



Assessment of SBUV Profile Algorithm Using High Vertical Resolution Sensors

R. McPeters, P.K. Bhartia, S. Frith, and G. Labow NASA Goddard Space Flight Center



Frascati, Italy

April 28, 2015



SBUV data from a series of 9 instruments reprocessed with coherent calibration – version 8.6



SBUV retrieval layer structure (20 layers) (*much finer than actual resolution*)



Compare with MLS

Agreement usually within ±5% at all altitudes and seasons.

Compare with MLS SBUV Smoothing error - Quasi-Biennial Oscillation





Typical SBUV Averaging Kernels for (a) the tropics and (b) northern middle latitudes. Different colors correspond to individual layers, (layer numbers are indicated on the right).

SBUV averaging kernel applied to MLS produces similar QBO pattern









Compare with NPP Limb Profiler



Profile Smoothing Error



We recommend using large layers for SBUV in lower stratosphere and upper troposphere



SBUV vs 4 mid-latitude sonde stations: 0 – 24 km layer

(Lindenberg, Hoehnpeissenberg, Boulder, Payerne)

Combined tropospheric layers agree with MLS: 254 – 16 hPa in tropics 254 – 25 hPa at mid and high latitudes



Profile Shape Error in TOMS Total O₃



Estimated using ozonesonde climatology (mean & covariance)

Conclusions

- SBUV agrees well with high resolution instruments in middle and upper stratosphere
 - Above 20 km, there is virtually no benefit from adding wavelengths or increasing measurement precision.

Disagreement in lower stratosphere / troposphere is a result of low SBUV vertical resolution

- Averaging kernel brings agreement
- Additional wavelengths may give a bit more profile information in troposphere

Total column ozone shape error significant SZA>80°