

Interactive comment on “Global Tropopause Altitudes in Radiosondes and Reanalyses” by Tao Xian and Cameron R. Homeyer

Tao Xian and Cameron R. Homeyer

chomeyer@ou.edu

Received and published: 7 February 2019

1 Main aspects:

1) Concerning the reproducibility of results, the paper lacks information about the radiosonde data used in the study: how were IGRA stations selected in the first place? The number of selected stations (317) and the corresponding amount of observations for 1985–2015 are given later in the results section, with their approximate locations shown in the Figures. But IGRA (version 2 released in 2016) contains temperature data from 800–900 radiosonde stations within the studied period. Nothing, however, is said about the choice of stations, concerning the homogeneity of time-series in terms of temporal and vertical features (i.e., leaving aside the much more difficult

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



problem of instrument biases): temporal regularity and continuity; vertical resolution around the tropopause.

We selected the radiosonde observations based on both complete vertical profiles and the homogeneity of time-series, as we had previously outlined in Sections 2.2 and 2.4. We have added a few clarifications to these sections to emphasize some key points related to analysis of the radiosonde data.

2) A linear interpolation to a 200-m regular vertical grid was applied prior both to radiosonde and reanalysis temperature data before tropopause identification. The authors claim this was done in order to enable reliable tropopause identification. This phrase is potentially confusing to the reader. Evidently, an interpolation is needed to verify the second condition of WMO's definition of first tropopause, as well as to look for a second tropopause. But a linear interpolation simply does not change the lapse rate between the known data points. So, the estimation of the first and second tropopause levels is essentially limited by the resolution of data as the authors in fact recognize in other parts of the paper. The gain resulting from the interpolation scheme should be explained to make this point clear.

Thank you for identifying an opportunity to improve clarity. As correctly inferred, the value gained from linearly interpolating the radiosonde data to a higher-resolution regular grid spacing is to enable thorough evaluation of the second WMO criterion and the criterion for identifying multiple tropopauses. We have clarified these points in Section 2.2.

3) Radiosonde data were analyzed at the principal synoptic hours, 0000UT and 1200UT, whereas reanalysis data were analyzed only at 0000UT. This means that half of the time-zones on the global reanalysis fields of temperature (at latitudes outside of the polar regions, after averaging over one or more years) is represented by daylight times, while the other half is represented by nocturnal times. In this respect, in Figs. 3-6 it is not clear why some radiosonde stations show 0000UT average values while

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



others show 0012UT values, since reanalysis-derived values refer always to 0000UT. Also, considering the diurnal variations of the tropopause height, it should be explained how the radiosonde-reanalysis tropopause differences listed in Table 1 were exactly calculated.

Although there is a diurnal cycle of tropopause height, the long-term tropopause trends from the reanalyses at different synoptic times are consistent (not shown). The comparisons listed in Table 1 are based on 00 UTC profiles only. This point has been clarified in Section 3.1.

4) Although not obligatory, to be more informative Table 1 should depict hemispheric seasons. Or perhaps individual months, but then restricting to North Hemisphere, where the amount of radiosonde data (used as reference to errors) is much larger there than in the South Hemisphere.

Rather than restricting values in the table to North Hemisphere only, the new Figures 2 & 3 satisfy this suggestion.

5) The calculation of tropopause altitude needs a bit of clarification: is moisture included in the hypsometric equation? Tropopause altitude refers to geometric altitude or geopotential altitude?

Before tropopause identification, geopotential height was computed for each reanalysis model-level output using the moisture-included hypsometric equation. Therefore, tropopause altitude refers to the geopotential altitude. This has been clarified in Section 2.3.

6) Maybe the large discrepancies between the results obtained from CFSR and the other reanalysis models (seen in all plots) deserve a slight explanation.

We have expanded discussion of trends and their potential ties to physics/dynamics in the Conclusions and discussion section. Some additional analysis was included, but the source of the discrepancies in CFSR relative to the remaining reanalyses remains

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

unclear.

2 Secondary aspects:

P2, L19. Where it reads $\frac{\partial T}{\partial z}$ (also known as vertical temperature gradient) it correctly should read $-\frac{\partial T}{\partial z}$ (negative of the vertical temperature gradient)

Corrected.

P4, L1. $\frac{\partial T}{\partial z}$ since they are only launched from land masses. Considering the radiosondes launched on whether ships and $\frac{\partial T}{\partial z}$ ships of opportunity (even if not used in the study) it should be better to write $\frac{\partial T}{\partial z}$ since they are mostly launched from land-masses.

Good point. Corrected.

P4, L6. $\frac{\partial T}{\partial z}$ Reanalyses assimilate global high-quality observations. Do not forget to mention other observation platforms besides radiosondes. Moreover, I doubt that all observations assimilated in reanalysis models are of high-quality. A meteorological reanalysis is supposed to deal with inaccurate and incomplete observations to some degree. $\frac{\partial T}{\partial z}$ Quality-controlled is closer to reality.

Replaced with “quality-controlled”.

P4, L 30. I don’t understand the words $\frac{\partial T}{\partial z}$ a physical perspective of the UTLS. I suppose that the authors point is that their paper provides an evaluation of reanalysis-model performance regarding the UTLS temperature structure.

Since there is a close correlation between double tropopause occurrence and STE events and the tropopause is a physical attribute of the atmosphere, tropopauses can be used to diagnose UTLS dynamics. The use of the term “behavior” seems to have

been the source of confusion here, so we've replaced it with "dynamics" (P4, L31 of the revision).

P6, L12. Thus, we are confident that IGRA data are suitable for tropopause analyses following the methods employed here. How can you tell, from a demonstration with two random soundings from one site? The study uses nearly 10^5 soundings from over 300 radiosonde stations! The above assertion is not acceptable. Although Fig. 1 serves the purpose of illustration of the idea, paradoxically, expressing here some uncertainty would give more confidence to the reader.

Excellent point. We have added a few clarifying bits of information here to address this issue. We did not limit this type of evaluation to a single station and did randomly select from alternative locations and time periods where we had access to the full resolution data. The point of this comparison is to demonstrate that mandatory and significant levels are sufficient for tropopause identification. We have acknowledged that results for alternative locations and times are consistent with that shown here and that differences in tropopause identifications between full resolution and reduced resolution profiles are ≤ 100 m (P6, L16 of the revision).

P7, L14-16. It's not totally clear whether Fig. 3 (and so on) uses only four months per year or not.

It is stated throughout the paper that trend analyses are based on monthly mean fields. Since this was not a common source of confusion for the reviewers, we have decided that additional clarification is unnecessary.

P13, L16. Increases in primary tropopause altitude are associated with a warming climate. The suggested connection is supported by a very few modeling experiments until now. I'd replace "are probably" by something less assertive like "is probably" or "is believed to be".

Replaced by "is believed to be".

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Fig. 6 and Fig. 8. If possible, the color scale legend "Double tropopause frequency" should be changed to "Double tropopause trend".

[These legends have been changed to "Double Tropopause Frequency Trend".](#)

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2018-945>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

