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Abstract  The solar cycle (SC) stratospheric ozone response is thought to influence surface weather and climate. To understand the chain of processes and ensure climate models adequately represent them, it is important to detect and quantify an accurate SC ozone response from observations. Chemistry climate models (CCMs) and observations display a range of upper stratosphere (1–10 hPa) zonally averaged spatial responses; this and the recommended data set for comparison remains disputed. Recent data-merging advancements have led to more robust observational data. Using these data, we show that the observed SC signal exhibits an upper stratosphere U-shaped spatial structure with lobes emanating from the tropics (5–10 hPa) to high altitudes at midlatitudes (1–3 hPa). We confirm this using two independent chemistry climate models in specified dynamics mode and an idealized timeslice experiment. We recommend the BASICv2 ozone composite to best represent historical upper stratospheric solar variability, and that those based on SBUV alone should not be used.

Plain Language Summary  Changes in the output of the Sun are thought to influence surface weather and climate through a set of processes initiated by the enhancement of upper stratosphere (32–48 km) ozone. In order to understand and assess the solar impact on the climate system, it is important that models reproduce the observed solar signal. However, the recommended data set for comparison with climate models remains disputed. We use newly improved observed ozone composites to determine both why there is disagreement between composites and which is most likely to be correct. We find that artifact-corrected composites represent the response better than those based on SBUV data alone. Further, we identify a U-shaped spatial structure with lobes emanating from the tropics to high altitudes at midlatitudes. An idealized chemistry climate model experiment and simulations considering historical meteorological conditions both support this conclusion. The results are of benefit to satellite-instrument scientists and to those engaged in atmospheric and climate research using both observations and climate models. The results will be important for assessing the solar signal in currently active and future assessments of chemistry climate models (e.g., Chemistry-Climate Model Initiative). We recommend the BASICv2 ozone composite to best represent historical upper stratospheric variability.

1. Introduction  The Sun’s output varies on multiple timescales that directly affect the Earth’s energy budget (Wild et al., 2013). Given that combined records of satellite observations are short (~40 years), the most useful timescale for assessing the climate response is the 11-year solar cycle (SC), whereby the total solar irradiance varies by ~0.1% (Kopp, 2016), influencing Earth’s global surface temperatures by ~0.08 K (Misios et al., 2016). Up to 60% of SC total solar irradiance variability is in the ultraviolet (<400 nm; Ermolli et al., 2013), which is absorbed by ozone in the Earth’s stratosphere (Haigh, 1994). At solar maximum, heating and photolysis rates at tropical latitudes are enhanced, and the increase in the equator-to-pole temperature gradient is thought to modify stratospheric winter-hemispheric zonal winds and influence regional surface climate (Gray et al., 2010; Kodera & Kuroda, 2002).
However, the exact mechanisms remain poorly understood, because the observational record is short and few climate models incorporate all the processes thought required (Hood et al., 2015), i.e., a well-resolved stratosphere, accurate photolysis and heating schemes, and coupled interactive ozone chemistry. Of the ∼40 CMIP5 models (Mitchell et al., 2015), only three were considered sufficiently complex to transmit the signal from the stratosphere to the surface (Figure 4 of Hood et al., 2015); eight were recently considered by Maycock et al. (2018) within the Chemistry-Climate Model Initiative (CCMI). Since stratospheric ozone is a critical starting point for a surface response, the observed SC ozone response represents an important constraint and test for climate models. Climate models that fail to represent a realistic SC ozone response are arguably unlikely to reproduce a realistic surface impact.

SC signals estimated from different observations show varying zonally averaged spatial structures and magnitudes (Austin et al., 2008; Dhomse et al., 2016; Maycock et al., 2016; Soukharev & Hood, 2006). The suggested reasons include different period length and date range (Chiodo et al., 2014; Kuchar et al., 2017); data sampling and instrument-type (Hood et al., 2015; Soukharev & Hood, 2006); unit conversion between volume mixing ratio (vmr) and number density (Ball et al., 2017; Damadeo et al., 2014; Maycock et al., 2016); instrumental drifts (Li et al., 2016); artifacts in merged composites (Ball et al., 2017; Harris et al., 2015); and regression model setup, and proxies used, in the analysis (Ball et al., 2016; Chiodo et al., 2014; Marsh & Garcia, 2007; Kuchar et al., 2017). Inferring the SC from observations given these concerns is therefore challenging.

The estimated SC ozone signal also depends on the chosen data set. For example, the “Bodeker” ozone composite (Bodeker et al., 2013; Hassler et al., 2008) shows a single, broad peak in the (sub)tropical upper stratosphere (∼3 hPa) as shown by Maycock et al. (2018); some CCMs display similar responses, while others display two midlatitudinal lobes (within ∼10–2 hPa) that are sometimes connected through a tropical peak to form a U-shaped structure (Austin et al., 2008; Damadeo et al., 2014; Dhomse et al., 2011; Hood et al., 2015; Maycock et al., 2016; Sekiyama et al., 2012). The range of different SC ozone response magnitudes and zonally averaged spatial structures in models indicate that processes may be missing or misrepresented in the CCMs. Maycock et al. (2016) evaluated multiple ozone composites that showed different responses and recommended SBUVMOD v8.6 (hereafter, SBUV N A A ) as an observational reference, but clear evidence was not provided to support this choice and, consequently, identify the SC ozone response to use as a reference. Here we demonstrate that recent improvements in methods to account for data artifacts lead to more robust estimates of observed SC ozone variability for evaluating historical climate model runs. Our aim is to demonstrate which ozone data sets are reliable and hence appropriate for inclusion in future analyses.

2. BASIC Observational Composites

Multiple composites exist that combine ozone satellite observations into long, continuous data sets (Steinbrecht et al., 2017; Tummon et al., 2015), but these contain artifacts that can alias into the SC estimate if a standard multiple linear regression (MLR) analysis is adopted (Ball et al., 2017; Maycock et al., 2016). Artifacts are artificial variability from instrumental drifts, biases, unit conversion, sampling, and the composite-merging procedure (Ball et al., 2017, 2018; Harris et al., 2015).

Ball et al. (2017) developed the BAyeSian Integrated and Consolidated (BASIC) methodology to combine multiple composites into a single data set; BASIC was specifically developed to remove artifacts where possible or otherwise reduce their impact. The World Climate Research Program (WCRP) Stratosphere-troposphere Process and their Role in Climate (SPARC) Long-term Ozone Trends and Uncertainties in the Stratosphere (LOTUS) activity recently assessed all available ozone composites and considered BASIC to be more robust to the effect of such outliers (Petropavlovskikh et al., 2019). The BASIC approach is further described in supporting information S1. We consider four BASIC composites; the dependencies of instruments and composites that form the BASIC composites are shown and referenced in Figure S1 (Ball et al., 2018; 2017; Bourassa et al., 2017; Davis et al., 2016; Froidevaux et al., 2015; Frith et al., 2017; Petropavlovskikh et al., 2019; Sofieva et al., 2017).

3. Chemistry Climate Model Simulations

CCMs need to show similar variability as observations on all timescales to compare like with like. Simulations of the CCMs SOCOL (Stenke et al., 2013) and WACCM (Marsh et al., 2013) are used here to compare with the BASIC observations, which requires that chemically and dynamically driven variability is as close to
the real world as possible so that MLR analysis captures the same variability in CCMs as in the observations. Thus, for the first experiment setup we considered the two models in specified dynamics (SD) mode as in Ball et al. (2018) with CCM-I-1 boundary conditions (Morgenstern et al., 2017). SD constrains CCM dynamics using temperature, wind field, and surface pressure meteorology from reanalysis to reduce CCM-specific internal variability and reproduce historical changes, while chemistry can evolve freely. SOCOL-SD (1980–2015) and WACCM-SD (1979–2014) use ERA-Interim (Dee et al., 2011) and MERRA-1 (Rienecker et al., 2011) reanalysis, respectively, and are independent (see supporting information S1 for SD-CCM specific details).

A second experimental setup was designed to reduce internal variability and isolate better the solar signal in a free-running model to ascertain if the observed zonally averaged spatial structure is robust. To do this, we perform a 10-member ensemble of timeslice experiments with free-running SOCOL, that is, without reanalysis constraints, using the SATIRE-S (Yeo et al., 2014) solar irradiance model (CCMI-1 recommends, and SD-CCMs here use, NRLSSI-1; Lean et al., 2005). SOCOL is spun-up for 10 years with constant 2008/2009 solar minimum conditions and repeating year 2000 boundary condition climatology (e.g., sea ice, sea surface temperature, greenhouse gases, and ozone depleting substances), after which solar irradiance is stepped up to constant, early-2002 solar maximum conditions for 2 years; we only consider the second year to allow for readjustments to the new solar conditions. The quasi-biennial oscillation (QBO) was switched off in this test to eliminate bias toward easterly or westerly phases (Labitzke & van Loon, 1995), so only weak easterly winds persist; this is an acceptable simplification given our focus on the photo-chemically controlled nonpolar upper stratosphere (1–10 hPa).

4. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

We apply MLR as in Ball et al. (2017), except we apply the Bremen Mg II index instead of 30-cm radio flux (Dudok de Wit et al., 2014). See supporting information S1 for MLR details.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1. Equatorial Profile Ozone Changes

We begin by putting the new results in the context of previous work. Figure 1a reproduces the Soukharev and Hood (2006) (SH06) equatorial SBUV v8 (black), SAGE-II v6.2 (gray), and HALOE v19 (light-gray) profiles for periods ending in 2003; their average form another often-used reference (Austin et al., 2008) (AEA08; not shown). Since SH06 and AEA08, SAGE-II v7.0 was released (Damadeo et al., 2014), and SBUV updated to v8.6 (Frith et al., 2014, 2017; McPeters et al., 2013); these updates are included in the BASIC composites (colored profiles). It was demonstrated that conversion of SAGE-II v6.2 from number density to vmr using NCEP reanalysis temperatures led to an early trend in 1985 to 1991 that would alias, and erroneously enhance, the solar signal there (Damadeo et al., 2014, 2018; Dhomse et al., 2016; Maycock et al., 2016; Remsberg, 2014); SAGE-II v7.0 uses MERRA and does not display that behavior.

BASICSG and BASICvmr (blue and turquoise lines, respectively), containing SAGE-II v7.0 that dominates the data in these composites for the ~1985–2003 period, show a single peak response close to 32 km (10 hPa), with BASICvmr displaying a slightly larger, lower peak; conversely, at this altitude the three SH06 profiles are at a minimum. The Bodeker profile (gray, dashed line) from Maycock et al. (2018) shows a similar structure to SH06 SAGE-II; this is expected since the product also contains SAGE-II v6.2. BASICSG and BASICvmr differ from the SH06 SAGE-II profile, especially above 37 km where SAGE-II v6.2 shows a larger SC response than v7.0 (Dhomse et al., 2016; Maycock et al., 2016); HALOE does not display the same large peak at 45–50 km and is in approximate agreement with BASICSG, which contains HALOE, and BASICvmr; both BASIC composites contain SAGE-II v7.0. The changes since SH06 indicate that earlier estimates may not be robust. The new composites should reflect improved data, and composites containing SAGE-II v6.2 should not be used, for example, as SH06 was in the recent CMIP5 comparative study (Hood et al., 2015).

In Figure 1a the updated SBUVNASA composite (yellow) shows a different equatorial structure to SBUV of SH06, with negative mean values at ~40 km exceeding the SH06 SBUV uncertainty; the inclusion of the 1979–1984 period has little impact on the profile (dotted, yellow). BASICSBUV and SBUVNASA differ little within uncertainties, except near between 32–42 km. The reduced negative mean profile of BASICSBUV supports the results of Li et al. (2016) who reported that the negative SBUV profile between 2 and 10 hPa (32–42 km) was due to a morning/afternoon observation asymmetry from satellite drift. These types of artifacts
Figure 1. Equatorial (25° S–25° N) solar cycle ozone responses: (a) for periods considered by Soukharev and Hood (2006) (SH06), as well as the Bodeker ozone composite profile from Maycock et al. (2018) (MEA18, dashed gray; 30° S–30° N); (b) BASIC composites for 1985–2016; (c) BASICv2 as in (b) with the mean of three-CMs from Hood et al. (2015) (HEA15) and SOCOL-SD and WACCM-SD CCMs. The period for each data set is given in the legends. Uncertainties are 2σ for BASICv2 (shading) and SH06 (bars) only; mean profiles for all others. Multiple linear regression used the Mg-II solar proxy for an equivalent of 100 solar flux units of the 10.7-cm radio flux.

are partially accounted for using BASIC (Ball et al., 2017), including satellite changes that introduce jumps in 1994/1995 (Figures 2 and 7 in Ball et al., 2017). However, since both SBUV\textsubscript{NASA} and SBUV\textsubscript{NOAA} contain similar artifacts, the BASIC approach cannot remove features common to both composites, as there is no additional information to discriminate. The addition of SWOOSH and GOZCARDS to both SBUV composites in BASIC\textsubscript{C2} allows this to be addressed, leading to a profile that peaks at ≈33–35 km (~7 hPa) and no negative response near 40 km. The implication is that composites containing only SBUV data should not be used to assess the SC response here.

The addition of 13 more years of data used in the MLR (shown in Figure 1b) does little to change the location of the BASIC\textsubscript{C2} peak and leads to a convergence of all BASIC composites to a peak response near 34 km (7 hPa); the anomalous additional peak in BASIC\textsubscript{aden} remains at 31 km, but the broad structure is very similar to all other BASIC composites. For context with CCMs, in Figure 1c, the mean of the three selected CCM profiles from HEA15 (one of which is WACCM in free-running mode) shows a single, broad peak at ~3 hPa, 5 km higher; BASIC\textsubscript{C2} is replotted from panel b. WACCM-SD and SOCOL-SD both show peaks close to but slightly lower than BASIC\textsubscript{C2} (10 and 8 hPa, respectively). The higher HEA15-CCM peak, similar to that of eight CCM CCMs in Maycock et al. (2018), is in agreement with SH06, AEA08, and the Bodeker data set from Maycock et al. (2018), but again, these all employ SAGE-II v6.2 known to induce an artificially large SC response in the upper stratosphere (Damadeo et al., 2014; Maycock et al., 2016). The revised and updated composites, corrected through the BASIC method, all suggest a lower equatorial peak and are supported by historically accurate reconstructions (SD-CCMs).

5.2. Zonally Averaged Spatially Resolved SC Response
In Figure 2, we expand our analysis to spatially resolved, zonally averaged SC responses in the four BASIC composites; we consider the 1985–2014 period for consistency with the SD-CCMs (Figure S2 shows little change if considering 1985–2016). BASIC\textsubscript{5G}, BASIC\textsubscript{aden}, and BASIC\textsubscript{C2} show similar responses: a U-shaped spatial structure with maxima located at ~45°S and ~45°N near 1.5–3 hPa and ~7–10 hPa in the (sub)tropics. BASIC\textsubscript{SBUV} does not show this structure, although there is an isolated peak close to 1 hPa in the Southern Hemisphere (SH), and tropical minima near 3 hPa are present in all BASIC composites.

In the absence of other information, there is no way to assess which spatial structure is correct between independent observations, especially since SC estimates can be biased by residual variability not captured by the regression model. Therefore, fair comparisons of CCMs with observations require simulations have similar unmodeled variance as the real-world atmosphere. Since SD-CCMs are forced with historical vari-
Figure 2. The latitude-pressure solar cycle ozone response (%) for the period 1985–2014 for four BASIC ozone composites (a–d, upper row) and two CCMs in specified dynamics mode (f–g, lower row); the SOCOL timeslice is shown in the lower left (e). Gray contours and shading represent where significance is less than 2\(\sigma\); blue dots represent the locations considered in Figure 4. BASIC_den is on geometric-altitude coordinates rescaled assuming a linear relationship with the \(\log_{10}[\text{pressure}]\) such that 16–48 km maps linearly to 100–1 hPa. The timeslice response is calculated from two sets of 10 ensemble runs with solar minimum (2008/2009) and solar maximum (2001/2002) conditions using the SOCOL CCM.

ability (reanalysis), they should provide a measure of data-independence to compare with observations (Ball et al., 2016; 2018), and evidence for which ozone data set is likely to be accurate irrespective of whether the estimated solar signal magnitude is correct.

Figure 2 shows that the SC estimates from SOCOL-SD and WACCM-SD display an enhanced tropical peak (~5–10 hPa) compared to BASIC3G, BASIC_den, and BASIC_v2, but the structure is in closer agreement with these than with BASIC_SBUV; indeed, simple spatial correlations for 60° S–60° N at and above 10 hPa yield higher correlations with BASIC3G (0.61 for SOCOL-SD; 0.87 for WACCM-SD) and BASIC_v2 (0.73; 0.81) than BASIC_SBUV (0.46; 0.05). There are differences between WACCM-SD and SOCOL-SD that include (i) a less significant mid-latitude upper-stratospheric peak in WACCM-SD that appears better represented by SOCOL-SD and (ii) a stronger, two-peak response in the equatorial profile at ~7–10 hPa in WACCM-SD that appears prevalent in BASIC5G and BASIC_den, while SOCOL-SD has a strong but single peak in that region. It is not clear why these differences exist, but CCMs are constructed differently, and the reanalysis nudging fields in each CCM are different and have different dynamical and temperature responses (Mitchell et al., 2015) that would directly influence ozone. Nevertheless, the gross spatial structures of the two SD-CCMs show many similarities to each other and provide evidence that BASIC5G, BASIC_den, and BASIC_v2 more
Figure 3. Solar cycle ozone response separated by month for (top to bottom) BASIC$_{v2}$, SOCOL-SD, and SOCOL-timeslice. Each panel ranges 60° S–60° N and 50–1 hPa.

likely represent historical SC ozone variability. This argues against the recommendation of Maycock et al. (2016) that SBUV should be considered the most appropriate for comparison of SC signals with climate models.

Some observational studies qualitatively support a U-shaped zonally averaged spatial structure, but many only display midlatitude peaks, or neither (Kyrölä et al., 2013; Maycock et al., 2016); this is similarly true for CCMs (Austin et al., 2008; Maycock et al., 2018). Indeed, free-running versions of SOCOL and WACCM (1960–2009) present only enhanced midlatitude lobes with no stratospheric tropical peak above 7 hPa (Maycock et al., 2018). Thus, the question arises: Is the U-shaped structure a reflection of the true solar ozone response, or is it an historical anomaly dependent on the specific observational period?

Figure 2e shows the solar maximum minus minimum difference from the timeslice experiments. Ozone displays a U-shaped structure, although with a reduced magnitude compared to BASIC$_{SG}$ and SOCOL-SD, and a deeper SH lobe reaching down to 15 hPa; such a deeper extension to lower altitudes in the SH is also apparent in BASIC$_{v2}$. Possible explanations for the differences include (i) the QBO is inactive; (ii) unmodeled variability aliases with regressors in the SD-CCMs or observations; and (iii) the timeslice experiments have a climate-model specific internal variability. The absence of a negative peak near 15 hPa in the timeslice analysis hints that this structure may have a relationship to the QBO, which is absent in the timeslice experiment, or that how MLR is applied may play a role in its appearance (Smith & Matthes, 2008). Indeed, qualitatively this agrees with Figure 8 of Chiodo et al. (2014) where the absence of a QBO in the model experiments leads to a small upward shift in the peak while the negative response disappears lower down; this result is consistent with the idealized timeslice experiment. Overall, the midlatitude peaks/lobes appear consistent, with some evidence for a tropical peak near 5–10 hPa. This implies that the U-shaped structure, with a peak near 5–10 hPa is not just a result of unmodeled variability during the observational era (since 1979), but a real structure in the response of stratospheric ozone to SC variability.

The reason for the U-shaped structure is revealed in Figure 3 where regression has been performed separately for each month; each panel displays the 60° S–60° N, 1–50 hPa SC ozone response for BASIC$_{v2}$, SOCOL-SD CCM, and SOCOL timeslice. Clear positive peaks in the timeslice simulations are in qualitative agreement in most months with SOCOL-SD or BASIC$_{v2}$. High-latitude upper stratosphere maxima become particularly pronounced during winter in both hemispheres, for example, November to March in the Northern Hemisphere (NH) and July to September in the SH. This suggests that the mechanism for increased
Figure 4. The evolution of the multiple linear regression-estimated solar cycle ozone signal (%) using 11-year windows centered on the dates at each dot for four latitude-pressure locations (see labels). These locations are highlighted as light-blue circles in Figure 2. Horizontal colored lines represent the 1985–2014 mean results from Figure 2. If statistically significant (2σ) the circle is solid; otherwise, it is open.

ozone could be the seasonal dependence of the meridional Brewer Dobson circulation and/or enhanced tropical upwelling; further investigation is required. The equatorial peak is present in both winter periods, though for longer during SH winter. While the peaks in the timeslice experiment are almost always apparent in SOCOL-SD and BASICv2, except in July, the alternative is not true; for example, high-altitude, SH peaks in June and July appear to be absent in the timeslice experiment. Further, the QBO appears to interfere with the height and extent of the tropical peak consistently from February to June, and no negative response is seen in the timeslice without a QBO, but whether this is due to a regression or dynamical aspect remains an open question (Chiodo et al., 2014; Smith & Matthes, 2008). In most months, the structure and magnitude of the SC ozone response agree well between SOCOL-SD and BASICv2, further supporting the robustness of the spatial structure.

In summary, there is agreement between timeslice, SOCOL-SD CCM, and BASICv2 in monthly variability. Given the average of the monthly timeslice results lead to a U-shaped structure (not shown), this provides evidence that the structure is a result of seasonal variations in the SC; the physical cause will be the focus of a follow-up study.

5.3. Why SBUV Does Not Display the U-shaped Response
The time-dependent SC signal demonstrated in Figure 1 (e.g., BASIC_{SBUV}) provides a way to assess which ozone composites are better for estimating the SC response. Since SD-CCMs and observations should contain the same historical ozone variability, given that the same regression model, the magnitude should evolve similarly provided that CCM photochemistry is correct. Thus, we select four locations (blue circles, Figure 2) in all data sets. MLR is applied without a trend-term to a sliding 11-year regression-window, first centered on 1990, covering 1985–1995. This is repeated for 1991, and so on until 2010 (2009 for SD-CCMs), and plotted in Figure 4; the 1985–2014 values in Figure 2 are shown as horizontal lines. The inclusion of years following
Figure 5. Ozone timeseries at 3.2 hPa (∼40 km) and 40–50° N: (a) monthly anomalies; (b) deseasonalised anomalies; (c) deseasonalized anomalies relative to BASICv2 with 24-month boxcar smoothed time series (thick lines), and the unitless Mg-II solar proxy plotted in the background; (d) the smoothed timeseries and Mg-II proxy (gray) from (c); (e) the correlation coefficient of the Mg-II proxy with the monthly ozone anomalies of each dataset relative to BASICv2 in (c) in 11-year windows centered on each dot, along with the 1985–2014 correlation coefficient (solid horizontal lines).

the two major eruptions (Figure S3), or if a longer 22-year window is adopted (Figure S4), has little impact on the following discussion.

Figure 4 reveals that the MLR-estimated solar signal depends on the period and so can evolve over time. We cannot currently ascribe this as a real (nonlinear) evolution in the ozone response, or quantify aliasing between regressors and/or unmodeled variability. The notably rapid change around 1997/1998 in all data sets (Figures 4b and 4c) is possibly due to aliasing between the volcanic and solar proxies (Chiodo et al., 2014; Kuchar et al., 2017), but only after Mt. Pinatubo (1994–2004 onward) when background level of the stratospheric aerosol optical depth (SAOD) correlate with the solar proxy (Figure S5a); the QBO shows little evolving solar correlation \( r < \pm 0.2 \); Figure S5b), while ENSO3.4 does display some \( r < \pm 0.3 \); Figure S5c). However, it is difficult to disentangle the simultaneous cross-correlation between multiple proxies (see Figure 7 of Kuchar et al., 2017). Figure 4d provides an example where all observations and CCMs display similar behavior, and BASIC_SBUV does not show any anomalous behavior compared to the others. However,
in the other three panels (Figures 4a–4c) near the three lobes that form the U-shaped structure BASIC\textsubscript{SBUV} is the lowest of the pack and displays a different evolution.

In particular, in Figure 4b, at 40–50° N and 3.2 hPa near the NH peak, all data sets evolve with similar absolute levels and temporal changes except BASIC\textsubscript{SBUV}, which is more strongly affected around 1996. Comparing the time series here reveals why. Figures 5a and 5b show the ozone anomalies and deseasonalized time series at 3.2 hPa and 40–50° N. We subtract BASIC\textsubscript{v2} from all composites in Figure 5c to give relative changes with smoothed time series, made clearer in Figure 5d along with the solar proxy. In Figure 5e, the 11-year window correlation coefficient of the monthly solar proxy with BASIC\textsubscript{v2}-relative time series from Figure 5d reveals BASIC\textsubscript{SBUV} has a consistently negative correlation that peaks around 2001/2002: during this period, the smoothed time series anticorrelate with the solar proxy (Figure 5d) and reduce the MLR-estimated solar signal. The anticorrelation results from the aforementioned SBUV satellite drift and switch (Figure 7 of Ball et al., 2017), confirming the effect as a composite artifact. This reinforces the conclusion that current SBUV-composites should not be used to assess the SC signal.

Overall, we find that it is likely that SBUV does not display the U-shaped structure due to the presence of artifacts in the time series. Further, the evolution of the SC response in BASIC\textsubscript{v2}, BASIC\textsubscript{nden}, BASIC\textsubscript{v1}, and the SD-CCMs agree reasonably well. We conclude that BASIC composites other than BASIC\textsubscript{SBUV} form a viable reference for evaluation of climate models over the satellite period.

6. Summary and Conclusions

We present results from new ozone composites formed using Bayesian algorithms designed to account for artifacts that bias the SC ozone response in the upper stratosphere (1–10 hPa) estimated using MLR. We find that SBUV-based composites differ in the zonally averaged response compared to the other composites as a result of artifacts in SBUV composites that anticorrelate with the solar proxy to reduce the attributed signal. We show that a U-shaped spatial structure in BASIC composites containing SAGE-II v7.0 is a likely feature that forms from seasonal changes. This is evidenced by (i) improved, artifact-corrected ozone composites; (ii) agreement with two independent SD-CCMs; and (iii) an idealized, timeslice experiment. The U-shaped structure provides a focus for future studies comparing observational and climate model results.

Currently, we cannot infer a “correct” time-independent solar signal due to its time evolution; more observations are needed for a confident result (Chiodo et al., 2014; Kuchar et al., 2017). Indeed, we question the validity of detecting a true solar signal using linear regression models when the ozone response is generally accepted to be nonlinear (Labitzke & van Loon, 1988; Roy & Haigh, 2011). However, the results presented still provide a measure to assess the consistency of the SC response between observations and simulations, as long as MLR is used consistently and unmodeled residual variability alias with proxies in a similar way. Missing processes or CCM-dependent internal variability may further interfere. Consideration of this topic is an aim within the SPARC SOLARIS-HEPPA initiative. Our results make clear that composites containing SAGE-II v6.2, or only SBUV data, should not be considered without clearly stating the associated caveats. Despite these concerns, we recommend BASIC\textsubscript{v2} for estimating the upper stratospheric solar signal given the assumptions of the regression model used to extract it and the period considered due to good agreement with the CCM experiments while including both SBUV and SAGE-II v7.0.
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