The influence of non-static sea ice on Antarctic and Southern Ocean numerical weather prediction

Zhaohui Wang^{1,1}, Alexander D. Fraser^{2,3}, Phillip Reid^{4,4}, Richard Coleman^{1,1}, and Siobhan O'Farrell^{5,6}

¹University of Tasmania
²Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems Cooperative Research Centre
³Australian Antarctic Program Partnership, Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia.
⁴Australian Bureau of Meteorolgy
⁵CSIRO Ocean and Atmosphere
⁶CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Aspendale, Victoria, Australia.

December 7, 2022

Abstract

Although operational weather forecasting centers are increasingly using coupled atmosphere-ocean-ice models to replace atmosphereonly models for short-term (10 days) weather forecasting, the influence of sea ice on such forecasting has yet to be fully quantified, especially in the Southern Ocean. To address this gap, a polar-specific version of the Weather Research and Forecasting model (Polar WRF) is implemented within a circumpolar Antarctic domain to investigate the impact of daily-updates of sea ice concentrations on short-term weather forecasting. Apart from some steep plateau regions adjacent to the Antarctic continental margin, Polar WRF shows good forecast skill in Antarctic surface variables. A statistically significant improvement in nearsurface temperature and humidity is shown from +96 hours to +192 hours when assimilating daily sea ice concentration into the model. Improvements in model performance are enhanced during July through September, which is a period of late sea ice advance. Regionally, model improvements are shown to encompass almost all sea ice regions, although marked in the Ross and Weddell seas sectors. The surface heat budget balance also shows remarkable improvement in outgoing radiative heat fluxes and both sensible and latent heat fluxes after 48 hours. Our results demonstrate the non-negligible effect of including daily-updates of sea ice concentrations in numerical weather forecasting, and endorsing the necessity of a fully coupled atmosphere-ocean-ice model in operational high-latitude Southern Hemisphere weather forecasting.

The influence of non-static sea ice on 1 **Antarctic and Southern Ocean** 2 numerical weather prediction 3 4 5 Zhaohui Wang¹, Alexander D. Fraser^{1,2}, Phil Reid^{3,2}, Richard Coleman^{1,2}, and 6 Siobhan O'Farrell⁴ 7 8 9 ¹ Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Tasmania, 10 Australia. ² Australian Antarctic Program Partnership, Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, 11 University of Tasmania, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia. 12 ³ Australian Bureau of Meteorology, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia. 13 ⁴ CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Aspendale, Victoria, Australia. 14 15 16 Corresponding author: Zhaohui Wang (zhaohui.wang@utas.edu.au) 17 18

ABSTRACT

20 Although operational weather forecasting centres are increasingly using global coupled 21 atmosphere-ocean-ice models to replace atmosphere-only models for short-term (10-day) 22 weather forecasting, the influence of sea ice on such forecasting has yet to be fully quantified, especially in the Southern Ocean. To address this gap, a polar-specific version of the Weather 23 24 Research and Forecasting model is implemented within a circumpolar Antarctic domain to 25 investigate the impact of daily updates of sea-ice concentration on short-term weather 26 forecasting. A statistically-significant improvement in near-surface atmospheric temperature 27 and humidity is shown from +48 hours to +192 hours when assimilating daily sea-ice 28 concentration into the model. Improvement in model performance is enhanced from July to 29 September, which is the period of late sea-ice advance. Regionally, model improvement is 30 shown to occur in most sea-ice regions, although the improvement is strongest in the Ross 31 Sea and Weddell Sea sectors. The surface heat balance also shows remarkable improvement 32 in outgoing radiative heat fluxes and both sensible and latent heat fluxes after 48 hours. This 33 research demonstrates the non-negligible effect of including daily updates of sea-ice 34 concentration in numerical weather forecasting and indicates the necessity of implementing a 35 fully coupled atmosphere-ocean-ice model in operational high-latitude southern hemisphere 36 weather forecasting.

37

SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

38 Antarctic sea ice plays important key roles in modulating Southern Ocean weather and 39 climate processes. Accurate representation of sea-ice properties is one of the keys for improving predictive skill in polar atmospheric forecasts. However, sea-ice representation is 40 41 relatively basic in widely-used global and regional forecast models, with static sea ice 42 properties throughout the forecast. Hence, we used a polar-optimised weather forecasting 43 model to evaluate the impacts of including daily updated sea-ice concentrations on short-term 44 weather forecasting. We found the forecast skill of near-surface temperature and humidity 45 show the most significant improvements. This indicates that it is important to include non-46 static sea ice in Antarctic short-term operational weather forecasting.

47 **1. Introduction**

Atmospheric numerical weather prediction (NWP) is the primary tool used for real-time
forecasting of short-term weather conditions (generally out to +10 days). NWP is achieved
using an atmospheric model which employs a number of dynamic/thermodynamic governing

51 equations, numerical computing methods and appropriate parameterisations of some physical 52 processes (Phillips 1971). NWP provides forecasts of the fundamental atmospheric variables, 53 such as temperature, winds, surface pressure and precipitation for the next several days (Mass 54 and Kuo 1998). Many countries' operational weather services run global NWP models, 55 however, results from these models are often regionally downscaled to higher-resolution 56 (spatial and temporal) forecast models (or limited-area models, LAMs) that are better able to 57 represent localised fine-scale meteorological conditions. LAMs typically nest within a global 58 model which provides the boundary conditions for larger spatial scale guidance.

59

60 Weather forecasting in the polar regions presents extra complexities in comparison to midand lower-latitudes (Jung and Matsueda 2016). Forecast guidance obtained from NWP 61 62 models is generally better at lower latitudes rather than at the poles, with strong interannual 63 variability in performance over high latitudes (Jung et al. 2016). This is particularly true in 64 the Antarctic region (Powers et al. 2012). Model initialisation over Antarctica and the 65 Southern Ocean is problematic, given the sparsity of in-situ observations. Polar-orbiting 66 satellites provide the potential for improving our observational base, but with these 67 observational systems there are difficulties in distinguishing surface features, such as snow 68 and ice-covered surfaces. Given that NWP is an "initial value problem" (Al-Yahyai et al. 69 2010), a lack of observational data is considered one of the prime reasons for poor model 70 performance in these regions. However, distinct and fundamental polar processes, which are 71 not necessarily included in global models, also add to the complexity and possible poor 72 model performance over the Antarctic (Wilby and Wigley 1997). For example, global NWP 73 models are tuned to simulate mid-latitude planetary boundary layers. However, Antarctica 74 has a very shallow and stable boundary layer which is difficult to simulate in global NWP 75 models. Such high-latitude processes can best be represented in a regional model (Tastula et 76 al. 2012).

77

An example of a regional model that is specifically designed to simulate atmospheric processes over Antarctica is the Antarctic Mesoscale Prediction System (AMPS), which is used in support of the U.S. Antarctic Program. AMPS is based on the polar-optimised version of the Weather Research and Forecasting model (Polar WRF) and provides a real-time atmosphere forecast product in six Antarctic domains, ranging from the entire Antarctic region with a 24 km grid size, to the McMurdo regional area with ~1 km grid resolution (Powers et al. 2012). The AMPS project shows improved performance, compared to global 85 NWP models, in providing forecast guidance for air, land and sea transportation and

86 navigation purposes in the Antarctic region. Aside from providing operational forecasts,

87 Polar WRF is often used in research to better understand polar-specific atmospheric

88 processes, for example the atmospheric boundary layer dynamics (Vignon et al. 2018),

- 89 Antarctic cyclonic activities (Pezza et al. 2016; Uotila et al. 2011) and katabatic winds (Wille
- 90 et al. 2017).
- 91

92 Another process important in the polar regions is cryosphere interactions – in particular, 93 interactions involving sea ice. Sea ice plays a key role in the Antarctic weather and climate 94 system as a modulator of atmospheric processes and ocean-ice-atmosphere interaction 95 (Massom & Lubin, 2006; Simpkins et al., 2012). Antarctic sea ice is characterised by strong seasonality, changing dramatically from ~ 19 million km² at maximum in late September 96 97 (austral late winter/early spring peak) to ~ 3 million km² at minimum in late February (austral 98 late summer trough) each year (Parkinson 2019; Eayrs et al. 2019). Over a 10-day timescale, 99 sea ice is highly dynamic, and in 2018, which is the year that this study focuses on, the 100 largest magnitude of 10-day sea-ice extent retreat can change by up to around 3 million km² 101 (Figure 1). Sea ice has an insulative effect between the relatively warm ocean and cold 102 atmosphere, and its presence or absence highly modifies heat and momentum exchange and 103 water vapour transport (Cassano et al., 2016; Massom and Stammerjohn 2010), especially 104 when snow-covered. The presence of sea ice and snow cover also significantly modulates 105 both the longwave and shortwave radiation balance due to its high albedo surface and its 106 much lower surface temperature than the open water (Thorndike et al. 1975). 107



Figure 1: Sea-ice concentration on the 26th of December 2018 (blue shading), and the sea-ice
edge on the 17th (red dashed line) and 26th (solid blue line) of December, illustrating a
period of rapid retreat.

108

113 Because of its key role in modulating weather and climate processes, accurate representation 114 of sea ice is an important variable to improve predictive skill in polar atmospheric forecasts. However, many global NWP models still use a static sea-ice cover - one where the 115 116 representation of sea ice remains fixed as a slab of constant thickness and fixed concentration 117 -- for the duration of the forecast. Some operational weather services are developing fully 118 coupled NWP systems, where the atmospheric model is coupled to an ocean/sea-ice model 119 (Smith et al. 2018; Day et al. 2022). Coupled regional modelling over the Arctic is being 120 developed and is showing some skill (Smith et al. 2013, 2021). Because global NWP models

121 do not have atmospheric polar modifications, it is difficult to quantify the impacts on an

- 122 improved atmospheric forecast performance, or otherwise, on the inclusion of Antarctic-
- 123 specific sea-ice coverage within a coupled global NWP model. At this stage there is no
- 124 operational, fully coupled regional model optimised for the Antarctic region.
- 125

126 The impact of non-static (in this case, daily-updated) Antarctic sea-ice concentration distribution on the synoptic-scale performance of a regional model over a circum-Antarctic 127 128 domain is investigated. We objectively quantify how the inclusion of an updating sea-ice 129 field within a polar-optimised model might improve short-term weather forecasts over 130 Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. In particular, the focus of the study is to: a) explore 131 whether or not forecast accuracy increases when non-static sea ice is implemented in the 132 Polar WRF model; b) characterise how errors propagate in space and time when using the unrealistic (static) sea-ice representation; c) determine which time period (e.g., sea-ice 133 134 advance, retreat, etc.) shows the greatest improvement when non-static sea-ice representation 135 is implemented in this atmospheric regional model; d) spatially characterise the forecast 136 improvement when a daily-updated sea-ice concentration field is prescribed; and e) determine 137 why these improvements happen, i.e., are the improvements ascribed to radiation, heat flux, 138 or other parameters? By answering these questions, a detailed analysis of the effects of non-139 static sea ice in an atmospheric model will be given. The results provide the impetus to move towards operational regional coupled modelling and provide a baseline against which to 140 141 compare future model performance.

142

143 **2. Methods**

144 The main objective is to investigate how the addition of a daily-updated sea-ice field in an

- 145 Antarctic-specific atmospheric regional circulation model may improve, or otherwise, model
- 146 forecast performance at a synoptic scale. The research domain covers the entire Antarctic
- 147 region, including the region of maximum sea-ice extent (Figure 2), using a polar
- 148 stereographic projection. Domain corners reach 30° S while the latitude at the midpoints of

- 149 the outer boundaries reaches 45° S. The experiment is based on the year 2018, which was the 150 most complete calendar year of sea-ice coverage at the start of this experiment.
- 151



Figure 2: The Polar WRF domain used for this study. Sectors are based on the widely usedregions for sea ice analysis (Zwally et al. 2002).

- 155
- 156 a. Data
- 157 The fifth-generation atmospheric reanalysis of the European Centre for Medium-Range
- 158 Weather Forecasts (ERA5; Hersbach et al., 2020) is used for forecast evaluation. ERA5
- 159 provides hourly atmospheric reanalysis data at a high spatial resolution (0.25° x 0.25°). The
- 160 regional NWP model used here (described below) requires initial and lateral boundary

161 conditions, such as wind, temperature, geopotential height and relative humidity. Boundary 162 conditions are obtained from ERA5 and updated every six hours. Surface boundary 163 conditions of sea-ice concentration and sea surface temperature are optional fields for use in 164 the regional model used here. For consistency between the initial and boundary conditions, 165 six-hourly sea-ice concentration distribution is also taken from ERA5, itself based on the 166 EUMETSAT Data Center (EDC) Ocean and Sea Ice Satellite Application Facility (OSI SAF) 167 operational dataset, although this field only updates once per day (in line with the underlying 168 dataset). In both the model experiments described below, sea surface temperature (SST) is 169 updated from ERA5 every six hours. For the lower boundary conditions, the elevation data 170 are obtained from the Radarsat Antarctic Mapping Project Digital Elevation Model (RAMP-171 DEM; Liu et al., 2001) with a horizontal spatial resolution of 1 km.

172

173 The use of reanalysis data as the reference to evaluate model performance is not an ideal 174 situation, particularly over Antarctica, due to the inherent biases in reanalysis model (Zhu et al. 2021; Tetzner et al. 2019). However due to the difficulties associated with validation of 175 176 modelled products in this region characterised by a lack of observational data, this evaluation 177 method is commonly used in operational verification (e.g., Eerola 2013; Schroeter et al., 178 2019). While comparison with observational data at Antarctic and mid-latitude stations can 179 provide a more independent validation, observational station data in Antarctica are relatively 180 sparse and have limitations for verification of spatial variability (Ebert et al. 2013). Also, due 181 to the site-specific nature of station data, stations may not be representative of grid cells, 182 especially at coastal sites. Thus, in this study, ERA5 is treated as the "real world" reference 183 when comparing to Polar WRF model output, with the acknowledgement that this situation is 184 not ideal.

185

186 ERA5 is basically an assimilation scheme with short-term forecasts for some selected 187 variables. It is important to understand the limitations and advantages of using ERA5 as a 188 forecast comparison. Previous research has widely validated ERA5 over Antarctica. Zhu et 189 al. (2021) suggests that ERA5 is appropriate for climatological studies of Antarctic near-190 surface temperatures. By validating with automatic weather station (AWS) observations, 191 Tetzner et al. (2019) suggests that ERA5 represents the magnitude and variability of near 192 surface temperature and wind regimes with high accuracy over the Antarctic Peninsula. Dong 193 et al. (2020) found that ERA5 has the best performance for magnitude and internal variability 194 of near-surface wind speed simulation among the six recent global reanalysis products that

195 they compared. However, there also exist conflicting studies: Roussel et al. (2020) found that

196 ERA5 has a high bias in precipitation simulations, and the seasonal cycles are not well-

197 reproduced in Antarctica. With these studies as background, we use ERA5 as a reference

198 noting the various possible issues.

199 *b. Model*

200 Polar WRF is a modification of the Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) model aimed 201 to better represent polar processes (Skamarock et al. 2008; Hines and Bromwich 2008). The 202 WRF model is developed and maintained by the USA National Center for Atmospheric 203 Research (NCAR) and other collaborative organisations, which is commonly used for 204 atmospheric research ranging from large eddy-resolving to global scale and has wide 205 applications (Skamarock et al. 2019). Polar WRF is developed and maintained by The Ohio 206 State University's Polar Meteorology Group (PMG) as a code supplement to the standard 207 WRF model (Hines et al. 2015). The Polar WRF model has been widely-used in both the 208 Arctic and Antarctic to better understand polar-specific atmospheric processes, for example, 209 atmospheric boundary layer dynamics (Vignon et al. 2018), the Ross Ice Shelf air stream

210 (Seefeldt and Cassano 2012) and katabatic winds (Nigro and Cassano 2014).

211

212 Polar modifications to the standard WRF model include polar-specific improvements to the 213 longwave flux, emissivity and freezing point of polar sea water, and thermal conductivity of 214 the permanent snow and ice exceeding 20 cm in depth (Bromwich et al. 2013). In addition, 215 fractional sea-ice concentration, which can be input from external datasets, is now coupled 216 into the standard WRF model since WRF Version 3.1 (Skamarock et al. 2008). Furthermore, 217 the sea-ice thickness, sea-ice/snow albedo and the snow depth can also now be specified as an 218 input (e.g., from the US National Snow and Ice Data Center; Hines et al., 2015). The main 219 modification of Polar WRF is optimising the Noah LSM for better representation of snow and 220 sea-ice processes and heat transfer in polar regions (Bromwich et al. 2009).

221

The choice of physics parameterisation used within this study are mainly based on the latest practice used by the PMG, which has been tested as a mature and appropriate physical scheme combination for operational Antarctic NWP. The Morrison double-moment scheme (Morrison et al. 2009) is selected as the microphysics option. The Kain-Fritsch (KF) scheme (Kain 2004) is implemented for cumulus cloud parameterisation and updated at every model time step. For radiation schemes, the Rapid Radiative Transfer Model for GCMs (RRTMG; 228 Clough et al., 2005) is chosen as the parameterisation for both shortwave and longwave 229 radiation. This parameterisation shows an improved radiation performance in polar regions 230 compared to the prior version (Hines et al. 2015). The shortwave and longwave radiation fields are updated every 30 minutes. We use the Mellor-Yamada-Nakanishi-Niino Level 2.5 231 232 PBL scheme (MYNN; Nakanishi and Niino 2006) for the planetary boundary layer and 233 update at every time step. The Nakanishi and Niino PBL's surface layer scheme (Nakanishi 234 and Niino 2006) is used as the corresponding atmospheric surface layer. The land surface 235 scheme is the Unified Noah Land Surface Model (Chen and Dudhia 2001) with polar 236 optimisation modified by the PMG (Hines and Bromwich 2008). Previous research has 237 shown that a higher model top pressure layer (i.e., representing a higher altitude) gives a 238 better representation of gravity wave propagation (Bromwich et al. 2005), so an upper model 239 top pressure value of 3 hPa was used for this study. A staggered vertical grid on 71 full-n 240 levels is set up on WRF hybrid vertical coordinates from the sea surface to 3 hPa with 241 vertical velocity damping within the top 8 km of the model to enhance vertical stability. Sea-242 ice albedo and thickness are set to uniform, circumpolar values of 0.8 and 1 m respectively, 243 recommended by Xue et al. (2022). Snow depth on sea ice was initialised to 5 cm following 244 Valkonen et al. (2014). It can be increased or decreased by precipitation or melting during the 245 simulation but always maintains a value of at least 5 cm. Table 1 describes the main schemes 246 and parameters that were implemented in the Polar WRF model configuration.

Model version	Polar WRF 4.1.1
Vertical coordinate	WRF hybrid vertical coordinate
Vertical resolution	71 levels up to 3 hPa. Vertical velocity damping is applied in the
	top 8 km
Horizontal grid	330 x 349 grid for the whole Antarctic region
Horizontal resolution	30 km grid cell size
Sea ice	ERA5 0.25° sea-ice fraction
Initial and boundary	ERA5 0.25° reanalysis with 6-hourly intervals
conditions	
Terrain field	1 km Radarsat Antarctic Mapping Project Digital Elevation Model
	(RAMP-DEM)
Longwave/shortwave	Rapid Radiative Transfer Model for GCMs (RRTMG)
Radiation	

Boundary layer	Mellor-Yamada-Nakanishi-Niino Level 2.5 PBL scheme (MYNN)
Surface layer	Nakanishi and Niino PBL surface layer scheme (MYNN)
Land surface option	Unified Noah Land Surface Model (LSM) with Polar optimisation
Microphysics	Morrison double-moment scheme
Cumulus	Kain-Fritsch (KF)
parameterisation	
Spin up	First 24 h used as model spin-up time
Time step	60 seconds; not adaptive

Table 1: Overview of the main physical schemes and parameters of Polar WRF used in theexperiments.

250

251 Figure 2 shows the Polar WRF domain used for this study. As briefly described above, it is a single domain with a polar stereographic projection, centred at the South Pole. The model 252 253 domain has a 30 km horizontal resolution with 330x349 grid points, covering the entire 254 Antarctic sea-ice zone at maximum extent (approximately matching the spatial coverage of 255 the National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC) southern hemisphere polar stereographic 256 projection). Ideally the domain would encompass the entire southern hemisphere. However 257 the polar-specific boundary layer physics used within Polar WRF are inconsistent with the 258 relatively turbulent boundary layers found over mid-latitude land masses (Edwards et al. 259 2020).

260

261 We compared two model experiments over a 10-day forecast period: (a) static sea ice 262 (denoted *PWstatic*); and (b) daily-updated sea ice (denoted *PWupdate*). Each experiment is 263 initiated approximately every five days in 2018 for the whole year, i.e., runs initiated on the 264 1st, 6th, 11th, 16th, 21st, 26th of each month, covering all phases of sea-ice advance and 265 retreat within one calendar year. Prior to each 10-day forecast, a spin-up for 24 hours was 266 performed to allow thermal-dynamic balance to be achieved, following Bromwich et al. 267 (2013) and Wilson et al. (2011). Previous research has shown that the planetary boundary layer in Antarctic regions requires at least 12 hours spin-up time to reach quasi-steady state 268 269 (Parish and Cassano 2003), and Hines & Bromwich (2008) found minimal difference 270 between a 12-hour and 24-hour spin-up for Polar WRF. Considering that a relatively long 271 forecast (10 days) is performed in this study, a 24-hour spin-up time is chosen, i.e., a total of 272 11 days model running period in each case. To ensure that all the meteorological conditions 273 are identical between the two experiments after spin-up, all the parameterisations and

- initial/boundary conditions stay the same, including the sea-ice concentration and SST
- 275 updates, throughout the first 24 hours (spin-up). All 24-hour spin-ups are discarded in the
- 276 following analysis.
- 277

Following a case study comparing the results of nudging and non-nudging experiments, the
nudging technique was not implemented in this study, because its influence on error
propagation is not in line with our experimental aims. A detailed discussion about nudging
versus non-nudging is given in Appendix A.

282 c. Evaluation

283 The two model experiments are evaluated by comparing hourly forecast output from Polar 284 WRF against hourly ERA5 data for several surface and near-surface variables, as well as on 285 pressure levels throughout the atmosphere. Key parameters at the near-surface level, such as 286 the 10 m winds (U10m/V10m) and 2 m air temperature (T2m) and dewpoint (TD2m), are 287 compared hourly throughout the 10-day forecast period. On pressure levels, geopotential 288 height, U (eastward) and V (northward) winds, temperature, and relative humidity at 37 289 levels are selected to investigate the upper-level model performance. The ERA5 data are 290 interpolated to the same grid as the Polar WRF model output using spline interpolation. 291

292 Four commonly used validation metrics are chosen for evaluation: mean error (ME;

293 commonly referred to as "bias"), mean absolute error (MAE), root-mean-squared error

294 (RMSE) and the Pearson's correlation coefficient (CORR). The statistical relationship

between WRF output and ERA5 is measured by CORR. Trends are not removed in our

analyses because the time periods are too short to include climate trends. The diurnal cycle is

also not removed because the cycle is an important assessment aspect in this study.

298 **3. Results and discussion**

299 a. Model performance and quality control

300 The annual average model forecast performance using updated sea ice (*PWupdate*) for the

301 five near-surface variables and three assessment metrics is shown in Figure 3. The RMSE,

302 MAE and bias of the variables are calculated in the first 48 hours (after spin-up) of each

303 forecast period against ERA5, then these variables are averaged for the 72 forecast periods to

304 provide an annual-average performance. For T2m, the performance is found to be very good 305 over the Southern Ocean (as expected due to regular updating of SST), with <1 K MAE and 306 RMSE. Relatively larger errors are observed over the Antarctic continent. The model tends to overestimate (positive bias) T2m around the Transantarctic Mountains $(1 \sim 4 \text{ K})$ and 307 308 underestimate along the Antarctic coast $(1 \sim 5 \text{ K})$. TD2m has a similar tendency but shows 309 lower errors on the Antarctic continent and slightly larger RMSE over the Southern Ocean. 310 These validation metrics are broadly similar to previous studies (Valkonen et al. 2014; Hines et al. 2019), where the RMSE in T2m is $1.7 \sim 2.8$ K (Valkonen et al. 2014) and $2.0 \sim 2.7$ K 311 312 (Hines et al. 2019), respectively. The errors obtained within the first 48 hours of the forecast 313 period shows the model has the ability to accurately represent the near-surface temperature 314 and humidity. The Polar WRF-simulated surface pressure (PSFC) corresponds well to that of 315 ERA5 on the Antarctic continent, even though noise is present, with a relatively large difference between Polar WRF-simulated and ERA5 surface pressure around the Antarctic 316 317 continent coastlines and other regions with steep orography. This noise appears to be partly 318 caused by the spline interpolation method used to interpolate the ERA5 pressure to the WRF 319 grid. The generally accurate simulation of PSFC indicates that Polar WRF can simulate 320 synoptic-scale pressure systems. U10m and V10m also show good agreement with ERA5. 321 U10m is underestimated (negative bias) along coastal regions (by $1 \sim 2$ m/s), while V10m is 322 slightly overestimated by a similar magnitude. The magnitude of errors (MAE and RMSE) of 323 near-surface winds are smaller than 3 m/s throughout almost the entire domain. 324 325



326

Figure 3: Model validation results showing the annual average bias, MAE and RMSE in
T2m, TD2m, PSFC, U10m and V10m. These metrics are calculated using the *PWupdate*experiment output against the ERA5 reanalysis. The metrics were calculated using 72 model
runs (throughout 2018) for the first 48 hours of each forecast period (after spin-up).

b. Influence of updating sea ice on the near-surface variables

333 Following the above validation, which indicated that this configuration of Polar WRF is appropriate for addressing the aims of this study, the *PWupdate* and *PWstatic* experiments are 334 335 compared with ERA5 reanalysis for the near-surface variables (Table 2). Of all the surface 336 variables, T2m and TD2m show the most significant improvement when daily-updated 337 fractional sea ice is implemented. Figure 4 shows the difference of RMSE for T2m and 338 TD2m between the simulations with updated sea ice and static sea ice, which were averaged 339 across the 72 model runs. In almost all sea-ice regions during the first six days, the *updating* 340 of sea ice has a positive impact on the T2m and TD2m forecasts. For many regions, the 341 difference becomes statistically significant (99% confidence level) immediately, with marked 342 improvement in the Ross Sea, Weddell Sea, and a part of the Indian Ocean sector. The 343 improvement in the seasonal average of T2m (Figure 5 a) is mainly contributed between June and September, corresponding to the period of late sea-ice advance (Figure 5 d). Updated sea-344 ice concentration values appear to make a useful contribution to the model during this period 345 346 of intense heat transfer from the ocean to the atmosphere. TD2m results also indicate

- 347 significant improvements when using updated sea ice (Figure 4 f j). The regional pattern of
- 348 TD2m is very similar to that of T2m.
- 349



350

Figure 4: The difference (*PWstatic* minus *PWupdate*) of annual average RMSE for T2m, TD2m and PSFC between Polar WRF with updated sea ice (*PWupdate*) and static sea ice (*PWstatic*) when compared with ERA5 reanalysis data. The metrics were calculated from the average of 72 model runs during 2018 (without spin-up) for every 48-hour forecasts. Here red shading indicates that updated sea ice outperforms static sea ice. Stippled areas indicate statistical significance at the 99% level.

358 Figure 4 also shows the influence of updated sea ice on PSFC (bottom row). Unlike the 359 temperature and humidity variables, the improvement for PSFC appears to be spatially 360 mixed, but with overall improvement of results (Table 2). The impacts are not statistically 361 significant (99% confidence level) until day 9 to 10 of the forecast period (Figure 4 o), while distinct improvements can be seen in T2m and TD2m within one-to-two days (Figure 4 a and 362 363 f). From the day 5 to 6 averaged RMSE, some small improvements are found in the 364 Bellingshausen Sea, Ross Sea, and Weddell Sea, although the impacts are not statistically 365 significant. Two regions of reduction in performance over the sea-ice region of the Weddell Sea sector and the Antarctic continent in the Western Pacific Ocean sector are visible from 366 day 5 to 6 (Figure 4 m). After this time, regions of positive and negative modifications 367

368 gradually expand towards the open ocean and the Antarctic continent during day 7 to 8

- 369 (Figure 4 n). Table 2 shows that *PWupdate* generally has a slightly smaller domain-averaged
- 370 RMSE of PSFC than the *PWstatic*.



373 Figure 5: (a) Hovmöller diagram of domain-averaged RMSE difference (PWstatic minus 374 *PWupdate*) south of 60° S for T2m between *PWstatic* and *PWupdate* compared with ERA5. 375 Here red indicates that *PWupdate* outperforms the simulation with *PWstatic*. The x-axis 376 represents the forecast time of each experiment and the y-axis represents the initiation date of 377 each forecast experiment. (b) Time series (across the year 2018) of the mean RMSE difference of each forecast period from the Hovmöller diagram. Positive values indicate that 378 379 the simulation with PWupdate outperforms PWstatic. (c) Time series (across the forecast 380 period) of the mean RMSE difference (*PWstatic* minus *PWupdate*). The blue shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval using bootstrap sampling from the 72 model runs. 381 Panel (d) shows the changes of sea-ice extent (SIE) and sea-ice area (SIA) over each 10-day 382 383 forecast period.

384

385 The near-surface wind forecast shows slight improvement in the *PWupdate* experiment

- 386 (Table 2). Table 2 indicates that U10m and V10m have smaller or similar domain-averaged
- 387 RMSE values (south of 60° S) for nearly every day in the first 10 days of forecasts, except
- 388 the zonal wind speed in the day 7 to day 8 average, where *PWstatic* shows a 0.01 m/s smaller
- 389 RMSE.
- 390

Day 1-2 mean	Day 1-2 mean	mean				Day 3-	t mean			Day 5-6	mean			Day 7-8	mean			Day 9-10) mean	
AVE Bias RMSE CORR AVE Bias RMSE	ias RMSE CORR AVE Bias RMSE	RMSE CORR AVE Bias RMSE	CORR AVE Bias RMSE	AVE Bias RMSE	Bias RMSE	RMSE		CORR	AVE	Bias	RMSE	CORR	AVE	Bias	RMSE	CORR	AVE	Bias	RMSE	COR
berature (K)																				
-16.61 -16.58	-16.58	-16.58	-16.58	-16.58					-16.61				-16.61				-16.62			
-16.59 0.02 3.22 0.96 -16.21 0.37 4.18	0.02 3.22 0.96 -16.21 0.37 4.18	3.22 0.96 -16.21 0.37 4.18	0.96 -16.21 0.37 4.18	-16.21 0.37 4.18	0.37 4.18	4.18		0.911	-16.08	0.54	5.13	0.849	-15.94	0.67	5.89	0.784	-16	0.62	6.31	0.738
-16.56 0.05 3.24 0.959 -16.17 0.41 4.22	0.05 3.24 0.959 -16.17 0.41 4.22	3.24 0.959 -16.17 0.41 4.22	0.959 -16.17 0.41 4.22	-16.17 0.41 4.22	0.41 4.22	4.22		0.907	-16.01	0.61	5.17	0.842	-15.86	0.75	5.93	0.776	-15.85	0.77	6.34	0.726
it temperature (K)	e (K)																			
-19.98	-19.94	-19.94	-19.94	-19.94					-19.98				-19.97				-19.98			
-19.77 0.21 3.22 0.951 -19.36 0.57 4.36	0.21 3.22 0.951 -19.36 0.57 4.36	3.22 0.951 -19.36 0.57 4.36	0.951 -19.36 0.57 4.36	-19.36 0.57 4.36	0.57 4.36	4.36		0.89	-19.22	0.76	5.45	0.816	-19.08	0.89	6.28	0.744	-19.12	0.86	6.8	0.69
-19.75 0.23 3.24 0.95 -19.32 0.61 4.4	0.23 3.24 0.95 -19.32 0.61 4.4	3.24 0.95 -19.32 0.61 4.4	0.95 -19.32 0.61 4.4	-19.32 0.61 4.4	0.61 4.4	4.4		0.887	-19.16	0.82	5.48	0.811	-19.01	0.97	6.34	0.736	-18.98	1	6.83	0.68
sure (hPa for average, Pa for others)	average, Pa for others)	Pa for others)	(5.																	
898.35 898.1	898.1	898.1	898.1	898.1			_		898.3				898.2				898.01			
898.4 5.16 344.94 0.984 897.65 -44.93 536.04	5.16 344.94 0.984 897.65 -44.93 536.04	344.94 0.984 897.65 -44.93 536.04	0.984 897.65 -44.93 536.04	897.65 -44.93 536.04	-44.93 536.04	536.04		0.927	897.17	-113.24	799.14	0.802	896.78	-141.88	1031.21	0.666	896.97	-104.28	1215.01	0.513
898.39 4.5 345.25 0.984 897.63 -46.46 537.12	4.5 345.25 0.984 897.63 -46.46 537.12	345.25 0.984 897.63 -46.46 537.12	0.984 897.63 -46.46 537.12	897.63 -46.46 537.12	-46.46 537.12	537.12		0.926	897.15	-115.39	801.82	0.801	896.69	-150.38	1036.3	0.663	896.88	-112.53	1210.46	0.509
peed (m/s) u component	component	ent																		
-0.09	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06					-0.08				-0.03				0.05			
-0.36 -0.27 2.7 0.893 -0.08 -0.14 4.16	-0.27 2.7 0.893 -0.08 -0.14 4.16	2.7 0.893 -0.08 -0.14 4.16	0.893 -0.08 -0.14 4.16	-0.08 -0.14 4.16	-0.14 4.16	4.16		0.733	-0.05	0.03	5.35	0.547	-0.03	0	6.17	0.403	-0.15	-0.2	6.63	0.315
-0.36 -0.27 2.7 0.893 -0.08 -0.14 4.18	-0.27 2.7 0.893 -0.08 -0.14 4.18	2.7 0.893 -0.08 -0.14 4.18	0.893 -0.08 -0.14 4.18	-0.08 -0.14 4.18	-0.14 4.18	4.18		0.732	-0.05	0.03	5.37	0.545	0.02	0.05	6.16	0.405	-0.11	-0.17	6.64	0.312
wind speed $(m/s) v$ component	/s) v component	nponent																		
0.92 0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85					0.89				0.89				0.85			
1.01 0.09 2.49 0.888 0.85 0 3.82	0.09 2.49 0.888 0.85 0 3.82	2.49 0.888 0.85 0 3.82	0.888 0.85 0 3.82	0.85 0 3.82	0 3.82	3.82		0.727	0.82	-0.07	4.95	0.537	0.82	-0.07	5.7	0.392	0.85	0	6.12	0.285
1.01 0.09 2.49 0.888 0.85 0 3.83	0.09 2.49 0.888 0.85 0 3.83	2.49 0.888 0.85 0 3.83	0.888 0.85 0 3.83	0.85 0 3.83	0 3.83	3.83		0.726	0.82	-0.07	4.96	0.536	0.81	-0.08	5.72	0.392	0.85	0	6.14	0.281

392 Table 2: The domain-averaged mean state, bias, RMSE and CORR of T2m, TD2m, PSFC

- and U10m/V10m, against their ERA5 counterparts. The metrics were calculated from the
 average of 72 model runs during 2018 (without spin-up) for every 48-hour forecasts.
- 395

396 Since T2m shows the largest improvement, a more comprehensive error analysis south of 60° 397 S is provided. The Hovmöller diagram of the domain-averaged RMSE difference between 398 *PWstatic* and *PWupdate* sea ice (Figure 5 a) shows that using updated sea ice can improve the 399 forecast skill of T2m for most forecast dates and forecast time periods of the year. The period 400 from July to September shows the largest improvement and fastest response to the more 401 realistic updating of sea-ice concentration. In these three months, the surface temperature 402 shows improvement after only one or two days forecast time, while it needs twice as long to 403 demonstrate improvement in other months. The maximum mean RMSE reduction can exceed 404 0.5 K at +144 hours forecast, and 0.3 K at +96 hours in June and September. Figure 5 (b) 405 shows that the updated sea-ice distribution has positive effects in most months of 2018, 406 especially in the months of sea-ice advance. Figure 5 (c) indicates that the updated sea ice 407 outperforms static sea ice at nearly every forecast time period (on average). However, 408 PWupdate shows a remarkable reduction in the advantage of forecast skill on the last two 409 days of the 10-day forecast period. This may be due to the reduction in accuracy and 410 reliability in the final two days. Overall, the contribution of updated sea ice generally 411 increases with the passing of the forecast time in the first eight days of forecast. Figure 5 (d) 412 shows the 10-day change in sea-ice extent and area initiated from each forecast period. The 413 periods of strongest T2m improvement roughly correspond to periods of sea-ice advance, 414 indicating the updated sea ice gives the largest NWP skill improvement in the sea-ice 415 formation season.

416

417 The mechanism that can be posited for underlying the T2m forecast skill increase, mainly 418 during sea-ice advance, relies on the large temperature difference between the atmosphere 419 (the top of the snow on the sea ice is close to the temperature of the atmosphere) and the 420 ocean. By comparing Figures 5 (b) and (d), it is evident that there is not an exact 421 correspondence between the seasonality of T2m improvement and the seasonality of sea-ice 422 advance, i.e., the T2m improvement peaks in July to September (Figure 5 b) while the rate of 423 sea-ice advance peaks in April (Figure 5 d). It can be considered that the magnitude of NWP 424 forecast skill improvement can be partitioned into three phenological regimes: (a) no 425 significant improvement to the modelled T2m during the period of sea-ice retreat, since the 426 ice temperature is similar to the ocean temperature (at the sea ice melting point -- so addition

- 427 of a more realistic sea-ice field does not change the surface temperature, which strongly
- 428 controls T2m); (b) minor improvement to modelled T2m during early sea-ice advance (i.e.,
- 429 when the air temperature is still cooling down -- e.g., April, when the heat flux from ocean to
- 430 atmosphere (versus sea ice to atmosphere) is not remarkable); and (c) significant and rapid
- 431 skill increase during sea-ice advance in the presence of a cold, near-surface air temperature
- 432 (e.g., July September) even though the advance is not as rapid as in April, the stronger heat
- 433 flux contrast gives a much more robust T2m forecast skill improvement.

434 c. Influence on surface heat balance

- 435 To diagnose the mechanism of T2m improvement, the influence of updated sea ice on the
- 436 surface energy balance is compared with the static sea-ice experiment in Polar WRF. During
- 437 times of minimal heat flux through sea ice, the near-surface air temperature is mainly
- 438 controlled by the surface heat energy balance (Valkonen et al. 2014). As T2m shows a
- 439 statistically significant improvement in this series of experiments, it is reasonable to suppose
- 440 the updated (realistic) sea ice makes a positive contribution to surface heat balance
- 441 modification. Table 3 lists the terms contributing to the net surface heat flux balance south of
- 442 60° S in ERA5, and the statistics for *PWupdate and PWstatic*. Figure 6 spatially indicates the
- 443 four surface heat flux terms and the surface net heat flux for the updated sea-ice assimilation.



Figure 6: Difference (*PWstatic* minus *PWupdate*) of annual-averaged RMSE in outgoing shortwave/longwave radiation fluxes, latent heat flux, sensible heat flux and net heat flux at the surface between *PWstatic* and *PWupdate* when compared with ERA5 reanalysis data. The metrics were calculated from the average of 72 model runs during 2018 (without spin-up) for every 48-hour forecasts. Here red shading indicates that the updated sea-ice experiment outperforms the static sea-ice experiment. Stippling indicates differences that are significant at the 99% level.

452

Table 3 gives a comprehensive assessment and comparison for area-weighted surface energy balance for each two-day forecast average (south of 60° S). For radiative heat fluxes in each upward and downward direction, the bias, RMSE and CORR show improvements in all five two-day averaging periods. The outgoing shortwave radiation has the best improvement (when shortwave is present), where the area-weighted average bias reduces from 3.05 to 0.79 W/m², RMSE reduces from 36.8 to 29.3 W/m² and CORR increases from 0.93 to 0.96 for the

- 459 day 9 to 10 averaging period, despite the considerable variability in T2m forecast
- 460 performance over these days (Figure 5 c). The outgoing longwave radiation CORR increases
- 461 from 0.80 to 0.82, the bias reduces from 4.02 to 0.33 W/m² while the RMSE reduction is not
- 462 so noticeable (22.9 to 22.4 W/m^2). For sensible heat flux, the WRF forecast value has large
- 463 biases around Antarctica compared with ERA5. Previous research also showed poor
- 464 correlation of sensible heat flux from WRF compared to observations (Tastula et al. 2012;
- 465 Valkonen et al. 2014). However, *PWupdate* reduces the RMSE from 36.0 to 35.1 W/m² and
- 466 increases CORR from 0.44 to 0.47 for the day 9-to-10 averaging period, again despite the
- 467 relatively poor forecast performance of T2m. For latent heat flux, the bias of *PWupdate* is
- 468 always larger than that of *PWstatic* i.e., *PWupdate* tends to underestimate the latent heat flux.
- 469 However, CORR in *PWupdate* is always larger than in *PWstatic*. The lower RMSE of
- 470 *PWupdate* shows the *PWupdate*-forecast latent heat flux is closer to the reanalysis field value.
- 471

		-2 mean		Day 3-4 mean					Day 5	-6 mean			Day 7	-8 mean			Day 9-	10 mean		
	AVE	Bias	RMSE	CORR	AVE	Bias	RMSE	CORR	AVE	Bias	RMSE	CORR	AVE	Bias	RMSE	CORR	AVE	Bias	RMSE	CORR
LW↓ (W/m	2)																			
ERA5	205.82				206.18				205.67				206.15				205.89			
Updated sea ice	212.64	6.82	24.94	0.814	213.94	7.77	32.10	0.686	214.23	8.56	38.01	0.559	214.85	8.69	42.04	0.459	214.87	8.98	44.77	0.378
Static sea ice	212.75	6.93	24.91	0.814	214.13	7.96	32.15	0.684	214.58	8.91	37.98	0.558	215.23	9.08	42.08	0.457	215.49	9.60	44.90	0.372
LW↑ (W/m	2)																			
ERA5	250.46				250.55				250.44				250.47				250.43			
Updated sea ice	251.95	1.49	12.71	0.963	253.08	2.53	15.75	0.931	253.49	3.06	18.65	0.890	253.89	3.43	20.95	0.848	253.76	3.33	22.40	0.819
Static sea ice	252.12	1.66	12.85	0.959	253.35	2.80	16.06	0.921	253.88	3.44	19.01	0.876	254.36	3.89	21.34	0.830	254.45	4.02	22.88	0.796
SW↓ (W/m	2)																			
ERA5	120.17				120.16				120.30				119.78				120.38			
Updated sea ice	125.09	4.92	43.34	0.973	125.16	5.00	50.01	0.965	125.09	4.79	55.63	0.956	124.72	4.93	59.36	0.949	124.91	4.53	61.61	0.946
Static sea ice	125.26	5.09	43.45	0.973	125.47	5.31	50.16	0.965	125.47	5.17	55.77	0.956	125.22	5.44	59.55	0.949	125.53	5.14	61.56	0.947
SW↑ (W/m	2)																			
ERA5	67.88				67.64				67.78				67.65				67.69			
Updated sea ice	69.08	1.20	22.52	0.976	68.65	1.00	25.22	0.970	68.61	0.82	27.38	0.963	68.54	0.89	28.49	0.960	68.49	0.79	29.33	0.956
Static sea ice	69.60	1.72	24.13	0.971	69.62	1.97	28.39	0.957	70.01	2.22	32.03	0.943	70.36	2.71	34.62	0.933	70.74	3.05	36.82	0.925
SH (W/m ²)																				
ERA5	-3.56				-3.76				-3.53				-3.59				-3.60			
Updated sea ice	4.40	7.96	21.17	0.815	3.53	7.29	25.17	0.714	3.13	6.66	29.70	0.614	2.95	6.55	32.72	0.523	2.89	6.50	35.11	0.468
Static sea ice	4.52	8.08	21.68	0.808	3.72	7.48	25.94	0.700	3.37	6.90	30.68	0.595	3.23	6.83	33.62	0.499	3.23	6.84	36.01	0.444
LH (W/m ²)													•							
ERA5	14.12				13.99				13.97				14.04				14.00			
Updated sea ice	14.06	- 0.06	11.19	0.797	13.76	- 0.22	15.76	0.710	13.53	- 0.44	19.17	0.618	13.56	- 0.48	21.92	0.552	13.49	0.52	23.81	0.500

Static sea ice	14.19	0.07	11.42	0.793	13.98	0.00	16.15	0.701	13.81	- 0.16	19.60	0.606	13.93	- 0.11	22.45	0.535	13.90	- 0.11	24.37	0.480
Qnet (W/m	1 ²)																			
ERA5	-2.92				-2.08				-2.68				-2.63				-2.26			
Updated sea ice	-1.77	1.15	42.10	0.639	0.09	2.17	51.52	0.610	0.56	3.24	60.64	0.583	0.62	3.25	67.07	0.563	1.15	3.41	71.87	0.548
Static sea ice	-2.43	0.49	43.10	0.637	-1.07	1.02	53.10	0.605	-1.01	1.67	62.65	0.574	-1.42	1.21	69.44	0.551	-1.31	0.95	74.51	0.532

Table 3: The domain-averaged mean state, bias, RMSE and CORR for each term of surface
energy balance, along with their ERA5 counterparts. The metrics were calculated from the
average of 72 model runs during 2018 (without spin-up) for every 48-hour forecasts.

476

477

478 Figure 6 indicates that the outgoing radiative surface fluxes, including both shortwave and 479 longwave radiation, has clear improvement over the domain with *PWupdate*. The turbulent 480 surface fluxes, namely the latent and sensible heat fluxes, also show an improvement when 481 using updated sea ice. The outgoing shortwave radiation flux has the most significant 482 reduction in RMSE, and it dominates the improvement in the net heat flux (the net surface 483 heat flux is the summation of net longwave and shortwave radiation and turbulent fluxes). 484 The reduction in outgoing longwave radiation RMSE is likely driven by a more realistic 485 surface temperature simulation when including an updated sea-ice field. The improvement 486 appears mainly in the sea-ice region, showing that a better sea-ice description improves 487 forecast skill of surface heat balance. The reduction in RMSE for outgoing radiative heat flux 488 appears to only affect the sea-ice region on a relatively long timescale (10 days) with limited 489 lower latitude influence. 490 491 By checking the seasonality of the surface heat balance (Figure B1 in Appendix B), the 492 upward shortwave radiation shows a significant improvement in the Antarctic summer, while 493 the longwave radiation shows a reasonable improvement for the sea-ice advance season 494 (May-September). The improved longwave radiation during the period of sea-ice advance 495 further indicates that it is due to the surface temperature improvement in *PWupdate* which 496 has more realistic sea-ice dynamic representation. Sensible and latent heat fluxes also gained 497 forecast skill in austral winter where the largest temperature difference occurs between ocean

498 499 and atmosphere.

500As expected from the *PWupdate* experiment, both downward shortwave and longwave501radiation improvements are not as strong as those in the upward direction (Table 3). The

502 upward longwave and shortwave radiation terms will have differences directly driven by the 503 specifications in the two experiments, whereas the downward longwave and shortwave 504 radiation should not be directly impacted by the prescribed differences between experiments. However, the downward longwave and shortwave radiation can be indirectly influenced by 505 506 the different cloud simulations in *PWstatic* and *PWupdate*. The downward shortwave 507 radiation shows an amount of noise when comparing the static and updated sea-ice 508 experiments (Figure B2 in Appendix B). This is mainly due to the modifications in the upper-509 level atmosphere and cloud simulation. Accurate Southern Ocean cloud simulation remains a 510 challenge in atmospheric NWP models (Hines et al. 2019). The cloud fraction products in the 511 WRF model are unreliable for use by forecasters due to their considerable bias with 512 observations (Hines et al. 2019). The unreliable cloud and upper air simulation in the model 513 limits improvement in downward radiative fluxes, although in the downward longwave 514 radiation, improvements are still found in the Antarctic coastal region and the region covered 515 by sea ice, while pockets of decrease in model forecast skill still exist at the ice edge. 516 517 Both latent and sensible heat fluxes show improvements over the domain (Figure 6) with a

statistically significant RMSE reduction over the sea-ice region. The sensible heat flux has a larger RMSE reduction than that of latent heat flux. The region showing the strongest improvement occurs at the sea-ice edge, indicating that the surface turbulent heat fluxes are more sensitive to the sea-ice advance/retreat than the sea-ice concentration change within consolidated ice.

523 *d. Influence on the vertical structure of the atmosphere*

524 To examine the influence of the updated sea-ice field through the troposphere, three-hourly

525 vertical profiles of three Polar WRF model variables (air temperature, relative humidity and

526 geopotential height) were interpolated to the 37 ERA5 pressure levels to facilitate

527 comparison. This comparison is shown in Figure 7.



Figure 7: Vertical profiles of differences in annual average RMSE in air temperature, relative 530 humidity and geopotential height between PWstatic and PWupdate when compared with 531 532 ERA5 reanalysis data. The metrics were calculated from the average of 72 model runs during 533 2018 (without spin-up) for every 48-hour forecasts. Here red indicates that the updated sea 534 ice outperforms static sea ice. 535

536 For the air temperature vertical profile (Figure 7, a - e), there is a clear improvement in sea

537 ice-covered latitudes (65° S to 80° S) from the surface to 900 hPa after +4 days, the

538 improvement can reach further inland (75° S to 82° S), and propagates to the 600 hPa level

539 after +6 days. However, the *PWupdate* experiment tends to show an air temperature forecast

skill decrease originating from the Southern Ocean (60° S) and propagating vertically to 600 540

541 hPa at around 75° S after +8 days.

542

Humidity is the most challenging variable to model in the upper troposphere, especially in the 543 polar regions (Elliott and Gaffen 1991; Wilson et al. 2011). The relative humidity result here 544 shows a large RMSE difference between WRF output and ERA5, with the value of 9 to 27% 545 between 900 and 500 hPa, even in the first 48 hours, and the RMSE difference can reach 45% 546 547 after 10 days (figure not shown). Since both the WRF output and ERA5 reanalysis values are 548 subject to their own independent biases, a relatively poor correspondence may be expected. 549 The upper troposphere relative humidity analyses are presented here for reference (Figure 7 f

550 - j), and results above 500 hPa will not be discussed. Relative humidity shows a forecast skill

- 551 decrease in the *PWupdate* experiment for the first 6 days (Figure 7 f h), while an
- improvement occurs from day 7 to 8 at around 950 hPa from 68° S to 82° S (Figure 7 i j).

The RMSE differences of geopotential height between *PWupdate* and *PWstatic* are not large (Figure 7 k - o). Even though the *PWupdate* does not depict a perceptible improvement in the first 8 days forecast (Figure 7 k - n), the negative effects are not significant, especially in the first 6 days (Figure 7 k - m). Considering the surface pressure is also not strongly changed, this indicates that the atmospheric pressure may not be significantly impacted by including updated sea ice.

560 **4. Conclusion**

561 Daily-updated sea-ice concentrations have been assimilated into the Polar WRF model to 562 compare with model runs using static sea ice throughout a 10-day forecast period across 563 Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. ERA5 was used to force the initial and boundary 564 conditions and compared with the model output as the "real world" reference. These 565 experiments were repeated for a total of 72 times throughout 2018.

566

567 The first 48 hours forecast of near-surface variables were used to evaluate the model

568 performance. Near-surface variable forecasts from Polar WRF with updated sea ice compared

569 well with the ERA5 reanalysis, showing a small bias and very high correlation. The bias,

570 MAE and RMSE errors were in good agreement with previous studies (Wilson et al. 2011;

571 Hines et al. 2019; Valkonen et al. 2014). The bias and errors are in a controlled and expected

572 range, especially in regions away from steep topography, indicating that the Polar WRF

573 model is suitable for use in our study to capture the effects of changes in sea-ice distribution.

574

For near-surface variables, the T2m and TD2m have the most statistically-significant
improvements with a domain-averaged value of 9% - 15% bias reduction after 48 hours
forecast. The surface pressure appears to be relatively insensitive to updated sea ice within a
10-day forecast. Near-surface winds, both in the meridional and zonal directions, show an

579 improvement but the magnitudes are relatively small.

580

581 Although limited improvement for indirectly-influenced variables is found, such as for winds

and surface pressure, the improvements are not as remarkable as the directly-influenced

583 variables, namely, the near-surface temperature and humidity. Temperature and humidity are

584 positively impacted due to the better simulation of surface heat fluxes, while improvements in

- the winds and surface pressure may be due to the modification of temperature and humidity.
- 586 Based on these results, the improvement in pressure and winds may have a greater lag and
- 587 muted response, which is hard to capture in a relatively short forecast time (10-day forecast),
- 588 but may be more obvious in a seasonal or climate context.
- 589
- Adding updated sea ice into the Polar WRF model significantly modified the surface heat balance, e.g., upward shortwave radiation has a domain-averaged value of 30% - 75% bias reduction immediately after spin-up. The improvement for upward shortwave radiation plays a dominant role in the modification. The upward longwave radiation, latent and sensible heat flux were also dramatically improved over the sea-ice region. These contribute to the energy
- balance, which results in the modification of surface temperature.
- 596

597 Even though this study found a statistically significant improvement at the surface and near-

- 598 surface when adding updated realistic sea-ice concentrations into the NWP model,
- 599 propagation of this improvement towards the upper troposphere is limited. Improvement
- 600 appears to be constrained within the planetary boundary layer (PBL), where atmospheric
- 601 variables can be directly influenced by the surface changes. Above the PBL, the propagation
- 602 of the improving signal weakens steadily since, particularly over much of the Antarctic
- 603 plateau, the turbulence and vertical mixing are rare. Compared with the Arctic, the polar
- 604 vortex over Antarctica is stronger and more resistant to blocking air mass exchange with mid-
- 605 latitudes (Waugh and Randel 1999; Qian et al. 2021). The zonally-dominated circulation of
- 606 the atmosphere at mid to high southern latitudes seems to provide a dynamic boundary,
- 607 limiting the propagation of improvements northward. In summary, the improvement of using
- 608 updated sea ice in the NWP model is most distinctive in +120 to +192 hour forecasts,
- 609 between June and September, south of 60° S, and below 700 hPa.
- 610

Further studies should include the investigation of the diurnal cycle of error propagation and the relationships between each impacted variable. The impact of updating sea ice on Antarctic NWP is a complicated process, and so the annual-average analyses presented here may ignore some important fine-scale responses, such as atmosphere and ocean interactions with the sea ice that would be naturally included in a fully coupled regional model. A series of case studies showing maximum impacts on atmospheric factors is necessary to provide more insight on those processes contributing to the forecast improvement. Furthermore, the

- 618 effect of a more realistic prescription of sea-ice thickness and snow depth, the values of
- 619 which are fixed within these model runs in Antarctic NWP, should be investigated as well. In
- 620 addition, the NWP model implemented for this study is an atmospheric-only model, albeit
- 621 with enhancements to increase the realism of sea ice. Coupling such a model to a
- 622 computationally-efficient ice/ocean model is the next logical step for use in operational
- 623 forecasting and requires further investigation.
- 624

625 Acknowledgments

626 This research was supported by scholarships from the Australian Government and the

- 627 Australian Research Council's Special Research Initiative for the Antarctic Gateway
- 628 Partnership (SRI40300001). This project received grant funding from the Australian
- 629 Government as part of the Antarctic Science Collaboration Initiative program. We would like
- 630 to acknowledge the use of the high-performance computing facilities provided by the
- 631 Tasmanian Partnership for Advanced Computing (TPAC) funded and hosted by the
- 632 University of Tasmania. This research was also supported by use of the Nectar Research
- 633 Cloud; a collaborative Australian research platform supported by the NCRIS-funded
- 634 Australian Research Data Commons (ARDC). We thank David Bromwich, Keith Hines and
- 635 Lesheng Bai from The Ohio State University PMG group for providing the Polar WRF model
- and the constructive and helpful discussion. We thank Marcus Thatcher and Jack Katzfey
- 637 from The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) for their
- helpful comments and discussion in relation to nudging. The authors thank NCAR Mesoscale
- and Microscale Meteorology for providing the standard release of the WRF model, and the
- 640 Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S) Climate Data Store (CDS) for providing the
- 641 ERA5 reanalysis data.
- 642

643 Data Availability Statement.

- 644 ERA5 data used in this study can be acquired through the Copernicus Climate Change
- 645 Service (C3S) Climate Data Store (CDS; https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu). Polar WRF
- 646 model can be downloaded from The Ohio State University Polar Meteorology Group
- 647 (<u>http://polarmet.osu.edu/PWRF/</u>) via registration. Model output used in this study can be
- 648 acquired from the corresponding author upon request.
- 649

650 651 **Appendix A: The influence of nudging on error propagation in Polar WRF** 652 653 Nudging is an important technique to constrain model simulations from drifting away from 654 the real conditions (Glisan et al. 2013). However, whether this technique should be used 655 depends on the purpose of the experiment. Here, using 10-day forecasts implemented in this 656 study, the influences of nudging on error propagation and on experiment purpose are 657 investigated. 658 659 The results from a single nudging versus no-nudging experiment with Polar WRF are

660 presented here. The model runs from 1-12 September 2018. One test is run with spectral nudging techniques, and includes nudging of winds, temperature, and geopotential height 661 662 from ERA5 every six hours, with daily-updated- and static- sea-ice concentration. Nudging is only applied to model layer 40 (around 400 hPa) and above following the suggestion of Zou 663 664 et al. (2021). A control test is run with the same configuration but does not use the nudging 665 technique. Both model runs use daily-updated sea-ice concentrations. 666 The difference in error propagation between nudging and non-nudging experiments is shown 667 668 in Figure A1. The error propagation is well-constrained by spectral nudging, especially at the

APPENDICES

669 Antarctic continental margin and sea-ice regions (Figure A1 a1 - e1). For the non-nudging experiment (Figure A1 $a^2 - e^2$), the RMSE develops and propagates after 48 hours forecast 670 period to spread across the Antarctic continent along the Transantarctic Mountains and 671 Dronning Maud Land, as well as from the Weddell Sea and Amundsen Sea to spread to other 672 673 sea-ice-covered regions of primary interest in this study. This indicates that the nudging 674 technique may interfere with (or confound) the results presented here.





Figure A1: RMSE of T2m in the daily-updated sea-ice experiment using ERA5 nudging
(upper panel), and without nudging experiment (bottom panel).

As the error propagation has been well constrained by the nudging technique, the differences caused by daily-updated-sea ice are much smaller in the nudging experiment than in the nonnudging experiment (Figure A2). It is noted that the nudged T2m RMSE difference for the 7 -8 day average is similar in magnitude to the 5 - 6 day time period, which indicates the nudging technique may have an excessive interference on error propagation. This may imply that nudging has a strong effect on constraining the error propagation that may overwhelm the magnitude of differences between static- and daily-updated-sea ice.

- 687
- 688



695

Figure A2: T2m RMSE difference (static minus daily-updated) in the nudging experiment
(upper panels) and non-nudging experiment (lower panels). Each column represents a twoday average of forecasts. Red shading indicates regions where Polar WRF with dailyupdated-sea ice outperforms Polar WRF with static-sea ice. The first 24 hours are discarded
as a spin-up period.

696 The nudging technique has relatively little influence on the first 48 hours of forecast period
697 (Figure A3), but the influence is stronger after that. The nudging technique keeps the error
698 tightly bound throughout the duration of the 10-day forecast.







Figure A3: Domain-averaged T2m RMSE in daily-updated sea-ice run for the nudging and
non-nudging experiments.

The RMSE difference between static and updated runs with nudging is much less than the
runs without nudging (Figure A4). It appears that the nudging technique has little influence
on the RMSE difference pattern in the first 144 hours (i.e., nudging just influences the RMSE
magnitude), however, the error pattern also changes after 144 hours.







713 Hence, although nudging can effectively constrain model error, it also strongly influences the 714 differences in error propagation between static and daily-updated runs. The ultimate aim of this study is not to provide an extremely accurate forecast, rather to investigate how static sea 715 716 ice impacts the forecast accuracy, and to provide an "upper bound" of forecast skill 717 improvement when coupling a dynamic sea-ice component into NWP. As the nudging 718 technique can cause interference in the interpretation of results, nudging is not used in this 719 study. In addition, nudging from reanalysis is impossible in the case of an operational short-720 term forecast which is what this study is aiming to simulate.

721

Appendix B: The influence of non-static sea ice on surface heat balance

Figure B1 shows the seasonality of the surface heat balance, including (a) outgoing

shortwave radiation, (b) outgoing longwave radiation, (c) latent heat flux, and (d) sensible

heat flux. Difference (*PWstatic* minus *PWupdate*) of annual-averaged RMSE in incoming

shortwave/longwave radiation fluxes at the surface between *PWstatic* and *PWupdate* when

726 compared with ERA5 reanalysis data are shown in Figure B2.



727

728 Figure B1: Hovmöller diagram of domain-averaged RMSE difference (PWstatic minus

729 PWupdate) south of 60° S for outgoing (a) shortwave radiation, (b) longwave radiation, (c)

730 latent heat flux and (d) sensible heat flux between PWstatic and PWupdate compared with

731 ERA5. Here red indicates that PWupdate outperforms the simulation with PWstatic. The x-

axis represents the forecast time of each experiment and the y-axis represents the initiation

733 date of each forecast experiment.





Figure B2: As in Figure 6, but for (a) – (e) incoming shortwave radiation and (f) – (g) incoming longwave radiation.

739

REFERENCES

Al-Yahyai, S., Y. Charabi, and A. Gastli, 2010: Review of the use of Numerical Weather
 Prediction (NWP) Models for wind energy assessment. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, 14,

742 3192–3198, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2010.07.001.

Bromwich, D. H., L. Bai, and G. G. Bjarnason, 2005: High-Resolution Regional Climate
Simulations over Iceland Using Polar MM5*. *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 133, 3527–3547,

- 745 https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR3049.1.
- 746 —, K. M. Hines, and L. Bai, 2009: Development and testing of Polar Weather Research
 747 and Forecasting model: 2. Arctic Ocean. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, D08122,
- 748 https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD010300.
- 749 —, F. O. Otieno, K. M. Hines, K. W. Manning, and E. Shilo, 2013: Comprehensive
- evaluation of polar weather research and forecasting model performance in the
- 751 Antarctic. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., **118**, 274–292,
- 752 https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JD018139.
- 753 Cassano, J. J., M. W. Seefeldt, S. Palo, S. L. Knuth, A. C. Bradley, P. D. Herrman, P. A.
- 754 Kernebone, and N. J. Logan, 2016: Observations of the atmosphere and surface state
- 755 over Terra Nova Bay, Antarctica, using unmanned aerial systems. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*,
- 756 **8**, 115–126, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-8-115-2016.
- 757 Chen, F., and J. Dudhia, 2001: Coupling an Advanced Land Surface–Hydrology Model with

- 758 the Penn State–NCAR MM5 Modeling System. Part I: Model Implementation and
- 759 Sensitivity. Mon. Weather Rev., 129, 569–585, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-
- 760 0493(2001)129<0569:CAALSH>2.0.CO;2.
- 761 Clough, S. A., M. W. Shephard, E. J. Mlawer, J. S. Delamere, M. J. Iacono, K. Cady-Pereira,
- 762 S. Boukabara, and P. D. Brown, 2005: Atmospheric radiative transfer modeling: a
- summary of the AER codes. J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf., 91, 233–244,
- 764 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2004.05.058.
- Day, J. J., S. Keeley, G. Arduini, L. Magnusson, K. Mogensen, M. Rodwell, I. Sandu, and S.
 Tietsche, 2022: Benefits and challenges of dynamic sea ice for weather forecasts. *Weather Clim. Dyn.*, 3, 713–731, https://doi.org/10.5194/wcd-3-713-2022.
- Dong, X., Y. Wang, S. Hou, M. Ding, B. Yin, and Y. Zhang, 2020: Robustness of the Recent
 Global Atmospheric Reanalyses for Antarctic Near-Surface Wind Speed Climatology. *J. Clim.*, 33, 4027–4043, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0648.1.
- Eayrs, C., D. Holland, D. Francis, T. Wagner, R. Kumar, and X. Li, 2019: Understanding the
 Seasonal Cycle of Antarctic Sea Ice Extent in the Context of Longer-Term Variability. *Rev. Geophys.*, 57, 1037–1064, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018RG000631.
- Ebert, E., and Coauthors, 2013: Progress and challenges in forecast verification. *Meteorol. Appl.*, 20, 130–139, https://doi.org/10.1002/met.1392.
- Edwards, J. M., A. C. M. Beljaars, A. A. M. Holtslag, and A. P. Lock, 2020: Representation
 of Boundary-Layer Processes in Numerical Weather Prediction and Climate Models.
- 778 *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.*, **177**, 511–539, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-020-00530-z.
- Eerola, K., 2013: Twenty-One Years of Verification from the HIRLAM NWP System. *Weather Forecast.*, 28, 270–285, https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-12-00068.1.
- Elliott, W. P., and D. J. Gaffen, 1991: On the Utility of Radiosonde Humidity Archives for
- 782 Climate Studies. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 72, 1507–1520, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520783 0477(1991)072<1507:OTUORH>2.0.CO;2.
- Glisan, J. M., W. J. Gutowski, J. J. Cassano, and M. E. Higgins, 2013: Effects of Spectral
 Nudging in WRF on Arctic Temperature and Precipitation Simulations. *J. Clim.*, 26,
 3985–3999, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00318.1.
- Hersbach, H., and Coauthors, 2020: The ERA5 global reanalysis. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*,
 146, 1999–2049, https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803.
- Hines, K. M., and D. H. Bromwich, 2008: Development and Testing of Polar Weather
- 790 Research and Forecasting (WRF) Model. Part I: Greenland Ice Sheet Meteorology*.
- 791 *Mon. Weather Rev.*, **136**, 1971–1989, https://doi.org/10.1175/2007MWR2112.1.

- 792 _____, ____, L. Bai, C. M. Bitz, J. G. Powers, and K. W. Manning, 2015: Sea Ice
- Enhancements to Polar WRF*. *Mon. Weather Rev.*, **143**, 2363–2385,
- 794 https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-14-00344.1.
- 795 —, —, S.-H. Wang, I. Silber, J. Verlinde, and D. Lubin, 2019: Microphysics of summer
- clouds in central West Antarctica simulated by the Polar Weather Research and
- 797 Forecasting Model (WRF) and the Antarctic Mesoscale Prediction System (AMPS).
- 798 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, **19**, 12431–12454, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-12431-2019.
- Jung, T., and M. Matsueda, 2016: Verification of global numerical weather forecasting
- systems in polar regions using TIGGE data. Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., 142, 574–582,
 https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2437.
- 802 —, and Coauthors, 2016: Advancing Polar Prediction Capabilities on Daily to Seasonal
- 803 Time Scales. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 97, 1631–1647, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS804 D-14-00246.1.
- Kain, J. S., 2004: The Kain–Fritsch Convective Parameterization: An Update. J. Appl. *Meteorol.*, 43, 170–181, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-
- 807 0450(2004)043<0170:TKCPAU>2.0.CO;2.
- Liu, H., K. Jezek, B. Li, and Z. Zhao, 2001: Radarsat Antarctic Mapping Project digital
 elevation model version 2. *Natl. Snow Ice Data Cent.*,.
- 810 Mass, C. F., and Y.-H. Kuo, 1998: Regional Real-Time Numerical Weather Prediction:
- 811 Current Status and Future Potential. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, **79**, 253–263,
- 812 https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1998)079<0253:RRTNWP>2.0.CO;2.
- 813 Massom, R., and D. Lubin, 2006: Polar Remote Sensing Volume I: Atmosphere and Oceans.
- 814 Massom, R. A., and S. E. Stammerjohn, 2010: Antarctic sea ice change and variability -
- 815 Physical and ecological implications. *Polar Sci.*, **4**, 149–186,
- 816 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polar.2010.05.001.
- Morrison, H., G. Thompson, and V. Tatarskii, 2009: Impact of Cloud Microphysics on the
 Development of Trailing Stratiform Precipitation in a Simulated Squall Line:
- 819 Comparison of One- and Two-Moment Schemes. *Mon. Weather Rev.*, **137**, 991–1007,
- 820 https://doi.org/10.1175/2008MWR2556.1.
- 821 Nakanishi, M., and H. Niino, 2006: An Improved Mellor-Yamada Level-3 Model: Its
- 822 Numerical Stability and Application to a Regional Prediction of Advection Fog.
- 823 *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.*, **119**, 397–407, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-005-9030-8.
- 824 Nigro, M. A., and J. J. Cassano, 2014: Identification of Surface Wind Patterns over the Ross
- 825 Ice Shelf, Antarctica, Using Self-Organizing Maps. Mon. Weather Rev., 142, 2361–

- 826 2378, https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-13-00382.1.
- 827 Parish, T. R., and J. J. Cassano, 2003: The Role of Katabatic Winds on the Antarctic Surface
- Wind Regime. *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 131, 317–333, https://doi.org/10.1175/15200493(2003)131<0317:TROKWO>2.0.CO;2.
- Parkinson, C. L., 2019: A 40-y record reveals gradual Antarctic sea ice increases followed by
 decreases at rates far exceeding the rates seen in the Arctic. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 116,
- 832 14414–14423, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906556116.
- 833 Pezza, A., K. Sadler, P. Uotila, T. Vihma, M. D. S. Mesquita, and P. Reid, 2016: Southern
- Hemisphere strong polar mesoscale cyclones in high-resolution datasets. *Clim. Dyn.*, 47,
 1647–1660, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-015-2925-2.
- Phillips, N. A., 1971: Numerical weather prediction. *Eos, Trans. Am. Geophys. Union*,
 https://doi.org/10.1029/EO052i006pIU420.
- 838 Powers, J. G., K. W. Manning, D. H. Bromwich, J. J. Cassano, and A. M. Cayette, 2012: A
- Becade of Antarctic Science Support Through Amps. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 93,
 1699–1712, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00186.1.
- Qian, Y., Y. Luo, F. Si, T. Yang, and D. Yang, 2021: Three-Year Observations of Ozone
 Columns over Polar Vortex Edge Area above West Antarctica. *Adv. Atmos. Sci.*, 38,
 1197–1208, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00376-021-0243-7.
- 844 Roussel, M.-L., F. Lemonnier, C. Genthon, and G. Krinner, 2020: Brief communication:
- Evaluating Antarctic precipitation in ERA5 and CMIP6 against CloudSat observations. *Cryosph.*, 14, 2715–2727, https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-14-2715-2020.
- Schroeter, B. J. E., P. Reid, N. L. Bindoff, and K. Michael, 2019: Antarctic Verification of
 the Australian Numerical Weather Prediction Model. *Weather Forecast.*, 34, 1081–
 1096, https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-18-0171.1.
- 850 Seefeldt, M. W., and J. J. Cassano, 2012: A description of the Ross Ice Shelf air stream
 851 (RAS) through the use of self-organizing maps (SOMs). *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 117,
- 852 https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016857.
- 853 Simpkins, G. R., L. M. Ciasto, D. W. J. Thompson, and M. H. England, 2012: Seasonal
 854 Relationships between Large-Scale Climate Variability and Antarctic Sea Ice
- 855 Concentration. J. Clim., 25, 5451–5469, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00367.1.
- 856 Skamarock, W. C., and Coauthors, 2008: A Description of the Advanced Research WRF
- 857 Version 3. *A Descr. Adv. Res. WRF Version 3*, 113, https://doi.org/10.5065/D6DZ069T.
- 858 Skamarock, W. C., and Coauthors, 2019: A description of the advanced research WRF model
- 859 version 4. Natl. Cent. Atmos. Res. Boulder, CO, USA, 145, 145.

- Smith, G. C., F. Roy, and B. Brasnett, 2013: Evaluation of an operational ice-ocean analysis
 and forecasting system for the Gulf of St Lawrence. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 139, 419–
 433, https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.1982.
- 863 —, and Coauthors, 2018: Impact of Coupling with an Ice–Ocean Model on Global
- 864 Medium-Range NWP Forecast Skill. *Mon. Weather Rev.*, **146**, 1157–1180,
- 865 https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-17-0157.1.
- 866 Smith, G. C., and Coauthors, 2021: The Regional Ice Ocean Prediction System v2: a pan-
- 867 Canadian ocean analysis system using an online tidal harmonic analysis. *Geosci. Model*868 *Dev.*, 14, 1445–1467, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-1445-2021.
- Tastula, E.-M., T. Vihma, and E. L. Andreas, 2012: Evaluation of Polar WRF from Modeling
 the Atmospheric Boundary Layer over Antarctic Sea Ice in Autumn and Winter. *Mon.*

871 *Weather Rev.*, **140**, 3919–3935, https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-12-00016.1.

- 872 Tetzner, D., E. Thomas, and C. Allen, 2019: A Validation of ERA5 Reanalysis Data in the
- Southern Antarctic Peninsula—Ellsworth Land Region, and Its Implications for Ice Core
 Studies. *Geosciences*, 9, 289, https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences9070289.
- Thorndike, A. S., D. A. Rothrock, G. A. Maykut, and R. Colony, 1975: The thickness
 distribution of sea ice. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 80, 4501–4513,
- 877 https://doi.org/10.1029/JC080i033p04501.
- Uotila, P., T. Vihma, A. B. Pezza, I. Simmonds, K. Keay, and A. H. Lynch, 2011:
- 879 Relationships between Antarctic cyclones and surface conditions as derived from high-
- resolution numerical weather prediction data. J. Geophys. Res., **116**, D07109,
- 881 https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JD015358.
- Valkonen, T., T. Vihma, M. M. Johansson, and J. Launiainen, 2014: Atmosphere-sea ice
 interaction in early summer in the Antarctic: evaluation and challenges of a regional
- atmospheric model. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, **140**, 1536–1551,
- 885 https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2237.
- Vignon, E., F. Hourdin, C. Genthon, B. J. H. Van de Wiel, H. Gallée, J. Madeleine, and J.
- 887 Beaumet, 2018: Modeling the Dynamics of the Atmospheric Boundary Layer Over the
- Antarctic Plateau With a General Circulation Model. J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 10, 98–
 125, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017MS001184.
- 890 Waugh, D. W., and W. J. Randel, 1999: Climatology of Arctic and Antarctic Polar Vortices

Using Elliptical Diagnostics. J. Atmos. Sci., 56, 1594–1613,

- 892 https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1999)056<1594:COAAAP>2.0.CO;2.
- 893 Wilby, R. L., and T. M. L. Wigley, 1997: Downscaling general circulation model output: a

- review of methods and limitations. *Prog. Phys. Geogr. Earth Environ.*, 21, 530–548,
 https://doi.org/10.1177/030913339702100403.
- 896 Wille, J. D., D. H. Bromwich, J. J. Cassano, M. A. Nigro, M. E. Mateling, and M. A.
- 897 Lazzara, 2017: Evaluation of the AMPS Boundary Layer Simulations on the Ross Ice
- 898 Shelf, Antarctica, with Unmanned Aircraft Observations. J. Appl. Meteorol. Climatol.,
- **56**, 2239–2258, https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-16-0339.1.
- 900 Wilson, A. B., D. H. Bromwich, and K. M. Hines, 2011: Evaluation of Polar WRF forecasts
- 901 on the Arctic System Reanalysis domain: Surface and upper air analysis. *J. Geophys.*902 *Res.*, **116**, D11112, https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JD015013.
- Xue, J., Z. Xiao, D. H. Bromwich, and L. Bai, 2022: Polar WRF V4.1.1 simulation and
 evaluation for the Antarctic and Southern Ocean. *Front. Earth Sci.*, 1–20,
- 905 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11707-022-0971-8.
- Zhu, J., A. Xie, X. Qin, Y. Wang, B. Xu, and Y. Wang, 2021: An Assessment of ERA5
 Reanalysis for Antarctic Near-Surface Air Temperature. *Atmosphere (Basel).*, 12, 217, https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12020217.
- Zou, X., D. H. Bromwich, A. Montenegro, S. Wang, and L. Bai, 2021: Major surface melting
 over the Ross Ice Shelf part I: Foehn effect. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 147, 2874–2894,
 https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.4104.
- 912 Zwally, H. J., J. C. Comiso, C. L. Parkinson, D. J. Cavalieri, and P. Gloersen, 2002:
- 913 Variability of Antarctic sea ice 1979–1998. J. Geophys. Res., 107, 3041,
- 914 https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JC000733.