

## Reply to the final report on manuscript AMT-2020-90

Thomas Trickl, November 28, 2020

### Reply to Referee 1:

*Although some efforts have been made to address some of the reviewers' concerns about length and detail, to my opinion the revised version remained somewhat at a status quo. Two reviewers have noted that the manuscript was too detailed, to a point that the reader eventually can lose focus, not foreseeing the actual objectives of these instrument development efforts. My suggestion to move some content into Supplementary material was simply rejected by the authors. Also, several figures that I recommended to just move out or delete are still in version 4. Two examples are the unnecessary Fig 8 and 9, which are already published elsewhere.*

In principle, I dislike moving material into supplementary material since this means an additional effort for the reader. An appendix is better, but I do not see what should be moved there without interrupting the flow. Nevertheless, I agree to shortening and citing already published work where the content is not crucial for the final system design, which was done in several sections.

Indeed, Figs. 8 and 9 are part of the paper on our ozone DIAL systems that is now in press and, thus, available. I removed them, expanding the description.

In principle, one could remove the section on Raman shifting and just describe the final solution. I decided to keep it since Raman shifting has been the standard solution in many ozone DIAL systems and since I want to clarify why we finally decided to abandon it. Again, I shortened the section and referred to two ILRC contributions. Diagrams will be published by Lisa Klanner in her thesis which is under revision and, thus, cannot be cited here.

*All in all, my opinion is that not enough efforts were made to shorten and refocus the content of the manuscript to the description of a "live" instrument with clear scientific objectives. These things said, I understand that in some cases, detailed descriptions of experimental development can be a good thing, and this might be an acceptable path forward.*

In the new version I tried to eliminate (as far as possible) material not needed for understanding the final system design. However, this is a technical paper, and I think that technical details are important given the complexity of the development. It is obvious that there will be more of these powerful systems in the future. It is not only the laser system that is novel. Also the performance of the detection electronics under these conditions has meant a step into unknown territory for us.

*I therefore recommend further minor revisions and recommend the manuscript to be accepted after the following revisions are made:*

1) *Shorten section 3.4, remove Figs 8 and 9. Refer to original figures and text published elsewhere, and shorten the corresponding section so that only the type of equipment and final performance is mentioned. There is no need to repeat such technical details already published elsewhere.*

Done.

2) *Move section 4.4 (lidar signal simulation) BEFORE the instrumental development sections. This section/paragraph and the corresponding Fig 10 can be included at the end of the introduction, or as its own section, to introduce the technical requirements of the system. The authors themselves state "Before finalizing the lidar design a number of simulations of the system performance were made", clearly showing that it is more logical to discuss the simulations first*

*as a mean to determine the required specifications of the system, these latter being detailed afterwards in the manuscript.*

Done: this is a reasonable solution!

### ***Reply to Editor's Comments:***

#### *Comments to the Author:*

*I would like you to make the following changes in the manuscript, which I believe will make the manuscript more valuable to the community as a reference for your system.*

*Both referees requested certain detailed material either be deleted or moved to a supplement or Appendix. Would you please look over the comments again and consider moving or removing some of it? I would suggest moving it which isn't hard, you could just move some of the paragraphs to the supplementary material section.*

*I have separately sent some specific changes to address.*

#### *Non-public comments to the Author:*

#### *Specific changes requested*

*1. Please remove Figures 8 and 9, and just cite where they have already appeared. Please shorten section 3.4 so that only the type of equipment and final performance is mentioned. There is no need to repeat technical details published previously, just reference it.*

*2. Please move section 4.4 (lidar signal simulation) so it is before the instrumental development sections. This section/paragraph and the corresponding Fig 10 can be included at the end of the introduction, or as its own section, to introduce the technical requirements of the system early on. This change would help the reader understand design choices described later.*

*3. Please go back over the original referee's reports and reconsider if you can make more of their changes, in particular moving sections to the Supplement section. I won't require this, but I personally agree with many of their points and think that changing them would improve the manuscript by making it easier to follow.*

I carefully re-examined the manuscript and made some improvements as described above. Instead of moving material into a supplementary section I cited our parallel paper on the ozone lidar systems or earlier ILRC work. Several paragraphs, details and sentences were removed on order to focus as far as possible just on the most recent design. I also found several ways to make the text more fluent.

To my opinion a certain amount of detail must be contained in a full-size technical paper like this one. This system development has brought a lot of new experience that should be documented. The detectors (that were introduced to the lidar community by us, together with the Licel electronics in 1995) have never been fully characterized before the current two lidar papers. Some of the findings must be outlined to understand the results for this big system.

As in the previous stage I add a version of the manuscript with all changes marked as supplementary material.

1 **A powerful lidar system capable of one-hour measurements of**  
2 **water vapour in the troposphere and the lower stratosphere as**  
3 **well as the temperature in the upper stratosphere and mesosphere**

4 Lisa Klanner<sup>1</sup>, Katharina Höveler<sup>1</sup>, Dina Khordakova<sup>2</sup>, Matthias Perfahl<sup>1</sup>, Christian Rolf<sup>2</sup>,  
5 Thomas Trickl<sup>1</sup>, Hannes Vogelmann<sup>1</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, Institut für Meteorologien und Klimaforschung (IMK-IFU),  
7 Kreuzeckbahnstr. 19, D-82467 Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany

8 <sup>2</sup>Forschungszentrum Jülich, IEK-7, Wilhelm-Johnen-Straße, 52425 Jülich, Germany  
9

10 *Correspondence to:* Dr. Thomas Trickl, e mail: thomas@trickl.de, Tel. 0049-8821-50283

11 **Abstract.** A high-power Raman lidar system has been installed at the high-altitude research station  
12 Schneefemerhaus (Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany) at 2675 m a.s.l., at the side of an existing wide-range  
13 differential-absorption lidar (DIAL). An industrial XeCl laser was modified for linearly polarized single-line  
14 operation at an average power of about 180 W. This high power and a 1.5-m-diameter receiver allow us to  
15 extend the operating range for water-vapour sounding to 20 km for a measurement time of just one hour, at an  
16 uncertainty level of the mixing ratio of 1 to 2 ppm. This was achieved for a vertical resolution varied between  
17 just 0.2 and 0.6 km in the stratosphere. The lidar was successfully validated with a balloon-borne cryogenic  
18 frost-point hygrometer (CFH). In addition, temperature measurements to altitudes around 87 km were  
19 demonstrated for one hour of signal averaging. The system has been calibrated with the DIAL, the CFH and  
20 radiosondes.

21 *Key words:* Lidar, Raman lidar, water vapour, temperature

22 **1 Introduction**

23 Water vapour in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere (UTLS) is the key factor controlling how much  
24 thermal infrared radiation escapes from the atmosphere into space (e.g., Kiehl and Trenberth, 1997; Schmidt et  
25 al., 2010; Lacis et al., 2013). In a warmer climate the atmosphere takes up more water vapour from the sea  
26 surface. However, this increase could be counteracted by additional cloud formation and precipitation. Also  
27 vertical exchange processes could change in a warmer climate (Trickl et al., 2010a; 2020a). Water vapour trends  
28 in the troposphere derived from observations are discussed in literature. Paltridge et al. (2009) report negative  
29 trends for the period 1973 to 2007 at all free-tropospheric altitudes in NCEP (National Centers for  
30 Environmental Prediction, <https://www.ncep.noaa.gov/>) re-analysis data, in particular in the upper troposphere,  
31 in contrast to the expectations from climate modelling. Other studies show at least regionally positive trends  
32 (Ross and Elliott, 2001; Mieruch et al. 2008; Chen and Liu, 2016). However, they evaluate columnar quantities  
33 that are dominated by the moist boundary layer where thermal radiation is trapped by water vapour anyway. In  
34 the lower stratosphere, the Boulder series shows a trend reversal from positive to negative occurred around 2000  
35 (Hurst et al., 2011), but the pronounced positive trend during the early phase since the late 1980s is not  
36 confirmed for other locations (Solomon et al., 2010; Hegglin et al., 2014).

37 Due to the role of water vapour as the most important greenhouse gas the optimization of high-accuracy, range-  
38 resolved vertical sounding instrumentation covering the entire free troposphere and the lower stratosphere has

1 become more and more important during the past two decades (Kämpfer et al., 2013). All the most commonly  
2 used sensors used for routine measurements have limitations. Operational radiosondes have been greatly  
3 improved within the troposphere in recent years, but deficiencies exist in the very cold tropopause region and the  
4 lower stratosphere where the sensors exhibit slow response and low sensitivity (Miloshevich et al., 2006; Vömel  
5 et al., 2007a; Steinbrecht et al., 2008; Kämpfer et al., 2013). Balloon-borne cryogenic frost-point hygrometers  
6 (CFH; Vömel et al., 2007b; 2016; Kämpfer et al., 2013; Hurst et al., 2016) and Lyman alpha hygrometers (Kley  
7 and Stone, 1978; Weinstock et al. 1990; Khattatov et al., 1994; Hintsä et al., 1999; Zöger et al., 1999; Kämpfer  
8 et al., 2013), though being highly accurate, are rarely used in dense routine measurement programmes due to  
9 their elevated costs. Ground-based microwave radiometers have an excellent temporal coverage, but their  
10 application is limited to the lower and middle troposphere (Westwater, 1978; Han and Westwater, 1995; Solheim  
11 and Godwin, 1998) and altitudes above 20 km (Nedoluha et L., 1997; Deuber al., 2004; 2005; Kämpfer et al.,  
12 2013) with somewhat limited vertical resolution. The value of satellite-borne measurements (Kämpfer et al.,  
13 2013) is limited by the considerable spatial averaging that results in a loss of information due to the high  
14 variability of water vapour even in the lower stratosphere (Zahn et al. 2014), but can yield reasonable averages  
15 and global coverage (e.g., Solomon et al., 2010).

16 There is just one long quantitative ground-based sounding series of stratospheric water vapour, obtained with the  
17 Boulder balloon-borne CFH (Scherer et al., 2008; Hurst et al., 2011). These measurements have been carried out  
18 since 1980 at intervals of about one measurement per month. Because of the considerable variability of water  
19 vapour up to at least the UTLS more frequent measurements with good vertical resolution are desirable (Müller  
20 et al., 2016). This variability is caused to a major extent by transport-induced patterns. Injections of water  
21 vapour into the stratosphere occur not only in the tropics (Rosenlof, 2003), where also freeze-drying has been  
22 claimed to matter (see, e.g., the discussions by Peter et al. (2003), Luo et al. (2003), Jensen et al. (2007) and  
23 Zahn et al. (2014)), but also in the jet-stream regions (Stohl et al., 2003; and references therein). Warm conveyor  
24 belts (WCBs) can lift moist polluted air from the boundary layer to the tropopause region (Stohl and Trickl,  
25 1999). Overshooting WCBs even transfer water vapour into the lower stratosphere (LS; Stohl, 2001), although  
26 possibly diminished by dehydration due to cirrus-cloud formation (cirrus clouds being almost ubiquitous in  
27 WCB air probed by our lidar systems). Most investigations related to this topic have been limited to airborne  
28 measurements of the chemical composition of the tropopause region (e.g., Pan et al., 2007; Gettelman et al.,  
29 2011; Zahn et al., 2014). It is reasonable to assume that water vapour transported into the LS by TST is an  
30 important target for vertical sounding of H<sub>2</sub>O with enhanced temporal density. The opposite mechanism,  
31 stratosphere-to-troposphere transport (STT), is much more important than previously thought, at least in Central  
32 Europe after some increase over several decades (Trickl et al., 2010a; 2020a). Growing STT can contribute to a  
33 lowering of the tropospheric humidity.

34 Lidar-based measurements have the potential of good temporal and vertical resolution and are, therefore,  
35 attractive for resolving transport-related concentration changes. However, the use of lidar systems for water  
36 vapour implies a major challenge due the strong decrease of both the backscatter signal and the water-vapour  
37 concentration with altitude. Despite the problems related to the extreme signal dynamics the NDACC (Network  
38 for the Detection of Atmospheric Composition Change) lidar working group has strongly advocated to develop  
39 powerful ground-based water-vapour lidar systems with UTLS capability, with focus on the Raman lidar  
40 technique. Several Raman lidar systems have already reached a reasonable UTLS performance (Congeduti et al.,  
41 1999; Whiteman et al., 2010; Dionisi et al., 2012; Leblanc et al., 2012; Dionisi et al., 2015, Vérémes et al.,

1 2019). Whiteman et al. (2010), Leblanc et al. (2012) and Vérémes et al. (2019) demonstrated vertical ranges  
2 extending to more than 20 km a.s.l. for averaging over many hours.

3 The most important detection barrier in the lower stratosphere is the very small mixing ratio of water vapour of 4  
4 to 5 ppm (e.g., Hurst et al., 2011). In principle, this would require a highly sensitive approach. Measurements of  
5 molecules in a range far below one part per trillion with respect to normal conditions can be achieved in the  
6 laboratory even under restrictive conditions (e.g., Trickl and Wanner, 1983; Trickl et al., 2010b). However, a  
7 fluorescence lidar approach cannot be used for atmospheric H<sub>2</sub>O because it electronically absorbs in the vacuum  
8 ultraviolet spectral region and undergoes photo-dissociation as concluded from the diffuse bands (e.g., Yoshino  
9 et al., 1997). As a consequence, lidar measurements of H<sub>2</sub>O in the lower atmosphere are restricted to the  
10 differential absorption lidar (DIAL) and Raman scattering methods. The detection sensitivity and the range of  
11 the DIAL method is limited by the signal noise of the absorption measurement. Raman scattering is the least  
12 sensitive approach. However, night-time Raman scattering is a so-called background-free method. Thus, the  
13 sensitivity for water-vapour can, in principle, be driven to any level by enhancement of the laser power and the  
14 diameter of the receiver, as long as allowed by financial or technical restrictions. Very importantly, a Raman  
15 lidar can be operated at wavelengths for which absorption in the atmosphere is negligible.

16 For a Raman lidar calibration with an external source is an important issue: The optical transmission data of a  
17 Raman lidar and the Raman scattering cross sections cannot be determined with sufficient accuracy. In addition,  
18 a degradation of the components must be taken into consideration. Thus, a trace-gas Raman lidar routinely  
19 operated over an extended period of time must be repeatedly calibrated with external references and the stability  
20 of the calibration must be verified. Mostly, radiosonde measurements are used as reference (e.g., Leblanc and  
21 McDermid, 2008; Dionisi et al., 2010), but also calibration with H<sub>2</sub>O column measurements are reported (Barnes  
22 et al., 2008; Vérémes et al., 2019). However, the Raman lidar systems are not necessarily located at routine  
23 balloon sounding stations. Even for on-site sonde launches the sondes usually rapidly drift away from the lidar  
24 which frequently results in discrepancies due to the high spatial variability of water vapour (Vogelmann et al.,  
25 2011; 2015). Infrequent comparisons with sondes necessitate additional performance control such as built-in  
26 lamps (Dionisi et al., Leblanc and McDermid, 2008; 2011; 2012; Whiteman et al., 2011) or monitoring the  
27 radiation backscattered from air or nitrogen.

28 At Garmisch-Partenkirchen, we first concentrated on the differential-absorption-lidar (DIAL) technique for  
29 measuring free-tropospheric water vapour (Vogelmann and Trickl, 2008; Trickl et al., 2013-2016; 2020a). This  
30 system has the great advantage of a good daytime performance. In recent years a high-power Raman lidar has  
31 been built that extends the range of the DIAL into the lower stratosphere during night-time with a data-  
32 acquisition time of just 1 h. Both systems are operated side by side at the Schneefernerhaus mountain station  
33 (UFS, Umweltforschungsstation Schneefernerhaus, 47° 25' 00'' N, 10° 58' 46'' E) at an altitude of 2675 m,  
34 which offers the possibility of direct and accurate calibration of the Raman lidar. The DIAL has been thoroughly  
35 validated and is free of bias at an uncertainty level of 1 % of average concentrations or less (Vogelmann, et al.,  
36 2011; Trickl et al., 2016). Both system probe the same atmospheric volume and can be very reliably compared  
37 up to about 8 km where the DIAL data start to become noisy.

38 The large system allows us to make temperature measurements up to the mesosphere based on an established  
39 approach for inverting the Rayleigh backscatter signal for 355 nm (Hauchecorne and Chanin, 1980). In this way,  
40 not only the primary green-house gas, but also the most important climate parameter is provided.

41 In this paper we report the development and the current state of the Raman lidar, before the beginning of routine  
42 measurements. We describe the steps to achieve up to 180 W of linearly polarized and single-line output from a

1 modified industrial xenon-chloride laser (308 nm) (Sect. 23), and the development of the far-field receiver  
2 receiver featuring a primary mirror with a diameter of 1.5 m (Sect. 34). Parallel to the ozone DIAL at IMK-IFU  
3 (Trickl et al., 2020b) a significant step forward in signal processing was made. The highly satisfactory lidar  
4 performance is demonstrated by examples of 1-h atmospheric measurements, also including a first demonstration  
5 of a temperature measurement up to 87 km (Sects. 4-6 and 67). Finally, conclusions and suggestions for  
6 upgrading the lidar are made (Sect. 78).

## 7 **2. Simulation of the system performance**

8 Before finalizing the first version of the lidar design a number of simulations of the system performance were  
9 made. Figure 1 shows the results. We assumed 200 W of laser power at 308 nm (as suggested by the laser  
10 specifications available at that time), a receiver diameter of 1.5 m, a range bin of 200 m, 10 % detection  
11 efficiency and a measurement time of 1 h. The atmospheric data were taken from the mid-latitude summer model  
12 of the LOWTRAN simulation program (Kneizys et al., 1988).

13 The simulation revealed that the Raman backscatter signal for stratospheric water vapour is roughly eight orders  
14 of magnitude smaller than the Rayleigh backscatter signal for 308 nm. This imposes extreme boundary  
15 conditions for the optical system (Sec. 3.3). The effect of the signal loss at 308 nm due to the absorption by  
16 ozone is not very severe up to 20 km. In comparison with the most commonly used primary wavelength of 355  
17 nm this loss is roughly compensated by the fourth-order frequency dependence of the Raman backscatter  
18 coefficient.

19 The atmospheric measurements demonstrate that the simulation is realistic (Sect. 8).

## 20 **2.3 Laser System**

### 21 **2.3.1 General Description**

22 Figure 2 gives an overview of the transmitter section of the new UFS Raman lidar system in the rear part of the  
23 lidar laboratory (see also Table 1). The transmitter consists of a high-power laser, a hydrogen Raman shifter and  
24 a motorized (Astro System Austria, ASA) beam steering mirror (not shown). The 0.5-m-diameter beam-steering  
25 mirror sending the radiation into the atmosphere is located in a vertical emergency exit shaft outside the  
26 laboratory. All dielectrically coated optics, in particular the large-diameter mirrors, were supplied by Laseroptik  
27 G.m.b.H. unless explicitly stated differently.

28 The efficiency of Raman scattering scales as  $\lambda^{-4}$  and, thus, is the highest in the ultraviolet (UV) spectral region.  
29 Here, the by far most powerful radiation sources are excimer lasers. The radiation source used in our system is a  
30 big XeCl laser system with a power of 350 W (pulse energy 1 J, repetition rate 350 Hz, pulse length 80 ns) in  
31 energy-stabilized mode of operation that is normally used for industrial applications (Coherent Göttingen  
32 (formerly: Lambda Physik), model Lambda SX 350C, size (l×w×h) = 2.500 m × 0.850 m × 1.925 m). The very  
33 high power of this laser system is much more important than the single-pass absorption loss in stratospheric  
34 ozone at the operating wavelength of 308 nm (Sect. 4.42). An ozone correction can be provided by a DIAL  
35 approach with an “off” emission at 353 nm (stimulated Raman shifting the laser radiation in H<sub>2</sub>) or at 355 nm  
36 (frequency-tripled Nd:YAG laser).

37 The laser was transported to UFS by a cogwheel train of Zugspitzbahn A.G. There, it ~~could was be~~ lifted to the  
38 7<sup>th</sup> floor of the building with the large elevator of UFS and then to the 8<sup>th</sup> floor with two pulleys, after removing  
39 the stairs.

40 As a consequence of its primarily industrial application, the laser system is operated under computer control  
41 providing energy stabilization and numerous safety features. This is highly helpful for the planned automatic

1 operation of the lidar system. However, a high beam divergence of nominally 1 mrad and 4 mrad in two  
2 perpendicular transverse orientations, random polarization and a three-line spectrum as shown in Fig. 32 are  
3 insufficient for the requirements of the lidar. Therefore, an approach had to be found for overcoming these  
4 disadvantages, considering the dangerous power level of this laser.

5 For our lidar concept a linearly polarized narrowband radiation is needed. Injection seeding with a XeCl master  
6 oscillator with these properties was the premier choice because this could have resulted in maintaining high  
7 average power. However, this idea was given up because of the manufacturer pointed out that there was no easy  
8 way of synchronization because of the specified 25- $\mu$ s pulse-to-pulse jitter of the big laser, and because of the  
9 considerable additional complexity and costs.

10 Instead, an intra-cavity solution was chosen. The resonator was stretched as shown in Fig. 34. The intra-cavity  
11 laser beam is first converted to an approximate squared cross section with another 2.5:1 cylindrical telescope in  
12 order to reduce the intensity in the new rear section. It is then fed through a Brewster-angle thin-film polarizer  
13 (transmittance 96 %) and a custom-made 70-mm-diameter Fabry-Perot etalon with 0.10 mm plate distance (SLS  
14 Optics Ltd.;  $R = 54\%$ ,  $T_{\min} \approx 7\%$ ,  $T_{\max} = 95.4\%$ ) to reach the 75-mm-diameter end mirror. The large diameter  
15 of the etalon is expected to provide strong reduction of ablation of material by scattered UV radiation and the  
16 resulting ageing of the etalon plates. The chosen plate distance sets the free spectral range exactly to twice the  
17 wavelength difference between the two groups of emission lines in Fig. 23. When setting the transmission  
18 maximum to the short-wavelength component (307.955 nm; all wavelengths in this paper are specified for  
19 vacuum) the gain at the wavelength pair around 308.2 nm is suppressed, despite the residual transmittance of  
20 about 7 %. Just the direct first-pass forward emission estimated by the manufacturer to about 7 mJ cannot be  
21 avoided.

22 The beam divergence with our long cavity was smaller than that determined by the manufacturer. We measured  
23 a burning spot of  $2.0 \times 1.2 \text{ mm}^2$  generated on a metal plate by focussing with a  $f = 2.0\text{-m}$  lens in front of the  
24 Raman shifter, corresponding to a divergence of  $1.0 \times 0.6 \text{ mrad}^2$ . ~~(most likely smaller than the full width of the~~  
25 ~~intensity distribution).~~ After the 5:1 beam expansion the beam divergence is 0.2 mrad or less, an important  
26 prerequisite for ensuring a moderate size of the focal areas in the very large receiver and its polychromator. ~~As~~  
27 ~~explained further below the final focal length is 1.75 m, resulting in a slightly better collimated beam.~~

## 28 **23.2 Laser Testing**

### 29 **General Remarks**

30 Despite the pronounced intra-cavity losses after multiple passes through the laser cavity the maximum pulse  
31 energy achieved at repetition rates below 100 Hz is about 0.75 J. We explain this by fresh gain generated all  
32 along the 80 ns of laser emission and by 92 % of the amplified energy being emitted after each round trip. Thus,  
33 the losses do not matter similarly as in a cavity with higher reflectance of the output mirror.

### 34 **Emission Spectrum**

35 For the laser operation we just slightly tilted the etalon vertically in order to avoid specular reflection. The  
36 wavelength is changed by horizontally tuning the etalon that is mounted on a motorized rotation stage (OWIS).

37 For monitoring the emission spectrum an inexpensive computer-controlled miniature grating spectrograph is  
38 used (Ocean Optics, HR 4000;  $\Delta\lambda = 0.07 \text{ nm}$ ). The performance of this spectrograph is highly satisfactory and  
39 stable as determined from a comparison of the 308.955-nm emission that is reproducibly obtained for maximum  
40 laser emission. Both the emissions around 308 nm and 353 nm are within the limited measurement range.

1 In Fig. 4-5 we show a typical spectrum of the laser radiation obtained with the HR 4000 spectrograph. The etalon  
2 was rotated to concentrate the pulse energy ~~is concentrated~~ almost exclusively in the low-wavelength spectral  
3 component. The etalon angle was not fully optimized to show the small impurity peak at 308.4 nm that is located  
4 at twice the distance between the strong line groups in Fig. 2-3 and is, thus, most likely corresponds to another,  
5 weaker line of XeCl. Under optimum conditions the impurity stays in the range between 1.0 and 1.5 %. Further  
6 suppression would require an etalon with a slightly larger free spectral range.

7 The contribution of the longer-wavelength doublet (308.2 nm) for an optimum etalon angle is less than 0.5 %.  
8 This value is in reasonable agreement with the 7 mJ of initial forward emission (Sect. 23.1), considering that just  
9 one half of this weak broadband emission goes into the correct wavelength component (Fig. 23).

10 Given the specified 0.07-nm resolution of the HR 4000 spectrograph the laser bandwidth is approximately 0.03  
11 nm. in good agreement with the 0.0357 nm in the spectrum measured by Coherent in a high grating order (Fig.  
12 23).

13 It is interesting to note that with an initially pronounced vertical tilt of the etalon we had achieved continuous  
14 single-line tuning of the laser, however with changing output pulse energy as a function of the horizontal tilt  
15 angle.

#### 16 **Polarizer**

17 Linear polarization is mandatory for single-line stimulated Raman shifting (Kempfer et al., 1994) and for the  
18 wavelength-separation strategy in our receivers (Sec. 3.2). Therefore, a thin-film polarizer was mounted in the  
19 extended laser cavity, in the expanded section of the beam where the intensity is reduced. Despite the widened,  
20 quadratic beam profile the substrate and the holder get rather warm after long operation of the laser at full power.  
21 This is caused by the absorption losses due to a maximum transmittance of just 94 %. Nevertheless, the degree  
22 of polarization of the laser output is as high as 99.4 %, in agreement with the expected 3.5 mJ (Sect. 23.1) of  
23 forward emitted radiation with wrong polarization after the first passage through the laser medium.

24 Laseroptik meanwhile promised the capability of producing thin-film polarizers with more than 99 %  
25 transmittance (as demonstrated for the polychromator). This would significantly reduce the thermal load and the  
26 intracavity radiation losses.

#### 27 **Alignment drifts**

28 A careful warm-up procedure was seen as mandatory because of the long resonator. Any small thermally  
29 induced misalignment leads to a pronounced rotation of the laser beam inside and outside the cavity which can  
30 lead to damage of components. Horizontal misalignment of the cavity starts to progress with growing repetition  
31 rate that requires to rotate both the etalon and the end mirror horizontally. If the optical surfaces of the etalon  
32 stay perfectly parallel the latter is difficult to understand and is tentatively ascribed to a combination of a slight  
33 mutual distortion of the etalon plates and the cylindrical telescope. Vertical corrections are mostly negligible.

34 Warm-up has been performed in 50-Hz steps. For each step, etalon and end mirror are realigned for maximum  
35 power after about five minutes of thermal equilibration. Very importantly, maximum power corresponds to  
36 optimum beam pointing and optimum spectral purity, which is highly welcome in view of automatic control of  
37 the modified laser. At the end a highly stable operation of the laser is achieved over many hours rarely requiring  
38 intervention.

39 For safety, six sand-blasted aluminium apertures were added as shown in Figs. 1-2 and 34, the first five of them  
40 with a cross section of  $43 \times 43$  mm<sup>2</sup>, the last one in the expanded beam, (width = 200) × (height = 120)-mm<sup>2</sup>. As



1 mentioned, inside the laser cavity even weak reflections can lead to damage at maximum repetition rate. Outside  
2 the laser head the apertures also help to control the beam pointing. At full power metal plates must be used to  
3 localize the beam instead of paper sheets.

#### 4 **Laser Pulse Energy**

5 In Fig. 5-6 the dependences of the pulse energy on repetition rate and load voltage, measured with the modified  
6 system, is shown. For each measurement both end mirror and etalon were optimized.

7 The maximum pulse energy for a load voltage of 1.95 kV was 797 mJ without etalon and 765 mJ with the etalon  
8 installed. This is much less than the 1.24 J at 1.95 kV and 300 Hz repetition rate achieved with the laser at the  
9 factory. Of course, there are considerable intra-cavity losses. These losses are mostly caused by the polarizer and  
10 the etalon, but perhaps also by deficiencies in imaging in the cylindrical telescope or by achieving less round  
11 trips within the elevated-gain period due to the longer cavity. However, the overall losses are considerably  
12 stronger than the optical losses, as we estimate from the moderate reduction in pulse energy when inserting the  
13 etalon. We conclude that the most important drop in power is caused by the reduced number of round trips in the  
14 extended cavity.

15 With growing repetition rate the energy first increases, but above 150 Hz it starts to drop considerably. This  
16 behaviour is not similarly pronounced without the etalon as shown for comparison. It is, thus, ascribed to thermal  
17 stress in the etalon. The optimum pulse energy at 350 Hz achieved for clean optics was 515 mJ, resulting in a  
18 power of 180 W, one order of magnitude higher than in 355-nm Nd:YAG-based water-vapour Raman lidar  
19 systems in the past. The power slowly decreases further during a long night-time measurement period, most  
20 likely due to growing thermal issues. Under typical conditions we have operated the lidar in the range of 400 to  
21 450 mJ, with aged gas even less. The pulse repetition rate was set to 300 Hz because of a time limitation in the  
22 data-acquisition system for operation with 16000 bins.

23 The pulse energy at low repetition rates rises from 499 mJ at 1.55 kV to 777 mJ at 2.0 kV (lower panel of Fig  
24 56).

#### 25 **23.3 Raman Shifter and Beam Expander**

26 As routinely done in stratospheric ozone DIAL systems we first applied stimulated Raman shifting in high-  
27 pressure hydrogen for generating an “off” wavelength of 353.144 nm (Klanner et al., 2012; Höveler et al., 2017)  
28 (See. 3.2) as a base for ozone corrections and a high-altitude temperature Rayleigh detection channel. We  
29 assumed that a conversion efficiency of a few per cent are sufficient for these purposes. In this way we could  
30 fulfil two goals, to minimize the loss of pulse energy in the fundamental wavelength for maximizing the  
31 detection sensitivity for water vapour, and to reduce the uncertainty in the pulse-energy level at 308 nm needed  
32 for calibration of the H<sub>2</sub>O Raman detection channel.

33 ~~One traditional problem with stimulated Raman shifting are losses due to the generation of high Stokes orders  
34 and due to optical breakdown, that can, according to our experience, efficiently be accomplished even with a  
35 long focal length of 1 m (Kempfer et al., 1994; Trickl et al., 2020b). Thus, we followed the design of the  
36 stratospheric ozone DIAL at Table Mountain (McDermid et al., 1991, and personal communication) and first  
37 selected an  $f=2.0$  m focussing lens. The length of the high pressure cell is 3.6 m.~~

38 ~~Indeed, the measurements at low repetition rates confirmed that just the first Stokes order was generated and the  
39 transmitted pump and Stokes energies summed up to 100%. For 780 mJ emitted by the laser (without etalon) at~~

1 ~~a repetition rate of  $10\text{ s}^{-1}$  19 % conversion into the first Stokes order was measured. However, the~~ 353-nm  
2 energy conversion efficiency was 19 % ( $f = 2.0\text{ m}$ ) and more ( $f = 1.75\text{ m}$ ) at a repetition rate of 10 Hz, at high  
3 ~~repetition rates~~ but did not exceed 3 % at a repetition rate of 350 Hz.. This required very critical astigmatic  
4 focussing influenced by a cylindrical beam expander in front of the laser (no longer used, therefore missing in  
5 Fig. 42). With a well-collimated laser beam no conversion was achieved at all at repetition rates beyond 100 Hz,  
6 ~~even when we lowered the threshold energy with the finally used  $f = 1.75\text{ m}$  lens (Fig. 1).~~

7 A new approach was introduced that is described below. The Raman shifter was then used just as a vacuum cell  
8 for the beam expander to avoid optical breakdown in air.

### 9 **3.4 New Approach with a Frequency-Tripled Nd:YAG Laser**

10 Instead of spending more time for Raman-shifting experiments, e.g., with longer focal lengths or a pair of  
11 crossed cylindrical lenses (Perrone and Picinno, 1997), we integrated in 2018 the injection-seeded Nd:YAG laser  
12 previously used in the water-vapour DIAL (Continuum, Powerlite 8020 Precision) into the system. This laser,  
13 modified for optimum beam quality for pumping a single-mode optical parametric oscillator, yields a reduced  
14 third-harmonic (355 nm) pulse energy of 160 mJ at a repetition rate of 20 Hz. This is sufficient for reasonable  
15 measurements (Sect. 6.2).

16 The use of this laser for providing the “off” wavelength has two advantages. Firstly, the full, stable power of the  
17 XeCl laser is available for the sounding of water-vapour, important for the H<sub>2</sub>O calibration. Secondly, the  
18 Nd:YAG laser is run delayed with respect to the XeCl laser. In this way interference of the 355-nm Rayleigh  
19 return in the H<sub>2</sub>O Raman channel is completely excluded.

20 The Powerlite laser is meanwhile operated under control of an external computer, and synchronized with the  
21 XeCl laser.

### 22 **2.5 Conclusions for the laser system**

23 Based on previously available laser specifications we had planned an average laser power of about 200 W (Sect.  
24 2), ensuring an order-of-magnitude increase with respect to frequency-tripled Nd:YAG lasers most commonly  
25 used in this field. Thus, the maximum single-line output of 180 W achieved in this project is acceptable. Also the  
26 high degree of polarization fulfils the requirements for the new lidar.

27 Nevertheless, the significant loss of power with respect to the free-running laser is a major disappointment.  
28 Solutions could come from injection seeding or shortening the laser cavity. We currently exclude injection  
29 seeding since this would add significant costs and complexity. Shortening means a removal of the cylindrical  
30 beam expander. This would enhance the intensity in both the etalon and the thin-film polarizer. However, as we  
31 learnt from Laseroptik, both optics can be meanwhile manufactured almost without optical loss. In this way, the  
32 thermal problems are minimized.

33 An important result is that for maximized output the beam pointing is extremely reproducible. Because of this  
34 property we have meanwhile started to develop automatic power optimization by horizontal rotation of both the  
35 etalon and the end mirror.

### 36 **3.4 Receiver design**

#### 37 **3.4.1 General Design Considerations**

1 As also pointed out by Trickl et al. (2020b) the receiver design of the IFU lidar systems follows a number of  
2 design principles:

- 3 (1) We use Newtonian telescopes for a less critical alignment.
- 4 (2) We separate the return in near-field and far-field channels because of the giant dynamical range of the  
5 backscatter signal (see Sec. 4.32).
- 6 (3) No optical elements or detectors are placed close to the focal points in order to avoid a modulation of the  
7 backscatter signal by the near-field scan of the focal point across inhomogeneously transmitting or detecting  
8 surfaces. This prohibits the use of optical fibres because of their unknown input surface quality (apart from  
9 coupling losses which mean throwing away a lot of the costly laser photons).
- 10 (4) Particularly inhomogeneous surfaces (such as those of the photomultiplier tubes (PMTs) used in our  
11 system) are placed in or very close to image planes (exit pupils) where the image spots and the light bundle  
12 as a whole stay stable in space. This also ensures that drifts in laser pointing have no influence on the  
13 position of the spot of the returning radiation on the detectors even for very long beam paths, resulting in a  
14 long-term stability as long as the no part of the light bundle is cut off by a holder or an aperture.
- 15 (5) The expensive interference filters are also placed in exit pupils to keep their diameter as small as possible.  
16 The interference filters are placed in a collimated part of the radiation bundle to minimize angular spread. In  
17 this way the near-field overlap is maximized.
- 18 (6) All lenses with focal lengths below 0.2 m are anti-reflection coated in order to avoid angle-dependent  
19 transmittances.

## 20 34.2 Telescopes

21 Two separate Newtonian telescopes are used with focal length  $f = 2$  m and diameter  $d = 0.38$  m (Intercon  
22 Spacetec, taken from our former eye-safe aerosol lidar (Carnuth and Trickl, 1994; Trickl, 2010), and with  $f = 5.0$   
23 m,  $d = 1.50$  m (Astrooptik Philipp Keller), respectively. The large focal length of the far-field telescope  
24 necessitated to install the receiver system in a separate tower on the terrace above the lidar (Fig. 67). The tower  
25 (Sirch and Hägele&Böhm) is covered by a 4.2-m-diameter astronomical dome with a 1.50-m slit (Baader  
26 Planetarium) which had proved to be an adequate solution under the arctic conditions on the high mountain. The  
27 entire structure is designed for withstanding wind speeds up to more than  $300 \text{ km h}^{-1}$ . The costs for the dome  
28 limit its size, and the slit width determines the width of the large telescope. Tower and dome were transported to  
29 the site by a big Kamov double-rotor helicopter (HELISWISS), the large mirror with a small helicopter from  
30 Heli Tirol. The mirror was lowered to the terrace, from where it was moved into the tower under assistance of  
31 two provisional cranes.

32 Although the frame of the large telescope is prepared for heating this turned out to be unnecessary because of a  
33 powerful heating system inside the tower. The tall frame carries both the secondary mirrors and the two  
34 polychromators without contact to the measurement compartment that is stepped on by the operators. The tower  
35 can be entered by two doors at the terrace level and upstairs. The upper door allows us to access the  
36 measurement compartment directly or to use the emergency exit also after a major snowfall.

## 37 34.3 Polychromators and Wavelength Separation

38 The final design of the polychromators is shown in Fig. 78. The optical table (OPTA G.m.b.H.) is in reality  
39 oriented vertically with the left-hand side representing the top. The entrance of the radiation arriving from the  
40 telescope is horizontal (see Fig. 89), i.e., rotated with respect to the drawing plane, as one can see from the

1 change in polarization vector (dot for out-of-plane to double arrow for in-plane orientation). The radiation  
2 bundle is spatially filtered with a rectangular aperture with four adjustable blades (custom-made by OWIS)  
3 placed in the focal plane. Due to space limitations the aperture is oriented perpendicularly to the beam axis. A  
4 slight tilt angle would be superior because of the longitudinal walk of the “focus” (Trickl et al., 2020b). This will  
5 be made possible in the future by mounting additional inclined apertures in front of the PMTs. In this way, also  
6 the different diameters of the focal points, caused by the different beam divergences of the two lasers, can be  
7 accounted for.

8 Several relay-imaging modules formed by confocally arranged  $f = 150$  mm lenses ( $f_1$ ) are seen (Sec. 3.1; see also  
9 (Vogelmann and Trickl, 2008)). In the sections with parallel beams (with one exception) beam splitters and  
10 interference filters are placed in or close to image planes of the primary mirror. Another confocal pair of  $f_1$   
11 lenses (not shown) is used to transfer the radiation from the focus of the large telescope to the first focal point in  
12 the polychromator. The short-f lenses ( $f_2$ ) image the principal mirror on to the photocathode of the  
13 photomultiplier tubes (PMTs). The exact positions of the intermediate and final exit pupils can be nicely  
14 identified with visible sky light after removing the interference filters.

15 The specifications of the polychromators are listed in Table 2, including the lidar vacuum wavelengths and the  
16 Raman shifts used. The Raman shifts in Table 2 sometimes differ from those in the lidar literature. The radiation  
17 for the different wavelengths are separated by dichroic beam splitters and narrowband interference filters. This is  
18 a highly demanding task considering the eight to ten orders of magnitude in signal between the Rayleigh and  
19 Raman channels (Sec. 4.3). Figure 7-8 shows the principal polychromator design without the black walls  
20 separating the detection compartments or surrounding the filters. In order to save costs, the optics of both  
21 polychromators are equal for except for focal length  $f_2$  that is chosen to achieve image diameters of the order of  
22 5 mm for the different primary mirrors.

23 The optics (Table 3) were mostly purchased from Laseroptik G.m.b.H., with the exception of the narrow-band  
24 interference filters and the steep-edge long-pass beam-splitters 5 and 6 (Materion Barr). The width of the  
25 interference filter for water vapour (347 nm) was chosen to cover the entire rather wide Q branch of  $H_2O$  in  
26 order to avoid a temperature influence on the backscatter profiles. A broad-band interference filter (IFB;  
27 Semrock;  $T = 85-90\%$ ) was recently added for additional suppression of a potential residual influence of  
28 radiation outside the wavelength range of the Raman returns such as scattered light from illuminations inside the  
29 laboratory, from the buildings of the ski area or residual 308-nm contributions.

30 The design in Fig. 7-8 differs for the two long-wavelength channels from that described by Klanner et al. (2012),  
31 used until 2017. The old approach to separate the 347-nm and 353-nm returns was based on a pair of beam  
32 splitters with steep spectral edge (BS-6 in Table 3) similar to those used for separating the  $N_2$  channel. The  
33 ~~angular alignment for optimum perfect separation of the  $H_2O$  signal was not possible for maximum suppression~~  
34 ~~of the 353-nm component, very critical, which is not helpful for a stable performance with stable calibration~~ Even  
35 ~~very small angular changes would imply calibration drifts during routine operation.~~ The modifications in Fig. 7-8  
36 remove the alignment-dependent signal loss in the  $H_2O$  channel. They benefit from the new laser concept (Sect.  
37 2.3.3): The 355-nm pulses are temporally shifted with respect to those at 308 nm. In this way any residual 355-  
38 nm interference in the 347-nm channel is avoided.

39 ~~Some of the components have been replaced by new ones with better performance over the years, i.e., polarizing~~  
40 ~~beam splitter 1 ( $R > 99\%$  for 308 nm), and the interference filter in channel 2. The latter filter now suppresses~~  
41 ~~radiation at the pump wavelength to a level of about  $2 \times 10^{-4}$ . The low transmittance of the shorter wavelength~~

1 interference filters is disappointing, but slightly exceeds that quoted. However,  $T = 55$  to  $65\%$  for a  $\Delta\lambda = 0.1$  nm  
2 filter has been achieved at 386.7 nm by the same manufacturer in the past (Whiteman et al., 2010).

### 3 **34.4 Detectors and Discriminators**

4 The detector choice is based on the experience from our stationary ozone lidar system. The final development  
5 stage took place parallel to that for the ozone DIAL and is described in detail in (Trickl et al., 2020b).  
6 Hamamatsu R7400U-03 tubes were chosen and integrated in an actively stabilized socket optimized for us in  
7 1999 for our three-wavelength aerosol lidar by Romanski Sensors (RSV). The socket is now modified to deliver  
8 optimized single-photon spikes without the ringing of the original PMTs that had previously enhanced the count  
9 rate in our ozone DIAL up to about 5 km (Fig. 8). Signal-induced nonlinearities can be avoided for normal  
10 operating voltages around 800 V if one limits the analogue signal to roughly 100 mV or less (Trickl et al.,  
11 2020b). This level is high in comparison with traditional PMTs. Nonlinearity in the photon-counting signal were  
12 revealed by a comparison with a simultaneous ozone measurement at Hohenpeißenberg for analogue signals of  
13 400 mV

14 The output of a PMT is fed into an impedance-matched junction containing the discriminator (also from RSV).  
15 The output for the analogue channel is slow, with single-photon pulses widened by a factor of two. The second  
16 branch is the fast discriminator that emits  $-0.4$ -V constant amplitude pulses with a full width at half maximum of  
17 0.6 to 1.5 ns, depending on the photon pulse height. The discriminator level that can be chosen from  $-2$  mV to  
18 lower voltages. This is important for the six-dynode PMT and its rather small pulses. The pulse-height  
19 distribution for 800 V shows pulses from  $-2$  to  $-23$  mV and peaks at about 10 mV (Trickl et al., 2020b) (Fig. 9).  
20 We have applied discriminator levels between  $-4$  and  $-5$  mV.

21 An important issue for achieving a high sensitivity is a low level of dark counts photons, which normally  
22 requires to cool the PMT ( $0.03$  counts  $s^{-1}$ : Trickl and Wanner, 1981). With the PMTs used here and  
23 discriminator levels of  $-4$  mV no dark count was registered in 50-ns bins within one hour ( $1 \times 10^6$  laser shots)  
24 without cooling. The average external background for atmospheric measurements is clearly less than 1 count for  
25 voltages up to the maximum of 1000 V, except for the H<sub>2</sub>O channel (see Sect. 67).

### 26 **34.5 Transient Digitizers**

27 Following the other lidar systems developed at IFU since 1995 we purchased two 12-bit, 20 Hz transient  
28 digitizer systems from Licel, each with six channels. Licel designed for this project and the ozone DIAL new,  
29 ground-free input amplifiers. This latest version has led an unprecedented performance in the ozone DIAL with a  
30 relative noise level of about  $\pm 1 \times 10^{-6}$  of the full voltage range after minor smoothing, yielding also highly  
31 sensitive aerosol measurements at 313 nm despite the short wavelength (Trickl et al., 2020b).

32 An exponentially decaying contribution of roughly  $10^{-5}$  of the peak signal is present that scales as the signal  
33 pulse area, i.e., grows with the wavelength. After introducing the discriminator for the photon-counting channel  
34 and the counter the exponential wing increased and a slight undershoot occurred in addition. The interference  
35 could be strongly reduced by adding an optocoupler to the trigger input of the counting system (Sect. 34.6).  
36 Some more sophisticated impedance matching is necessary for achieving an ultimate performance. Examples for  
37 the performance so far achieved are shown in Sect. 67.

38 Another limitation has resulted from the high data transfer produced by the chosen 16000 bins (120 km): The  
39 repetition rate of the laser had to be limited to 300 Hz in order to allow for a reliable data storage.

## 34.6 Photon counting

Single-photon counting is mandatory in a lidar system with stratospheric capability. In order to benefit from the temporal resolution of the PMTs we purchased MCS6 and one MCS6A five-channel photon counting systems from Fast Comtec. Just two of them were used at the end since the analogue signal range for the near-field receiver was found to be good enough to do without photon counting. The signals are scanned for falling edges at intervals of 100 ps which means a maximum count rate of about 5 GHz for equidistant picosecond pulses.

A bottle neck of this counting system is the sequential data transfer to the computer that limits the signal to  $1.8 \times 10^7 \text{ s}^{-1}$ . The multi-channel scaler was, therefore, triggered with a delay of 10 to 20  $\mu\text{s}$  with respect to the laser pulse which resulted in a fully linear performance for  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ . However, if an earlier beginning of the individual measurement is desired on-board averaging becomes necessary that is not implemented in this model. Another limiting issue has been the control program of the counting system: An automatic start from outside UFS is not reliable and, thus, a “mouse click” on the “start” symbol is needed on the remote computer.

## 34.7 System Control

The electronic components of the two DIAL systems (Ingenieurbüro W. Funk) are ground-free. The trigger pulse is derived from a photodiode and subsequently distributed into numerous output channels via optocouplers. The supply voltages are transferred to the different devices in shielded cables. The shields of the cable leading to the PMTs are open on the side of the detectors. The supply voltage can be set by the lidar PC via an I<sup>2</sup>C bus. Electromagnetic interference in the lidar signals from outside (e.g., the laser) has been kept at a negligible level by using doubly shielded cables (Suhner, G03332; the outer shield is left open on one side) and ground-free circuits.

The data acquisition of the lidar system is controlled from a central Linux computer via a perl program and ethernet. The Licel transient digitizers are fully read every 10 seconds. At a repetition rate of 300 Hz this allows for an integration without overflow due to 24-bit depth for each unit. This data stream is subsequently integrated for each channel by the controlling program until the end of the measurement after one million laser shots corresponding to an integration time of roughly one hour. The measurement data is finally stored in an ASCII file including meta information in the file header.

The same perl program is designed to control also the photon counting devices via ethernet communication with the Windows based FASTComTec software. As mentioned, this communication does not yet work reliably for control from outside UFS.

Meanwhile, the excimer laser can be operated via Ethernet, as well as the rotation of the etalon, the spectrometer HR400 and a new motorized end mirror of the XeCl laser. The laser power supply and cooling water pump are controlled by Wago-SPS units (programmed in CodeSys) via a Java web interface. The beam steering mirror is motorized and remotely controlled with a custom made software from ASA. The slit of the lidar dome, the covers of the telescopes, the laser output mirror and the power supply of the lidar receiver are controlled with a Wago-SPS system via a Java Web interface.

## 4.5 Data Processing

### 5.1 Reference data

Apart from the water vapour DIAL we use as external references meteorological data from different sources. Up to typically 32 km radiosonde data from the nearest-by sounding stations Munich (Oberschleißheim; 101 km roughly to the north), Hohenpeißenberg (42 km to the north) and Innsbruck (32 km to the south-east) are taken.

Irupdlhu#alohqdevwd#hlohq

1 Up to a geopotential altitude of roughly 54 km we import data from NCEP (National Centers for Environmental  
2 Prediction, <http://www.ncep.noaa.gov/>). The NCEP values are calculated daily for all NDACC stations. Beyond  
3 this, initial density and temperature guesses are derived from the U.S. Standard Atmosphere (1976). For all  
4 reference data the geopotential altitudes are converted into real ones.

#### 5 **45.1-2 Water Vapour**

6 A great advantage of a Raman lidar is that uncalibrated H<sub>2</sub>O densities are obtained in a robust way by  
7 multiplying the backscatter signal for the full ro-vibrational Q branch by the square of distance r (range  
8 correction). Thus, small perturbations of the signal do not matter as severely as in the DIAL algorithm that  
9 implies derivative calculations. However, in our system the choice of a particularly powerful UV laser  
10 implicated a short operating wavelength of 308 nm. Thus, for obtaining number densities an ozone correction  
11 must be made that is based on the DIAL solution for the wavelengths 307.955 nm and 353.11 nm (or recently  
12 354.22 nm).

13 For simplicity we have so far preferred to calculate just water-vapour volume mixing ratios, which also makes a  
14 range correction superfluous. The uncalibrated mixing ratios are calculated by dividing the H<sub>2</sub>O backscatter  
15 signal by the vibrational nitrogen Raman backscatter signal. Here, the influence of ozone exactly cancels on the  
16 upward path because the transmitted wavelength is the same for both Raman channels. On the downward path a  
17 small residual absorption in the stratospheric ozone exists at 331.75 nm that grows to almost 2 % at 20 km and  
18 has been neglected given the current level of accuracy at this altitude. The photon counting data are collected at  
19 51.2 ns per bin instead of the 50 ns in the transient digitizers and are interpolated to match the time scale of the  
20 analogue data. In order to avoid excessive data array sizes, we double the bin size to 100 ns during the  
21 subsequent calculations, averaging pairs of neighbouring signals,

22 In the useful range for H<sub>2</sub>O up to roughly 20 km the relative noise of the nitrogen Raman signal is negligible and  
23 no smoothing is applied. Smoothing is just applied to the Raman signal ratios that are determined separately for  
24 the analogue and the photon-counting data. The smoothing approach is based on a numerical low-pass filtering  
25 approach with Blackman window described and characterized in the parallel paper by Trickl et al. (2020b). This  
26 numerical filtering approach is free of ringing. The filtering interval is dynamically increased. As shown in Sec.  
27 6 a purely quadratic dependence

$$28 \quad L = 1.2 \times 10^{-4} i^2$$

29 as a function of 15-m bin  $i$  (minimum interval size: 2 bins,  $i \leq 300$ ) (or slightly modified for noisier data) is  
30 adequate. In one case (5 February 2019) a third-order polynomial was used for  $L$  to achieve a better vertical  
31 resolution in the lowermost stratosphere in the presence of a steep concentration feature. In a Raman lidar this  
32 dependence does not require much modification from measurement to measurement, whereas in a DIAL the  
33 strongly changing water-vapour concentration results in considerable change in absorption and, thus, of the  
34 smoothing requirements. The definition of vertical resolution so far used by us is given by the range interval  
35 corresponding to the 25 % to 75 % rise of the response of the smoothing filter to a Heaviside step (VDI, 1999).  
36 For the Blackman filter the VDI vertical resolution is 19.3 % of the size of the smoothing interval. Leblanc et al.  
37 (2016) recommend to define the vertical resolution as the full width at half maximum of a delta response which  
38 is 34.7 % of the filtering interval for the Blackman filter. Equation 1 yields a VDI vertical resolution of 155 m at  
39 10 km, 348 m at 15 km and 619 m at 20 km, and a delta-response vertical resolution of 277 m at 10 km, 624 m at  
40 15 km and 1109 m at 20 km.

Trupdwlhu#f#kuliw@l#k#l hww  
Trupdwlhu#f#kuliw@l#k#l hww#hxwvfk  
Trupdwlhu#f#kuliw@l#k#l hww  
Trupdwlhu#f#kuliw@l#k#l hww  
Ihogixqnlw#h#fiqghuw  
Trupdwlhu#f#kuliw@l#k#l hww  
Trupdwlhu#f#kuliw@l#k#l hww  
Trupdwlhu#f#kuliw@l#k#l hww  
Trupdwlhu#f#kuliw@l#k#l hww

1 The role of aerosols is limited to extinction and, in the case of biogenic particles (Immler et al., 2005; Reichardt  
 2 et al., 2017), to fluorescence in a Raman lidar. The presence of aerosols is best judged from the 355-nm channel.  
 3 The influence of extinction is very low when calculating the H<sub>2</sub>O mixing ratio from the ratio of the H<sub>2</sub>O and N<sub>2</sub>  
 4 profiles. An estimate of the extinction coefficients at the two wavelengths can be obtained from the 355-nm data.  
 5 The system testing was limited to clear nights. Thus, aerosol effects could be neglected.

### 6 **4.5.2.3 Temperature**

7 The retrieval of temperature from lidar data is a highly demanding task. For instance, an uncertainty of 1 K  
 8 means a relative uncertainty of 0.33 % at a temperature of 300 K. Thus, a very high quality of the backscatter  
 9 signals is a prerequisite for reasonable results. For our system the two conventional methods have been selected,  
 10 evaluating the temperature dependences of the rotational Raman spectra received just below 308 nm (Arshinov  
 11 et al., 1983) and the direct retrieval of temperature from backscatter profiles (Hauchecorne and Chanin, 1980).

12 The retrieval of temperature profiles from rotational Raman backscattering has not yet been optimized and is,  
 13 thus, not described here. The main problem has been that the first generation of 307.390 nm interference filters  
 14 obtained from Materion Barr did not sufficiently reject the 307.955-nm contribution. In principle, this  
 15 contribution is a reasonable reference in the absence of aerosol because it is independent of temperature. Thus,  
 16 several successful temperature retrievals could be achieved for the near-field receiver (Höveler, 2015).

17 The evaluation of temperature profiles directly from backscatter profiles has been tested for the Rayleigh  
 18 channels at 308 nm, 353 nm, 355 nm as well as the nitrogen Raman channel (332 nm). Due to the signal losses  
 19 caused by ozone the range of the N<sub>2</sub> channel is limited. We finally decided to invert the backscatter signal for  
 20 355 nm (Sec. 2.3). The analogue and photon counting backscatter profiles are merged into a single profile,  
 21 switching at about 28 km. The resulting profile is, again, smoothed with the Blackman filter mentioned above.  
 22 Similar to water vapour the filtering interval  $\Delta$  is enhanced as (approximately)

$$23 \quad L = 2 \times 10^{-5} i^2$$

24 as a function of 15-m bin  $i$ .

25 We follow the strategy of calculating the temperature described by Shibata et al. (1986). In a first step the  
 26 density is calculated and subsequently the temperature. However, instead of the simplified density algorithm we  
 27 use a fully quantitative Klett-type approach with downward integration from the far end (Klett, 1981; 1985). The  
 28 result is calibrated to the number density  $n$  and not to the backscatter coefficient:

$$29 \quad n(r) = \frac{n(r_{ref}) r_{ref}^2 S(r_{ref})}{r^2 S(r) + 2n(r_{ref}) \sigma_R \left[ 1 + \int_r^{r_{ref}} r'^2 S(r') dr' \right]}, \quad (1)$$

30  $S(r)$  being the ozone-corrected backscatter signal,  $r_{ref}$  the reference distance and  $\sigma_R$  the Rayleigh extinction  
 31 coefficient. We take as a first approximation a reference value calculated from NCEP (National Centers for  
 32 Environmental Prediction, <http://www.ncep.noaa.gov/>) data. ~~The NCEP values are available up to a geopotential  
 33 altitude of roughly 54 km. Beyond this, initial guesses from the U.S. Standard Atmosphere (1976) are taken,  
 34 after converting the geopotential altitudes into real ones (as in the case of the NCEP data).~~ The results of the  
 35 inversion with Eq. 1 are then compared with radiosonde or NCEP values in a low-noise range of the backscatter  
 36 profile at moderate altitudes. If the agreement in this reference range is not sufficient,  $n(r_{ref})$  is modified, and the  
 37 procedure is repeated until agreement is reached. This approach is highly robust, a change in reference value



1 corresponding to an approximate parallel shift of the **density** curves. For the selection of  $r_{ref}$ , it is advisable to  
 2 select a position for which the signal  $S(r_{ref})$  is closest to the average of adjacent data points. In this way, the  
 3 subsequent correction necessitated by the local data noise are the lowest.

4 The temperature is subsequently calculated from the density by applying

$$5 \quad T(z) = T(z_0) \frac{n(z_0)}{n(z)} + \frac{m_{air}}{k n(z)} \int_z^{z_0} n(z') g(z') dz' , \quad (2)$$

6 with  $z$  being the altitude above sea level,  $m_{air} = 28.9644$  u (U.S. Standard Atmosphere (1976); 1 u =  
 7  $1.6605390 \times 10^{-27}$  kg) the mass of an “average air molecule”, and  $g$  the gravitational acceleration (Mohr et al.,  
 8 2014),

$$9 \quad g(z) = g_0 \left( \frac{r_E}{r_E + z} \right)^2 ,$$

10 with  $g_0 = 9.80665$  m s<sup>-1</sup> and the earth radius  $r_E = 6356766$  m.

11 Equation 2 immediately shows that selecting  $z_0$  at the upper end of the data-evaluation range means a strong  
 12 decrease with the growing density on the way downward. As a consequence, the second term in Eq. 2 clearly  
 13 dominates the temperature about 15 km downward from  $z_0$ . Here, the the number density retrieved in the first  
 14 step determines the temperature. Any density error critically enters the computation of the temperature. Thus, the  
 15 range of the temperature retrieval is shorter than that of the density retrieval.

#### 16 **4.3.4 Uncertainties**

17 Uncertainties  $u$  of both water vapour and temperature have been approximated by the expression

$$18 \quad u = \sqrt{u_0^2 + \left( u_1 \frac{r^2}{r_{ref}^2} \right)^2 + (u_2 S(r))^2} , \quad (3)$$

19 with coefficients  $u_0$ ,  $u_1$ , and  $u_2$  that are adjusted by comparison with reference measurements as shown in the  
 20 examples in Sect. 6.7. The second term in Eq. 3, quadratic in  $r$ , reflects the quadratic rise of the noise of the  
 21 unsmoothed quantities. The reference distance  $r_{ref}$  is chosen at the upper end of the data evaluation range. By the  
 22 approach with Eq. 3 considerable computation efforts have been avoided.

#### 23 **4.4 Simulation of the system performance**

24 ~~Before finalizing the lidar design a number of simulations of the system performance were made. Figure 10~~  
 25 ~~shows the results for 200 W of laser power at 308 nm, a range bin of 200 m, 10 % detection efficiency and a~~  
 26 ~~measurement time of 1 h. The atmospheric data were taken from the mid-latitude summer model of the~~  
 27 ~~LOWTRAN simulation program (Kneizys et al., 1988).~~

28 ~~It is obvious that the Raman backscatter signal for stratospheric water vapour is roughly eight orders of~~  
 29 ~~magnitude smaller than the Rayleigh backscatter signal for 308 nm. This imposes extreme boundary conditions~~  
 30 ~~for the optical system (Sec. 3.3). The effect of the signal loss at 308 nm due to the absorption by ozone is not~~  
 31 ~~very severe up to 20 km. In comparison with the most commonly used primary wavelength of 355 nm this loss is~~  
 32 ~~roughly compensated by the fourth order frequency dependence of the Raman backscatter coefficient.~~

33 ~~As demonstrated by the atmospheric measurements the polychromators fully meet the requirements.~~

## 1 **5.6 Calibration of the water-vapour profiles with the DIAL**

2 The calibration of the Raman lidar by the water-vapour DIAL operated in the same laboratory is a unique chance  
3 to overcome the restrictions imposed by the sometimes extreme variability of water vapour (Vogelmann et al.,  
4 2011; 2015). This variability is caused by a rapid sequence of atmospheric layers of strongly different origin.  
5 The humidity varies from very high (origin in the boundary layer) to extremely low (origin in the stratosphere).  
6 Our routine measurements since 2007 have revealed that on 84 % of our ozone measurement days stratospheric  
7 influence could be identified in the free troposphere (Trickl et al. 2020a). This leads to a particularly strong  
8 modulation of the humidity profile.

9 In Fig. 11.9 we show the first example of a comparison between the two lidar systems on 25 April 2013. The  
10 measurements took place under highly complex conditions in the presence of three dry layers, two of them  
11 clearly related to stratospheric air as follows from the almost negligible humidity. 315-h backward trajectories  
12 with the HYSPLIT model (<http://ready.arl.noaa.gov/HYSPLIT.php>; Draxler and Hess, 1998; Stein et al., 2015),  
13 run here with re-analysis meteorological data, show a five- to seven-day descent from altitudes above 9 km over  
14 western Canada and more than 10 km above the Aleutian Islands for the layers at 4.2 km and 6.7 km,  
15 respectively.

16 This was the only case in our entire test phase in which a slight 308-nm background was superimposed on the  
17 signal. This background could be reliably removed by subtracting a very simple exponential curve. After  
18 calibration of the data from the Raman lidar with those from the DIAL above 5.5 km reasonable agreement was  
19 found in a major fraction of the free troposphere. However, due to using the same electronics in that early phase  
20 the measurements were not made simultaneously. Thus, a few differences are visible and ascribed to  
21 sometimes extreme spatial and temporal variability of water vapour (Vogelmann et al., 2011) mentioned above.

22 The strong variability becomes even more obvious from comparisons with the Innsbruck (~~32 km to the south-~~  
23 ~~east;~~ (shown) and Munich radiosonde (~~100 km to the north;~~ not shown) ascents that differ strongly and do not  
24 show similarly dry layers despite similar courses of the trajectories calculated for these sites in comparison with  
25 those for the lidar station. This example demonstrates that simultaneous calibration of the Raman lidar with the  
26 quality-assured DIAL (e.g., Trickl et al., 2016) is mandatory. Unfortunately, comparisons have no longer been  
27 possible after 2014 due to a permanent laser damage of the DIAL. The development of a new Ti:sapphire laser  
28 system with high repetition rate is under way and emission was already demonstrated.

29 The stability of the calibration can be monitored by using the signals of the 308-nm, 332-nm and 355-nm  
30 channels outside ranges affected by aerosol.

31 During the rest of the test period in part described in the following the system was calibrated by comparison with  
32 sonde humidity profiles from Munich, Innsbruck and Hohenpeißenberg, selecting sections of the sonde profiles  
33 looking most reasonable. Geopotential altitudes are converted into true altitudes. During one night in February  
34 2019 very successful comparisons with a CFH sensor (launched in the valley) were made.

## 35 **6.7 Measurements in the Atmosphere**

36 After the completion of the lidar systems testing started in autumn 2012. The measurements demonstrated the  
37 perfect suppression of interference from the other channels in the water-vapour channel by spectral filtering and  
38 shielding. This achievement implies, according to the simulations in Sec. 4.5.3, a suppression of more than nine  
39 decades of 308-nm background.

1 In early 2015, [also](#) the near-field receiver was completed and performed well. Even rotational Raman retrievals  
2 with a temperature noise level of 1 K were achieved (Höveler, 2015). In addition, single-photon counting  
3 successfully entered operation for the far-field receiver, but was given up for the small telescope because of the  
4 excellent analogue performance. In the following, we show results just for the far-field receiver since a good  
5 system performance at high altitudes has been the main goal of this project. The examples were chosen to show  
6 the performance under different conditions such as different levels of background noise and different situations  
7 of calibration.

## 8 **6.7.1 Water Vapour Measurements up to 20 km**

### 9 *1 July 2015*

10 The first, [quite instructive](#) measurement demonstrating a detection range up to 20 km was achieved on 1 July  
11 2015 (Fig. [1210](#)). ~~The polychromator was, still, operated under testing conditions, i.e., just provisionally~~  
12 ~~optically tightened against light from the instrument panels inside the detection compartment to facilitate~~  
13 ~~alignment studies. However, it turned out that the only significant radiation leak was the~~[Due to a](#)-wide entrance  
14 slit of the polychromator (about  $40 \times 40 \text{ mm}^2$  [to facilitate alignments in the dark](#)). ~~The a~~ strong background of  
15 155 photon counts per hour in 15-m bins ~~occurred that is ascribed~~[included to](#) scattered radiation from the almost  
16 full moon. Despite the resulting noise of [about  \$\pm 25\$  counts](#) the [background-corrected](#) signal, arithmetically  
17 averaged over ~~52-51~~ bins, ~~it s~~ stays positive to distances up to 19.7 km (22.4 km a.s.l.).

18 The signal was accumulated over 1 h with a laser pulse energy of just 295 mJ (300 Hz) due to a dirty ~~eel~~  
19 window [of the laser pump chamber](#). The analogue signal was corrected just with a very small exponential  
20 ~~correction-decay function~~, leaving a slight residual signal undershoot at distances around 12 km that is ascribed  
21 to the parallel use of analogue detection and photon counting (Sec. [34.4](#)). The peak analogue signal is about 3  
22 mV, but is rescaled here to match the counting signal. The photon-counting noise corresponds to an analogue  
23 voltage of just about  $\pm 15 \text{ nV}$ .

24 ~~The w~~Water vapour mixing ratios [is shown in](#) ~~were calculated just by using the analogue data for nitrogen~~  
25 ~~(corrected for a very small exponential wing) because of missing data in the corresponding counting channel~~  
26 ~~during this measurement~~ (Fig. [1311](#)). The calibration of the mixing ratio was very difficult since there was  
27 macroscopic mutual disagreement of the lidar and all three Vaisala RS 92 radiosonde profiles inspected (Klanner  
28 et al., 2017, Fig. 3). A few points below 7 km where the sonde data agree were chosen as reference. The  
29 Hohenpeißenberg mixing ratio (early morning) agrees best with the lidar results in the tropopause region and is,  
30 therefore, displayed here.

31 The example of 1 July 2015 is special in our test phase: There was very low water vapour around 15.7 km (about  
32 2 ppm). The drop is verified by the Hohenpeißenberg profile. Although the sonde data become highly uncertain  
33 at higher altitudes we see principal agreement with the lidar. HYSPLIT trajectory calculations indicated  
34 advection of tropical air from the Caribbean Sea above the tropopause, slightly downward shifted most likely  
35 because of a wrong model orography at the northern rim of the Alps. In the tropics freeze drying in cirrus clouds  
36 has been suggested to lead to dehydration and, thus, low humidity (see Sect. 1). Such an inhomogeneity is a  
37 strong motivation for lidar work that features a potential for a good time resolution. Water vapour is an excellent  
38 tracer for troposphere-to-stratosphere transport (TST) and there is some hope that we can study some cases of  
39 TST in the future.

### 40 *Measurements since 2018*

1 The measurements since 2018 were carried out with full optical insulation of the channels including the covers  
2 of the polychromators, with narrow entrance slit and with measurements at 355 nm with the separate Powerlite  
3 laser. In 2018 and until 6 February 2019, a total of fourteen 1-h measurements and several shorter tests were  
4 carried out during nights completely without clouds. The minimum H<sub>2</sub>O mixing ratios were 4 to 6 ppm, i.e., in  
5 the range one would expect for the stratosphere from the literature cited in the introduction.

6 ~~The finally chosen size of the horizontal entrance slit was roughly 4 mm × 8 mm, slightly larger than the~~  
7 ~~minimum that is determined by the product of the large beam divergence of the enlarged laser beam and the~~  
8 ~~focal length of 5 m (receiver). The background signal in 1 h was mostly zero in all 7.5-nm bins (rarely 1 count)~~  
9 ~~except for H<sub>2</sub>O. Here, typically 3 to 5 counts were registered. In one case a narrower slit was used. The smallest~~  
10 ~~slit size tested was (roughly 2 mm × 8 mm). This led to 1 to 2 background counts per 7.5-m bin and 1 h, but also~~  
11 ~~to an indication of a lower backscatter signal. This behaviour would be in agreement with the large beam~~  
12 ~~diameter in the focal plane of roughly 2.5 mm as expected from the laser beam divergence and the receiver focal~~  
13 ~~length of 5 m. The finally chosen size of the horizontal entrance slit was roughly 4 mm × 8 mm resulting in 3 to~~  
14 ~~5 counts background counts.~~

15 The reason for the background counts in the water-vapour channel could not be fully clarified. Upper-  
16 atmosphere air-glow spectra (Broadfoot et al., 1968; Johnston et al., 1993) show several features in the  
17 wavelength range of the in the lidar return for  $\lambda \geq 332$  nm. However, some spectral overlap also exists with the  
18 components at 332 nm, 353 nm and 355 nm where the measured background is very low. ~~No clarification has~~  
19 ~~been possible.~~

#### 20 *19 July 2018*

21 During the early hours of 19 July 2018, two subsequent measurements were made that could be compared. The  
22 average laser pulse energy was just 380 mJ (300 Hz). The background count rate was 5-8 counts h<sup>-1</sup> bin<sup>-1</sup> for a  
23 ~~slightly~~ larger entrance slit.

24 The mixing ratios obtained are shown in Fig. 4412. The calibration of the first measurement was estimated from  
25 the Munich sonde data for the launch at 1:00 CET. The profile for the second measurement looks completely  
26 different which, again, demonstrates the strong atmospheric variability of water vapour. Here, the calibration of  
27 the lidar mixing ratios was based on the Innsbruck sonde (nominal daily launch: 4:00 CET). We assume that the  
28 horizontal homogeneity is much better in the the tropopause region, where we, thus, centred the calibration.  
29 However, the agreement is also reasonable around 6.5 km (5 to 10 %).

30 The two profiles for the lidar agree quite well up to about 18 km (Fig. 4513), despite the elevated signal  
31 background. The second measurement was noisier which is reflected by the larger error bars.

32 It is interesting to note that the sonde data are substantially lower than the mixing ratios from the lidar, which is  
33 also the case in the following examples. We speculate that this is due to a change in sonde type from RS 92 to  
34 RS 41 by the German Weather Service. We have found that the RS 92 data highly realistic in our tropospheric  
35 studies in comparison with our DIAL (Trickl et al., 2014-2016). For 2018, the data for the new sonde type  
36 exhibited a positive bias of 2-3 % relative humidity (RH) in intrusion layers.

#### 37 *5 February 2019: system validation*

38 On 5 and 6 February 2019 several balloons with cryogenic frostpoint hygrometers (CFH; Vömel et al., 2007;  
39 2016), standard Vaisala RS-41-SGP radiosondes (Vaisala et al., 2019), ECC ozone sondes (Smit et al., 2007) and  
40 COBALD backscatter sondes (Brabec, 2011) were launched in the valley at IMK-IFU (9 km to the north-east of

1 UFS) by a team of the Forschungszentrum Jülich. The data were transmitted to a ground station installed for this  
2 campaign at the Zugspitze summit. The combined balloon payload is well tested and regularly also used by the  
3 GCOS Reference Upper Air Network (GRUAN) (e.g., Dirksen et al., 2014).

4 The CFH has an uncertainty of about 2-3 % in the troposphere and less than 10 % in the lower stratosphere.  
5 Thus, the CFH is especially suitable for measuring water vapour under the dry conditions at the tropopause and  
6 in the stratosphere up to altitudes of 28 km.

7 The first night of the campaign was clearer and these results are presented in the following. The conditions for  
8 the comparison were excellent: the sondes rose almost vertically up to 8.5 km and then slowly drifted to the  
9 south-east (Innsbruck). The balloons stayed within 20 km distance ~~from IMK-IFU~~ up to the tropopause (12.8 km  
10 a.s.l.) and remained within 30 km ~~from IMK-IFU~~ up to 20 km a.s.l.

11 The launch times of the balloons were 18:03 CET (ascent to 16.147 km), 19:03 CET (29.475 km), and 23:00  
12 CET (29.469 km). The profiles of the CFH H<sub>2</sub>O mixing ratio during that period mutually agreed to within 0.5  
13 ppm between 13.0 km and 17.5 km and slightly more up to 26 km. Just two of the three lidar measurements at  
14 UFS cover the full standard measurement time of one hour and are presented here.

15 The H<sub>2</sub>O Raman backscatter profile for the measurement before midnight is shown in Fig. 4614. Due to a narrow  
16 slit the H<sub>2</sub>O raw data exhibit an average -background of just 2.33 counts (subtracted here) with a standard  
17 deviation of 1.55 counts. Two curves with gliding arithmetic means over  $\pm 25$  and  $\pm 75$  bins are included that  
18 suggest a useful range up to  $r = 17$  km ( $h = 19.7$  km a.s.l.). The remarkably low sensitivity limit for the averaged  
19 curve corresponds to roughly 0.1 nV of analogue voltage. The dynamic range within the dry free troposphere and  
20 the lower stratosphere covers astonishing seven decades.

21 The nitrogen Raman backscatter signal is considerably larger. Thus, the onset saturation effects can be seen in  
22 the photon-counting data below  $r = 4$  km. Here, the analogue data are, still, valid for at least two more downward  
23 kilometres. The analogue signal starts to deviate from the photon-counting signal due to an exponential decay in  
24 the signal processing mentioned in Sect. 34.5. We do not correct this effect because the photon-counting method  
25 is used at high altitudes.

26 Figures 47-16 and 48-17 show the water vapour mixing ratios obtained for two measurement periods on 5  
27 February with 1-h lidar measurements together with those from the almost simultaneous CFH ascents. In  
28 addition, the values for the Munich radiosonde (6 Feb, launched at 1:00 CET) are included for comparison. The  
29 grey curve corresponds to the VDI vertical resolution used for the numerical filtering that is about 0.2 km at 14  
30 km and 0.47 km at 20 km. Due to the moderate smoothing around 13 km the downward humidity step at 12.8 km  
31 is just slightly widened with respect to the CFH sensor. We reduced the vertical resolution of the first  
32 measurement around this step by introducing a third-order dependence (polynomial) of the smoothing interval  
33 (Eq. 1), but could not improve the steepness of this step. We conclude that the width of the step in the lidar result  
34 is primarily determined by the long data acquisition over 1 h.

35 The lidar was calibrated in the upper troposphere above 7.7 km yielding an almost perfect agreement with the  
36 CFH measurements in this range. Between 7.7 km and 5.7 km it is, still, satisfactory with deviation of 5 to 10 %.  
37 Below this altitude the agreement for the first profile was also acceptable, the lidar value lying in the middle of  
38 the CFH mixing ratios for ascent and descent (the latter not shown for clearness). This was quite different for the  
39 second profile recorded before midnight when the atmosphere was obviously highly inhomogeneous in space,  
40 even on a horizontal scale of 10 km given by the almost vertical rise of the balloon. The presence of several very  
41 thin dry layers, also over Munich, indicate a pronounced filamentation.

1 Below this zone the agreement is good for both measurements. This indicates a good cancellation of the overlap  
2 functions of the nitrogen and water-vapour channels, similar to DIAL systems.

### 3 **6.7.2 Temperature Measurements**

#### 4 ***Rotational Method***

5 A few measurements based on the rotational temperature method were evaluated for the near-field receiver  
6 (Höveler, 2015). The Cabannes influence was corrected for. A good performance with a temperature noise of  
7 less than 1 K in a range up to 8 km in the free troposphere was achieved. With recently purchased new narrow-  
8 band interference filters (Materion Barr rejection of Cabannes radiation to  $2 \times 10^{-4}$ ) and a better polarizing beam  
9 splitter (Laseroptik,  $T > 99\%$ ) we expect a much better rejection of the Cabannes radiation.

#### 10 ***Rayleigh Method***

11 Temperature profiles based on the Rayleigh approach have been made for the wavelengths 308 nm, 332 nm, 353  
12 nm and, finally, 355 nm. For 308 nm and 332 nm the signals must be corrected for the absorption of the radiation  
13 in ozone. The range for 332 nm ends far below the mesosphere and is, therefore, no longer considered. For 308  
14 nm a temperature retrieval up to 55 km was achieved. However, the backscatter signal was attenuated with a  
15 neutral-density filter by a factor of one thousand in order to avoid detector overload. This means that, without  
16 attenuation, a high-speed chopper must be added to cut off the signal returning from the first ten kilometres.  
17 Then, the performance could be excellent. The 353-nm channel was successfully tested at low repetition rates  
18 (yielding reasonable temperatures up to 52 km), but was given up because of the loss of Raman conversion at  
19 full power.

20 Here, we present the first demonstration of a measurement with the separate frequency-tripled Nd:YAG laser  
21 (Sect. 23.4) up to the mesosphere on 16 November 2018. This example yields the best example of the technical  
22 performance of the UFS lidar: Figure 49-17 shows the backscatter signals for a 1-h measurement up to as high as  
23 120 km. The smoothed combined signal (analogue at low altitudes, photon counting at high altitudes; cyan  
24 curve) exhibits low to moderate noise up to 95 km (VDI vertical resolution: black curve). The average photon  
25 counting background is considerably less than 1 count. This results in an overall dynamic range of 8 decades.  
26 The analogue signal exhibits a considerable distortion at high altitudes which we ascribe of the known (Trickl,  
27 2010) magnetic interference of the [flashlamp-pumped](#) Nd:YAG laser. Again, a correction is not necessary  
28 because the photon-counting data are used at high altitudes.

29 For comparison, we give simulated backscatter profiles calculated from the U.S. Standard Atmosphere and a  
30 combination of the 1:00 CET Munich radiosonde and the 13:00 CET NCEP data for our station downloaded  
31 from the NDACC web site. The curve for the standard atmosphere (green) is climatological and slightly deviates  
32 from the lidar results at high altitudes. It just guides the eye. No deviation of the lidar backscatter profile with  
33 respect to the sonde and NCEP data is seen up to end of these data at 53 km (blue curve).

34 The strong near-field signal peak was attenuated by using a narrow aperture and by rotating the laser beam away  
35 from the telescope axis. However, this resulted in a slightly reduced overlap as far as almost 20 km, as can be  
36 seen in the temperature data (Fig. 2018). The combined raw data were smoothed with a VDI vertical resolution  
37 scaling as shown in Fig. 4917, the maximum value staying below 2 km.

38 The temperature data were initialized at 87 km a.s.l. (density: at 95 km) by using the temperature of the U.S.  
39 Standard atmosphere as the start value. The performance is surprisingly good, despite the strongly growing noise  
40 of the raw data in this altitude range. The agreement with the temperatures from the Munich radiosonde and

1 NCEP is very good up to the upper end of the NCEP table (50 km) downloaded from the NDACC web site. For  
2 higher altitudes we first compared our results with the MSIS model output calculated for our site, as  
3 recommended by Wing et al. (2018). There is a strong discrepancy that could not be reduced by selecting the  
4 MSIS temperature at 87 km as the start value of the retrieval: The temperature converged to the curve for  
5 calibrating with the standard atmosphere within just 15 km.

6 A comparison with the temperature of the Microwave Limb Sounder (MLS) during the early hours of 16  
7 November for a position 3.5° farther to the east. Considering the difference in position the agreement with the  
8 MLS temperature profile is quite good, with a strong similarity in structure. The temperature peak at 65 km is  
9 present, but slightly downward shifted.

10 Finally, the mesospheric OH airglow measurements at UFS by DLR (Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und  
11 Raumfahrt) yielded an average temperature of 194.3 K ± 4 K at estimated 86.5 km during the period of the lidar  
12 measurement. This is quite enjoyable despite an uncertainty due to the 45° slant path of the field of view of the  
13 OH spectrometer and due to gravity-wave activity indicated in the OH data.

14 In summary we are highly satisfied by this first result for a wide-range temperature measurement. In principle,  
15 due to the very small average background signal, Poisson effects in the photon statistics must be taken into  
16 consideration. More advanced approaches are needed, such as that presented by Sica and Haeefe (2016).

## 17 **7.8 Discussion and Conclusions**

18 The primary goals of the system development described in this paper have been to reduce the measurement time  
19 for lower-stratospheric water vapour up to at least 20 km to one hour and to achieve temperature measurements  
20 up to more than 80 km. These goals have been met, with a satisfactory performance. Nevertheless, a comparison  
21 with the simulations in Sect. 4.4.2 clearly shows that the measured lidar signal for water vapour is considerably  
22 smaller than predicted.

23 At 15 km our measurements typically yield H<sub>2</sub>O Raman returns of 2 counts per 7.5-m bin and hour. This is  
24 converted to 53 counts for the 200-m bins used in the calculation in Sect. 4.4.2, one sixth of the 315 counts  
25 simulated. Roughly a factor of two is due to the lower laser paper-power in comparison with the 200 W assumed  
26 in the simulation. For the rest, apart from uncertainties in the parameters used in the numerical estimate, we  
27 found that the most likely reason for this discrepancy is that the Raman cross section used in the calculations is  
28 presumably given for the sum of all three ro-vibrational branches. Indeed, the peak signal increased by roughly a  
29 factor of three when we removed the 347-nm interference filter, which includes the missing attenuation by the  
30 interference filter ( $T = 0.72$ ).

31 As a consequence, we carried out measurements without interference filter. However, this resulted in a much  
32 higher stratospheric mixing ratio of 120 ppm due to insufficient blocking of 308- or 332-nm radiation. Thus, for  
33 collecting the signal from the entire ro-vibrational band at least a broad-band interference filter (bandwidth  
34 almost 20 nm) must be added to reject residual contributions from the other channels and to reduce the observed  
35 3 to 4 background counts.

36 The background is dominated by the size of the entrance slit. The optimum slit width is different for both lasers,  
37 given different beam divergences. Therefore, in the future two additional slits will be used in focal points of the  
38 347-nm and 355-nm channels (Fig. 7.8). These slits are easier accessible than the entrance slit which facilitates to  
39 optimize their position and size.

40 There are obvious possibilities to enhance the laser power. Better transmitting intracavity optics should be  
41 installed for significantly reducing the thermal load. A higher transmittance would, therefore, also allow us to

Trupdwlnhu#ejolv#huhlqlj#q1juhlfk,

1 remove the cylindrical telescope (Fig. 34) that was introduced to reduce the intracavity intensity on the optical  
2 components added by us. As a consequence, the resonator would become shorter and the number of cavity round  
3 trips within the fluorescence time of XeCl would grow. As pointed out in Sect. 23.1 the reduction of the numbers  
4 of round trips is likely to be the dominant loss factor in the extended resonator.

5 The calibration of the water-vapour channel was confirmed to be a key issue for the long-term operation of the  
6 lidar. We hope that the UFS DIAL can soon be re-activated for filling this gap. Additional control by inspecting  
7 the data from surrounding radiosonde stations or the signal level at 308 nm and 332 nm are other important tools  
8 to ensure long-term stability of the system. A longer comparison with CFH sensors than in the campaign in  
9 February 2019 would also be advantageous. This would be particularly important during periods with  
10 fluorescing aerosol in the lower stratosphere in order to assess the influence of this kind of background at 347  
11 nm.

12 The temperature measurements with a separate, frequency-tripled Nd:YAG laser were quite successful.  
13 Improvements could result from using a diode-pumped Nd:YAG laser with 300 or 350 Hz repetition rate,  
14 matching that of the XeCl laser. Such lasers are meanwhile available. We expect lower pulse energies for such a  
15 laser at 355 nm, but the currently available 160 mJ yielded too much backscatter signal anyway. The remaining  
16 efforts will concentrate on testing the rotational Raman channels with the new spectral filters, on implementing  
17 the ozone correction (not possible for the configuration with 353 nm) and on completing the remote control of  
18 the lidar system. Automatic control of the alignment is the key to more frequent measurements. Lidar  
19 measurements at high temporal resolution may yield more information on the role of atmospheric transport, in  
20 particular TST, on the water vapour concentration in the UTLS. Finally, we head for long-term operation of the  
21 system with stable performance in order to provide insight into the H<sub>2</sub>O feedback in the climate system.

## 22 **5 Data availability**

23 Data can be obtained on request from several authors of this paper (christian.rolf@fzj.de; thomas@trickl.de,  
24 hannes.vogelmann@kit.de)

## 25 **6 Author statement**

26 All authors from Garmisch-Partenkirchen were involved in system development and lidar testing. The Jülich  
27 team launched balloons at IMK-IFU.

## 28 **7 Competing interests**

29 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.  
30

## 31 **Acknowledgements**

32 The authors thank Hans Peter Schmid for his interest and support. They are indebted to Werner Funk, Bernd  
33 Mielke, Heinz Josef Romanski and Bernhard Stein for numerous important discussions and technical  
34 improvements. Stuart McDermid sent valuable information on the feasibility of Raman lidar measurements of  
35 H<sub>2</sub>O in the stratosphere which encouraged us to start this project. We strongly appreciate the intense discussions  
36 with our NDACC colleagues. Wolfgang Steinbrecht generously made available results from the nearby  
37 Hohenpeißenberg observatory, Gerald Nedoluha provided the MLS reference data. The good co-operation with  
38 the Coherent team in Göttingen was crucial for the laser upgrading. Also crucial has been the excellent help by



1 Werner Moorhoff and Laseroptik who made numerous attempts for optimizing the performance of their  
2 dielectric coatings. In particular, their tenacity in optimizing the reflectance of the large mirrors in the transmitter  
3 at their own costs this project prevented serious damage to this project. [Carsten Schmidt and Michael Bittner](#)  
4 [kindly communicated the OH temperature data.](#) This work has been funded by the Bavarian State Ministry of  
5 Environment and Consumer Protection under contracts 45001226 (KIT), TLK01U-49581 and VAO-II TPI/01.  
6 KIT acknowledges support of lidar measurements by the European Space Agency (ESA) under Contract  
7 4000123691/18/NL/NF (FIRMOS validation campaign). Balloon profiles utilized in this paper have been  
8 provided within the same ESA project by the Forschungszentrum Jülich via subcontract with KIT. The balloon  
9 activities were also partly supported by the Helmholtz Association in the framework of MOSES (Modular  
10 Observation Solutions for Earth Systems).  
11 The service charges for this open-access publication have been covered by a Research Centre of the Helmholtz  
12 Association.

### 13 **References**

- 14 Arshinov, Y. F., Bobrovnikov, S. M., Zuev, V. E., and Mitev, V. M.: Atmospheric temperature measurements  
15 using a pure rotational Raman lidar, *Appl. Opt.*, 22, 2984-2990, 1983.
- 16 Avila, G., Fernandez, J. M., Tejada, G., and Montero, S.: The Raman spectra and cross-sections of H<sub>2</sub>O D<sub>2</sub>O,  
17 and HDO in the OH/OD stretching regions, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 228, 38-65, 2004.
- 18 Barnes, J. E., Kaplan, T., Vömel, H., and Read, W. G.: NASA/Aura/Microwave Limb Sounder water vapor  
19 validation at Mauna Loa Observatory by Raman lidar, 113, D15S03, doi:10.1029/2007JD008842, 5 pp., 2008.
- 20 Brabec, M.: Backscatter and Humidity Measurements in Cirrus and Dust Clouds using Balloon Sondes, Ph.D.  
21 thesis, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zürich (Switzerland), 96 pp., 2011.
- 22 Bragg, S. L., Brault, J. W., and Smith, W. H.: Line Positions and Strengths in the H<sub>2</sub> Quadrupole Spectrum,  
23 *Astrophys. J.*, 263, 999-1004, 1982.
- 24 Broadfoot, A. L., and Kendall, K. R.: The Airglow Spectrum, 3100 – 10,000 Å, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 73, 426-428,  
25 1968.
- 26 Carnuth, W., and Trickl, T.: A powerful eyesafe infrared aerosol lidar: application of stimulated Raman  
27 backscattering of 1.06 µm radiation, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, 65, 3324-3331, 1994.
- 28 Chen, B., and Liu, Z.: Global water vapor variability and trend from the latest 36 year (1979 to 2014) data of  
29 ECMWF and NCEP reanalyses, radiosonde, GPS, and microwave satellite, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 121, 11,442–  
30 11,462, doi:10.1002/2016JD024917, 2016.
- 31 Congeduti, F., Marengo, F., Baldetti, P., and Vicenti, E.: The multiple lidar '9-eyes', *J. Opt. A*, 1, 185-191, 1999.
- 32 Deuber, B., Kämpfer, N., Feist, D. G.: A New 22-GHz Radiometer for Middle Atmospheric Water Vapor Profile  
33 Measurements, *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 42, 974-984, 2004.
- 34 Deuber, B., Haefele, A., Feist, D. G., Martin, L., Nedoluha, G. E., Yushkov, V., Khaykin, S., Kivi, R., and  
35 Vömel, H.: Middle Atmospheric Water Vapour Radiometer (MIAWARA): Validation and first results of the  
36 LAPBIAT Upper Tropospheric Lower Stratospheric Water Vapor Validation Project (LAUTLOS-WAVVAP)  
37 campaign, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, D13306, doi: 10.1029/2004JD005543, 10 pp., 2005.
- 38 Dickenson, G. D., Niu, M. L., Salumbides, E. J., Komasa, J., Eikema, K. S. E., Pachucki, K., and Ubachs, W.:  
39 Fundamental Vibration of Molecular Hydrogen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110, 193601, 5 pp., 2013.

1 Dionisi, D., Congeduti, F., Liberti, G. L., and Cardillo, F.: Calibration of a Multichannel Water Vapor Raman  
2 Lidar through Noncollocated Operational Soundings: Optimization and Characterization of Accuracy and  
3 Variability, *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.*, 27, 108-121, 2010.

4 Dionisi, D., Liberti, G. L., and Congeduti, F.: Variable Integration Domain technique for Multichannel Raman  
5 Water Vapour Lidar Measurements, in: Reviewed and Revised Papers Presented at the 26<sup>th</sup> International Laser  
6 Radar Conference (ILRC 2012), Porto Heli (Greece, [25-29 June 2012](#)), A. Papayannis, D. Balis, V. Amiridis,  
7 Eds., published in Greece on behalf of the International Co-ordination Group for Laser Atmospheric Studies  
8 (ICLAS), 861-864, 2012; system description in Ref. 41

9 Dionisi, D., Keckhut, P., Courcoux, Y., Hauchecorne, A., Porteneuve, J., Baray, J. L., Leclair de Bellevue, J.,  
10 Vèrèmes, H., Gabarrot, F., Payen, G., Decoupes, R., and Cammas, J. P.: Water vapor observations up to lower  
11 stratosphere through the Raman lidar during the Maïdo Lidar Calibration Campaign, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 8,  
12 1425-1445, 2015.

13 Dirksen, R. J., Sommer, M., Immler, F. J., Hurst, D. F., Kivi, R., and Vömel, H.: Reference quality upper-air  
14 measurements: GRUAN data processing for the Vaisala RS92 radiosonde, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 7, 4463-4490,  
15 doi.org/10.5194/amt-7-4463-2014, 2014.

16 Draxler, R., and Hess, G.: An overview of the HYSPLIT\_4 modelling system for trajectories, dispersion, and  
17 deposition, *Aust. Meteorol. Mag.*, 47, pp. 295-308, 1998.

18 Gettelman, A., Hoor, P., Pan, L. L., Randel, W. L., Hegglin, M. I., and Birner, T.: The Extratropical Upper  
19 Troposphere and Lower Stratosphere, *Rev. Geophys.*, 49, RG3003, doi: 10.1029/2011RG000355, 31 pp., 2011.

20 Golubiatnikov, G. Y., and Krupnov, A. F.: Molecular constants of the ground state of oxygen (<sup>16</sup>O<sub>2</sub>) accounting  
21 for new experimental data, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 225, 222-224, 2004.

22 Han, Y., and Westwater, E. R.: Remote Sensing of Tropospheric Water Vapor and Cloud Liquid Water by  
23 Integrated Ground-Based Sensors, *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.*, 12, 1050-1059, 1995.

24 Hauchecorne, A., and Chanin, M.-L.: Density and Temperature Profiles Obtained by Lidar between 33 and 70  
25 km, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 7, 565-568, 1980.

26 Hegglin, M. I., Plummer, D. A., Shepherd, T. G., Scinocca, J. F., Anderson, J., Froidevaux, L., Funke, B., Hurst,  
27 D., Rozanov, A., Urban, J., von Clarmann, T., Walker, K. A., Wang, H. J., Tegtmeier, S., and Weigel, K.:  
28 Vertical structure of stratospheric water vapour trends derived from merged satellite data, *Nature Geoscience*, 7,  
29 768-776, 2014.

30 Hints, E. J., Weinstock, E. M., Anderson, J. G., May, R. D., and Hurst, D. F.: On the accuracy of in situ water  
31 vapor measurements in the troposphere and lower stratosphere with Harvard Lyman- $\alpha$  hygrometer, *J. Geophys.*  
32 *Res.*, 104, 8183-8189, 1999.

33 Hocke, K., and Martin, L.: Monitoring Atmospheric Water Vapour, International Space Science Institute, Bern  
34 (Switzerland), ISSI Scientific Reports Series, Vol. 10, Springer (New York, Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London),  
35 ISBN 978-1-4614-3908-0, 326 pp., 2013.

36 Höveler, K.: Entwicklung eines Nahbereichsempfängers zur Messung von Wasserdampf- und  
37 Temperaturprofilen für das Hochleistungs-Raman-Lidar am Schneefernerhaus, Masterarbeit, Karlsruher Institut  
38 für Technologie, Fakultät für Physik, 138 pp., 2015 (in German).

39 [Höveler, K., Klanner, L., Trickl, T., and Vogelmann, H.: The Zugspitze Raman Lidar: System Testing. 27<sup>th</sup>](#)  
40 [International Laser Radar Conference, New York City \(U.S.A., 5 to 10 July 2015\), B. Gross, F. Moshairy, M.](#)  
41 [Arend, Eds., Poster Session A2, „Lidar for Trace Gas Monitoring“, A2.8, EPJ Web of Conferences 199 \(2016\)](#)

Trupdwlnhufkjhvwwoow

1 [21004, 4 pp., DOI: 10.1051/epjconf/ 201611905008, http://www.epj-conferences.org/articles/epjconf/pdf/2016/](https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/201611905008)  
2 [14/epjconf\\_ilrc2016\\_05008.pdf.](https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/201611905008)

3 Hurst, D. F., Oltmans, S. J., Vömel, H., Rosenlof, K. H., Davis, S. M., Ray, E. A., Hall, E. G., and Jordan, A. F.:  
4 Stratospheric water vapor trends over Boulder, Colorado: Analysis of the 30 year Boulder record, *J. Geophys.*  
5 *Res.*, 116, D02306, doi: 10.1029/2010JD015065, 12 pp., 2011.

6 Hurst, D. F., Read, W. G., Vömel, H., Selkirk, H. B., Rosenlof, K. H., Davis, S. M., Hall, E. G., Jordan, A. F.,  
7 and Oltmans, S. J.: Recent divergences in stratospheric water vapor measurements by frost point hygrometers  
8 and the Aura Microwave Limb Sounder, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 9, 4447-4457, 2016.

9 Immler, F., Engelbart, D., and Schrems, O.: Fluorescence from atmospheric aerosol detected by lidar indicates  
10 biogenic particles in the lowermost stratosphere, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 345-355, 2005.

11 Jensen, E. J., Ackermann, A. S., and Smith, J. A.: Can overshooting convection dehydrate the tropical  
12 tropopause layer? *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D11209, doi: 10.1029/2006JD007943, 5 pp., 2007.

13 Johnston, J. E., and Broadfoot, A. L.: Midlatitude Observations of the Night Airglow: Implications to Quenching  
14 Near the Mesopause, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 21593-21603, 1993.

15 Kämpfer, N. (Ed.), Smit, H., Kivi, R., Paukkunen, A., Vömel, H., Jeannot, P., Youshkov, V., Nedoluha, G.,  
16 Haefele, A., De Wachter, E., Schneider, M., Demoulin, P., Sussmann, R., Notholt, J., Leblanc, T., Trickl, T.,  
17 Vogelmann, H., Braathen, G. O., Urban, J., Lambert, J.-C., International Space Science Institute, Bern  
18 (Switzerland), ISSI Scientific Reports Series, Vol. 10, ISBN 978-1-4614-3908-0, Springer (Berlin, Heidelberg,  
19 New York), 326 pp., 2013.

20 Khattatov, V., Yushkov, V., Kaplanov, M., Zaitzev, I., Rosen, J., and Kjöme, N.: Some results of water vapor,  
21 ozone and aerosol balloon borne measurements during EASOE, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 21, 1299-1302, 1994.

22 Kempfer, U., Carnuth, W., Lotz, R., and Trickl, T.: A wide range ultraviolet lidar system for tropospheric ozone  
23 measurements: development and application, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, 65, 3145-3164, 1994.

24 Kiehl J. T., and Trenberth, K. E.: Earth's Annual Global Mean Energy Budget, *Bull Am. Met. Soc.*, 78, 197-208,  
25 1997.

26 Klanner, L., Trickl, T. and Vogelmann, H.: On the Way to Combined DIAL and Raman-Lidar Sounding of  
27 Water Vapour on Mt. Zugspitze – a Progress Report, in: Reviewed and Revised Papers Presented at the 26<sup>th</sup>  
28 International Laser Radar Conference (ILRC 2012), Porto Heli (Greece, [25-29 June](https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/201217601026) 2012), A. Papayannis, D.  
29 Balis, V. Amiridis, Eds., published in Greece on behalf of the International Co-ordination Group for Laser  
30 Atmospheric Studies (ICLAS), 853-826, 2012.

31 L. Klanner, T. Trickl, H. Vogelmann, Water-vapour measurements up to the lower stratosphere — the high  
32 power Raman lidar at the Schneefernerhaus, 28<sup>th</sup> International Laser Radar Conference, Bucharest (Romania, [24-](https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/201817601026)  
33 [28 June](https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/201817601026) 2017), EPJ Web of Conferences, 176, 01026, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/201817601026>, 4 pp.,  
34 2018.

35 Klett, J. D.: Stable analytical inversion solution for processing lidar returns, *Appl. Opt.*, 20, 211-220, 1981.

36 Klett, J. D.: Lidar inversion with variable backscatter/extinction ratios, *Appl. Opt.*, 24, 1638-1643, 1985.

37 Kley, D., and E. J. Stone, E. J.: Measurement of water vapor in the stratosphere by photodissociation with Ly  $\alpha$   
38 (1216 Å) light, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, 49, 691-697, 1978.

39 Kneizys, F. X., Anderson, G. P., Shettle, E. P., Gallery, W. O., Abreu, L. W., Selby, J. E. A., Chetwynd, J. H.,  
40 and Clough, S. A.: Users guide to LOWTRAN 7, Rep. AFGL-TR-88-0177, Environ. Res. Pap., 1010, 1988.

1 Kreipl, S.: Messung des Aerosoltransports am Alpennordrand mittels Laserradar (Lidar), Dissertation, Friedrich-  
2 Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg (Germany), 195 pp., 2006; in German.

3 Kung, A.H., Trickl, T., Gershenfeld, N. A., and Lee, Y. T.: State-selective Detection of H<sub>2</sub> by 1 + 1 REMPI via  
4 the C <sup>1</sup>Π<sub>u</sub> (v' = 0, J') States, Chem. Phys. Lett., 144, 427-430, 1988.

5 Lacis, A. A., Hansen, J. E., Russell, G. L., Oinas, V., and Jonas, J.: The role of long-lived greenhouse gases as  
6 principal LW control knob that governs the global surface temperature for past and future climate change, Tellus  
7 B, 65, 19734, doi:10.3402/tellusb.v65i0.19734, 25 pp., 2013.

8 Leblanc, T., and McDermid, I. S.: Accuracy of Raman lidar water vapor calibration and its applicability to long-  
9 term measurements, Appl. Opt., 47, 5592-5603, 2008.

10 Leblanc, T., and McDermid, I. S.: Reply to “Comments on “Accuracy of Raman lidar water vapor calibration  
11 and its applicability to long-term measurements””, Appl. Opt., 50, 2177-2178, 2011.

12 Leblanc, T., McDermid, I. S., and Walsh, T. D.: Ground-based water vapor Raman lidar measurements up to  
13 upper troposphere and lower stratosphere for long-term monitoring, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 5, 17-36, 2012.

14 Leblanc, T., Sica, R. J., van Gijssel, J. A. E., Godin-Beekmann, S., Haeferle, A., Trickl, T., Payen, G., and  
15 Gabarrot, F.: Proposed standardized definitions for vertical resolution and uncertainty in the NDACC lidar ozone  
16 and temperature algorithms. Part 1: Vertical resolution, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 9, 4029-4049, 2016; 18-pp.  
17 supplement

18 Luo, B. P., Peter, T., Wernli, H., Fueglistaler, S., Wirth, M., Kiemle, C., Flentje, H., Yushkov, V. A., Khattatov,  
19 V., Rudakov, V., Thomas, A., Borrmann, S., Toci, G., Mazzinghi, P., Beuermann, J., Schiller, C., Cairo, F., Di-  
20 Donfrancesco, G., Adriani, A., Volk, C. M., Strom, J., Noone, K., Mitev, V., MacKenzie, R. A., Carslaw, K. S.,  
21 Trautmann, T., Santacesaria, V., and Stefanutti, L.: Ultrathin Tropical Tropopause Clouds (UTTCS): II.  
22 Stabilization mechanism, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 23, 1083-1091, 2003.

23 McDermid, I. S., Haner, D. A., Kleiman, M. M., Walsh, T. D., and White, M. L.: Differential absorption lidar  
24 systems for tropospheric and stratospheric ozone measurements, Opt. Eng., 30, 22-30, 1991.

25 Mieruch, S., Noël, S., Bovensmann, H., and Burrows, J. P.: Analysis of global water vapour trends from satellite  
26 measurements in the visible spectral range, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 8, 491-504, 2008.

27 Miloshevich, L. M., Vömel, H., Whiteman, D. N., Lesht, B. M., Schmidlin, F. J., and Russo, F.: Absolute  
28 accuracy of water vapor measurements from six operational radiosonde types launched during AWEX-G and  
29 implications for AIRS validation, J. Geophys. Res., 111, D09S10, doi: 10.1029/2005JD006083, 25 pp., 2006.

30 Mohr, P. J., Newell, D. B., and Taylor, B. N.: CODATA Recommended Values of the Fundamental Physical  
31 Constants: 2014, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg (Maryland, U.S.A.),  
32 <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1507.07956.pdf>, 11 pp., 2014.

33 Müller, R., Kunz, A., Hurst, D. F., Rolf, C., Krämer, M., and Riese, M.: The need for accurate long-term  
34 measurements of water vapor in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere with global coverage, Earth's  
35 Future, 4, 25-32, 2016.

36 Nedoluha, G. E., Bevilacqua, R. M., Gomez, R. M., Waltman, W. B., Hicks, B. C., Thacker, D. L., Russell III, J.  
37 M., Abrams, M., Pumphrey, H. C., and Connor, B. J.: A comparative study of mesospheric water vapor  
38 measurements from the ground-based water vapor millimeter-wave spectrometer and space-based instruments, J.  
39 Geophys. Res., 102, 16647-16661, 1997.

1 Peter, T., Luo, B. P., Wirth, M., Kiemle, C., Flentje, H., Yushkov, V. A., Khattatov, V., Rudakov, V., Thomas,  
2 A., Borrmann, S., Toci, G., Mazzinghi, P., Beuermann, J., Schiller, C., Cairo, F., Di Donfrancesco, G., Adriani,  
3 A., Volk, C. M., Strom, J., Noone, K., Mitev, V., MacKenzie, R. A., Carslaw, K. S., Trautmann, T.,  
4 Santacesaria, V., and Stefanutti, L.: Ultrathin Tropical Tropopause Clouds (UTTCS): I. Cloud morphology and  
5 occurrence, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 23, 1083-1091, 2003.

6 Paltridge, G., Arking, A., and Pook, M.: Trends in middle- and upper-level tropospheric humidity from NCEP  
7 reanalysis data, *Theor. Appl. Climatol.*, 98, 351–359, 2009.

8 Pan, L. L., Bowman, K. P., Shapiro, M., Randel, W. J., Gao, R. S., Campos, T., Davis, C., Schauffler, S., Ridley,  
9 B. A., Wei, J. C., and Barnett, C.: Chemical behavior of the tropopause observed during the Stratosphere-  
10 Troposphere Analyses of Regional Transport experiment, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D18110, doi:  
11 10.1029/2007JD008645, 13 pp., 2007.

12 Perrone, M. R., and Piccinno, V.: On the benefits of astigmatic focusing configurations in stimulated Raman  
13 scattering processes, *Opt. Comm.*, 133; 534-540, 1997.

14 Reichardt, J., Leinweber, R., and Schewe, A.: Fluorescing Aerosols and Clouds: Investigations of Co-existence,  
15 28<sup>th</sup> International Laser Radar Conference, Bucharest (Romania, [24-28 June 2017](#)), EPJ Web of Conferences  
16 176, 05010, <https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/201817605010>, 4 pp., 2018.

17 Rosenlof, K. H.: How Water Enters the Stratosphere, *Science*, 302, 169-170, 2003.

18 Ross, R.J., and Elliott, W. P.: Radiosonde-Based Northern Hemisphere Tropospheric Water Vapor Trends, *J.*  
19 *Climate*, 14, 1602–1612, 2001.

20 Rouillé, G., Millot, G., Saint-Loup, R., and Berger, H.: High-Resolution Stimulated Raman Spectroscopy of O<sub>2</sub>,  
21 *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 154, 372-382, 1992.

22 Scherer, M., Vömel, H., Fueglistaler, S., Oltmans, S. J., and Staehelin, J.: Trends and variability of midlatitude  
23 stratospheric water vapour deduced from the re-evaluated Boulder balloon series and HALOE, *Atmos. Chem.*  
24 *Phys.*, 8, 1391–1402, 2008.

25 Schmidt, G. A., Ruedy, R. A., Miller, R. L., and Lacis, A. A.: Attribution of the present-day total greenhouse  
26 effect, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, D20106, doi:10.1029/2010JD014287, 6 pp. 2010.

27 Shibata, T., Kobuchi, M., and Maeda, M.: Measurements of density and temperature profiles in the middle  
28 atmosphere with a XeF lidar, *Appl. Opt.*, 25, 685-688, 1986.

29 Sica, R. J., and Haefele, A.: Retrieval of temperature from a multiple-channel Rayleigh-scatter lidar using an  
30 optimal estimation method, *Appl. Opt.*, 54, 1872-1889, 2015.

31 Smit, H. G. J., Straeter, W., Johnson, B. J., Oltmans, S. J., Davies, J., Tarasick, D. W., Hoegger, B., Stubi, R.,  
32 Schmidlin, F. J., Northam, T., Thompson, A. M., Witte, J. C., Boyd, I., and Posny, F.: Assessment of the  
33 Performance of ECC-ozonesondes under Quasi-flight Conditions in the Environmental Simulation Chamber:  
34 Insights from the Jülich Ozone Sonde Intercomparison Experiment (JOSIE), *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D19306,  
35 doi:10.1029/2006JD007308, 18 pp., 2007.

36 Solheim, F., and Godwin, J. R.: Passive ground-based remote sensing of atmospheric temperature, water vapor,  
37 and cloud liquid water profiles by a frequency synthesized microwave radiometer, *Meteorol. Z.*, 7, 370-376,  
38 1998.

1 Solomon, S., Rosenlof, K. H., Portmann, R. W., Daniel, J. S., Davis, S. M., Sanford, T. J., and Plattner, G.-K.:  
2 Contributions of Stratospheric Water Vapor to Decadal Changes in the Rate of global warming, *Science*, 327,  
3 1219-1223, 2010.

4 Stein, A. F., Draxler, R. R., Rolph, G. D., Stunder, B. J. B., Cohen, M. D., and Ngan, F.: NOAA's HYSPLIT  
5 atmospheric transport and dispersion modeling system, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 96, 2059-2077, 2015.

6 Steinbrecht, W., Claude, H., Schönenborn, F., Leiterer, U., Dier, H., and Lanzinger, E., Pressure and  
7 Temperature Differences between Vaisala RS80 and RS92 Radiosonde Systems", *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.*,  
8 25, 909-927, 2008.

9 Stohl, A., and Trickl, T.: A textbook example of long-range transport: Simultaneous observation of ozone  
10 maxima of stratospheric and North American origin in the free troposphere over Europe, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104,  
11 30445-30462, 1999.

12 Stohl, A.: A 1-year Lagrangian "climatology" of airstreams in the Northern Hemisphere troposphere and  
13 lowermost stratosphere, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 7263-7279, 2001.

14 Stohl, A., Bonasoni, P., Cristofanelli, P., Collins, W., Feichter, J., Frank, A., Forster, C., Gerasopoulos, E.,  
15 Gäggeler, H., James, P., Kentarchos, T., Kromp-Kolb, H., Krüger, B., Land, C., Meloen, J., Papayannis, A.,  
16 Priller, A., Seibert, P., Sprenger, M., Roelofs, G. J., Scheel, H. E., Schnabel, C., Siegmund, P., Tobler, L., Trickl,  
17 T., Wernli, H., Wirth, V., Zanis, P., and Zerefos, C.: Stratosphere-troposphere exchange - a review, and what we  
18 have learned from STACCATO, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, 8516, doi:10.1029/2002JD002490, STA 1, 15 pp., 2003.

19 Trickl, T.: Upgraded 1.56- $\mu\text{m}$  lidar at IMK-IFU with 0.28 J/pulse", *Appl. Opt.*, 49, 3732-3740, 2010.

20 Trickl, T., and Wanner, J.: The dynamics of the reactions  $F + IX \rightarrow IF + X$  ( $X = \text{Cl}, \text{Br}, \text{I}$ ); a laser-induced  
21 fluorescence study, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 78, 6091-6101, 1983.

22 Trickl, T., and Wanner, J.:  $IF(A \rightarrow X, B \rightarrow X)$  chemiluminescence from the  $F + I_2F$  reaction, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 74,  
23 6508-6510, 1981; repeated with reduced noise: Trautmann, M., Trickl, T., and Wanner, J.:  $IF(A \rightarrow X, B \rightarrow X)$   
24 Chemiluminescence of Fluorine-iodide Systems in a Crossed Molecular Beam Experiment, in: "Selectivity in  
25 Chemical Reactions", NATO Advanced Science Institute Series, Series C (Mathematical and Physical Sciences),  
26 Vol. 245, Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Workshop in Bowes-on-Windermere (Great Britain), Sep. 7 to  
27 11, 1987, J. C. Whitehead, Ed., Kluwer Academic Publishers (Dordrecht, The Netherlands), 525-529, 1988;  
28 <http://www.trickl.de/NATO1988.pdf>.

29 Trickl, T., Proch, D., and Kompa, K. L.: Resonance-Enhanced 2 + 2 Photon Ionization of Nitrogen: The Lyman-  
30 Birge-Hopfield Band System, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 162, 184-229, 1993.

31 Trickl, T., Proch, D., and Kompa, K. L.: The Lyman-Birge-Hopfield System of Nitrogen: Revised Calculation of  
32 the Energy Levels, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 171, 374-384, 1995.

33 Trickl, T., Feldmann, H., Kanter, H.-J., Scheel, H. E., Sprenger, M., Stohl, A., and Wernli, H.: Deep  
34 stratospheric intrusions over Central Europe: case studies and climatological aspects, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10,  
35 499-524, 2010a.

36 Trickl, T., Kung, A. H., and Lee, Y. T.: A Pulsed Source of Cold Hydrogen and Hydrogen Clusters:  
37 Development and Extreme-ultraviolet Studies, *Appl. Phys. B*, 101, 321-335, 2010b; the detection sensitivity for  
38  $\text{H}_2$  was enhanced by orders of magnitude with respect to the  $1.7 \times 10^5 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  of Kung et al. (1988).

39 Trickl, T., Giehl, H., Jäger, H., and Vogelmann, H.: 35 years of stratospheric aerosol measurements at Garmisch-  
40 Partenkirchen: from Fuego to Eyjafjallajökull, and beyond, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 5205-5225, 2013.

1 Trickl, T., Vogelmann, H., Giehl, H., Scheel, H. E., Sprenger, M., and Stohl, A.: How stratospheric are deep  
2 stratospheric intrusions? *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 9941-9961, 2014.

3 Trickl, T., Vogelmann, H., Flentje, H., and Ries, L.: Stratospheric ozone in boreal fire plumes – the 2013 smoke  
4 season over Central Europe, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 9631-9649, 2015.

5 Trickl, T., Vogelmann, H., Fix, A., Schäfler, A., Wirth, M., Calpini, B., Levrat, G., Romanens, G., Apituley, A.,  
6 Wilson, K. M., Begbie, R., Reichardt, J., Vömel, H. and Sprenger, M.: How stratospheric are deep stratospheric  
7 intrusions into the troposphere? LUAMI 2008, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 8791-8815, 2016.

8 Trickl, T., Vogelmann, H., Ries, L., and Sprenger, M.: Very high stratospheric influence observed in the free  
9 troposphere over the Northern Alps – just a local phenomenon? *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 20, 243-266, 2020a.

10 Trickl, T., Neidl, F., Giehl, H., Perfahl, M., and Vogelmann, H.: Three decades of tropospheric ozone lidar  
11 development at Garmisch-Partenkirchen, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, AMT-2020-89, in press, 2020b.

12 U.S. Standard Atmosphere 1976, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Organization (NOAA), National  
13 Aeronautics and Space Administration, United States Air Force, NOAA-S/T 76-1562, U.S. Printing Office  
14 (Washington, D.C.), 227 pp., 1976.

15 Vaisala: Vaisala Radiosonde RS41 Measurement Performance, White Paper, Vaisala, Helsinki (Finland),  
16 [https://www.vaisala.com/sites/default/files/documents/WEA-MET-RS41-Performance-White-paper-](https://www.vaisala.com/sites/default/files/documents/WEA-MET-RS41-Performance-White-paper-B211356EN-B-LOW-v3.pdf)  
17 [B211356EN-B-LOW-v3.pdf](https://www.vaisala.com/sites/default/files/documents/WEA-MET-RS41-Performance-White-paper-B211356EN-B-LOW-v3.pdf), 28 pp., 2017.

18 VDI guide line 4210, Remote sensing, Atmospheric measurements with LIDAR, Measuring gaseous air  
19 pollution with the DAS LIDAR, Verein Deutscher Ingenieure (Düsseldorf, Germany), pp. 47, 1999.

20 Vèrèmes, H., Payen, G., Keckhut, P., Dufлот, V., Baray, J.-L., Cammas, J.-P., Evan, S., Posny, F., Körner, S.,  
21 and Bossert, P.: Validation of the Water Vapor Profiles of the Raman Lidar at the Maïdo Observatory (Reunion  
22 Island) Calibrated with Global Navigation Satellite System Integrated Water Vapor, *Atmosphere*, 10, 713,  
23 doi:10.3390/atmos10110713, 21 pp., 2019.

24 Vömel, H., Selkirk, H., Miloshevich, L., Valverde-Canossa, J., Valdés, J., Kyro, E., Kivi, R., Stolz, W., Peng,  
25 G., and Diaz, J. A., Radiation Dry Bias of the Vaisala RS92 Humidity Sensor, *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.*, 24,  
26 953-963, 2007a.

27 Vömel, H., David, D. E., and Smith, K.: Accuracy of tropospheric and stratospheric water vapor measurements  
28 by the cryogenic frost point hygrometer: Instrumental details and observations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D08305,  
29 doi: 10.1029/2006JD007224, 14 pp., 2007b.

30 Vömel, H., Naebert, T., Dirksen, R., and Sommer, M.: An update on the uncertainties of water vapor  
31 measurements using Cryogenic Frostpoint Hygrometers, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 9, 3755-3768, 2016.

32 Vogelmann, H., and Trickl, T.: Wide-range sounding of free-tropospheric water vapor with a differential-  
33 absorption lidar (DIAL) at a high-altitude station, *Appl. Opt.*, 47, 2116-2132, 2008.

34 Vogelmann, H., Sussmann, R., Trickl, T., and Borsdorff, T.: Intercomparison of atmospheric water vapor  
35 soundings from the differential absorption lidar (DIAL) and the solar FTIR system on Mt. Zugspitze, *Atmos.*  
36 *Meas. Tech.*, 4, 835-841, 2011.

37 Vogelmann, H., Sussmann, R., Trickl, T., and Reichardt, A.: Spatiotemporal variability of water vapor  
38 investigated using lidar and FTIR vertical soundings above the Zugspitze, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 3135-3148,  
39 2015.

1 Weinstock, E. M., Schwab, J. J., Nee, J. B., Schwab, M. J., and Anderson, J. G.: A cryogenically cooled  
2 photofragment fluorescence instrument for measuring stratospheric water vapor”, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, 61, 1413-  
3 1432, 1990.

4 Westwater, E. R.: The accuracy of water vapor and cloud liquid determination by dual-frequency ground-based  
5 microwave radiometry”, *Radio Sci.*, 13, 677-685, 1978.

6 Whiteman, D. N., Rush, K., Rabenhorst, S., Welch, W., Cadirola, M., McIntire, G., Russo, F., Adam, M.,  
7 Venable, D., Connell, R., Veselovski, I., Forno, R., Mielke, B., Stein, B., Leblanc, T., McDermid, S., and  
8 Vömel, H.: Airborne and Ground-based measurements using a High-Performance Raman Lidar, *J. Atmos.*  
9 *Ocean. Technol.*, 27, 1781–1801, 2010.

10 Whiteman, D. N., Venable, D., and Landulfo, E.: Comments on “Accuracy of Raman lidar water vapor  
11 calibration and its applicability to long-term measurements”, *Appl. Opt.*, 50, 2170-2176, 2011.

12 Wing, R., Hauchecorne, A., Keckhut, P., Godin-Beekmann, S., Khaykin, S., McCullough, E. M., Mariscal, J.-F.  
13 and d’Almeida, E.: Lidar temperature series in the middle atmosphere as a reference data set – Part I: Improved  
14 retrievals and a 20-year cross-validation of two co-located French lidars, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 11, 5531–5547,  
15 2018.

16 Yoshino, K., Esmond, J. R., Parkinson, W. H., Ito, K., and Matsui, T.: Absorption cross section measurements of  
17 water vapor in the wavelength region 120 to 188 nm, *Chem. Phys.*, 211, 387-391, 1996; erratum: *Chem. Phys.*,  
18 215, 429-430, 1997.

19 Zahn, A., Christner, E., van Velthoven, P. F. J., Rauthe-Schöch, A., and Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M.: Processes  
20 controlling water vapor in the upper troposphere/lowermost stratosphere: An analysis of 8 years of monthly  
21 measurements by the IAGOS-CARIBIC observatory, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 119, 11505-11525, doi:  
22 10.1002/2014JD021687, 2014.

23 Zöger, M., Afchine, A., Eicke, N., Gerhards, M.-T., Klein, E., McKenna, D. S., Mörschel, U., Schmidt, U., Tan,  
24 V., Tuijter, F., Woyke, T., and Schiller, C.: Fast in situ stratospheric hygrometers: A new family of balloon-  
25 borne and airborne Lyman- $\alpha$  photofragment fluorescence hygrometers, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104, 1807-1816, 1999.

26



1 **Table 1. Transmitter details**

2	Laser source	XeCl laser (Coherent, model Lambda SX)
3	Laser wavelength	307.955 nm
4	Maximum power (at 2.0 kV)	420 W
5	Stabilized power (all lines)	350 W
6	Single-line power	180 W
7	Line width	0.036 nm
8	Optimum spectral purity	99.5 %
9	Linear polarization	99.6 %
10	Pulse repetition rate	350 s <sup>-1</sup>
11	Raman shifted wavelength	353.144 nm
12	Maximum Raman conversion effi-	
13	ciency (f = 2.0 m, 40 bar, 350 s <sup>-1</sup> )	5 % with distorted alignment, otherwise 0 %
14	Second laser (starting 2018)	Nd:YAG (Continuum, model PL8020 Precision)
15	Wavelength	354.8123 nm (injection-seeded)
16	Pulse energy	160 mJ at 20 Hz repetition rate
17	Final beam expansion (f = 1.75 m)	5.7:1
18	Final beam dimensions	0.20×0.20 m <sup>2</sup>
19	Final beam divergence	≤ 0.5 mrad

20  
21

1 **Table 2: Receiver details**

2	Primary mirrors	0.13 m diameter, $f = 0.72$ m
3		0.50 m diameter, $f = 2.0$ m
4	Field of view	large telescope: about $0.8 \times 0.2$ mrad <sup>2</sup>
5	Detection wavelengths:	306.791 nm, 307.390 nm, 307.355 nm, 331.751 nm, 346.978 nm,
6		353.144 nm, 354.812336 nm <sup>a</sup>
7	Raman shifts:	Vibrational Q branch of H <sub>2</sub> O <sup>b</sup> : 3652 cm <sup>-1</sup> (centre of the stronger lines. Range
8		of Q-branch: 3628 to 3658 cm <sup>-1</sup> ( $\Delta\lambda = 0.36$ -nm)
9		nitrogen, Q <sub>6</sub> line (population peak) <sup>c</sup> : 2329.1821 cm <sup>-1</sup>
10		N <sub>2</sub> and O <sub>2</sub> rotational shifts: taken from references in footnotes c and d
11		hydrogen, Q <sub>1</sub> line <sup>e</sup> : 4155.2521 cm <sup>-1</sup>
12	Wavelength separation	polarization-sensitive beam splitters and interference filters ( <a href="#">Table 3</a> )
13		( $\Delta\lambda = 0.75$ nm f.w.h.m. for H <sub>2</sub> O, 0.25 nm otherwise)
14	PMTs	Hamamatsu R7400U-03, modified by RSV
15	Pre-amplifiers	Analog Modules, gain 1–10, bandwidth 4 MHz, sometimes used for H <sub>2</sub> O
16	Transient digitizers	Licel, 6 units, 12 bit, 20 MHz, ground-free input stages
17	Photon counting	FAST ComTec, 100 ps time bins, 7.5-m detection bins

18

19 (a) Measured during the project described by Vogelmann and Trickl (2008)

20 (b) Avila et al., 2004

21 (c) Trickl et al., 1993; 1995

22 (d) Rouillé, 1992; Golubiatnikov and Krupnov, 2004

23 (e) Bragg et al., 1982; Dickensen et al., 2013

24

25

1 **Table 3: Specifications of the polychromator optics**

2 **Broadband optics**

3 <b>Component</b>	4 <b>Diameter</b>	5 <b>Focal Length</b>	6 <b>or Wavelength</b>	7 <b>Comments</b>
8 f <sub>1</sub> lenses	75 mm	150 mm		
9 f <sub>2</sub> lenses	15 mm	17 mm		large telescope
	15 mm	30 mm		small telescope
45°-high reflectors	75 mm	all wavelengths		S and P polarization
45°-beam splitter 1	75 mm	308 nm		T = 99 % P (308 nm), T = 99-100 % P (> 325 nm) T = 94 % S (355 nm) R ≈ 99.8 % S (308 nm)
45°-beam splitter 2	75 mm	308 nm		T = 63 % S, R = 37 % S
45°-beam splitter 3	75 mm	308 nm		R = 100 % P (308 nm) T = 83 % P (332 nm) T ≈ 90 % P (347, 355 nm)
45°-beam splitter 4	75 mm	355 nm		T = 99 % P (332, 347 nm) R ≈ 99.8 % S (355 nm)
45°-beam splitter 5	75 mm	332 nm		R = 99.8 % P, T > 99 % P (347, 355 nm)
<del>45°-beam splitter 6<sup>a)</sup></del>	<del>75 mm</del>	<del>347 nm</del>		<del>R = 84 % P T = 99.3 % P (353 nm)</del>

<sup>a)</sup>No longer used since 2018, not shown in Fig. 9

25 **Narrow-band interference filters**


26 <b>Wavelength</b>	27 <b>Bandwidth</b>	28 <b>Maximum T</b>	29 <b>Maximum T</b>	30 <b>Producer</b>
[nm]	[nm]	(large telescope)	(small telescope)	
306.791	0.25	25 %	25 %	Materion Barr
307.390	0.15	27 %	25 %	Materion Barr
307.955	0.25	35 %	32 %	Materion Barr
331.751	0.25	52 %	43 %	Materion Barr
346.978	0.75	74 %	62 %	Materion Barr
353.144	0.25	43 %	34 %	Materion Barr
354.812	< 1.2	> 80 %		Alluxa

35 All diameters 50 mm

36  
37

1 Figures:


2



3 Fig. 1. Simulations of the backscatter signals for four wavelengths specified in the upper right corner; an average  
4 laser power at 308 nm of 200 W, a receiver diameter of 1.5 m, a detection efficiency of 10 %, a range bin of 200  
5 m and a measurement time of 1 h were assumed.


6

1




2 **Fig. 2.** Overview of the transmitter part of the UFS Raman lidar: The laser beam profile is expanded to a 36×36-  
3 mm<sup>2</sup> square shape by a  $f = -100$  mm –  $f = 250$  mm pair of cylindrical lenses (recently removed), sent down by a  
4 combination of two plane mirrors (rotating the polarization by 90°) before it is focussed into a vacuum cell  
5 (originally Raman shifter) 3.6 m long with a  $f = 1.75$  m lens (initially  $f = 2.0$  m). The beam diverges from the  
6 focal point is collimated by an  $f = 10$  m concave mirror and reaches the motorized beam-steering mirror in a  
7 vertical exit shaft outside the laboratory (not shown). Three apertures allow to control the beam pointing.

8




2 **Fig. 3.** Emission spectrum of a Coherent high-power XeCl laser in broadband operation (source: Coherent); the  
3 dashed red curve is the sum of three Gaussian lines with centres at 308.955 nm, 308.173 nm and 308.215 nm and  
4 full width at half maximum of 0.0357 nm.

5



2 **Fig. 4.** Top view of the modified Lambda SX laser system;  $36 \times 36\text{-mm}^2$  square apertures (A) are used for  
 3 protecting optical components from potential powerful reflections from accidentally rotated components. The  
 4 polarizer is oriented out of plane at Brewster's angle.


5  
 6



2 **Fig. 5.** Spectrum of the laser emission with almost optimized etalon angle; the laser was operated with 10 Hz  
3 repetition rate, 1.75 kV load voltage and 663 mJ (including the polarizer).  
4




1



2 **Fig. 6.** Optimized pulse energy as a function of the repetition rate (top) and load voltage (bottom); for  
3 comparison: The maximum pulse energy of the broadband laser as delivered is 1.25 J (at 2.0 kV and 300 Hz).  
4

1



2 **Fig. 7.** Receiver tower mounted on the terrace above the lidar laboratory: The tower is covered by a 4.2-m-  
3 diameter astronomical dome with a 1.5-m slit: The laser beam (violet) emerges from a former emergency shaft.  
4 The plane formed by the axes of the large telescope and the laser beam contains the section of the laser beam in  
5 the lower floor. This plane is perpendicular to the plane formed by the axes of the small telescope and the laser  
6 beam. Abbreviations:

7 BSM beam-steering mirror

8 PM: primary mirror


9 SM: secondary mirror

10 P: Polychromator

11 1, 2: belonging to far-field receiver, near-field-receiver, respectively


12 The two red arrows indicate the two entrances of the tower.

13




2 **Fig. 8.** Final polychromator design: The true orientation of the mounting plate (vertical) is rotated clockwise by  
 3 90°. The radiation cone from the telescopes (arrow) enters the polychromators from behind the plate as indicated  
 4 by the polarization dot next to the arrow. In detail:


- 5 EA: Entrance aperture with four adjustable blades (OWIS)  
 6 1: Beam splitter transmitting almost all P-polarized radiation (308-355 nm) and highly reflects the S-  
 7 polarized 308-nm radiation (Laseroptik)  
 8 2: 63%/37% beam splitter for S-polarized 308-nm radiation (Laseroptik)  
 9 3: Beam splitter reflecting all radiation at 308 nm and transmitting 83-91% of the longer-wavelength P  
 10 components (Laseroptik)  
 11 4: Polarizing beam splitter (Laseroptik)  
 12 5: Sharp-edged long-pass filter for P polarization reflecting about 99% at 332 nm and transmitting 99%  
 13 of the longer-wavelength components (Materion-Barr)  
 14 IF: Interference filters with bandwidths of 0.25 nm except for 307.39 nm (0.15 nm) and 347 nm (0.75 nm)  
 15 (Materion Barr, [354.84 nm](#): Alluxa)  
 16 IFB: Broadband interference filter transmitting between 330 and 355 nm with  $T = 85-90\%$  and blocking the  
 17 radiation outside this range by at least  $10^5$  (Semrock).  
 18 Lenses:  $f_1 = 150$  mm and  $f_2 = 18$  mm (large telescope),  $f_2 = 30$  mm (small telescope)  
 19 Detailed specifications: Table 3  
 20



2 **Fig. 409.** Comparison of consecutive measurements of the Raman lidar and DIAL at UFS on 25 April, 2013: the  
 3 sonde measurements at Munich (not shown) and Innsbruck strongly differ from those of the lidar systems. For  
 4 comparison, we show the densities corresponding to 20 % RH as calculated from the Munich radiosonde.  
 5  
 6




2 **Fig. 4-10.** 347-nm Raman backscatter signals as a function of the vertical distance above UFS, obtained during  
 3 the first hours on 1 July, 2015. Despite a high noise level of about 12 counts (square root of signal) the averaged  
 4 signal remains positive up to  $r = 19.7$  km. The averaged signal covers six decades, the peak signal being roughly  
 5 3 mV. The average laser pulse energy, 295 mJ, was low due to a contaminated cell window.  
 6  
 7




2 **Fig. 4211.** Water-vapour mixing ratio obtained for the measurement in Fig. 4511; the calibration is based on  
 3 looking at zones of best agreement below 7 km between the sonde data for Munich (1 CET), Innsbruck (4 CET)  
 4 and Hohenpeißenberg (6 CET). Just the Hohenpeißenberg (MOHp) results are displayed here because they agree  
 5 best with the lidar values above 11 km. 51-pt and 101-pt arithmetic-means smoothing was applied to the mixing  
 6 ratios derived from the photon-counting data at high altitudes, the corresponding VDI vertical resolutions are  
 7 specified in the legend.

8




2 **Fig. 4312.** Calibration of the measurements on 19 July 2018: The profile derived from the first measurement  
 3 agrees better with the 1:00 CET sonde data from Munich. The mixing ratios for the second measurement almost  
 4 coincides with those from the later sonde launch at the airport of Innsbruck. The average laser pulse energy was  
 5 380 mJ (300 Hz).  
 6




2 **Fig. 1413.** Comparison of the two lidar measurements on 19 July, 2018, and the Innsbruck sonde on a zoomed  
 3 scale: The lidar values agree well up to 18 km, ranging between 5 ppm and 12 ppm. The mixing ratio for the  
 4 radiosondes (presumably RS41) is much lower than that for the lidar in the stratosphere.  
 5






2 **Fig. 1514.** Nitrogen and water-vapour backscatter signals on 5 February 2019 as a function of the vertical  
 3 distance above UFS; The H<sub>2</sub>O backscatter profiles averaged over 151 7.5-m bins (i.e., raw data; VDI vertical  
 4 resolution: 562.5 m) become noisy at about 17 km (19.7 km a.s.l.). The laser pulse energy was just 360 mJ (300  
 5 Hz).


6  
7  
8  
9  
10



2 **Fig. 1615.** Vertical distributions of water-vapour derived from two measurements of the Raman lidar on 5  
 3 February 2019 together with those from the midnight Munich sonde and the CFH sensors; the CFH data in the  
 4 upper troposphere were used for calibration.  
 5




2 **Fig. 4716.** Zoomed portion of Fig. 20: The agreement between lidar and CFH is satisfactory up to almost 20 km.  
 3 Above this, the lidar values start wider excursions around the CFH mixing ratios.  
 4  
 5



2 **Fig. 4817.** 355-nm backscatter coefficients for a 355-nm measurement on November 16, 2018 together with the  
 3 smoothed combined analogue plus photon counting signal; the VDI vertical resolution of the smoothing  
 4 procedure is given in metres. Simulated backscatter signals calculated from the U.S. Standard Atmosphere  
 5 (1976) a combined radiosonde and NCEP profile are included for comparison.

6



2 **Fig. 4918.** Temperature profile from the measurement in Fig. 21, in comparison with data from the Munich 1:00  
 3 CET radiosonde, NCEP (13:00 CET), the MSIS model and MLS; the temperatures were retrieved from the lidar  
 4 signal by initializing the temperature at about 87 km using both the U.S. Standard and the MSIS values. Both  
 5 retrievals converge to the same curve within 15-20 km from the top. [The red dot shows the temperature from OH](#)  
 6 [airglow measurements at UFS by DLR.](#)