

Effects of model resolution on predicting atmospheric ducting conditions with Harmonie-AROME

Karoliina Hämäläinen¹, Laura Rautiainen¹, Jani Tyynelä¹, and Lauri Laakso¹

¹Finnish Meteorological Institute, PL 503, 00101 Helsinki, Finland.

Correspondence: Karoliina Hämäläinen (karoliina.hamalainen@fmi.fi)

Abstract. To avoid hazardous situations, it is important to be able to forecast the condition leading to anomalous propagation of electromagnetic signal. In this study, the operational weather forecasting model Harmonie-AROME used by the Finnish meteorological institute was utilized to assess the effects of model resolution on predicting atmospheric ducting conditions. Four separate model configurations were tested altering the vertical and horizontal resolution. The testing period (from 19th of June to 12th of July, 2022) included several occasions when anomalous propagation had been detected at Northern Baltic sea by the Utö coastal surveillance radar. The comparison against the observations show potential of predicting ducting conditions with numerical weather prediction model. At the same time the results reveal the limitations of the model in producing realistic vertical profiles of temperature and humidity especially near surface.

Copyright statement. © 2026 Finnish Meteorological Institute. All rights reserved.

1 Introduction

Modern society relies on telecommunication and different radar applications, both on civil and military sector. In this context, aviation and marine traffic are especially vulnerable to disturbances. Certain weather conditions can cause anomalous signal propagation of the electromagnetic waves leading to interference in radar applications ([Patterson and Skolnik, 2008](#); [Bean and Dutton, 1966](#)) and radio communication ([Dougherty, 1981](#)). During such conditions the signal gets trapped into a shallow horizontal layer.

This ~~phenomena~~[phenomenon](#) is commonly called ~~as~~-ducting (Turton et al., 1988).

Atmospheric ducting cannot be measured directly; however, its presence can be detected through its impact on electromagnetic signal propagation. One clear indicator is the anomalous extension of radar coverage under certain meteorological conditions (Norin et al., 2023; Norin, 2022). In such cases, targets located well beyond the normal radar horizon can become detectable (~~Patterson and Skolnik, 2008~~)([Patterson and Skolnik, 2008](#); [Huang et al., 2022b](#); [Rautiainen et al., 2023c](#)). This occurs when the radar signal becomes trapped within a quasi-horizontal refractive layer in the atmosphere, allowing it to propagate over extended distances with reduced attenuation.

Ducting conditions can also be detected using a transmitter–receiver pair to determine the presence and strength of a received signal (Grabner and Kvicera, 2003; Rautiainen et al., 2025). Fixed radio transmission infrastructure, such as radio towers, can

serve as monitoring points for observing instances of unexpected long-range signal propagation, thus providing empirical
25 evidence of ducting.

The electromagnetic signal propagation characteristics depend on meteorological conditions (Turton et al., 1988). The vertical stratification of air temperature and humidity are the main properties affecting atmospheric refractivity, and thus signal propagation. Weather events involving strong turbulent mixing, such as wind and precipitation, prevent the evolution of such stratification. While, evaporation, subsidence, advection, and nocturnal radiative cooling are known as meteorological conditions leading to the existence of ducts. In addition, temperature stratification caused by sea surface conditions plays a critical role. For example, cold seas can create stable atmospheric layers, while warm seas nourish instability. Seasonal variations between winter and summer have an effect on heat fluxes and thermal stratification. Over ice-covered surfaces, ducting can occur due to a sharp thermal stratification.

Often the duct types are divided into four categories depending on how the duct is formed (Derksen, 2016; Babin et al., 1997; Mai et al., 2020): surface duct, surface-based duct, elevated duct and evaporation duct. Surface and surface-based ducts form due to temperature inversion and/or hydrolapse which causes a decrease in refractivity. The meteorological conditions leading to inversion are advection, subsidence near high pressure system or cold fronts, or radiative night time cooling, or cold sea surface. Surface ducts are more common on sea areas (Turton et al., 1988). Elevated ducts have similar structure as surface ducts, but the ducts are not connected to the surface. Elevated ducts are formed near subsidence areas or due to uplift of the air near frontal systems. The evaporation duct occur when a strong humidity gradient develops, caused by rapid evaporation from the warm sea surface into cooler, drier air above. This moist air affect on the refractive properties of the atmosphere, creating a ducting layer that can trap the radio waves. The factors influencing ~~on~~ evaporation duct formation include: (1) high sea surface temperatures, (2) ~~stable atmospheric conditions~~, a strong near-surface moisture gradient, and (3) light to moderate winds. In contrast to surface-based ducts, evaporation ducts are not as strongly controlled by atmospheric stability. Over the sea, a strong temperature difference between the air and the water can generate a near-surface unstable layer that favors rapid evaporation which leads to ducting conditions.

Traditionally, propagation models get their initial conditions from in-situ observations such as ~~radiosonde soundings (Wagner, 1960; Ao,~~ mast measurements (Grabner and Kvicera, 2003; Wang et al., 2018; Rautiainen et al., 2023a) or radiosonde soundings (Wagner, 1960; Ao, . These observations are accurate at the site, but do not represent wider atmosphere and do not give indication of the possible situation after few hours or days. To be able to utilize these propagation models in forecasting of future conditions, they need to be coupled with a weather prediction model such as ~~Haaek et al. (2010); Pastore et al. (2021)~~ Atkinson et al. (2001); Atkinson and Zhu (2006) have tested. But how well do the weather prediction models meet the needs of the propagation models? Are the weather prediction models able to generate reasonable enough vertical structures of temperature and humidity?

In this study, the effects of NWP (Numerical Weather Prediction) model Harmonie-AROME (Bengtsson et al., 2017), resolution (both horizontal and vertical) on forecasted modified refractivity gradient is studied. The modeled vertical profiles of modified refractivity, specific humidity and air temperature are compared against the mast measurements carried out at Utö atmospheric and marine research station (Laakso et al., 2018; Rautiainen et al., 2023a). The aim of this study is to enhance the understanding on how well the NWP model can represent the ducting conditions (Von Engel and Teixeira, 2004; Lopez,

2009; Norin et al., 2023) in a marine environment (Förster and Riechen, 2006; Essen et al., 2012; Mesnard and Sauvageot, 2010; Norin, 2022; Rautiainen et al., 2025).

In this paper, in section 2 we present observations used for the model validation. Section 3 describes the post-processing methods and NWP model used in this study. Section 4 is dedicated to the results. Section 6 presents the conclusions based on the results and the final section 5, is dedicated to wider discussion and future plans.

2 Observations

In this study experimental data from different sources and different purposes is used. For NWP model data-assimilation we use a wide range of continuous meteorological observations. The data used include SYNOP, TEMP, soundings, lidar, weather radar, ceilometer and satellite observations, which are used in initialization of forecast runs through assimilation (Grønsleth and Randriamampianina, 2012; Hagelin et al., 2021; Barkmeijer et al., 2021).

NWP model simulations are compared with extensive field observations at Utö Atmospheric and Marine Research Station (see Fig. 1). The station and observations are described in detail in Laakso et al. (2018); Honkanen et al. (2018) and Rautiainen et al. (2023b, a). In this study we utilize vertical observations of air temperature and humidity from two measurements mast located approximately 500 m apart. T and RH are measured with Rotronik HC2A-S3 T-RH and Vaisala HMP155EC T-RH sensors installed at 4 m, 7 m, 12 m, 22 m, 32 m and 59 m heights above the mean sea level (amsl), allowing a very precise examination of the vertical structure of the atmosphere near the surface.

According to Rautiainen et al. (2025), ducting was frequently observed with the Utö coastal surveillance radar. Based on these analysis, we selected the period from 19 June to 11 July 2022 for NWP model simulations. Within this time frame, multiple ducting episodes occurred. The testing period was restricted to three weeks due to the computational cost of the NWP experiments.

3 Methods

3.1 Calculating Atmospheric Refractivity and possibility of Ducting

The [interpretation of atmospheric ducting in terms of modified refractivity and duct type classification is well established in the literature and has been discussed in several classic studies \(Bean and Dutton, 1966; Turton et al., 1988\), as well as in marine and evaporation-duct applications \(Paulus, 1985; Babin et al., 1997; Atkinson et al., 2001; Wang et al., 2018\). In the present study, we follow this standard framework to relate the modelled vertical gradients of temperature and humidity to the presence of ducting conditions.](#)

[The prognostic values for atmospheric refractivity can be calculated based on NWP model output. The equation 1 \(~~Turton et al., 1988~~\) \(Bean and Dutton, 1966\) shows the semi-empirical formulation for refractivity \$N\$](#)

$$N = \frac{77.6}{T} (p + 4810 \frac{e}{T}) \quad (1)$$

in which the T is the air temperature [K], p is the air pressure [hPa], and e is the water vapor pressure [hPa]. This empirical formula is valid in the temperature range from -50°C to 40°C (ITU, 2019). The water vapor pressure is not a common output parameter of the NWP model, but it can be calculated through specific humidity q [~~unitless~~kg/kg] (Babin et al., 1997; Bechtold, 2015):

$$q = \frac{e \cdot \epsilon}{p - (1 - \epsilon) \cdot e} \quad (2)$$

in which ϵ is a ratio of molar masses of vapor and dry air (0.622). From this equation the water vapor pressure can be derived:

$$e = \frac{p \cdot q}{\epsilon + (1 - \epsilon) \cdot q} \quad (3)$$

The best way to ~~estimate signal propagation in the atmosphere is to use modified refractivity~~model the atmosphere for simulating signal propagation uses modified refractivity. M (Turton et al., 1988), which can be calculated based on refractivity N . Modified refractivity takes into account the ~~natural bending of the signal in the atmosphere due to~~ curvature of the ~~ground~~Earth when determining whether refraction is bending signals towards the ground or not. In equation 4, the z is the height above the surface level and R is the mean radius of the ~~earth~~Earth.

$$M = N + \frac{z}{R} \cdot 10^6 \quad (4)$$

The vertical gradient of the M describes the behaviour of the signal propagation in the atmosphere. When modified refractivity decreases with height, the signal is strongly bent downwards. In contrast, when modified refractivity increases with height, the signal propagates nearly straight, while the Earth's curvature causes the surface to fall away beneath it at longer distances. Based on the strength and sign of the gradient the signal propagation can be divided into four categories (Turton et al., 1988): standard, sub-refractivity, super-refractivity and trapping. Depending on the elevation angle of the emitted radar beam, a signal that enters the duct at a sufficiently small incidence angle can become trapped within the layer, where it is repeatedly refracted and guided along the duct (~~Turton et al., 1988~~)(Bean and Dutton, 1966).

Based on the NWP model output, modified refractivity was calculated for each grid point, with one hour time interval. Next, the vertical gradient of modified refractivity was calculated and the duct types were computed. These calculations were executed for all four model experiments to compare how the changes in model resolution affect the forecast skill of ducting.

Based on ~~Turton et al. (1988)~~Bean and Dutton (1966), the presence of hydrolapse and temperature inversion enhance the formation of a duct, while pressure changes are negligible. Yet, the effects of hydrolapse are more dominant. ~~Based on the equation 4 we can draw conclusions on the expected strength of the duct. The simplified table ??, is presented here to help to understand~~

115 ~~the connections between the~~ Equation 1 shows how refractivity depends on temperature and humidity. ~~The amount of (+) signs~~
~~indicate how strong duct can be expected to form in different weather conditions. Note, that the strength of~~ However, the duct
~~is due to the differences between the air masses on different levels. These variations affect how the electromagnetic signals~~
~~propagate, causing stronger or weaker ducting conditions depending on the atmospheric conditions~~ existence and intensity
of ducting are governed by the vertical changes in these quantities, because ducting is associated with a negative vertical
120 ~~gradient in modified refractivity rather than with uniformly warm, cold, dry, or humid conditions alone. In practice, strong~~
~~vertical contrasts in moisture and temperature between adjacent layers are therefore more important for duct formation than~~
~~the absolute state of a single layer.~~

3.2 Weather model Harmonie-AROME

The current operational numerical weather prediction model used at FMI (Finnish Meteorological Institute) is Harmonie-
125 AROME (Müller et al., 2017; Frogner et al., 2019). At the time this study took place the model version was cy43h2.2.1. The
Harmonie-AROME is a meso-scale model suitable for convective permitting scales. It has non-hydrostatic dynamics (Bénard
et al., 2010; Bubnová et al., 1995) with fully compressible Eulerian equations (Laprise, 1992; Simmons and Burridge, 1981).
The equations are solved in time and space with a semi-Lagrangian advection scheme on a grid and a semi-Implicit two-time-
level scheme following spectral representation of prognostic variables with double Fourier decomposition (ECMWF, 2015).
130 The model calculation step is 75 seconds, and the horizontal grid space is 2.5 km with 65 vertical levels (Bengtsson et al.,
2017). Wherein, the lowest model level is approximately at 10 m height and the top is at 10 hPa (~33 000m). The model
physics parameterization schemes are described in more detailed in Bengtsson et al. (2017) and Seity et al. (2011).

In HARMONIE-AROME, each grid point consists of multiple surface tiles, and near-surface variables such as temperature
(T2m) and specific humidity (Q2m) are computed as weighted averages over these tiles according to their fractional coverage.
135 For each tile the diagnostic values are obtained by interpolating between lowest model level and surface (Geleyn, 1988; Dian
and Masek, 2015).

The Harmonie-AROME is nested together with IFS forecasts from ECMWF (The European Centre for Medium-Range
Weather Forecasts, ECMWF (2023)). IFS provides initial and boundary conditions for Harmonie-AROME, including the sea
surface temperature (SST) analysis. This analysis ~~originate~~ originates from the OSTIA Sea Surface Temperature (SST) analysis
140 provided by the UK ~~Meteorological~~ Met Office (Good et al., 2020). ~~In the operational runs the SST is kept constant during the~~
~~whole forecast cycle, which may cause forecasting error on near surface temperature in an upwelling situation~~ FMI's operational
~~configuration, SST is prescribed from the OSTIA analysis and kept constant throughout the full 24-h forecast cycle. While this~~
~~assumption is generally sufficient under many conditions, it may introduce errors in near-surface atmospheric temperature and~~
~~stability during periods of rapid SST variations, particularly during coastal upwelling. Upwelling brings colder subsurface~~
145 ~~water to the surface, thereby altering the air-sea temperature difference. This change can modify the near-surface atmospheric~~
~~stratification and the vertical gradient of modified refractivity. Similar effects may occur during other processes causing rapid~~
~~SST changes, such as coastal mixing or the passage of fronts.~~

In respect to radar refractivity, the most important parameterization scheme in Harmonie-AROME is the turbulence scheme HARATU (Van Meijgaard et al., 2012). The turbulence scheme affects air temperature and humidity, through cloud/fog formation and wind. The turbulent kinetic energy (TKE) has source and sink terms which take into account wind shear, buoyancy, transport and dissipation of TKE. The turbulent mixing length includes two parts: a stable conditions and near-neutral convective conditions (Lenderink and Holtslag, 2004). The stability coefficients take into account moist processes, such as cloud droplet condensation and evaporation and how these processes affect latent heat.

3.3 NWP experiments

In this study, four ~~different model resolutions were tested to see how the vertical and horizontal resolution affects predictions of radar refractivity. These model configurations are presented in Table 1. The vertical resolution was tested with 65 model configurations were selected to investigate the sensitivity relevant to the present analysis while keeping the experimental design within a physically meaningful range of resolutions. The 2500L65 experiment corresponds to the current operational Harmonie-AROME configuration, whereas 2500L90 represents the coming increase in vertical resolution. The 750L65 and 90-levels. Similarly, the horizontal resolution was changed between 750L90 experiments were included to assess the effect of increasing horizontal resolution while preserving the same model physics and vertical structure. A horizontal grid spacing of 750 m and 2500 m. For all of the model configurations m remains consistent with the present model formulation, whereas substantially finer scales would require additional development of the parameterization schemes and model dynamics. These configurations are summarized in Table 1. For all experiments, the forecast length was set to 24 h + analysis time, and cycled 4 and the model was cycled four times per day (00, 06, 12 and 18 UTC). The study area (fig Fig. 1) and period (19 June–11 July, in the period (19 June–11 July 2022) were chosen based on selected on the basis of available observations from the Utö mast and Utö the coastal surveillance radar (Rautiainen et al., 2025).~~

~~The NWP model output was post-processed. To ensure comparability with the model output, the mast observations were averaged to hourly means by calculating the arithmetic mean over each 1 h interval. This procedure was adopted to match the temporal resolution of the model output. For each measurement level, temperature, relative humidity, and pressure were therefore converted to hourly means before computing the modified refractivity and its vertical gradients, by using the equations presented in section (2). The values for modified refractivity were calculated and compared against the observation based values. The results of these calculations are presented in next section.~~

~~The comparison between model and observations was performed by computing the gradient between adjacent observation levels and between the nearest corresponding model levels, without interpolating either dataset onto a common height grid. Because the observational heights did not exactly correspond to the model levels, the closest model level was selected for comparison. And because the model vertical coordinates are hybrid levels, the comparison was based on the nearest matching level pairs rather than an interpolated common-height profile. This procedure was used for all model configurations and all lead times.~~

180 The effect of using hourly averaged observations instead of instantaneous values was assessed and found to be small (not shown here). In addition, the temperature and specific humidity profiles were ~~also~~ analyzed to widen the understanding of possible forecasting errors. ~~The results of these calculations are presented in next section.~~

3.4 Verification metrics

Model performance was evaluated using standard categorical verification metrics derived from a 2×2 contingency table. 185 Ducting conditions were defined in a binary framework (“Yes”/“No”) for both observations and forecasts using the modified refractivity gradient threshold $dM/dh < 0$. The observational classification was based on mast measurements from which the vertical gradient of modified refractivity was derived, as described in Section XX. This classification yields four possible outcomes: hits (both forecast and observed), false alarms (forecast only), misses (observed only), and correct rejections (neither forecast nor observed).

190 From these counts, a set of skill scores was calculated. The frequency bias (Bias) quantifies the ratio of forecast occurrences to observed occurrences, indicating underprediction (Bias < 1) or overprediction (Bias > 1), with an ideal value of 1. The proportion correct (PC) represents the fraction of all correctly classified cases, including both hits and correct rejections.

To emphasize the correct prediction of ducting events, the threat score (TS), also known as the critical success index, was used. TS measures the proportion of correctly forecast events relative to all cases where ducting was either forecast or observed, 195 excluding correct rejections. The probability of detection (POD) describes the fraction of observed ducting events that were successfully forecast, whereas the false alarm ratio (FAR) represents the fraction of forecast events that did not occur. Since POD is insensitive to false alarms and FAR does not account for missed events, these metrics are interpreted together.

The resulting skill scores are summarized in the Performance diagram (fig. 8), where POD is plotted against the success ratio (1 - FAR). In this representation, points closer to the upper-right corner indicate better overall performance, combining high 200 detection rates with low false alarm frequencies. Lines of constant frequency bias and threat score provide additional guidance for interpretation, allowing simultaneous assessment of forecast reliability and event detection capability.

4 Results

Analysis of vertical gradients from Utö mast observations, in figure 2, show separately the effects of temperature and water vapor pressure on the M -gradient. A positive temperature gradient with decreasing modified refractivity occurs in 8.6% of time 205 during testing period, while a negative water vapor pressure gradient with decreasing modified refractivity is more frequent at $\sim 30\%$. The combined condition of positive temperature and negative water vapor pressure gradients occurs in 8.6% of cases (not shown in fig), similar to the temperature-only condition. This, highlights the dominant role of moisture in generating negative M -gradients and conditions favorable for ducting.

Figure 3 represents time series of modified refractivity for the testing period. The first panel shows the calculated values 210 based on the Utö mast measurements. The next four panels are model experiments with varying vertical and horizontal resolutions, with 65–90 levels and ~~750m–2500m~~ 750 m–2500 m. The vertical axis is restricted to the NWP model levels that are

comparable to the Utö measurements (lower than 60m). Therefore, only the lowest three levels are included in the figures for the L65 and four levels for the L90. Note, the M -gradient is the change between two levels. The bluish negative values indicate presence of ducting conditions.

215 The top panel of figure 3 shows, that during the test period ducting conditions were mostly occurring in a very shallow layer ($< 15\text{m}$) above the ground. The following panels in this same figure, immediately reveal the limitations of the NWP model. None of the experiments are able to capture the near surface ducts (lower than 15m) correctly. However, the results in the upper level ($\sim 30\text{m}$) show remarkably similar features compared to observations.

The first ducting situation around midnight of 22nd June 2022, was captured by all the NWP model configurations. In the
220 experiments with L65 vertical resolution, the forecasted ducting conditions are expected to be much stronger compared to the observation. Yet, the experiments with L90 have a more realistic vertical structure. The gradient is not as strong near the surface during this event; however, this comes at the cost of temporal accuracy regarding the event's duration. Similar features are seen during the ducting event from 25th to 28th of June. A broader analysis of the weather maps (not shown here) reveal that the first event is related to a cold front passing over Utö islands. The longer ducting event during 26th ~~th~~ th 28th June is related to a high
225 pressure system over Estonia, leading to subsidence.

The time series of specific humidity is presented in figure 4. There is a hydrolapse (specific humidity decreasing with height) during the event on 22nd June 2022. Yet, the model is dryer than the observation. Also based on figure 4 (two upper most pannels), the model experiments are much colder than observed. Similar features also occur between 26th ~~th~~ th 28th June and 2nd ~~of~~ July.

230 During the time period between 3rd ~~rd~~ th 10th ~~of~~ July strong ducting conditions are observed near the surface which the models are not able to replicate (fig. 3). The model experiments with L90 have a small guess about the event, but they are not able to form strong enough ducting conditions near the surface and the duration of the events are far too short. The vertical humidity structure is not strong enough in these cases. Overall, experiments with 750m horizontal resolution are able to capture the diurnal temperature cycle more accurately, compared to 2500m experiments (fig. 6). These events are also related to frontal
235 activity, but much weaker occluded fronts.

In figure 5, scatter plots for temperature, specific humidity and modified refractivity are shown between the modeled and observed values for heights 2 m, 30 m and 60 m. A perfect forecast would land on the diagonal. Similar features were present in all the model configurations, thereby only our operational weather forecasting configuration (2500L65) is presented here. Based on this figure, the weather model under predicts high temperature ($>22\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$) and water vapor pressure ($>22\text{ hPa}$) values,
240 which leads to an underestimation of the magnitude of the modified refractivity. Importantly, as already shown the importance of moisture (fig. 2), too-low value near the surface reduces the likelihood of achieving a negative M -gradient. Yet, if the forecasting error is of equal size for the consecutive vertical levels, it does not have an effect on the M -gradient.

A detailed inspection of the tile distribution (see. section 3.2) at the Utö mast coordinates shows that, at 2500 m horizontal resolution, the grid point is classified as 100% sea. At higher resolution (750m) experiments, the same location is still mainly
245 sea, with more than 80% sea fraction. This leads to a different surface energy balance compared to the actual measurement

site, which is located on a small island. In particular, the higher heat capacity of water restrict the diurnal temperature cycle and limits daytime warming (fig. 6), resulting in a systematic cold bias during early summer.

At 30 m height, the observed diurnal cycle is no longer evident (even in measurements, fig. 4), yet the negative temperature bias persists. A similar increase in bias is also seen in specific humidity during this period, suggesting that the misrepresentation of surface conditions affects both temperature and moisture fields. In contrast, the model reproduces wind speed and direction at 30 m reasonably well, indicating that the large-scale flow is captured accurately, while near-surface thermodynamic processes remain poorly represented.

Figure 7 shows an example of profiles, and highlights the challenges the model faces in representing near-surface temperature inversions and humidity structures. Observations show a much sharper vertical gradient close to the surface than either of the model configurations, even though the total temperature and humidity difference between the surface and 30 meters height is similar. The limited number of vertical levels in the model leads to too linear representation of the profile compared to the observations, which benefit from a higher vertical resolution and therefore are able to capture more detailed structure in this shallow layer. Although the L90 experiment has a more realistic vertical structure of specific humidity, it is not able to capture the shallow temperature inversion correctly, leading to over-prediction of the M -value.

Figure 8 shows the performance diagram of modified refractivity for Utö station during the testing period. The probability of detection (POD) and success ratio (SR) are presented for each observation level and model experiment separately. The perfect forecast would land at the top right corner, having POD = 1 and SC = 1, with false alarm ratio = FAR = 0. At the lowest observation levels (5m and 10m), the probability of detection for negative modified refractivity gradient is only 47%. However, higher up (20m, 30m, 60m), the models exhibit significantly similar features to the observations, with prediction accuracies ranging from 91% to 97%. Overall, the false alarm ratio remains very modest, at approximately 6% to 10%. FAR is a ratio between correctly forecasted events and false alarms. FAR does not take into account missed events.

5 Discussion

The aim of this study was to evaluate the ability of the NWP model HARMONIE-AROME to forecast ducting by varying both horizontal and vertical resolution. Forecasts were compared to observations from the Utö mast. The results indicate that vertical resolution has a greater impact on forecast accuracy than horizontal resolution, particularly for near-surface temperature and humidity structures. In complex coastal and archipelago environments, such as the Finnish coastline, small-scale surface features may not be fully resolved at typical model grid resolutions. As demonstrated by the Utö case, this can locally influence the representation of near-surface conditions, even though the model performs well overall.

~~Signal propagation also~~ The probability of trapping depends on the relative position between the duct and the signal source: the closer the source is to the duct, the higher source height relative to the trapping layer, as well as on the wavelength of the electromagnetic signal. A source located within the trapping layer interacts more strongly with the layer, increasing the likelihood of anomalous signal propagation. In contrast, a source located outside the trapping layer may still interact with the layer and experience anomalous propagation, with the likelihood of signal-trapping such propagation increasing as the

distance to the trapping layer decreases. A dedicated propagation model is therefore required to calculate actual signal paths.
280 Nevertheless, NWP refraction forecasts provide a useful overview of the location and height of potential ducts, allowing users to assess possible impacts based on their own position.

Future work includes exploring methods to artificially increase the number of diagnostic levels or the resolution of certain variables without the need to run the full 3D model at higher vertical resolution, which is computationally expensive. Such approaches may allow more detailed analyses of near-surface and boundary layer processes while keeping the operational
285 model setup unchanged. In parallel, further improvements in vertical resolution could be considered, but diagnostic tools provide a cost-effective alternative to adding additional model levels.

If these developments are successful, ensemble forecasts of refractivity could be implemented ~~-, providing to provide~~ estimates of forecast uncertainty, as previously demonstrated by Zhao et al. (2016) and Guo et al. (2025). Ensemble forecasting is already performed with our current numerical weather prediction system (Bengtsson et al., 2017; Frogner et al., 2019), providing
290 a foundation for extending the approach to refractivity and ducting forecasts. As refractivity is highly sensitive to small vertical variations in temperature and humidity, ~~enhancing forecasts~~ improving the representation and prediction of these parameters will directly improve the predictability of ducting conditions.

Overall, the results of this study support the plan to increase the number of vertical levels in the operational NWP model and to continue improving the representation of near-surface thermodynamic processes.

295 6 Conclusions

Although the model struggles to reproduce near-surface temperature inversions and humidity structures, at higher levels the forecasts are in closer agreement with observations. The grid point at Utö is largely sea, even at 750 m resolution, which limits daytime warming and the diurnal cycle near the surface. Consequently, due to the misrepresentation of the land–sea distribution at the measurement site, the model systematically underestimates near-surface temperature and humidity. Introducing more
300 vertical levels improves the representation of gradients and adds structure to the forecasts, reflecting the sensitivity of modified refractivity to vertical changes in temperature and humidity.

Notably, at 30 m height the model and observations begin to resemble each other, and wind speed and direction are well captured. This indicates that, when surface effects are less dominant, the model has the potential to reproduce thermodynamics accurately. Overall, the study highlights the importance of resolving both vertical structure and heterogeneous coastal sur-
305 faces in high-resolution models to improve forecasts of temperature, humidity, and ducting conditions in marine and coastal environments.

Code and data availability.

The Harmonie-AROME model, developed collaboratively at the European level, is not publicly available, as it is built on the same code framework as the global ECMWF/IFS and MF/Arpege models. These global models are not open source and share a

310 substantial portion of their code with Harmonie. Therefore the access is restricted to ECMWF, Arpege, and ACCORD partners. Similarly, the raw data from the test period (spanning over three weeks and four experiments, approximately 5 T) cannot be fully shared due to its size. In our experiments, we used the NWP version `harmonie_release/git/tags/harmonie-43h2.2.1`, with modifications applied only to the Harmonie namelist variables related to resolution, as detailed here:

```

# In harmonie_exp/nam/config_exp.h
DOMAIN=DUCT2500                # See definitions in scr/Harmonie_domains.pm
TOPO_SOURCE=gmted2010           # Input source for orography.
GRID_TYPE=CUBIC                 # Type of grid (LINEAR|QUADRATIC|CUBIC)
VLEV=65                        # Vertical level definition name

# In harmonie_exp/scr/Harmonie_domains.pm
315 sub Harmonie_domains{
    my $domain=shift;
    my %domains = (
        'DUCT750'=>{
            'TSTEP'  => '30',
            320     'NLON'  => '800',
            'NLAT'   => '720',
            'LONC'   => '21.38',
            'LATC'   => '59.78',
            'LON0'   => '21.38',
            325     'LAT0'   => '59.78',
            'GSIZE'  => '750.',
        },
        'DUCT2500'=>{
            'TSTEP'  => '60',
            330     'NLON'  => '400',
            'NLAT'   => '360',
            'LONC'   => '21.38',
            'LATC'   => '59.78',
            'LON0'   => '21.38',
            335     'LAT0'   => '59.78',
            'GSIZE'  => '2500.',
        },
    ),

```

For reasons of national security, the computational code used for ducting calculations is not available. However, pre-computed modified refractive values based on point forecasts for the Utö measurement station, along with observations for the test period
340 (19 June 2022 – 11 July 2022), are made available. These datasets are provided in NetCDF and csv format and can be accessed for further analysis: DOI10.5281/zenodo.20305838 (Hämäläinen et al., 2026).

All scripts for plotting are available: <https://zenodo.org/records/20305839> (Hämäläinen, 2026).

Author contributions. Karoliina Hämäläinen: Model simulations, Data analysis, Writing (main responsible for draft preparation and editing).
345 Laura Rautiainen: Providing observational data, Writing (review, editing). Jani Tyynelä: Supervision, Writing (review, editing), Project administration. Lauri Laakso: Supervision, Writing (review)

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no financial, personal, or other competing interests that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements. The authors gratefully acknowledge the Finnish Scientific Advisory Board for Defence for funding this research through the project “*Predicting signal propagation conditions using numerical methods*”. In addition, a preliminary study supporting this work was
350 funded by the Academy of Finland through the project “*Enabling forecasts on radar performance in marine environment*” (project number 338150).

The authors also acknowledge the technical and research infrastructure support provided by the Finnish Marine Research Infrastructure (FINMARI) and the Integrated Carbon Observing System (ICOS), which contributed to the data collection and analysis used in this study. The authors further acknowledge the ACCORD consortium for the development and continued advancement of the Harmonie-AROME
355 modelling system.

References

- Ao, C. O.: Effect of ducting on radio occultation measurements: An assessment based on high-resolution radiosonde soundings, *Radio Science*, 42, 1–15, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006RS003485>, 2007.
- Atkinson, B. and Zhu, M.: Coastal effects on radar propagation in atmospheric ducting conditions, *Meteorological Applications*, 13, 53–62, 2006.
- Atkinson, B. W., Li, J., and Plant, R. S.: Numerical modeling of the propagation environment in the atmospheric boundary layer over the Persian Gulf, *Journal of applied meteorology*, 40, 586–603, 2001.
- Babin, S. M., Young, G. S., and Carton, J. A.: A new model of the oceanic evaporation duct, *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 36, 193–204, 1997.
- 365 Barkmeijer, J., Lindskog, M., Gustafsson, N., Bojarova, J., Azad, R., Monteiro, I., Secriba, P., Whelan, E., Ridal, M., Sánchez Arriola, J., et al.: HARMONIE-AROME 4D-Var, ALADIN-HIRLAM Newsletter No. 16, <https://www.umr-cnrm.fr/aladin/IMG/pdf/nl16.pdf>, published February 8, 2021, 2021.
- Basha, G., Venkat Ratnam, M., Manjula, G., and Chandra Sekhar, A. V.: Anomalous propagation conditions observed over a tropical station using high-resolution GPS radiosonde observations, *Radio Science*, 48, 42–49, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/rds.20012>, 2013.
- 370 Bean, B. R. and Dutton, E. J.: in: *Radio meteorology*, <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:124549052>, 1966.
- Bechtold, P.: *Atmospheric Thermodynamics*, Tech. rep., ECMWF, Shinfield Park, Reading, England, <https://www.ecmwf.int/sites/default/files/elibrary/2015/16954-atmospheric-thermodynamics.pdf>, accessed: 2023-03-02, 2015.
- Bengtsson, L., Andrae, U., Aspelien, T., Batrak, Y., Calvo, J., de Rooy, W., Gleeson, E., Hansen-Sass, B., Homleid, M., Hortal, M., et al.: The HARMONIE–AROME model configuration in the ALADIN–HIRLAM NWP system, *Monthly Weather Review*, 145, 1919–1935, 2017.
- 375 Bubnová, R., Hello, G., Bénard, P., and Geleyn, J.-F.: Integration of the Fully Elastic Equations Cast in the Hydrostatic Pressure Terrain-Following Coordinate in the Framework of the ARPEGE/Aladin NWP System, *Monthly Weather Review*, 123, 515–535, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1995\)123<0515:IOTFEE>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1995)123<0515:IOTFEE>2.0.CO;2), 1995.
- Bénard, P., Vivoda, J., Mašek, J., Smolíková, P., Yessad, K., Smith, C., Brožková, R., and Geleyn, J.-F.: Dynamical kernel of the Aladin–NH spectral limited-area model: Revised formulation and sensitivity experiments, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 136, 155–169, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.522>, 2010.
- 380 Derksen, J.: *Radar Performance Modelling*, Master’s thesis, Delft University of Technology, 2016.
- Dian, M. and Masek, J.: Improving the Computation of Screen Level Fields (Temperature, Moisture), Report of LACE Stay at CHMI in Prague 11.04. 2015–29.04. 2015, 2015, Prague, https://www.rclace.eu/media/files/Physics/2016/dian_screeninter_pragueApr2016.pdf, 2015.
- 385 Dougherty, H. T.: The role of elevated ducting for radio service and interference fields, vol. 81, US Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information ..., 1981.
- ECMWF: IFS Documentation CY41R1: Part III: Dynamics and Numerical Procedures, ECMWF, <https://www.ecmwf.int/node/9210>, accessed: 2015-03-02, 2015.
- 390 ECMWF: IFS Documentation, <https://www.ecmwf.int/en/publications/ifs-documentation>, accessed: 2023-03-14, 2023.

- Essen, H., Danklmayer, A., Förster, J., Behn, M., Hurtaud, Y., Fabbro, V., and Castanet, L.: Joint French-German radar measurements for the determination of the refractive index in the maritime boundary layer, in: *Optics in Atmospheric Propagation and Adaptive Systems XV*, vol. 8535, pp. 16–24, SPIE, 2012.
- Förster, J. and Riechen, J.: Measurements of refractive variability in the marine boundary layer in comparison with mesoscale meteorological model predictions, in: *Optics in atmospheric propagation and adaptive systems IX*, vol. 6364, p. 636402, SPIE, 2006.
- Frogner, I.-L., Andrae, U., Bojarova, J., Callado, A., Escribà, P., Feddersen, H., Hally, A., Kauhanen, J., Randriamampianina, R., Singleton, A., et al.: HarmonEPS—the HARMONIE ensemble prediction system, *Weather and Forecasting*, 34, 1909–1937, 2019.
- Geleyn, J.-F.: Interpolation of wind, temperature and humidity values from model levels to the height of measurement, *Tellus A*, 40, 347–351, 1988.
- Good, S., Fiedler, E., Mao, C., Martin, M. J., Maycock, A., Reid, R., Roberts-Jones, J., Searle, T., Waters, J., While, J., et al.: The current configuration of the OSTIA system for operational production of foundation sea surface temperature and ice concentration analyses, *Remote Sensing*, 12, 720, 2020.
- Grabner, M. and Kvicera, V.: Refractive index measurement at TV tower Prague, *RADIOENGINEERING-PRAGUE*, 12, 5–7, 2003.
- Grønsleth, M. S. and Randriamampianina, R.: Assimilation of Radar Reflectivity Data in HARMONIE, Tech. rep., Norwegian Meteorological Institute, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Roger-Randriamampianina/publication/265360510_Assimilation_of_radar_reflectivity_data_in_HARMONIE/links/54c651dd0cf2911c7a58aa76/Assimilation-of-radar-reflectivity-data-in-HARMONIE.pdf, accessed: 2023-03-19, 2012.
- Guo, H., Wang, B., Zou, J., Zhao, X., Wang, B., Qiu, Z., Wang, H., Liu, L., Liu, X., and Wang, H.: Establishment and Evaluation of an Ensemble Bias Correction Framework for the Short-Term Numerical Forecasting on Lower Atmospheric Ducts, *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*, 13, 2397, 2025.
- Haack, T., Wang, C., Garrett, S., Glazer, A., Mailhot, J., and Marshall, R.: Mesoscale modeling of boundary layer refractivity and atmospheric ducting, *Journal of applied meteorology and climatology*, 49, 2437–2457, 2010.
- Hagelin, S., Azad, R., Lindskog, M., Schyberg, H., and Körnich, H.: Evaluating the use of Aeolus satellite observations in the regional numerical weather prediction (NWP) model Harmonie-Arome, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 14, 5925–5938, 2021.
- Hämäläinen, K.: Harmonie-AROME ducting plotting, <https://zenodo.org/records/20305839>, 2026.
- Hämäläinen, K., Rautiainen, L., Tyynelä, J., and Laakso, L.: Data for manuscript: "Effects of model resolution on predicting atmospheric ducting conditions with Harmonie-AROME", <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20305838>, 2026.
- Honkanen, M., Tuovinen, J.-P., Laurila, T., Mäkelä, T., Hatakka, J., Kielosto, S., and Laakso, L.: Measuring turbulent CO₂ fluxes with a closed-path gas analyzer in a marine environment, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 11, 5335–5350, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-11-5335-2018>, 2018.
- Huang, L., Zhao, X., and Liu, Y.: The Statistical Characteristics of Atmospheric Ducts Observed Over Stations in Different Regions of American Mainland Based on High-Resolution GPS Radiosonde Soundings, *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, Volume 10 - 2022, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2022.946226>, 2022a.
- Huang, L.-F., Liu, C.-G., Wang, H.-G., Zhu, Q.-L., Zhang, L.-J., Han, J., Zhang, Y.-S., and Wang, Q.-N.: Experimental Analysis of Atmospheric Ducts and Navigation Radar Over-the-Horizon Detection, *Remote Sensing*, 14, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs14112588>, 2022b.
- ITU: The radio refractive index: its formula and refractivity data, Recommendation ITU-R P.453-14, International Telecommunication Union, <https://www.itu.int/rec/R-REC-P.453/en>, 2019.
- Laakso, L., Mikkonen, S., Drebs, A., Karjalainen, A., Pirinen, P., and Alenius, P.: 100 years of atmospheric and marine observations at the Finnish Utö Island in the Baltic Sea, *Ocean science*, 14, 617–632, 2018.

- Laprise, R.: The Euler Equations of Motion with Hydrostatic Pressure as an Independent Variable, *Monthly Weather Review*, 120, 197–207, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1992\)120<0197:TEEOMW>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1992)120<0197:TEEOMW>2.0.CO;2), 1992.
- Lenderink, G. and Holtslag, A. A.: An updated length-scale formulation for turbulent mixing in clear and cloudy boundary layers, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society: A journal of the atmospheric sciences, applied meteorology and physical oceanography*, 130, 3405–3427, 2004.
- Lopez, P.: A 5-yr 40-km-resolution global climatology of superrefraction for ground-based weather radars, *Journal of applied meteorology and climatology*, 48, 89–110, 2009.
- Mai, Y., Sheng, Z., Shi, H., Liao, Q., and Zhang, W.: Spatiotemporal distribution of atmospheric ducts in Alaska and its relationship with the Arctic vortex, *International Journal of Antennas and Propagation*, 2020, 9673 289, 2020.
- Mesnard, F. and Sauvageot, H.: Climatology of anomalous propagation radar echoes in a coastal area, *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 49, 2285–2300, 2010.
- Müller, M., Homleid, M., Ivarsson, K.-I., Køltzow, M. A., Lindskog, M., Midtbø, K. H., Andrae, U., Aspelien, T., Berggren, L., Bjørge, D., et al.: AROME-MetCoOp: A Nordic convective-scale operational weather prediction model, *Weather and Forecasting*, 32, 609–627, 2017.
- Norin, L.: Observations of anomalous propagation over waters near Sweden, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques Discussions*, 2022, 1–20, 2022.
- Norin, L., Wellander, N., and Devasthale, A.: Anomalous propagation and the sinking of the Russian warship Moskva, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 104, E2286–E2304, 2023.
- Pastore, D. M., Greenway, D. P., Stanek, M. J., Wessinger, S. E., Haack, T., Wang, Q., and Hackett, E. E.: Comparison of atmospheric refractivity estimation methods and their influence on radar propagation predictions, *Radio Science*, 56, 1–17, 2021.
- Patterson, W. L. and Skolnik, M.: The Propagation Factor, F_p , in the radar equation, *Radar Handbook*, p. 263, 2008.
- Paulus, R. A.: Practical application of an evaporation duct model, *Radio Science*, 20, 887–896, <https://doi.org/10.1029/RS020i004p00887>, 1985.
- Rautiainen, L., Tyynelä, J., Lensu, M., Siiriä, S., Vakkari, V., O'Connor, E., Hämäläinen, K., Lonka, H., Stenbäck, K., Koistinen, J., et al.: Utö Observatory for Analysing Atmospheric Ducting Events over Baltic Coastal and Marine Waters, *Remote Sensing*, 15, 2989, 2023a.
- Rautiainen, L., Tyynelä, J., and Laakso, L.: Occurrence and characteristics of ducts based on radiosonde profiles measured at Jokioinen., *Tech. rep.*, Finnish Meteorological Institute, 2023b.
- Rautiainen, L., Tyynelä, J., Laakso, L., Lensu, M., Siiriä, S., Vakkari, V., O'Connor, E., Hämäläinen, K., Lonka, H., Stenbäck, K., and Koistinen, J.: Radar over-the-horizon observations for studying atmospheric ducting in a marine environment, in: 2023 IEEE Conference on Antenna Measurements and Applications (CAMA), pp. 318–320, <https://doi.org/10.1109/CAMA57522.2023.10352708>, 2023c.
- Rautiainen, L., Lensu, M., Vakkari, V., Tyynelä, J., Kanarik, H., and Laakso, L.: Marine Atmospheric Ducting Statistics Based on 2 Years of Coastal Surveillance Radar Observations, *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 64, 63–76, 2025.
- Seity, Y., Brousseau, P., Malardel, S., Hello, G., Bénard, P., Bouttier, F., Lac, C., and Masson, V.: The AROME-France convective-scale operational model, *Monthly Weather Review*, 139, 976–991, 2011.
- Simmons, A. J. and Burridge, D. M.: An Energy and Angular-Momentum Conserving Vertical Finite-Difference Scheme and Hybrid Vertical Coordinates, *Monthly Weather Review*, 109, 758–766, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1981\)109<0758:AEAAMC>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1981)109<0758:AEAAMC>2.0.CO;2), 1981.
- Turton, J., Bennetts, D., and Farmer, S. G.: An introduction to radio ducting, *Meteorological Magazine*, 117, 245–254, 1988.
- Van Meijgaard, E., Van Uft, L., Lenderink, G., De Roode, S., Wipfler, E. L., Boers, R., and van Timmermans, R.: Refinement and application of a regional atmospheric model for climate scenario calculations of Western Europe, *KVR 054/12*, KVR, 2012.

- Von Engeln, A. and Teixeira, J.: A ducting climatology derived from the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts global analysis fields, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 109, 2004.
- Wagner, N. K.: An analysis of radiosonde effects on the measured frequency of occurrence of ducting layers, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 65, 2077–2085, 1960.
- Wang, Q., Alappattu, D. P., Billingsley, S., Blomquist, B., Burkholder, R. J., Christman, A. J., Creegan, E. D., de Paolo, T., Eleuterio, D. P., Fernando, H. J. S., Franklin, K. B., Grachev, A. A., Haack, T., Hanley, T. R., Hocut, C. M., Holt, T. R., Horgan, K., Jonsson, H. H., Hale, R. A., Kalogiros, J. A., Khelif, D., Leo, L. S., Lind, R. J., Lozovatsky, I., Planella-Morato, J., Mukherjee, S., Nuss, W. A., Pozderac, J., Rogers, L. T., Savelyev, I., Savidge, D. K., Shearman, R. K., Shen, L., Terrill, E., Ulate, A. M., Wang, Q., Wendt, R. T., Wiss, R., Woods, R. K., Xu, L., Yamaguchi, R. T., and Yardim, C.: CASPER: Coupled Air–Sea Processes and Electromagnetic Ducting Research, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 99, 1449 – 1471, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-16-0046.1>, 2018.
- Zhao, Q., Haack, T., McLay, J., and Reynolds, C.: Ensemble Prediction of Atmospheric Refractivity Conditions for EM Propagation, *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 55, 2113 – 2130, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-16-0033.1>, 2016.
- Zhu, J., Zou, H., Kong, L., Zhou, L., Li, P., Cheng, W., and Bian, S.: Surface atmospheric duct over Svalbard, Arctic, related to atmospheric and ocean conditions in winter, *Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research*, 54, 264–273, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15230430.2022.2072052>, 2022.




Figure 1. Model domain around Utö Island in the southwest Finnish archipelago. Utö Island is marked with a red dot.





Figure 2. Scatter plots of observed vertical gradients of temperature (dT/dh ; orange) and water vapor pressure (de/dh ; blue) gradients versus against the modified refractivity gradient (dM/dh ; gray) at different vertical across all analyzed levels between 2m to 60m. Orange and blue points highlight cases satisfying the ducting-related conditions $dT/dh > 0$ and $dM/dh < 0$, based on observations and $de/dh < 0$ and $dM/dh < 0$, respectively. The proportion of such cases are given is shown in the title each panel title.

Utö vertical profile timeseries comparison



Utö time series comparison: EXP = 2500L65




Figure 4. Time series of temperature (T), specific humidity (Q), modified refractivity gradient (dM/dh), and wind speed (WS) and direction (WD) at 2 m and 30 m at the Utö mast location. Dark blue curves show indicate model results from the operational model configuration, while light blue curves show observations from the Utö mast observations. In panel (a), and the pink curve in the top panel represents 2 m temperature from the nearest Automatic Weather Station (AWS), located further farther inland on Utö Island.

Utö scatter comparison: EXP = 2500L65




Figure 5. Scatterplots of modeled versus observed near-surface atmospheric variables at Utö for experiment EXP = 2500L65. Panels (a–c) show temperature (T , red °C), panels (d–f) specific humidity (q , blue g/kg), and panels (g–i) modified refractivity (M , green M-units), each evaluated at 2 m, 30 m, and 59 m above ground level. Model-In all panels, observations are on the x-axis and model values (on the y-axis). The dashed line represents the theoretical perfect forecast. For each panel: sample size (n) are plotted against observations, mean bias (x -axis model - observation), and RMSE are presented.

Utö temperature time series at mast location




Figure 6. Time series of air temperature at Utö mast location at three levels heights: (a) 2 m (top), 30 m (middle), and 59 m (bottom) 59 m. Colors indicate Model results are shown for two horizontal resolutions of, 2500 m (dark blue) and 750 m (light blue), and are compared with observations in (pink). Vertical resolutions are shown resolution is indicated by line style: solid lines (denote 65 model levels) and dashed lines (denote 90 model levels).

Observed and modelled vertical profiles at Utö 2022-07-06 12:00:00




Figure 7. Vertical profiles of temperature (T), water vapor pressure (e), and modified refractivity (M) on 6th of July 2022 at 12 UTC from observations at the Utö mast and two model configurations with different numbers of levels (, 2500L65 and 2500L90). Colors indicate temperature (T, red), water vapor pressure (e, blue), and modified refractivity (M, green). Observations and model profiles are shown as points connected by lines, with observations in black and the 2500L65 and 2500L90 configurations in dark and light blue, respectively. Both model configurations have a horizontal resolution of 2500 m and modified refractivity (M) using 65 and 90 hybrid vertical levels, respectively. Of these, 3 levels in 2500L65 and 4 levels in 2500L90 are located below 60 m.




Figure 8. Performance diagram of modeled modified refractivity against Utö mast measurements, showing four skill scores: POD (vertical axis), success ratio (horizontal axis), frequency bias (Bias, straight lines), and threat score (TS, curved lines). Model experiments are distinguished by color, with symbols indicate heights. The perfect score lies at the top-right corner. All forecast lead times (+1 to +24 h) are included.

Effects of temperature and humidity on strength of refractivity, N. Temperature Humidity Duct strength Warm Dry + Warm Humid ++ Cold Dry +++ Cold Humid ++++

Table 1. List of different model set-ups.

Experiment	Horizontal resolution	Number of model levels
750L65	750m	65
2500L65	2500m	65
750L90	750m	90
2500L90	2500m	90