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Abstract: A mass-conservative version of the semi-implicit semi-Lagrangian High-Resolution Limited Area Model (HIRLAM) is presented. The explicit continuity equation is solved with the semi-Lagrangian semi-implicit time-stepping scheme that involves the same non-complicated elliptic equation as in HIRLAM. Contrarily to the traditional semi-Lagrangian method the trajectories are backward in the horizontal and forward in the vertical, that is, cells moving with the flow depart from model layers and arrive in a regular column, and their vertical displacements are computed from continuity of mass and hydrostatic balance in the arrival column. This involves just two-dimensional upstream integrals and allows for a Lagrangian discretization of the energy conversion term in the thermodynamic equation.

Preliminary validation of the new model version is performed using an idealized baroclinic wave test case. The accuracy of the new formulation of HIRLAM is comparable to the reference version though it is slightly more diffusive. A main finding is that the new discretization of the energy conversion term leads to more accurate simulations compared to the traditional ‘Eulerian’ treatment.
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1 Introduction

The semi-Lagrangian method for advection together with a semi-implicit treatment of the gravity wave terms is well known to be an efficient and accurate numerical method for atmospheric models (for a review see Staniforth and Côté 1991). A deficiency of the semi-Lagrangian semi-implicit method is the lack of formal mass-conservation. The mass-conservation can be restored by the application of so-called mass-fixers that repeatedly restore global mass-conservation. However, mass-fixers are not completely satisfactory since the mass restoration is not local, so mass is not added where spurious sinks have removed mass (and vice versa). A first step toward a locally mass-conservative semi-Lagrangian semi-implicit model has been taken with the development of the cell-integrated semi-Lagrangian (CISL), or equivalently, finite-volume semi-Lagrangian advection scheme (e.g., Nair and Machenhauer 2002). For a recent review of finite-volume methods used in meteorology see Machenhauer and Olk (1997), and the detailed stability analysis given in Lauritzen (2007).

A semi-implicit time-stepping of the fast waves requires that the term involving the flow divergence in the continuity equation must be handled in a semi-implicit manner. As described in Machenhauer and Olk (1997), when the mass equation is discretized using a CISL scheme the flow divergence appears only in the way the trajectories determine Lagrangian departure volumes, and therefore the Lagrangian divergence should be computed implicitly. This, however, leads to a complicated elliptic system as shown in detail in Lauritzen (2005) and Thuburn (2007). To retain a simpler elliptic system as in HIRLAM we chose a ‘predictor-corrector’ approach (Lauritzen et al. 2006, hereinafter referred to as LKM06).

The semi-Lagrangian component of the model obviously involves the determination of the characteristics. Here we track cells moving with the flow that depart from a model layer and arrive in a vertical column of regular Eulerian grid cells in the horizontal (Machenhauer and Olk 1998) but at vertical levels that are different from the model levels. That is, a cell originating from a particular model layer moves forward and with vertical walls along the backward trajectories determined from horizontal winds (Fig. 1). So in the horizontal the trajectories are backward and in the vertical they are forward. Consequently, the upstream integral, which determine the mass advected into the regular column is two-dimensional, and existing two-dimensional CISL methods are directly applicable. Contrastly to conventional fully three-dimensional upstream trajectory algorithms where the vertical displacements are computed from time-extrapolated vertical displacements, we use the CISL continuity equation to determine the mass-flux into...
the arrival column and can then determine the vertical displacements from hydrostatic balance. Hereby the pressure at the top of a mass cell transported into the arrival column is obtained as a diagnostic variable. This is used for a simple Lagrangian discretization of the vertical velocity in pressure coordinates given by the difference between the pressure over the departure cell and the hydrostatically determined pressure over the arrival cell divided by the time step. Since the parcel trajectories are forward in the vertical, they generally do not arrive at model layers, and therefore a vertical remapping of the prognostic variables back to model layers must be performed (Machenhauer and Olk 1998; Lin 2004). These remappings are, however, only one-dimensional. This concept of 'floating Lagrangian surface', along which the Lagrangian cells here in fact are moving during a time step, was theoretically introduced by Starr (1946). With this reference the concept has been utilized also by Lin (2004) and Nair and Tufo (2007).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 the continuous primitive equations are reformulated for the new model. In Section 3 the discretization of the equations is presented which encompasses the Eulerian discretization grid, discretization of the hydrostatic equation, new trajectory algorithm, explicit CISL continuity equation and the semi-implicit CISL continuity equation. The remaining equations of motion are discretized using a grid point representation as in HIRLAM, but modified for the hybrid trajectory and the Lagrangian discretization of the energy conversion term in the thermodynamic equation. Finally, the CISL continuity equation for tracers and the vertical remapping are discussed. Section 4 contains preliminary results from tests of the new dynamical core followed by conclusions and a discussion in Section 5.

2 Reformulation of the primitive equations

Consider the equations for a quasi-hydrostatic and moist-diabatic atmosphere using the vertical coordinate, \( \eta(p, p_s) \), introduced by Simmons and Burridge (1981):

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{du}{dt} &= -\frac{1}{a \cos \theta} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \lambda} - \frac{R_d T_v}{p} \frac{1}{a \cos \theta} \frac{\partial p}{\partial \lambda} \\
&\quad + f v + \frac{u v}{a} \tan \theta + P_u + K_u, \\
\frac{dv}{dt} &= -\frac{1}{a} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \theta} - \frac{R_d T_v}{p} \frac{1}{a} \frac{\partial p}{\partial \theta} - f u \\
&\quad - \frac{a^2}{a} \tan \theta + P_v + K_v, \\
\frac{dT}{dt} &= \frac{R_d T_v}{c_p} \frac{\omega}{p} + P_T + K_T, \\
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \ln \frac{\partial p}{\partial \eta} \right) &= -D - \frac{\partial \eta}{\eta}, \\
\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \eta} &= -\frac{R_d T_v}{p} \frac{\partial p}{\partial \eta},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( t \) is time, \( \lambda \) is the longitude, \( \theta \) the latitude, \( a \) the radius of the earth, \( f \) the Coriolis parameter, \( u \) and \( v \) are the horizontal wind components towards east and north, respectively, \( \Phi \) the geopotential, \( p \) the pressure, \( \omega = dp/dt \) the vertical velocity in pressure coordinates, \( T \) the temperature, \( D \) the divergence, and \( T_v \) the virtual temperature given by

\[
T_v = T \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{b}{a} - 1 \right) q \right],
\]

\[
e = \frac{R_d}{R_v},
\]

and the total derivative and specific heat capacity are given by

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{u}{a \cos \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} + \frac{v}{a} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} + \dot{\eta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta},
\]

\[
c_p = c_{pd} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{c_{pv}}{c_{pd}} - 1 \right) q \right],
\]

respectively, and \( \dot{\eta} \) is the \( \eta \)-coordinate vertical velocity. \( R_d \) and \( R_v \) are the gas constants for dry air and water vapor, respectively, and \( c_{pd} \) and \( c_{pv} \) are the specific heat capacity of dry air and water vapor at constant pressure. Finally, the terms \( K_T, K_u, \) and \( K_v \) represent horizontal diffusion processes, and \( P_T, P_u, \) and \( P_v \) represent physical processes.

The continuity equation (5) is reformulated to use the CISL approach by expanding the left-hand side and replacing the right-hand side, which is the three-dimensional divergence, with its Lagrangian form

\[
\frac{1}{\delta V} \frac{d}{dt} \delta V = 0,
\]

where \( \delta V \) is an infinitesimal volume element in the \( (\lambda, \theta, \eta) \)-coordinate system. Making use of the chain rule for differentiation, the Lagrangian form of the continuity equation can be written as

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\partial p}{\partial \eta} \delta V \right) = 0,
\]

(e.g., Machenhauer 1994). Equations (1), (2), (4), (6) and (12) form the basis for the discretizations in the new model version.

3 Discretization of the primitive equations

3.1 Discretization grid

In the horizontal the Arakawa C-grid defines the Eulerian grid cells and grid points. The prognostic mass variable is the mass integrated over a regular Eulerian grid cell with velocity component grid points at its sides (Fig. 3 in LKM06). The points in the centre of the Eulerian mass cells are called mass points. They are also temperature grid points.

Following Simmons and Burridge (1981), the atmosphere is divided into \( NLEV \) layers and the layer index is increasing toward the surface. The pressure at the interface between layer \( k \) and \( k + 1 \) is defined by the pressure

\[
p^{\text{cal}}_{k+1/2} = A_{k+1/2} + B_{k+1/2} p_s,
\]
where \(A_{k+1/2}\) and \(B_{k+1/2}\) are predefined constants, \(p_s\) is the surface pressure and \(0 \leq k \leq NLEV\). The vertical index \(k + 1/2\) refers to a ‘half level’ and the pressure \(p_{k+1/2}\) is the pressure at the ‘bottom’ of the cell with vertical index \(k\). In HIRLAM the pressure at the top of the atmosphere \(p_{1/2}\) is set to zero. The pressure thickness of layer \(k\) is denoted \(\Delta p_k = p_{k+1/2} - p_{k-1/2}\). In between the half levels are the ‘full levels’ and their exact location is discussed in the next Section. The vertical staggering of the dependent variables is a Lorenz-type staggering in which \(T\), \(u\) and \(v\) are at the full levels and the geopotential, pressure, and vertical velocity are at half levels.

### 3.2 Hydrostatic equation

Since the pressure gradient force involves the horizontal gradient of \(\Phi_k\) in the momentum equations, the full level geopotential \(\Phi_k\) is needed. Hence the discretization of the pressure gradient force is related to the hydrostatic equation. The finite-difference analogue of the hydrostatic equation (6) for a single layer and for the air mass from the surface and up to half level \(k + 1/2\) is given by

\[
\Phi_{k+1/2} - \Phi_{k-1/2} = -R_d \langle T_v \rangle_k (\Delta \ln p)_k, \tag{14}
\]

\[
\Phi_{k+1/2} = \Phi_s + R_d \sum_{\ell=1}^{NLEV} \langle T_v \rangle_{\ell} (\Delta \ln p)_{\ell}, \tag{15}
\]

respectively, where

\[
(\Delta \ln p)_k \equiv \ln \left( \frac{p_{k+1/2}}{p_{k-1/2}} \right). \tag{16}
\]

To get \(\Phi_k\) the popular approach by Simmons and Burridge (1981) is used

\[
\Phi_k = \Phi_{k+1/2} + \alpha_k R_d \langle T_v \rangle_k, \tag{17}
\]

where the last term on the right-hand side of (17) is an approximation to

\[
R_d \int_{p=p_k}^{p=p_{k+1/2}} T_v d \ln p. \tag{18}
\]

Under the assumption that \(T_v\) is constant equal to \(\langle T_v \rangle_k\) over the half layer, \(p = p_k\) to \(p = p_{k+1/2}\), \(\alpha_k\) is the approximation to the integral

\[
\int_{p=p_k}^{p=p_{k+1/2}} d \ln p. \tag{19}
\]

Simmons and Burridge (1981) approximates \(\alpha_k\) with

\[
\alpha_k = \begin{cases} 
\ln 2 & , \text{for } k = 1, \\
1 - \frac{p_{k+1/2}}{\Delta p_k} (\Delta \ln p)_k & , \text{for } k = 2, \ldots, NLEV.
\end{cases} \tag{20}
\]

This approximation is used here as well.
For the discretizations in the trajectory algorithm the pressure (which is held at half levels) is needed at full levels in the new HIRLAM version. Equation (19) is used to define the full level pressure consistent with the definition of \( \alpha_k \):

\[
 p_k = p_{k+1/2} \exp(-\alpha_k),
\]

(21)

where the integral constant has been set to zero so that \( p_1 = \frac{1}{2} p_3/2 \). Equation (21) is slightly different from the approximation \( p_k = (p_{k+1/2} + p_{k-1/2})/2 \) used in the current operational HIRLAM.

### 3.3 The explicit CISL equations

As indicated in the introduction and illustrated in Figure 1 the mass transport is modeled by finite volumes that originate at time \( t = n \Delta t \) from a model layer \( k \), move with vertical walls with the three dimensional flow and end up at time \( t = (n+1) \Delta t \) in a regular grid column (arrival column). We will call such a moving finite volume a Lagrangian cell. The mass in a Lagrangian cell with thickness \( \delta z = z_2 - z_1 \) is at a certain time:

\[
 M_{\delta V} = \int_{\delta A} \left( \int_{z_1}^{z_2} \rho \, dz \right) \, dA = \frac{1}{g} \int_{\delta A} \delta p \, dA
\]

(22)

where the hydrostatic equation \( dp = -g \rho \, dz \) was used in the inner integral. Thus, the condition for local mass-conservation is

\[
 \frac{d(M_{\delta V})}{dt} = \frac{1}{g} \frac{d}{dt} (\langle \delta p \rangle \delta A) = 0.
\]

(23)

Here, local mass-conservation is defined as conservation of the mass of individual Lagrangian cells. From (23) the CISL continuity equation for moist air is obtained by integration in time from \( n \Delta t \) to \( (n+1) \Delta t \). It may be written as

\[
 \langle \delta p_k \rangle^{n+1}_{\text{expl}} = \langle \Delta p_k \rangle^n_{\text{eul}} \frac{\delta A_k}{\Delta A},
\]

(24)

where

\[
 \langle \Delta p_k \rangle^n_{\text{eul}} = \frac{1}{\delta A_k^n} \int_{\Delta A_k^n} S(\langle \Delta p_k \rangle) \, dA.
\]

(25)

A sub-script ‘expl’ has been added in (24) to distinguish the updated value from that in the semi-implicit continuity equation (47) to be presented in Section 3.4.2. Note, that brackets \( \langle \cdot \rangle \) denote a mean value over a regular grid area \( \Delta A \) whereas a mean value over an irregular departure area \( \delta A_k^n \), as defined in (25), is denoted \( \langle \cdot \rangle^n_{\text{eul}} \) (Figure 1).

\( S(\langle \Delta p_k \rangle) \) refers to the sub-grid-scale representation based on the known Eulerian cell averaged values \( \langle \Delta p_k \rangle \) at time level \( n \). Depending on the CISL advection scheme the departure area \( \delta A_k^n \) at a certain model level \( k \) is determined by straight-line segments connecting the departure points of four trajectories. Each of these is ending up in a corner point of the arrival area \( \Delta A \) at the pressure level \( p_k^{n+1} \).

Note that \( p_k^{n+1} \) is the cell averaged pressure at full level \( \langle p_k \rangle^{n+1} \) interpolated to the corner point in question.

In traditional semi-Lagrangian models (e.g., Ritchie 1991). In the iterative procedure of the present mass-conservative HIRLAM version, given horizontal wind vectors determine just the horizontal position of the departure point whereas the vertical position of the arrival point, that is the updated Lagrangian pressure \( \langle p_k \rangle^{n+1}_{\text{expl}} \), is calculated from hydrostatic balance in the arrival cell columns; after the quasi-horizontal displacements of mass cells determined by the CISL continuity equation have taken place. As a by-product the difference between the arrival pressure and the departure pressure of Lagrangian cells divided by the time step determines a mean vertical velocity along the trajectories. This Lagrangian vertical velocity is used in the energy conversion term of the thermodynamic equation instead of the Eulerian vertical velocities used in traditional semi-Lagrangian models as HIRLAM.

For a certain trajectory in level \( k \) let the \( n \)th iteration of the horizontal position vector of the departure point and the position vector of the arrival point be called \( r_* \) and \( r \), respectively. Then \( r_* \) is determined by

\[
 r_* = r - \langle V \rangle \Delta t.
\]

(26)

Here \( \langle V \rangle \) is an averaged horizontal wind vector along the trajectory. It is approximated by

\[
 \langle V \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left( V^n_{\text{eul}} + \frac{\Delta t}{8} \frac{dV^n}{dt} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta p^{n+1}}{\delta p^n} \frac{\Delta t}{8} \frac{dV^{n+1}}{dt} \right),
\]

(27)

where \( \langle V^n \rangle \) and \( \langle V^{n+1} \rangle \) denote values interpolated to the departure point \( (r_*, p^n_{\text{expl}}) \) and the arrival point \( (r, p^{n+1}_{\text{expl}}) \), respectively, for which cubic Lagrange interpolation is used. \( \delta p^{n+1} = 2V^n - V^{n-1} \) is the time-extrapolated horizontal wind valid at time \( t = (n+1) \Delta t \). The accelerations in (27) are approximated with

\[
 \frac{dV}{dt} \approx V \cdot \nabla V.
\]

(28)

(McGregor 1993). The initial condition for the iteration is \( r_* = r \) and \( p_*^{n} = p^{n}_{\text{eul}} \). The wind components are interpolated from their C-grid positions to the grid cell vertices, where they are needed in (27), using cubic Lagrangian interpolation.

When in a certain iteration the four corner points \( r_* \) of the departure cell at model layer \( k \) have been determined from (26) the horizontal upstream area \( \delta A_k^n \) can be constructed and the mass transport from this model layer into the arrival column can be computed using the explicit CISL continuity equation (24). The two-dimensional integral in (25) is computed by a CISL scheme. Here we use the scheme of Nair and Machenhauer (2002) or alternately the cascade scheme of Nair et al. (2002) both using a parabolic sub-grid-scale representation. When the mass transported into the arrival column from all NLEV
model layers (Figure 1) have been computed, the cell averaged pressure at the bottom of each Lagrangian cell \( \langle p_{k+1/2} \rangle_{\text{expl}} \) can be determined by the assumption of hydrostatic balance. This implies simply that it is the weight of the air mass above the cell bottom:

\[
\langle p_{k+1/2} \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \langle p_i \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1}.
\]  

(29)

The cell averaged pressure at full levels is obtained from (21):

\[
\langle p_k \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} = \exp \left\{ - \langle \alpha_k \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} \right\} \langle p_{k+1/2} \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1},
\]  

(30)

where \( \langle \alpha_k \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} \) results by substituting \( \langle p_{k+1/2} \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} \), determined from (29), for \( p_{k-1/2} \) in the formula for \( \alpha_k \) (20). The procedure is then iterated.

It was found empirically that two iterations of the trajectory algorithm are sufficient. Using the values determined from the final iteration also the explicit updated cell averaged surface pressure \( \langle p_s \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} \) can be determined from the assumption of hydrostatic balance:

\[
\langle p_s \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} = \sum_{k=1}^{N \text{LEV}} \langle \delta p_k \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1}.
\]  

(31)

Using these surface pressures in (13) explicit updated Eulerian half levels may be determined.

For a global model version global mass-conservation follows from (31). This is seen by substituting (24) in (31), multiplying the result by \( \Delta t \) and sum over all horizontal grid cells

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{k=1}^{N \text{LEV}} (\delta p_{i,j,k})_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} \Delta A_{i,j} = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{k=1}^{N \text{LEV}} \langle \delta p_{i,j,k} \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} \Delta A_{i,j}^{n},
\]  

(32)

where \( I \) and \( J \) is the number of Eulerian grid cells in the zonal and meridional direction, respectively. At each level \( k \) the departure areas are constructed such that the sum of all departure areas \( \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \Delta A_{i,j}^{n} \), like the sum of Eulerian grid areas \( \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \Delta A_{i,j} \), is equal to the global area. The right-hand side of (32) is the weight of the total mass at time \( t \), which according to (32) is equal to the weight of the total mass at time \( t + \Delta t \). Thus the total mass is conserved.

In the case of a limited area model, as the present HIRLAM version, the left-hand side is still the weight of the total mass in the total limited integration area at time \( t + \Delta t \), which according to (32) is equal to the weight of the total mass in the total upstream departure area \( \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \Delta A_{i,j}^{n+1} \) at time \( t \). However, these areas vary generally from time step to time step and differ from level to level, so consequently, the total mass in the integration area will change during each time step. The change is equal to the difference between the total inflow and the total outflow through the limited area boundary. Generally, further changes in the total mass in the integration area will result from the boundary relaxation performed at the end of the time step.

As already mentioned, we discretize the vertical velocity \( \omega = dp/dt \) on the right-hand side of the explicit thermodynamic equation (4) in a Lagrangian fashion, that is, the mean value \( \langle \omega_k \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1/2} \) of \( \omega \) along the trajectories for a cell departing from level \( k \) is determined by

\[
\langle \omega_k \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1/2} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left[ \langle p_k \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} - \langle p_k \rangle_{*}^{n} \right],
\]  

(33)

where the pressure at level \( k \) averaged over the departure area is given by

\[
\langle p_k \rangle_{*}^{n} = \frac{1}{\delta A_k^{n}} \int_{\delta A_k^{n}} S(\langle p_k \rangle) \, dA,
\]  

(34)

(Figure 1). Also here the values obtained in the last iteration are used. The explicit CISL thermodynamic equation then becomes

\[
(T_k)_k^{n+1} = (T_k)_*^{n} + \Delta t R_d \left[ \left( T_k^{n} \right)_*^{n} \left( \frac{\bar{T}_k^{n+1} - \langle p_k \rangle_{*}^{n}}{\langle p_k \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} + \langle p_k \rangle_{*}^{n}} \right) \right] \times \left[ \langle p_k \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1} - \langle p_k \rangle_{*}^{n} \right].
\]  

(35)

3.4 The semi-implicit CISL equations

In this Section the derivation of a semi-implicit system of prognostic equations from the system of explicit equations is described briefly. The derivation is described in more details in Lauritzen (2005) and Machenhauer et al. (2007). All steps in a complete derivation will not be dealt with here. We will focus on steps that deviate from the traditional semi-implicit system of HIRLAM that is derived in Undén (2002). Central parts of the derivation are similar to those described for the CISL shallow water model of Lauritzen et al. (2006).

Let us summarize the steps involved in a complete derivation. First the explicit system is made semi-implicit by averaging in time between time-level \( n \) and \( (n+1) \):

1. the linearized part of the pressure gradient force in the momentum equations,
2. the linearized divergence term in the continuity equation and
3. the linearized divergence term in the energy conversion term in the thermodynamic equation.

This is done for the present HIRLAM version in Section 3.4.1, 3.4.2, and 3.4.3, respectively. Secondly the formula for the updated surface pressure and temperature (at time level \( (n+1) \)) are inserted into the formula for the linearized pressure gradient force in the momentum equations. Finally the divergence operator, \( \nabla \cdot () \), is applied...
to the momentum equations resulting in the set of coupled elliptic equations with updated divergence as the unknown variable. These insertions and the final derivation of the elliptic system are not repeated here. They are derived similarly and result in a similar elliptic system, a set of coupled Helmholtz equations, as in HIRLAM. The reader is referred to Undén (2002) or Lauritzen (2005) for details. The final solution to the elliptic system determines the semi-implicit corrections to the explicit solutions for all the prognostic variables.

3.4.1 The linearized pressure gradient force

The pressure gradient force at level $k$

$$PGF_k = -\frac{R_d(T_v)_k}{p_k} \nabla p_k - \nabla \Phi_k = -\frac{R_d(T_v)_k}{p_k} \nabla p_k$$

$$- \nabla \left( \Phi_s + R_d \sum_{l=k+1}^{NLEV} (T_v)_l (\Delta \ln p)_l + \alpha_k R_d (T_v)_k \right),$$

is linearized and temporally averaged as in HIRLAM. The result is

$$- \nabla G_k = - \nabla \left[ \Phi_s + \frac{R_d}{2} \sum_{l=k+1}^{NLEV} \left\{ (T_v)_l^n + (\tilde{T}_v)_l^{n+1} \right\} (\Delta \ln p^ref)_l + \frac{R_d \alpha_k}{2} \left\{ (T_v)_l^n + (\tilde{T}_v)_l^{n+1} \right\} - \frac{R_d \alpha_k}{2p^ref} \nabla (p^s)_n + (\tilde{p}^s)^{n+1} \right],$$

where $T^ref$ and $p^ref$ is a constant reference temperature and a constant reference surface pressure, respectively. $(\Delta \ln p^ref)_k$ and $\alpha_k^ref$ are defined by (16) and (20) with the half level pressures obtained from (13) by choosing $p_s = p^ref_s$. See also Appendix A for a suggestion for an alternative Lagrangian discretization of the pressure gradient force.

3.4.2 The semi-implicit CISL continuity equation

The discretization of the explicit continuity equation was discussed in Section 3.3. The derivation of the semi-implicit continuity equation considered here is a direct extension of the derivation for the shallow water model in Lauritzen et al. (2006). Defining the discretized Lagrangian divergence

$$D_k^{n+1/2} = \frac{1}{\Delta A} \frac{\Delta A_n - \Delta A_k^n}{\Delta t} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta A} \right),$$

and substituting $\Delta A_k^n/\Delta A$ from the explicit continuity equation (24) in the form

$$\langle \delta p_k \rangle_{exp}^{n+1} = \langle \Delta p_k \rangle^{n} \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta A},$$

it may be written as

$$\langle \delta p_k \rangle_{exp}^{n+1} = \langle \Delta p_k \rangle^{n} - \Delta t \langle \Delta p_k \rangle^* \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta A} \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta A},$$

where the superscript '*' refers to the deviation from the reference value. Treating the linear term as a temporal average the ('ideal') semi-implicit continuity equation yields

$$\langle \delta p_k \rangle_{exp}^{n+1} = \langle \delta p_k \rangle_{exp}^{n+1} - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \langle \Delta p_k \rangle^* \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta A} \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta A},$$

or

$$\langle \delta p_k \rangle_{exp}^{n+1} = \langle \delta p_k \rangle_{exp}^{n+1} - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \langle \Delta p_k \rangle^* \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta A} \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta A},$$

where $\bar{D}_k^{n+1}$ is defined as the Lagrangian divergence for the last part of the hybrid trajectory

$$\bar{D}_k^{n+1} = \bar{D}_k^{n+1} (V^n_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{\Delta A} \Delta A - \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta t},$$

and

$$D_k^n = D_k^n (V^n_k) = \frac{1}{\Delta A} \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta A},$$

Thus,

$$D_k^n + \bar{D}_k^{n+1} = 2 \bar{D}_k^{n+1}. \tag{46}$$

This was used to derive (43) from (42).

In order to proceed with the derivation of the semi-implicit system the predictor-corrector approach from Lauritzen et al. (2006) is introduced. This results in elliptic equations in the same simple form as in HIRLAM. The predictor-corrector approach is given by

$$\langle \delta p_k \rangle_{exp}^{n+1} = \langle \delta p_k \rangle_{exp}^{n+1} - \frac{\Delta t}{2} (\Delta p_k)^* \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta A} \frac{\Delta A_k^n}{\Delta A}, \tag{47}$$

where the discretized Eulerian divergence $D_k^n$ is defined in the C-grid in spherical coordinates as

$$D_k^n = \frac{1}{a \cos \theta} \left\{ \frac{\Delta_A u_k^n}{\Delta x} + \frac{\Delta_A v_k^n (\cos \theta)}{\Delta y} \right\} \tag{48}$$

and

$$\frac{\Delta_A u_k^n}{\Delta x} + \frac{\Delta_A v_k^n (\cos \theta)}{\Delta y} = \frac{\Delta_A u_k^n}{\Delta x} + \frac{\Delta_A v_k^n (\cos \theta)}{\Delta y}, \tag{49}$$

where $\Delta x = a \cos \theta \Delta \lambda, \Delta y = a \Delta \theta, \delta_A()$ is a centered finite difference over a grid distance in longitude. $\delta_A()$ is defined similarly. The updated surface pressure is the
weight of the air in the arrival column, so it is obtained by summing (47) over all NLEV layers.

As shown in Section 3.3 the explicit continuity equation is conserving mass exactly, both locally and globally. Since the correction terms in (47), which correct the explicit prediction, consist of linear divergence terms, integration of these terms over the entire integration area is zero if the Lagrangian and the Eulerian divergence is zero at the boundaries or if the integration area is global. Consequently, with these assumptions fulfilled, the semi-implicit continuity equation also conserves global mass. It is the author’s impression from preliminary tests that the semi-implicit correction terms generally are small compared to the explicit local mass changes, so it is our impression that the local mass-conservation is only slightly modified by the semi-implicit corrections.

3.4.3 The semi-implicit version of the thermodynamic equation

Also a linear dependence on divergence in the thermodynamic equation (4) needs to be temporary averaged in the semi-implicit model version. Specifically, it is the energy conversion term \((R_d T, \omega)/(c_{pd} p)\), approximated in the explicit model with (35), that is divergence dependent. To isolate this dependence \(\langle \omega k \rangle^{n+1/2}\), given by (33), is expanded as follows

\[
\langle \omega k \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1/2} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left( (p_k)^{n+1}_{\text{expl}} - (p_k)^n \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left\{ \exp(\alpha_k)^{n+1} \sum_{l=1}^{k} (p_l)^{n+1}_{\text{expl}} - (p_l)^n \right\},
\]

(50)

where (21) and (29) have been used. When \(\langle p_k \rangle^{n+1}_{\text{expl}}\) is substituted from (39) the result is

\[
\langle \omega k \rangle_{\text{expl}}^{n+1/2} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left\{ \exp(\alpha_k)^{n+1} \sum_{l=1}^{k} \langle \Delta p_k \rangle^* - (p_l)^n \right\}
\]

\[- \exp(\alpha_k)^{n+1} \sum_{l=1}^{k} \langle \Delta p_k \rangle^* \frac{\delta A^{n+1/2}}{\Delta A}.
\]

(51)

When (52) is inserted in the explicit thermodynamic equation, the result is linearized about a reference temperature \(T^{\text{ref}}\) and surface pressure \(p^{\text{ref}}\), and the linear term is temporary averaged, we get the (‘ideal’) semi-implicit thermodynamic equation

\[
T^{n+1}_k = (T_k)^{n+1}_{\text{expl}} - \frac{\Delta t R_d}{c_{pd}} \left(\frac{T^{\text{ref}}}{P^{k+1/2}}\right) \times
\]

\[\sum_{l=1}^{k} \langle \Delta p_l \rangle^* \left\{ \frac{\delta A^{n+1}}{\Delta A} \right\}.
\]

(53)

where again \(\delta A^{n+1}_l\) is defined by (44). In order to obtain the same uncomplicated elliptic equations as in HIRLAM the predictor-corrector approach of Lauritzen et al. (2006) is again utilized. This changes (53) to

\[
T^{n+1}_k = (T_k)^{n+1}_{\text{expl}} - \frac{\Delta t R_d}{c_{pd}} \left(\frac{T^{\text{ref}}}{P^{k+1/2}}\right) \times
\]

\[\sum_{l=1}^{k} \langle \Delta p_l \rangle^* \left\{ \frac{\delta A^{n+1}}{\Delta A} \right\}.
\]

(54)

3.5 Continuity equations for tracers

The explicit continuity equations for humidity, cloud water, and other atmospheric constituents or tracers are similar to the one for moist air, equation (24), except that they are derived using the densities of the constituents in question \(\rho_i = Q_i \rho\) instead of the density of moist air. Here \(Q_i\) is the specific concentration of the constituent. It is defined as the ratio between the mass of the constituent and the mass of the moist air it is mixed into.

The tracer mass in a Lagrangian cell with thickness \(\delta z = z_2 - z_1\) is at a certain time:

\[
M_{q_i, \delta V} = \int \int \left( \int_{z_1}^{z_2} Q_i \rho \, dz \right) \, dA \]  

(55)

\[
= \frac{1}{g} \int \int q_i \, \delta p \, dA \]  

(56)

\[
= \frac{1}{g} \langle q_i \delta p \rangle \delta A, \]  

(57)

where the hydrostatic equation \(\delta p = -g \rho \delta z\) was used in the inner integral and a vertical averaged value, defined by \(\langle q_i \delta p \rangle = -g \int_{q_i}^{\beta A} Q_i \, dp\), was introduced. Thus, the condition for local tracer mass-conservation is

\[
\frac{dM_{AV}}{dt} = \frac{1}{g} \frac{d(\langle q_i \delta p \rangle \delta A)}{dt} = 0. \]  

(58)

This is valid only for passive tracers. For non-passive tracers, as water vapor and cloud water, source and sink terms must be added on the right-hand side of (58). The explicit CISL continuity equation for a passive tracer is obtained from (58) by integration in time from \(n\Delta t\) to \((n + 1)\Delta t\). The result is

\[
\langle q_i \rangle_k \delta p_k^{n+1}_{\text{expl}} = \langle q_i \rangle_k \Delta p_k^* \frac{\delta A^n_k}{\Delta A}. \]  

(59)

The trajectories determined for the moist air continuity equation is used for the tracers as well, so the upstream integrations in (59) are performed over the same upstream areas \(\delta A^n_k\) as those in (24).

The conservation properties for explicit unforced predictions (59) for limited area models, as the new HIRLAM version, are as described in Section 3.3 for moist air. That is, (59) ensure global tracer mass-conservation. This is proven as for moist air (see Section 3.3).

So far only preliminary test runs with humidity and cloud water variables included have been made. No other
tracer variables were included. In these preliminary tests of the new HIRLAM version the explicit form of the tracer continuity equations (59), with appropriate forcing terms, were used. This form is not completely consistent with the semi-implicit continuity equation (47) used for the moist air, as (59) does not degenerate to (47) if the initial and the reference specific concentrations \( Q_i \) are set to 1. Theoretically one can obtain such a consistency by making similar corrections to the explicit tracer predictions as were made to the explicit moist air predictions, i.e. instead of using (59) the following ‘semi-implicit’ tracer continuity equation

\[
(\langle q_i \rangle_k \delta p_k)^{n+1} = (\langle q_i \rangle_k \delta p_k)_\text{expl}^{n+1} \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{2} \langle (q_i)_k \Delta p_k \rangle_{\text{ref}}^n \left( D - \overline{D} \right)_k^{n+1} \\
+ \frac{\Delta t}{2} \langle (q_i)_k \Delta p_k \rangle_{\text{ref}}^n \left( D - \overline{D} \right)_k^{n+1} \delta A_n^{n+1} / \Delta A
\]

(60)

It is seen that the right-hand side with \( (q_i)_k^0 \equiv 1 \) and \( (q_i)_k \equiv 1 \) degenerates to the right-hand side of (47). If (60) is practical will depend, especially, on the magnitude of the difference between explicit predictions with (59) and ‘semi-implicit’ predictions with (60). In this paper we use the explicit tracer transport equation (59).

3.6 Vertical remapping and interpolation

Each of the preliminary updated tracer densities \( \langle (q_i)_k \delta p_k \rangle^{n+1} \), obtained from (60) (or from (59)) at the end of a time step, is an average over a Lagrangian layer \( \langle \delta p_k \rangle_{\text{ref}}^{n+1} \). The preliminary values must be remapped to become averaged values over the updated Eulerian model layers \( \langle \delta p_k \rangle_{\text{eul}}^{n+1} = \langle \delta p_{k+1/2} \rangle_{\text{eul}}^{n+1} - \langle \delta p_{k-1/2} \rangle_{\text{eul}}^{n+1} \). This vertical remapping is based on a piecewise parabolic sub-grid scale representation (Colella and Woodward 1984), except at the top and at the surface where piecewise constant representations are applied. Higher-order reconstructions based on extrapolations near the boundaries could be expected to improve accuracy but this was not explored in this preliminary study.

Likewise the updated grid point values \( T_k^{n+1} \), \( u_k^{n+1} \) and \( v_k^{n+1} \) are given at the end of each time step at the updated discrete Lagrangian levels \( \langle \delta p_k \rangle^{n+1} = \exp(\alpha k)^{n+1} \langle \delta p_{k+1/2} \rangle^{n+1} \). They must be interpolated to the discrete Eulerian model levels \( \langle \delta p_{k+1/2} \rangle^{n+1} = \exp(\alpha_{k+1/2})^{n+1} \langle \delta p_{k+1/2} \rangle^{n+1} \). Since the prognostic equations for the velocity components and temperature are solved with a grid-point semi-Lagrangian scheme based on cubic Lagrange interpolation, we also use cubic Lagrange interpolation for the vertical remapping of these variables.

In the present approach at the end of each time step the vertical mean values of tracer densities over Lagrangian layers are remapped to become averaged values over the Eulerian model layers. This gives rise to a certain smoothing or damping of the density fields. To minimize this damping it may be considered to keep the Lagrangian layer mean values for a number of consecutive time steps before performing the actual remapping to Eulerian model layer mean values. This could be done simply by letting the arrival cells of the previous time step be the departure cells of the new time step. In the finite volume integrations of Lin (2004) the final vertical remapping of the dynamical prognostic variables were postponed successfully for several consecutive short explicit time steps. So, it seems likely that the Lagrangian layer mean values and the Lagrangian level values may be kept without remapping and interpolation even for several large semi-implicit time steps. Present parameterization schemes need Eulerian model layer mean values or Eulerian model level values. So, at time steps between final remappings and interpolations special remappings and interpolation may be performed for the purpose of parameterization.

As an alternative to the vertical remapping and interpolation procedure chosen here the mass, momentum and total energy conserving vertical remapping algorithm presented in Lin (2004) might be applied. To do that the updated gridpoint values of temperature and velocity components obtained here at the Lagrangian levels at the end of a time step must be interpreted as averaged values over the corresponding Lagrangian levels. The computationally more expensive Lin(2004) algorithm might prove to be more accurate than the present procedure because total energy in a closed system is conserved in the Lin (2004) algorithm and dissipated kinetic energy is consistently converted locally to total potential energy, an effect which is not explicitly included in HIRLAM. A problem seems, however, to be that the energy-conserving vertical remapping introduces spurious contributions to the pressure gradient force leading to unphysical temperature profiles at the model top (C.-C. Chen personal communication).

4 Preliminary test results

The Jablonowski-Williamson baroclinic wave test case consists of an analytic steady-state zonal solution to the global primitive equations (Jablonowski and Williamson 2006; hereafter referred to as JW06). The steady-state surface pressure is constant 1000 hPa. The steady-state is unstable so that an overlaid perturbation triggers the development of an idealized baroclinic wave in the Northern Hemisphere. By day 4 a well-defined wave train is established, and by day 7-9 a significant deepening of the highs and lows takes place before a break down by day 20-30 leads to a full circulation in both hemispheres.

The limited integration area of HIRLAM, in which the new model version has been implemented, is not prepared for an extension to a global domain. In the meridional direction both poles cannot be included in the integration area and in the zonal direction periodic boundaries cannot be used due to the elliptic solver in HIRLAM. Due to these technical issues it would be difficult to extend the integration area of HIRLAM to a...
complete global domain. We choose to make the limited-area domain as global as possible and try to minimize the effects of the boundaries. The active domain extends meridionally from 80°S to 80°N, and zonally 360° from 80°W to 280°E. The zonal extension is chosen such that the initial perturbation, centred at (20°E, 40°N), is far away from the western domain boundary (exactly 100°W).

The relaxation zone is located just inside the boundary of the active domain. Within this zone the updated values are relaxed toward the initial values with a weight that decreases from 1 at the boundary to zero at approximately 6° from it. To accommodate the CISL schemes there is a halo zone around the active domain in which the fields are held fixed at their initial value.

Two horizontal resolutions are used. The lower resolution is \( \Delta \lambda \approx 1.45°, \Delta \theta \approx 1.15° \), and the highest resolution is \( \Delta \lambda \approx 0.74°, \Delta \theta \approx 0.59° \). In the vertical there are 27 levels and the placement of the levels is as in JW06, but with one more layer added at the top of the atmosphere (so that the pressure at the upper boundary is zero as in HIRLAM). The time-step for the low- and high-resolution runs is 30 and 15 minutes, respectively.

The new dynamical cores do not use decentering or filtering of the non-linear terms in time as in HIRLAM, but it was necessary to retain horizontal diffusion in order to avoid noise problems. All integrations were run with \( \nabla^6 \) implicit horizontal diffusion on \( T, u \) and \( v \) (see p.12-13 in Undén 2002). The horizontal diffusion coefficients are based on HIRLAM default values scaled for resolution so that the \( e \)-folding time of the 2\( \Delta x \) wave is the same regardless of resolution (McDonald 1998). There has been no attempt to tune the diffusion coefficients for these idealized runs.

In the shallow-water model of LKM06 the constant horizontal mean geopotential used for the semi-implicit scheme was chosen sufficiently large to avoid instabilities because of the ‘predictor-corrector’ approach applied in the semi-implicit CISL scheme. In a baroclinic model that corresponds to an increase in the reference temperature so that the equivalent depths are increased. In HIRLAM the reference temperature is set to 300 K and in the new dynamical core version it is set to 360 K. The reference surface pressure is unchanged 1000 hPa.

The boundaries introduce effects that are not present in the global model runs. The boundary relaxation and the elliptic solver trigger a weak wave, hereinafter referred to as the \textit{boundary wave} (Fig. 2b), with a structure that is very similar to the large amplitude wave train, hereinafter referred to as the \textit{main wave}, triggered by the overlaid velocity perturbation (Fig. 2a). The \textit{boundary wave} is approximately symmetric about the equator and located in the mid-latitudes. By comparing runs with and without the initial overlaid perturbation on the balanced initial state, it is seen that the \textit{boundary wave} is very similar in the two runs and, thus, the \textit{boundary wave} is not a result of boundary reflections of fast waves triggered by the overlaid velocity perturbation (not shown). The \textit{boundary wave} grows as it propagates eastward just as the main wave train does, and with variation on the order of 1-2 hPa around day 7 after which the deepening accelerates. By placing the velocity perturbation 100° from the western boundary, where the \textit{boundary wave} is triggered, the \textit{main wave} and \textit{boundary wave} are initially located far from each other and, hence, the interaction between the two waves is minimized. In the following analysis it is assumed that the \textit{boundary wave} does not interact non-linearly with the \textit{main wave} train, and that the gravity waves triggered by the perturbation do not interact with the \textit{boundary wave}. Under this assumption the \textit{boundary wave} can be ‘removed’ from the flow by subtracting the deviation from 1000 hPa in the unperturbed run from the perturbed run. As showed on Fig. 2c this is a reasonable operation, that makes the comparison of the limited-area model runs with global model reference solutions feasible.

The error measures defined in JW06 are used to assess the accuracy and convergence characteristics of the new CISL HIRLAM version. Since an analytical solution is not available, JW06 provided high-resolution reference solutions computed with four different dynamical cores. These provide independent estimates of the true solution.

JW06 defined the uncertainty for any reference solutions as the maximum deviation in terms of the \( l_2 \) error measure between the highest and second highest horizontal resolution runs of all model versions (see JW06 for details).

The uncertainty is marked with the shaded region on Fig. 3, hence, a model integration has converged when its \( l_2 \) difference is located in the shaded area. For the computation of the \( l_2 \) differences the reference solution from the finite-volume dynamical core of the NCAR Community Atmosphere Model (CAM) version 3 is used (Lin 2004). The resolution of the CAM reference solution is \((\Delta \lambda, \Delta \theta) = (0.3125°, 0.25°)\).

Fig. 3 shows the \( l_2 \) differences for different HIRLAM versions. First of all it can be seen that up to day 8 both the HIRLAM (reference) and the CISL-HIRLAM have converged in the high-resolution runs (Fig. 3a). After day eight the wave is too close to the boundaries and cannot be compared with the global model simulations provided by JW06. Before approximately day 5 the wave train has very little amplitude and \( l_2 \) differences reflect interpolation errors rather than forecast skill. For the lower resolution runs the CISL version of HIRLAM has not converged whereas HIRLAM has, so the finite-volume model needs higher resolution than the grid-point model to get the same level of accuracy. This has also been observed for the finite-volume dynamical core in CAM (Lin 2004), which needs higher resolution to reach the same level of accuracy as the lower-resolution spectral dynamical core of CAM (JW06).

Regarding phase errors (not shown) the CISL-HIRLAM performs slightly better than HIRLAM at both resolutions. When using the cascade scheme of Nair et al. (2002) instead of the fully two-dimensional CISL scheme of Nair and Machenhauer (2002) the accuracy in terms of the \( l_2 \) difference is not altered (Fig. 3b).

The importance of the consistent Lagrangian discretization of the energy conversion term introduced in Section 3 is demonstrated on Fig. 3c. The \( l_2 \) differences and phase errors (not shown) are larger when using the Eulerian...
Figure 2. (a) shows the surface pressure, $p_s$, in hPa at day 6 for the Jablonowski-Williamson baroclinic wave test case for the high-resolution run with CISL-HIRLAM. Thick solid contour is 1000 hPa, the contour interval is 1 hPa and shaded region marks values below 1000 hPa. The main wave is located from approximately 90E to 160W in the northern hemisphere. (b) When subtracting the CAM reference solution from the CISL-HIRLAM data the boundary wave, which is triggered by the boundary relaxation and elliptic solver in HIRLAM, becomes clearly visible. The thick solid contour is 0 hPa, the contour interval is 0.2 hPa and shaded region marks negative values. The boundary wave is also present in the unperturbed CISL-HIRLAM run that does not contain the main wave. (c) shows the CAM reference solution and the unperturbed CISL-HIRLAM solution subtracted from the perturbed CISL-HIRLAM solution. This demonstrates that the boundary wave can, to a first approximation, be ‘removed’. Contours in (c) are the same as in (b).

The treatment of the conversion term (R-CISL) compared to the Lagrangian discretization presented herein.

CISL-HIRLAM has also been coupled with the HIRLAM physics package and initial tests run from the initial condition of a strongly developing extra-tropical storm have been performed (not shown). The new model version ran stably and produced simulations quite similar to REF-HIRLAM. Also for the full-physics run the Lagrangian discretization of the energy-conversion term lead to more accurate simulations compared to the traditional discretization.
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5 Conclusions and discussion

It has been demonstrated that the semi-implicit semi-Lagrangian primitive equation model HIRLAM can be rendered mass-conservative by combining a cell-integrated semi-Lagrangian (CISL) version of the continuity equation with the grid point form of the prognostic momentum and thermodynamic equations. Long time steps are obtained with the application of the recently developed predictor-corrector method of Lauritzen et al. (2006) that results in the same non-complicated elliptic equations as in the semi-implicit scheme of HIRLAM. Contrarily to traditional approaches in semi-Lagrangian models, the vertical displacements of Lagrangian mass cells in the new model version are determined without use of time extrapolated vertical velocities. They are diagnosed from their horizontal displacements, determined from the horizontal flow and maintenance of hydrostatic balance. This is used to diagnose vertical velocities that discretize the energy conversion term in the thermodynamic equation in a Lagrangian fashion.

The new dynamical core has been validated using a recently developed idealized baroclinic wave test case for global dynamical cores (Jablonowski and Williamson 2006). Except for a slight smoothing of a low resolution run the new model version was found to be accurate compared to a high-resolution global reference simulation when the artifacts introduced at the limited-area boundaries were, at least to first order, removed from the flow. The model has also been coupled to HIRLAM physics, and stable 48-hour forecasts from an initial condition leading to a strong extra-tropical cyclone development have been performed but not reported on here. A main finding in both test cases is that the new model version based on the Lagrangian discretization of the energy conversion term in the thermodynamic equation was significantly more accurate than when using the traditional Eulerian treatment of the conversion term.

The model version presented here is for a limited area on the sphere. For wider applications, an extension to a full global domain is, of course, needed. No serious problems is expected in such an extension, especially as both advection schemes used here have originally been formulated on the sphere, both using the same local approach for accurate transport over the polar regions. Also, the discretization of the pressure gradient force may be performed in a Lagrangian fashion as outlined in Appendix A. As described in Machenhauer et al. (2007), we note that the approach of solving the CISL continuity equation via a two dimensional upstream integration is not only valid in the quasi-hydrostatic case. This method is general and can be used to extend the CISL-HIRLAM scheme to the non-hydrostatic case.
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Appendix A: Suggestion for a Lagrangian pressure
gradient force discretization

Lin (1997) derived an Eulerian expression for the hori-
zontal pressure gradient force aiming at an elimination
of the well-known inertia caused by different trans-
current in the two terms that the pressure gradient
force traditionally is split into when using terrain follow-
ning coordinates (see (1) and (2)). As illustrated in Figure 4
the pressures \( p_{k, n+1}^{\text{expl}} \) and \( p_{k, n}^{\text{expl}} \) can be used to determine a
similar Lagrangian mean value of the explicit horizontal
pressure gradient force \( PGF_{h} \) acting upon a Lagrangian
mass cell moving with the three dimensional flow along a
hybrid trajectory. The mean pressure gradient force along
the sloping hybrid trajectory is

\[
PGF_{h} = \left[ \left( -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial s} \right)_{k}^{n+1/2} \right]_{\text{expl}}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{p_{k, n+1}^{\text{expl}} - p_{k, n}^{\text{expl}}}{\Delta s'}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{p_{k, n+1}^{\text{expl}} - p_{k, n}^{\text{expl}}}{\Delta s} \cos(\varphi),
\]

where \( \rho \) is an approximation to the mean density along
the hybrid trajectory (e.g. the arithmetic mean value of the
density of the mass cell at the arrival and the departure
positions), \( \Delta s \) is the horizontal distance between the mid
points of the mass cells at the arrival and the departure
position, and \( \Delta s' \) is the corresponding distance along
the sloping trajectory (Fig. 4). Thus, \( \varphi \) is the slope of the
hybrid trajectory determined by \( \tan \varphi = \frac{\Delta s}{\Delta z} \), where \( \Delta z \)
is the height difference of the mid points of the mass
cells at the arrival and the departure position. In order to
determine \( PGF_{h} \) the vertical component of the pressure
gradient force, \( PGF_{v} \), in which a hydrostatic atmosphere
is balanced by gravity \( g \), must be subtracted from \( 61 \).
So, use properly interpolated eastward and northward com-
ponents of \( PGF_{h} \) determined by \( 61 \). This must be expected
to lead to increased accuracy, even in semi-implicit inte-
grations and even though the linearized pressure gradient
force is based on the two-term expression.
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