# Differences in trends and anomalies of upper-air observations from GPS RO, radiosondes, and AMSU

Florian Ladstädter

Hallgeir Wilhelmsen Andrea K. Steiner Barbara Angerer

Wegener Center and IGAM/Institute of Physics, University of Graz, Austria florian.ladstaedter@uni-graz.at

EGU (April 26, 2017)



1/26



#### GPS RO, RS, and (A)MSU data

#### Comparing GPS RO, RS, and (A)MSU

Trends





# Datasets—(A)MSU, RS, and GPS RO

- (A)MSU: Microwave nadir sounder:
  - + Long time series, good spatial coverage
  - need sophisticated calibration, low vertical resolution
- Radiosondes: In-situ balloons:
  - + Long time series, high vertical resolution
  - sparse spatial coverage, lots of changes in instrumentation
- ► GPS Radio Occultation: Limb sounder:

+ Good global coverage, high vertical resolution, no inter-mission calibration

- Short time series (2001–ongoing), influenced by background fields in low and high altitudes



3 / 26

# GPS RO in the UTLS

- GPS RO temperatures are best within 8-25 km
- RO good for validations of lower stratosphere (LS) temperature products and for LS trend analyses (but: short time period...)
- Use WEGC RO OPSv5.6 temperatures to compare to radiosonde and models, and to AMSU TLS channel (MSU channel 4)
- For radiosondes, use Vaisala RS80/90/92/41 from the ERA-I archive
- For AMSU, use calibrated, gridded monthly data from RSS, STAR, UAH



# Methods—Climatologies, Sampling Error, MSU-equivalent temperatures

- Use radiative transfer model (RTTOV) on single profiles to retrieve MSU-equivalent brightness temperatures
- ► Do this for RO and RS, only if profile sufficiently covers range for channel 4 weighting function (≈ 8 - 30 km)
- Calculate gridded RO climatologies for multi-satellites, and correct for sampling error
- Do the same for RS, and also correct for sampling error



MSU weighting function (from RSS)



# GPS RO sampling



Good spatial coverage of RO. But needs to take care when doing trend analysis, because of CHAMP period.



6 / 26

0

# Radiosonde sampling-only Vaisala



Sparse spatial sampling; constant number of measurements during th time period, but changes in instrumentation for Vaisala sondes.



# Sampling Error



Transition from CHAMP to COSMIC period is not a big issue.





#### GPS RO, RS, and (A)MSU data

#### Comparing GPS RO, RS, and (A)MSU

Trends





# **MSU TLS Anomalies**



All datasets look very similar, but looking at the differences...



10/26 😐 🙂



11/26 😐 🕚



Jump clearly visible; also trend in anomaly difference for RS vs. RO



• •

12/26



Also in the tropics







14/26



#### GPS RO, RS, and (A)MSU data

#### Comparing GPS RO, RS, and (A)MSU

#### Trends



15/26 🖸 🙎

# Trends method

- Use multiple linear regression
- QBO indices from PCA analysis over RO temperatures
- ENSO3.4 and solar flux indices
- Time period September 2001 to October 2016
- See poster X5.335 from Hallgeir about retrieving variability indices from RO temperatures



16/26

### Trend differences for AMSU datasets to GPS RO





17 / 26

· •

# Trends in MSU TLS



- Largest trend from ECMWF
- RS close to ECMWF
- RO at around 0.25 K/decade
- Trends positive; but contributions from UT in the tropics

 Slightly negative trends, except for RS



18 / 26

# Trends in MSU TLS



 AMSU datasets and RO/RS not in good agreement globally, but differences are small  Negative trends for AMSU datasets



19/26

# Vertically resolved trends RO—Tropics



Positive trends in lowermost stratosphere; effects of initialization visible above 30 km and of moist air retrieval below 8 km



20 / 26

# Trends robust? (10-yrs trend)



Limit to COSMIC period, only 10 years: very different in the stratosphere (but: short-term trends are not robust)



# Trends robust? (10-yrs trend)





22 / 26

•

# Trends robust? (10-yrs trend)





23 / 26

•

# Vertically resolved trends RO and RS



RS shows positive trend in lower troposphere in tropics, in UTLS consistent with RO; for mid-latitudes RO and RS highly consistent



24 / 26

# Vertically resolved trends RO, RS, models



RO: warming above tropopause; RS: consistent with RO (SE corrected); ECMWF too large warming, due to model changes; ERA-I and ECMWF wave-like structures, ERA-I missing warming in upper troposphere?



# Conclusions

- RO and RS consistent in upper-troposphere/lower stratosphere (when RS sampling is properly accounted for)
- Knowledge about data characteristics essential for proper comparisons of variability and trends
- Especially the spatial sampling plays a major role
- Differences of AMSU and RO is still an unresolved issue and needs further work
- See also: poster on RO trend analysis (Andrea Steiner et. al, X5.338)
- See also: poster on variability indices from RO (Hallgeir Wilhelmsen et. al, X5.335)
- See also: poster on WEGC RO data record quality and influence of ECMWF jumps (Barbara Angerer et. al, X3.154 on Thursday evening)



26 / 26





27 / 26

•

# Influence of sampling error correction on TLS anomaly differences from RS





28 / 26

00

# Influence of sampling error correction on radiosonde trends



Large improvement due to sampling error correction



29 / 26

0

# GRUAN





30/26 🖸 🙎

## RS Sampling in Europe Vaisala RS distribution 2010





31 / 26

0