

Interactive comment on “Comparative study between ground-based observations and NAVGEM-HA reanalysis data in the MLT region” by Gunter Stober et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 16 December 2019

General comments:

This study shows comparisons of MLT dynamics between the ground-based observations and the new reanalysis data which covers the mesosphere. The new analysis technique which could overcome data gap and uneven sampling in the observation is well introduced, although a setting of the vertical retrieval kernel should be carefully discussed. The authors clearly describe the good performance of NAVGEM-HA reanalysis data in terms of climatology and the short-term response to the sudden stratospheric warming. The possible mechanisms for the short-term response of the semi-diurnal tides are also well discussed in Section 5. Since this paper shows many attractive

C1

observational/simulated results, the time-lag and/or the time scale of the short-term response of the semi-diurnal tides, in my opinion, should be a little more described in Section 4, which might be helpful for the discussion of the above mechanisms. In addition, the discussion section could be shortened by moving some sentences/paragraphs to the other sections. So, I would recommend publication of this paper only with some minor revisions described below.

Comments:

1. Page 4, line 18: It would be better to replace the sentence “The Rayleigh backscatter is . . . under the assumption of hydrostatic equilibrium” by a new one; “The temperature are calculated under the assumption of hydrostatic equilibrium from the Rayleigh backscatter which is proportional to the atmospheric air density.”
2. Page 4, line 22: “only down to” → “only above” ??
3. Page 4, line 29: please delete “?”.
4. Page 5, line 28: What is the advantage of the ASF compared with a wavelet technique such as S transform (Stockwell et al., 1996)?
5. The benefits of the ASF and a part of the discussion for the vertical kernel described in Section 5.1 would be better to be moved in Section 2 to shorten Section 5.
6. Page 6, lines 1-12: Please insert two references about gravity waves in MLT regions: Chen et al. (2013) to (Page 6, line 9), which shows a case study of observed gravity waves with the vertical wavelength of 22~23 km. Shibuya et al. (2017) to (Page 6, line 6). which shows a case study of gravity waves with the wave periods of quasi-12 h (The climatological study of the above cases is discussed in Chen et al., 2016, JGR and Shibuya and Sato, 2019, ACP, respectively, which I think need not to be introduced here).
7. Page 7, lines 22: The altitudes of the wind reversal are quite different from the observations and the reanalysis data, which should be mention in the main text. The

C2

altitude of the wind reversal is quite important for the breaking condition of the upward propagating gravity waves.

8. Page 8, lines 9: Why is the amplitude of the semi-diurnal tides in reanalysis data overestimated above the altitude of 90 km? I'm afraid that this point is not discussed in Section 5.

9. Page 10, in Figure 3: Please add the explanation to the representation of a tidal phase (p12?).

10. Page 10, line 9: Please mark the central date of the sudden stratospheric warming in the figures after Fig. 6.

11. Page 10, line 12: Why does the data gap in the observation at Andenes exist near the central date of SSW? Is this related to the SSW?

12. Page 11, line 6 (CRITICAL): Please mention the time-lag between the central date of the SSW and the amplification of the semidiurnal tide both in the observation and the reanalysis data in Figs 6, 7, 9 and 10, respectively.

13. Page 12, line 4: In Figure 8, the SW2 tidal amplitude seems to decrease after the central date of SSW below the altitude of 85 km? Such a decrease is not dominant in each localized point in NAVGEM-HA in Figs. 6 and 7. Why is this found only in the zonal mean?

14. Page 12, line 21-24: Please move the sentence "Atmospheric . . ." to Introduction.

15. Page 22, line 4-9: For the discussion of the amplification of the tides after the SSW, the time-lag of the amplification should be one of the key components. For example, the time-lag might be related to the vertical group velocity of the tides which propagate from the source region. Did the previous study discuss such a time-lag in their proposed mechanism?

16. Page 22, line 24: Moreover → Moverover.

C3

References: Chen, C., Chu, X., McDonald, A. J., Vadas, S. L., Yu, Z., Fong, W., and Lu, X.: Inertia–gravity waves in Antarctica: A case study using simultaneous lidar and radar measurements at McMurdo/Scott Base (77.8° S, 166.7° E). *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118(7), 2794–2808, 2013. Stockwell, RG; Mansinha, L; Lowe, RP (1996). "Localization of the complex spectrum: the S transform". *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*. 44 (4): 998–1001. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.462.1500. doi:10.1109/78.492555. Shibuya, R., Sato, K., Tsutsumi, M., Sato, T., Tomikawa, Y., Nishimura, K., and Kohma, M.: Quasi-12 h inertia–gravity waves in the lower mesosphere observed by the PANSY radar at Syowa Station (39.6° E, 69.0° S), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 6455–6476, 2017

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-1006>, 2019.

C4