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Abstract

A mesoscale model coupling the Weather Research and Forecasting model and the three-dimensional Price-Weller-Pinkel ocean model is used to investigate the dynamical ocean response to Megi (2010). It is found that Megi induces sea surface temperature (SST) cooling very differently in the Philippine Sea (PS) and the South China Sea (SCS). The results are compared to the in situ measurements from the Impact of Typhoons on the Ocean in the Pacific (ITOP) 2010 field experiment, satellite observations, as well as ocean analysis field from Eastern Asian Seas Ocean Nowcast/Forecast System of the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory.

The uncoupled and coupled experiments simulate relatively accurately the track and intensity of Megi over PS; however, the simulated intensity of Megi over SCS varies significantly among the experiments. Only the experiment coupled with three-dimensional ocean processes, which generates rational SST cooling, reasonably simulates the storm intensity in SCS. Our results suggest that storm translation speed and upper ocean thermal structure are two main factors responsible for Megi’s distinct different impact over PS and over SCS. In addition, it is shown that coupling with one-dimensional ocean process (i.e. only vertical mixing process) is not enough to provide sufficient ocean response, especially under slow translation speed (~2-3 m s⁻¹), during which vertical advection (or upwelling) is significant. Therefore,
coupling with three-dimensional ocean processes is necessary and crucial for TC forecasting. Finally, the simulation results show that the stable boundary layer forms on top of the Megi-induced cold SST area and increases the inflow angle of the surface wind.
1. Introduction

Track predictions of tropical cyclone (TC) have been significantly improved over the past three decades, yet progress in TC intensity forecasts has been limited. The internal dynamics, environmental forcing, and ocean features, are generally identified as important elements affecting TC intensity change [Wang and Wu, 2004]. Specifically in terms of TC intensification, certain ocean conditions, such as sea surface temperature (SST) and upper ocean thermal structure (UOTS; upper ocean typically means 0-200 m or so), play an important role [Shay et al., 2000; Lin et al., 2005; Wu et al., 2007; Jaimes et al., 2015; Cione, 2015]. A TC exerting strong wind stress on the ocean surface induces significant cooling in SST through the dynamic processes of entrainment mixing and upwelling [Price, 1981; Price et al., 1994]. The major factors affecting the above dynamic processes are the TC translation speed and the underlying UOTS [Price, 1981; Price et al., 1994; Bender and Ginis, 2000; Wu et al., 2007; Lin et al., 2008; Yablonsky and Ginis, 2009]. TC-induced SST cooling, in turn, has been considered one of the main factors that limit the storm intensity and its intensification. Bender and Ginis [2000] showed that forecasts of TC intensity could be significantly improved when the TC-induced ocean feedback was considered into the model simulations. In fact, UOTS is highly related to the ocean features (e.g. eddies), which can now be effectively detected from the sea
surface height anomaly field observed by satellite altimetry [Lin et al., 2005, 2008; Goni et al., 2009]. The observational and numerical studies have shown that rapid intensification can occur when the storm passes over a warm ocean eddy. In contrast, when the TC encounters a cold ocean eddy, the SST cooling can be enhanced, and thus TC intensity would be further limited due to the stronger negative feedback associated with the decrease of the heat flux from the ocean [Lin et al., 2005, 2008; Wu et al., 2007; Sung et al., 2014; Walker et al., 2015]. Therefore, it is important to include the information of ocean eddies while conducting TC intensity forecasts.

Some recent studies (e.g., Bender et al., 2007) suggested that coupling one-dimensional (1D) ocean processes associated with the current shear-induced mixing in an ocean model is adequate to represent the TC-induced upper ocean responses. However, for a slow-moving TC or a TC that is over the ocean with relatively low upper ocean heat content, the three-dimensional (3D) ocean processes cannot be neglected [Price, 1981; Price et al., 1994; Lin et al., 2005; Yablonsky and Ginis, 2009; Halliwell et al., 2011]. Meanwhile, in a recent study, based on an atmosphere-ocean coupled model, Lee and Chen [2014] showed that the TC-induced cold wake affects not only TC intensity but also TC structure. Warm air over the cooler SST can enhance the stability of the TC boundary layer (TCBL) and result in the formation of a stable boundary layer (SBL). Thus, convection in rainbands
would be suppressed and the inflow angle would increase. The enhanced inflow allows the moisture-laden air of the boundary layer to enter the storm core with higher equivalent potential temperature, and thus results in deeper convection in the inner core. The stabilizing effect can counteract and partially offset the negative feedback on intensity associated with the TC-induced cold wake.

The abundant atmospheric (e.g., dropsondes) and oceanic (e.g., Airborne Expendable BathyThermograph; AXBT) data obtained from aircrafts and research vessels during ITOP (Impact of Typhoons on the Ocean in the Pacific, 2010) field experiment [D’Asaro et al., 2014; Lin et al., 2013] provide a unique opportunity to further investigate the interaction between the TC and its underlying ocean. As a case in point, Typhoon Megi (2010), of which the evolution is shown in Fig. 1, intensified rapidly and reached category-5 intensity at moderate TC translation speed (5~7 m s$^{-1}$) over the Philippine Sea (PS) associated with a favorable UOTS (i.e., the depth of 26°C isotherm ~ 110 m; Lin et al., 2013; Ko et al., 2014). The intensity of Megi decreased after making landfall in Luzon and then re-intensified slightly after entering the South China Sea (SCS). During Megi’s passage over SCS, its track recurved sharply from westward to northward with slow TC translation speed (about 2.5 m s$^{-1}$) and steady intensity.

In this study, huge contrast in Typhoon Megi’s evolution between the two basins
(PS vs SCS) is identified [cf. D’Asaro et al., 2014; Ko et al., 2014; Guan et al., 2014].

By employing an atmosphere-ocean coupled model including either 1D or 3D ocean processes, this study investigates the ocean responses in these two basins and their impacts on Megi’s intensity, as well as to examine the role of SBL. The atmosphere-ocean coupled model and experiment designs are described in Section 2. Section 3 presents the results from model simulations as well as the feature of SBL and its impact on Megi. Finally, the summary is given in Section 4.

2. Model and experiment designs

a. Atmosphere-ocean coupled model

The atmosphere-ocean coupled model employed in this study is based on the University of Miami Coupled Model (Chen et al., 2007, 2013; Lee and Chen, 2014), which consists of the Weather Research and Forecasting Model (WRF; Skamarock et al., 2008) and the three-dimensional Price-Weller-Pinkel (3DPWP) ocean model [Price et al., 1994]. The detail of coupling processes is described in Lee and Chen [2014]. The WRF and 3DPWP use the same time step which is set as one minute in the outermost domain. The WRF model exchanges its information of the surface layer (e.g., surface wind stress) with that of the top layer in the 3DPWP at every time step.
In WRF, the horizontal grid points in the 12-, 4-, and 1.3-km domains are
334×250, 250×250, and 250×250, and the inner two domains are vortex-following
movable nests while the outermost domain is fixed. The vertical grid points are 35
η levels with 8 levels in the lowest 1 km. The model physics contains the
Kain-Fritsch scheme [Kain, 2004] for cumulus parameterization (only adopted in the
outermost domain), the WRF Single-Moment 6-class (Hong and Lim, 2006) scheme
for microphysical parameterization, the Yonsei University (Hong et al., 2006) scheme
for the boundary layer parameterization, and the Monin-Obukhov scheme for the
surface layer parameterization with the surface drag and enthalpy coefficient based on
Donelan et al. [2004] and Garratt [1992], respectively.

The 3DPWP has the same horizontal grid points as in WRF and has 30 vertical
layers with intervals of 10 m and 20 m for layers from 5 m (the top level in the
3DPWP and considered as the sea surface) to 195 m and from 210 m to 390 m,
respectively. The ocean processes include entrainment/mixing, vertical
advection/upwelling, horizontal advection, and pressure gradient force. However, it
should be noted that the present implementation of the 3DPWP does not contain
background ocean currents and bathymetry.

b. Experiment designs
To investigate the ocean response to Megi, an uncoupled experiment (UC) and two coupled experiments are conducted here. The latter two are coupled with the 3D ocean processes (C3D) and the 1D ocean processes (C1D, which only considers vertical entrainment/mixing processes and does not include advection processes), respectively. Then, we compare the results from the above three experiments to clarify the role of the ocean and the importance of 3D ocean processes in TC simulations.

The limited ocean response (i.e. SST cooling = ~1°C) and the subsequent impact on Megi’s intensity among all experiments in PS are similar (Fig. 6a), suggesting that Megi is relatively insensitive to the underlying ocean processes, specifically when UOTS is favorable. Therefore, from the TC perspective, we focus on the SCS region where the ocean response is more pronounced and thus has a great impact on Megi’s intensity. To further investigate the ocean response among all experiments in SCS without the influence of PS, we keep the intensity and structure of the simulated Megi identical before and after the typhoon passes over PS. Therefore, the C3D experiment is carried out for 4 days starting from 0000 UTC 15 October, and the model output of C3D at 0000 UTC 19 October is used as the initial condition for all experiments for the following 3 days of simulation, viz., the period during which Megi travels over SCS. This step ensures that the simulated Megi in all experiments
is identical before entering SCS.

Final analysis data of the National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) is used as the initial and lateral boundary condition in WRF. The initial field (e.g., temperature and salinity) for the ocean model is based on the analysis data from the Hybrid Coordinate Ocean Model (HYCOM). However, the SST field in the HYCOM analysis is substituted with satellite microwave observations from the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM)/Microwave Imager (TMI) and Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer for Earth Observing System (AMSR-E).

It is found that the differences in the initial UOTS between PS and SCS are significant (Fig. 2). Although the SST in PS is slightly colder than the SST in SCS, the subsurface thermal structure in PS appears more favorable for TC intensification as compared to that in SCS. It can be clearly seen that PS has higher T100 (the average temperature from surface to 100 m depth; Price 2009) and deeper ocean mixed layer depth (Fig. 2b, d). Recall that in this study the initial (or background) current in the ocean model is set at rest and that the currents are generated through geostrophic adjustment. In fact, the background current should not make significant difference to the present results.

c. Eastern Asian Seas Nowcast/Forecast system
Because there is no AXBT observation during Megi's passage over SCS in the ITOP experiment, it is difficult to verify the results of the model simulations conducted in the present study. Collaborating with the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory (NRL), we use the dataset from the Eastern Asian Seas Nowcast/Forecast System (EASNFS; Ko et al., 2008) for the comparison. EASNFS is based on the Navy Coastal Ocean Model. Better atmospheric forcing is derived from WRF. Assimilating the ITOP data (e.g., the location of TC center, storm motion vector, and the 700-hPa axisymmetric surface wind profile) based on the Ensemble Kalman Filter system [Wu et al., 2010], the forcing is then used to drive EASNFS to generate realistic ocean analysis field. In all, the ocean response in the model simulations can therefore be verified by both the satellite observation and the high temporal and spatial resolution ocean analysis from EASNFS.

3. Results and discussions

a. The tracks of the simulated Megi

The intensities and tracks of the 7-day simulation starting from 0000 UTC 15 October in all experiments are similar, and the differences between the tracks of all experiments are less than 30 km (not shown). Some southward deviations (of about 100-150 km) are found at 48h before Megi reaches Luzon (only the result of C3D is
shown in Fig. 3). The ocean response in C3D, such as the position of cold wake (on the right-hand side of the TC track) and the value of maximum SST cooling (of about 1.5°C), is close to the satellite observation and EASNFS ocean analysis (Fig. 4). In addition, the vertical profile of the ocean temperature in C3D is consistent with the AXBT data from ITOP and their coefficient of determination ($R^2$) is up to 0.92 (Fig. 5), though less correlation occurs in the upper 50 m. This lower correlation is probably due to a relative small range of temperature variation (~3°C) and the somewhat mismatch of cooling patterns between observations and model simulations (Fig. 4). Nevertheless, the root-mean-square difference between simulated and observed temperatures in the upper 50 m is about 0.7°C, suggesting that the model is still of reasonable accuracy. According to the above results, it is adequate to consider the 4-day simulation of C3D as the pre-run for all experiments in SCS.

In all 3-day simulations in SCS starting from 0000 UTC 19 October, the tracks of Megi are generally consistent with one another, as well as with the best track from Joint Typhoon Warning Center (JTWC, Fig. 3). Although some eastward bias (of about 100~150 km) are found after Megi’s departure from Luzon, all experiments can generally capture the feature of northward recurvature and rapid decrease of the TC translation speed over SCS. The nearly identical tracks among all experiments indicate that the ocean has no significant impact on the motion of Megi over this
relatively short (4-day) simulation period. In this paper, the focus is to examine the
response of ocean to Megi, and its feedback to Megi’s intensity.

b. Megi’s evolutions and ocean responses among three experiments

The evolutions of minimum sea level pressure (MSLP) in the uncoupled and
coupled experiments (namely UC, C1D, and C3D) are shown in Fig. 6. Although
the simulated intensity in C3D is weaker than the best track data of both JTWC and
Japan Meteorological Agency (JMA) by about 20 hPa, the feature of rapid
intensification can still be well simulated during the same period from 1200 UTC 16
October (965 hPa) to 1200 UTC 17 October (919 hPa). The simulated maximum
intensity (908 hPa) is reached at 2000 UTC 17 October before making landfall in
Luzon. Evolution of the simulated intensity is found to be relatively diverse after
0600 UTC 19 October over SCS. In the uncoupled experiment (UC), the storm
continues to intensify and reaches a lower MSLP (903 hPa) at 1700 UTC 21 October
than that over PS. However, the storm intensities in coupled experiments (C1D and
C3D), both of which consider the ocean feedback, increase slowly and only reach an
MSLP of 925 hPa and 931 hPa, respectively. These features can also be found in
both best-track datasets. The discrepant evolution of storm intensity among these
three experiments can clearly be attributed to the negative SST feedback, i.e.,
significant SST cooling in SCS, as observed by satellite (Fig. 1a).

Data of the sea surface current in C1D, C3D, and EASNFS analyses are shown in Fig. 7. The surface current induced by the wind stress of Megi in C3D remains on the right-hand side of the TC track and appears in a clockwise near-inertial motion.

Before 0000 UTC 18 October, the surface current over PS in C3D intensifies with the increasing storm intensity and reaches a current speed of 1.2 m s\(^{-1}\). Similar to C3D, the surface current in EASNFS occurs on the right-hand side of the TC track, but reaches a slightly higher current speed of 1.8 m s\(^{-1}\) over PS. The simulated surface current of C3D over PS is relatively close to that of EASNFS. As Megi enters SCS during the period from 1800 UTC 18 October to 0300 UTC 19 October, the translation speed of Megi rapidly slows down prior to the sudden northward recurvature. Although the intensification of Megi over SCS is less significant than that over PS, the ocean response of the surface current of SCS in C3D is still clear due to the slow translation speed. The result of C3D, which simulates a surface current of about 1.8 m s\(^{-1}\) over SCS, is consistent with that of EASNFS, while the surface current of 2.8 m s\(^{-1}\) in C1D is apparently overestimated.

According to satellite observation (Fig. 8a), the change in SST from 0000 UTC 19 October to 0000 UTC 22 October clearly appears along Megi’s track with a pronounced SST cooling of about 7°C. C1D, C3D, and EASNFS are all able to
capture the distribution of SST cooling, with the maximum cooling occurring at the
turning point (Fig. 8b-d). Both ocean-coupled experiments (C1D and C3D) can
simulate such ocean response although the SST cooling in C1D only reaches about
5°C. Due to the absence of upwelling process in C1D, the SST cooling is
underestimated and the degree of underestimation is affected by the TC translation
speed and the underlying UOTS. In the C1D experiment starting at 0000 UTC 15
October (hereafter C1D_1015), the SST cooling over PS is similar to that in C3D (not
shown) due to the favorable UOTS for TC development and the moderate TC
translation speed (5~7 m s\(^{-1}\)). In C1D, the underestimation in both magnitude and
extent of SST cooling is relatively pronounced in SCS than that in PS due to the
unfavorable UOTS for the storm intensification (i.e., thinner ocean mixed layer and
lower T100, Fig. 2) and slow TC translation speed (about 2.5 m s\(^{-1}\), Fig. 3b). This
feature is consistent with the results from previous numerical studies [Sanford et al.,
2007; Yablonsky and Ginis, 2009; Halliwell et al., 2011].

In addition to verifying the SST cooling of model simulations, it is necessary to
assess the performance of the upper-ocean evolution at different depths. As
discussed in Section 3a, the AXBT data from ITOP is used to verify the ocean
response of C3D over PS. Due to the absence of AXBT data over SCS, we employ
the EASNFS analysis to verify the result of our simulations, in particular the vertical
The profile of ocean temperature over SCS. The along-track vertical profiles of ocean temperature in C1D and C3D are shown in Fig. 9. At the initial state (Fig. 9a), it is shown that the initial warm features of PS, including a thicker ocean mixed layer and weaker stratification below the ocean mixed layer, provide a more favorable ocean condition for Megi to reach category-5 intensity, despite the lower SST in PS than that in SCS. As Megi passes through both PS and SCS, the TC-induced upper-ocean responses in PS and in SCS are significantly different (Fig. 9b-c). In PS, the result of C3D indicates that the change of upper-ocean temperature is small, and that there is a similar result in C1D_1015 (starting at 0000 UTC 15 October) (Fig. 9). The vertical profiles of ocean temperature in SCS are significantly affected both in C3D and in C1D. It is found that in the former, the profile is shifted upward and the depth of ocean mixed layer is reduced due to the effect of upwelling process. As a result, C3D induces greater SST cooling as compared to the C1D experiment.

To clearly examine the difference of initial UOTS between PS and SCS, we average the along-track vertical profiles of ocean temperature in these two basins (Fig. 10a). Since the SST in PS is about 30°C and close to that in SCS at the initial state, the storm intensity in UC, which does not consider SST negative feedback, increases both in PS and SCS (Fig. 6). However, the difference in the initial UOTS between PS and SCS is distinct and can cause significantly different ocean response with
respect to varied ocean dynamic processes. The UOTS response in SCS is examined as follows. At 0000 UTC 22 October, the ocean mixed layer in C1D is deepened by the solely vertical mixing process, the upper ocean mixed layer is cooled and the lower ocean mixed layer is warmed through the vertical mixing of ocean temperature (Fig. 10c). Due to the absence of advection processes and pressure gradient force in C1D, the ocean depth affected by the storm (of about 150 m) is limited. In C3D, the ocean temperature profile can be shifted upward by the upwelling process and therefore the colder water at deeper depth is carried upward (Fig. 10d) [the temperature budget analysis shows that, as compared to the upwelling term, the other two terms from horizontal advection and pressure gradient force play rather minor roles in SST cooling (figures not shown)]. The UOTS response of SCS in C3D is similar to that of EASNFS (Fig. 10b, d). It is indicated that consideration of the 3D ocean dynamic processes, particularly under an unfavorable ocean condition for storm intensification and/or a slow TC translation speed, can better capture the upper-ocean response than considering only the vertical mixing process (i.e., C1D).

c. Stable boundary layer

Zhang et al. [2011] evaluated the impact of different definitions of TCBL from both dynamical and thermodynamical perspectives. Following the definition in Lee
and Chen [2014], the TCBL in this study is defined as the height at which the virtual potential temperature ($\theta_v$) is 0.5K higher than that at the surface. The horizontal distributions of TCBL height in UC, C1D, and C3D at 0000 UTC 21 October are shown in Fig. 11. The height of TCBL in UC is about 600 m in the inner core region and about 800-1000 m in the outer region, and the horizontal distributions of TCBL in C1D and C3D are similar to that in UC except over the cold wake region. However, the height of TCBL in C1D and C3D are lower than 400 m in the pronounced cold wake region where the magnitude of SST cooling is less than 4°C. In particular, the height of TCBL in C3D is reduced to below 300 m. It is indicated that the height of TCBL is significantly reduced in the region where Megi has passed due to the TC-induced SST cooling. The stability of TCBL is also affected by the SST cooling effect.

In order to assess the effect of SST cooling, the stability of TCBL is defined by the sign of $\delta \theta_v / \delta z$ (i.e., stable for $\delta \theta_v / \delta z > 0$; Lee and Chen, 2014). We calculate the stability at each layer within the TCBL, which is referred as stable boundary layer (SBL) when all layers within TCBL are stable. The horizontal distributions of SBL in UC, C1D, and C3D at 0000 UTC 21 October are shown in Fig. 12. While the SBL in UC is not formed, it is found that the features of SBL in C1D and C3D are evident, and especially more significant in C3D. Compared to Fig. 11b
and c, the region of SBL formation in Fig. 12 is close to the region where the height of TCBL is significantly reduced. It is found that consideration of the SST negative feedback not only reduces the height of TCBL but also increases its stability and forms the SBL.

To compare our results with those in Lee and Chen [2014], in this study we also examine the inflow angle which is defined as the angle between the actual wind and the tangential wind. To compare the difference of the inflow angle (10-m wind) between UC and C3D, the simulated Megi is relocated at the same center (Fig. 13). Note that the TC translation speed is also deducted to remove the TC-movement-induced wavenumber-1 asymmetry. It is shown that the inflow angle of C3D in the cold wake region is larger than that of UC, but this feature is indistinct out of the cold wake region. To quantitatively evaluate the enhancement of inflow angle associated with the SBL effect induced by SST negative feedback, we calculate the area mean of the differences of inflow angle (C3D minus UC) within the radius between 150 and 400 km (excluding the inner core region where the calculated angle appears very sensitive to the high wind) in the SBL region and the other (non-SBL) region (Fig. 14).

It should be noted that SBL in C3D is formed at 0000 UTC 20 October. The fact that the mean difference of inflow angle is rather negligible in the other region
without SBL indicates that the mean inflow angles in UC and in C3D are similar. In the SBL region, however, the mean difference of inflow angle is always positive (with the maximum up to 30°), i.e., the mean inflow angle of C3D in the SBL region is larger than that of UC due to the effect of SST cooling. The result from the above analysis is consistent with that in Lee and Chen [2014]. In order to discuss the significance of the result, the standard deviation is superposed, as indicated by the light-colored lines of Fig. 14. Although the standard deviation in the SBL region overlaps with that in the other region, the mean difference of inflow angle in the SBL region including the standard deviation is largely positive. The enhancement of inflow angle induced by the SST cooling effect is statistically significant at the 99% confidence level (paired t-test with one-sided distribution; Larsen and Marx, 1981) during the period between 0000 UTC 20 October and 0000 UTC 22 October.

4. Summary

Based on the WRF-3DPWP coupled model, the ocean-uncoupled and -coupled experiments are conducted in this case study of Megi (2010) to evaluate the impact of ocean dynamic process on the upper-ocean thermal structure and the storm intensity. With the abundant atmospheric and ocean data from ITOP (2010), the results of model simulations can be verified through comparison with observations, including the
AXBT in situ measurement, the satellite observation, and the EASNFS ocean analysis obtained from NRL.

In this study, an ocean-uncoupled experiment (UC) and two ocean-coupled experiments (C1D and C3D) with different ocean dynamic processes are conducted to evaluate the ocean responses and their impacts on Typhoon Megi. The comparison of results from UC, C1D, and C3D shows that all three experiments can capture Megi’s track and that the two ocean-coupled experiments can better simulate the evolution of Megi’s intensity while the storm intensity in SCS is significantly overestimated in the ocean-uncoupled experiment. Overestimation of the storm intensity due to the lack of negative SST feedback is more significant for cases in which upper-ocean thermal structure is more unfavorable for storm intensification, e.g., with shallower ocean mixed layer depth, lower ocean heat content, and slower TC translation speed.

It is found that a model coupled with 3D ocean clearly outperforms the one coupled with 1D ocean in generating appropriate ocean response, namely, SST cooling. This suggests that consideration of not only 1D vertical mixing process but also 3D (especially vertical) advection is critical to the success of TC intensity simulations, and thus of TC forecasts. These results are consistent with the previous numerical studies in the Atlantic basin [Sanford et al., 2007; Yablonsky and Ginis,
For typhoon main development region in the western North Pacific, typically only 30-40% of the ocean area appears to be favorable to TCs [Pun et al. 2013], and statistically about 50% of typhoons have translation speed lower than 5 m s\(^{-1}\) [Lin et al., 2014]. Therefore, consideration of a 3D ocean model is crucial and would improve TC intensity simulations and forecasts in the western North Pacific.

Finally, the simulation results show that the stability of Megi's boundary layer has a close connection to its induced SST cooling. Stable boundary layer (SBL) forms above the cooling area, leading to an increase in inflow angle of 10 m winds and thus possibly affecting the inner-core dynamics. The impact of SBL on Megi's intensity needs to be further investigated and is the topic of our next study.
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List of Acronyms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3DPWP</td>
<td>Three-Dimensional Price-Weller-Pinkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXBT</td>
<td>Airborne Expendable BathyThermograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1D</td>
<td>Coupled one-dimensional ocean experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1D_1015</td>
<td>Coupled one-dimensional ocean experiment starting at 0000 UTC 15 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3D</td>
<td>Coupled three-dimensional ocean experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASNFS</td>
<td>Eastern Asian Seas Nowcast/Forecast System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYCOM</td>
<td>Hybrid Coordinate Ocean Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITOP</td>
<td>Impact of Typhoons on the Ocean in the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMA</td>
<td>Japan Meteorological Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTWC</td>
<td>Joint Typhoon Warning Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSLP</td>
<td>Minimum Sea Level Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRL</td>
<td>Naval Research Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Philippine Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>Stable Boundary Layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>South China Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST</td>
<td>Sea Surface Temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Tropical Cyclone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCBL</td>
<td>Tropical Cyclone Boundary Layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Uncoupled experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOTS</td>
<td>Upper-Ocean Thermal Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRF</td>
<td>Weather Research and Forecasting Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1: (a) Megi-induced SST cooling based on satellite SST observations between 22 October 2010 and 15 October 2010. Megi's track is superimposed. (b) and (c) are Megi's 6 hourly minimum sea level pressure and translation speed from 0000 UTC 15 October to 0000 UTC 22 October 2010, respectively. "x" in (b) represent the observations from the C-130 aircrafts during the ITOP experiment. Megi's best track data is from JTWC. The ocean response, i.e. SST cooling, is much significant over the SCS than over the PS.

Figure 2: Initial ocean thermal condition for the experiments starting from 0000 UTC 15 October. (a) SST, (b) T100, (c) T100 minus SST, and (d) mixed layer depth. Megi's track is superimposed and the open square depicts the initial location of Megi in the model simulations. The subsurface thermal structure is very different between the SCS and the PS (b-d), although both SSTs are relatively warm (a).

Figure 3: Model simulated (a) track and (b) translation speed of Megi from 0000 UTC 15 to 0000 UTC 22 October 2010. In the PS segment, only C3D simulated results (red lines) are shown. Blue and green lines represent UC and C1D simulations. Differences in track simulations between all the experiments are small.

Figure 4: SST cooling at 0000 UTC 19 October 2010 relative to the initial SST 0000 UTC 15 October 2010 based on (a) satellite observations, (b) EASNFS, and (c) C3D simulation. The green (blue) dots in (a) represent the AXBT drop off locations on 16 (17) October 2010 during the ITOP field experiment. Six hourly
JTWC best track data are superimposed. The red dot indicates the center of Megi at 0000 UTC 19 October 2010. The cooling over the PS in the C3D simulation is consistent with the satellite observation and EASNFS analysis.

Figure 5: Comparison between AXBT observations and C3D simulations. Blue dots represent the data between surface and 50 m depth, while red dots represent the data between 50 and 200 m depth. The coefficient of determination ($R^2$) between observation and model is up to 0.92.

Figure 6: The evolutions of simulated and observed Megi intensity as defined by MSLP over (a) the PS and (b) the SCS. The initial condition in (a) is from HYCOM analysis on 15 October 2010, whereas the initial condition in (b) is from C3D output at 0000 UTC 19 October 2010. Blue, red and green lines represent the simulations from UC, C3D and C1D, respectively. Black solid and dashed lines represent the best-track data from JTWC and JMA, respectively. "x" represent the observations from C-130 aircrafts during the ITOP experiment. The overall differences in the intensity evolution between coupled and uncoupled experiments are small over the PS, while becoming significant in the SCS due to different ocean responses.

Figure 7: Sea surface current at (1) 0000 UTC 18 October and (2) 0000 UTC 22 October from (a) EASNFS ocean analysis, (b) C3D, and (c) C1D. Megi's track is superimposed and the red dot represents the center of Megi on that day. Note that since C1D experiment starting from 0000 UTC 19 October, there is no sea surface current display at 0000 UTC 18 October.

Figure 8: Megi induced SST cooling in the SCS based on (a) satellite observation, (b)
EASNFS, (c) C3D, and (d) C1D. SST cooling is estimated relative to the SST at 0000 UTC 15 October 2010. Rows (1) to (4) are the SST cooling at 0000 UTC from 19 to 22 October 2010. Six hourly track of Megi is superimposed and the red dot indicates the location of Megi on that day. EASNFS, C3D and C1D are all able to capture the distribution of SST cooling, with the maximum cooling occurring at the recurvature point.

Figure 9: (a) Initial ocean thermal structure along Megi's track at 0000 UTC 15 October 2010. (b) and (c) are simulated ocean thermal structure at 0000 UTC 22 October 2010 from C3D and C1D, respectively. The triangle represents the location of Megi and the white area represents the Luzon Island. The upper ocean responses between C3D and C1D are significantly different over the SCS (after 19 October 2010).

Figure 10: Profiles of averaged temperature along Megi's track. (a) Temperature profiles at the initial time 0000 UTC 15 October 2010. Thick (thin) lines represent averaged (individual) temperature profile, while red and blue ones depict profiles in PS and SCS, respectively. (b), (c) and (d) are averaged temperature profiles over the SCS segment from EASNFS, C1D, and C3D simulations at 0000 UTC 15 October 2010, respectively. The solid (dashed) line indicates time period after (before) Megi. The changes in the upper-ocean thermal structure are similar between EASNFS and C3D.

Figure 11: Simulated height of the TCBL (in meter) at 0000 UTC 21 October 2010 from (a) UC, (b) C3D and (c) C1D. Contours represent the SST cooling and the red dot indicates the center of Megi. The horizontal distributions of TCBL in C1D and C3D are similar to that in UC except over the cold wake region.
Figure 12: Same as Fig.11, but is for SBL (grey area). SBL forms over the area with strong Megi-induced SST cooling.

Figure 13: (a) Comparison of the wind fields between UC (blue) and C3D (red) at 0000 UTC 21 October 2010. The grey shading represents area of the SST cooling. (b) zoom-in area over the SST cooling. The inflow angle of C3D in the cold wake region is larger than that of UC.

Figure 14: Difference in averaged inflow angle at 10 m within 150 - 400 km from Megi's center between C3D and UC. Blue and red colors represent such difference over SBL region and other (i.e. non-SBL) region, respectively. One standard deviation for each averaged line is shown. The unit is in degree.
Figure 1: (a) Megi-induced SST cooling based on satellite SST observations between 22 October 2010 and 15 October 2010. Megi’s track is superimposed. (b) and (c) are Megi’s 6 hourly minimum sea level pressure and translation speed from 0000 UTC 15 October to 0000 UTC 22 October 2010, respectively. "x" in (b) represent the observations from the C-130 aircrafts during the ITOP experiment. Megi’s best track data is from JTWC. The ocean response, i.e. SST cooling, is much significant over the SCS than over the PS.
Figure 2: Initial ocean thermal condition for the experiments starting from 0000 UTC 15 October. (a) SST, (b) T100, (c) T100 minus SST, and (d) mixed layer depth. Megi’s track is superimposed and the open square depicts the initial location of Megi in the model simulations. The subsurface thermal structure is very different between the SCS and the PS (b-d), although both SSTs are relatively warm (a).
Figure 3: Model simulated (a) track and (b) translation speed of Megi from 0000 UTC 15 to 0000 UTC 22 October 2010. In the PS segment, only C3D simulated results (red lines) are shown. Blue and green lines represent UC and C1D simulations. Differences in track simulations between all the experiments are small.
Figure 4: SST cooling at 0000 UTC 19 October 2010 relative to the initial SST 0000 UTC 15 October 2010 based on (a) satellite observations, (b) EASNFS, and (c) C3D simulation. The green (blue) dots in (a) represent the AXBT drop off locations on 16 (17) October 2010 during the ITOP field experiment. Six hourly JTWC best track data are superimposed. The red dot indicates the center of Megi at 0000 UTC 19 October 2010. The cooling over the PS in the C3D simulation is consistent with the satellite observation and EASNFS analysis.
Figure 5: Comparison between AXBT observations and C3D simulations. Blue dots represent the data between surface and 50 m depth, while red dots represent the data between 50 and 200 m depth. The coefficient of determination ($R^2$) between observation and model is up to 0.92.
Figure 6: The evolutions of simulated and observed Megi intensity as defined by MSLP over (a) the PS and (b) the SCS. The initial condition in (a) is from HYCOM analysis on 15 October 2010, whereas the initial condition in (b) is from C3D output at 0000 UTC 19 October 2010. Blue, red and green lines represent the simulations from UC, C3D and C1D, respectively. Black solid and dashed lines represent the best-track data from JTWC and JMA, respectively. "x" represent the observations from C-130 aircrafts during the ITOP experiment. The overall differences in the intensity evolution between coupled and uncoupled experiments are small over the PS, while becoming significant in the SCS due to different ocean responses.
Figure 7: Sea surface current at (1) 0000 UTC 18 October and (2) 0000 UTC 22 October from (a) EASNFS ocean analysis, (b) C3D, and (c) C1D. Megi’s track is superimposed and the red dot represents the center of Megi on that day. Note that since C1D experiment starting from 0000 UTC 19 October, there is no sea surface current display at 0000 UTC 18 October.
Figure 8: Megi induced SST cooling in the SCS based on (a) satellite observation, (b) EASNFS, (c) C3D, and (d) C1D. SST cooling is estimated relative to the SST at 0000 UTC 15 October 2010. Rows (1) to (4) are the SST cooling at 0000 UTC from 19 to 22 October 2010. Six hourly track of Megi is superimposed and the red dot indicates the location of Megi on that day. EASNFS, C3D and C1D are all able to capture the distribution of SST cooling, with the maximum cooling occurring at the recurvature point.
Figure 9: (a) Initial ocean thermal structure along Megi’s track at 0000 UTC 15 October 2010. (b) and (c) are simulated ocean thermal structure at 0000 UTC 22 October 2010 from C3D and C1D, respectively. The triangle represents the location of Megi and the white area represents the Luzon Island. The upper ocean responses between C3D and C1D are significantly different over the SCS (after 19 October 2010).
Figure 10: Profiles of averaged temperature along Megi's track. (a) Temperature profiles at the initial time 0000 UTC 15 October 2010. Thick (thin) lines represent averaged (individual) temperature profile, while red and blue ones depict profiles in PS and SCS, respectively. (b), (c) and (d) are averaged temperature profiles over the SCS segment from EASNFS, C1D, and C3D simulations at 0000 UTC 15 October 2010, respectively. The solid (dashed) line indicates time period after (before) Megi. The changes in the upper-ocean thermal structure are similar between EASNFS and C3D.
Figure 11: Simulated height of the TCBL (in meter) at 0000 UTC 21 October 2010 from (a) UC, (b) C3D and (c) C1D. Contours represent the SST cooling and the red dot indicates the center of Megi. The horizontal distributions of TCBL in C1D and C3D are similar to that in UC except over the cold wake region.
Figure 12: Same as Fig. 11, but is for SBL (grey area). SBL forms over the area with strong Megi-induced SST cooling.
Figure 13: (a) Comparison of the wind fields between UC (blue) and C3D (red) at 0000 UTC 21 October 2010. The grey shading represents area of the SST cooling. (b) zoom-in area over the SST cooling. The inflow angle of C3D in the cold wake region is larger than that of UC.
Figure 14: Difference in averaged inflow angle at 10 m within 150 - 400 km from Megi's center between C3D and UC. Blue and red colors represent such difference over SBL region and other (i.e. non-SBL) region, respectively. One standard deviation for each averaged line is shown. The unit is in degree.