1 2	
3	
4	Comparison of Global Observations and Trends of Total Precipitable Water Derived
5	from Microwave Radiometers and COSMIC Radio Occultation from 2006 to 2013
6	
7	
8	Shu-peng Ho <sup>1</sup> , Liang Peng <sup>1</sup> , Carl Mears <sup>2</sup> , Richard A. Anthes <sup>1</sup>
9	<sup>1</sup> University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, P.O. Box 3000, Boulder, CO. 80307-
10	3000
11	<sup>2</sup> Remote Sensing Systems, Santa Rosa, California, USA,
12	Corresponding author address: Dr. Shu-Peng Ho, COSMIC Project Office, University
13	Corporation for Atmospheric Research, P. O. Box 3000, Boulder CO. 80307-3000
14	E-mail: spho@ucar.edu
15	
16	
17	Manuscript for Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics
18	
19	9 November 2017
20	
21	Shu-Peng Ho, COSMIC Project Office, Univ. Corp. for Atmospheric Research, P. O.
22	Box 3000, Boulder CO. 80307-3000, USA (spho@ucar.edu)
23	
24	
25	
26	

### 27 Abstract

28 We compare atmospheric total precipitable water (TPW) derived from SSM/I (Special 29 Sensor Microwave Imager) and SSMIS (Special Sensor Microwave Imager Sounder) 30 radiometers and WindSat to collocated TPW estimates derived from COSMIC 31 (Constellation System for Meteorology, Ionosphere and Climate) radio occultation (RO) 32 under clear and cloudy conditions over the oceans from June 2006 to December 2013. 33 Results show that the mean microwave (MW) radiometer - COSMIC TPW differences 34 range from 0.06-0.18 mm for clear skies, 0.79-0.96 mm for cloudy skies, 0.46-0.49 mm for 35 cloudy but non-precipitating conditions, and 1.64-1.88 mm for precipitating conditions. 36 Because RO measurements are not significantly affected by clouds and precipitation, the 37 biases mainly result from MW retrieval uncertainties under cloudy and precipitating 38 conditions. All COSMIC and MW radiometers detect a positive TPW trend over these eight 39 years. The trend using all COSMIC observations collocated with MW pixels for this data 40 set is 1.79 mm/decade, with a 95% confidence interval of (0.96, 2.63), which is in close 41 agreement with the trend estimated by the collocated MW observations (1.78 mm/decade 42 with a 95% confidence interval of 0.94, 2.62). The sample of MW and RO pairs used in 43 this study is highly biased toward middle latitudes (40°-60°N and 40°-65°S), and so these 44 trends are not representative of global average trends. However, they are representative of 45 the latitudes of extratropical storm tracks and the trend values are approximately four to 46 six times the global average trends, which are approximately 0.3 mm/decade. In addition, 47 the close agreement of these two trends from independent observations, which represent 48 an increase in TPW in our data set of about 6.9%, are a strong indication of the positive 49 water vapor-temperature feedback in a warming planet in regions where precipitation from

50	extratropical storms is already large.
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	
61	
62	
63	
64	
65	
66	
67	
68	
69	
70	
71	
72	

### 73 **1. Introduction**

74 Clouds are important regulators for Earth's radiation and hydrological balances. 75 Water vapor is a primary variable that affects cloud radiative effects and hydrological 76 feedbacks. In addition, the three-dimensional distribution of water vapor is a key factor for 77 cloud formation and distribution (Soden et al., 2002). Held and Soden (2000) and Soden 78 and Held (2006) illustrated that water vapor amounts will increase in response to global 79 warming. Climate models predict that the column-integrated amount of water vapor, or 80 total precipitable water, will increase by  $\sim 7\%$  per 1 K increase in surface temperature 81 (Wentz and Schabel, 2000; Trenberth et al., 2005; Wentz et al., 2007). Therefore, accurate 82 observations of long-term water vapor under both clear and cloudy skies are important for 83 understanding the role of water vapor on climate as well as cloud formation and 84 distribution, which is still one of the largest uncertainties in understanding climate change 85 mechanisms (IPCC 2013). Trends in global and regional vertically integrated total 86 atmospheric water vapor, or Total Precipitable Water (TPW), are important indicators of climate warming because of the strong positive feedback between temperature and water 87 88 vapor enhancements. Accurate observations of TPW are therefore important in identifying 89 climate change and in verifying climate models, which estimate a wide range of TPW 90 trends (Roman et al. 2014).

91 The TPW depends on temperature (Trenberth and Guillemot, 1998; Trenberth et 92 al., 2005). Global TPW can be derived from satellite visible, infrared, and microwave 93 sensors (i.e., Wentz and Spencer, 1998; Fetzer et al. 2006; John and Soden, 2007; Fetzer 94 et al. 2008; Noël et al. 2004). However, no single remote sensing technique is capable of 95 completely fulfilling the needs for climate studies in terms of spatial and temporal coverage

96 and accuracy. For example, while water vapor retrievals from visible and infrared satellite 97 sensors are limited to clear skies over both land areas and oceans, passive microwave (MW) 98 imagers on satellites can provide all sky water vapor products, but only over oceans. These 99 water vapor products are mainly verified by comparing to either reanalyses, radiosonde 100 measurements, or other satellite data (i.e., Soden, and Lanzante, 1996; Sohn and Smith, 101 2003; Noël et al. 2004; Palm et al. 2008; Sohn and Bennartz, 2008; Wick et al. 2008 102 (hereafter Wick2008); Milz et al. 2009; Prasad and Singh, 2009; Pougatchev et al. 2009; 103 Knuteson et al., 2010; Larar et al. 2010; Wang et al. 2010; Ho et al. 2010a, b). Results from 104 these validation studies show that the quality of water vapor data from different satellite 105 sensors varies under different atmospheric conditions. The change of reanalysis systems 106 and inconsistent calibration among data may also cause uncertainty in long-term stability 107 of water vapor estimates. In addition, it is well known that radiosonde sensor characteristics 108 can be affected by the changing environment (Luers and Eskridge, 1998; Wang and Zhang, 109 2008). Ho et al. (2010b) demonstrated that the quality of radiosonde humidity 110 measurements varies with sensor types, adding extra difficulties in making a consistent 111 validation of long term water vapor products.

MW imagers are among the very few satellite instruments that are able to provide long-term (close to 30 years) all-weather time series of water vapor measurements using similar sensors and retrieval techniques (Wentz, 2015). The measured radiances at 19.35, 22.235, and 37.0 GHz from SSMIS and 18.7, 23.8, and 37.0 GHz from WindSat are used to derive TPW, total cloud water (TCW), wind speed, and rainfall rates over oceans (Wentz and Spencer, 1998). These four variables are retrieved by varying their values until the brightness temperatures calculated using a forward model match satellite-observed

brightness temperatures. Because MW radiation is significantly affected (absorbed or
scattered) by heavy rain, these four variables are only retrieved under conditions of no or
light-to-moderate rain (Schlüssel and Emery, 1990; Elsaesser and Kummerow, 2008;
Wentz and Spencer, 1998).

123 Recently, version 7.0 daily ocean products mapped to a 0.25° grid derived from 124 multiple MW radiometers were released by Remote Sensing System (RSS) (Wentz, 2013). 125 Many validation studies have been performed by RSS by comparing the MW TPW 126 retrievals with those from ground-based Global Positioning System (gb-GPS) stations 127 (Mears et al, 2015; Wentz, 2015). Because the gb-GPS stations are nearly always located 128 on land, these validation studies use stations located on small and isolated islands (Mears 129 et al., 2015). RSS results for TPW collocated with those derived from gb-GPS over these 130 island stations show that their mean differences vary from station to station, and can be as 131 large as 2 mm. The mean difference also varies with surface wind speed, varying from 1 132 mm at low wind speeds to -1 mm at high wind (20 m/s) speeds. The difference is near zero 133 for the most common wind speeds (6 to 12 m/s). Because the uncertainty of the input 134 parameters and change of antenna for each GPS receiver (Bock et al., 2013), the mean 135 TPW(RSS) – TPW (gb-GPS) can vary from -1.5 mm to 1.5 mm for a single MW radiometer 136 (see Figure 4 in Mears et al., 2015). Wentz (2015) compared 17 years of Tropical Rainfall 137 Measuring Mission (TRMM) Microwave Imager (TMI) TPW collocated with gb-GPS 138 TPW over the region from 45°N to 45° S. The mean TMI- gb-GPS TPW bias was estimated 139 to be 0.45 mm with a standard deviation ( $\sigma$ ) of 2.01 mm.

140 Unlike passive MW radiometers and infrared sensors, radio occultation (RO) is an141 active remote sensing technique. RO can provide all-weather, high vertical resolution (from

142  $\sim 100$  m near the surface to  $\sim 1.5$  km at 40 km) refractivity profiles (Anthes, 2011). The 143 basis of the RO measurement is a timing measured against reference clocks on the ground, 144 which are timed and calibrated by the atomic clocks at the National Institutes for Standards 145 and Technology (NIST). With a GPS receiver onboard the LEO (Low-Earth Orbiting) 146 satellite, this technique is able to detect the bending of radio signals emitted by GPS 147 satellites traversing the atmosphere. With the information about the relative motion of the 148 GPS and LEO satellites, the bending angle profile of the radio waves can be used to derive 149 all-weather refractivity, pressure, temperature, and water vapor profiles in the neutral 150 atmosphere (Anthes et al., 2008).

151 Launched in June 2006, COSMIC (Constellation Observing System for 152 Meteorology, Ionosphere, and Climate) RO data have been used to study atmospheric 153 temperature and refractivity trends in the lower stratosphere (Ho et al., 2009a, b, and 2012), 154 and modes of variability above, within, and below clouds (Biondi et al., 2012, 2013; Teng 155 et al., 2013; Scherllin-Pirscher et al., 2012; Zeng et al., 2012; Mears et al., 2012). Wick2008 156 demonstrated the feasibility of using COSMIC-derived TPW to validate SSM/I TPW 157 products over the east Pacific Ocean using one month of data. Many studies have 158 demonstrated the usefulness of RO derived water vapor to detect climate signals of El 159 Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO; Teng et al., 2013; Scherllin-Pirscher et al, 2012; Huang 160 et al., 2013), Madden-Julian Oscillation (MJO; Zeng et al., 2012), and improving moisture 161 analysis of atmospheric rivers (Neiman et al., 2008; Ma et al. 2011).

162 The objective of this study is to use COSMIC RO TPW to characterize the global 163 TPW values and trends derived from multiple MW radiometers over oceans, including 164 under cloudy and precipitating skies. COSMIC TPW from June 2006 to December 2013

are compared to co-located TPW derived from MW radiometers over the same time period.
Because RO data are not strongly sensitive to clouds and precipitation, COSMIC TPW
estimates can be used to identify possible MW TPW biases under different meteorological
conditions. We describe datasets and analysis method used in the comparisons in Section
2. The comparison results under clear skies and cloudy skies are summarized in Sections 3
and 4, respectively. The time series analysis is in Section 5. We conclude this study in
Section 6.

172

## 173 2. RSS Version 7.0 Data and COSMIC TPW Data and Comparison Method

### 174 2.1 RSS Version 7.0 Data Ocean Products

175 The RSS version 7.0 ocean products are available for SSM/I, SSMIS, AMSR-E, 176 WindSat, and TMI. The inversion algorithm is mainly based on Wentz and Spencer, 177 (1998), where above a cutoff in the liquid water column (2.45 mm), water vapor is no 178 longer retrieved. The various radiometers from the different satellites have been precisely 179 inter-calibrated at the radiance level by analyzing the measurements made by pairs of 180 satellites operating at the same time. This was done for the explicit purpose of producing 181 versions of the datasets that can be used to study decadal-scale changes in TPW, wind, 182 clouds, and precipitation, so special attention was focused on inter-annual variability in 183 instrument calibration. The calibration procedures and physical inversion algorithm used 184 to simultaneously retrieve TPW, surface wind speed (and thereby surface wind stress and 185 surface roughness) and the total liquid water content are summarized in Wentz (2013) and 186 Wentz (1997), respectively. This allows the algorithm to minimize the effect of wind speed, 187 clouds, and rain on the TPW measurement.

188	The RSS version 7.0 daily data are available on a 0.25° latitude x 0.25° longitude
189	grid for daytime and nighttime (i.e., 1440x720x2 daily per day). Figures 1a-d shows the
190	RSS V7.0 monthly mean F16 SSMIS TPW (in mm), surface skin temperature (in K), liquid
191	water path (LWP, in mm), and rain rate (RR, in mm/h), respectively, in 2007. Figure 1
192	shows that the variation and distribution of TPW over oceans (Figure 1a) is, in general,
193	closely linked to surface skin temperature variations over the Intertropical Convergence
194	Zone (ITCZ) (Figure 1b), which is modulated by clouds and the hydrological cycle (Soden
195	et al., 2002). The distribution of monthly TPW is consistent with that of cloud water, where
196	highest TPW values (and LWP and RR) occur in persistent cloudy and strong convective
197	regions over the tropical west Pacific Ocean near Indonesia.

Because COSMIC reprocessed TPW data are only available from June 2006 to December 2013 (i.e., COSMIC2013), the SSM/I F15, SSMIS F16, SSMIS F17, together with WindSat RSS Version 7.01 ocean products covering the same time period are used in this study. Table 1 summarizes the starting date and end date for RSS SSM/I F15, SSMIS F16, SSMIS F17, and WindSat data. The all sky daily RSS ocean products for F15, F16, F17, and WindSat are downloaded from <u>http://www.remss.com/missions/ssmi</u>.

204

### 205 2.2 COSMIC TPW Products

The atmospheric refractivity N is a function of pressure P, temperature T, water vapor pressure  $P_W$ , and water content W through the following relationship (Kursinski 1997; Zou et al. 2012):

210 
$$N = 77.6 \frac{P}{T} + 3.73 \times 10^5 \frac{P_W}{T^2} + 1.4 W_{water} + 0.61 W_{ice}$$
(1)

212 where P is the pressure in hPa, T is the temperature in K, P<sub>w</sub> is the water vapor pressure in hPa, Wwater is the liquid water content in grams per cubic meter (gm<sup>-3</sup>), and Wice is the 213 ice water content in gm<sup>-3</sup>. The last two terms generally contribute less than 1% to the 214 215 refractivity and may be ignored (Zou et al., 2012). However, they can be significant for 216 some applications under conditions of high cloud liquid or ice water content, as shown by 217 Lin et al. 2010; Yang and Zou 2012; Zou et al. 2012. We will neglect these terms in this 218 study, but because we are looking at small differences between MW and RO TPW in 219 cloudy and precipitating conditions in this paper, we estimate the possible contribution of 220 these terms to RO TPW and the consequences of neglecting them here. Since both of these 221 terms increase N, neglecting them in an atmosphere in which they are present will produce 222 a small positive bias in water vapor pressure  $P_w$  and therefore total precipitable water when 223 integrated throughout the entire depth of the atmosphere.

Typical value of cloud LWC range from ~0.2 gm<sup>-3</sup> in stratiform clouds (Thompson, 2007) to 1 gm<sup>-3</sup> in convective clouds (Thompson, 2007; Cober et al. 2001). Extreme values may reach ~2 gm<sup>-3</sup> in deep tropical convective clouds (i.e., cumulonimbus). Ice water content values are smaller, typically 0.01 - 0.03 gm<sup>-3</sup> (Thompson, 2007). Heymsfield et al., (2002) reported high ice water content values ranging from 0.1 - 0.5 gm<sup>-3</sup> in tropical cirrus and stratiform precipitating clouds, although it may rarely reach as high as 1.5 gm<sup>-3</sup> in deep tropical convective clouds (Leroy et al., 2017).

For extremely high values of  $W_{water}$  and  $W_{ice}$  of 2.0 and 0.5 gm<sup>-3</sup>, the contributions to N are 2.8 and 0.3 respectively. The values of N in the atmosphere decrease exponentially upward, from ~300 near the surface to ~150 at P=500 hPa. Using the above extreme values at 500 hPa,  $W_{water}$  may contribute from up to 1.6% of N and  $W_{ice}$  up to 0.2%. Thus we may assume that in most cases the error in N due to neglecting these terms will be less than 1%. The effect on TPW will be even less, since clouds do not generally extend through the full depth of the atmosphere. Finally, the ~200 km horizontal averaging scale of the RO observation footprint makes it unlikely that such extremely high values of water and ice content will be present over this scale. We conclude that the small positive bias in RO TPW introduced by neglecting the liquid and water terms in (1) will be less than 1%.

To resolve the ambiguity of COSMIC refractivity associated with both temperature and water vapor in the lower troposphere, a 1D-var algorithm (http://cosmicio.cosmic.ucar.edu/cdaac/doc/documents/1dvar.pdf) is used to derive optimal temperature and water vapor profiles while temperatures and water vapor profiles from the ERA-Interim reanalysis are used as a priori estimates (Neiman et al. 2008; Zeng et al. 2012).

Note that because RO refractivity is very sensitive to water vapor variations in the troposphere (Ho et al. 2007), and is less sensitive to temperature errors, RO-derived water vapor product is of high accuracy (Ho et al. 2010 a, b). It is estimated that 1K of temperature error will introduce less than 0.25 g/kg of water vapor bias in the troposphere in the 1D-var retrievals. Although the first guess temperature and moisture are needed for the 1D-Var algorithm, the retrieved water vapor profiles are weakly dependent on the first guess water vapor profiles (Neiman et al. 2008).

The horizontal footprint of a COSMIC observation is about 200 km in the lower troposphere and its vertical resolution is about 100 m near the surface and 1.5 km at 40 km. The COSMIC post-processed water vapor profiles version 2010.2640 collected from COSMIC Data Analysis and Archive Center (CDAAC)

257 (http://cosmicio.cosmic.ucar.edu/cdaac/index.html) are used to construct the COSMIC 258 TPW data. To further validate the accuracy of COSMIC-derived water vapor, we have 259 compared COSMIC TPW with those derived from ground-based GPS (i.e., International 260 Global Navigation Satellite Systems-IGS, Wang et al. 2007) which are assumed to be 261 independent of location. Only those COSMIC profiles whose lowest penetration heights 262 are within 200 meters of the height of ground-based GPS stations are included. Results 263 showed that the mean global difference between IGS and COSMIC TPW is about -0.2 mm 264 with a standard deviation of 2.7 mm (Ho et al., 2010a). Similar comparisons were found 265 by Teng et al. (2013) and Huang et al. (2013).

266

### 267 **2.3 Preparation of COSMIC TPW data for Comparison**

In this study, only those COSMIC water vapor profiles penetrating lower than 0.1 km are integrated to compute TPW. Approximately 70% to 90% of COSMIC profiles reach to within 1 km of the surface (Anthes et al., 2008). Usually more than 30% of COSMIC water vapor profiles reach below 0.1 km in the mid-latitudes and higher latitudes, and a little bit less than 10% in the tropical regions. To compensate for the water vapor amount below the penetration height, we follow the following procedure:

i) we assume the relative humidity below the penetration height is equal to 80%. This is

- a good assumption especially over oceans near the sea surface (Mears et al., 2015);
- ii) the temperatures below the penetration height are taken from the ERA-interimreanalysis;
- 278 iii) we compute the water vapor mixing ratio below the penetration heights;

iv) we integrate the TPW using COSMIC water vapor profiles above the penetrationheights with those water vapor profile below the penetration heights.

The COSMIC TPW estimates are not very sensitive to the assumption of 80% relative humidity below 0.1 km (Step i above). The assumption of 80% +/-10% (i.e., 90% and 70%) relative humidity below 0.1 km introduces an uncertainty of about -/+ 0.03 mm in the WV - COSMIC comparisons for all conditions. As shown in Section 4, this uncertainty is small compared to the observed differences between the RO and MW estimates.

286 Pairs of MW and RO TPW estimates collocated within 50 km and one hour are 287 collected. The location of RO observation is defined by the RO tangent point at 4-5 km 288 altitude. Wick2008 used MW-RO pairs within 25 km and one hour in time. To evaluate 289 the effect of the spatial difference on the TPW difference, we also computed TPW 290 differences for MW-RO pairs within 75 km, 100 km, and 150 km, and 200 km. We found 291 the larger spatial difference increases the mean TPW biases slightly to  $\pm -0.25$  mm and the 292 standard deviations to +/- 1.91 mm, which is likely because of the high spatial variability 293 of water vapor. Note that, although not shown, the mean biases and standard deviations of 294 the mean biases are slightly larger over the tropics than over mid-latitudes. This could be 295 because of the combined effect of the larger spatial TPW variation in the tropical region 296 than those in the mid-latitudes (see Fig. 1a, and Neiman et al., 2008; Teng et al., 2013; 297 Mears et al., 2015) and the fact that the MW TPW retrieval uncertainty is also larger over 298 stronger convection regions. More results are detailed in Section 4.

With a 0.25°×0.25° grid, there are about 20 to 60 MW pixels matching one COSMIC observation. The number of pixels varies at different latitudes. A clear MW-RO pair is defined as instances when *all* the TCW values for the collocated MW pixels are

302 equal to zero. A cloudy MW-RO ensemble is defined as instances when all the TCW values 303 from the collocated MW pixels are larger than zero. Partly cloudy conditions (some of 304 pixels zero and some non-zero) are excluded from this study. The cloudy ensembles are 305 further divided into precipitating and non-precipitating conditions. MW-RO pairs are 306 defined as cloudy non-precipitating when less than 20% of MW pixels have rainfall rates 307 larger than zero mm/hour. Cloudy precipitating MW-RO pairs are defined when more than 308 20% of the pixels have rainfall rates larger than zero. Because microwave radiances are not 309 sensitive to ice, we treat cloudy pixels of low density like cirrus clouds as clear pixels.

310 The matching pairs of RO and MW observations are not distributed uniformly over 311 the world oceans. In fact, they are heavily concentrated in middle latitudes, as shown in 312 Figure 1e. This biased distribution is caused by several factors, including the polar orbits 313 of the satellites, which produce more observations in higher latitudes, and also the failure 314 of many COSMIC RO soundings to penetrate to 0.1km in the subtropics and tropics (due 315 to super-refraction which is often present in these regions). Thus the results presented here, 316 especially the trends, are not representative of global averages. However, the main purpose 317 of this paper is to compare two independent satellite systems for obtaining TPW under 318 varying sky conditions. If the agreement is good, one has confidence in both systems. In 319 this case, SSM/I and WindSat estimates of TPW will be verified and then can be used with 320 confidence globally, including where RO observations are sparse or do not exist.

321

# 322 **3.** Comparison of MW and RO TPW with clear skies

In total there are 26,678 F15-RO pairs, 32,610 F16-RO pairs, 31,291 F17-RO pairs,
and 21,996 WindSat-RO pairs from June 2006 to December 2013, respectively. Figures

325 2a-d show scatter plots for F15-COSMIC TPW, F16-COSMIC TPW, F17-COSMIC TPW, 326 and WindSat-COSMIC TPW under clear skies. Figures 2a-d show that the MW clear sky 327 TPW from F15, F16, F17, and WindSat are all very consistent with those from co-located 328 COSMIC observations. As summarized in Table 2, under clear conditions where SSM/I 329 provides high quality TPW estimates, the mean TPW bias between F16 and COSMIC 330 (F16- COSMIC) is equal to 0.03 mm with a standard deviation  $\sigma$  of 1.47 mm. The mean 331 TPW differences are equal to 0.06 mm with a  $\sigma$  of 1.65 mm for F15, 0.07 mm with a  $\sigma$  of 332 1.47 mm for F17, and 0.18 mm with a  $\sigma$  of 1.35 mm for WindSat. The reason for larger 333 standard deviation for F15 may be because the F15 data after August 2006 were corrupted 334 by the "rad-cal" beacon that was turned on at this time (Hilburn and Wentz, 2008). On 14 335 August 2006, a radar calibration beacon (RAD-CAL) was activated on F15. This radar 336 interfered with the SSM/I, primarily the 22V channel, which is a key channel for water 337 vapor retrievals. Although a correction method derived by Hilburn and Wentz (2008) and 338 Hilburn (2009) was applied, the 22 V channel is not being full corrected (Wentz, 2012). 339 As a result, there are still errors in the water vapor retrievals. F16 had solar radiation 340 intrusion into the hot load during the time period, while F17 and WindSat had no serious 341 issues.

342

### 343 4. Global comparisons of MW and RO TPW with cloudy skies

### 344 4.1 Comparison of MW, RO, and Ground-based GPS TPW

Figures 3a-c depict the scatter plots for F16-COSMIC pairs under cloudy, cloudy non-precipitating, and precipitating conditions from June 2006 to December 2013 over oceans. While there is a very small bias (0.031 mm) for clear pixels (Figure 2b), there is a

348 significant positive TPW bias (0.794 mm) under cloudy conditions (Figure 3a). This may 349 explain the close to 0.45 mm mean TMI-gb GPS TPW biases found by Wentz et al., (2015) 350 where a close to 7 years of data were used. Figure 3c depicts that the large SSM/I TPW 351 biases under cloudy skies are mainly from the pixels with precipitation (mean bias is equal 352 to 1.825 mm) although precipitation pixels are of about less than 6% of the total F16-353 COSMIC pairs. Because RO measurements are not significantly affected by clouds and 354 precipitation, the biases mainly result from MW retrieval uncertainty under cloudy 355 conditions. The fact that the MW-COSMIC biases for precipitating conditions (1.825 mm, 356 Figure 3c and 1.64-1.88 mm in Table 2) is much larger than those for cloudy, but non-357 precipitating conditions, indicates that significant scattering and absorbing effects are 358 present in the passive MW measurements when it rains. The correlation coefficients for 359 F15-RO, F16-RO, F17-RO, and WindSat-RO pairs for all sky conditions are all larger than 360 0.96 (not shown).

361 MW and gb-GPS TPW comparisons show similar differences as the MW-RO 362 differences under different sky conditions. We compared F16 pixels with those from gb-363 GPS within 50 km and 1 hour over the 33 stations studied by Mears et al. (2015) from 2002 364 to 2013. Figures 4a-d depict the scatter plots for F16-gb-GPS TPW under clear, cloudy, 365 cloudy non-precipitating, and cloudy precipitating conditions, respectively. The F16-gb-366 GPS mean biases are equal to 0.241 mm (clear skies), 0.614 mm (cloudy skies), 0.543 mm 367 (cloudy-non precipitation) and 1.197 mm (precipitation), which are similar to those 368 estimated from MW-RO comparisons (Table 2).

The above results show that the MW estimates of TPW are biased positively compared to both the RO and the ground-based GPS estimates, which are independent

measurements. The biases are smallest for clear skies and largest for precipitating
conditions, with cloudy, non-precipitating biases in between. Overall, the results suggest
that clouds and especially precipitation contaminate the MW radiometer measurements,
which in turn affect the MW TPW retrievals.

375

# 376 4.2 Time Series of MW, RO, and Ground-based TPW Biases under Various 377 Meteorological Conditions

378 To further examine how rain and cloud droplets affect the MW TPW retrievals, we 379 show how the F16-RO TPW biases vary under different meteorological conditions in 380 Figure 5. The bias dependence on wind speed (Figure 5a) is small. Unlike the results from 381 Mears et al., (2015), the mean TPW biases between F16 and COSMIC are within 0.5 mm 382 with high winds (wind speed larger than 20 m/s). Figure 5b indicates that the F16-COSMIC 383 bias is larger with TPW greater than about 10 mm, which usually occurs under cloudy 384 conditions. The F16-COSMIC biases can be as large as 2.0 mm when the rainfall rate is 385 larger than 1 mm/hour (Figure 5c), which usually occurs with high total liquid cloud water 386 conditions. The F16 TPW biases can be as large as 2 mm when total cloud water is larger 387 than 0.3 mm (Figure 5d). Figure 5e shows that the larger F16-COSMIC TPW biases (2-3 388 mm) mainly occur over regions with surface skin temperature less than 270 K (higher 389 latitudes, see Figure 1b). The F15, F17, and WindSat TPW biases under different 390 meteorological conditions are very similar to those of F16 (not shown).

In Figure 6 we compare RSS V7.0 F16 MW TPW to the ground-based GPS TPW
 over various meteorological conditions. The magnitudes of the MW-gb-GPS TPW
 differences under high rain rate and high total cloud water conditions are somewhat smaller

than those of MW-RO pairs (varying from about 0.5 mm to 2.0 mm), which may be because
most of the MW-gb-GPS samples are collected under low rain rates (less than 1 mm/hour)
conditions.

397

## 398 5. Eight Year Time Series and Trend Analysis under All Skies

## 399 5.1 Monthly Mean TPW Time Series Comparison

400 To further examine MW TPW long-term stability and trend uncertainty due to rain 401 and water droplets for different instruments, we compared time series of the MW and 402 COSMIC monthly mean TPW differences from June 2006 to December 2013. Figures 7a-403 d show the monthly mean F16-COSMIC TPW differences from June 2006 to December 404 2013 for clear, cloudy, cloudy non-precipitating, and precipitating conditions. In general, 405 the microwave TPW biases under different atmospheric conditions are positive and stable 406 from June 2006 to December 2013, as reflected in relatively small standard deviation 407 values (Table 3). Except for F15, the standard deviations of the monthly mean TPW 408 anomaly range are less than 0.38 mm (Table 3). In contrast, the F15-COSMIC monthly 409 mean  $\sigma$  range from 0.48 mm to 0.69 mm with different conditions.

Table 3 also shows the trend in the RO estimates of TPW differences over the eightyear period of study. The trends are range from -0.12 mm/decade (WindSat, clear skies) to 2.52 mm/decade (F15, precipitating conditions). The overall trend of TPW as estimated by RO (second line in each row of Table 3) is positive as discussed in the next section. Table 3 shows that in general the trends are more strongly positive under cloudy and precipitating conditions compared to clear conditions.

### 417 **5.2 De-seasonalized Trends of MW-RO Differences and TPW**

Figure 8 depicts the de-seasonalized trends of the MW-RO TPW differences for F15 (Figure 8a), F16 (Figure 8b), F17 (Figure 8c), and WindSat (Figure 8d) under cloudy skies. Except for F15, the de-seasonalized trends of the MW-RO TPW differences for the MW radiometers are close to zero, indicating little change over these eight years. The trends of the biases associated with F15, F16, F17 and WindSat under all sky conditions range from -0.09 to 0.27 mm/decade (details not shown).

The reason for larger standard deviations of the MW minus RO differences for F15 (Tables 2 and 3 and Figure 8a) is very likely because the F15 data after August 2006 were corrupted by the "rad-cal" beacon that was turned on at this time. Adjustments were derived and applied to reduce the effects of the beacon, but the final results still show excess noise relative to uncorrupted measurements (Hilburn and Wentz, 2008). RSS does not recommend using these measurements for studies of long-term change. Thus we consider the F15 data less reliable during the period of our study.

431 Figure 9 shows the de-seasonalized time series of the monthly mean TPW for all 432 MW and RO pairs under all sky conditions. The close to eight year trends for TPW 433 estimated from both passive MW radiometers and active COSMIC RO sensors are positive 434 and very similar in magnitude. The mean trend of all COSMIC RO TPW is 1.79 435 mm/decade with a 95% confidence interval of (0.96, 2.63) mm/decade while the mean 436 trend from all the MW estimates is 1.78 mm/decade with a 95% confidence interval of 437 (0.94, 2.62). This close agreement between completely independent measurements lends 438 credence to both estimates. The mean TPW over this period, calculated from all MW data in our data set was 26.04 mm; thus the trend of 1.78 mm/decade represents a trend ofapproximately 6.9% per decade for our data set.

441 As discussed earlier, the trend of 1.78 mm/decade is heavily biased toward middle 442 latitudes (40°N-60°N and 40°-65°S) and is not representative of a global average. In fact, 443 it is four to six times larger than previous estimates over earlier time periods. For example, 444 Durre et al. (2009) estimated a trend of 0.45 mm/decade for the Northern Hemisphere over 445 the period 1973-2006. Trenberth et al. (2005) estimated a global trend of 0.40 +/- 0.09 446 mm/decade for the period 1988 to 2001. Using SSM/I data, Wentz et al. (2007) estimated 447 and an increase of 0.354 mm/decade over the period 1997-2006. The 100-year trend in 448 global climate models is variable, ranging from 0.55 to 0.72 mm/decade (Roman et al., 449 2014).

450 The very close agreement between RO and MW observations where they co-exist 451 gives credibility to both observing systems and allows us to use global MW data to compute 452 global TPW trends over all oceanic regions, including where RO observations are sparse 453 or absent. Figure 10 shows the global map of TPW trends over oceans using all F16, F17, 454 and WindSat data from 2006 to 2013. Figure 10 shows that the positive trends in TPW 455 occur mainly over the central and north Pacific, south of China and west of Australia, 456 south-east of South America, and east of America. Positive trends also exist in general 457 over the middle latitudes (40°N-60°N and 40°-65°S) where most of our matching RO and 458 MW data pairs occur.

Mears et al. (2017) computed global average (60°S to 60°N) TPW using a number
of data sets from 1979 to 2014. Figure 11 shows the data from the ERA-Interim reanalysis
(Dee et al. 2011), RSS MW, and COSMIC. (This figure was obtained using the same data

462	used to construct Fig	gure 2.16 in Mears e	t al., 2017	'). Fig. 11	shows close agr	eement between
	(		/	/ / 7		

463 RSS MW and COSMIC. The global mean trend from June 2006 to December 2013 from

the COSMIC observations is 0.32 mm/decade and for RSS MW it is 0.31 mm/decade.

465

### 466 **6. Conclusions and Discussions**

467 RSS water vapor products have been widely used for climate research. The newly 468 available RSS V7.0 data products have been processed using consistent calibration 469 procedures (Wentz, 2013). This was done for the explicit purpose of producing versions of 470 the datasets that can be used to study decadal scale changes in TPW, wind, clouds, and 471 precipitation. These water vapor products are mainly verified by comparing to either 472 reanalyses, radiosondes measurements, or other satellite data. However, because the 473 quality of these datasets may also vary under different atmospheric conditions, the 474 uncertainty in long-term water vapor estimates may still be large. In this study, we used 475 TPW estimates derived from COSMIC active RO sensors to identify TPW uncertainties 476 from four different MW radiometers under clear, cloudy, cloudy/non-precipitating, and 477 cloudy/precipitating skies over nearly eight years (from June 2006 to December 2013). 478 Because RO data have low sensitivity to clouds and precipitation, RO-derived water vapor 479 products are useful to identify the possible TPW biases retrieved from measurements of 480 passive microwave imagers under different sky conditions. We reach the following 481 conclusions:

482 1) Clear sky biases: The collocated COSMIC RO TPW estimates under clear skies
483 are highly consistent with the MW TPW estimates under clear sky conditions (within +/484 0.2 mm and with a correlation coefficient greater than 0.96). The mean TPW bias between

F16 and COSMIC (F16- COSMIC) is equal to 0.03 mm with a standard deviation  $\sigma$  of 1.47 mm. The mean TPW differences are equal to 0.06 mm with a  $\sigma$  of 1.65 mm for F15, 0.07 mm with a  $\sigma$  of 1.47 mm for F17, and 0.18 mm with a  $\sigma$  of 1.35 mm for WindSat. The consistent F15-COSMIC, F16-COSMIC, F17-COSMIC, and WindSat-COSMIC TPW under clear skies show that COSMIC TPW can be used as reliable reference data to identify and correct TPW among different MW imagers for other sky conditions.

491 2) Biases under cloudy skies: While there are very small biases for clear pixels, 492 there are significant positive MW TPW biases ( $\sim 0.80$  mm) under cloudy conditions when 493 compared to RO TPW. The large SSM/I TPW biases under cloudy skies result mainly from 494 the pixels with precipitation. The mean bias is equal to 1.83 mm for COSMIC-F16 pairs, 495 which is much larger than the bias for cloudy, but non-precipitating conditions. This 496 indicates that the significant scattering and absorbing effects are present in the passive MW 497 measurements when it rains. The F16 – Ground-based GPS mean biases are equal to 0.24 498 mm (for clear skies), 0.61 mm (for cloudy skies), 0.54 mm (for cloudy/non-precipitating 499 skies) and 1.2 mm (for precipitating skies) which are consistent with those from F16-500 COSMIC comparisons.

3) Biases among different instruments: Using RO TPW estimates collocated with
different MW instruments, we are able to identify possible TPW inconsistencies among
MW instruments even they are not collocated. The de-seasonalized trends in MW-RO TPW
differences for three MW radiometers (i.e., F16, F17, and WindSat) are close to zero,
indicating consistency among these radiometers. However, the F15-COSMIC differences
are larger and show a significant trend over the eight years of the study. It is likely that F15

507 data after August 2006 were corrupted by the "rad-cal" beacon that was turned on at this508 time.

509 4) Trend of TPW under all skies: The eight-year trends of TPW estimated from 510 both passive MW radiometer and active COSMIC sensors in our data set show increasing 511 TPW, with slightly higher trends under cloudy conditions. The mean trend of COSMIC 512 RO TPW collocated with MW observations in our data set is 1.79 mm/decade with a 95% 513 confidence interval of (0.96, 2.63) mm/decade. The corresponding mean trend from all the 514 MW estimates is 1.78 mm/decade with a 95% confidence interval of (0.94, 2.62). The mean 515 trend from all the MW estimates under cloudy conditions is 1.93 mm/decade with a 95% 516 confidence interval of (0.97, 2.89). The mean trend from all the COSMIC RO TPW 517 estimates under cloudy conditions is 1.82 mm/decade with a 95% confidence interval of 518 (0.88, 2.76). These increases represent about a 6.9% per decade increase in the mean TPW 519 of our data set. The close agreement between completely independent measurements lends 520 credence to both estimates.

The trends of TPW in our data set, which are heavily biased toward middle latitudes (40°N-60°N and 40°S-65°S) are higher than previous global estimates over earlier time periods by about a factor of four to six. As also shown by the regional distribution of TPW trends estimated from the MW observations, the large positive trends in these latitudes, which are the main latitudes of extratropical storm tracks, are a strong confirmation of the water vapor-temperature feedback in a warming global atmosphere particularly under cloudy conditions.

528 Other studies have suggested that this positive feedback results in a nearly constant 529 global mean relative humidity (Soden and Held, 2006; Sherwood et al., 2010). However,

530 it is difficult to directly relate our estimated TPW trends to constant RH hypothesis of 531 Earth's atmosphere under global warming. The global mean surface temperature has been 532 rising at about the rate of 0.2 K/decade in the past twenty years. A 0.2K increase in 533 temperature would produce about a 1.4% increase in saturation water vapor pressure based 534 on the Clausius-Clapeyon equation. To maintain a constant RH for this temperature 535 increase, the actual water vapor pressure (and specific humidity) would also have to 536 increase by 1.4%. In this study, we observe an increase of TPW in our dataset of about 1.78 537 mm/decade which is 6.9 percent increase per decade in TPW. Our dataset is dominated 538 mainly by cloudy samples over middle latitudes (40°N-60°N and 40°-65°S). Thus, from 539 these numbers alone we would expect an increase in mean RH under cloudy conditions by 540 more than 6%, which is unlikely and well outside the range of changes in relative humidity 541 in models (e.g. Figure 2 in Sherwood et al., 2010). However, the changes in the global 542 mean RH are not related in such a simple fashion to changes in the global mean temperature 543 and precipitable water. For example, Figure 10 depicts that there are very large differences in the spatial distribution of TPW changes, which shows regional variations of +/- 4 544 545 mm/decade. Thus, some regions are drying and others are moistening. The variations in 546 global mean surface temperature are also large, but very different from those of TPW, with 547 the polar regions and continents warming up much faster than the atmosphere over the 548 oceans. In cold polar regions, an increase in temperature will result in a smaller increase in 549 saturation vapor pressure than the same increase in temperature in the tropics. The global 550 evaporation and precipitation patterns also vary greatly, as water vapor transport is 551 important in the global water vapor balance. All of this, as discussed by Held and Soden 552 (2000), Soden and Held (2006), and Sherwood et al. (2010) means that the relationships

553	between global mean temperature increase, TPW changes, and the resulting change in
554	global mean RH are not simple.
555	
556	Acknowledgements. This work is supported by the NSF CAS AGS-1033112. We thank
557	Eric DeWeaver (NSF) and Jack Kaye (NASA) for sponsoring this work.
558	
559	
560	
561	
562	
563	
564	
565	
566	
567	
568	
569	
570	
571	
572	
573	
574	
575	

### 576 **References**

- 577 Anthes, R. A., P. Bernhardt, Y. Chen, L. Cucurull, K. Dymond, D. Ector, S. Healy, S.-P.
- 578 Ho, D. Hunt, Y.-H. Kuo, H. Liu, K. Manning, C. McCormick, T. Meehan, W. Randel,
- 579 C. R. Rocken, W. Schreiner, S. Sokolovskiy, S. Syndergaard, D. Thompson, K.
- 580 Trenberth, T.-K. Wee, Z. Zeng, 2008: The COSMIC/FORMOSAT-3 Mission: Early
- 581 Results, *Bul. Amer. Meteor. Sci.* 89, No.3, 313-333, DOI: 10.1175/BAMS-89-3-313.
- 582 Anthes, R.A., 2011: Exploring Earth's atmosphere with radio occultation: contributions to
- 583 weather, climate and space weather. Atmos. Meas. Tech., 4, 1077-1103,
- 584 DOI:10.5194/amt-4-1077-2001.
- 585 Biondi, R., W. Randel, S.-P. Ho, T. Neubert, and S. Syndergaard, 2012: Thermal
- structure of intense convective clouds derived from GPS radio occultations. *Atmos*. *Chem. Phys.*, doi:10.5194/acp-12-5309-2012.
- 588 Biondi, R., S.-P. Ho, W. Randel, T. Neubert and S. Syndergaard, 2013: Tropical cyclone
- 589 cloud-top heights and vertical temperature structure detection using GPS radio
- 590 occultation measurements, J. Geophy. Research, VOL. 118, 1–13,
- 591 doi:10.1002/jgrd.50448.
- 592 Bock, O., Bosser, P., Bourcy, T., David, L., Goutail, F., Hoareau, C., Keckhut, P.,
- 593 Legain, D., Pazmino, A., Pelon, J., Pipis, K., Poujol, G., Sarkissian, A., Thom, C.,
- 594 Tournois, G., and Tzanos, D. 2013: Accuracy assessment of water vapour
- 595 measurements from in situ and remote sensing techniques during the DEMEVAP
- 2011 campaign at OHP, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 6, 2777–2802, doi:10.5194/amt-62777-2013.
- 598 Cober, S. G., G. A. Isaac, and J. W. Strapp, 2001: Characterizations of aircraft icing

- environments that include supercooled large drops. J. Appl. Meteor., 40, 1984–2002.
- 600 Durre, I., C. N. Williams Jr., X. Yin, and R. S. Vose, 2009: Radiosonde-based trends in
- 601 precipitable water over the Northern Hemisphere: An update, J. Geophys. Res., 114,
- 602 D05112, doi:10.1029/2008JD010989.
- 603 Dee D.P., S.M. Uppala, A.J. Simmons, P. Berrisford, P. Poli, S. Kobayashi, U. Andrae,
- 604 M.A. Balmaseda, G. Balsamo, P. Bauer, P. Bechtold, A.C.M. Beljaars, L. van de
- Berg, J. Bidlot, N. Bormann, C. Delsol, R. Dragani, M. Fuentes, A.J. Geer, L.
- Haimberger, S.B. Healy, H. Hersbach, E.V. Hólm, L. Isaksen, P. Kållberg, M.
- 607 Köhler, M. Matricardi, A.P. McNally, B.M. Monge-Sanz, J.-J. Morcrette, B.-K.
- Park, C. Peubey, P. de Rosnay, C. Tavolato, J.-N. Thepaut, and F. Vitart, 2011: The
- 609 ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation

610 system. Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc. 137: 553–597. DOI:10.1002/qj.828

- Elsaesser, G. S. and C. D. Kummerow, 2008: Towards a fully parametric retrieval of the
  non-raining parameters over the global ocean. *J. Appl. Meteor. & Climatol.*, 47, 1590
   1598.
- 614 Fetzer, E. J., B. H. Lambrigtsen, A. Eldering, H. H. Aumann, and M.T. Chahine, M.T.,
- 615 2006: Biases in total precipitable water vapor climatologies from atmospheric infrared
  616 sounder and advanced microwave scanning radiometer. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111,
  617 D09S16, doi: 10.1029/2005JD006598.
- 618 Fetzer, E. J., W.G. Read, D. Waliser, B. H. Kahn, B. Tian, H. Vömel, F. W. Irion, H. Su,
- A. Eldering, M. T. Juarez, J. Jiang, and V. Dang, 2008: Comparison of upper
- tropospheric water vapor observations from the Microwave Limb Sounder and
  Atmospheric Infrared Sounder. J. Geophys. Res., 113/D22, D22110.

- Held, I. M., and B. J. Soden, 2000: Water vapor feedback and global warming, Annu. Rev.
- 623 Energy Environ., 25, 441–475, doi:10.1146/annurev.energy.25.1.441.
- Heymsfield, A. J., A. Bansemer, P. R. Field, S. L. Durden, J. L. Stith, J. E. Dye, W. Hall,
- and C. A. Grainger, 2002: Observations and parameterizations of particle size
- 626 distributions in deep tropical cirrus and stratiform precipitating clouds: Results from in
- 627 situ observations in TRMM field campaigns. J. Atmos. Sci., 59, 3457-3491,
- 628 doi:10.1175/1520-0469(2002)059, 3457.
- 629 Hilburn, K.A., 2009: Including temperature effects in the F15 RADCAL Beacon
- 630 correction. RSS Technical Report 051209, Remote Sensing Systems, Santa Rosa, CA.
- 631 <u>http://www.remss.com/papers/RSS\_TR051209\_RADCAL.pdf</u>.
- Hilburn, K. A., F. J. Wentz, 2008: Mitigating the impact of RADCAL beacon
  contamination on F15 SSM/I ocean retrievals, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35,
  L18806, doi:10.1029/2008GL034914.
- Ho, S.-P., Kuo, Y.-H., and Sokolovskiy, S., 2007: Improvement of the temperature and
  moisture retrievals in the lower troposphere using AIRS and GPS radio occultation
  measurements. *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.*, 24, 1726-1739,
  doi:10.1175/JTECH2071.1.
- Ho, S.-P., G. Kirchengast, S. Leroy, J. Wickert, A. J. Mannucci, A. K. Steiner, D. Hunt,
- 640 W. Schreiner, S. Sokolovskiy, C. O. Ao, M. Borsche, A. von Engeln,
- 641 U. Foelsche, S. Heise, B. Iijima, Y.-H. Kuo, R. Kursinski, B. Pirscher, M. Ringer, C.
- 642 Rocken, and T. Schmidt, 2009a: Estimating the Uncertainty of using GPS Radio
- 643 Occultation Data for Climate Monitoring: Inter-comparison of CHAMP Refractivity
- 644 Climate Records 2002-2006 from Different Data Centers, J. Geophys.

- 645 *Res.*, doi:10.1029/2009JD011969.
- 646 Ho, S.-P., M. Goldberg, Y.-H. Kuo, C.-Z Zou, W. Schreiner, 2009b: Calibration of
- 647 Temperature in the Lower Stratosphere from Microwave Measurements using
- 648 COSMIC Radio Occultation Data: Preliminary Results, Terr. Atmos. Oceanic Sci.,
- 649 Vol. 20, doi: 10.3319/TAO.2007.12.06.01(F3C).
- Ho, S.-P., Y.-H. Kuo, W. Schreiner, X. Zhou, 2010a: Using SI-traceable Global Positioning
- 651 System Radio Occultation Measurements for Climate Monitoring [In "States of the
  652 Climate in 2009]. *Bul. Amer. Meteor. Sci.*, 91 (7), S36-S37.
- Ho, S.-P., Zhou X., Kuo Y.-H., Hunt D., Wang J.-H., 2010b: Global Evaluation of
- 654Radiosonde Water Vapor Systematic Biases using GPS Radio Occultation from

655 COSMIC and ECMWF Analysis. *Remote Sensing*. 2010; 2(5):1320-1330.

- Ho, S.-P., D. Hunt, A. K. Steiner, A. J. Mannucci, G. Kirchengast, H. Gleisner, S. Heise,
- 657 A. von Engeln, C. Marquardt, S. Sokolovskiy, W. Schreiner, B. Scherllin-Pirscher,
- 658 C. Ao, J. Wickert, S. Syndergaard, K. B. Lauritsen, S. Leroy, E. R. Kursinski, Y.-H.
- 659 Kuo, U. Foelsche, T. Schmidt, and M. Gorbunov, 2012: Reproducibility of GPS
- 660 Radio Occultation Data for Climate Monitoring: Profile-to-Profile Inter-comparison
- of CHAMP Climate Records 2002 to 2008 from Six Data Centers, J. Geophy.

662 *Research*. VOL. 117, D18111, doi:10.1029/2012JD017665.

- Huang, C.-Y., W.-H. Teng, S.-P. Ho, Y.-H. Kuo, 2013: Global Variation of COSMIC
- 664 Precipitable Water over Land: Comparisons with Ground-based GPS Measurements
  665 and NCEP Reanalyses, *Geophysical Research Letters*, DOI: 10.1002/grl.50885.
- 666 IPCC, 2013: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working
- 667 Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate

- 668 Change (IPCC). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New
  669 York, NY, USA, 1535 pp, doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.
- John, V. O. and B.J. Soden, 2007: Temperature and humidity biases in global climate
- models and their impacts on climate feedbacks. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34,
  L18605, doi:10.1029/2007GL030736.
- 673 Knuteson, R., S. Bedka, J. Roman, D. Tobin, D. Turner, and H. Revercomb, 2010: AIRS
- and IASI Precipitable Water Vapor (PWV) Absolute Accuracy at Tropical, Mid-
- 675 Latitude, and Arctic Ground-Truth Sites. Presented at the International TOVS Study
- 676 Conference, Monterey, CA, USA, 14-10 April 2010, available online at
  677 http://cimss.ssec.wisc.edu/itwg/itsc/itsc17/.
- 678 Kursinski, E.R., G.A. Hajj, J.T. Schofield and R.P. Linfield, 1997: Observing Earth's
- atmosphere with radio occultation measurements using the Global Positioning
  System. J. Geophys. Res. 102, No. D19, 23,429-23,465.
- Larar, A. M., W. L. Smith, D. K. Zhou, X. Liu, H. Revercomb, J. P. Taylor, S. M. Newman,
- and P. Schlüssel, 2010: IASI spectral radiance validation inter-comparisons: case study
- assessment from the JAIVEx field campaign, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 411-430.
- 684 Leroy, D., Fontaine, E., Schwarzenboeck, A., Strapp, J. W., Korolev, A., McFarquhar, G.,
- Dupuy, R., Gourbeyre, C., Lilie, L., Protat, A., Delanoë, J., Dezitter, F., and Grandin,
- A., 2017: Ice crystal sizes in high ice water content clouds. Part 2: Statistics of mass
- 687 diameter percentiles in tropical convection observed during the HAIC/HIWC project,
- 688 *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.*, doi: 10.1175/JTECH-D-15-0246.1.
- Lin, L., X. Zou, R. Anthes, and Y.-H. Kuo, 2010: COSMIC GPS cloudy profiles. *Mon.*
- 690 *Wea. Rev.*, 138, 1104–1118.

- Luers, J. K. and R.E. Eskridge, 1998: Use of radiosonde temperature data in climate
  studies. *J. of Climate*, 11, 1002–1019.
- 693 Ma, Z., Y.-H. Kuo, F. M. Ralph, P. J. Neiman, G. A. Wick, E. Sukovich, and B. Wang,
- 694 2011: Assimilation of GPS radio occultation data for an intense atmospheric river
- 695 with the NCEP regional GSI system. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 139, 2170–2183,
- 696 doi:10.1175/2011MWR3342.1.
- 697 Mears, C., J. Wang, S.-P. Ho, L. Zhang, and X. Zhou, 2012: Global Climate Hydrological
- 698 cycle, Total column water vapor [in "State of the Climate in 2011"]. *Bull. Amer.*699 *Meteor. Soc.*, 93(7), \$25–\$26, doi:10.1175.
- 700 Mears, C., J. Wang, D. Smith, and F. J. Wentz, 2015: Intercomparison of total precipitable
- 701 water measurements made by satellite- borne microwave radiometers and ground702 based GPS instruments. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 120, 2492–2504,
  703 doi:10.1002/2014JD022694.
- Mears C., S.-P. Ho, L. Peng, and J. Wang, 2017): Total Column Water Vapor, [In "State
  of the Climate in 2016]. *Bul. Amer. Meteor. Sci.*, 98 (8), S93–S98,
- doi:10.1175/2017BAMSStateoftheClimate.1.
- 707 Milz, M., S. A. Buehler, and V. O. John, 2009: Comparison of AIRS and AMSU-B
- monthly mean estimates of upper tropopsheric humidity, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, L10804,
  doi:10.1029/2008GL037068.
- 710 Neiman, P. J., F. M. Ralph, G. A. Wick, Y.-H. Kuo, T.-K. Wee, Z. Ma, G. H. Taylor, and
- 711 M. D. Dettinger, 2008: Diagnosis of an intense atmospheric river impacting the Pacific
- 712 Northwest: Storm summary and offshore vertical structure observed with COSMIC
- satellite retrievals. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 136, 4398–4420.

- Noël, S., M. Buchwitz, and J. P. Burrows, 2004: First retrieval of global water vapour
- column amounts from SCIAMACHY measurements, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 4, 111–
  125.
- 717 Palm, M., C. Melsheimer, S. Noel, J. Notholt, J. Burrows, and O. Schrems, 2008: Integrated
- 718 water vapor above Ny Alesund, Spitsbergen: a multisensor intercomparison. *Atmos.*
- 719 *Chem. Phys. Discuss.* 8, 21171–21199.
- 720 Pougatchev, N., T. August, X. Calbet, T. Hultberg, O. Oduleye, P. Schlussel, B. Stiller, K.
- 521 St. Germain, and G. Bingham, 2009: IASI temperature and water vapor retrievals –
- error assessment and validation. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 6453–6458.
- 723 Prasad, A. K. and R. P. Singh, 2009: Validation of MODIS Terra, AIRS, NCEP/DOE
- AMIP-II Reanalysis-2, and AERONET Sun photometer derived integrated precipitable
- water vapor using ground-based GPS receivers over India. J. Geophys. Res., 114,
- 726 D05107, doi:10.1029/2008JD011230.
- Roman, J., R. Knuteson, and S. Ackerman, 2014: Time-to-detect trends in precipitable
  water vapor with varying measurement errors. *J. Climate*, 27, 8259-8275.
- 729 Scherllin-Pirscher, B., C. Deser, S.-P. Ho, C. Chou, W. Randel, and Y.-W. Kuo, 2012:
- 730 The vertical and spatial structure of ENSO in the upper troposphere and lower
- stratosphere from GPS radio occultation measurements, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39,
- 732 L20801, 6 PP., 2012, doi:10.1029/2012GL053071.
- 733 Schlüessel, P., & Emery, W. J. 1990: Atmospheric water vapour over oceans from SSM/I
- measurements. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 11(5), 753-766.

- 735 Sherwood, S.C., W. Ingram, Y. Tsushima, M. Satoh, M. Roberts, P.L. Vidale and P.A.O.
- Gorman, 2010: Relative humidity changes in a warmer climate. J. Geophys. Res.,
  115, D09104, doi:10.1029/2009JD012585.
- Soden, B. J., and J. R. Lanzante, 1996: An assessment of satellite and radiosonde
  climatologies of upper-tropospheric water vapor. *Journal of Climate*, 9(6), 12351250.
- Soden, B. J., R. T. Wetherald, G. L. Stenchikov, and A. Robock, 2002: Global cooling after
  the eruption of Mount Pinatubo: A test of climate feedback by water
  vapor. *Science*, 296(5568), 727-730.
- Sohn, B. J., and E. A. Smith, 2003: Explaining sources of discrepancy in SSM/I water
  vapor algorithms. *J. Climate*, 16, 3229–3255, doi:10.1175/15200442(2003)016,3229:ESODII.2.0.CO;2.
- Soden, B.J. and I.M. Held, 2006: Assessment of climate feedbacks in coupled oceanatmosphere models. J. Climate, 19, 3354-3360.
- Sohn, B.-J., and R. Bennartz, 2008: Contribution of water vapor to observational estimates
- of longwave cloud radiative forcing, J. Geophys. Res., 113, D20107,
  doi:10.1029/2008JD010053.
- 752 Teng, W.-H., C.-Y. Huang, S.-P. Ho, Y.-H. Kuo, and X.-J. Zhou, 2013: Characteristics of
- 753 Global Precipitable Water in ENSO Events Revealed by COSMIC Measurements,
- 754 *J. Geophy. Research*, Vol. 118, 1–15, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50371.
- Thompson, A., 2007: Simulating the adiabatic ascent of atmospheric air parcels using thecloud chamber, Department of Meteorology, Penn State.
- 757 Trenberth K. E. and Guillemot, C. J., 1998: Evaluation of the atmospheric moisture and

758	hydrological cycle in the NCEP/NCAR reanalyses. Clim. Dyn., 14:213-231
759	Trenberth, K.E., J. Fasullo, and L. Smith, 2005: Trends and variability in column
760	integrated atmospheric water vapor. Climate Dynamics, 24, 741-758.
761	Wang, J., L. Zhang, A. Dai, T. Van Hove, and J. Van Baelen, 2007: A near-global, 8-year,
762	2-hourly data set of atmospheric precipitable water from ground-based GPS
763	measurements. J. Geophys. Res., 112, D11107, doi:10.1029/2006JD007529.
764	Wang, J and Zhang L. 2008: Systematic Errors in Global Radiosonde Precipitable Water
765	Data from Comparisons with Ground-Based GPS Measurements, J. of Climate, 21,
766	DOI:10.1175/2007JCLI1944.1.
767	Wang, L., X. Wu, M. Goldberg, C. Cao, Y. Li, and SH. Sohn, 2010: Comparison of AIRS
768	and IASI Radiances Using GOES Imagers as Transfer Radiometers toward Climate
769	Data Records. J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol. 49, 478–492.
770	Wick, G.A., Kuo, YH., Ralph, F.M., Wee, TK., Neiman, P.J., Ma, Z, 2008:
771	Intercomparison of integrated water vapor retrievals from SSM/I and
772	COSMIC. Geophys. Res. Lett. 2008, 28, 3263-3266.
773	Wentz, F. J., 1997: A well-calibrated ocean algorithm for SSM/I. J. Geophys.
774	Res., 102, 8703–8718.
775	Wentz, F. J., and R. W. Spencer, 1998: SSM/I rain retrievals within a unified all-weather
776	ocean algorithm. J. Atmos. Sci., 56, 1613–1627.
777	Wentz, F. J., and M. Schabel, 2000: Precise climate monitoring using complementary

778

Wentz, F.J., Lucrezia Riccardulli, K. Hilburn, and C. Mears, 2007: How much more rain 779 will global warming bring? Science, 317, 233-235. 780

satellite data sets, *Nature*, 403, 414–416.

- Wentz, F. J., 2013: SSM/I version-7 calibration report. *Remote Sensing Systems Tech*.
  Rep. 011012, 46 pp.
- 783 Wentz, F. J. 2015: A 17-Year climate record of environmental parameters derived from
- the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM) microwave imager, J. Clim.,
- 785 doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0155.1.
- Yang, S., and X. Zou, 2012: Assessments of cloud liquid water contributions to GPS RO
- refractivity using measurements from COSMIC and CloudSat. J. Geophys. Res.,
- 788 117, D06219, doi:10.1029/2011JD016452.
- 789 Zeng, Z., S.-P. Ho, S. Sokolovskiy, 2012: The Structure and Evolution of Madden-Julian
- 790 Oscillation from FORMOSAT-3/COSMIC Radio Occultation Data, J. Geophy.
- 791 *Research*, 117, D22108, doi:10.1029/2012JD017685.
- 792Zou, X., S. Yang, and P. S. Ray, 2012: Impacts of ice clouds on GPS radio occultation
- 793 measurements. J. Atmos. Sci., 69, 3670–3682.
- 794
- 795
- 796
- 797
- 798
- 799
- 800
- 801
- 802
- 803

# 807 Table 1. Satellite Instruments Used in This Study

	Satellite	Instrument	Operation period
	DMSP F15	SSM/I	December 1999-present
	DMSP F16	SSMIS	October 2003-present
	DMSP F17	SSMIS	December 2006-present
	Coriolis	WindSat	February 2003-present
808			
809			
810			
811			
812			
813			
814			
815			
816			
817			
818			
819			
820			
821			
822			
823			
824			

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation of differences (MW minus RO) in TPW (in mm)
between four MW radiometers and COSMIC RO under various sky conditions. The
sample numbers for each pair are shown in the third position of each column.

F16

Sky condition

Clear

Cloudy

Non Precip

Precip

F15

0.06/1.65/3064

0.80/1.92/23614

0.49/1.69/17223

1.64/2.28/6391

Mean/o/N

0.03/1.47/3551

0.79/1.73/29059

0.46/1.46/21854

1.83/2.05/7205

F17

0.07/1.47/2888

1.88/2.08/7032

WindSat

0.82/1.76/28403 0.96/1.73/20194

0.47/1.49/21371 0.49/1.36/13004

0.18/1.35/1802

1.85/2.00/7190

872 Table 3: Mean and standard deviation (std) of the mean in mm of the monthly time series 873 of differences of MW minus RO TPW under various sky conditions. The trend of the RO 874 estimates of TPW in mm/decade and the 95% confidence level are shown below the 875 mean and  $\sigma$  values in each row.

Stay condition		Moon/g of mor	thly time cories			
sky condition	Mean/o of monthly time series					
	RO trend (95% confidence levels indicated in ())					
	F15	F16	F17	WindSat		
Clear	0.07/0.56	0.05/0.28	0.08/0.27	0.23/0.38		
	1.65 (0.47,2.84)	1.09 (-0.28,2.46)	0.21 (-1.22,1.65)	-0.12 (-1.89,1.66)		
Cloudy	0.77/0.51	0.78/0.18	0.82/0.15	0.95/0.17		
	1.49 (0.40,2.58)	2.02(0.87,3.16)	1.85 (0.64,3.06)	1.85 (0.68,3.01)		
Non Precipitation	0.46/0.48	0.45/0.17	0.48/0.15	0.47/0.19		
	0.86 (-0.24,1.95)	2.02 (0.87,3.17)	2.37 (1.23,3.50)	2.12 (0.95,3.30)		
Precipitation	1.62/0.69	1.81/0.31	1.88/0.29	1.88/0.32		
	2.52 (0.55,4.480	1.32 (-0.53,3.17)	0.26 (-1.59,2.10)	0.39 (-1.25,2.04)		

---

896 Figure Captions

897

- Figure 1. a.-e: The RSS V7.0 monthly mean F16 SSM/I a) TPW (in mm), b) surface skin
- temperature (in K), c) liquid water path (LWP, in mm), and d) rain rate (RR, in
- 900 mm/hour), and e) distribution of matches of COSMIC RO and F16, F17, and WindSat
- 901 estimations of TPW used in this study.

902

- 903 Figure 2. TPW scatter plots for the COSMIC and RSS Version 7.0 pairs under clear
- 904 conditions for a) F15, b) F16, c) F17, and d) WindSat.

905

- 906 Figure 3. TPW scatter plots for the COSMIC and RSS Version 7.0 F16 SSM/I pairs
- 907 under a) cloudy, b) cloudy but non-precipitation, and c) precipitation conditions.

908

- 909 Figure 4. TPW scatter plots for the gb-GPS and RSS Version 7.0 F16 SSM/I pairs from
- 910 June 2006 to December 2013 under a) clear, b) cloudy, c) cloudy but non-precipitation,
- 911 and d) precipitation conditions.

912

- 913 Figure 5. Mean and standard of the mean for the F16-COSMIC TPW biases varying with
- a) wind speed (m/s), b) TPW (mm), c) rain rate (mm/hour), d) total cloud water (mm),
- 915 and e) surface skin temperature (K). The vertical black bracket superimposed on the
- 916 mean denotes the standard error of the mean. The green dashed line is the number of

samples, indicated by the scale on the right.

919	Figure 6. Mean and standard of the mean for the F16- gb-GPS TPW biases varying with
920	a) wind speed (m/s), b) TPW (mm), c) rain rate (mm/hour), d) total cloud water (mm) and
921	e) surface skin temperature (K). The vertical black bracket superimposed on the mean
922	denotes the standard error of the mean. The green dashed line is the number of samples,
923	indicated by the scale on the right.
924	
925	Figure 7. The time series of monthly mean F16 – COSMIC TPW differences under a)
926	clear, b) cloudy, c) cloudy but non-precipitation, and d) precipitation conditions. The
927	black line is the mean difference for microwave radiometer minus COSMIC; the vertical
928	lines superimposed on the mean values are the standard error of the mean. The number of
929	the monthly MW radiometer- COSMIC pairs is indicated by the green dashed line (scale
930	on the right Y axis).
931	

932 Figure 8. The time series of de-seasonalized TPW differences (microwave radiometer –

933 COSMIC) under cloudy skies for a) F15, b) F16, c) F17, d) WindSat. The black line is

the mean difference for microwave radiometer minus COSMIC; the vertical lines

superimposed on the mean values are the standard error of the mean. The number of the

936 monthly MW radiometer- COSMIC pairs is indicated by the green dashed line (scale on

- the right Y axis). The trends are shown by solid red line. The 95% confidence intervals
- 938 for slopes are shown in the parentheses.

940	Figure 9. The de-seasonalized time series of monthly mean TPW for all MW and
941	COSMIC observations under all sky conditions. The red and blue dashed lines are the
942	best fit of de-seasonalized COSMIC and MW TPW time series, respectively.
943	
944	Figure 10. The global map of TPW trend in mm/decade over oceans using all F16, F17,
945	WindSat data from 2006 to 2013.
946	
947	Figure 11. Global mean TPW monthly anomaly (mm) relative to 1981-2010 mean for
948	ocean regions 60°S-60°N from ERA-Interim reanalysis (green), RSS microwave (blue) and
949	COSMIC (red). (Based on data from Mears et al., 2017).
950	
951	
952	
953	
954	
955	
950	
958	
959	
960	
961	
962	
963	
964	
965	
966	
967	
968	
969	
970	







Figure 1. a-e: The RSS V7.0 monthly mean F16 SSM/I a) TPW (in mm), b)

and WindSat estimations of TPW used in this study.

surface skin temperature (in K), c) liquid water path (LWP, in mm), d) rain rate

(RR, in mm/hour), and e) distribution of matches of COSMIC RO and F16, F17



Figure 2. TPW scatter plots for the COSMIC and RSS Version 7.0 pairs under clearconditions for a) F15, b) F16, c) F17, and d) WindSat.



 $\begin{array}{c} 1000\\ 1001 \end{array}$ 

Figure 3. TPW scatter plots for the COSMIC and RSS Version 7.0 F16 SSM/I pairs
under a) cloudy, b) cloudy but non-precipitation, and c) precipitation conditions.



Figure 4. TPW scatter plots for the gb-GPS and RSS Version 7.0 F16 SSM/I pairs from June 2006 to December 2013 under a) clear, b) cloudy, c) cloudy but non-precipitation, and d) precipitation conditions.



Figure 5. Mean and standard of the mean for the F16-COSMIC TPW biases varying with
a) wind speed (m/s), b) TPW (mm), c) rain rate (mm/hour), d) total cloud water (mm),
and e) surface skin temperature (K). The vertical black bracket superimposed on the
mean denotes the standard error of the mean. The green dashed line is the number of
samples, indicated by the scale on the right.



Figure 6. Mean and standard of the mean for the F16- gb-GPS TPW biases varying with a) wind speed (m/s), b) TPW (mm), c) rain rate (mm/hour), d) total cloud water (mm) and e) surface skin temperature (K). The vertical black bracket superimposed on the mean denotes the standard error of the mean. The green dashed line is the number of samples, indicated by the scale on the right.



Figure 7. The time series of monthly mean F16 – COSMIC TPW differences under a)
clear, b) cloudy, c) cloudy but non-precipitation, and d) precipitation conditions. The
black line is the mean difference for microwave radiometer minus COSMIC; the vertical
lines superimposed on the mean values are the standard error of the mean. The number of
the monthly MW radiometer- COSMIC pairs is indicated by the green dashed line (scale
on the right Y axis).





Figure 8. The time series of de-seasonalized TPW differences (microwave radiometer – COSMIC) under cloudy skies for a) F15, b) F16, c) F17, d) WindSat. The black line is the mean difference for microwave radiometer minus COSMIC; the vertical lines superimposed on the mean values are the standard error of the mean. The number of the monthly MW radiometer- COSMIC pairs is indicated by the green dashed line (scale on the right Y axis). The trends are shown by solid red line. The 95% confidence intervals for slopes are shown in the parentheses.



Figure 9. The de-seasonalized time series of monthly mean TPW for all MW and
COSMIC observations under all sky conditions. The red and blue dashed lines are the
best fit of de-seasonalized COSMIC and MW TPW time series, respectively.





1139
1140 Figure 10. The global map of TPW trend in mm/decade over oceans using all F16,
1141 F17, WindSat data from 2006 to 2013.

- . . . . .





1153 Figure 11. Global mean TPW monthly anomaly (mm) relative to 1981-2010 mean for

1154 ocean regions 60°S-60°N from ERA-Interim reanalysis (green), RSS microwave (blue) and

1155 COSMIC (red). (Based on data from Mears et al., 2017).