altitude).

The middle panel of Fig. 6 shows the total GWED. Between 47 and 53 km altitude, and above 67 km the total GWED increases with altitude. In between is a layer of ~~slightly decreasing total GWED, caused mainly by the decrease of potential~~

5 ~~GWED~~ nearly constant total GWED where the kinetic GWED is roughly constant and the potential GWED slightly decreases.

A possible reason might be the near adiabatic temperature gradient between 50 and 60 km altitude (some profiles show gradients of $\approx -7 \text{ K km}^{-1}$), which hinders the upward propagation of gravity waves.

The right panel of Fig. 6 shows the ratio of kinetic to potential GWED and the intrinsic period $2\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1}$ that a monochromatic low- or medium-frequency gravity wave with the given E_{pot} and E_{kin} would have (Geller and Gong, 2010):

$$10 \quad \hat{\omega} = \pm f \sqrt{\frac{E_{\text{kin}}/E_{\text{pot}} + 1}{E_{\text{kin}}/E_{\text{pot}} - 1}}, \quad (2)$$

with the Coriolis parameter $f = 2\Omega \sin \phi$ (Ω : angular speed of Earth's rotation, ϕ : latitude of observation). We have shown earlier that at times of quasi-monochromatic waves the intrinsic periods calculated from the energy ratios agree to the results of the hodograph method (Baumgarten et al., 2015). While the hodograph method can only be applied in the case of a quasi-monochromatic wave – because it would otherwise be hard or even impossible to identify an ellipse from the zonal and meridional wind fluctuations –, the energy ratio method is applicable also to wind and temperature fluctuations caused by various waves, keeping in mind that the derived $2\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1}$ is not the intrinsic period of a certain wave. However, the method has been applied previously to data sets probably affected by superposition of various gravity waves (e.g., Geller and Gong, 2010; Baumgarten et al., 2015). Note that since temperature and horizontal wind fluctuations are more sensitive to long-period gravity waves than to short-period gravity waves, the energy ratio method is biased toward long-period gravity waves, as stated by Lane et al. (2003) and evaluated by Geller and Gong (2010, their App. A). Nevertheless, due to the temporal integration of the data [presented here](#), short-period gravity waves are discarded anyway. The retrieved $2\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1}$ is larger than 8 h in most parts; highest values are about 11 h, reasonably smaller than the upper limit of $2\pi f^{-1} = 12.82 \text{ h}$. According to the relationship for the group velocity vector (e.g., Fritts and Alexander, 2003)

$$20 \quad (c_{gx}, c_{gy}, c_{gz}) = (\bar{u}, \bar{v}, 0) + \frac{[k(N^2 - \hat{\omega}^2), l(N^2 - \hat{\omega}^2), -m(\hat{\omega}^2 - f^2)]}{\hat{\omega} (k^2 + l^2 + m^2 + \frac{1}{4H^2})}, \quad (3)$$

25 with k, l, m as zonal, meridional, and vertical wave number, respectively, this indicates a more horizontal wave propagation, as $\hat{\omega}^2 - f^2 \rightarrow 0$ (and $\hat{\omega}^2 \ll N^2$). The two pronounced minima of $2\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1}$ around 46 km and 53 km altitude are caused by equality of potential and kinetic GWED; wind fluctuations are quite low at these altitudes, while the temperature fluctuations are quite large. This then indicates waves which propagate more vertically, as the weight of $N^2 - \hat{\omega}^2$ in Eq. (3) decreases and the weight of $\hat{\omega}^2 - f^2$ increases. The different vertical-to-horizontal propagation conditions at 46 km and 53 km compared to the remaining altitude ranges may ~~be caused by different reasons~~ have different causes: 1. different origin of the waves; 2. changing background propagation conditions, i.e., filtering/Doppler shift due to the strong zonal wind shear ~~in this altitude range at these altitudes, reducing wind speeds~~ from 80 m s^{-1} to 20 m s^{-1} . A clear distinction ~~of both~~ between these possible explanations is

not possible: While the second option is clearly visible in Fig. 5 (large temperature gradient and strong wind shear), the first option can not be excluded. However, a detailed investigation of propagation conditions is beyond the scope of this study.

Figure 6 includes also GWEDs and the $2\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1}$ derived from ECMWF data for the same time period. In the lower part (up to ≈ 50 km altitude), the GWEDs are comparable to the lidar data. Above, the total GWED derived from ECMWF data decreases with altitude. Therefore, at 70 km altitude the GWEDs derived from ECMWF data are nearly two orders of magnitude too small. The kinetic-to-potential GWED ratio is on the same order as the GWED ratio derived by lidar, although the shapes differ, yielding differing profiles of $2\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1}$.

Are these results special or typical? Figure 7 shows mean GWEDs for January 2012, 2014, and 2015, derived from lidar (panel a) and ECMWF data (panel b). For this, altitude profiles of GWED of all nights with at least 10 h of data were averaged. Comparing Figs. 6 and 7(a), the data from 20/21 January 2015 is not unusual. Although the mean total GWED of January 2015 increases ~~in nearly the entire~~ nearly throughout the altitude range (in contrast to the data of 20/21 January 2015), the increase is slightly ~~larger steeper~~ below ≈ 55 km altitude than it is above. The same is true for January 2014. In January 2012 the GWED between 40 and 60 km altitude is somewhat smaller than in January 2014 and 2015. The increase of total GWED with altitude exhibits a scale height of ≈ 16 km. This is 2.3 times larger than the pressure scale height of 7 km; a relation previously obtained by Fritts and VanZandt (1993) by posing a model gravity wave spectrum. The same scale height was found by Kaifler et al. (2015), although they observed potential energy densities only. Similar scale heights for total energy density and potential energy density would imply a kinetic-to-potential GWED ratio constant with altitude. However, our observations show that the kinetic-to-potential GWED ratio is typically between 5 and 10 and slightly increases with altitude, as can be seen in the right panel of Fig. 7(a). When comparing absolute values of GWED to previous studies it is necessary to keep in mind that GWEDs depend on season, locally different wave sources, and data analysis procedures (e.g., Baumgarten et al., 2017). Nevertheless, studies by Alexander et al. (2011) and Mzé et al. (2014) at Antarctic and mid-latitude stations, respectively, found quantitatively similar results for potential GWEDs averaged over multiple years. Comparing data obtained at high-latitude stations is further affected by the position of the polar vortex, as shown by Whiteway et al. (1997).

Looking at mean GWEDs derived from ECMWF, below 45 km altitude they are of similar order as the mean total GWEDs derived from lidar data. Above, the mean GWEDs derived from ECMWF are more or less constant with altitude, yielding an underestimation of GWED in ECMWF by factor 3 to 10. This is in line with the underestimated temporal temperature and wind speed variability found in Sect. 4.3.

4.5 Larger-scale variations

Applying the method to calculate energy densities not on 1 h profiles (as described in Sect. 3.2) but on all nightly mean temperature and wind speed profiles of one month yields energy densities on a larger time scale. Taking into account only nights with at least 10 h of observations largely reduces the effect of gravity waves and highlights the contribution from planetary waves or diurnal tides. It has to be noted that applying Eq. (1) to such large-scale variations assumes vertical displacements to be adiabatic and periodic, and advection is neglected. Analogous to the term gravity wave energy density (GWED) we will use the term large-scale wave energy density (LWED) to denote the so derived energy densities. The results for January 2012,

January 2014, and January 2015 are shown in Fig. 8, for lidar data (panel a) and ECMWF data (panel b). Compared to GWED, potential and kinetic LWEDs are more variable with altitude and it occurs more often, that potential LWED is larger than kinetic LWED. Therefore, kinetic-to-potential LWED ratios vary over more than two orders of magnitude. Although total LWEDs show distinct vertical variations, the overall increase with altitude is rather small: It slightly increases in January 2012 (with a local maximum around 70 km altitude) and January 2014 and slightly decreases in January 2015 with a local maximum around 60 km altitude. Contrary to GWED, total LWED derived from ECMWF data is roughly of the same order of magnitude as the total LWED obtained from lidar data, not only in the lower part but in the entire altitude range; e.g., at 61 km altitude mean total LWEDs range from $\approx 2.2 \cdot 10^2 \text{ J kg}^{-1}$ to $\approx 7.3 \cdot 10^2 \text{ J kg}^{-1}$ for the lidar data and from $\approx 1.7 \cdot 10^2 \text{ J kg}^{-1}$ to $\approx 2.4 \cdot 10^2 \text{ J kg}^{-1}$ for the ECMWF data. The kinetic-to-potential energy ratio is larger for the ECMWF data compared to lidar data; especially above 55 km altitude. The explanation is that while the kinetic LWEDs derived from lidar data and ECMWF data are of the same order, the potential LWEDs derived from ECMWF data are smaller than derived from lidar data. Hence, the day-to-day variability of temperatures in ECMWF is too weak, which is visible in Fig. 2 for January 2012.

Comparison of GWED and LWED profiles shows that LWEDs are mainly on the same order of magnitude as GWEDs. Increased mean LWED-to-GWED ratios (up to 10) occur between 60 km and 70 km altitude and below 50 km altitude for potential energy densities, and below 50 km altitude for kinetic energy densities, as is shown in Fig. 9. The total LWED is about 2 to 6 times larger than the total GWED.

5 Summary and conclusions

We presented results of more than 300 h of simultaneous temperature and wind observations by Doppler lidar in the Arctic stratosphere and mesosphere, ranging from 30 up to about 85 km altitude, obtained during Januaries 2012, 2014, and 2015.

Considering only these three years, large variability in the mean temperatures and horizontal winds is observed. The temperature and wind data were affected by large-scale dynamics in the middle atmosphere, e.g., an SSW in January 2012. After this minor SSW, two phenomena that are commonly linked to major SSWs (in particular polar vortex split events) were observed by the ALOMAR RMR lidar: an elevated stratopause and the reformation of the polar vortex. This large-scale activity can be seen for example in the LWED for January 2012 at about 70 km altitude when comparing to altitudes below or the Januaries 2014 and 2015.

We compared mean temperatures and winds from lidar observations to ECMWF and HWM07 data, where we used model data only at times of the lidar observations. Below ≈ 55 km altitude monthly mean zonal and meridional winds derived from lidar observations and extracted from ECMWF model data agree very well, with differences smaller than 2 m s^{-1} and 5 m s^{-1} , respectively. Above, we found differences of up to 20 K, 20 m s^{-1} , and 5 m s^{-1} for monthly mean profiles of temperature, zonal, and meridional wind, respectively, between lidar and ECMWF data and of up to 30 m s^{-1} between lidar and HWM07 data.

Analysis of monthly mean gravity wave energy densities showed an increase of total GWED per unit mass with altitude with a scale height of ≈ 16 km, which agrees with previously published values. ~~From~~ For one sample night we investigated

the ratio of kinetic to potential GWED ~~-(which is typically 5 to 10) the intrinsic period that a monochromatic gravity wave with the given energy densities would have is deduced for one exemplary night, which~~ and found that it varies remarkably with altitude. These variations ~~of $\hat{\omega}$~~ might be caused by diverse origins of the waves or changing background conditions for wave propagation. Comparison with ECMWF data shows that GWEDs are underestimated in ECMWF by factor 3 to 10
5 above 50 km altitude. Analyzing fluctuations of nightly mean profiles allows a similar study for large-scale waves instead of gravity waves. Compared to GWEDs, the LWEDs show larger vertical variations but the overall increase with altitude is smaller. Contrary to GWEDs, the kinetic-to-potential LWED ratios might become smaller 1, this indicates more variability in temperature than in wind, which applies for the remarkable temperature changes in January 2012 at 40 km and 70 km altitude in the course of the SSW (cf. Fig. 2). Likewise, a ratio larger 1 indicates larger wind speed variability, e.g., in January 2014 and
10 January 2015 around 50 km altitude, when the stratopause temperature is quite stable while wind speeds vary strongly (they are affected sensitively by the shape and position of the polar vortex). Total LWEDs derived from ECMWF data agree reasonably well to LWEDs derived from lidar data: E.g., at 61 km altitude the mean LWEDs derived from lidar and ECMWF data are $\approx 4.5 \cdot 10^2 \text{ J kg}^{-1}$ and $\approx 2.0 \cdot 10^2 \text{ J kg}^{-1}$, respectively. LWEDs are mainly on the same order of magnitude as GWEDs. Altitudes of enhanced large-scale variations, namely between 60 km and 70 km altitude for temperatures and below 50 km
15 altitude for winds, they exceed GWEDs by up to 10. The total LWED is about 2 to 5 times larger than the total GWED.

In future studies daylight data will be included, which will allow to capture tidal effects and extend the analyses to other seasons.

Acknowledgements. This study benefited from the excellent support by the dedicated staff at the ALOMAR observatory and the voluntary lidar operators during winter campaigns. The European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) is gratefully acknowledged
20 for providing the forecast data; cycles Cy37r3 and Cy40r1 were used in this study. The DoRIS project was supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation, No. BA 2834/1-1). This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under grant agreement No. 653980 (ARISE2), and was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under project No. LU 1174 (PACOG) and by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research through the program Role Of The Middle atmosphere In Climate (ROMIC).

References

- Alexander, S. P., Klekociuk, A. R., and Murphy, D. J.: Rayleigh lidar observations of gravity wave activity in the winter upper stratosphere and lower mesosphere above Davis, Antarctica (69°S, 78°E), *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, n/a–n/a, doi:10.1029/2010JD015164, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2010JD015164>, d13109, 2011.
- 5 Assink, J. D., Waxler, R., and Drob, D.: On the sensitivity of infrasonic traveltimes in the equatorial region to the atmospheric tides, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, n/a–n/a, doi:10.1029/2011JD016107, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016107>, d01110, 2012.
- Baron, P., Murtagh, D. P., Urban, J., Sagawa, H., Ochiai, S., Kasai, Y., Kikuchi, K., Khosrawi, F., Körnich, H., Mizobuchi, S., Sagi, K., and Yasui, M.: Observation of horizontal winds in the middle-atmosphere between 30° S and 55° N during the northern winter 2009–2010, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 6049–6064, doi:10.5194/acp-13-6049-2013, <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/13/6049/2013/>, 2013.
- 10 Baumgarten, G.: Doppler Rayleigh/Mie/Raman lidar for wind and temperature measurements in the middle atmosphere up to 80 km, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 3, 1509–1518, 2010.
- Baumgarten, G., Fiedler, J., Hildebrand, J., and Lübken, F.-J.: Inertia gravity wave in the stratosphere and mesosphere observed by Doppler wind and temperature lidar, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42, 10,929–10,936, doi:10.1002/2015GL066991, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015GL066991>, 2015GL066991, 2015.
- 15 Baumgarten, K., Gerding, M., and Lübken, F.-J.: Seasonal variation of gravity wave parameters using different filter methods with daylight lidar measurements at mid-latitudes, *J. Geophys. Res.*, accepted, 2017.
- Bossert, K., Fritts, D. C., Pautet, P.-D., Taylor, M. J., Williams, B. P., and Pendelton, W. R.: Investigation of a mesospheric gravity wave ducting event using coordinated sodium lidar and Mesospheric Temperature Mapper measurements at ALOMAR, Norway (69°N), *J. Geophys. Res.*, 119, 9765–9778, doi:10.1002/2014JD021460, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2014JD021460>, 2014JD021460, 2014.
- 20 Chandran, A., Collins, R. L., Garcia, R. R., Marsh, D. R., Harvey, V. L., Yue, J., and de la Torre, L.: A climatology of elevated stratopause events in the whole atmosphere community climate model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 118, 1234–1246, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50123, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50123>, 2013.
- Chandran, A., Garcia, R. R., Collins, R. L., and Chang, L. C.: Secondary planetary waves in the middle and upper atmosphere following the stratospheric sudden warming event of January 2012, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 1861–1867, doi:10.1002/grl.50373, 2013.
- 25 Chanin, M. L. and Hauchecorne, A.: Lidar Observation of Gravity and tidal Waves in the Stratosphere and Mesosphere, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 86, 9715–9721, 1981.
- de la Torre, L., Garcia, R. R., Barriopedro, D., and Chandran, A.: Climatology and characteristics of stratospheric sudden warmings in the Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, n/a–n/a, doi:10.1029/2011JD016840, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016840>, 2012.
- 30 Dörnbrack, A., Gisinger, S., and Kaifler, B.: On the Interpretation of Gravity Wave Measurements by Ground-Based Lidars, *Atmosphere*, 8, doi:10.3390/atmos8030049, <http://www.mdpi.com/2073-4433/8/3/49>, 2017.
- Drob, D. P., Emmert, J. T., Crowley, G., Picone, J. M., Shepherd, G. G., Skinner, W., Hays, P., Niciejewski, R. J., Larsen, M., She, C.-Y., Meriwether, J. W., Hernandez, G., Jarvis, M. J., Sipler, D. P., Tepley, C. A., O'Brien, M. S., Bowman, J. R., Wu, Q., Murayama, Y., Kawamura, S., Reid, I. M., and Vincent, R. A.: An empirical model of the Earth's horizontal wind fields: HWM07, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 35, 2008.
- Eckermann, S. D., Hirota, I., and Hocking, W. K.: Gravity wave and equatorial wave morphology of the stratosphere derived from long-term rocket soundings, *Quart. J. R. Met. Soc.*, 121, 149–186, doi:10.1002/qj.49712152108, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/qj.49712152108>, 1995.

- Ehard, B., Kaifler, B., Kaifler, N., and Rapp, M.: Evaluation of methods for gravity wave extraction from middle-atmospheric lidar temperature measurements, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 8, 4645–4655, doi:10.5194/amt-8-4645-2015, <http://www.atmos-meas-tech.net/8/4645/2015/>, 2015.
- Fee, D., Waxler, R., Assink, J., Gitterman, Y., Given, J., Coyne, J., Mialle, P., Garcés, M., Drob, D., Kleinert, D., Hofstetter, R., and Grenard, P.: Overview of the 2009 and 2011 Sayarim Infrasound Calibration Experiments, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 118, 6122–6143, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50398, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50398>, 2013.
- Franke, S. J., Chu, X., Liu, A. Z., and Hocking, W. K.: Comparison of meteor radar and Na Doppler lidar measurements of winds in the mesopause region above Maui, Hawaii, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, D09S02, doi:10.1029/2003JD004486, 2005.
- Friedman, J. S., Tepley, C. A., Castleberg, P. A., and Roe, H.: Middle-atmospheric Doppler lidar using an iodine-vapor edge filter, *Opt. Lett.*, 22, 1648–1650, 1997.
- Fritts, D. C. and Alexander, M. J.: Gravity wave dynamics and effects in the middle atmosphere, *Rev. Geophys.*, 41, 1003, doi:10.1029/2001RG000106, 2003.
- Fritts, D. C. and VanZandt, T. E.: Spectral estimates of gravity wave energy and momentum fluxes. Part I: Energy dissipation, acceleration, and constraints., *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 50, 3685–3694, doi:10.1175/1520-0469(1993)050<3685:SEOGWE>2.0.CO;2, 1993.
- Geller, M. A.: Dynamics of the middle atmosphere, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 34, 359–375, 1983.
- Geller, M. A. and Gong, J.: Gravity wave kinetic, potential, and vertical fluctuation energies as indicators of different frequency gravity waves, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, n/a–n/a, doi:10.1029/2009JD012266, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2009JD012266>, 2010.
- Gill, A. E.: *Atmosphere–Ocean Dynamics*, vol. 30 of *International Geophysics Series*, Academic Press, 1982.
- Goldberg, R. A., Fritts, D. C., Williams, B. P., Lübken, F.-J., Rapp, M., Singer, W., Latteck, R., Hoffmann, P., Müllemann, A., Baumgarten, G., Schmidlin, F. J., She, C.-Y., and Krueger, D. A.: The MaCWAVE/MIDAS rocket and ground-based measurements of polar summer dynamics: Overview and mean state structure, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31, n/a–n/a, doi:10.1029/2004GL019411, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2004GL019411>, 124S02, 2004.
- Hauchecorne, A. and Chanin, M.-L.: Density and temperature profiles obtained by lidar between 35 and 70 km, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 7, 565–568, doi:10.1029/GL007i008p00565, 1980.
- Hays, P. B., Abreu, V. J., Dobbs, M. E., Gell, D. A., Grassl, H. J., and Skinner, W. R.: The High-Resolution Doppler Imager on the Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 10 713, doi:10.1029/93JD00409, 1993.
- Hedlin, M. A. H. and Walker, K. T.: A study of infrasonic anisotropy and multipathing in the atmosphere using seismic networks, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 371, doi:10.1098/rsta.2011.0542, <http://rsta.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/371/1984/20110542>, 2012.
- Hildebrand, J., Baumgarten, G., Fiedler, J., Hoppe, U.-P., Kaifler, B., Lübken, F.-J., and Williams, B. P.: Combined wind measurements in the Arctic middle atmosphere, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 5, 2433–2445, doi:10.5194/amt-5-2433-2012, 2012.
- Holton, J. R.: The Influence of Gravity Wave Breaking on the General Circulation of the Middle Atmosphere, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 40, 2497–2507, doi:10.1175/1520-0469(1983)040<2497:TIOGWB>2.0.CO;2, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1983\)040<2497:TIOGWB>2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1983)040<2497:TIOGWB>2.0.CO;2), 1983.
- Huang, W., Chu, X., Williams, B. P., Harrell, S. D., Wiig, J., and She, C.-Y.: Na double-edge magneto-optic filter for Na lidar profiling of wind and temperature in the lower atmosphere, *Opt. Lett.*, 34, 199–201, doi:10.1364/OL.34.000199, 2009.

- Jablonowski, C. and Williamson, D. L.: The Pros and Cons of Diffusion, Filters and Fixers in Atmospheric General Circulation Models, pp. 381–493, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-11640-7_13, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-11640-7_13, 2011.
- Kaifler, B., Kaifler, N., Ehard, B., Dörnbrack, A., Rapp, M., and Fritts, D. C.: Influences of source conditions on mountain wave penetration into the stratosphere and mesosphere, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42, 9488–9494, doi:10.1002/2015GL066465, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015GL066465>, 2015GL066465, 2015.
- Kent, G. S. and Wright, R. W. H.: A review of laser radar measurements of atmospheric properties, *J. Atmos. Terr. Phys.*, 32, 917–943, 1970.
- Killeen, T. L., Wu, Q., Solomon, S. C., Ortland, D. A., Skinner, W. R., Niciejewski, R. J., and Gell, D. A.: TIMED Doppler Interferometer: Overview and recent results, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111, A10S01, doi:10.1029/2005JA011484, 2006.
- 10 Kristoffersen, S. K., Ward, W. E., Brown, S., and Drummond, J. R.: Calibration and validation of the advanced E-Region Wind Interferometer, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 6, 1761–1776, doi:10.5194/amt-6-1761-2013, <http://www.atmos-meas-tech.net/6/1761/2013/>, 2013.
- Labitzke, K.: Temperature Changes in the Mesosphere and Stratosphere Connected with Circulation Changes in Winter, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 29, 756–766, 1972.
- Labitzke, K. and Kunze, M.: Interannual Variability and Trends in the Stratosphere, in: *Climate and Weather of the Sun-Earth System (CAWSES): Highlights from a Priority Program*, edited by Lübken, F.-J., Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2012.
- 15 Lane, T. P., Reeder, M. J., and Guest, F. M.: Convectively generated gravity waves observed from radiosonde data taken during MCTEX, *QJRM*, 129, 1731–1740, doi:10.1256/qj.02.196, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1256/qj.02.196>, 2003.
- Le Pichon, A., Assink, J. D., Heinrich, P., Blanc, E., Charlton-Perez, A., Lee, C. F., Keckhut, P., Hauchecorne, A., Rüfenacht, R., Kämpfer, N., Drob, D. P., Smets, P. S. M., Evers, L. G., Ceranna, L., Pilger, C., Ross, O., and Claud, C.: Comparison of co-located independent
- 20 ground-based middle atmospheric wind and temperature measurements with numerical weather prediction models, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 120, 8318–8331, doi:10.1002/2015JD023273, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023273>, 2015JD023273, 2015.
- Lindzen, R. S.: Turbulence and stress owing to gravity wave and tidal breakdown, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 86, 9707–9714, 1981.
- Liu, A. Z., Hocking, W. K., Franke, S. J., and Thayaparan, T.: Comparison of Na lidar and meteor radar wind measurements at Starfire Optical Range, NM, USA, *J. Atmos. Solar-Terr. Phys.*, 64, 31–40, doi:10.1016/S1364-6826(01)00095-5, 2002.
- 25 Lübken, F.-J. and Müllemann, A.: Temperatures, densities, and winds in the high latitude (78°N) mesosphere, *Adv. Space Res.*, 32, 731–740, doi:10.1016/S0273-1177(03)00408-3, 2003.
- Lübken, F.-J., Baumgarten, G., Hildebrand, J., and Schmidlin, F. J.: Simultaneous and co-located wind measurements in the middle atmosphere by lidar and rocket-borne techniques, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 9, 3911–3919, doi:10.5194/amt-9-3911-2016, <http://www.atmos-meas-tech.net/9/3911/2016/>, 2016.
- 30 Manney, G. L., Schwartz, M. J., Krüger, K., Santee, M. L., Pawson, S., Lee, J. N., Daffer, W. H., Fuller, R. A., and N. J. Livesey, N.: Aura Microwave Limb Sounder observations of dynamics and transport during the record-breaking 2009 Arctic stratospheric major warming, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36, doi:10.1029/2009GL038586, 2009.
- Matsuno, T.: A Dynamical Model of the Stratospheric Sudden Warming, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 28, 1479–1494, 1971.
- Matthias, V., Hoffmann, P., Manson, A., Meek, C., Stober, G., Brown, P., and Rapp, M.: The impact of planetary waves on the latitudinal displacement of sudden stratospheric warmings, *Ann. Geophys.*, 31, 1397–1415, doi:10.5194/angeo-31-1397-2013, <http://www.ann-geophys.net/31/1397/2013/>, 2013.
- 35 Meriwether, J. W. and Gerrard, A. J.: Mesosphere inversion layers and stratosphere temperature enhancements, *Rev. Geophys.*, 42, RG3003, doi:10.1029/2003RG000133, 2004.

- Meyer, W., Philbrick, C. R., Röttger, J., Rüster, R., Widdel, H.-U., and Schmidlin, F. J.: Mean winds in the winter middle atmosphere above northern Scandinavia, *J. Atmos. Terr. Phys.*, 49, 675–687, doi:10.1016/0021-9169(87)90012-2, 1987.
- Müllemann, A. and Lübken, F.-J.: Horizontal winds in the mesosphere at high latitudes, *Adv. Space Res.*, 35(11), 1890–1894, 2005.
- Mzé, N., Hauchecorne, A., Keckhut, P., and Thétis, M.: Vertical distribution of gravity wave potential energy from long-term Rayleigh
5 lidar data at a northern middle-latitude site, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 119, 12,069–12,083, doi:10.1002/2014JD022035, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2014JD022035>, 2014JD022035, 2014.
- Nappo, C. J.: An introduction to atmospheric gravity waves, Academic Press, 2002.
- Placke, M., Hoffmann, P., Gerding, M., Becker, E., and Rapp, M.: Testing linear gravity wave theory with simultaneous wind and
10 temperature data from the mesosphere, *J. Atmos. Solar-Terr. Phys.*, 93, 57–69, doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2012.11.012>, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364682612002854>, 2013.
- Randel, W. J.: The Evaluation of Winds from Geopotential Height Data in the Stratosphere, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 44, 3097–3120, 1987.
- Rex, M., von der Gathen, P., Harris, N. R. P., Lucic, D., Knudsen, B. M., Braathen, G. O., Reid, S. J., De Backer, H., Claude, H., Fabian, R.,
Fast, H., Gil, M., Kyrö, E., Mikkelsen, I. S., Rummukainen, M., Smit, H. G., Stähelin, J., Varotsos, C., and Zaitcev, I.: In situ measure-
15 ments of stratospheric ozone depletion rates in the Arctic winter 1991/1992: A Lagrangian approach, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103, 5843–5853,
doi:10.1029/97JD03127, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/97JD03127>, 1998.
- Rüfenacht, R., Kämpfer, N., and Murk, A.: First middle-atmospheric zonal wind profile measurements with a new ground-based microwave
Doppler-spectro-radiometer, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 5, 2647, 2012.
- Rüfenacht, R., Murk, A., Kämpfer, N., Eriksson, P., and Buehler, S. A.: Middle-atmospheric zonal and meridional wind profiles from
20 polar, tropical and midlatitudes with the ground-based microwave Doppler wind radiometer WIRA, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 7, 4491–4505,
doi:10.5194/amt-7-4491-2014, <http://www.atmos-meas-tech.net/7/4491/2014/>, 2014.
- Schmidlin, F. J., Lee, H., and Michel, W.: The Inflatable Sphere: A Technique for the Accurate Measurement of Middle Atmosphere Tem-
peratures, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 96, 22 673–22 682, doi:10.1029/91JD02395, 1991.
- Schöch, A., Baumgarten, G., and Fiedler, J.: Polar middle atmosphere temperature climatology from Rayleigh lidar measurements at ALO-
MAR (69° N), *Ann. Geophys.*, 26, 1681–1698, 2008.
- 25 Schroeder, S., Preusse, P., Ern, M., and Riese, M.: Gravity waves resolved in ECMWF and measured by SABER, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36,
n/a–n/a, doi:10.1029/2008GL037054, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2008GL037054>, 110805, 2009.
- She, C.-Y., Vance, J. D., Williams, B. P., Krueger, D. A., Moosmuller, H., Gibson-Wilde, D., and Fritts, D.: Lidar studies of atmospheric
dynamics near polar mesopause, *Trans. Am. Geophys. Union (EOS)*, 83, 289–, doi:10.1029/2002EO000206, 2002.
- Shepherd, G. G., Thuillier, G., Gault, W. A., Solheim, B. H., Hersom, C., Alunni, J. M., Brun, J.-F., Brune, S., Charlot, P., and Cog-
30 ger, L. L.: WINDII, the wind imaging interferometer on the Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 10 725,
doi:10.1029/93JD00227, 1993.
- Souprayen, C., Garnier, A., Hertzog, A., Hauchecorne, A., and Porteneuve, J.: Rayleigh-Mie Doppler wind lidar for atmospheric measure-
ments. I: Instrumental setup, validation, and first climatological results, *Appl. Optics*, 38, 2410–2421, doi:10.1364/AO.38.002410, 1999.
- Tepley, C. A.: Neutral winds of the middle atmosphere observed at Arecibo using a Doppler Rayleigh lidar, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 99, 25 781–
35 25 790, doi:10.1029/94JD02213, 1994.
- Tomikawa, Y., Sato, K., Watanabe, S., Kawatani, Y., Miyazaki, K., and Takahashi, M.: Growth of planetary waves and the forma-
tion of an elevated stratopause after a major stratospheric sudden warming in a T213L256 GCM, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, n/a–n/a,
doi:10.1029/2011JD017243, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2011JD017243>, d16101, 2012.




Figure 1. January mean temperatures and horizontal winds derived by lidar for the years 2012 (red), 2014 (purple), and 2015 (green). Shaded areas represent the respective standard deviations.

von Zahn, U., von Cossart, G., Fiedler, J., Fricke, K. H., Nelke, G., Baumgarten, G., Rees, D., Hauchecorne, A., and Adolfsen, K.: The ALOMAR Rayleigh/Mie/Raman lidar: objectives, configuration, and performance, *Ann. Geophys.*, 18, 815–833, 2000.

Whiteway, J. A. and Carswell, A. I.: Lidar observations of gravity wave activity in the upper stratosphere over Toronto, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100, 14,113–14,124, doi:10.1029/95JD00511, 1995.

- 5 Whiteway, J. A., Duck, T. J., Donovan, D. P., Bird, J. C., Pal, S. R., and Carswell, A. I.: Measurements of gravity wave activity within and around the Arctic stratospheric vortex, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 24, 1387–1390, doi:10.1029/97GL01322, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/97GL01322>, 1997.

Widdel, H.-U.: Vertical movements in the middle atmosphere derived from foil cloud experiments, *J. Atmos. Terr. Phys.*, 49, 723–741, doi:10.1016/0021-9169(87)90015-8, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0021916987900158>, 1987.

- 10 Widdel, H.-U.: Foil chaff clouds as a tool for in-situ measurements of atmospheric motions in the middle atmosphere: Their flight behaviour and implications for radar tracking, *J. Atmos. Terr. Phys.*, 52, 89–101, doi:10.1016/0021-9169(90)90071-T, 1990.

Wu, D. L., Schwartz, M. J., Waters, J. W., Limpasuvan, V., Wu, Q., and Killeen, T. L.: Mesospheric Doppler Wind Measurements from Aura Microwave Limb Sounder (MLS), *Adv. Space Res.*, 42, 1246–1252, doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2007.06.014>, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0273117707006412>, 2008.

- 15 Xia, H., Dou, X., Sun, D., Shu, Z., Xue, X., Han, Y., Hu, D., Han, Y., and Cheng, T.: Mid-altitude wind measurements with mobile Rayleigh Doppler lidar incorporating system-level optical frequency control method, *Opt. Express*, 20, 15 286–15 300, doi:10.1364/OE.20.015286, <http://www.opticsexpress.org/abstract.cfm?URI=oe-20-14-15286>, 2012.

Yuan, T., Thurairajah, B., She, C.-Y., Chandran, A., Collins, R. L., and Krueger, D. A.: Wind and temperature response of midlatitude mesopause region to the 2009 Sudden Stratospheric Warming, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, D09 114, doi:10.1029/2011JD017142, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2011JD017142>, 2012.

- 20 Zink, F. and Vincent, R.: Wavelet analysis of stratosphere gravity wave packets over Macquarie Island I. Wave parameters, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 2001.




Figure 2. Temporal evolution of temperature and horizontal winds during January and early February 2012 after a minor SSW. The profiles are averages of all 1 h profiles of the respective night(s). Solid lines and shaded areas: lidar data and respective standard deviations; dashed lines: ECMWF data with same temporal sampling.




Figure 3. January mean temperatures and horizontal winds for the years 2012 (a), 2014 (b), and 2015 (c), and cumulated data (d). ALOMAR RMR lidar (orange), ECMWF (blue), HWM07 (rose). Shaded areas represent the respective standard deviations. The horizontal bars mark the model levels of ECMWF data for one exemplary sample profile in each season. The ECMWF cycles used are Cy37r3 for 2012 and Cy40r1 for 2014 and 2015.




Figure 4. Differences between lidar data and ECMWF data for January 2012 (red), January 2014 (purple), and January 2015 (green); the ECMWF cycles used are Cy37r3 for 2012 and Cy40r1 for 2014 and 2015. **(a)** Mean difference $\frac{1}{N}\Sigma(x_{\text{ECMWF}} - x_{\text{lidar}})$; shading represents the respective standard deviations, dotted lines depict the standard error of the mean of the lidar data. **(b)** Distribution of differences $x_{\text{ECMWF}} - x_{\text{lidar}}$ on hourly basis for different altitude ranges. **(c)** Mean ratio of RMS of lidar and ECMWF data. See Tab. 2 for an overview of the number of 1 h profiles taken into account.




Figure 5. Temperature and horizontal winds for the night 20/21 January 2015; lidar (orange), ECMWF (blue). Thin lines denote 1 h profiles, thick lines denote the nightly mean profiles, the horizontal bars mark the model levels of ECMWF data for one [exemplary sample profile](#); dashed and dotted lines show the RMS and the mean measurement uncertainty of the 1 h profiles, respectively.




Figure 6. Gravity wave energy densities per unit mass and the intrinsic period ($2\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1}$) a monochromatic gravity wave with the given kinetic-to-potential GWED ratio would have, for the night 20/21 January 2015; lidar (orange), ECMWF (blue). Left: potential (solid) and kinetic (dashed) GWED. Middle: total GWED. Right: kinetic-to-potential GWED (solid) and $2\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1}$ (dashed); the dotted vertical lines denote unity and $2\pi f^{-1}$, respectively. Shading represents the respective standard deviation.




Figure 7. January mean gravity wave energy densities for 2012 (red), 2014 (purple), and 2015 (green) derived from lidar data (a) and ECMWF data (b). Shading represents the respective standard deviation. Left: potential (solid) and kinetic (dashed) GWED. Middle: total GWED. Right: kinetic-to-potential GWED.




Figure 8. January energy densities per unit mass for large-scale waves for 2012 (red), 2014 (purple), and 2015 (green) derived from lidar data (a) and ECMWF data (b); see text for details. Left: potential (solid) and kinetic (dashed) LWEDs. Middle: total LWED. Right: kinetic-to-potential LWED.




Figure 9. Mean LWED-to-GWED ratios for lidar data (orange) and ECMWF data (blue). Left: potential energy densities. Middle: kinetic energy densities. Right: total energy densities.

Table 1. List of lidar observations taken into account in this study.

night	1 h profiles
19/20 January 2012	2
21/22 January 2012	15
22/23 January 2012	13
23/24 January 2012	2
24/25 January 2012	3
28/29 January 2012	12
29/30 January 2012	15
1/2 February 2012	1
3/4 February 2012	2
10/11 January 2014	14
11/12 January 2014	17
14/15 January 2014	11
15/16 January 2014	17
17/18 January 2014	11
18/19 January 2014	17
19/20 January 2014	13
20/21 January 2014	11
21/22 January 2014	5
22/23 January 2014	12
23/24 January 2014	1
24/25 January 2014	12
26/27 January 2014	10
27/28 January 2014	5
29/30 January 2014	7
30/31 January 2014	7
19/20 January 2015	16
20/21 January 2015	16
21/22 January 2015	13
22/23 January 2015	16
23/24 January 2015	17

Table 2. Number of nights and 1 h profiles taken into account for figures showing monthly mean data.

year	all observations		long observations (≥ 10 h)	
	nights	1 h profiles	nights	1 h profiles
2012	7	62	4	55
2014	16	170	11	145
2015	5	78	5	76 ^a

^a The observations in the night 21/22 January 2015 consist of two parts of 11 h and 2 h, respectively, separated by a gap of 5 h.