Large-scale planetary disturbances in stratospheric temperature at high-latitudes in the Southern Summer Hemisphere
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Abstract

The global structure and propagation of large-scale (periods >5 days) waves in the Southern Hemisphere summer (December 2006–February 2007) at 60° S–75° S latitude are examined using temperature data from GPS radio occultation measurements by COSMIC/FORMOSAT 3 satellite constellation from 10 to 40 km altitude. Spectral analysis has revealed eastward propagating planetary scale perturbations with wavenumbers 1 and 2 and periods of 10-, 16- and 23 days, zonally symmetric waves with the same periods and stationary waves with wavenumber 1 and 2. The presence of the zonally symmetric waves is interpreted as an indication of the coupling of the stationary and traveling waves. The results obtained show a very dynamically active Antarctic summer stratosphere. The novel aspect of the work is in the use of the GPS COSMIC data providing multiple local times each day, thus allowing large-scale wave analysis at high Southern latitudes and revealing planetary wave activity not normally observed in summer, but more consistent with late winter and spring conditions in the stratosphere.

1 Introduction

Large-scale planetary waves determine the dynamic temperature and wind regimes of the atmosphere. In the Southern Hemisphere these large-scale waves have a predominant eastward direction of propagation (e.g. Randel and Newman, 1998 and references therein). Temperature observations from the Selective Chopper Radiometer (SCR) on the Nimbus satellites revealed intense wave activity at high Southern latitudes in late winter and spring consisting of oscillations predominantly with a wavenumber 1 (wave 1) identified as a stationary wave, accompanied by an eastward propagating oscillation with wavenumber 2 (wave 2) (Chapman et al., 1974; Hartmann, 1975; Hirota, 1976). Observations of an eastward traveling wave 2 with a period of ~10–20 days in the Southern Hemisphere stratosphere in winter and spring were also reported.
by Venne (1980), Mechoso and Hartman (1982), Venne and Stratford (1979, 1982),
Prata (1984), Mechoso et al. (1988), Hirota (1988), Shiotani et al. (1990), Manney et
al. (1991), Fishbein et al. (1993), to mention a few. Some westward propagating free
Rossby waves have also been observed (Rogers, 1976; Hirota, 1975, 1976; Mechoso
and Hartmann, 1982; Hirota and Hirooka, 1984). It was suggested that the source of
these eastward propagating waves is instability associated with their relation to the
seasonal evolution of the mean zonal winds field (Hirota, 1976; Hatmann, 1979, 1983;
Hirota et al., 1990; Shiotani et al., 1993).

In contrast, the Nimbus observations revealed that the Southern Hemisphere sum-
mer was very quiescent. Model simulations (e.g. Forbes et al., 1995) also supported
this pattern. However, medium-scale waves (zonal wavenumbers 4–7) were observed
to frequently dominate the Southern Hemisphere summer wind and temperature fields
(e.g. Randel and Stanford, 1985 a,b, and references therein). It was shown that the
Southern Hemisphere summer flow vacillates between periods of highly perturbed
states, caused by nonlinear baroclinic instabilities, on one hand, and zonally symmetric
states – on the other, with a time scale of 10–20 days.

Recent satellite experiments like the Microwave Limb Sounder (MLS) (Waters et al.,
1993) and the Improved Stratosphere and Mesospheric Sounder (ISAMS) (Taylor et al.,
1993) on the Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite (Reber et al., 1993), the Sounding
the Atmosphere using Broadband Emission Radiometry (SABER) on board the Ther-
mosphere, Ionosphere, Mesosphere Energetics and Dynamics (TIMED) satellite (Russ-
sell et al., 1999; Yee, 2003) and the MLS (Waters et al., 2006) on the AURA spacecraft
(Schoeberl et al., 2006) have provided global temperature observations throughout the
middle atmosphere, which have been used to study the global signatures of planetary–
scale perturbations including those in the Southern Hemisphere high latitudes (e.g.
Hirooka, 2000; Palo et al., 2005; Ern et al., 2007). However, the spatial and tempo-
ral coverage of these observations has been restricted by orbit configurations, view-
ing geometry and vertical resolution. Studies employing model data assimilated fields
(temperature, wind and geopotential height) like those provided by the United King-
dom Meteorological Office (UKMO), the National Centre for Environmental Predictions (NCEP) and the European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecast (ECMWF) still remain the main source of information about the dynamics of the stratosphere, and in particular the Southern Hemisphere stratosphere.

Experiments like the Global Positioning System/Meteorology (GPS/Met) (Ware et al., 1996; Rocken et al., 1997) and the Challenging Minisatellite Payload (CHAMP) (Wickert et al., 2004) have provided a new global high-resolution datasets of temperature, pressure and refractivity profiles in the 1–40 km altitude range and have successfully been used in the study of short vertical wavelengths and global and regional scale gravity wave activity (Tsuda et al., 2000; Venkat Ratnam et al., 2004; de la Torre et al., 2006), as well as equatorial Kelvin waves (e.g. Tsai et al., 2004; Randel and Wu, 2005; Tsuda et al., 2006; Venkat Ratnam et al., 2006; Baumgaertner and McDonald, 2007; Hei et al., 2008). Temperature observations from the Constellation Observing System for Meteorology, Ionosphere and Climate (COSMIC) GPS satellite constellation (Rocken et al., 2000) have also been successfully used in the study of gravity waves’ global distribution (e.g. Alexander et al., 2008a, b).

In the present study we employ COSMIC temperature observations to examine the dynamics of the Southern Hemisphere stratosphere in summer at high latitudes. The analysis is concentrated on the morphology of the temperature field at 30 km height (∼10 hPa) and the decomposition of large-scale oscillations with periods between 2 and 30 days. In the following sections we first introduce the COSMIC temperature dataset, and then describe the data analysis procedures used in the spectral decomposition of the oscillations observed. The results obtained are presented and discussed, before summarizing our conclusions.

2 COSMIC temperature data

The Constellation Observing System for Meteorology, Ionosphere and Climate (COSMIC)/ Formosa Satellite Mission 3 (FORMOSAT-3) (Rocken et al., 2000) was launched
on 14 March 2006 on a circular orbit with an inclination of 72° at an altitude of 512 km (Cheng et al., 2006). This GPS radio-occultation (RO) constellation mission is a collaborative project of the National Space Organization (NSPO) in Taiwan and the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research (UCAR) in the United States of America. The COSMIC/FORMOSAT-3 spacecraft constellation consists of six micro-satellites, each carrying an advanced GPS receiver for radio occultation and precision orbit studies. By measuring the phase delay of radio waves from GPS satellites as they are occulted by the Earth’s atmosphere, accurate and precise vertical profiles of bending angles of radio waves’ trajectories are obtained in the ionosphere, stratosphere and troposphere. From these bending angle measurements profiles of atmospheric refractivity are obtained. The procedures used to obtain stratospheric and tropospheric bending angle and refractivity profiles from the raw COSMIC phase and amplitude data have been described by Kuo et al. (2004), while the RO method for obtaining atmospheric soundings has been summarized by Kursinski et al. (1997) (see also, Kursinski et al., 2000; Anthes et al., 2000; Kuo et al., 2000). Some of the preliminary results from the COSMIC mission have been summarized by Anthes et al. (2008).

Immediately after launch the six micro-satellites were orbiting very close to each other at the initial altitude of 512 km. In the first few months of the mission this provided an opportunity for estimating the precision of the radio-occultation technique through comparisons with the independent measurements of each satellite, but globally led to over-sampling of some regions, while others remained under-sampled or not observed at all. Over a period of 17 months after the launch the satellites were gradually positioned at their nominal orbits at ∼800 km, with orbital plane separations of 30°. The satellite mission presently provides about 1500–2000 RO global observations of vertical profiles of atmospheric pressure, air density, temperature, and water vapor, as well as ionospheric electron density per day over all local solar times. The best latitude coverage is at middle and high latitudes around 55° and 80° latitude in both hemispheres (Rocken et al., 2000).

One of the data products of the COSMIC/FORMOSAT-3 mission is “dry” temperature
profiles, which are computed from the observed refractivity under the assumption that the water vapour pressure is zero. The difference between the dry temperature and the actual (kinetic) temperature in the radio-occultation retrieval is due to the presence of water vapour. Above the tropopause (∼10 km height at high latitudes) it is assumed that water vapour content is negligible and thus the state of the temperature field in the lower stratosphere can be described by the dry temperature profiles. The original COSMIC data are available at 0.1 km vertical resolution, but they have an effective vertical resolution of the order of 1 km in the upper troposphere and the stratosphere. Therefore the original (non-independent) data are interpolated to the approximate real resolution of 1 km. The precision of the COSMIC refractivity is <0.2% between 10 and 20 km, and 0.7% at 30 km height (Schreiner et al., 2007). The accuracy of the COSMIC derived temperatures is better than 0.5 K.

The data considered in the present analysis are COSMIC version 2.0 “dry” temperatures at altitudes from 10 to 40 km, over the latitude range of 55° to 80° in the Southern Hemisphere summer for the period of 1 December 2006 to 1 March 2007 (Day 334, 2006 to Day 60, 2007).

3 Data analysis

The measurements were first binned according to latitude and altitude for each of the days of observations within latitude bands of 5°, overlapping by 2.5° and with a height resolution of 1 km. Thus, a given latitude/altitude band in the 55° S–80° S range contains all temperature observations within that latitude band with their respective universal times and longitudes, or on average about 60–70 profiles per day. As was already mentioned, earlier in the mission the orbit planes of the different satellites were in close proximity of each other, which led to non-uniform global spatial and temporal coverage. Therefore a given latitude/longitude was often sampled at different universal times (UT) (and different local solar times) on a given day. In order to reduce the scatter and gaps in the data the observations within each of the 5°-latitude bands and for each of the
months considered (December 2006, January and February, 2007) are binned also according to UT with a resolution of 0.5 days (12 h). With respect to the missing data in longitude the observational gaps are linearly interpolated. Further the data were transformed into a 60×60 mesh, preserving the 0.5-day binning grid in UT, and then zonally fitted with a harmonic wave function with wave numbers from 1 to 3. This procedure serves the purpose of filtering out the data from observation noise and small-scale perturbations. The 60×60 gridded temperature data (0.5 day/6°) (UT/longitude) for each month, latitude band and height were combined to produce Hovmöller diagrams (time-longitude) of the temperature field. The Hovmöller diagrams are often used to investigate the zonal and temporal propagation of specific wave components (Shiotani et al., 1997; Wheeler and Kiladis, 1999; Tsai et al., 2004; Randel and Wu, 2005). These presentations have revealed the unmistakable presence of planetary-scale periodic perturbations in the COSMIC temperature data consistent with the presence of stationary wave 1 at ∼200° E, coupled with some other transient waves.

To examine further the amplitude and direction of these perturbations at a given latitude band and height, the data were binned according to longitude and UT and weighted over the number of observations within each bin. After some testing, two binning resolutions in longitude were chosen, in order to obtain sufficient zonal coverage for planetary wave analysis. First, for a preliminary diagnostic, a 40°-binning in longitude was carried out which provided a uniform global coverage without gaps and in spite of being rather coarse, was still sufficient to preserve the main signatures of planetary perturbations with a period greater than 2 days. The second binning format considered a longitudinal grid of 15°; the need for this higher resolution is explained in detail in Sect. 3.2. Thus the data were binned in latitude bands of 5°, longitude bins of 40° (15°), height bins of 1 km and UT resolution of 0.5 days (12 h) and subjected to spectral analysis, the results of which are discussed next.
3.1 Lomb-Scargle periodograms

To examine the planetary wave variability in the stratosphere (10–40 km) during the period of interest (1 December 2006–1 March 2007), 30-day time segments sliding by one-day intervals were used (similar to Tsai et al., 2004), covering the period from 15 November 2006 to 15 March 2007 (15 days before and after) for each of the latitude/longitude/height/UT bins. The necessity of time segments and the choice of their length for wave decomposition arises from the fact that a planetary wave packet lasts several periods and the time segment should be sufficient to allow for more than one cycle to be examined. Fedulina et al. (2004) concluded that the time segments must be of a minimum length of 70 days in order to isolate planetary waves with periods of about 10–20 days and determine their direction of propagation. Chshyolkova et al. (2006) used a time window with a variable length equaling three times the periods of the wave (e.g. 48-day time window for a 16-day wave with a 4-day step), while Pancheva et al. (2008) successfully used 45-day time intervals with a one-day step to resolve signatures with periods of 23 days and less. All these studies used UKMO assimilated data fields to examine the planetary wave characteristics in the stratosphere. Since the planetary-scale perturbations usually last more than one cycle a 30-day time segment would allow the full resolution of planetary waves with periods of the order of 16 days and less.

The data from each of these 30-day segments were subjected to standard spectral analysis beginning with the Lomb-Scargle periodogram with amplitude and phase estimation (Scargle, 1982; Hocke, 1998). The Lomb-Scargle periodogram analysis is in essence a least-mean-square analysis, where the data are modeled by sinosoids for each 40°-longitude bin over the entire 30-day UT grid. This covers an array of 10 longitudes (resolution of 40°) and 61 time intervals (resolution of 0.5 days) for each 30-day time segment. The daily periodograms yield the wave parameters e.g. periods, amplitudes and phases, corresponding to the median of the respective 30-day segments thus covering the period of 1 December 2006 (Day 334) to 1 March 2007 (Day 60 or
425, starting 1 January 2006). Here only results from the analysis carried out for the latitude range from 60° S to 75° S are reported.

3.2 Planetary waves decomposition

Because the COSMIC satellite data, as any data from other low-earth-orbiting satellite (e.g. UARS, TIMED, AURA) are asynoptic, i.e. unevenly sampled, they cannot be subjected to standard Fourier transform analysis to extract information on perturbation frequencies present in the observations (Hayashi, 1980; Salby, 1982a, b; Wu et al., 1995). Instead a least-square fitting methods are applied (e.g. Wu et al., 1995) to estimate the space-time Fourier coefficients for the analysis of large-scale perturbations in the COSMIC temperatures at high Southern latitudes.

Test runs using the 40° longitudinal binning for the planetary wave decomposition showed that it is too coarse to resolve signatures with same period, but different zonal wave numbers. Therefore the data were binned into 15°-longitude and 0.5-day of UT at each of the selected latitude bands and height levels.

The wave decomposition is performed by a linear 2-D (time-longitude) least-square multiple regression simultaneously fitting of all traveling waves with the periods determined in the Lomb-Scargle periodogram analysis, and zonal wave numbers from −3 to 3, as well as the first three modes of stationary planetary waves (SPW) with zonal wave numbers 1, 2 and 3, over each of the 30-day segments in order to avoid a possible distortion of the usually weaker traveling waves by the much stronger SPWs (Pancheva et al., 2008; P. Mukhtarov and D. Pancheva, personal communication, 2008). The wave decomposition is performed by fitting a model of the general wave form to the data as:

\[
T = T_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \sum_{s=-3}^{3} A_{si} \cos \left( \frac{2\pi \sigma_i t + \frac{2\pi}{360} s l - \varphi_{si}}{\psi_s} \right) + \sum_{s=1}^{3} B_s \cos \left( \frac{2\pi}{360} s l - \psi_s \right) ,
\]

where \(t\) is the time in days, starting from 1 December 2006 (Day 334, starting 1 January 2006), \(l\) – the longitude in degrees, normalized by 360°, \(\sigma_i\) – the investigated wave number, \(A_{si}\) – the amplitude coefficient, \(\varphi_{si}\) – the phase angle, \(B_s\) – the amplitude coefficient, and \(\psi_s\) – the phase angle.
frequencies ($\sigma_i = 1/T_i$, where $T$ is the wave period of the $i$th wave, in days, determined by the Lomb-Scargle periodograms), and $s$ is the zonal wave number (the number of waves along the globe at a given latitude band) from $-3$ to 3. $T_0$ is the mean temperature; $A_{si}$, $\varphi_{si}$ – the amplitudes and phases of the traveling waves, and $B_s$, $\psi_s$ – the amplitude and phases of the stationary waves with the respective periods and wave numbers. All these parameters are obtained in the fitting procedure. The cosine terms in Eq. (1) are expressed as time series of sines/cosines of the angle $(2\pi \sigma_i t + \frac{2\pi}{360} s l)$, and these sines/cosines are the independent parameters in the least-mean squares fitting. The amplitudes $A_{si}$ ($B_s$) and phases $\varphi_{si}$ ($\psi_s$) are calculated for each $s$ and $\sigma$ from the coefficients $a_j$, $b_j$ determined in fitting the sine/cosine terms of the wave form. Then
\[
A_{si} (B_s) = \sqrt{a_j^2 + b_j^2}, \varphi_{si} (\psi_s) = \tan^{-1} \left( a_j / b_j \right),
\]
and $j=1, \ldots , N$, where $N=i \cdot s+3$. More detailed description of the procedure can be found elsewhere (e.g. Wu et al., 1995; Pogoreltsev et al., 2002).

The phase of the traveling waves is defined as the time of the wave maximum at zero longitude, while the phase of the stationary waves is defined as the longitude of the wave crest (maximum). Following the established convention, positive wave numbers describe westward propagation, while negative wave numbers – eastward propagation.

4 Results

Composite plots of the COSMIC temperature data as a function of longitude over the period of Day 334–425 (1 December 2006–1 March 2007) revealed the presence of a distinct perturbation which developed over time to what appears as a wave 1, both at the end of December 2006 and the second part of January 2007. Figure 1a–c shows an example of such a composite plot for each of the three months at 30 km height and 65° S latitude; the temperature measurements are given in colour code from purple to red (solid circles) from the beginning to the end of each month. Earlier
in December (Fig. 1a, purple to green solid circles) the temperature data at 30 km show a perturbation with a ridge at \(\sim 170^\circ\) E, which moved eastward to \(\sim 220^\circ\) E, and a trough at \(350^\circ\) E–\(30^\circ\) E. Over time the perturbation developed into a structure with two ridges at \(\sim 200^\circ\) E and \(\sim 360^\circ\) E and troughs at \(60^\circ–70^\circ\) E and \(300^\circ\) E, indicating a wave-2 pattern. The amplitude of this perturbation ranges between \(\sim 15\) K at the beginning of the month to \(\sim 8\) K toward the end. At the beginning of January (Fig. 1b) there is a perturbation with a crest at around \(200^\circ\) E and a not very distinct trough at \(340^\circ\) E, which developed into a wave 2 and possibly wave 3 toward the end of the month with peaks around \(90^\circ\) E, \(230^\circ\) E–\(240^\circ\) E and \(350^\circ\) E (yellow to red circles). There is a considerable day-to-day variability in February, but the oscillation pattern of the perturbations observed is quite mixed.

Figure 2 gives the spatial and temporal distribution of the temperature field at 30 km height in December from \(60^\circ\) S to \(75^\circ\) S. The wave perturbations initially seen in the “raw” data in Fig. 1 are now clearly visible illustrating both the complex dynamical structure at each of the latitude bands considered, as well as the variability in the magnitude of these structures. At the beginning of December a signature with a peak at \(\sim 200^\circ\) E (wave 1) is seen to develop, gradually moving eastward. Toward the end of the month another signature appears with 2 or 3 crests whose amplitude increases poleward. In spite of the fact that the latitude bins are relatively small and overlap by \(2.5^\circ\), there is a considerable difference in the dynamics and magnitude of perturbations over the \(20^\circ\) latitude range considered.

The Hovmöller diagrams expressed in terms of residual temperatures, \(dT\), (the difference between the observation and the zonal mean of all available observations, \(dT = T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{mean}}\)) at 30 km for latitudes from \(60^\circ\) S to \(75^\circ\) S, shown in Fig. 3, indicate a wave 1 eastward propagating perturbation throughout December 2006 (Day 334–365) at about \(200^\circ\) E (Day 340–345). A second peak at about the same longitude can also be seen around Day 380–385 at all latitude bands considered. At \(70^\circ\) S–\(75^\circ\) S two more, smaller peaks appear at about Day 365 and 410, most apparent at \(70^\circ\) S. The peaks at \(70^\circ\) S and \(200^\circ\) E are about 20 days apart. These signatures are present at
all high latitudes together with weaker perturbations, mostly after Day 380 (the second part of January and February 2007) in what also appears to be eastward propagating wave 2.

Contour plots of the periodograms obtained for each of the 10 longitude bins, show strong perturbations with periods greater than 5 days and amplitudes often maximizing at periods around 10 and 16 days in December 2006 and the second part of January/February 2007 at all longitudes. Figure 4 illustrates the distinct presence of these perturbations at 65°S, 30 km height and 40°E, 120°E, 200°E and 280°E longitude. The period of the 16-day wave varies with time between 15 and 20 days, and the amplitude peaks are of ~2 K. A perturbation with a period of about 23–25 days is also observed in December 2006 (Day 334–365). All these signatures are above the 95% confidence level. An interesting feature is the appearance and the regularity in periods of these perturbations, particularly in the second half of January and February, seen also at the other latitude bands, not shown here. The amplitude of the perturbations varies with longitude but their presence in the temperature field is easy to identify, with the 16-day and 10-day waves often comparable in magnitude and amplitudes of the order of 1.5–2 K. The amplitude peaks with periods of ~30 days are likely related to the length of the time segments used in the Lomb-Scargle analysis and are not discussed here.

The propagation direction of the perturbations identified in the periodogram can be obtained from the individual phase values, and the results show eastward propagating 10-day and 16-day perturbations from Day 334 to Day 380 (1 December 2006 to 15 January 2007). Figure 5 gives the amplitude and phase variability of perturbations with period of 16 days (solid line/solid circles) and 10 days (dotted line/asterisks) at 60°S and 40°E (Fig. 5a) and 65°S and 200°E (Fig. 5b) at 30 km height, obtained in the Lomb-Scargle analysis. The magnitude of the 16-day wave is twice that of the 10-day wave with a well defined eastward propagation (phase increases with time) and with phase speeds of 24° day$^{-1}$ and 32.6° day$^{-1}$ for the 16- and 10-day wave, respectively. A stationary wave 2 with a period of 11–14 days settles in after Day 380 (15 January
2007) with peaks at 90° and 270° (or 180° apart) and amplitude of about 1–1.5 K. A review of amplitude and phase plots at the other latitude/longitude bands of 200° E–280° E (not included here) showed also the dominant presence of a stationary wave with a phase of 270° (or 12 days).

The Hovmöller diagrams and the Lomb-Scargle periodogram analysis showed that for most cases the eastward propagating 16-day and 10-day waves are the dominant waves accompanied by a stationary wave 2 during the period of Day 380–Day 425 (15 January–1 March 2007). In addition, the Lomb-Scargle periodograms revealed a strong perturbation with a period of ∼23 days in December, and some intermittent appearances throughout the rest of the period.

The 2-D spectral decomposition revealed the presence of both eastward and westward propagating 10-, 16- and 23-day oscillations with larger eastward amplitudes in December 2006, while stronger westward components were obtained in the second part of the period, (after Day 380, 15 January 2007), as can be seen in Fig. 6a at 65° S. A strong stationary wave 1 was also present. The 30-day time segments used in the analysis are sufficient to track two cycles of a 16-day oscillation but a 23-day oscillation might not be fully resolved and therefore the results concerning this oscillation might not be conclusive.

From the westward travelling waves, the 16-day wave peaks around Days 347, 360 and 380, while the 23-day oscillation in the first half of the period (334–380) is comparable with the 16-day oscillation in amplitude, but later becomes the strongest of the three, although with an amplitude of ∼1 K.

As to be expected the stationary waves with wave 1 and wave 2 dominate the spectrum with the largest amplitudes in December 2006; another, much weaker peak is observed at the end of January, around Day 390.

Figure 6b shows the 10-, 16- and 23-day zonally symmetric oscillations (s=0). The 16- and 23-day zonally symmetric waves have almost the same amplitude (with the 23-day wave being slightly stronger), suggesting that they might be representing the same oscillation. Observations have shown that the 16-day wave can appear with a
period of 12–24 days (Speth and Madden, 1983), so what we see could be the same 16-day oscillation.

Pancheva et al. (2008) have shown that the zonally symmetric waves with periods of 10-, 16-, and 23 days are secondary waves generated by the coupling of the stationary wave 1 with traveling waves with the same periods. It is interesting that the zonally symmetric waves are the dominant oscillations in the January/February 2007 period (summer) and are almost of the same amplitude as the stationary wave 1 in December 2006 (Fig. 6a, upper right panel).

The planetary wave parameters determined in the 2-D spectral analysis are now used to model the temperature field at 30 km height over the 1 December 2006–1 March 2007 observation period and at the latitude range from 60° S to 75° S in an attempt to verify the oscillations derived.

Considering only oscillations with wave numbers from −2 to 2, but without $s=0$ (i.e. no contribution from zonally symmetric waves) and wave periods of 10-, 16- and 23 days, the modeled temperature field is calculated using Eq. (1) and the Hovmöller diagrams of the ‘filtered’ data at 65° S and 70° S are shown in Fig. 7. The large perturbation seen at the bottom of Fig. 3a–d, between Day 340–360 and 100° E–300° E, is well captured both in terms of its magnitude and spatial extent. The signature propagates eastward with a phase speed of $\sim 9^\circ$ day$^{-1}$ and has an amplitude of 6–7 K. For the rest of the period the modeled wave amplitudes are considerably smaller than indicated by the “raw” data in Fig. 3. This is particularly apparent in the signatures seen around 200° E and Day 385 and Day 410 at 65° S and 70° S. Accounting for the presence of zonally symmetric waves ($s=0$) (Fig. 6, dotted lines) significantly improves overall the modeled Hovmöller diagrams, but leads to slight overestimation of the amplitude of the oscillation around Day 334–365, December 2006, while the amplitudes for the rest of the period although increased, still remained smaller than the raw data by a factor of about 2. This discrepancy likely results from the fact that while the data shown in Fig. 3b,c are binned only in UT and represent all measurements available from Day 334 to Day 425 (1 December 2006–1 March 2007), the data which eventually
produced the least mean square fits and the plots in Fig. 7 were also further binned and weighted over every 15° longitude, before being over-sampled to create a 90×90 bin grid in UT/longitude used in the 2-D wave decomposition. The amplitudes obtained here are greater than those determined from the Lomb-Scargle analysis applied over the 40°-longitude bins.

Finally the period of the 10-, 16- and the 23-day waves can vary within a range of 7–11 days for the 10-day wave, 12-20 days for the 16-day wave, and 22–27 days for the 23-day wave (Salby, 1981, 1984). The plots of the 30-day Lomb-Scargle periodograms, samples of which were shown in Fig. 4, also indicate variability with latitude/time of the respective periods although within relatively smaller range of 9–11 days, 15–18 days and 22–27 days, respectively. Since all 30-day time segments were fitted with 10-, 16- and 23-day harmonics there is the possibility that the model wave form did not fit the exact peak of the respective perturbation, also leading to reduction of the amplitudes obtained through the wave decomposition, in comparison with the raw data, particularly in the vicinity of 200° E–280° E during the January/February period, Day 365–425.

With this in mind the planetary wave parameters obtained are considered to give a faithful representation of the main dynamical perturbations seen from 60° S to 75° S over the period of 1 December 2006 to 1 March 2007 (Day 334 to Day 425, starting 1 January 2006).

5 Discussion

The analysis of the COSMIC temperature data and the reverse modeling of the observed temperature field revealed the dominant presence of eastward propagating 16- and 23-day wave 1 and wave 2 and stationary wave 1 in December, some westward transient 16- and 23 day waves in the second half of January and February, as well as a dominant 16-day zonally symmetric wave.

Shiotani et al. (1990) examined the presence of eastward wave 2 in geopotential height data at 10 hPa (∼30 km) at 60° S, for late winter and spring (August–October)
and found an eastward wave 2 with a period of 9.2 days, which persisted over a period of almost two months, as well as a wave 1, at ~180° E with a period of ~10 days. An eastward wave 3, similar to wave 2 and with same phase speed was also observed. The authors concluded that a wave system moved eastward at a rate of 180° in 10 days and suggested that eastward traveling wave 2 with a period of ~10 days was the result of interaction between the stationary wave 1 and the eastward traveling wave 2. Shiotani et al. (1990) also showed that the times of wave-1 events were related to the phase overlap of wave 1 and wave 2 in such a way that when the wave 1 and wave 2 crests overlap the wave 1 amplitude reaches maximum. It was also suggested that the source of these eastward propagating waves is instability associated with their relation to the seasonal evolution of the mean zonal wind field. The finding of Shiotani et al. (1990) was supported by numerical simulations by Ushimaru and Tanaka (1992) who examined the interaction between wave 1, wave 2 and zonal mean flow and also found that the amplitude of wave 2 is negatively correlated with the amplitude of wave 1. In many cases the large amplitude of wave 1 occurs only for every two passages of wave 2 over wave 1. Ushimaru and Tanaka (1992) concluded that the interaction between wave 1 and wave 2 causes the periodic variation of wave amplitudes through their energy/entropy exchange and controls the degree of interaction with zonal mean flow through the horizontal phase movement.

Power spectral analysis of temperature observations by the MLS experiment on the UARS by Fishbein et al. (1993) also revealed the presence of a temperature wave 1 and wave 2 at 60° S–75° S during a period of minor stratospheric warming in August/September 1992. The power spectra were typical for the southern winter containing primarily stationary waves and eastward propagating waves consistent with earlier reports (Mechoso and Hartman, 1982; Manney et al., 1991; Shiotani et al., 1993). The MLS analysis showed that wave 1 got most of its power from a stationary wave and a 9-day traveling wave, reaching a maximum when the traveling wave became in phase with the stationary wave. However, the wave 2 had traveling component similar to that of wave 1, but did not have a stationary wave component.
Palo et al. (2005) examined the planetary wave dynamics prior to the major stratospheric warming in the winter of 2002 in the Southern Hemisphere employing SABER temperature data. They started from the premises that wave forcing plays a key role in the preconditioning of the atmosphere prior to stratospheric warming and examined the wave interaction between eastward-propagating waves with a period of 10 days, quasi-stationary waves and the zonal mean atmospheric state. The SABER stratospheric temperature data at 30 km height, revealed a 10-day eastward propagating wave 1, superimposed on a large stationary wave 1 and thus confirmed earlier report by Shibatani et al. (1993) that the coexistence of quasi-stationary wave with wave number 1 and eastward propagating waves with periods between 7 and 23 days, usually with a wave number 2, is a common feature of the winter to early spring in the Southern Hemisphere.

Pancheva et al. (2008) found that the spectrum of the zonally symmetric waves at high Northern latitudes indicate the same three prevailing periods of 22–24, 15–17 and 11–12 days as those seen in the eastward and westward traveling planetary waves suggesting a possible nonlinear interaction between the quasi-stationary planetary waves and the traveling waves leading to the generation of a traveling wave with the same period as the primary traveling wave but with a different zonal wave number. The results obtained in the present study and shown in Fig. 6 for the Southern Hemisphere appear consistent with this interpretation.

As a matter of fact the Chsyolkova et al. (2006) study showed that the planetary wave activity with periods of 2–30 days was confined to the winter season and coupled with the eastward flow, but absent in the Austral summer in the wind field at 10 hPa (~30 km), even when a major stratospheric warming in winter was observed, as in 2002.

Lawrence and Jarvis (2001, 2003) observed simultaneous planetary wave oscillations with quasi-periods of 5-, 10-, and 16 days during the winter between 1997 and 1999 and investigated the planetary wave coupling between the lower and upper Antarctic atmosphere. It was found that a quasi 16-day signature with period between
12 and 20 days dominates the winter Antarctic atmosphere throughout the 30–220 km altitude range, with a maximum in the stratosphere and near 60° S. The 10 day wave was also found to be the strongest in the winter stratosphere.

All these recent studies (Lawrence and Jarvis, 2001, 2003; Palo et al., 2005; Chshyolkova et al., 2006; Pancheva et al., 2008) consider the stratospheric dynamics during the Antarctic winter and spring seasons, including periods of major stratospheric warmings. Yet, although similar planetary wave signatures are revealed in the COSMIC data, they are for a period when no major stratospheric warming event was registered and for a season when planetary wave activity should be negligible in the Southern Hemisphere (e.g. Hio and Hirota, 2002; Chshyolkova et al., 2006). This poses the question as to the source of these perturbations.

The strong planetary wave activity, including the Austral 16-day wave 1, observed in December 2006 appears to be related to the breaking of the Antarctic polar vortex at the beginning of the month. The intensity of the Antarctic polar vortex is determined by different factors with planetary wave forcing from the troposphere being the major agent. In 2006 the Antarctic polar vortex was very well developed until the beginning of December when it started to be eroded by unusually increasing planetary wave activity. The vortex breakup occurred on 6 December 2006 (Day 341) and was late in comparison to the long-term mean of Day 329 (November 25; http://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/stratosphere/winter_bulletins/sh_06/). Lange-matz and Kunze (2008) examined changes of the polar vortex characteristics during spring, including the Antarctic 2006 spring season (September–November, 2006) and found that the Antarctic polar vortex was stronger during winter than the Arctic polar vortex and this led to a longer lifetime of the Antarctic vortex and a later transition from spring to summer circulation. Thus the month of December is considered to be still representative of spring conditions in the Southern Hemisphere. Labitzke et al. (2006) have shown that the state of the polar vortex also depends on the phase of the Quasi-Biennial Oscillation (QBO) of the zonal wind in the tropical stratosphere and the level of solar activity. In that regard, the cold temperature anomalies and the amplitude of the
westward zonal mean wind of the QBO cycle in 2006/2007 were the strongest since 2001.

It has been suggested that the inter-annual variations of the 16-day oscillation are also associated with the equatorial QBO (Espy and Witt, 1996; Espy et al., 1997; Luo et al., 2000). Espy et al. (1997) reported 16-day waves in the summer mesosphere/lower thermosphere (MLT) region (80–120 km) at 60° N only during the westward phase of the QBO in the upper stratosphere. These results are consistent with Luo et al. (2002) who showed that these waves are sensitive to the background winds and to a weak QBO modulation. The period of December 2006–February 2007 was marked by a decrease in the westward phase of the stratospheric zonal mean wind before reversing to eastward in mid-March, 2007. In January–February 2007 the equatorial QBO was in its westward shear phase with the zero zonal mean flow line at ~24 km height (Alexander et al., 2008b, Fig. 1). Thus, the observed 16-day wave in the COSMIC stratospheric temperatures at the Southern Hemisphere’s high latitudes appears similar to Espy et al. (1997)’s observations. A 16-day oscillation in the MLT region was also observed at the tropical latitudes (33° S) in the Southern Hemisphere. Malinga and Poole (2002) reported that the 16-day oscillation appeared strongest during the eastward stratospheric winter jet, but there was also a strong signature during the equinoxes and it could sometimes be found in summer. Numerical simulation of the 16-day wave under January conditions by Forbes et al. (1995) confirmed the interpretation that this wave is a result of direct upward propagation into the MLT region.

From all three wave periods considered the traveling 23-day wave appeared to be the strongest, but not much is known of its characteristics in the stratospheric temperature field. Studies, involving radar wind observations in the Northern Hemisphere’s MLT region (e.g. Luo et al., 2001) have shown that this oscillation correlates with solar rotation period and climatology, similar to the 16-day wave and is accompanied by a 25-day oscillation in the F10.7 flux with a time lag of 8–9 days (Pancheva and Mitchell, 2004; Pancheva et al., 2008). Pancheva and Mitchell (2004) identified the 23-day wave as a vertically propagating internal wave with a wavelength of 94–96 km, and confirmed
that it is accompanied by a 25-day oscillation of the F10.7 solar flux thus suggesting some dependence of the solar rotation period.

In the stratosphere the 25-day perturbations seen in geopotential height and temperature data were consistent with vertically propagating internal wave associated with radiation flux changes related to the solar activity fluctuations exerting solar forcing on the ozone layer (Ebel et al., 1981; Ebel et al., 1986). In view of these studies the 23 day signature in December 2006 could be just the 16-day oscillation.

The COSMIC analysis also revealed the presence of zonally symmetric waves ($s=0$) with periods of 10-, 16-, and 23 days, dominating the planetary wave activity in the second part of January and February, 2007. A possible source of these waves is a non-linear interaction between the stationary planetary wave 1 and traveling waves with the same periods and zonal wave number 1. Pancheva et al. (2008) have shown this to be the case for the observed planetary wave activity during the major stratospheric warming in the Arctic winter of 2003/2004.

Although the COSMIC analysis yielded very distinct 16-day wave 1 signature and similarities can be drawn between Espy et al. (1997), Shiotani et al. (1990) and the results presented herein, it is impossible to further elaborate on the origin of this wave without information on the zonal mean wind field, which will eventually require the employment of data assimilated fields, like those from UKMO and NCEP.

6 Conclusions

The present study examined the global planetary wave structure at the Southern Hemisphere high latitudes in summer, December 2006–February 2007, employing new, high resolution temperature data from the COSMIC/FORMOSAT 3 satellite mission.

Eastward traveling wave 1 and wave 2 with periods of 10-, 16-, and 23 days were identified in the lower stratosphere at 10–40 km height, which were coupled with strong quasi-stationary wave 1. The presence of zonally symmetric waves in the decomposed wave spectrum indicates that such a coupling could be taking place. This interaction
is likely the source of the zonally symmetric waves with periods of 16- and 10 days, which to a great extent dominate the dynamics of the temperature field in the middle and late summer as seen in the COSMIC observations. Thus the COSMIC findings might indicate the changing dynamics of the Southern middle atmosphere, the dramatic manifestation of which was the major stratospheric warming in 2002. The source of these summer time temperature perturbations and their inter-annual variability is currently examined and will be the subject of a future report.

The results obtained have demonstrated the unique capability of the COSMIC temperature dataset in studying large-scale planetary wave perturbations employing direct observations rather than data assimilated fields for the better understanding of the global stratospheric dynamics and its seasonal variability at high latitudes and in particular of the Antarctic region.
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Fig. 1. COSMIC temperature data at 65° S and 30 km height for: (a) December, 2006; (b) January, 2007, and (c) February, 2007, as a function of longitude. The temperature measurements are given in colour code from purple to red (solid circles) for the beginning to the end of each month.
Fig. 2. Temperature at 30 km for December 2006 (Day 334-365) from 60° S to 75° S. The perturbations appear to be propagating predominantly eastward, the phase increasing with time (phase defined as the wave maximum).
Fig. 3. Hovmöller diagrams of the residual temperatures, $dT(T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{mean}})$, in Kelvin, at 30 km height and from 60° S to 75° S.
Fig. 4. Contour plots of the Lomb-Scargle periodograms with amplitude and phase determination at 65° S latitude band and 30 km height for the period of Day 334 to Day 425 (1 December 2006–1 March 2007): (a) 40° E; (b) 120° E; (c) 200° E, and (d) 280° E.
Fig. 5. Amplitude (left) and phase (right) for the 16-day wave (solid line/solid circles) and 10-day wave (dotted line/asterisks) at 65° S and 30 km height at: (a) 40° E and (b) 200° E. Data obtained from the Lomb-Scargle periodogram analysis.
Fig. 6a. Amplitudes of the large-scale perturbations at 30 km altitude for the period from Day 334 to Day 425 (1 December 2006–1 March 2007) for the eastward (left column) and westward (right column) propagation at 65° S. The 10-day wave is in green; the 16-day wave in red; the 23-day wave in blue, and the stationary planetary wave (SPW) in black.
Fig. 6b. Amplitudes of the large-scale perturbations at 30 km altitude for the period from Day 334 to Day 425 (1 December 2006–1 March 2007) for the zonally symmetric ($s=0$) waves at 65° S. The 10-day wave is in green; the 16-day wave in red, and the 23-day wave in blue.
Fig. 7. Hovmöller diagrams of the modeled temperature field at 30 km height and 65° S (left column) and 70° S (right column) using the planetary wave parameters obtained by the 2-D least-mean-square fitting of the data without zonally symmetric waves (upper row) and with zonally symmetric waves included (lower row). Only planetary waves with wave number ±2 and periods of 10-, and 16 days are considered.