

Author response to Referee 1 comments

I thank the referee for reviewing the manuscript. I have tried to address all of the comments and revise the manuscript, and hope the revision is satisfactory. Before responding to each comment, I note several changes:

-Figures 10 and 11 now include results from CONV.

-Figure 12 in the previous version has been removed. The figure and discussion were a bit lengthy compared to the messages obtained. I mention the results from the figure in the text only, so that this does not affect the overall argument in this study.

-I have corrected some existing figures (Figs. 2c, 5b, 9a,b), but this does not affect the argument. Figure 5b in the previous version used the (CL, AR) data for STDD on the MSSW onset dates identified in CONV. It now uses the (CL, AR) data for STDD on the MSSW onset dates identified in STDD. In Figs. 2c and 9a,b, a few color shades did not appear as intended.

Please also note that the pages and numbers in my response below refer to those in the (unformatted) manuscript.

One general but minor comment I have is that the use of the STDD, CONV, and AMIP acronyms was not particularly useful and in fact made things more muddled. I would recommend just sticking with JRA-55, JRA-55C, and JRA-55AMIP. If the author thinks the acronyms add something, then the acronyms should at least be used earlier in the abstract/introduction so that readers become used to seeing them prior to section 2.

Because this study deals with the JRA-55 family data only, the “JRA-55” part in JRA-55 (standard), JRA-55C, and JRA-55AMIP are obvious and redundant, and hence could be removed. One could then refer to the products as standard, conventional, and AMIP: I simplify these by using the acronyms (STDD, CONV, and AMIP), and I think these are clear and easy to remember when reading the manuscript. I have introduced these acronyms in Abstract and Section 1, as suggested.

The other general comment I have is that I appreciated the creativity the author used to make the plots, some of which were very useful ways of visualizing the results; but Figure 8 went a bit overboard, with different symbols, colors, letters and numbers. Some of these attributes may be useful, like the colors; but the different symbols didn't seem to point to anything of particular interest. Right now the text reads (Page 8, Line 21-22 and Line 27-28): “Both overestimations and underestimations in the zonal wind by CONV occur for these cases”, which indicates that these symbols are not adding much to our understanding and making the plot more difficult to read. The author could just make a note in the text that they also considered biases in the CONV winds relative to the STDD winds but didn't notice any systematic relationship.

As suggested, I have simplified Fig. 8 and added a note in the text (p. 8, l.23).

Specific Comments

Page 1, Line 9, 19: It is not entirely clear what “conventional” observations include until section 2. It would be better to directly state here that this means everything except satellite data.

Fixed.

Page 1, Line 13: Readers unfamiliar with vortex geometry diagnostics may be unfamiliar with “aspect ratio” of the polar vortex; might be good to briefly relate this to displacements/splits here to be clear. Also in section 2.2.2.

I have added “in which the vortex is highly stretched or splits” to clarify MSSW features of high aspect ratio of the polar vortex (p. 1, l. 15). In Section 2.2.2, we already mentioned that AR is a measure of how stretched the vortex is. A more specific relationship of CL and AR is explained when presenting results (p. 6, l. 30-).

Page 2, Line 17: Here, is “This study” referring to S-RIP, or to the current study?

Fixed. I have rephrased this part as “The present study”.

Page 3, Line 21: prior to 1979, how different are the CONV and STDD products?

CONV is different from STDD even before 1979, as Kobayashi et al. (2014) state “The JRA-55C covers the period from November 1972, when the JRA-55 starts to use satellite data, to 2012”. Figure 12 does not suggest a gap in RMSD between before and after 1979 for NH winter or SH spring.

Page 5, Line 9-10: Might mention that the tropospheric jets seem shifted, which may (or may not) be consistent with biases in the stratosphere.

I have added a sentence about the zonal wind differences in NH for DJF (p. 5, l. 11-).

Page 6, Lines 32-33, Figure 5: Maybe I’m just confused about what exactly this plot is showing, but I don’t understand why in panel (b), the black dots representing STDD don’t seem to match the location of the STDD dots in panel (a). This makes lines 32-33 also confusing, as the statement does seem accurate based on the red/black dots in panel (b) but does not seem accurate when comparing panel (b) to panel (a).

Figure 5b is now corrected to use the (CL, AR) data for STDD on the MSSW onset dates identified in STDD. The description about Fig. 5b is modified at p. 7, l. 3.

Page 7, Line 5-6: Might mention that this implies few splits in AMIP.

Fixed. I have added a sentence mentioning this.

Page 8, Line 19-20: the closeness to the y-axis may indicate a large contribution from the wave component, but in terms of proximity to the y-axis, there seems to be many “red”/weak wind points as

well as strong ones. Might need to rephrase to clarify that for large values of the y-component, the zonal wind is stronger.

I have explained that the zonal wind in STDD is relatively strong when the y-component is large (≥ 100 m) at p. 8, l. 21.

Page 9, Line 5: Just to clarify, in Figure 9 are you comparing the products using dates from STDD for both, or the central dates of each product?

We take the former option in Fig. 9. Namely, it uses the dates defined in STDD.

Page 10, Line 12-13: Just to clarify, in Figure 11 are the grey lines all the cases between 25-75th percentile?

I guess “the grey lines” may be thin blue or red lines in Fig. 11. Anyway, yes, this figure used all the 25th to 75th percentile values of the maximum heat flux in STDD, but the thin lines are removed for simplicity, and only the composites are shown.

Also, is the number of cases in your stated 25-75th percentile range similar for AMIP and STDD? It looks somewhat similar in Figure 10 but might be worth mentioning.

I have added the values for AMIP (p. 10, l. 19).

Also you could consider drawing in light dashed lines the 25th and 75th percentile lines in Figure 10, as a way to clarify what you are plotting in Figure 11.

Fixed.

Page 12, Line 10-12: Is there a difference in latitude of maximum heat flux/EPFD forcing, or a difference in the maximum winds of the climatological polar jet in these data sets (or the edge of the vortex)? Could that also have an influence?

The climatological polar night jet in AMIP is stronger than in STDD, and the maximum is located somewhat more poleward (see Fig. A1, attached below). This feature is also seen in Fig. 1c. On the other hand, the latitudinal profiles of the maximum heat flux are similar between STDD and AMIP. The stronger climatological jet in AMIP may play a role in the different vortex responses (as discussed in Section 5) of AMIP from STDD

Page 15, Table 1 caption: make clear that “differences” are the number of days between onset dates.

Fixed.

Page 16, Figure 1: It wasn't entirely clear from this figure whether values between -5 to +5 are not significant (since they still are shaded)- could this be more clear? Or are any shaded values significant? I guess it's confusing since the colorbar doesn't have any white, non-significant level.

Yes, any shaded values in Fig. 1 are judged to be significant, as “Color shades (in Fig. 1) plot only differences of CONV or AMIP from STDD that are judged to be statistically significant”. I have added the word “only” here (p. 4, l. 28).

Page 18-19, Figures 3-4: I think these could be made more clear by staying consistent across panels and always making STDD line dashed, even in panel (a),(d). Also state in the caption what the non-bold and bold lines refer to.

Fixed.

Page 19, Figure 4: I would add in DJF to the plot titles for the top row and SON to the plot titles for the bottom row.

Fixed.

Page 26, Figure 11: by residual [v], do you mean the TEM term \bar{v}^* ? Or what is meant by residual [v]? (and page 10, line 17).

Yes, the “residual [v]” means the TEM term \bar{v}^* . I have explained this at p. 10, l. 24, and Fig. 11 caption.

Technical Corrections

Page 1, Line 18: change “It shows” to “We find”

Fixed (p. 1, l. 20).

Page 1, Line 21: “vital” is maybe not quite the right word here

I have rephrased the word to “important” (p. 1, l. 23).

Page 1, Line 26: “Some of weak conditions”! remove “of”

Fixed (p. 1, l. 28).

Page 2, Line 5: “the middle atmosphere science”; remove “the”, change to middle atmosphere dynamics

Fixed.

Page 2, Line 10: Missing “with” after “associated”

Fixed.

Page 2, Line 11: “metrological” should be “meteorological”

Fixed.

Page 2, Line 13: I would change “go along with” to “are part of”

Fixed.

Page 2, Line 33: I’m not sure what is meant by “articulate design”. Maybe “meticulous” would work better? Same with Page 11, Line 25.

Rephrased as suggested.

Page 5, Line 22: change “at the grid points are” to “at this location is”

Fixed.

Page 5, Line 32: delete “the”, change “wind” to “winds”

Fixed.

Page 7, Line 23: should be Fig 6b,d.

Corrected.

Page 8, Line 3: change “whereas even in” to “and even” (remove “in”)

Fixed.

Page 8, Line 10: change to “Figure 8 presents scatter plots of the zonal and wave components contributing to the total RMSD values for these cases.”

Fixed.

Page 8, Line 12: Change “on” to “of”

Fixed.

Page 9, Line 20-21: change to “explained in terms of wave forcing from the troposphere and/or the vortex response in the stratosphere.”

Fixed.

Page 10, Line 13: change to “25th” and “75th”

Fixed.

Page 10, Line 16: might say “This feature is quite similar between the two products by construction” since you have chosen the range of heat flux values to be similar.

Fixed.

Page 10, Line 23: not sure “contributed by” is the right phrase here. Maybe “can be attributed to”.
Fixed.

Page 10, Line 33: change “use” to “uses”

This part has been removed (Fig. 12 in the previous version).

Page 11, Line 15: change “larger in magnitude as going toward” to “increases in magnitude toward”

Changed as suggested (p. 11, l. 10).

Page 11, Line 30: change “These differences of CONV” to “The differences in CONV”

Changed as suggested (p. 11, l. 25).

Page 12, Line 19: change “should” to “could” (since model biases are potentially possible in CONV as well, given lack of non-satellite data in stratosphere).

Changed as suggested (p.12, l. 18).




Figure A1: (a) Latitudinal distributions of the climatological zonal mean zonal wind at 10 hPa: (black) STDD, (blue) CONV, and (red) AMIP. Panel (b) is similar, but plots poleward eddy heat flux of waves 1-3 at 100 hPa averaged from lag= -20 to 0 day. Here, the lag= 0 day is when the 21-day mean heat flux in 40-90N, 100 hPa maximizes for each DJF season (as in Fig. 10b).

Author response to Referee 2 comments

I thank the referee for reviewing the manuscript. I have tried to address all of the comments and revise the manuscript, and hope the revision is satisfactory. Before responding to each comment, I note several changes:

-Figures 10 and 11 now include results from CONV.

-Figure 12 in the previous version has been removed. The figure and discussion were a bit lengthy compared to the messages obtained. I mention the results from the figure in the text only, so that this does not affect the overall argument in this study.

-I have corrected some existing figures (Figs. 2c, 5b, 9a,b), but this does not affect the argument. Figure 5b in the previous version used the (CL, AR) data for STDD on the MSSW onset dates identified in CONV. It now uses the (CL, AR) data for STDD on the MSSW onset dates identified in STDD. In Figs. 2c and 9a,b, a few color shades did not appear as intended.

Please also note that the pages and numbers in my response below refer to those in the (unformatted) manuscript.

Major comments:

I think the summary and discussion should be expanded a bit. What does it mean for the quality of the reanalysis if the AMIP type experiment has too little variability? I guess you would expect that if the model was perfect then the statistics of the AMIP experiment would be similar to the statistics of the reanalysis. Do the results of this paper mean that we should expect the number of sudden warmings to be underestimated in the reanalysis products?

I have added a discussion sentence suggesting that even STDD (or CONV) may underestimate stratospheric variability (p. 11, l.27).

It is generally accepted that sudden warmings include some preconditioning. It could be the case that the general lower wave-forcing in the AMIP experiment leaves the vortex very strong so that even after a strong wave event we don't see a sudden warming. Perhaps this is discussed in the text with other words but I would like the authors to include the concept of "preconditioning".

I have added a sentence that suggests a possible relationship of the stronger vortex to a lack of preconditioning in AMIP (p. 12, l. 9).

Minor comments:

Perhaps the title could be more precise on what the paper is about. I would suggest that the words "reanalysis" and "assimilation" should be included in the title. Not everybody knows what the "JRA family" is.

I have added a subtitle "Impacts of assimilation of observational data in JRA-55 reanalysis data" as suggested.

p1, 115: This sentence is unclear.

I have rephrased a few sentences around it (p. 1, l.15-17).

p2, 116: ".. will also be investigated". Does that refer to the S-RIP or the present paper?

I have added a word "there" at the end of sentence, so that this sentence refers to the S-RIP work, not the present study (p.2, l. 17).

p5, top: The degrees of freedom used in the statistical tests should be given. I guess you treat all months as independent. But this assumption at least requires some discussion.

I have mentioned that the degree of freedom in the test is equated to the number of years (p. 5, l.2). This is a reasonable treatment since the test uses DJF or SON means for the target years and they can be regarded independent from year to year.

p11, 13: over 4 -> above 4

This part has been removed.

p17, 18 RMSE -> RMSD?

Fixed (p. 8, l. 18).

p5, 122: The sentence "The zonal wind at the gridpoints" does not make sense.

I have rephrased it (p. 5, l. 24).

p5 130: It should be made clear here that this sentence refers to a single event.

I have rephrased the sentence slightly, so that it is clearer that it refers to a single event of the SH MSSW in September, 2002 (p. 6, l.1).

p6, 16: The difference in the widths of the pdf's is very small.

I have rephrased the sentence avoiding the use of "narrow(er)" at p. 6, l. 9-10.

p6, 128: Why is there this linear relationship between AR and CL? It seems that if the displacement is large then the change in shape is large? Is this physically based or an effect of the way the parameters are calculated?

Please note that a large displacement of the vortex is captured by a large decrease in CL. The next sentence also explained/explains how the linear relationship between AR and CL arises for the MSSWs (p. 7, l. 1-2).

Table 1: Why is the AMIP experiment not in the table?

The MSSW dates in AMIP were/are not included in Table 1, since it will not make much sense to compare the AMIP dates to the STDD or CONV dates. The MSSWs in AMIP (free-running simulation) are internally generated, and their exact dates are irrelevant from those in STDD and CONV.

Author response to Referee 3 comments

I thank the referee for reviewing the manuscript. I have tried to address all of the comments and revise the manuscript, and hope the revision is satisfactory. Before responding to each comment, I note several changes:

-Figures 10 and 11 now include results from CONV.

-Figure 12 in the previous version has been removed. The figure and discussion were a bit lengthy compared to the messages obtained. I mention the results from the figure in the text only, so that this does not affect the overall argument in this study.

-I have corrected some existing figures (Figs. 2c, 5b, 9a,b), but this does not affect the argument. Figure 5b in the previous version used the (CL, AR) data for STDD on the MSSW onset dates identified in CONV. It now uses the (CL, AR) data for STDD on the MSSW onset dates identified in STDD. In Figs. 2c and 9a,b, a few color shades did not appear as intended.

Please also note that the pages and numbers in my response below refer to those in the (unformatted) manuscript.

Major comments

Style: The paper takes a largely descriptive approach to comparing the datasets until section 6. I really was hoping that the author might incorporate a little more discussion throughout the manuscript, particularly when comparing the JRA-55 and JRA-55C datasets, since there is a great deal more that might be said about the differences here, particularly since they seem to be confined to the upper stratosphere and sometimes significantly influence the timing of SSW events. As noted above, the paper describes the comparisons in quite a lot of detail leading to unnecessary figures and text and making the paper overly long.

The descriptive style of this study is by intention, since we compare dynamical variability in the extratropical stratosphere especially from a morphological point of view. I think the present analysis and manuscript are reasonably organized: survey climatology and variability (MSSWs) among the three products in Section 3, describe RMSD distributions and compare them to the MSSWs in Section 4 (STDD vs CONV), and examine wave forcing and vortex response in Section 5 (STDD vs AMIP).

It will be possible to compare vertical structures of the polar vortex between STDD and CONV for various dynamical conditions. Then, one may find that the vortex has largely different structures especially in the upper stratosphere between STDD and CONV even when the two products have a MSSW on a same onset date. However, it will be difficult to combine such an analysis to the current manuscript, and I therefore retain the overall structure (and most figures, except for Fig. 12) of the manuscript. I have added a discussion paragraph to mention this extension as possible future work (p. 12, l. 20-24).

Methodology: In a number of places the author compares the SSWs detected in the standard JRA-55

dataset with those detected in the other two datasets. I can see the merit in this, but wouldn't it make more sense to compare the same dates when SSWs are detected in the standard re-analysis with the other datasets. Then one can really assess the extent to which tropospheric information contribute to producing the SSW seen in the standard assimilation. Similarly, I think it could be very informative to compare the JRA55-C and JRA55-AMIP simulations in this way.

While Table 1 compares the MSSW onset dates identified in STDD to those identified in CONV and I mention their time differences in places in the text, I also compared/compare features between STDD and CONV on the MSSW onset dates identified in STDD, such as in Figs. 8 and 9f-j. Figures 10 and 11 also use the maximum of the 21 day mean heat flux for DJF identified in each product.

Figure 11, which now includes results from CONV, will contribute to the latter point. It shows that AMIP is an outlier in terms of the zonal wind evolution, while all three products are similar in the other quantifies: AMIP underestimates a vortex response, or a zonal wind deceleration at 10 hPa to a wave forcing of similar strength from the troposphere (which can be regarded as a model bias). STDD and CONV are similar in all quantities of interest, but the zonal wind in CONV is slightly stronger than that in STDD. This seems consistent with the result that CONV misses or delays several MSSWs compared to STDD.

I didn't find the following figures (and associated analysis) added much and suggest they could be removed or added to a supplement. Figures 6, 7, 9, 11, 13.

Please refer to my response to the first comment.

Minor comments

Throughout I find the name 'conventional' a little confusing for JRA55-C since this is really just 'non-satellite'

I follow the paper (Kobayashi et al. 2014) of the developers of the JRA-55C product for the use of the word "conventional". I also explain the meaning of "conventional" at the beginning (p. 1, l. 10).

p2 l15 Could you say more about the AMIP-style integration? Is this a continuous run with just SST and other boundary forcing?

I have added an explanation about AMIP at p. 3, l. 19-20.

p3 l15 Why did the author introduce new nomenclature for the datasets? I think using the standard names would be more useful for comparison with other studies.

Because this study deals with the JRA-55 family data only, the "JRA-55" part in JRA-55 (standard), JRA-55C, and JRA-55AMIP are obvious and redundant, and hence could be removed. One could then refer to the products as standard, conventional, and AMIP: I simplify these by using the acronyms (STDD, CONV, and AMIP), and I think these are clear and easy to remember when reading the manuscript.

p8 13 What do you mean by 'envelope'

I have removed the phrase using the word "envelope", as the sentence is clear without it.

Fig. 2 etc. Please remove the wedge where the shading and contours don't wrap around the zero line

I have improved the figures as suggested.

Fig. 5 I found the lines between the two dates (observed and observed in JRA55-C) tended to obscure the points. I think these could be removed without much loss of information.

I think that the lines are useful since it enables one to compare/connect corresponding cases between STDD and CONV. I have changed the lines and STDD data points into grey, so that they do not disturb the main distribution for CONV in (b).

Fig. 8 The arrows and labels in the panels made the quite hard to read and to distinguish different points. I like this plot but could it be simplified?

I have somewhat simplified the figure.

Fig. 10 Could you show the heat flux distribution at the bottom of each panel for the different cases to make the point made in the text about the shift between the two datasets more clearly?

I have changed the figure accordingly.

Comparison of large-scale dynamical variability in the extratropical stratosphere among the JRA-55 family data sets: Impacts of assimilation of observational data in JRA-55 reanalysis data

Masakazu Taguchi¹

5 ¹Department of Earth Science, Aichi University of Education, Kariya, 448-8542, Japan

Correspondence to: Masakazu Taguchi (mtaguchi@aeu.ac.jp)

Abstract. This study compares large-scale dynamical variability in the extratropical stratosphere, such as major stratospheric sudden warmings (MSSWs), among the Japanese 55-year Reanalysis (JRA-55) family data sets. The JRA-55 family consists of three products: a standard product (STDD) of the JRA-55 reanalysis data, and two sub-products of JRA-55C (CONV) and JRA-55AMIP (AMIP). CONV assimilates only conventional surface and upper air observations only without assimilation of satellite observations, whereas AMIP runs the same numerical weather prediction model without assimilation of observational data. A comparison of the occurrence of MSSWs in Northern winter shows that compared to STDD, CONV delays several MSSWs by one to four days and also misses a few MSSWs. CONV also misses the Southern Hemisphere MSSW in September 2002. AMIP shows much fewer MSSWs in Northern winter, and especially lacks MSSWs of high aspect ratio of the polar vortex, in which the vortex is highly stretched or splits. A further examination of daily geopotential height differences between STDD and CONV reveals occasional peaks in both hemispheres that are separated from MSSWs. The delayed and missed MSSW cases have smaller height differences in magnitude than such peaks. The height differences for those MSSWs include large contributions from the zonal component, which reflect underestimations in the weakening of the zonal mean polar night jet in CONV. We also explore strong planetary wave forcings and associated polar vortex weakenings for STDD and AMIP. We find a lower frequency of strong wave forcings and weaker vortex responses to such wave forcings in AMIP, consistent with the lower MSSW frequency.

1 Introduction

Large-scale dynamical variability is an important feature in the extratropical stratosphere especially in the Northern Hemisphere (NH) winter stratosphere (e.g., Labitzke and van Loon, 1999; Yoden et al., 2002; Waugh and Polvani, 2010). The NH winter stratosphere exhibits large intraseasonal and interannual variations, reflecting anomalously strong and weak conditions of the polar vortex. The polar vortex in the Southern Hemisphere (SH) spring stratosphere also shows large variations, e.g., in its strength and distribution, while the SH winter stratosphere is more dynamically quiescent. Some weak conditions of the polar vortex correspond to the occurrence of stratospheric sudden warmings (SSWs), during which the polar night jet weakens and polar stratospheric temperatures rise as the polar vortex largely distorts and/or breaks

- 削除: JRA-55C
- 削除: JRA-55AMIP
- 削除: the standard product, JRA-55C
- 削除: JRA-55C
- 削除: JRA-55AMIP
- 削除: .
- 削除: JRA-55
- 削除: JRA-55C
- 削除: are consistent with
- 削除: JRA-55C
- 削除: JRA-55
- 削除: JRA-55AMIP. It shows
- 削除: JRA-55AMIP
- 書式変更: フォントの色 : 自動

削除: a vital

削除: of

down (e.g., Limpasuvan et al., 2004; Charlton and Polvani, 2007). A SSW is classified as a major SSW (MSSW), when it accompanies a reversal of the zonal mean zonal wind often looked at 60° N, 10 hPa (e.g., Butler et al., 2015). A SSW without such a zonal wind reversal is classified as a minor SSW.

Previous studies investigate aspects of such dynamical variability in the extratropical stratosphere using multiple reanalysis data sets. Reanalysis data sets are a vital tool to understand atmospheric variability and relevant processes in the climate science including middle atmosphere dynamics, but different reanalyses sometimes yields different results for the same diagnostics. Martineau and Son (2010) examined time evolutions of the Northern Annular Mode index for stratospheric vortex weakening and intensification events among five reanalyses and found good agreement. Martineau et al. (2016) investigated dynamical consistency in the extratropical stratosphere among eight reanalyses as quantified by the residual of the zonal momentum equation. Applying a multiple linear regression analysis to nine reanalyses, Mitchell et al. (2015) studied signatures of interannual variability associated with natural forcings, and found remarkable similarity among the data sets. Manney et al. (2005) conducted a diagnostic comparison of the SH MSSW in September 2002 among several meteorological data sets.

Some of these studies are part of a coordinated activity of the Stratosphere-troposphere Processes And their Role in Climate (SPARC) Reanalysis Intercomparison Project (S-RIP; Fujiwara et al., 2017). The climatology and interannual variability of monthly mean temperature and wind fields are surveyed in the S-RIP framework. Furthermore, various aspects of the dynamical coupling between the NH extratropical stratosphere and troposphere will be also investigated there.

The present study focuses on the Japanese 55-year Reanalysis (JRA-55; Kobayashi et al., 2015) data among others, which is one of newer reanalyses. A unique feature of JRA-55 is that in addition to the standard product (STDD), two companion products, JRA-55C (CONV) and JRA-55AMIP (AMIP), are also available. CONV assimilates conventional surface and upper air observations only, without assimilation of satellite observations. AMIP is an AMIP-type simulation using the same forecast model as in STDD and CONV, without assimilation of any observational data. The three products are called the “JRA-55 family data sets” as a whole (Kobayashi et al., 2014).

Previous studies investigated some aspects of the JRA-55 family data sets especially in the stratosphere. Kobayashi and Iwasaki (2016) examined the Brewer-Dobson circulation in the lower stratosphere to show that the mass stream function at 100 hPa (vertically integrated northward mass flux above 100 hPa) is similar between STDD and CONV in annual and seasonal averages, but it is much weaker for AMIP. Kobayashi et al. (2014) and Kobayashi and Iwasaki (2016) also showed that the polar night jet in the winter stratosphere for each hemisphere is stronger for CONV than for STDD, associated with weaker upward wave propagation and driving. Differences of AMIP from STDD are qualitatively similar, but are much larger in magnitude.

This study seeks to compare the climatology and large-scale dynamical variability, such as frequency and vortex geometry of SSWs, in the NH and SH extratropical stratosphere among the JRA-55 family data sets. A motivation for this study is that dynamical variability in the extratropical stratosphere remains relatively unexplored in the JRA-55 family data sets while they provide a good opportunity for a clear comparison owing to the meticulous design. In order to better understand the

删除: the

删除: science

删除: metrological

删除: go along with

删除: This

删除: ,

删除: ,

删除: JRA-55C

删除: JRA-55AMIP

删除: JRA-55

删除: JRA-55C

删除: JRA-55

删除: JRA-55C

删除: JRA-55AMIP

删除: JRA-55C

删除: JRA-55

删除: JRA-55AMIP

删除: JRA-55

删除: articulate

differences of MSSWs, we further describe differences of daily geopotential height fields between ~~STDD~~ and ~~CONV~~, and relate them to the occurrence of MSSWs. We also explore strong wave forcings and associated stratospheric vortex responses for ~~STDD~~ and ~~AMIP~~.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 explains the data and analysis methods used in this study. Section 3 surveys the climatology and variability in the extratropical stratosphere in the JRA-55 family data sets. Section 4 further examines ~~STDD~~ and ~~CONV~~, and Section 5 examines ~~STDD~~ and ~~AMIP~~. Finally, Section 6 provides summary and discussion.

2 Data, and analysis method

2.1 Data

This study makes use of daily averages for the three products of the JRA-55 family data sets. The horizontal resolution is $2.5^\circ \times 2.5^\circ$, with 37 levels up to 1 hPa. The full period is from 1958 to 2012, but we use a shorter period in some comparisons (see below). We mainly use the zonal mean zonal wind, poleward eddy heat flux by wave components of zonal wave numbers 1-3 (waves 1-3), and geopotential height. The eddy heat flux in the extratropical lower stratosphere (e.g., 40-90° N, 100 hPa) is used as a proxy for planetary wave forcing from the troposphere, since it is proportional to the vertical component of the Eliassen-Palm (EP) flux under the quasi-geostrophic scaling (Andrews et al., 1987).

We regard ~~STDD~~, or the standard JRA-55 reanalysis data (Kobayashi et al., 2015) as a good representation of the real world. A comparison of ~~CONV~~ to STDD elucidates effects of assimilation of satellite data, since the inclusion or exclusion of assimilation of satellite data is the only difference between the two (Kobayashi et al., 2014). We also compare ~~AMIP~~ to STDD to examine model biases, since the AMIP data are obtained from an AMIP-type *forecast* simulation using the same numerical weather prediction model and same boundary conditions (sea surface temperatures, greenhouse gases, and so on; see Kobayashi et al. 2015) without assimilation of any observational data.

For the comparison between STDD and CONV, we use the data from 1972/73 to 2012/13 when CONV is available. For the comparison between STDD and AMIP, we use the data from 1957/58 to 2012/13 (i.e., full period). We sort the data in time for both hemispheres so that they begin from June in each year and end in May in the next year to facilitate our main focus on NH winter when the NH extratropical stratosphere is dynamically active. For both NH and SH, we refer to each year from June to May by the year to which the month of January belongs.

2.2 Analysis methods

2.2.1 Identification of MSSW onset dates

The method outlined by Charlton and Polvani (2007) is basically followed to identify MSSWs. This method identifies the onset date (denoted as lag= 0 day) of a MSSW as when the zonal mean zonal wind at 60° N, 10 hPa reverses from a westerly wind to an easterly wind. We focus on MSSWs during the winter period of December-January-February (DJF). In order to

削除: JRA-55

削除: JRA-55C

削除: JRA-55

削除: JRA-55AMIP

削除: JRA-55

削除: JRA-55C

削除: JRA-55

削除: JRA-55AMIP

書式変更: フォントの色 : 自動

削除: , and refer to it as STDD.

削除: JRA-55C (referred to as

削除:)

削除: JRA-55AMIP (referred to as

削除:)

identify two (or more) MSSWs in one season, the onset dates between two successive events must be separated more than 20 days, and the zonal wind must recover above 20 m s^{-1} between them. The latter condition is added to ensure that the polar vortex is sufficiently re-established after the first event. The resultant onset dates of the MSSWs identified for STDD and CONV are shown in Table 1. The onset dates for STDD are identical to those in Butler et al. (2017), as far as the DJF
5 MSSWs are concerned.

2.2.2 Calculation of polar vortex geometry

In order to characterize geometry of the polar vortex, centroid latitude (CL) and aspect ratio (AR) are calculated for the 10 hPa height according to Seviour et al. (2013). This method diagnoses where the center of the vortex is located (CL) and how stretched the vortex is (AR), where the vortex is defined as the region of the 10 hPa height lower than a threshold of Z_b . The
10 parameter Z_b is taken as the climatological and zonal mean of the 10 hPa height at 60° N in each product, and is different among the three products. The height fields are smoothed with a 5 day running mean in calculating CL and AR so as to filter out day-to-day fluctuations and capture dominant geometry features.

2.2.3 Calculation of RMSD of geopotential height fields

Differences in daily geopotential height fields, e.g., at 10 hPa, between STDD and CONV, are evaluated with the root mean
15 square difference (RMSD) as follows:

$$\text{RMSD} = \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i (Z_{\text{CONV}}(x_i) - Z_{\text{STDD}}(x_i))^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i} \right]^{1/2}. \quad (1)$$

Here, Z_{STDD} and Z_{CONV} denote geopotential height fields at a level on a day of interest for STDD and CONV, respectively, x_i
denotes spatial grid points (longitude and latitude), and w_i is cosine of latitude. The summations are taken for all
extratropical grid points (indexed with i from 1 to n) poleward of 30° N/S . Note that an arbitrary RMSD value is divided into
20 contributions from the zonal and wave components as follows:

$$\text{RMSD}^2 = \text{RMSD}_{\text{zonal}}^2 + \text{RMSD}_{\text{wave}}^2. \quad (2)$$

Here, $\text{RMSD}_{\text{wave}}$ is calculated by applying Eq. (1) to wave fields of Z_{STDD} and Z_{CONV} .

3 Survey of climatology and variability in the extratropical stratosphere during NH winter and SH spring

This section surveys the climatology (long-term mean) and variability in the extratropical stratosphere for NH winter and SH
25 spring using the zonal mean zonal wind and 10 hPa geopotential height.

3.1 Climatology

Figure 1 shows the climatological zonal mean zonal wind in DJF and September-October-November (SON) for STDD,
CONV, and AMIP. Color shades plot only differences of CONV or AMIP from STDD that are judged to be statistically

書式変更: フォントの色 : 自動

significant according to Student t test (two-side test) at the 95 % level. When taking differences between STDD and CONV, the STDD data after the 1972/1973 season are used as stated in Sect. 2.1. The degree of freedom in the test is equated to the number of years, as the test uses DJF or SON means for the target years.

The climatological zonal wind is similar between STDD and CONV in a large part of the domain below the middle stratosphere for both seasons, although some differences are notable in the upper stratosphere. The differences are positive near the westerly jets in both hemispheres during the cold seasons, which indicate the stronger westerly jets for CONV. The SH easterly winds for DJF also have positive differences. Negative differences appear in NH subtropical and SH mid-latitudes for SON. Tropospheric wind differences are generally small in magnitude.

The wind differences of AMIP from STDD are roughly similar to those of CONV in spatial pattern, but are larger in vertical extent and magnitude in the stratosphere. AMIP also shows significant differences in the troposphere, although their magnitudes are smaller. In particular, the zonal wind has positive differences around 60° N for DJF, which extend to the stratosphere.

These differences in the polar night jet are consistently reflected in Fig. 2, which similarly shows maps of the climatological 10 hPa geopotential height. The polar vortex is very similar between STDD and CONV in strength and shape for both NH winter and SH spring (Fig. 2b,e). This feature corresponds to the absence of significant differences in the zonal wind at 10 hPa (Fig. 1b,e). On the other hand, AMIP simulates the vortex that is stronger than the STDD counterpart for both seasons (Fig. 2c,f), consistent with the positive wind differences around the polar night jet from the geostrophic wind relationship (Fig. 1c,f). Positive height differences are also notable in surrounding mid-latitudes.

Some of these results about the climatological zonal wind are consistently seen in Kobayashi et al. (2014) and Kobayashi and Iwasaki (2016). The latter study further claimed that the stronger polar vortex in CONV and AMIP reflects weaker wave propagation and driving.

3.2 Variability

Next, we examine variability in the extratropical stratosphere by looking at daily time series of the zonal mean zonal wind at 60° N/S, 10 hPa (Fig. 3). The zonal mean zonal wind at this location is used as a measure of strength (and also flow direction) of the polar vortex for cold seasons in each hemisphere. The climatological seasonal cycle (long-term mean) and variability (standard deviation of interannual variability for each day) are also plotted in the figure. The climatology and standard deviation are smoothed in time so that they consist of low frequency components with periods longer than about 100 days.

The climatology and standard deviation of the zonal wind overlap between STDD and CONV for both NH and SH (Fig. 3b,e). A comparison of probability distribution functions (PDFs) of the daily zonal wind at 60° N for DJF and at 60° S for SON between STDD and CONV shows that they are very close to each other (Fig. 4b,e). It is difficult to notice frequency differences of easterly winds, or MSSWs in NH during DJF in Figs. 3b and 4b, which are further examined in Sect. 3.3. In

削除: the grid points are

削除: proxy for

contrast, one can see that STDD shows SH easterly winds in late September reflecting the occurrence of the MSSW in September 2002, whereas CONV underrepresents it as a minor SSW without a zonal wind reversal (Fig. 3d,e).

AMIP has stronger climatological winds from mid-winter to spring, and somewhat smaller variability around January in NH.

5 One also sees in Fig. 3a,c that zonal wind reversals during DJF are less frequent for AMIP than for STDD. These features are reflected in PDFs of daily zonal wind data for STDD and AMIP (Fig. 4c). It is clear that the PDF for AMIP is biased toward the positive side, consistent with the stronger climatological westerly wind and less frequent zonal wind reversals. It is also notable that apart from the climatological difference, the daily zonal wind data for AMIP has smaller variability. Another PDF is drawn in thin solid line in Fig. 4c for zonal wind data for AMIP that are artificially decreased by the climatological wind difference between STDD and AMIP, so that this PDF has the same mean value as the STDD PDF. One sees that this PDF has somewhat lower frequencies of extreme (both strong and weak) wind values.

10 The AMIP zonal wind data are also biased toward stronger vortex states in the SH extratropical stratosphere for SH winter and spring (Figs. 3f and 4f). The stronger climatological wind is notable from September to November. No MSSW (zonal wind reversal) is simulated from September to mid-October in AMIP.

3.3 Frequency and vortex geometry of MSSWs in NH

15 Figures 3 and 4 showed that the zonal wind variability in NH looks similar between STDD and CONV, suggesting that the occurrence of MSSWs is also similar. On the other hand, AMIP clearly lacks the zonal wind variability and easterly winds, suggestive of fewer MSSWs. In this subsection, we examine the frequency and also vortex geometry of NH MSSWs for the three products.

20 Table 1 lists the onset dates of DJF MSSWs identified for STDD and CONV. The frequency of DJF MSSWs for STDD is 30 events in the 56 seasons (53.6 % for each season) and 22 events in the 41 seasons after 1972/73 (53.7 %). CONV shows 19 events in the 41 seasons (46.3 %). A comparison of the MSSW onset dates between STDD and CONV in the 41 seasons shows that CONV reproduces most MSSWs in STDD as inferred from Fig. 3, but delays seven cases by one to four days. CONV also misses three cases, underrepresenting them as minor SSWs that do not accompany a zonal wind reversal. The latter feature is similar to the SH MSSW in September 2002, when CONV represents it as a minor SSW (Fig. 3). It is also noted that no opposite case exists where an onset date is represented earlier in CONV than in STDD or where a MSSW is represented only in CONV. The delayed and missed cases seem distributed randomly in time (year).

25 The frequency of DJF MSSWs for AMIP is 9 for the 56 seasons (16.1 %), which is much smaller than for STDD. The lower frequency of MSSWs in AMIP is consistent with the stronger westerly wind (Figs. 1-4).

30 The geometry of the polar vortex during the MSSWs for STDD is characterized in a scatter plot between CL and AR on lag=0 day (Fig. 5a). One sees that the data points for STDD roughly form a linear distribution, with a correlation coefficient of +0.68. Data points located near the lower-left end correspond to MSSWs of low CL (e.g., vortex displacement MSSWs), and those near the opposite end correspond to MSSWs of high AR (e.g., vortex split MSSWs). Such a linear distribution was

删除: (

删除:)

删除: .

删除: the

删除: wind

删除: . Thus,

删除: , but is narrower with

pointed out by Taguchi (2016). This distribution reflects that the zonal mean zonal wind at 60° N, 10 hPa representing the vortex strength tends to weaken as CL becomes low and/or AR becomes high (Fig. 5d).

CONV roughly reproduces a similar linear distribution of CL and AR on the MSSW onset dates. The differences in CL and AR vary from one MSSW to another.

5 In addition to the lower frequency, the MSSWs for AMIP show a notable feature about the vortex geometry that all MSSWs have low CL and AR. No MSSW in AMIP shows high AR, e.g., over 2, on lag= 0 day. This implies a lack of vortex split MSSWs. The absence of MSSWs of high AR is consistent with the scatter plot for all DJF data for AMIP (Fig. 5f): the data points for AMIP are biased toward high CL and low AR.

10 In the following, we further explore these differences in the frequency and vortex geometry of MSSWs. In Sect. 4, we relate the occurrence of MSSWs to general RMSD distributions of geopotential height fields between STDD and CONV. In Sect. 5, we examine strong planetary wave forcings and associated stratospheric vortex weakenings for STDD and AMIP.

4 Comparison of CONV to STDD

15 In Sect. 3, we showed that CONV is close to STDD in terms of the climatological zonal mean zonal wind and height in the NH extratropical stratosphere (Figs. 1 and 2). The daily time series and PDFs of the zonal wind also look similar between the two runs (Figs. 3 and 4), although the occurrence of MSSWs is slightly different. In this section, we describe general RMSD distributions of daily extratropical height fields between STDD and CONV at various levels, and relate them to the occurrence of MSSWs.

4.1 Climatological RMSD distributions

20 First, we examine climatological distributions of RMSD for NH and SH. Figure 6a,c plots the long-term means of RMSD as a function of time (season) and height. It is common between the two hemispheres and all seasons that RMSD increases with height. This result will be expected, since the assimilation of conventional observations in CONV does not extend to the upper stratosphere. In the NH upper stratosphere, RMSD has a semi-annual cycle, with two peaks in NH summer and winter. The winter peak is larger than the summer counterpart, and extends deeper down to the middle stratosphere such as 10 hPa. Such a semi-annual cycle is also notable in the SH upper stratosphere. The winter peak also extends deeper than the summer peak in SH as in NH.

25 The climatological height distributions of RMSD for NH winter and SH spring are extracted in Fig. 6b,d to emphasize interhemispheric differences during the dynamically active seasons. It confirms the increase in RMSD with height for both hemispheres. It also reveals that RMSD is larger in SH than in NH in a large part of the domain, except for the upper stratosphere. The SH has considerable magnitudes of RMSD even in the troposphere. It may be that conventional observations are insufficient in SH, and assimilation of satellite observations lead to larger differences.

30 An examination of year-to-year changes in RMSD suggests a trend in SH, which is discussed in Sect. 6.2.

削除: CONV tends to underestimate equatorward shift of the polar vortex for MSSWs located near the lower-left end, as CL for CONV is larger than the STDD counterpart. On the other hand, the differences in AR for MSSWs located near the opposite end vary: some MSSWs for CONV overestimate AR compared to the STDD counterparts, whereas underestimations are also notable for others.

書式変更: フォントの色 : 自動

削除: as may be expected.

削除: 5b

4.2 Case-to-case variability in RMSD, and MSSWs in NH

We further examine day-to-day variability in RMSD, particularly cases of extreme RMSD values, and compare them to the occurrence of MSSWs. Figure 7a,b shows daily time series of RMSD at 10 hPa in both NH and SH during dynamically active seasons. PDFs of the RMSD values are also plotted in Fig. 6c,d: DJF and SON data are used for NH and SH, respectively. In addition to the climatological difference, notable minimum and maximum RMSD values are also larger in SH than in NH. SH RMSD often attains large local maxima, e.g., over 400 m, and even NH RMSD sometimes exhibits sharp peaks.

In order to examine specific geopotential height distributions, we identify cases of extremely large RMSD values for each of NH and SH as when RMSD attains local maxima over a threshold. The threshold is defined as the 95 percentile of all RMSD values during DJF in NH or SON in SH for the 41 seasons. The local maxima must be separated by more than 30 days when they are identified in the same season. RMSD values around the MSSW onset dates (from lag= -10 to +10 days) are excluded from this procedure, and are used separately.

Figure 8 presents scatter plots of the zonal and wave components contributing to the total RMSD values for these cases. Note that the distance of each data point from the origin gives the total RMSD value (Eq. 2). The figure also includes the results of all MSSW onset dates identified in STDD. The data points use different colors according to the zonal mean zonal wind at 60° N/S, 10 hPa in STDD on the target day of each case (see the colorbar). Note that data points plotted in red corresponds to MSSWs in STDD.

One sees in Fig. 8a that several data points that are located far from the origin and hence have largest total RMSD values are not associated with the MSSWs, except for one MSSW case. Some of the data points are located relatively close to the y-axis, implying large contributions from the wave component. The zonal mean zonal wind in STDD is relatively strong (over 20 m s⁻¹) for these cases, when they have large values of the y-component (≥ 100 m).

The opposite also holds for other data points, when the zonal component makes large contributions and the zonal wind is weaker, (≤ 20 m s⁻¹). We also examined zonal wind differences of CONV from STDD for these cases but didn't notice any systematic relationship, as both overestimations and underestimations by CONV occur (not shown). The five largest values of total RMSD are labelled as a-e in Fig. 8a for Fig. 9.

Regarding the MSSWs, one may expect that the missed and delayed cases have larger RMSD values than the other MSSWs, but it turns out that this is not the case (see also Fig. 8c). All of the three missed cases (labelled as f-h), and one of the delayed cases (with a time difference of 4 days, labelled as i) appear in the intermediate data points near the coordinate point of (40, 40). The exceptional MSSW, located near (200, 100), is a delayed case with a time difference of 3 days (labelled as j).

As for SH, a large part of the data points are located near the y-axis, implying an important role of the wave component. For these cases, STDD has strong westerly winds over 20 m s⁻¹, and both overestimations and underestimations in the zonal wind by CONV occur. The missed MSSW case (September 2002 MSSW in STDD, labelled as p) also occurs with a large contribution from the wave component.

删除: typical
删除: as inferred from envelopes
删除: whereas
删除: in

删除: between contributions from
删除: on
删除: and markers
删除: and its difference (CONV minus STDD)
删除: legends). The marker for each MSSW case accompanies a number (from 0 to 4) or a letter "M". The numbers denote the time differences in the MSSW onset dates between STDD and CONV, and the letters "M" mean
删除: these are missed
删除: CONV (Table 1).
删除:
删除: RMSE
删除: . There is
删除: exceptional
删除: accompanied by a number of 3
删除: .
删除: . Both
删除: in the zonal wind
删除: for these cases
删除: and missed
删除: Two
删除: differences
删除: 2 and
删除:) and all of the three missed cases

Figure 9a-e plots 10 hPa height maps for the five largest RMSD values in NH selected from Fig. 8a. One sees large differences in places, which often occur near the edge of the polar vortex rather than near the center of the vortex. These differences do not have strong zonal symmetry but vary in the zonal direction, consistent with the large contributions from the wave component (Fig. 8a). These differences are reflected in different distributions of contour lines of 30000 m representative of the vortex edge, implying different shapes of the vortex between STDD and CONV.

The height differences during the four MSSWs (three missed cases and one delayed case, Fig. 9f-i) are generally smaller in magnitude. Both STDD and CONV show very similar vortex shapes in terms of the 30000 m contour lines. The difference fields have negative, albeit small in magnitude, values over polar latitudes, suggesting that the extratropical zonal wind is stronger in CONV. This is consistent with the fact that these MSSWs are missed or delayed in CONV.

One exception is the MSSW with the time difference of 3 days (Fig. 9j). In this case, the polar vortex similarly splits into two cyclones for both STDD and CONV. Nonetheless, the height differences have largely negative values in high latitudes.

Figure 9k-o is similar, but for the SH cases of the five largest RMSD values (Fig. 8b). The differences in SH are generally larger in magnitude than the NH counterparts, and are dominated by wave 1 component. The dominance of wave 1 reflects that the location of the polar vortex (or distribution of the 30000 m contour) in CONV is notably deviated from the STDD counterpart.

As for the SH MSSW, STDD shows a split of the vortex into two cyclones, whereas CONV shows that the vortex (30000 m contour line) shifts away from the South Pole and highly stretches, without a split (Fig. 8p). The height differences are comparable in magnitude to the preceding five cases. Negative values prevail in the height difference over polar latitudes, consistent with the underrepresentation of this case as a minor SSW in CONV.

5 Comparison of AMIP to STDD

We showed in Sect. 3 that the MSSW frequency for AMIP is much lower than that for STDD. In particular, AMIP lacks MSSWs of high AR. In order to better understand these differences, (especially the former), in this section we examine extreme planetary wave forcings (poleward eddy heat fluxes) and stratospheric vortex weakening responses to them. Since it is well known that MSSWs are a response of the polar vortex to anomalously strong planetary wave forcings from the troposphere (Matsuno, 1971; Limpasuvan et al., 2004), the differences may be explained in terms of wave forcing from the troposphere and or the vortex response in the stratosphere.

5.1 Lower MSSW frequency for AMIP

The first issue is the lower frequency of MSSWs in AMIP. One may hypothesize that it is due to a lower frequency of strong wave forcings and/or weaker vortex responses to such wave forcings.

In Fig. 10a, we examine how the poleward eddy heat flux in the extratropical lower stratosphere (40-90° N, 100 hPa) and zonal wind deceleration are related for all MSSWs in STDD and AMIP. The heat flux is averaged in time from lag= -20 to 0

書式変更: フォントの色 : 自動

削除: ,

削除: either or both of

day, and the zonal wind deceleration is also calculated for the 21 days. We focus on the 21 day period, since the correlation between the two quantities for the MSSWs in STDD maximizes when we average the heat flux for about 10 to 30 days (not shown). This is consistent with the fact that polar vortex strength is highly correlated to the heat flux when the latter is averaged for a few weeks or longer (Polvani and Waugh, 2004). This method follows Taguchi (2017), who examined the
5 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) historical simulations with 30 models. It is common between STDD and AMIP that as expected, the zonal wind decelerates more strongly when the wave forcing is stronger. The distribution for STDD has a correlation coefficient of -0.70.

Since this plot is based on the data around the MSSWs, it does not explain how/why the MSSWs are much fewer for AMIP. In order to obtain a clue for the difference in the MSSW frequency, we look at extreme planetary wave forcings by
10 identifying a maximum of the poleward heat flux (averaged for 21 days, from 20 day before to each day) of waves 1-3 for each winter season in STDD and AMIP. We also extract zonal wind decelerations associated with the maximum wave forcings (Fig. 10b).

The plot shows two features in addition to similar linear distributions between the wave forcing and wind deceleration for both STDD and AMIP as in the MSSWs. First, AMIP lacks relatively strong forcings. For example, STDD has ten samples
15 over a threshold of 25 K m s^{-1} , whereas AMIP has only three. Second, the zonal wind decelerations for wave forcings around 20 K m s^{-1} seem stronger for STDD than for AMIP.

The second point is further examined in a composite analysis with respect to the days of the maximum heat flux that ranges from the 25th percentile (17.4 K m s^{-1}) to the 75th percentile (23.9 K m s^{-1}) of all maximum heat flux values in STDD (Fig. 11). The two percentile values are similar for AMIP: 16.9 and 22.0 K m s^{-1} . The range limitation intends to subsample wave
20 forcings of similar magnitudes for both STDD and AMIP.

As a result, the composite daily heat flux increases from lag ≈ -20 to 0 day for both STDD and AMIP (Fig. 11c). The lag = 0 day here denotes when the 21 day mean heat flux maximizes. This feature is quite similar between the two products, by
construction. The 21 day means from lag = -20 to 0 day are not significantly different at the 95 % level. The composite residual mean meridional wind (in the transformed Eulerian-mean equations) and wave driving (EP flux
25 divergence/convergence) are also similar between the two (Fig. 11b,d), and their 21 day means are not significantly different at the 95 % level. In contrast, the composite zonal wind evolution is different, as the zonal wind decelerates more strongly for STDD. It is around 40 m s^{-1} before lag ≈ -20 days in both STDD and AMIP, before decreasing to lag ≈ 0 day. The wind deceleration from lag = -20 to 0 day is 28.5 m s^{-1} for STDD and 17.6 m s^{-1} for AMIP, and this difference is judged to be significantly different at the 95 % level. This feature is consistent with Fig. 10b.

30 Thus, these results suggest that the lower frequency of MSSWs for AMIP can be attributed to the lower frequency of extreme wave forcings, and the weaker vortex response in the stratosphere. These differences may reflect model biases in AMIP (or effects of data assimilation in STDD), which will be discussed in Sect. 6.

Figures 10 and 11 additionally include results from CONV for reference. It is shown that the results from CONV are similar to those from STDD in terms of planetary wave forcing from the troposphere and vortex response in the stratosphere.

删除: 25
删除: 75
删除: 11).

删除: , and the

删除: poleward wind

删除: is contributed by

5.2 Lack of MSSWs of high AR in AMIP

The second issue is the lack of MSSWs of high AR in AMIP. Again, this may be due to a lack of appropriate wave forcings leading to such MSSWs, and/or a difference of vortex responses to such forcings.

An analysis of AR changes associated with the maximum 21 day mean heat flux of waves 1-3 (defined for Figs. 10b,d and 11) in STDD and AMIP indicates that the lack of MSSWs of high AR in AMIP can be explained by a different vortex response in the stratosphere to strong wave forcings from the troposphere. The heat flux maxima of waves 1-3 include similar contributions from wave 1 and wave 2 between STDD and AMIP, but extreme AR values occur only for STDD (not shown).

It is noted that the climatological, or background, difference in the 10 hPa height will play a role in explaining the different vortex response. The climatological difference is negative and increases in magnitude toward polar latitudes (Fig. 2). Then, it is likely to follow that when the polar vortex in STDD largely stretches for a high AR value in response to a wave forcing, it will be more difficult for the deeper AMIP vortex to exhibit similar stretching even for the same forcing. This idea is related to Seviour et al. (2016), who pointed out a close connection between the frequency of vortex split MSSWs and climatological AR for 13 CMIP5 models.

6 Summary and discussion

6.1 Summary

This study has compared large-scale dynamical variability in the NH and SH extratropical stratosphere, such as MSSWs, among the JRA-55 family data sets. In spite of the importance of dynamical variability in the stratosphere, such an aspect was relatively unexplored in the JRA-55 family data sets and also other reanalyses. This study owes the comparison to the meticulous design of the JRA-55 family data sets.

First, a survey of the climatological states confirms the stronger polar night jet in both hemispheres for CONV and AMIP than for STDD. This difference is more notable for AMIP. A comparison of MSSWs reveals that CONV reproduces a large part of MSSWs identified in STDD. However, CONV delays several cases by one to four days, and also misses three cases underrepresenting them as minor SSWs. The SH MSSW in September 2002 is also underrepresented as a minor SSW in CONV. AMIP lacks MSSWs, especially those of high AR values. The differences in CONV could be understood by the bias of the numerical weather prediction model (as seen in AMIP) and the paucity of data assimilation as hypothesized by Kobayashi et al. (2014). It is also suggested that due to the bias of the model, even STDD (or CONV) may underestimate stratospheric variability compared to the real world.

Next, we examined daily RMSD distributions of geopotential height fields between STDD and CONV, and relate them to the occurrence of MSSWs. In spite of the slight climatological differences in the zonal mean zonal wind and 10 hPa geopotential height, the examination shows that CONV is sometimes significantly different from STDD in terms of daily

削除: Charlton and Polvani (2007) showed that vortex split MSSWs, which are characterized by high AR, are predominantly associated with amplified wave 2 activity.

削除: Such a relationship between planetary wave forcings and MSSWs

削除: high

削除: is seen in Fig. 12a, which is a scatter plot between wave 1 and wave 2 heat flux (averaged from lag= -20 to 0 day) for

削除: MSSWs in STDD (crosses) and AMIP (circles). The data points are colored according to AR values on lag= 0 day (see the colorbar). Panel (c) is similar, but looks for a

削除: AR value from 10 days before to 10 days after each MSSW onset date, and use the day of the AR maximum as the key in calculating the 21 day mean heat flux. This treatment is included to capture increases in AR that do not always occur on the MSSW onset dates but sometimes occur around them. The plots show that some MSSWs of high AR values over 4 occur when wave 2 forcing is strong over $\approx 10 \text{ K m s}^{-1}$ and wave 1 forcing is weak below $\approx 5 \text{ K m s}^{-1}$. There are other MSSWs of high AR values that are accompanied by large wave 1 forcing over $\approx 10 \text{ K m s}^{-1}$ even when wave 2 forcing is relatively weak. The inclusion of the time lead or lag in identifying the AR maxima contributes to the increases in AR.

Since these plots, again, focus on the MSSWs and do not reveal how/why AMIP lacks MSSWs of high AR, in Fig. 12b we examine similar pictures for the maximum of the

削除: for each winter identified in Sect. 5.1. In Fig. 12d, we further allow time lead or lag for identifying AR maxima as in the MSSW case. A comparison between STDD and AMIP shows that the distributions of the data points roughly overlap between the two. Nonetheless, extreme AR values over 4 occur only for STDD. These suggest that

削除: plays an important role in explaining the lack of MSSWs of high AR in AMIP. The lack of extreme wave forcings for AMIP seen in Fig. 10b is not conspicuous in Fig. 12b,d, but can be confirmed when taking the sum of the wave 1 and wave 2

削除: larger

削除: as going

書式変更: フォントの色 : 自動

削除: articulate

削除: These

削除: of

削除: (2014).

height fields. The differences are large especially in the upper stratosphere in both hemispheres during dynamically active seasons, with larger values in SH. The RMSD values in NH winter sometimes have sharp peaks, apart from the MSSWs. The RMSD peaks include contributions from the wave component that are larger than or comparable to those from the zonal component. RMSD values for some of the delayed MSSWs and all of the missed MSSWs are smaller than such peaks. In such MSSW cases, CONV overestimates the zonal mean zonal wind in the extratropical stratosphere by definition, and both of the zonal and wave components make important contributions.

Furthermore, we examined strong planetary wave forcings and associated zonal wind decelerations (polar vortex weakenings) in STDD and AMIP. It turns out that in AMIP, extreme wave forcings are fewer and zonal wind decelerations to such wave forcings are weaker. The stronger polar vortex in AMIP may also contribute to the lack of MSSWs since it will act to prohibit “preconditioning” of the vortex for MSSWs. These features are commonly seen in some of the CMIP5 historical simulations (Taguchi 2017). These model biases may be reflected in CONV, where they are likely to contribute to the delay and miss of several MSSWs. The latter factor (different vortex responses in AMIP from STDD) is also suggested to be relevant to the lack of MSSWs of high AR values in AMIP.

削除: These two factors are

6.2 Discussion

Finally, we discuss several aspects unanswered in this study.

This study reveals large RMSD values for stratospheric height fields between STDD and CONV (Figs. 7-9), but does not fully answer how/why such differences occur. It does not seem simple to understand what patterns such large differences take and when they occur. They could be explained by the effects of the assimilation of satellite data, but future study is needed to understand the effects more specifically.

削除: should

Whereas we mostly focus on the middle stratosphere such as 10 hPa height distributions, the RMSD increase with height suggests that upper stratospheric heights have larger differences between STDD and CONV. This will invite a further study about differences in vertical vortex structures between the two products. For example, it is possible that even MSSWs identified on same onset dates in STDD and CONV have notable differences in the upper stratosphere between them.

削除: 13

A further examination of year-to-year variations in RMSD at several levels suggests a decreasing trend in SH (Fig. 12). The SH decreasing trend is statistically significant at the 95 % level for all four levels. Such a trend is absent or much weaker in NH. This suggests that the impacts of assimilation of satellite data decrease over the decadal time scale especially in SH. Further details and mechanisms will be worthy of investigation.

The differences between STDD and AMIP, which are relevant to model biases, are characterized by the stronger climatological polar vortex and lack of MSSWs for AMIP. The lack of MSSWs in AMIP is not fully explained by the climatological difference, although it is consistent. This suggests that some additional factors or processes, such as tropospheric planetary wave forcing and stratospheric vortex response, play roles.

Detailed analyses of these aspects will be therefore useful. A decomposition technique of eddy heat flux (e.g., Nishii et al., 2009; Fletcher and Kushner, 2011) could be applied so as to better understand the lack of extreme wave forcings from the

troposphere in AMIP. A zonal momentum budget analysis as in Martineau et al. (2016) could be also conducted to diagnose stratospheric vortex responses to strong wave forcings in the three products, including how/why several MSSWs are delayed or missed in CONV compared to STDD.

Acknowledgements

5 The author thanks the Japan Meteorological Agency for making the JRA-55 family data sets available. The data were obtained from the Research Data Archive at the National Center for Atmospheric Research, Computational and Information Systems Laboratory. [The author acknowledges that comments from three anonymous reviewers and Dr. Martineau improved the manuscript.](#) This study is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (S) 2422401101 and (C) 15K05286.

References

- 10 Andrews, D. G., Holton, J. R. and Leovy, C. B.: Middle Atmosphere Dynamics, Academic Press, San Diego, California, 1987.
- Butler, A. H., Seidel, D. J., Hardiman, S. C., Butchart, N., Birner, T. and Match, A.: Defining sudden stratospheric warmings, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 96(11), 1913–1928, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00173.1, 2015.
- Butler, A. H., Sjoberg, J. P., Seidel, D. J. and Rosenlof, K. H.: A sudden stratospheric warming compendium, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 9, 63–76, doi:10.5194/essd-9-63-2017, 2017.
- 15 Charlton, A. J. and Polvani, L. M.: A new look at stratospheric sudden warmings. Part I: Climatology and modeling benchmarks, *J. Clim.*, 20(3), 449–469, doi:10.1175/JCLI3996.1, 2007.
- Fletcher, C. G. and Kushner, P. J.: The role of linear interference in the annular mode response to tropical SST forcing, *J. Clim.*, 24(3), 778–794, doi:10.1175/2010JCLI3735.1, 2011.
- 20 Fujiwara, M., Wright, J. S., Manney, G. L., Gray, L. J., Anstey, J., Birner, T., Davis, S., Gerber, E. P., Harvey, V. L., Hegglin, M. I., Homeyer, C. R., Knox, J. A., Krüger, K., Lambert, A., Long, C. S., Martineau, P., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Santee, M. L., Tegtmeier, S., Chabrilat, S., Tan, D. G. H., Jackson, D. R., Polavarapu, S., Compo, G. P., Dragani, R., Ebisuzaki, W., Harada, Y., Kobayashi, C., McCarty, W., Onogi, K., Pawson, S., Simmons, A., Wargan, K., Whitaker, J. S. and Zou, C.-Z.: Introduction to the SPARC Reanalysis Intercomparison Project (S-RIP) and overview of the reanalysis systems, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 17(July), 1417–1452, doi:10.5194/acp-2016-652, 2017.
- 25 Kobayashi, C. and Iwasaki, T.: Brewer-Dobson circulation diagnosed from JRA-55, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 121(4), 1493–1510, doi:10.1002/2015JD023476, 2016.
- Kobayashi, C., Endo, H., Ota, Y., Kobayashi, S., Onoda, H., Harada, Y., Onogi, K. and Kamahori, H.: Preliminary results of the JRA-55C, an atmospheric reanalysis assimilating conventional observations only, *Sola*, 10, 78–82, doi:10.2151/sola.2014-016, 2014.
- 30

書式変更: フォントの色 : 自動

書式変更: フォントの色 : 自動

- Kobayashi, S., Ota, Y., Harada, Y., Ebita, A., Moriya, M., Onoda, H., Onogi, K., Kamahori, H., Kobayashi, C., Endo, H., Miyaoka, K. and Takahashi, K.: The JRA-55 Reanalysis: General specifications and basic characteristics, *J. Meteorol. Soc. Japan. Ser. II*, 93(1), 5–48, doi:10.2151/jmsj.2015-001, 2015.
- Labitzke, K. G. and van Loon, H.: *The Stratosphere: Phenomena, History, and Relevance*, Springer, Berlin, 1999.
- 5 Limpasuvan, V., Thompson, D. W. J. and Hartmann, D. L.: The life cycle of the Northern Hemisphere sudden stratospheric warmings, *J. Clim.*, 17(13), 2584–2596, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(2004)017<2584:TLCOTN>2.0.CO;2, 2004.
- Manney, G. L., Allen, D. R., Krüger, K., Naujokat, B., Santee, M. L., Sabutis, J. L., Pawson, S., Swinbank, R., Randall, C. E., Simmons, A. J. and Long, C.: Diagnostic comparison of meteorological analyses during the 2002 Antarctic winter, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 133(5), 1261–1278, doi:10.1175/MWR2926.1, 2005.
- 10 Martineau, P. and Son, S. W.: Quality of reanalysis data during stratospheric vortex weakening and intensification events, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 37(22), 1–5, doi:10.1029/2010GL045237, 2010.
- Martineau, P., Son, S.-W. and Taguchi, M.: Dynamical consistency of reanalysis data sets in the extratropical stratosphere, *J. Clim.*, 160222131641003 [online] Available from: <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0469.1?af=R>, 2016.
- 15 Matsuno, T.: A dynamical model of the stratospheric sudden warming, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 28(8), 1479–1494, doi:10.1175/1520-0469(1971)028<1479:ADMOTS>2.0.CO;2, 1971.
- Mitchell, D. M., Gray, L. J., Fujiwara, M., Hibino, T., Anstey, J. A., Ebisuzaki, W., Harada, Y., Long, C., Misios, S., Stott, P. A. and Tan, D.: Signatures of naturally induced variability in the atmosphere using multiple reanalysis datasets, *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 141(691), 2011–2031, doi:10.1002/qj.2492, 2015.
- 20 Nishii, K., Nakamura, H. and Miyasaka, T.: Modulations in the planetary wave field induced by upward-propagating Rossby wave packets prior to stratospheric sudden warming events: A case-study, *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 135(638), 39–52, doi:10.1002/qj.359, 2009.
- Polvani, L. M. and Waugh, D. W.: Upward wave activity flux as a precursor to extreme stratospheric events and subsequent anomalous surface weather regimes, *J. Clim.*, 17(18), 3548–3554, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(2004)017<3548:UWAFAA>2.0.CO;2, 2004.
- 25 Seviour, W. J. M., Mitchell, D. M. and Gray, L. J.: A practical method to identify displaced and split stratospheric polar vortex events, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40(19), 5268–5273, doi:10.1002/grl.50927, 2013.
- Seviour, W. J. M., Gray, L. J. and Mitchell, D. M.: Stratospheric polar vortex splits and displacements in the high-top CMIP5 climate models, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 121(4), 1400–1413, doi:10.1002/2015JD024178, 2016.
- 30 Taguchi, M.: Connection of predictability of major stratospheric sudden warmings to polar vortex geometry, *Atmos. Sci. Lett.*, 17(1), 33–38, doi:10.1002/asl.595, 2016.
- Taguchi, M.: A study of different frequencies of major stratospheric sudden warmings in CMIP5 historical simulations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, [122, 5144–5156](https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD025826), doi:10.1002/2016JD025826, 2017.

削除: submitted to

削除: . Atmos.,

Waugh, D. W. and Polvani, L. M.: Stratospheric polar vortices, in: *The Stratosphere: Dynamics, Transport, and Chemistry*, Polvani, L. M., Sobel, A. H. and Waugh, D. W. (Eds.), American Geophysical Union, Washington, D.C., 43-57, 2010.

Yoden, S., Taguchi, M. and Naito, Y.: Numerical Studies on Time Variations of the Troposphere-Stratosphere Coupled System., *J. Meteorol. Soc. Japan*, 80(4), 811–830, 2002.

Table 1: Onset dates (in the dd-month-yyyy format) of DJF MSSWs for STDD and CONV, with differences in the onset dates (number of days) of CONV from STDD. Grey region indicates the period when CONV is unavailable. The letters “M” mean that the MSSWs identified in STDD are missed in CONV.

STDD	CONV	DIFF
30 Jan 1958		
17 Jan 1960		
30 Jan 1963		
18 Dec 1965		
23 Feb 1966		
07 Jan 1968		
02 Jan 1970		
18 Jan 1971		
31 Jan 1973	01 Feb 1973	1
09 Jan 1977	13 Jan 1977	4
22 Feb 1979	22 Feb 1979	0
29 Feb 1980	29 Feb 1980	0
06 Feb 1981	M	—
04 Dec 1981	M	—
24 Feb 1984	24 Feb 1984	0
01 Jan 1985	04 Jan 1985	3
23 Jan 1987	23 Jan 1987	0
08 Dec 1987	08 Dec 1987	0
21 Feb 1989	21 Feb 1989	0
15 Dec 1998	16 Dec 1998	1
26 Feb 1999	26 Feb 1999	0
11 Feb 2001	11 Feb 2001	0
31 Dec 2001	M	—
18 Jan 2003	18 Jan 2003	0
05 Jan 2004	07 Jan 2004	2
21 Jan 2006	22 Jan 2006	1
24 Feb 2007	24 Feb 2007	0
22 Feb 2008	22 Feb 2008	0
24 Jan 2009	25 Jan 2009	1
09 Feb 2010	09 Feb 2010	0




Figure 1: The climatological zonal mean zonal wind in the JRA-55 family data sets for (a-c) DJF and (d-f) SON in black contours. Panels (a,d) are for STDD, (b,e) for CONV, and (c,f) for AMIP. Contour interval is 10 m/s. Panels (b,c,e,f) also plot differences from STDD by color shades (see the colorbar) that are statistically significant at the 95 % level. When taking differences of CONV from STDD, the STDD data after the 1972/1973 season are used.

削除:






Figure 2: Same as in Fig. 1, but for the climatological mean 10 hPa height. Contour interval is 500 m. Thick contours denote 30000 m.






Figure 3: Daily time series of the zonal mean zonal wind [U] at 10 hPa (grey solid lines); (a-c) 60° N, and (d-f) 60° S. The square brackets denote the zonal mean. Panels (a,d) are for STDD, (b,e) for CONV, and (c,f) for AMIP. The climatological seasonal cycle, and standard deviation of interannual variability for each day are denoted by black broken lines in (a,c) and by black solid lines in the other panels. Broken lines in (b,c,e,f) denote the results from STDD. The STDD data after the 1972/1973 season are used in (b,e). Month labels are placed at the first day of each month.

削除:

削除: Solid lines in each panel denote the





Figure 4: PDFs of the daily zonal mean zonal wind at 60° N, 10 hPa for DJF (a-c) and at 60° S, 10 hPa for SON (d-f) in broken lines (a,d) or in solid lines (the other panels). Panels (a,d) are for STDD, (b,e) for CONV, and (e,f) for AMIP. Broken lines in (b,c,e,f) denote the results from STDD. The STDD data after the 1972/1973 season are used in (b,e). In panel (c), an additional PDF is drawn in thin solid line for the AMIP zonal wind data that are artificially decreased by the climatological difference from STDD, so that the decreased wind data have the same mean value as in STDD.



削除:

削除: thick

削除: .





Figure 5: (a-c) Scatter plots between CL and AR of the 10 hPa height on the onset dates of the NH MSSWs: (a) STDD, (b) CONV, and (c) AMIP. Ellipses denote representative distributions of the data points extracted by an empirical orthogonal function analysis. Each data point in (b) is connected to the corresponding case in STDD (grey), and accompanied by a number denoting the time difference in the onset dates (Table 1). Panels (d-f) plot results for all DJF days available to each product. Each data point is colored by the zonal mean zonal wind at 60° N, 10 hPa (see the colorbar).



削除:

削除、

書式変更: フォント: MS 明朝




Figure 6: (a,c) Time-height sections of the climatology of RMSD: (a) NH, and (c) SH. Contour interval is 100 m, with additional contours at 25, 50, and 75 m. Panels (b,d) plot seasonal means as a function of height: (b) NH for DJF, and (d) SH for SON. Horizontal lines denote 5 and 95 percentiles.

5




Figure 7: (a,b) Daily time series of RMSD at 10 hPa: (a) NH, and (b) SH. Broken lines denote the climatological seasonal cycle. Panels (c,d) show PDFs of the RMSD values for DJF in NH and for SON in SH.







Figure 8: (a,b) Scatter plots between zonal and wave contributions to total RMSD for large RMSD peaks exceeding the 95 percentile of all RMSD values; (a) NH for DJF, and (b) SH for SON. Results for all MSSW onset dates in STDD are also shown. Panel (c) is a larger version of (a). The data points are plotted in different colors, which denote the zonal mean zonal wind in STDD at 60° N/S, 10 hPa on the target dates (see the colorbar). Red data points correspond to the MSSW cases. Letters a-j in (a,c) and k-p in (b) denote cases used in Fig. 9. Grey lines denote $y=x/3$, $y=x$, and $y=3x$.



- 削除:
- 削除: in STDD
- 削除: and markers
- 削除: , respectively,
- 書式変更: フォント: MS 明朝
- 削除: and its difference between STDD and CONV
- 削除: The σ denotes
- 削除: standard deviation of all zonal wind difference data between STDD and CONV: 1.9 m s⁻¹ for DJF in NH, and 3.7 m s⁻¹ for SON in SH.
- 削除: e
- 削除: o
- 削除: 9. Each data point for the MSSWs accompanies a number from 0 to 4 or a letter M. The numbers denote the time differences in the onset date, or the letters M mean that the MSSWs in STDD are missed in CONV (Table 1). Th...



削除:

Figure 9: (Black contours in a-e and k-o) Maps of the 10 hPa height in STDD for the five largest RMSD values: (a-e) NH, and (k-o) SH. These labels are the same as in Fig. 8a,b. The target dates are also denoted in the ddmmyyyy format. Contour interval is 500 m, and thick black contours denote 30000 m in STDD. Magenta contours denote 30000 m for the 10 hPa height in CONV on the same dates. Color shades denote differences of CONV from STDD (see the colorbar). Panels (f-j) are similar, but for the three missed MSSW cases and the two delayed cases in NH. These labels are also denoted in Fig. 8a,c. Panel (p) is similar, but for the 2002 MSSW in SH (see Fig. 8b).





Figure 10: (a) Scatter plot between 21 day mean heat flux (lag= -20 to 0 day) of waves 1-3, and associated zonal wind deceleration for the 21 days for all MSSWs in STDD (black), CONV (blue), and AMIP (red). Panel (b) is similar, but uses the maximum of the 21 day mean heat flux of waves 1-3 in each DJF season as the key. Vertical broken lines denote the 25th and 75th percentile values of the heat flux in STDD, used for the composite analysis in Fig. 11. Panels (c,d) show frequency distributions of the 21 day mean heat flux for the respective cases. The full period data are used for STDD.



削除:

削除:)





Figure 11: Composite time series with respect to the maximum of the 21 day mean heat flux of wave 1-3 in each DJF season for STDD (black), CONV (blue), and AMIP (red): (a) zonal mean zonal wind at 60° N, 10 hPa, (b) residual mean meridional wind in the transformed Eulerian-mean equations at 60° N, 10hPa, (c) heat flux of waves 1-3 at 40-90° N, 100 hPa, and (d) EP flux divergence/convergence of waves 1-3 at 60° N, 10 hPa. The lag= 0 day denotes when the 21 day mean heat flux maximizes. The full period data are used for STDD.



削除:

削除:)

削除: Thick lines denote composite results, and thin lines denote results for each case.




Figure 12: Year-to-year variations of RMSD at four levels as indicated. Solid lines denote results in NH for DJF, and broken lines denote results in SH for SON.





Figure 12: (a) Scatter plot between wave 1 heat flux and wave 2 heat flux (both averaged from lag=-20 to 0 day in 40-90° N, 100 hPa) for all MSSWs in STDD (crosses) and AMIP (circles). Each data point is colored according to the AR value on the onset dates (see the colorbar). Panel (c) is similar, but looks for the AR maximum between 10 days before and 10 days after each MSSW onset date, and uses the day as the key. Panels (b,d) are similar, but use the maximum of 21 day mean heat flux of waves 1-3 (40-90° N, 100 hPa) in each DJF season instead of the MSSWs.



9. Each data point for the MSSWs accompanies a number from 0 to 4 or a letter M. The numbers denote the time differences in the onset date, or the letters M mean that the MSSWs in STDD are missed in CONV (Table 1). The MSSW data points are further related to f-j and p, which denote the panels in Fig. 9. Broken




Figure 12: (a) Scatter plot between wave 1 heat flux and wave 2 heat flux (both averaged from lag= -20 to 0 day in $40-90^\circ$ N, 100 hPa) for all MSSWs in STDD (crosses) and AMIP (circles). Each data point is colored according to the AR value on the onset dates (see the colorbar). Panel (c) is similar, but looks for the AR maximum between 10 days before and 10 days after each MSSW onset date, and uses the day as the key. Panels (b,d) are similar, but use the maximum of 21 day mean heat flux of waves 1-3 ($40-90^\circ$ N, 100 hPa) in each DJF season instead of the MSSWs.




Figure 13