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ABSTRACT
Convective processes in the atmosphere over the Maritime Continent and their diurnal cycles have important repercussions for the circulations in the Tropics and beyond. In this work, we present a new dataset of precipitable water vapor (PWV) obtained from the Sumatran GPS Array (SuGAr), a dense network of GPS stations principally for examining seismic and tectonic activity along the western coast of Sumatra and several offshore islands. The data provide an opportunity to examine the characteristics of convection over the area in greater detail than before. In particular, our results show that the diurnal cycle of PWV on Sumatra has a single late-afternoon peak, while that offshore has both a mid-day and a nocturnal peak. The SuGAr data are in good agreement with GPS radio occultation data from the Constellation Observing System for Meteorology, Ionosphere, and Climate (COSMIC) mission, as well as with imaging spectrometer data from the Ozone Measuring Instrument (OMI). A comparison between SuGAr and the NASA Water Vapor Project (NVAP), however, shows significant differences, most likely due to discrepancies in the temporal and spatial resolutions. To further understand the diurnal cycle contained in the SuGAr data, we explored the impact of the Madden Julian Oscillation (MJO) on the diurnal cycle with the aid of the Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) model. Results show that the daily mean and the amplitude of the diurnal cycle appear smaller during the suppressed relative to the developing/active MJO phase. Furthermore, the evening/nighttime peaks of PWV offshore appear later during the suppressed phase of the MJO compared to the active phase.
1. Introduction

The island of Sumatra, or Sumatera in Indonesian, sits at the western edge of the Maritime Continent, an area situated between the Indian and the Pacific Ocean which also includes the Malay Peninsula, large islands, such as Java, Borneo, Sulawesi, New Guinea, and the Philippines, as well as a galaxy of smaller islands. The combination of easterly trade winds over the tropical Pacific Ocean and the relatively shallow seabeds between many of the islands makes the waters around the Maritime Continent some of the warmest on Earth, with values of sea surface temperature (SST) persistently above 300 K (Locarnini et al. 2013). Thus, the ocean around the Maritime Continent is also known as the Tropical, or Indo-Pacific Warm Pool.

Ramage (1968) was one of the first to recognize the importance of the Maritime Continent in the world’s climate. In essence, the abundance of atmospheric water vapor due to high SSTs facilitates the development of deep convection which, in turn, results in large amounts of latent heat release in the free troposphere, shaping the circulation in the Tropics and beyond (e.g., Neale and Slingo 2003). Despite this importance, Global Climate Models (GCMs) often display large errors when simulating the diurnal cycle in this region (Yang and Slingo 2001). The reasons may be ascribed to inadequately resolved complex topography and convective processes. Given the Maritime Continent’s remote impact over the planet, simulation errors can propagate on a global scale. A better understanding of the interaction among the diurnal cycle, convective activity, and large-scale circulation patterns, such as the Madden-Julian Oscillation (MJO), is therefore highly desirable.

More generally, the diurnal cycle of convection in the Tropics still represents a challenge. For example, GCMs tend to predict a peak of convection at midday over land, while observations suggest this happens in the late afternoon (e.g., Yang and Slingo 2001; Betts and Jakob 2002; Bechtold
et al. 2004; Dai and Trenberth 2004). This problem can have a number of repercussions, including on the calculation of the Earth’s radiation budget, given the importance of the relative phase between solar radiation and cloud cover. One reason for this early bias in precipitation could be that the onset of deep convection, or the transition from shallow to deep convection, in the models has inadequate dependence on mid-tropospheric humidity. From a conceptual point of view, the dynamical features that participate in the transition—updrafts, downdrafts, and cold pools—and how they interact are still the subjects of much study (e.g., Adams et al. 2013; Schlemmer and Hohenegger 2014; Feng et al. 2015a; Torri et al. 2015; Gentine et al. 2016; Schlemmer and Hohenegger 2016; Torri and Kuang 2016; Schiro et al. 2016; Grant and van den Heever 2016; Romps and Jeevanjee 2016; Adams et al. 2017; Drager and van den Heever 2017; Grant et al. 2018; Grant and van den Heever 2018; Haerter and Schlemmer 2018; Tian and Kuang 2019; Torri and Kuang 2019), and many questions still remain to be fully answered.

In the Maritime Continent, convection develops over the islands in response to diabatic heating at the surface and then propagates offshore (e.g., Houze et al. 1981; Yang and Slingo 2001; Qian 2008; Love et al. 2011; Peatman et al. 2014). In an observational study of convection in the northwest region of Borneo, Houze et al. (1981) hypothesized that the offshore propagation of convection was due to land-sea breezes. While this and similar ideas were considered by other authors (e.g., Zhou and Wang 2006; Qian 2008; Fujita et al. 2010, 2011; Wapler and Lane 2012), in a study on convection on the Panama Bight, Mapes et al. (2003) argued that sea breezes do not have the right speed nor the outward extent to explain the propagation of convection, and suggested that gravity waves were instead responsible. This hypothesis was used in the modeling study of Love et al. (2011) to explain the presence of nocturnal convection off the coasts of Sumatra, and was also considered by Hassim et al. (2016), who showed that gravity waves were important for
the propagation of convection generated over land off the coasts of Papua New Guinea during nighttime.

An important aspect of the diurnal cycle we will consider in part of this study is the complex interaction between the Maritime Continent diurnal cycle and the MJO (Madden and Julian 1971, 1972; Zhang 2005). The MJO is essentially a convectively active envelope that develops over the Indian Ocean and slowly propagates eastward. Because the MJO has such an important influence on the rainfall over the Maritime Continent (e.g., Tian et al. 2006; Suzuki 2009; Fujita et al. 2011; Oh et al. 2012; Hagos et al. 2016; Sakaeda et al. 2017; Kerns and Chen 2018), and, more generally, on the weather of the planet (see, among many others, Kiladis and Weickmann 1992; Mo 2000; Higgins et al. 2000; Higgins and Shi 2001; Bond and Vecchi 2003; Jones et al. 2004; Becker et al. 2011; Schreck et al. 2013; Thompson and Roundy 2013; Matsueda and Takaya 2015; Klotzbach et al. 2016; Zhou et al. 2016; Zheng et al. 2018; Tippett 2018; Barrett 2019), it is important to forecast the MJO accurately.

Upon reaching the Maritime Continent, some MJO events weaken and do not propagate further (e.g., Rui and Wang 1990; Salby and Hendon 1994; Zhang and Hendon 1997; Hsu and Lee 2005; Oh et al. 2013; Feng et al. 2015a; Vincent and Lane 2017). With few exceptions, GCMs are known to have relatively low skill in simulating the MJO (Inness et al. 2003; Inness and Slingo 2006; Kim et al. 2009; Jiang et al. 2015; Kim et al. 2018), particularly when crossing the Maritime Continent. Many GCMs tend to produce events that collapse too frequently while propagating through the Maritime Continent, an issue often referred to as the ”Maritime Continent prediction barrier” (e.g., Inness et al. 2003; Inness and Slingo 2006; Kim et al. 2016; Zhang and Ling 2017; Wang et al. 2018). Several studies have suggested that the strong diurnal cycle over the Maritime Continent might play an important role in creating this barrier (e.g., Neale and Slingo 2003; Peatman et al. 2014, 2015; Majda and Yang 2016; Hagos et al. 2016). Hagos et al. (2016), for example, showed
that removing the diurnal cycle of insolation led to a more coherent propagation of the MJO across the Maritime Continent.

Even general conclusions about interactions between the MJO and the diurnal cycle over the Maritime Continent often diverge (e.g., Sui and Lau 1992; Chen and Houze Jr 1997; Tian et al. 2006; Fujita et al. 2011; Rauniyar and Walsh 2011; Oh et al. 2012; Vincent et al. 2016). For example, Oh et al. (2012) used reanalysis data to show that the diurnal cycle of rainfall was weaker over the islands of the Maritime Continent and stronger over the ocean, during the mature stage of the MJO. On the other hand, Tian et al. (2006) analyzed data from the Tropical Rainfall Measurement Mission and reported an enhanced cycle of deep convective cloud amount during the mature stage of the MJO over both land and ocean. In an earlier paper, Sui and Lau (1992) reported that active periods of intraseasonal variability were associated with a diminished diurnal cycle of convection over the Maritime Continent. Similarly varying results were found examining the MJO impact on the phase of rainfall and cloudiness, with some authors documenting a change (e.g., Chen and Houze Jr 1997; Fujita et al. 2011; Rauniyar and Walsh 2011; Oh et al. 2012), while others found no significant differences (e.g., Tian et al. 2006; Suzuki 2009).

Precipitable, or column, water vapor has proven to be a particularly useful variable for studying tropical deep convection given its strong relationship with precipitation (Zeng 1999; Bretherton et al. 2004; Holloway and Neelin 2009, 2010; Lintner et al. 2011; Schiro et al. 2016), as well as a critical metric for models to replicate (Adams et al. 2013, 2017; Lintner et al. 2017). The PWV-precipitation relationship, observed essentially only over tropical oceans, is shown to be non-linear with precipitation increasing exponentially above a certain PWV threshold value (see e.g., Bretherton et al. 2004). A caveat should be kept in mind, however, that this relationship has been found to be weaker over coasts for rainfall associated with land-sea effects (Bergemann and Jakob 2016). Furthermore, PWV is readily available from radiosondes and different satellite platforms.
However, these observations are often not adequate for representing the convective diurnal cycle given their temporal and/or spatial resolution, availability only in clear-sky conditions, or being less reliable over land. Ground-based Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) or GPS-derived PWV is advantageous because it has high temporal resolution (~5 minutes) and is available under all-weather conditions (Bevis et al. 1992; Solheim et al. 1999). This manuscript examines the diurnal cycle of PWV obtained from a network of GPS stations situated on the west coast of Sumatra and on the archipelago of islands offshore.

Several previous studies of Maritime Continent convection have used GPS PWV data. For instance, field campaigns focusing on the diurnal cycle have been carried out (Wu et al. 2003, 2008; Realini et al. 2014). Fujita et al. (2011) conducted a longer term study, from 2005 to 2008, employing a network of 24 GPS stations and interpolated NCEP reanalysis meteorological data over Sumatra with the goal of assessing MJO effects on the diurnal cycle of convection in the Indian Ocean off the coasts of Sumatra. Compared with previous studies, the network employed here, the Sumatran GPS Array, is denser, with more stations over Sumatra. The data produced by this expanded network are better suited to shed light on the convective processes affected by the complex topography of Sumatra, on how convection propagates offshore over the ocean, and on how this is influenced by the MJO.

In Section 2, we will introduce the datasets used for this study and discuss the model setup for the simulations. In Section 3, we will present the main results from the SuGAr network, compare them with other datasets and model outputs, and discuss the differences revealed by the SuGAr data during different phases of the MJO. In Section 4, we will synthesize observational and modeling result to interpret our findings, from the perspective of the impact of the MJO on the diurnal cycle of PWV over Sumatra.
2. Methods and Data

In this section, we present the SuGAr GPS Array and the PWV obtained. Likewise, the PWV datasets employed from comparison purposes are described. Finally, the setup of the WRF numerical simulations and how the output was used to diagnose MJO phases are presented.

a. SuGAr GPS Array Data

The principal data employed here originate from 60 GPS stations called the Sumatran GPS Array (SuGAr; Feng et al. 2015b), established in 2002 in a collaborative effort between the Indonesian Institute of Science (LIPI) and the California Institute of Technology principally to monitor seismic and tectonic activity. The zenith total delay data produced (see following paragraph) are available with a temporal resolution of 5 minutes and can be converted to PWV. Although the majority of the stations are located on the archipelago to the west of Sumatra, many are at various heights on the island of Sumatra (Figure 2 (a)). The precise coordinates and the elevation of the stations can be found in Feng et al. (2015b). For this study, we will discuss results obtained with data from 45 stations from 2008 to 2013.

Delays in GPS signals due to the presence of atmospheric water vapor provide the basis for calculating PWV. Furthermore, given the relative insensitivity of L-band radio signals to cloud droplets and rainfall, GPS can provide all-weather PWV data (Solheim et al. 1999). It should be noted that the requirements necessary for measuring millimetric displacements in tectonic studies can be relaxed with minimal influence on the accuracy of GPS PWV, allowing for the expansion of GPS meteorological sites into logistically difficult places as well as decreasing costs (Rocken et al. 2005; Adams et al. 2011, 2015).

Specifically, PWV is calculated from the zenith total delay (ZTD), which represents the refractivity delay of the signal induced by constituent atmospheric gases, including water vapor (Bevis et al.
PWV was calculated from ZTD using GPS-Inferred Positioning System and Orbit Analysis Simulation Software (GIPSY-OASIS; https://gipsy-oasis.jpl.nasa.gov/), obtained from NASA JPL. In order to convert ZTD to PWV, surface pressure and temperature are necessary. These were obtained from the Integrated Surface Hourly (ISH) dataset (NCDC and AFCCC 2005) at 3-hour intervals. Given that these data do not necessarily coincide geographically with SuGAr stations, the nearest ISH site was chosen. To approximate changes in pressure and temperature given differences between the meteorological station height and the GPS antenna elevation, the hypsometric equation was used, and a lapse rate of 6.5 K km$^{-1}$ was applied. The corresponding 3-hour ZTD data were then converted into PWV with these adjusted pressure and temperature values. Results derived from these data were compared with the data sources described below.

b. COSMIC Radio Occultation Data

The GPS radio occultation (RO) provides high vertical resolution, all-weather vertical profiles of atmospheric water vapor globally. Data from Constellation Observing System for Meteorology, Ionosphere, and Climate (COSMIC; Kuo et al. 2004; Anthes et al. 2008) are employed in this study as a point of comparison with the SuGAr data. Several factors may affect the comparison. Firstly, COSMIC water vapor profiles have different horizontal and temporal coverage relative to ground-based GPS PWV, with typically one daily profile over a $400 \times 400$ km$^2$ area (Xie et al. 2018). Secondly, the path-length representative of the water vapor is on average over approximately 200 to 300 km (Kursinski et al. 1997; Ao et al. 2012), compared with the $\sim20$ km-diameter viewing cone of ground-based GPS (Adams et al. 2013). Another important caveat when using COSMIC, or radio occultation data in general, is that the presence of a moisture inversion over marine boundary layers, particularly in subtropical regions, can cause super-refraction, which
can bias the retrieved data (see e.g., Xie et al. 2006; Schröder et al. 2018). Regardless, COSMIC RO data can be compared with SuGAr data to check their consistency (see Section 3).

c. **OMI**

The Ozone Measuring Instrument (OMI) is onboard the NASA EOS-Aura satellite in a sun-synchronous orbit. It is an ultraviolet/visible imaging spectrometer that provides daily global observations around 13:30 local time. Although OMI was primarily designed to observe ozone, PWV data have been retrieved from the blue spectral range at a resolution of 13 km × 25 km (Wagner et al. 2013; Wang et al. 2016). This paper uses the latest version 4 OMI PWV available at NASA’s Aura Validation Data Center. OMI observations have a similar sensitivity for land and ocean, making them attractive to study the Maritime Continent. However, errors due to clouds can propagate into large errors in PWV. Thus, we adopt the recommended data filtering criteria by requiring cloud fraction to be smaller than 15% and cloud top pressure higher than 750 mb, in addition to spectral fitting root mean square less than 0.005 (Wang et al. 2019). Due to the frequent deep convective cloudiness of the Maritime Continent, a large portion of retrieved PWV values are filtered out.

d. **NVAP-M**

The NASA water V Apor Project (NVAP) is a global dataset created by combining water vapor retrievals obtained from different sources (Randel et al. 1996; Vonder Haar et al. 2012). Here, we utilize the data from the NASA Making Earth Science Data Records for Use in Research Environments (MEaSUREs) initiative, obtained by reprocessing and extending the original NVAP data (Vonder Haar et al. 2012), specifically, NVAP-M PWV, available from 1988 until 2009, with a horizontal and temporal resolution of 0.5° and 6 hours, respectively.
The ARW version of the Weather Research and Forecasting Model (WRF; Skamarock and Coauthors 2008), version 3.8.1, is used to compare its output with the PWV values retrieved from SuGAr, and to diagnose different phases of the MJO. WRF is a fully compressible non-hydrostatic model, offering many user-selected configurations and parameterization schemes, and is widely used in atmospheric process studies, such as the MJO (e.g., Wang et al. 2015; Hagos et al. 2016; Hassim et al. 2016; Vincent et al. 2016; Vincent and Lane 2017, 2018; Tan et al. 2018).

In this study, WRF is run in a two-way nested configuration, with an outer domain containing the tropical Indian Ocean and the Maritime Continent (20°N – 20°S; 48°E – 120°E) at 9 km horizontal resolution, and an inner domain focused on Sumatra (6°N – 6°S; 94°E – 107°E) at 3 km horizontal resolution. Variables are outputted every 3 hours in the outer domain and every 30 minutes in the inner one. There are 45 vertical levels, 8 of which are in the lowest 1 km, and the nominal top is at 20 hPa. Our setup follows Wang et al. (2015), differing only in the nested domain and the integration period. We conducted two simulations: the first, started on 1 January 2012 and run until 31 December 2012, to compare WRF with SuGAr; the second, from 1 September 2011 to 1 April 2012, mainly to compute the outgoing longwave radiation (OLR) field for MJO-index calculations. The second simulation allows us to investigate the effect of the MJO at temporal and spatial resolutions finer than those for SuGAr PWV. The shorter time period for the second simulation is because the MJO undergoes significant seasonal shifts in its location (Wheeler and Kiladis 1999).

For both simulations, the initial and boundary conditions, as well as SSTs, were provided by ERA-Interim reanalysis (Dee et al. 2011). Cloud microphysics were parameterized using the WRF Double Moment (WDM) scheme (Lim and Hong 2010), while radiative transfer was pa-
rameterized using the GCM version of the Rapid Radiative Transfer Model (RRTM) longwave radiation scheme (Iacono et al. 2008) and the updated Goddard shortwave scheme (Chou and Suarez 1994). Surface fluxes were computed using the Revised MM5 Monin-Obukhov scheme (Jiménez et al. 2012). The Unified Noah land-surface model (Chen and Dudhia 2001) was used to compute temperatures over land, the Yonsei University scheme PBL (YSU; Hong et al. 2006) to parameterize subgrid scale vertical turbulent mixing, convective processes were resolved explicitly by the model. For the first three days, horizontal winds were relaxed to the reanalysis values using spectral nudging with zonal wavenumber 0-4 and meridional wavenumber 0-2. No nudging was imposed after day 3. Rayleigh-damping was imposed in the top 7 km of the model to prevent reflection of gravity waves (Klemp et al. 2008).

To ensure that the model reproduces the passage of the MJO in a reasonably accurate manner, we compared the modeled precipitation rates diagnosed in the outer domain with those estimated by the Tropical Rainfall Measurement Mission (TRMM) 3B42 V7 Huffman et al. (2007). The TRMM data have a temporal resolution of 3 hours and a spatial resolution of $0.25^\circ \times 0.25^\circ$ degrees. Figure 1 (a) and (b) show, respectively, the Hovmöller diagrams of precipitation rate in WRF and TRMM data. Each panel was constructed by first averaging precipitation rates in the latitudinal band between 10 N and 10 S. In spite of some differences, the main features seen by TRMM, particularly the eastward propagation of a number of convective envelopes, are well reproduced. Together with a favorable comparison with SuGAr data to be discussed later, this provides confidence in the use of WRF to better understand how the MJO affects the diurnal cycle of PWV over the Maritime Continent.
f. Diagnosing MJO phases

Among the methods to diagnose MJO phases, we have opted for the all-season OLR-based index described in Kiladis et al. (2014). We computed the index using daily means of OLR simulated in the outer domain for the period from 1 October 2011 to 1 April 2012. In order to reduce the computational costs involved, we coarsened the model output by a factor of 4 in each horizontal direction. Following Kiladis et al. (2014), we also applied a 30-96 day bandpass filter to the eastward-only wavenumbers (including the zonal mean), and computed the 2 leading empirical orthogonal functions (EOFs) of the resulting field. Finally, the principal components associated with the EOFs were used to span a two-dimensional phase space where different octants represent 8 phases of the MJO cycle. As the analysis was on a relatively short simulation, we did not use a 121-day sliding time window to compute the MJO phases as in Kiladis et al. (2014).

3. Results

We begin by presenting the average diurnal cycle of PWV obtained from SuGAr, discussing the daily mean and the diurnal amplitude at various GPS stations. We then compare SuGAr data with PWV values obtained from other datasets: for COSMIC and OMI, we compare single measurements, whereas for NVAP-M we compare the average diurnal cycles. We also compare SuGAr PWV data with the numerical simulations. Finally, we analyze SuGAr data under the context of WRF-derived MJO phases to examine how the MJO affects the diurnal cycle of PWV over Sumatra.

a. The diurnal cycle

Given that the diurnal cycle from stations offshore often reveal a double-peak structure of different magnitudes, we first discuss the daily mean and the amplitude of the average diurnal cycle
of PWV (Figure 2 (a)) for every SuGAr station analyzed (Figure 2 (b)). Typical daily mean SuGAr PWV values are mostly between 50 mm and 55 mm for near-sea-level sites. The amplitude was computed as the difference between the maximum and minimum PWV of the averaged diurnal cycle. Stations along the coast of Sumatra have higher amplitudes, ranging between 2 and 5 mm, whereas those on the archipelago remain mostly under 2 mm. This result conforms with other studies, showing that the diurnal cycle is generally weaker over the ocean than over land (e.g., Gray and Jacobson 1977; Yang and Slingo 2001; Nesbitt and Zipser 2003).

Figure 2 (c) and (d) show, respectively, the daily mean and the amplitude of the diurnal cycle as a function of station altitude. There appears to be some weak correlation with height, although the relationship is debatable. The colors of the dots in (c) represent the distance of the corresponding SuGAr station from the coast of Sumatra, with negative values to the east, and positive to the west. While there is a clear difference in the amplitudes between stations along the west coast of Sumatra and those on the archipelago, the same does not hold for the daily means.

Figure 3 (a) shows the normalized average diurnal cycles for all SuGAr stations. The normalization was conducted for each station by first subtracting the minimum value of the average diurnal cycle and then dividing by the amplitude. The resulting normalized diurnal cycle ranges from 0 to 1 for each station. The profiles are colored according to the distance from the west coast of Sumatra, with brighter yellows indicating that the station is on Sumatra, and darker blue indicating the station is on one of the islands in the offshore archipelago. For convenience, we have picked a distance of 20 km from Sumatra’s west coast and divided stations in two groups: the first, called ”Archipelago”, contains all the stations lying west of the demarcating line; the second, called ”Sumatra”, those to the east. The thicker navy- and mustard-colored lines indicate the normalized average diurnal cycle representative of the two groups.
The diurnal cycle of the Sumatra group has a unimodal shape with a late afternoon peak, while that of the Archipelago groups is nearly semi-diurnal, with one peak around midday and the other late at night (e.g., Wu et al. 2003; Mori et al. 2004; Sakurai et al. 2005; Wu et al. 2008; Sakurai et al. 2009; Wu et al. 2009; Fujita et al. 2011; Kamimera et al. 2012; Yokoi et al. 2017). It is possible that a semi-diurnal pattern could result from averaging together a large number of diurnal cycles, where some stations have a diurnal cycle that peaks at noon and the rest a diurnal cycle that peaks at night. To investigate this, the power spectral density for each year and station is computed and shown in Figure 3 (b) and (c) for the Sumatra and the Archipelago stations, respectively. The curves are normalized by the 3-hour sampling frequency of the data. For Archipelago stations, the peaks in the spectrum at 24 and 12 hours are comparable, suggesting that semi-diurnal variations for the PWV are indeed present in the Archipelago PWV data.

In order to gain a better appreciation for how the diurnal cycle of PWV changes from the Sumatra to the Archipelago stations, we take advantage of the density of the SuGAr network by examining the transect SDKL-RNDG-PBLI-PBKR in the northern part of the domain (highlighted with red circles in Figure 2 (a)). The diurnal cycles averaged over the 5-year period are shown in Figure 4 (a). Due to the station elevation range—from 894.4 m for SDKL, near the city of Sidikalang, to -3.49m for PBLI, located on one of the Banyak islands—the mean of each curve is subtracted for easier visualization. The figure illustrates that the diurnal cycle of PWV has a progressively smaller amplitude and a later afternoon/evening peak as one goes from stations on Sumatra to those offshore.

From another perspective, Figure 4 (b) shows the corresponding ZTD values for the four stations filtered to remove anomalous data below 2,000 cm. The mean for each station has been removed as in Figure 4 (a). Figure 4 (b) shows that, even though the relationship between PWV and ZTD depends on local pressure and temperature in a non-trivial way, the amplitudes of ZTD become
smaller and the cycles show later peaks as one goes westward away from Sumatra. Moreover, compared with PWV data, the higher temporal resolution of ZTD is helpful for better illustrating the changes in the timing of the diurnal cycle with geographical location.

b. Comparisons with other datasets

In this section, we compare the SuGAr PWV with other datasets. Apart from being important in data validation, this procedure could be useful to calibrate datasets that have much broader spatial coverage and can be extended to the entire Maritime Continent.

1) COSMIC

COSMIC data have global coverage but are much more sparse than SuGAr data. We compared the datasets point by point: every time a COSMIC data point was within a radius of 1.5° degrees in latitude and longitude from a SuGAr station, it was matched with the SuGAr PWV closest in time. The co-location radius was based on the 300 km spatial resolution of COSMIC data (e.g., Kursinski et al. 1997).

All points satisfying this condition were collected, and a density matrix was constructed with a resolution of 2.5 mm in PWV, which means that the \((i, j)\) entry of the matrix contains the density of matches within 2.5 mm between the datasets. In order to convert the total number of matches to density, we normalized the counts by the square of the resolution, \(2.5 \times 2.5 \text{ mm}^2\). The result is shown in Figure 5 (a), where the one-to-one line is drawn for easier comparison. Overall, there is a good agreement, in spite of the scatter that can be partly attributed to the different resolution of the two datasets, and partly to topography.
2) OMI

OMI PWV retrievals are highly sensitive to clouds, which, for this study, implies many missing data due to cloud filtering. For this reason, as well as its once-a-day availability, we used the same method as for the COSMIC dataset and directly compared ‘coincident’ measurements. For each GPS station, the corresponding filtered Version 4 OMI data (Section 2c) within 0.25° degree latitude and 0.25° degree longitude was averaged. Because OMI measurements are made approximately at 13:30 local time, for each SuGAr station we have matched its values at 13:00 LST of the corresponding day, the closest to the OMI observational time. For points with matched local time, only OMI data with cloud fraction less than 15% were used to create Figure 5 (b). OMI and SuGAr compare reasonably well, up to approximately 50 mm. The agreement degrades for higher values of PWV. Over-estimation of PWV by OMI was noticed previously (Wang et al. 2016) and was attributed to the presence of clouds. A 5% cloud fraction cutoff is expected to decrease the discrepancy, but leaves few data pairs to analyze.

3) NVAP-M

Available from 1988 until 2009, NVAP-M has at best only two years of data overlap with SuGAr, particularly given that not all the SuGAr stations go back to 2008 (Feng et al. 2015b). Due to this limitation, we compared the average diurnal cycles for two time intervals: 1988–2009 for NVAP-M, and 2008–2013 for SuGAr, with the underlying assumption that no significant changes to the diurnal convective dynamics over Sumatra occurred between the two time intervals.

Because NVAP-M data has greater spatial and temporal coverage than COSMIC over the Sumatra region, we can reconstruct an average diurnal cycle for NVAP-M grids. As we did with SuGAr, we considered the daily mean as well as the amplitude of the time-averaged diurnal cycle. The results are shown in Figure 6 (a) and (b), where the values derived from the SuGAr stations are
represented by color points, and NVAP-M values are represented by the background colors; Figure 6 (c) and (d) show a point-to-point comparison between the SuGAr and NVAP-M daily means and amplitudes, respectively, for the grid box corresponding to each SuGAr station. The colors of the points in Figure 6 (c) and (d) correspond to the distance from the west coast of Sumatra, with positive values referring to points to the west of the coast and negative values to the east.

Figure 6 (a) and (c) indicate that the daily mean values diagnosed with SuGAr express a much smaller range than those from NVAP-M. In particular, while points on the archipelago of smaller islands seem to compare reasonably well, measurements over Sumatra show significant discrepancies. This could be related to the coarse resolution of NVAP-M and the significant topography over Sumatra. The colors in Figure 6 (a) indeed show a relatively sharp increase of PWV values going from the mountain chain in Sumatra towards the ocean, which suggests that these points are more prone to errors caused by coarse resolution, not properly representing sharp changes in elevation.

Figure 6 (b) compares the amplitudes derived from the two datasets. Figure 6 (d) indicates that the amplitudes compare better for Archipelago stations, but, as with the daily mean values, there are significant discrepancies for Sumatra stations.

To better appreciate the differences in the average diurnal cycles derived from these two datasets, Figure 7 (a) shows a comparison between the PWV average diurnal cycles along the transect described at the beginning of this section, the continuous lines representing values from SuGAr, and the dashed lines the values from NVAP-M. The SuGAr values are the same as in Figure 4. The values of NVAP-M are chosen from the grid box containing the SuGAr stations we wish to compare with. Because the SuGAr stations PBLI and PBKR correspond to the same NVAP-M grid box, only one curve (dashed violet) is shown for them. The NVAP-M results suggest a much smoother transition of PWV values from the mountainous zones towards the lower-lying points on the archipelago than SuGAr. Notice also that the phases of the diurnal cycles are not well
represented by NVAP-M. The dashed blue line shows a peak 6 hours later than the continuous, and the two-peak cycles in violet appear out of phase by 6 hours. Given that the NVAP-M has a temporal resolution of 6 hours, such discrepancies in phase are not too surprising.

4) WRF

We supplement our data analysis with a comparison between the SuGAr dataset and WRF. Following the same recipe as that for the NVAP-M data, we present the results in Figure 8: (a) and (c) show a comparison of the daily means, while (b) and (d) compare the amplitudes. The top panels, (a) and (b), show the values distributed geographically, with SuGAr stations represented by dots and WRF values as background colors; (c) and (d) show a point-to-point comparison, where values from each SuGAr station are compared with WRF values for the grid box corresponding to the position of the SuGAr station. The colors of the scatter-points in the bottom plots represent distance from Sumatra’s west coast, as in Figure 3.

Figure 8 (a) and (c) suggest that the daily means diagnosed from SuGAr are systematically higher than those simulated with WRF. The difference is approximately 2 mm for most stations, although for some it reaches 4 mm, particularly over Sumatra. Figure 8 (b) and (d) suggest that the diurnal cycle amplitudes simulated by WRF compare well with SuGAr observations. At larger values the difference is greater, but it is hard to discern given the fewer stations in those regimes.

Figure 9 is constructed in the same way as Figure 3, but for WRF results. The agreement between the two figures is quite good, although for Archipelago stations, the peaks at 24 and 12 hours in the power spectral density of SuGAr are of comparable magnitude, while those from WRF differ by a factor 3. Nevertheless, the average shapes of the diurnal cycles in Figure 9 (a) are very similar to those in Figure 3 (a). Good agreement in the shapes of the diurnal cycles between SuGAr and WRF can also be seen when comparing the values in the transect, as shown in Figure
7 (b). SuGAr stations are moister than the corresponding grid boxes in WRF, amplitudes for some stations appear greater than WRF, and phases seem overall well reproduced. This provides additional confidence when using WRF to study the processes that influence the diurnal cycle of PWV revealed by SuGAr.

Figure 10 represents the average diurnal cycle diagnosed using WRF along a portion of a longitudinal slice at latitude 1.48° S. The black line at the bottom represents the topography of Siberut island—scaled by a factor of 100— that the slice cuts through. The figure shows a series of peaks over Siberut between 13 and 16 LST, possibly the result of thermally forced convection over the island (e.g., Cronin et al. 2015; Wang and Kirshbaum 2015; Wang and Sobel 2017), while peaks of PWV over the ocean to the east and to the west of Siberut tend to happen late at night. Notice, however, that convection has a diurnal periodicity almost everywhere, except for those grid points along the coast of the island. Thus, it would seem intuitive to think that the coarser the resolution, the greater the area along the coast where a double-peaked diurnal cycle could be observed. This suggests that caution should be exercised before generalization of the finding that PWV has a semi-diurnal cycle for Archipelago stations: the semi-diurnal feature could alternatively be the result of the locations of the SuGAr stations and the effective resolution of 20 km—coarser than the WRF simulation—associated with the GPS data.

c. The diurnal cycle and the MJO

As explained in Section 2, we derived the all-season index of Kiladis et al. (2014) from the simulated OLR from 1 October 2011 to 1 April 2012. Figure 11 shows the filtered OLR anomalies at different phases of the MJO. Given that the MJO is a continuous process, there is some ambiguity in identifying precisely which is the active and which is the suppressed phase. For the purpose of this paper, we consider Phase 4 and 5 to be the active phase stage, and Phased 8 and 1 the sup-
pressed phases. We will refer to the phases in between as decaying (Phases 6 and 7) or developing (Phases 2 and 3).

For every station, we average all the diurnal cycles for the days within the same MJO phase. Figure 12 (a) and (b) show, respectively, the results for the Sumatra and Archipelago groups, with different colors indicating different phases of the MJO. For both groups, the largest values of PWV are observed during Phase 4 (active phase), and the lowest values are in Phase 8 (suppressed phase).

Figure 12 (c) shows the difference between the daily mean values during Phase 8 and those during Phase 4, and Figure 12 (d) shows the difference in amplitudes. The amplitude of the diurnal cycle is greater during the developing and active phases, and smaller during the suppressed phase. Stations along the west coast of Sumatra exhibit a particularly large change, from an average amplitude difference of almost 6 mm to less than 2 mm. Among these stations, the change is somewhat gradual as the convective envelope arrives and passes by.

The amplitude of the PWV diurnal cycle for Archipelago stations is also affected, although in a more complex way. As we have previously discussed, the amplitudes for Archipelago stations tend to be rather small, making disentangling the MJO signal from noise difficult. Comparing some of the developing/active phases with the suppressed phases, it appears that the nighttime peaks (1-4 LST) are larger in the former than in the latter scenarios. The peaks at midday appear less sensitive to MJO phases.

Finally, changes in the timing of PWV peaks are difficult to decipher given the relatively coarse resolution of 3 hours. For Sumatra stations, the peak of the diurnal cycle appears to shift from 22 LST in the suppressed phase to 19 LST in developing/active phases. Something similar seems to hold for Archipelago stations, whereby the nighttime peak tends to happen later in the day during the suppressed rather than the active MJO phase, while the midday peak does not appear to vary.
much, apart from some slight changes during Phases 7 and 8. Because the changes are of the same
order of magnitude as the temporal resolution of the SuGAr dataset, we follow up with a further
test. The same analysis is repeated for ZTD which has a higher temporal resolution: Figure 13
(a) and (c) confirm the shift forward of a few hours in evening peaks for the Sumatra stations
and nighttime peaks for the Archipelago stations as conditions advance from a developing/active
MJO phase to a suppressed one; however, the midday peaks for Archipelago stations vary little
throughout the different MJO phases.

Encouraged by the favorable comparison between SuGAr data and the WRF simulations, we
use WRF to investigate how the MJO affects the diurnal cycle of PWV. The panels of Figure 14
represent the diurnal cycles of the simulated PWV, averaged in the direction parallel to the Sumatra
coast, as a function of distance from the west coast of Sumatra, positive values being to the west,
negative to the east, averaged over the days of each MJO phase. For simplicity, we have subtracted
the diurnal cycles of PWV averaged over all simulated days in each panel. As seen for SuGAr,
the highest values of PWV occur during the development of Phase 4 and 5, whereas the lowest
values are seen during Phases 7 and 8. There are some slight differences in the other phases, but
otherwise WRF is able to capture the observed variations in PWV.

To shed light on the diurnal cycle during distinct MJO phases, Figure 15 compares the daily
mean and amplitude as in Figure 8 (c) and (d), where Figure 15 (a) and (c) refer to Phase 4 of the
MJO, while (b) and (d) to Phase 8. The panels concur with our previous results with mean values
and amplitudes generally being larger during the active Phase 4, and smaller during the suppressed
Phase 8. As in Figure 12, the simulated amplitudes for Sumatra stations are more affected by the
MJO relative to those of the Archipelago. While there appears to be reasonable agreement for both
diurnal cycle means and amplitudes during Phase 8, the panels for Phase 4 suggest the simulated
daily mean PWV values are lower than SuGAr PWV while the amplitudes are larger. Compared
with Figure 8 (c) and (d), there is greater scatter around the one-to-one line, although one should keep in mind that Figure 8 was constructed using data from an entire year, whereas Figure 15 for single MJO phases during a 6-month period.

To further illustrate the changes in simulated PWV values between different MJO phases, Figure 16 (a) shows the amplitudes diagnosed with WRF as a function of the distance from the coast and the different MJO phases. For stations within 50 km of the coast in both directions, amplitudes tend to maximize during the active Phase 4, consistent with the SuGAr observations. Between 50 and 100 km to the west of Sumatra’s west coast, where many Archipelago stations are located, the amplitudes display fairly large values also during Phase 3.

Changes in the timing of the diurnal cycle peaks can be seen in Figure 16 (b), where the PWV values are plotted as a function of local time and distance for Phase 4 in color, while those for Phase 8 in contours. Because the topography creates a strong gradient in PWV values, we limit the contours at 46 mm and the color bar at 52 mm for the figure. As we saw from the SuGAr data, the diurnal cycle of PWV appears to peak earlier in the day during the enhanced phase—the exact time depending on the location—than it does during the suppressed phase. At a distance between 0 and 100 km, the difference seems large enough that it could also be seen using a 3-hour resolution dataset. This supports our earlier finding that the peak time in the diurnal cycle of PWV changes with different phases of the MJO.

Figure 16 (c) and (d) represent the diurnal cycle of precipitation rate in WRF for Phase 4 and 8, respectively. The main difference is the presence of a coherent band of precipitation that starts propagating westward in the late afternoon and reaches a distance of 200 km from the coast at approximately 3 LST. This convective system also appears in Phase 3, but not in Phase 8, when precipitation appears to propagate westward more slowly and less coherently, possibly as a result
of unorganized convection over the ocean. This feature is also present in Figure 16 (c), although
the different range of the color bar makes it harder to appreciate.

4. Discussion

Given the complex topography of the Maritime Continent, a dense network of stations like
SuGAr that can provide high-temporal resolution, all-weather PWV, is highly valuable for under-
standing the interactions between convection and the larger-scale circulation (e.g., Bretherton et al.
2004; Peters and Neelin 2006; Holloway and Neelin 2009, 2010; Schiro et al. 2016; Schiro and
Neelin 2018). In this paper, we illustrate how SuGAr data can be used for this purpose, using a
transect of stations from the Barisan mountains to the small islands offshore of Sumatra almost
perpendicularly to the shoreline. The GPS network data are used to construct the average diurnal
cycles of PWV.

While Figure 4 (a) shows how the diurnal cycle changes progressively as we move offshore, it
is potentially influenced by the relatively low temporal resolution. ZTD data is available every 5
minutes, and, being proportional to PWV, they are analyzed to boost the confidence in the conclu-
sion drawn from the PWV data. The 3-hourly ISH meteorological variables limit the GPS PWV
temporal resolution. One way to address this problem is to interpolate the surface temperature and
pressure data used in the algorithm to convert ZTD to achieve a much higher resolution. However,
although PWV values retrieved from ZTD are not particularly sensitive to surface temperature,
they are more sensitive to surface pressure: for example, a 10 K temperature change would give a
difference roughly between 0.5 and 1.5 mm in PWV, a 10 mb pressure change can lead to changes
in derived PWV on the order to 3.5 mm. Thus, the result likely depends on the interpolation
method.
Our comparisons between datasets are encouraging. Both COSMIC and OMI PWV are linearly related to SuGAr PWV, although OMI data diverge at larger PWV due to cloud contamination. On the one hand, the comparison provides confidence in SuGAr PWV; on the other hand, it permits assessment of other datasets over the complex topography and island configuration of the Maritime Continent. Because both OMI and COSMIC have much broader spatial coverage than SuGAr, our study increases confidence in those datasets for regions broader than the one we have focused on. Our results suggest that caution should be exercised when using NVAP-M to study diurnal cycle in the Maritime continent region, as NVAP-M PWV values are significantly lower than SuGAr’s for Sumatra stations, and higher for Archipelago stations. The time of peak of the diurnal cycles also appears to differ from SuGAr. The coarser spatial and temporal resolutions of NVAP-M may have contributed to the discrepancies.

The SuGAr PWV contains important information about how the MJO interacts with the diurnal cycle of convection over the Maritime Continent. To our knowledge, many previous observational studies on the topic, with the exception of Fujita et al. (2011), either focused on a larger area, such as the entire Maritime Continent, or on specific campaigns that were limited in time to only a few MJO cycles. Given its density and long-term coverage, SuGAr PWV has the potential to provide the much needed metrics for models to replicate, as well as intensive case studies for single sites or transects, as we have demonstrated. This paper serves to motivate more in-depth future studies using the SuGAr data. In particular, ongoing work with the SuGAr data and WRF simulations is being conducted to understand the underlying physical mechanisms that explain why the diurnal cycle of PWV is significantly modulated by the MJO.

In comparing our results with the previous literature, one should keep in mind that Maritime Continent studies range widely in the observational techniques used, time period examined, and the geographical area studied. To our knowledge, Fujita et al. (2011) is the one most comparable to
this paper in terms of the data used and the study area. Our work differs from Fujita et al. (2011) in several aspects. We used more GPS stations in the area, compared against other datasets, analyzed the details of the shape and timing of the diurnal cycles, raised/tested a couple of hypotheses about the diurnal cycles. Both our and their papers examine the effect of MJO on diurnal cycle.

Figure 13 (b) and (d) show the anomalies of ZTD computed with respect to the mean of each MJO phase. The plots are similar to Fig. 6 of Fujita et al. (2011), where the deviations from the mean PWV for each MJO phase were presented, the main differences being that we are considering a different variable and that also has higher temporal resolution.

Figure 13 (d) is possibly the most immediately comparable to Fujita et al. (2011) since it is based on GPS stations placed in similar locations in the archipelago to the west of Sumatra. The midday/early afternoon positive anomalies have a similar behavior to those observed by Fujita et al. (2011). They tend to occur earlier in the day during the active phase, and later during the suppressed phase of the MJO. Likewise, the troughs appear earlier during the active phase, and there are no significant variations across MJO phases. A similar behavior is observed for stations on Sumatra, with ZTD peaking earlier in the day during the active phase of the MJO. Finally, Fujita et al. (2011) showed that the late afternoon/evening peaks in PWV happen later in the day during the active phase, while we observe only a slight shift of the peaks of ZTD and earlier in the day.

5. Conclusions

In this study, we have presented a new dataset of PWV measurements obtained from a GPS network called SuGAr, whose stations are located along the west coast of Sumatra and on the smaller islands offshore. This dataset could be considered as an expansion of that used in Fujita et al. (2011), with the addition of many stations on the island of Sumatra, and an overall greater
density of stations. Interested in how this dataset could be used to better understand the diurnal
cycle of PWV, we have examined the daily means and amplitudes of the diurnal cycle for each
station between 2008 and 2013. As expected, the mean correlates well with the altitude of the
station, while the amplitudes decrease progressively from Sumatra to the islands offshore. We
have then discussed the peaks of the average diurnal cycles, observing that the average profile for
stations over land tended to have a single peak at 19 LST, while the stations offshore tended to
have two peaks, one at 13 LST, and the other at 1 LST.

We also compared the values of PWV obtained from SuGAr with those retrieved from other
datasets for validation. Radio occultation data acquired from COSMIC were matched with the
corresponding values from the closest SuGAr station. We found relatively good agreement, in spite
of the scarcity of COSMIC data over Sumatra for the period of interest. We conducted a similar
comparison with PWV values obtained from the visible spectra of OMI, and found reasonable
agreement with SuGAr when PWV is below about 50 mm. The discrepancy at higher values is
likely due to the high sensitivity of OMI to clouds.

A comparison followed with NVAP-M PWV. In this case, the spatial coverage was much larger
than for the other two missions, but NVAP-M only has data from 1988 until 2009, so we com-
pared average diurnal cycles in the same location as SuGAr stations from different time periods.
Agreement between the two datasets was poorer than other two comparisons. The daily means
diagnosed from NVAP-M have a much wider range than those from SuGAr, from which they di-
verged substantially for coastal stations on Sumatra. Moreover, amplitudes from NVAP-M were
much larger than those calculated from SuGAr, especially for stations over Sumatra. We suspect
the poor agreement between the two datasets is related to the coarse resolution of NVAP-M, which,
combined with the complex topography of Sumatra, could lead to large discrepancies.
We further analyzed the observed diurnal cycle with the aid of WRF. The model provides accessibility to non-observables on regular grid at higher resolutions than the data, opening up the possibility of gaining a deeper understanding of the underlying processes. Overall, the simulations capture the most pronounced features in the observed diurnal cycle for the purpose of this study. Specifically, though the simulated mean values are lower by a few mm for most stations, the simulated amplitudes aligned well with the observations, especially for stations on the offshore archipelago.

The phases of the diurnal cycles were also rather well captured by WRF: on average, values co-located with SuGAr stations over Sumatra had a single peak at about 19 LST, while the averaged diurnal cycle for the locations offshore had double-peaked structure as SuGAr stations also exhibited. A closer examination of the island of Siberut led us to speculate that the double peak could be a combination of having stations along the coast of the smaller islands to the west of Sumatra and of having a coarse spatial resolution of 20 km: the peak at 1 LST could be due to the offshore propagation of the moist convection developed over Sumatra, while the peak at 13 LST could be a result of convection over Siberut.

We investigated how the MJO modulates the diurnal cycle of PWV for the period between 1 October 2011 and 1 April 2012. Starting from the OLR field computed through a WRF simulation for the time period of interest, we distinguished 8 MJO phases, and we averaged diurnal cycles of PWV for each phase. Our results show that the largest values of PWV are obtained in the developing and active phase of the MJO, while the lowest PWV are seen during suppressed phases. Stations over the island experience large variations of amplitudes, with the highest during the active phases, and the smallest during the suppressed ones. Amplitudes seemed affected also for stations on the archipelago, although to a lesser extent given that these stations have smaller amplitudes. In the suppressed phase, there also seems to be a shift in the peak: for the stations
over Sumatra, the peak moves from 19 LST in the active phase to 22 LST in the suppressed phase.

Similar changes seemed to happen for stations on the archipelago.
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