

**Evaluation of ozone
profile and
tropospheric ozone
retrievals**

J. Bak et al.

**Evaluation of ozone profile and
tropospheric ozone retrievals from
GEMS and OMI spectra**

J. Bak¹, J. H. Kim¹, X. Liu², K. Chance², and J. Kim³

¹Pusan National University, Busan, Korea

²Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Cambridge, MA, USA

³Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea

Received: 28 August 2012 – Accepted: 5 September 2012 – Published: 18 September 2012

Correspondence to: J. H. Kim (jaekim@pusan.ac.kr), J. Bak (sunnypark@pusan.ac.kr)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Abstract

Korea is planning to launch the GEMS (Geostationary Environment Monitoring Spectrometer) instrument into a Geostationary (GEO) platform in 2018 to monitor tropospheric air pollutants on an hourly basis over East Asia. GEMS will measure backscattered UV radiances covering the 300–500 nm wavelength range with a spectral resolution of 0.6 nm. The main objective of this study is to evaluate ozone profiles and stratospheric column ozone amounts retrieved from simulated GEMS measurements. Ozone Monitoring Instrument (OMI) Level 1B radiances, which have the spectral range 270–500 nm at spectral resolution of 0.42–0.63 nm, are used to simulate the GEMS radiances. An optimal estimation-based ozone profile algorithm is used to retrieve ozone profiles from simulated GEMS radiances. Firstly, we compare the retrieval characteristics (including averaging kernels, degrees of freedom for signal, and retrieval error) derived from the 270–330 nm (OMI) and 300–330 nm (GEMS) wavelength ranges. This comparison shows that the effect of not using measurements below 300 nm on tropospheric ozone retrievals is insignificant. However, the stratospheric ozone information decreases greatly from OMI to GEMS, by a factor of ~ 2 . The number of the independent pieces of information available from GEMS measurements is estimated to 3 on average in the stratosphere, with associated retrieval errors of $\sim 1\%$ in stratospheric column ozone. The difference between OMI and GEMS retrieval characteristics is apparent for retrieving ozone layers above ~ 20 km, with a reduction in the sensitivity and an increase in the retrieval errors for GEMS. We further investigate whether GEMS can resolve the stratospheric ozone variation observed from high vertical resolution EOS Microwave Limb Sounder (MLS). The differences in stratospheric ozone profiles between GEMS and MLS are comparable to those between OMI and MLS above ~ 3 hPa (~ 40 km) except with slightly larger biases and larger standard deviations by up to 5%. At pressure altitudes above ~ 3 hPa, GEMS retrievals show strong influence of a priori and large differences with MLS, which, however, can be sufficiently improved by using better a priori information. The GEMS-MLS differences show negative biases of less

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



than 4 % for stratospheric column ozone, with standard deviations of 1–3 %, while OMI retrievals show similar agreements with MLS except for 1 % smaller biases at mid and high latitudes.

Based on the comparisons, we conclude that GEMS will measure tropospheric ozone and stratospheric ozone columns with accuracy comparable to that of OMI and ozone profiles with slightly worse performance than that of OMI below ~ 3 hPa.

1 Introduction

Atmospheric ozone is a key air pollutant that must be monitored routinely over the globe due to its huge impact in determining UV-dose, air quality, radiation budget, and climate change (e.g. Crutzen, 1996; Hauglustaine and Brasseur, 2001; Liu and Trainer, 1987). The main goal of early space-based remote sensing was to observe daily total column ozone and stratospheric ozone profiles globally (e.g. McPeters et al., 1998). Total column ozone observations were accomplished with the successive launch of the Total Ozone Monitoring Spectrometer (TOMS), onboard Nimbus-7 (November 1978–May 1993), Meteor-3 (August 1991–November 1994), ADEOS (July 1996–June 1997), and Earth Probe (July 1996–December 2005) polar-orbiting satellites (Bhartia and Welle-meyer, 2002). The vertical distribution of stratospheric ozone has been observed from the Solar Backscatter UltraViolet (SBUV) on Nimbus 7 and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) weather satellites (1984 to now) (Bhartia et al., 1996). The TOMS and SBUV record has played an essential role in warning of the problem of ozone depletion over Antarctica and in assessing the recovery of the ozone layer since the Montreal Protocol came into effect (Salby et al., 2011; Kuttippurath et al., 2012). Since the middle 1990s, several UV/visible (and near infrared) spectrometers have been launched to continue the TOMS total ozone record, including the Global Ozone Monitoring Experiment (GOME), the SCanning Imaging Absorption spectroMeter for Atmospheric CHartograpY (SCIAMACHY), the Ozone Monitoring Instrument (OMI), GOME-2, and the Ozone Mapper Profiler Suite (OMPS). These low Earth orbit (LEO)

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶


Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

instruments measure spectra over wide wavelength ranges (OMI: 270–500 nm, GOME: 240–790 nm, SCIAMACHY: 240–2380 nm, OMPS: 270–380 nm) whereas TOMS and SBUV measure backscattered radiances at 6 and 12 discrete UV wavelength bands, respectively (European Space Agency, 1995; Bovensmann et al., 1999; Levelt et al., 2006). Thus they also measure additional tropospheric gases, including NO₂, H₂CO, H₂O, H₂C₂O₂, and SO₂, which are indispensable for modeling tropospheric chemistry and forecasting air quality, and the halogen compounds BrO, OCIO, and IO, which are responsible for stratospheric and tropospheric ozone depletion (Kuhl et al., 2008; Saiz-Lopez et al., 2007). These instruments have also shown their capability to measure ozone profiles into the troposphere, resulting from advanced radiometric and wavelength calibration and forward calculations (Munro et al., 1998; van der A et al., 2002; van Oss et al., 2001; Liu et al., 2005, 2010a; Cai et al., 2012). With the success of measuring air quality trace gases from polar-orbiting satellites, there is increasing interest in placing UV/visible spectrometers in geostationary orbit for much higher temporal resolution (e.g. hourly) (Bovensmann et al., 2004; Chance, 2005, 2006; Natraj et al., 2011; Zoogman et al., 2011; Bak et al., 2012; Fishman et al., 2012). The National Institute of Environmental Research (NIER/Ministry of Environment Korea) will launch GEMS in 2018 onboard the GeoKOMPSAT (Geostationary Korea Multi-Purpose SATellite) (Kim, 2012). GEMS is a spatial scanning UV/visible spectrometer to measure tropospheric pollutants including O₃, NO₂, H₂CO, SO₂ and aerosols over the Asia-Pacific region. Creating an international constellation which includes GEMS, GMAP-Asia (Geostationary mission for Meteorology and Air Pollution, Japan) GEO-CAPE (Geostationary Coastal and Air Pollution Events, USA) and Sentinel-4 (European Space Agency) starting in the 2017–2020 time frame will provide global understanding of air quality and climate change issues.

The main objective of this study is to examine what ozone information content can be achieved with the spectral characteristics of GEMS, employing its 300–500 nm spectral range. First, we determine whether or not GEMS achieves all of the tropospheric ozone information that is obtainable from OMI, over its 270–500 nm range.

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievalsJ. Bak et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Second, we determine what stratospheric ozone information is available from the reduced GEMS spectral range. Due to wavelength-dependent absorption and Rayleigh scattering, the tropospheric information is mostly contained in the Huggins band between 300 and 340 nm, whereas Hartley band information at wavelengths shorter than ~ 290 nm mainly provides information for the altitude dependence of the ozone distribution above the stratospheric peak (Bhartia et al., 1996; Chance et al., 1997). The 300 nm lower limit of the GEMS spectral range is determined using the results of this study for tropospheric ozone, considering the difficulty and expense of building an instrument for GEO measurements with an extended range. However, accurate measurements of the stratospheric ozone profile and column ozone on an hourly basis would allow us to improve understanding of the impact of the change in the stratospheric ozone to the radiation budget and vertical structure of temperature in the troposphere (Haigh, 1994). Thus it is very valuable to examine the potential capability of retrieving stratospheric profiles and stratospheric ozone column with proposed GEMS spectral coverage.

In this paper, we perform ozone profile retrievals using an optimal estimation-based technique (Rodgers, 2000; Liu et al., 2005, 2010a) from OMI Level 1B radiances (Levelt et al., 2006) with fitting windows within the 270–330 nm range, including the OMI fitting window, 270–330 nm and the eventual GEMS fitting window, 300–330 nm. We first compare the retrieval sensitivity (averaging kernels and degrees of freedom for signal, DFS) and the retrieval quality (solution errors) from retrievals using different fitting windows. This comparison determines the 300 nm lower limit of the proposed GEMS spectral range for keeping tropospheric ozone information; it will ultimately show that how much stratospheric ozone information content is available with the GEMS reduced spectral range. Second, we validate the predicted GEMS results for stratospheric ozone profiles and columns using high vertical resolution ozone profiles made by MLS.

Our paper is organized as follows. The GEMS program is introduced in Sect. 2. The ozone profile retrieval algorithm used in this study is explained in Sect. 3. In Sect. 4, we

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

analyze the retrieval characteristics of OMI and GEMS to evaluate how different spectral coverage affects the performance. Comparison of GEMS and OMI stratospheric ozone retrievals to MLS measurements is presented in Sect. 5. Section 6 presents conclusions on the accuracy of stratospheric ozone columns and profiles and of tropospheric ozone columns and profiles when measured with the planned GEMS spectral coverage.

2 GEMS program

GEMS is planned for launch in 2018 onboard GeoKOMPSAT, together with ABI (Advanced Baseline Imager) typed sensor and GOCI-2 (Geostationary Ocean Color Imager-2). The spatial domain of GEMS covers 5000 km × 5000 km ranging from 5° S (Indonesia) to 45° N (south of the Russian border) and from 75° E to 145° E. The nominal spatial resolution is 7 km N/S × 8 km E/W at Seoul. The N/S spatial resolution ranges from 4.9 km near the Equator to 9 km at the northern boundary of the domain while E/W resolution changes to keep the aspect ratio the same as that in Seoul. The spatial resolution at Seoul is 5.5 times better than the 13 km × 24 km resolution of the state-of-the-art OMI LEO instrument at direct nadir. The planned GeoKOMPSAT longitude is 128.2° E. The temporal resolution is 1 h during day time. The spectral coverage of 300–500 nm in one channel is selected to focus on measurable tropospheric trace gases. A simple one-channel design helps to ensure the 7–10 yr lifetime requirements. Based on sensitivity studies of spectral resolution and signal to noise ratios to retrieve concentrations of NO₂, SO₂, H₂CO and O₃, the spectral resolution is selected to be 0.6 nm. SO₂ was the main driver in optimizing the resolution and signal-to-noise ratio requirements.

To ensure the accurate retrieval of trace gases, the accuracies on the wavelength and radiometric calibrations are required to be better than 0.01 nm and 4%. Utilizing the solar Fraunhofer lines, the actual accuracy may be determined to much higher accuracy (0.001 nm or better) (Caspar and Chance, 1997; Chance, 1998). The current

requirement for polarization sensitivity is $< 2\%$. The impact of stray light on the UV/VIS measurements shall be less than 2% of the true signal. The performance of the system is comparable to or expected to be better than the existing LEO instruments. GEMS will provide the first hourly measurements of trace gases from space.

Accurate cloud pressure is an input for both ozone and trace gas retrieval algorithms. OMI has used the O_2-O_2 absorption near 477 nm and rotational Raman scattering in the range 346–352 nm to determine cloud top heights (e.g. Acarreta et al., 2004; Joiner and Vasilkov, 2006; Vasilkov et al., 2008). GEMS includes both these spectral ranges. In addition, cloud information at much higher spatial resolution will be available from an ABI typed sensor within typically 7 min from GEMS data acquisition.

3 Ozone profile retrieval algorithm

We use the OMI ozone profile algorithm of Liu et al. (2010a) to retrieve ozone profiles from BUUV measurements. This algorithm retrieves partial ozone columns at 24 layers from the surface to ~ 60 km (0.22 hPa) using optimal estimation (OE) (Rodgers, 2000), optimally combining information from measurements with a priori information, depending on the sensitivity of the measurements. The principle of OE is to find the optimal solution by simultaneously and iteratively minimizing differences between measured and simulated radiances, and between the state and the a priori vector (e.g. an ozone profile), constrained by measurement and a priori error covariance matrixes, respectively (Rodgers, 2000). We perform retrievals from OMI radiances with OMI (270–330 nm) and GEMS (300–330 nm) spectral ranges respectively, after correcting some systematic biases derived from zonal mean MLS V2.2 data in the tropics, (Liu et al., 2010b). GEMS is designed to have spectral resolution of 0.6 nm, while the spectral resolution of OMI is approximately 0.63 nm below 310 nm and 0.42 from 310–365 nm (Levelt et al., 2006). The change in the sensitivity due to the different spectral resolution of OMI and GEMS should be insignificant (Natraj et al., 2011). For simplicity of comparison, the effects of spectral resolution are ignored. The performance of the GEMS system is at

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



least comparable to the existing similar LEO instruments, as pointed out in Sect. 2 and thus we use the OMI random-noise errors to construct measurement covariance error matrices for the retrieval performance of both OMI and GEMS. The inverse algorithm of Liu et al. (2010a) uses a monthly and zonal mean ozone profile climatology (McPeters et al., 2007) to define the a priori vector and the a priori error covariance matrix. We limit the study to solar zenith angles less than 85° and the average fitting residuals less than 3%, consistent with OMI experience.

4 Comparison of retrieval characteristics between OMI and GEMS

This section shows the validity of the proposed GEMS spectral coverage for providing the adequate tropospheric ozone information as well as investigating the loss of the stratospheric ozone information from excluding shorter UV wavelengths. We perform ozone retrievals from one orbit of OMI UV measurements on 30 April 2006 with four spectral ranges (windows). The upper limit of these windows is fixed to be 330 nm while the lower limit varies from 270 nm to 310 nm. We investigate the effect of different windows on ozone retrievals using their retrieval sensitivities and errors. We use the Averaging Kernel (AK), which characterizes how well the measurements probe the vertical distribution of atmospheric ozone information (Rodgers, 2000; Liu et al., 2005, 2010a) to represent the retrieval sensitivity. Each row of the AK matrix indicates the sensitivity of the retrieved ozone at each layer to the perturbation of ozone at all layers. When the diagonal value of the AK matrix for a layer is unity, the measurements have perfect information for ozone at that layer. The AKs can be used to estimate the Vertical Resolution (VR) of retrievals often specified as the Full Width at Half Maximum (FWHM). Each diagonal element of the AK gives the DFS for that layer, the number of independent pieces of information available at that layer from measurements. The DFS is a standard measure of the capability of atmospheric profile retrievals from satellite measurements (e.g. Liu et al., 2005, 2010a; Worden et al., 2007; Natraj et al., 2011; Bak et al., 2012). The error budget in OE-based retrievals is estimated in terms of

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



the random-noise error, smoothing error, solution error, and systematic error (Rodgers, 2000). For retrieval error, we use the solution error defined as the root-sum-square of the random noise and the smoothing errors; the random noise error from the measurements and the smoothing error due to the limited vertical resolution of retrievals and the use of a priori information are directly estimated from the retrievals (Liu et al., 2005, 2010a). Solution error for UV retrievals is typically dominated by the smoothing error (Liu et al., 2005, 2010a).

Figure 1 shows how the retrieval characteristics for the stratospheric and tropospheric column ozone change for the different spectral windows. The integrated DFS values/retrieval errors in the troposphere and stratosphere are plotted in 1° latitude bins, with corresponding solar zenith angles. The stratospheric DFS shows larger values at higher latitudes mainly because the optical path length through the stratospheric ozone layer becomes longer due to larger solar zenith angles. Conversely, the tropospheric DFS values tend to be smaller at larger solar zenith angles due to the decreased penetration of UV radiation into the deep troposphere (Liu et al., 2010a). In addition, the change of the tropospheric DFS with respect to latitude is much more complicated, because of the influences of clouds, aerosols, and surface reflectivity. There is no distinct loss in the tropospheric DFS of the 300–330 nm relative to that from 270–330 nm. However, the tropospheric DFS values are reduced by a factor of 2 with the change of the lower limit from 270 nm to 310 nm, for most of the tropics. The corresponding retrieval errors show the negligible increase with the change of window from OMI to GEMS, the significant increase for the 305–330 nm window. At mid/high latitudes, tropospheric ozone retrievals seem to be less affected by the spectral coverage used due to the limited light penetration at wavelengths less than ~ 300 nm into the troposphere at high solar zenith angle. This result suggests that the lower limit 300 nm of the proposed GEMS spectral coverage is acceptable for simplifying the design of the spectrometer as well as minimizing loss in tropospheric ozone information. However, the lower limit for GEMS leads to a serious loss of the stratospheric ozone information compared to OMI. The average stratospheric DFS values decrease from ~ 6 for OMI

to ~ 3 for GEMS although the change in corresponding stratospheric ozone column retrieval errors is negligible.

We further examine altitude regions where excluding measurements below 300 nm causes much loss of stratospheric information. In Fig. 2, the performances for retrieving ozone profiles from OMI (blue lines) and GEMS (red lines) are compared with respect to the mean AKs and mean relative retrieval errors in low and mid latitude regions, respectively. In the atmosphere below ~ 20 km, AKs for each instrument show similar distributions. This illustrates that GEMS contains not only most of the tropospheric ozone information compared to OMI, but also most of the capability to separate tropospheric from stratospheric ozone columns. OMI AKs have well-defined peaks from ~ 25 km to 45 km, with the highest DFS values. GEMS AK plots have very broad peaks above 30 km, with rapid reduction of their DFS values. The GEMS profile retrieval errors increase by 1–2 % for most of the stratosphere and by 3–4 % above ~ 40 km, compared to OMI. In addition, Fig. 2 shows the comparison of the retrieval errors with a priori errors (black line). The magnitude of GEMS retrieval errors is very close to a priori error above ~ 40 km, indicating the weak retrieval sensitivity and the strong influence of a priori on the retrievals. The reduction of the spectral range thus has some impact on the quality of the stratospheric ozone profile retrievals from GEMS.

5 Evaluation of ozone retrievals against MLS

In this section, we assess whether information available from GEMS measurements is enough to resolve the true variability of the stratospheric ozone profiles. The MLS V3.3 standard O_3 products for April 2006 are used as reference values. We collocate MLS and OMI pixels within $\pm 0.5^\circ$ in both latitude and longitude and 500 s in time, giving $\sim 30\,000$ collocated pixels. We apply data screening to exclude bad retrievals from both profile algorithms using criteria described in Sect. 3 for OMI and in Sect. 5.1 for MLS. V3.3 MLS O_3 profiles are recommended for use from 261–0.02 hPa (Livesey et al., 2011). They are provided at 12 pressure levels per pressure decade from 1 hPa and

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



higher pressures (~ 1.3 km resolution), 6 per decade from 0.1–1 hPa (~ 2.5 km resolution), and 3 per decade at lower pressures. For comparisons, the MLS profiles of volume mixing ratio are converted into partial ozone columns in Dobson Units (DU, 1 DU = 2.69×10^{16} cm $^{-2}$). V3.3 MLS and OMI/GEMS partial columns are interpolated into the MLS V2.2 retrieval grids. The vertical spacing of the V2.2 pressure grid is similar to OMI, ~ 2.5 km below 0.1 hPa, and hence the interpolation error on the difference between OMI and MLS retrieved profiles is expected to be smaller when comparing them on this grid.

In Figs. 3–7 we compare the OMI and GEMS profiles and column ozone to MLS from 215 hPa to 0.2 hPa, the vertical range recommended by Liu et al. (2010b) for comparing OMI and MLS v2.2 ozone profiles. The comparison approach largely follows Liu et al. (2010b).

5.1 MLS data

MLS is on board the Aura platform with OMI, so the effect of the spatiotemporal variability on comparisons with OMI (and GEMS) is relatively small (Liu et al., 2010b). MLS measures microwave thermal emission from many molecules; ozone profiles are derived from emission near 240 GHz. MLS is limb-viewing and thus has higher vertical resolution but much sparser horizontal coverage than OMI. The V3.3 MLS O $_3$ data used here is from the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center Earth Sciences (GES) Data and Information Services Center (DISC). Although extensive validation results for the V3.3 MLS ozone product have been not released, they are not expected to differ significantly from those for the V2.2 data (Livesey et al., 2011). Based on the V2.2 MLS validation papers by Froidevaux et al. (2008), Jiang et al. (2007), and Livesey et al. (2008), the precision of the ozone profiles is $\sim 5\%$ for much of the stratosphere, increasing to $\sim 10\%$ at the lowest stratospheric altitudes. The precision of the stratospheric column ozone down to 215 hPa is about 2%. To exclude bad retrievals, we reject profiles with negative ozone values less than -0.15 ppmv over 45–261 hPa pressure range and consider profile having even *status* value, *quality* higher than 0.6, *convergence* lower

than 1.18, and *precision* value higher than 0, according to the V3.3 data screening recommendations by Livesey et al. (2011).

5.2 Comparison of profiles

We analyze the statistical differences of GEMS/OMI retrievals and a priori relative to MLS profiles for April 2006. A priori profiles are based on the monthly zonal mean ozone profile climatology of McPeters et al. (2007) (hereafter the “LLM” climatology). The absolute difference is normalized to MLS measurements to define the relative differences. Figure 3 shows the mean biases versus 10° latitudinal bins at each MLS layer from 0.22–215 hPa and the corresponding 1 σ standard deviations. OMI and GEMS retrievals have similar agreement with MLS around the mean tropopause (black line), but show some large negative biases, usually within –20% to –40% below 68 hPa at low/mid latitude. The standard deviations of the biases range from 20% to 50%. These large differences in the tropopause region likely originate from insufficient vertical resolution of OMI to capture the small-scale changes observed by MLS. A priori biases have opposite signs around tropical tropopause, mostly positive, indicating that some of the differences (where ozone values are relative small) are due to systematic biases between OMI/GEMS and MLS.

The largest impact of not using measurements below 300 nm is mainly found for pressures less than ~3 hPa (~40 km) where there is no peak in the AKs for GEMS and the retrieval error is very close to a priori (Fig. 2). GEMS retrievals show the large biases of ~20% down to 3 hPa, especially at high latitude. The GEMS positive mean biases at these layers are consistent with those of the a priori, indicating the strong influence of the a priori on retrievals. Moreover, the GEMS retrievals have more vertical oscillation in the biases between 1–50 hPa especially in 30° S–30° N, due to reduced vertical sensitivity and stronger a priori influence relative to OMI retrievals. For example, the tropical region shows distinct negative bias of ~–10% at ~2 hPa and positive bias of ~10% at ~10 hPa where OMI is retrieved within $\pm 5\%$ with respect to MLS.

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Figure 4 shows globally-averaged profiles of mean biases and standard deviations for April 2006. From 60 to 100 hPa, the global mean biases of GEMS show 5 % larger negative mean biases than OMI. From 1 hPa to 0.2 hPa, the global biases range from ~ 0 % to 17 % for GEMS and from 0 % to 10 % for OMI. The global mean bias profiles remain within $\pm 5\%$ between 1 hPa and 60 hPa for both OMI and GEMS retrievals. However, the corresponding standard deviations of GEMS mean biases are found to be slightly larger than those for OMI, by up to $\sim 5\%$.

5.3 Comparison of sub-column O₃ in the stratosphere

In order to better understand the information obtained with different spectral windows, we explore the retrieval performance for sub-layer column O₃. The profiles are integrated into the three pressure layers, bounded by the 0.2, 1, 68, and 215 hPa pressure levels. Figure 5a gives scatter plots of GEMS versus MLS layer column ozone grouped into low (0°–30°), mid (30°–60°), and high (60°–90°) latitude bands for the Northern Hemisphere. Figure 5b and c give OMI and a priori with respect to MLS. The comparison statistics (mean biases, standard deviations, and correlation coefficients) are summarized in Table 1.

First, the weak sensitivity of GEMS measurements to 0.2–1 hPa layer column O₃ (upper column O₃) is clearly found, with a correlation coefficient of ~ 0 with MLS. In this layer, the scatter of GEMS versus MLS is very similar to that of a priori and MLS, especially in the low/mid latitudes. In contrast, OMI contains more information content than GEMS due to the inclusion of spectral information below 300 nm, as seen from the positive correlation of more than 0.6 with MLS above 30° N. Second, both OMI and GEMS retrievals show considerable sensitivity to middle and lower layer column O₃. They show much better agreement with MLS than with a priori. However, the GEMS retrievals have slightly weaker correlation with MLS than does OMI even below 1 hPa. The GEMS performance for the middle column O₃ increases the positive biases by $\sim 0.4\%$ at low latitude and $\sim 1.5\%$ at mid/high latitude in relation to OMI. For the lower column O₃, the largest difference between OMI and GEMS with MLS is at mid

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



latitude: mean biases increase from -9.1 DU ($-13. \%$) for OMI to -15.5 DU (-20.8%) for GEMS. In this pressure range, the ozone is mostly retrieved in the UTLS region and some of large negative biases are associated with the insufficient vertical resolution of nadir BUUV observation. The larger negative biases of GEMS indicate that there is some impact of the 270 to 300 nm spectral information on retrieval in the UTLS region despite the negligible difference in the retrieval sensitivity around the tropopause between OMI and GEMS as shown in Fig. 2.

5.4 Comparison of stratospheric column ozone

We compare stratospheric column ozone (SCO) from 0.2 to 215 hPa as function of latitude in Fig. 6. Both OMI and GEMS SCO are generally negatively biased with respect to MLS. In Table 1, we indicate the positive biases above 68 hPa and negative biases below it for sub-layer column O_3 between 215 hPa and 0.2 hPa. Therefore, the SCO negative biases might be largely contributed by the retrievals in the UTLS region. The OMI biases relative to MLS V3.3 for April 2006 investigated in this study are within 10 DU (-3%) that are larger compared to the biases relative to MSL V2.2 for 2006 within 5.5 DU (2%) (Liu et al., 2010b). The mean biases show their maximum values in mid latitudes; their standard deviations increase generally with latitude. The GEMS/OMI biases in the tropics are less than -2% . The main difference in OMI and GEMS stratospheric column ozone is found at latitude bands above 35° N/S; GEMS biases are larger than OMI biases by up to 5 DU ($\sim 1 \%$). Standard deviations for the GEMS and MLS differences are similar to those for the OMI and MLS differences, varying from 1 % to 3 %, depending on latitude.

6 Conclusions

We investigate the retrieval performance for ozone profiles from OMI level 1B data using different spectral windows (OMI: 270–330 nm, GEMS: 300–330 nm), in order to

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



identify the weakness of excluding measurements below 300 nm on retrievals. This exclusion makes little difference for tropospheric ozone retrievals. The change of the lower spectral limit from 300 nm to 310 nm leads to a significant reduction in the tropospheric DFS with a significant increase in the associated retrieval errors. Therefore, the proposed GEMS spectral coverage is nearly optimal for maximizing the tropospheric ozone information available from UV measurements. However, the exclusion of spectral information below 300 nm substantially reduces the stratospheric DFS. The loss of stratospheric ozone information occurs mostly above ~ 20 km. The stratospheric column retrieval errors do not vary much with spectral coverage, but the errors at individual layers show significant increases.

GEMS retrievals have, on average, 3 independent pieces of information in the stratosphere. In order to determine whether the 3 independent pieces are enough to report the stratospheric ozone profiles and stratospheric column ozone, we further evaluate both OMI and GEMS retrievals using high-resolution MLS V3.3 standard O₃ product for April 2006. GEMS profiles show an excellent agreement with MLS data except for the UTLS region and altitudes above ~ 3 hPa; the global mean biases are within $\pm 5\%$ with standard deviation of 5–10%. This agreement is comparable to that of OMI and MLS except with larger standard deviations by up to 5%. The weakness of GEMS profile retrievals is mainly found above ~ 3 hPa. Comparisons at layers above 3 hPa show large dependence of GEMS on a priori (LLM climatology), with the large differences between a priori and MLS. This illustrates that the GEMS ozone profile retrievals above ~ 3 hPa can be improved by using better a priori information. A priori information used in this study is basically from the LLM climatology, derived using ozone measurements from ozonesondes (1988–2002), SAGE II (1988–2001), and Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite (UARS) MLS (1991–99). Figure 7 is the same as Fig. 3, except for using a priori data from the updated version of the LLM climatology presented by McPeters and Labow (2012) (hereafter, the “ML climatology”). This climatology is formed from the Aura MLS V3.3 data (2004–2010) and ozonesonde data (1988–2010). We found that the a priori information from the ML climatology greatly improves the GEMS/OMI

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



retrievals above ~ 3 hPa. Even for below ~ 3 hPa, some improvements are found outside of the UTLS region. However, the ML climatology tends to increase the differences between retrievals and MLS generally in the UTLS compared to the LLM climatology. We will further investigate the various a priori data to select the optimal one for GEMS ozone profile retrievals in a future study.

Both GEMS and OMI retrievals below 68 hPa show large mean biases with MLS and their large standard deviations, but GEMS has larger biases. The altitude region below 68 hPa is associated with the UTLS region where atmospheric dynamical processes strongly influence ozone variability. The LLM climatology only represents ozone variances as function of month and latitude and thereby is not suitable for representing the ozone variances in the UTLS region. Therefore, some standard deviations of the differences between OMI/GEMS and MLS might be related to differences between a priori and true states. Therefore, there is substantial room for improving ozone retrievals in the ULTS region by using the dynamically-oriented a priori information. The tropopause-height dependent (TB) climatology of ozone profiles for the OMI retrieval algorithm is under development by Bak et al. (2011). We will investigate the use of TB climatology for GEMS retrievals in future work. Furthermore, we indicated that the large negative biases around the tropopause are associated with the systematic biases between OMI/GEMS and MLS V3.3 retrievals.

Based on the comparison results, we determine that future GEMS measurements are suitable for deriving ozone profiles below ~ 3 hPa with accuracy slightly worse than OMI. We compare the stratospheric column ozone (SCO) integrated over the 0.2–215 hPa as a function of latitude. GEMS SCO shows similar quality to OMI SCO. The GEMS SCO biases are less than -4% and -3% for OMI with the similar standard deviations of their biases. As the total ozone column is derived from wavelengths longer than 300 nm, the similar OMI/GEMS SCO retrieval performance indirectly demonstrates that the tropospheric ozone column retrieval performance is similar to that of OMI.

Acknowledgements. This research was supported by the Eco Innovation Program of KEITI (ARQ201204015), Korea. Research at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory was funded by NASA and the Smithsonian Institution. We acknowledge OMI and MLS science teams for providing the satellite data used in this study.

5 References

- Acarreta, J. R., de Haan, J. F., and Stammes, P.: Cloud pressure retrieval using the O₂-O₂ absorption band at 477 nm, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, 05204, doi:10.1029/2003JD003915, 2004.
- Bak, J., Liu, X., Wei, J., Pan, L., Kim, J. H., Chance, K., and Barnet, C. D.: Improvement of OMI ozone profile retrievals in the troposphere and lower stratosphere by use of a tropopause-based ozone profile climatology, 2011 AGU Fall Meeting, A13E0389B, San Francisco, 4–10 December, 2011.
- Bak, J., Kim, J. H., Spurr, R. J. D., Liu, X., and Newchurch, M. J.: Sensitivity study of ozone retrieval from UV measurements on geostationary platforms, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 118, 309–319, 2012.
- 15 Bhartia, P. K. and Wellemeyer, C. W.: TOMS-V8 total O₃ algorithm, OMI Algorithm, Theoretical Basis Document vol. II, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, 2387 pp., 2002.
- Bhartia, P. K., McPeters, R. D., Mateer, C. L., Flynn, L. E., and Wellemeyer, C.: Algorithm for the estimation of vertical ozone profiles from the backscattered ultraviolet technique, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101, 18793–18806, 1996.
- 20 Bovensmann, H., Burrows, J. P., Buchwitz, M., Frerick, J., Noël, S., Rozanov, V. V., Chance, K. V., and Goede, A. P. H.: SCIAMACHY: mission objectives and measurement modes, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 56, 127–150, 1999.
- Bovensmann, H., Eichmann, K. U., Noel, S., Rozanov, V., Vountas, M., and Burrows., J. P.: EUMETSAT contract EUM/CO/03/1166/SAT, Final Report, available at: http://www.eumetsat.int/groups/pps/documents/document/pdf_mtg_rep09.pdf, 2004.
- 25 Caspar, C. and Chance, K.: GOME wavelength calibration using solar and atmospheric spectra, paper presented at third ERS Symposium on Space at the Service of our Environment, Florence, Italy, 14–21 March, 1997.
- Cai, Z., Liu, Y., Liu, X., Chance, K., Nowlan, C. R., Lang, R., Munro, R., and Suleiman, R.: Characterization and correction of global ozone monitoring experiment 2 ultraviolet
- 30

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

measurements and application to ozone profile retrievals, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, 07305, doi:10.1029/2011JD017096, 2012.

Chance, K.: Analysis of BrO measurements from the global ozone monitoring experiment, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 25, 3335–3338, 1998.

5 Chance, K.: Ultraviolet and visible spectroscopy and spaceborne remote sensing of the Earth's atmosphere, *C. R. Phys.*, 6, 836–847, 2005.

Chance, K.: Spectroscopic measurements of tropospheric composition from satellite measurements in the ultraviolet and visible: steps toward continuous pollution monitoring from space, in: *Remote Sensing of the Atmosphere for Environmental Security*, edited by: Perrin, A., Ben Sari-Zizi, N., and Demaison, J., P.O. Box 17, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands, NATO Security through Science Series, ISBN: 1-4020-5089-5, Springer, 1–25, 2006.

10 Chance, K. V., Burrows, J. P., Perner, D., and Schneider, W.: Satellite measurements of atmospheric ozone profiles, including tropospheric ozone, from ultraviolet/visible measurements in the nadir geometry: a potential method to retrieve tropospheric ozone, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Ra.*, 57, 467–476, 1997.

Crutzen, P.J.: My life with O₃, NO_x, and other YZO_x Compounds, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.*, 35, 1758–1777, 1996.

European Space Agency: The GOME Users Manual, edited by: Bednarz, F., European Space Agency Publication SP-1182, ESA Publications Division, ESTEC, Noordwijk, The Netherlands, ISBN-92-9092-327-x, 1995.

20 Fishman, J., Iraci, L. T., Al-Saadi, J., Chance, K., Chavez, F., Chin, M., Coble, P., Davis, C., DiGiacomo, P. M., Edwards, D., Eldering, A., Goes, J., Herman, J., Hu, C., Jacob, D., Jordan, C., Kawa, S. R., Key, R., Liu, X., Lohrenz, S., Mannino, A., Natraj, V., Neil, D., Neu, J., Newchurch, M., Pickering, K., Salisbury, J., Sosik, H., Subramaniam, A., Tzortziou, M., Wang, J., and Wang, M.: The United States' Next Generation of Atmospheric Composition and Coastal Ecosystem Measurements: NASA's Geostationary Coastal and Air Pollution Events (GEO-CAPE) Mission, *Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, in press, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00201.1, 2012.

30 Froidevaux, L., Jiang, Y. B., Lambert, A., Livesey, N. J., Read, W. G., Waters, J. W., Browell, E. V., Hair, J. W., Avery, M. A., McGee, T. J., Twigg, L. W., Sumnicht, G. K., Jucks, K. W., Margitan, J. J., Sen, B., Stachnik, R. A., Toon, G. C., Bernath, P. F., Boone, C. D., Walker, K. A., Filipiak, M. J., Harwood, R. S., Fuller, R. A., Manney, G. L., Schwartz, M. J., Daffer, W. H., Drouin, B. J., Cofield, R. E., Cuddy, D. T., Jarnot, R. F., Knosp, B. W.,

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Perun, V. S., Snyder, W. V., Stek, P. C., Thurstans, R. P., and Wagner, P. A.: Validation of aura microwave limb sounder stratospheric ozone measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D15S20, doi:10.1029/2007JD008771, 2008.

Haigh, J. D.: The role of stratospheric ozone in modulating the solar radiative forcing of climate, *Nature*, 370, 544–546, doi:10.1038/370544a0, 1994.

Hauglustaine, D. A. and Brasseur, G. P.: Evolution of tropospheric ozone under anthropogenic activities and associated radiative forcing of climate, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 32337–32360, doi:10.1029/2001JD900175, 2001.

Jiang, Y. B., Froidevaux, L., Lambert, A., Livesey, N. J., Read, W. G., Waters, J. W., Bojkov, B., Leblanc, T., McDermid, I. S., Godin-Beekmann, S., Filipiak, M. J., Harwood, R. S., Fuller, R. A., Daffer, W. H., Drouin, B. J., Cofield, R. E., Cuddy, D. T., Jarnot, R. F., Knosp, B. W., Perun, V. S., Schwartz, M. J., Snyder, W. V., Stek, P. C., Thurstans, R. P., Wagner, P. A., Allaart, M., Andersen, S. B., Bodeker, G., Calpini, B., Claude, H., Coetzee, G., Davies, J., De Backer, H., Dier, H., Fujiwara, M., Johnson, B., Kelder, H., Leme, N. P., König-Langlo, G., Kyro, E., Laneve, G., Fook, L. S., Merrill, J., Morris, G., Newchurch, M., Oltmans, S., Parrondos, M. C., Posny, F., Schmidlin, F., Skrivanekova, P., Stubi, R., Tarasick, D., Thompson, A., Thouret, V., Viatte, P., Vömel, H., von Der Gathen, P., Yela, M., and Zabolck, G.: Validation of aura microwave limb sounder ozone by ozonesonde and lidar measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D24S34, doi:10.1029/2007JD008776, 2007.

Joiner, J. and Vasilkov, A. P.: First results from the OMI rotational Raman scattering cloud pressure algorithm, *IEEE T. Geosci. Remote*, 44, 1272–1282, 2006.

Kim, J.: GEMS(Geostationary Environment Monitoring Spectrometer) onboard the GeoKOMP-SAT to Monitor Air Quality in high Temporal and Spatial Resolution over Asia-Pacific Region, EGU General Assembly 2012, 22–27 April 2012, Vienna, Austria., p. 4051, 2012.

Kuhl, S., Pukite, J., Deutschmann, T., Platt, U., Wagner, T.: SCIAMACHY limb measurements of NO₂, BrO and OCI O. Retrieval of vertical profiles: algorithm, first results, sensitivity and comparison studies, *Adv. Space Res.*, 42, 1747–1764, 2008.

Kuttippurath, J., Lefèvre, F., Pommereau, J.-P., Roscoe, H. K., Goutail, F., Pazmiño, A., and Shanklin, J. D.: Antarctic ozone loss in 1989–2010: evidence for ozone recovery?, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 12, 10775–10814, doi:10.5194/acpd-12-10775-2012, 2012.

Levelt, P. F., van den Oord, G. H. J., Dobber, M. R., Malkki, A., Visser, H., de Vries, J., Stammes, P., Lundell, J. O. V., and Saari, H.: The ozone monitoring instrument, *IEEE T. Geosci. Remote*, 44, 1093–1101, 2006.

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Liu, S. C. and Trainer, M.: Responses of the tropospheric ozone and odd hydrogen radicals to column ozone change, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 6, 221–233, doi:10.1007/BF00053857, 1987.
- Liu, X., Chance, K., Sioris, C. E., Spurr, R. J. D., Kurosu, T. P., Martin, R. V., and Newchurch, M. J.: Ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals from global ozone monitoring experiment: algorithm description and validation, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, 20307, doi:10.1029/2005JD006240, 2005.
- Liu, X., Bhartia, P. K., Chance, K., Spurr, R. J. D., and Kurosu, T. P.: Ozone profile retrievals from the Ozone Monitoring Instrument, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 2521–2537, doi:10.5194/acp-10-2521-2010, 2010a.
- Liu, X., Bhartia, P. K., Chance, K., Froidevaux, L., Spurr, R. J. D., and Kurosu, T. P.: Validation of Ozone Monitoring Instrument (OMI) ozone profiles and stratospheric ozone columns with Microwave Limb Sounder (MLS) measurements, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 2539–2549, doi:10.5194/acp-10-2539-2010, 2010b.
- Livesey, N. J., Filipiak, M. J., Froidevaux, L., Read, W. G., Lambert, A., Santee, M. L., Jiang, J. H., Pumphrey, H. C., Waters, J. W., Cofield, R. E., Cuddy, D. T., Daffer, W. H., Drouin, B. J., Fuller, R. A., Jarnot, R. F., Jiang, Y. B., Knosp, B. W., Li, Q. B., Perun, V. S., Schwartz, M. J., Snyder, W. V., Stek, P. C., Thurstans, R. P., Wagner, P. A., Avery, M., Browell, E. V., Cammas, J. P., Christensen, L. E., Diskin, G. S., Gao, R. S., Jost, H. J., Loewenstein, M., Lopez, J. D., Nedelec, P., Osterman, G. B., Sachse, G. W., and Webster, C. R.: Validation of aura microwave limb sounder O₃ and CO observations in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D15S02, doi:10.1029/2007JD008805, 2008.
- Livesey, N. J., Read, W. G., Froidevaux, L., Lambert, A., Manney, G. L., Pumphrey, H. C., Santee, M. L., Schwartz, M. J., Wang, S., Cofield, R. E., Cuddy, D. T., Fuller, R. A., Jamot, R. F., Jiang, J. H., Knosp, B. W., Stek, P. C., Wagner, P. A., and Wu, D. L.: Version 3.3 Level 2 data quality and description document, JPL California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, 91109–8099, 2011.
- McPeters, R. D., Bhartia, P. K., Krueger, A. J., and Herman J. R. : Earth probe total ozone mapping spectrometer (TOMS) data products user's guide, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland 20771, 1998.
- McPeters, R. D., Labow, G. J., and Logan, J. A.: Ozone climatological profiles for satellite retrieval algorithms, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, 05308, doi:10.1029/2005JD006823, 2007.

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

- McPeters, R. D. and Labow, G. J.: Climatology 2011: an MLS and sonde derived ozone climatology for satellite retrieval algorithms, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 1117, 10303, doi:10.1029/2011JD017006, 2012.
- Munro, R., Siddans, R., Reburn, W., and Kerridge, B.: Direct measurement of tropospheric ozone distributions from space, *Nature*, 392, 168–171, 1998.
- Natraj V., Liu, X., Kulawik, S. S., Chance, K., Chatfield, R., Edwards, D. P., Eldering, A., Francis, G., Kurosu, T., Pickering, K., Spurr, R., Worden, H.: Multispectral sensitivity studies for the retrieval of tropospheric and lowermost tropospheric ozone from simulated clear sky GEO-CAPE measurements, *Atmos. Environ.*, 45, 7151–7165, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.09.014, 2011.
- Rodgers, C. D.: *Inverse Methods for Atmospheric Sounding: Theory and Practice*, World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 2000.
- Saiz-Lopez, A., Chance, K. V., Liu, X., Kurosu, T. P., and Sander, S. P.: First observations of iodine oxide from space, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, 12812, doi:10.1029/2007GL030111, 2007.
- Salby, M., Titova, E., and Deschamps, L.: Rebound of Antarctic ozone, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 5, 38, 09702, doi:10.1029/2011GL047266, 2011.
- van der A, R. J., van Oss, R. F., Pitters, A. J. M., Fortuin, J. P. F., Meijer, Y. J., and Kelder, H. M.: Ozone profile retrieval from recalibrated GOME data, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107, 4239, doi:10.1029/2001JD000696, 2002.
- van Oss, R. F., Voors, R. H. M., and Spurr, R. J. D.: Ozone profile algorithm, in: *OMI Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document, Vol. 2, OMI Ozone Products*, edited by: Bhartia, P. K., 51–73, NASA Goddard Space Flight Cent., Greenbelt, Md, 2001.
- Vasilkov, A. P., Joiner, J., Yang, K., and Bhartia P. K.: Improving total column ozone retrievals by using cloud pressures derived from Raman scattering in the UV, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31, 20109, doi:10.1029/2004GL020603, 2004.
- Vasilkov, A., Joiner, J., Spurr, R., Bhartia, P. K., Levelt, P., and Stephens, G.: Evaluation of the OMI cloud pressures derived from rotational Raman scattering by comparisons with other satellite data and radiative transfer simulations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D15S19, doi:10.1029/2007JD008689, 2008.
- Worden, J., Liu, X., Bowman, K., Chance, K., Beer, R., Eldering, A., Gunson, M., and Worden, H.: Improved tropospheric ozone profile retrievals using OMI and TES radiances, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, 01809, doi:10.1029/2006GL027806, 2007.

Zoogman, P., Jacob, D. J., Chance, K., Zhang, L., Sager, P. L., Fiore, A. M., Eldering, A., Liu, X., Natraj, V., and Kulawik, S. S.: Ozone air quality measurement requirements for a geostationary satellite mission, *Atmos. Environ.*, 45, 7143–7150, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.05.058, 2011.

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.

Table 1. Comparison statistics corresponding to Fig. 5.

Lat.	GEMS – MLS		Upper column O ₃ [0.2 hPa–1 hPa] OMI – MLS		A priori – MLS	
	Bias ± 1σ ^a	<i>R</i> ^b	Bias ± 1σ	<i>R</i>	Bias ± 1σ	<i>R</i>
0° N–30° N	0.02 ± 0.07 (1.7 ± 5.3)	0.04	0.04 ± 0.07 (3.2 ± 5.5)	0.19	0.04 ± 0.07 (3.0 ± 5.5)	0.02
30° N–60° N	0.09 ± 0.10 (7.7 ± 8.1)	–0.06	0.02 ± 0.7 (1.9 ± 6.1)	0.64	0.07 ± 0.08 (6.1 ± 7.0)	0.28
60° N–90° N	0.10 ± 0.18 (9.8 ± 15.5)	–0.21	–0.01 ± 0.8 (–0.9 ± 7.2)	0.64	0.04 ± 0.12 (3.9 ± 10.7)	0.04
Lat.	GEMS – MLS		Middle column O ₃ [1 hPa–68 hPa] OMI – MLS		A priori – MLS	
	Bias ± 1σ	<i>R</i>	Bias ± 1σ	<i>R</i>	Bias ± 1σ	<i>R</i>
0° N–30° N	2.23 ± 3.65 (1.0 ± 1.6)	0.83	1.42 ± 2.86 (0.6 ± 1.2)	0.89	2.76 ± 5.54 (1.3 ± 2.4)	0.44
30° N–60° N	4.00 ± 7.10 (1.7 ± 3.0)	0.88	0.44 ± 5.65 (0.2 ± 2.4)	0.92	1.22 ± 12.52 (0.7 ± 5.4)	0.04
60° N–90° N	4.85 ± 8.28 (2.2 ± 3.7)	0.92	1.75 ± 7.05 (0.8 ± 3.2)	0.93	2.98 ± 14.49 (1.7 ± 6.6)	0.54
Lat.	GEMS – MLS		Lower column O ₃ [68 hPa–215 hPa] OMI – MLS		A priori – MLS	
	Bias ± 1σ	<i>R</i>	Bias ± 1σ	<i>R</i>	Bias ± 1σ	<i>R</i>
0° N–30° N	–7.09 ± 3.72 (–40.7 ± 15.7)	0.91	–6.53 ± 3.62 (–37.3 ± 16.3)	0.92	0.17 ± 5.58 (4.1 ± 26.8)	0.75
30° N–60° N	–15.48 ± 11.96 (–20.8 ± 16.0)	0.94	–9.09 ± 11.18 (–13.0 ± 15.3)	0.96	–5.45 ± 25.32 (1.6 ± 30.6)	0.70
60° N–90° N	–12.19 ± 15.27 (–8.4 ± 10.7)	0.81	–7.88 ± 14.67 (–5.3 ± 10.2)	0.83	–17.03 ± 21.0 (–10.4 ± 13.9)	0.43

^a Mean biases and 1σ standard deviations are in DU (values in parenthesis are in percent).

^b Correlation coefficient.

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.




Fig. 1. Retrieval characteristics with the four spectral ranges between 270 nm and 330 nm, calculated from OMI level 1b data in orbit 9522 on 30 April 2006. In the left panels (**a,c**), the mean of Degrees of Freedom for Signal (DFS) in the troposphere and stratosphere are plotted in 1° latitude bins (80° S to 80° N) with solar zenith angles given. The right panels (**b,d**) show the corresponding retrieval errors in tropospheric and stratospheric ozone columns, normalized to the a priori.

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.




Fig. 2. Comparison of mean averaging kernels and relative retrieval errors (normalized to a priori profiles) at each layer from OMI (blue) and GEMS (red) retrievals, for low latitude (30° S– 30° N: upper panel) and mid latitude (30° S/N– 60° S/N: lower panel). The associated a priori error is also plotted with black line in right figures. In this analysis, we only consider pixels with cloud fraction of less than 0.3 and surface albedo less than 20 %. The caption includes the average conditions for low/mid latitude pixels: solar zenith angle (\overline{SZA}), viewing zenith angle (\overline{VZA}), cloud fraction ($\overline{f_c}$), and surface albedo ($\overline{\alpha_s}$). The dashed line denotes the mean tropopause height. The first column of each legend gives the center altitudes of the 24 layers. The other two columns in the left figures give DFS; in the right figures they give absolute retrieval errors in Dobson units ($1 \text{ DU} = 2.69 \times 10^{16} \text{ cm}^{-2}$).

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

◀ ▶

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.




Fig. 3. Comparison of MLS ozone profile measurements with respect to **(a)** GEMS and **(b)** OMI retrievals for 10° latitude bins (-80° S– 80° N) for April 2006. **(c)** The a priori (based on LLM climatology) used in the GEMS/OMI retrievals is also compared with MLS. Left and right panels show the Mean Biases (MB) and the 1σ Standard Deviations (SD) of the relative differences as functions of MLS vertical layers (0.22–215 hPa). The black line indicates the position of the mean tropopause during April 2006.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.




Fig. 4. Mean biases and 1σ standard deviations calculated using all the collocated profiles globally for April, 2006.

Title Page

Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.




Fig. 5. Scatter plots of (a) GEMS versus MLS, (b) OMI versus MLS, and (c) a priori versus MLS for partial column ozone at three vertical layers between 0° N and 90° N for April 2006. The layers are bounded by 0.2, 1, 68, and 215 hPa. Color coding for different latitude bins is indicated in the legend on the top left panel. Dashed lines are unit slope.

Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.




Fig. 6. Comparison of Stratospheric Column Ozone (SCO) above 215 hPa in 10° latitude bins for April 2006. The upper panel and lower panel display the mean biases (square symbol) and standard deviations (triangle symbol) for absolute differences (DU) and relative differences (%), respectively. The relative difference is defined as the absolute difference $\times 100\%$ / MLS .

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of ozone profile and tropospheric ozone retrievals

J. Bak et al.




Fig. 7. Same as Fig. 3, but for the use of ML climatology (2012) as a priori data.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion