Calibrated measurements of PMSE strengths at three different locations observed with SKiYMET radars and narrow beam VHF radars
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Abstract

While PMSE are a well recognized summer phenomenon in the polar regions, debate still exists on their relative strengths as function of latitude and longitude. Different radar design and noise calibration procedures complicate comparison between sites. Here, we use radars at multiple sites, some with a common design, to better determine the radar backscatter cross-section, and hence compare PMSE strengths. Five radars at Yellowknife (62°53′N, 114°33′W), Andenes (69°33′N, 16°03′E) and Resolute Bay (75°03′N, 95°03′W) in the northern hemisphere were used to observe PMSE during July 2005. At Yellowknife, data were collected for thirteen days. In other two locations data were collected continuously for the full month of July. The radars were independently calibrated using the same method, and absolute backscatter cross-sections were determined. Resolute Bay is close to both the magnetic and geomagnetic north poles, and inside the auroral oval, while the other two sites are under the auroral oval on some occasions. Inter-comparison of the calibrated observations indicates that the strength of the PMSE at Yellowknife and Andenes are comparable, and both are significantly stronger than at Resolute Bay.

1. Introduction

Polar Mesosphere Summer Echoes (PMSE) are strong coherent radar echoes from the cold summer mesosphere at high latitudes. Following their unexpected discovery in the late seventies by Ecklund and Balsley (1981) several active radar campaigns were conducted in the American and European sectors of the northern hemisphere (e.g., Czechowsky and Rüster, 1985; Hoppe et al., 1988; Röttger et al., 1988). Results of these campaigns led to a debate among researchers, since the well known classical coherent radar backscatter theories such as neutral turbulent backscatter theory and Fresnel (partial) reflection theory had failed to explain the observed features of PMSE (see Cho and Kelley, 1993; Rapp and Lübken, 2004 and references therein). After an intense three decades of theoretical and experimental studies, it is now widely accepted that the cold mesopause temperature ($T \approx 150$ K) and nanometer size charged ice particles play a decisive role in producing PMSE. Nevertheless, understanding the physical process that causes the small scale fluctuations that are necessary to produce radar echoes, remains a challenging task.

2. Uncertainties in geographic and geomagnetic relative strengths

The relative strengths of PMSE at different radar sites, and hence latitudinal and longitudinal variations, still remains an open question. Since the inclusion of dynamical processes in thermal models predicts much colder mesopause temperature near the poles than at mid-latitudes (e.g., García and Solomon, 1985), it is not unreasonable to expect more intense and frequent occurrences of PMSE towards the poles. Recently, Rapp and Lübken (2004) argued that the temperature dependence agrees with experiments at least in regard to occurrence rates, especially in the European sector of the northern hemisphere. On the other hand, Huaman et al. (2001) reported a low occurrence rate of PMSE at Resolute Bay (75°03′N, 95°03′W) observed by a 51.5 MHz VHF radar. The Resolute Bay VHF radar has been continuously monitoring PMSE since 1997. The low occurrence rates of PMSE at this site have recently raised many important questions on the appropriateness of current PMSE theories, as well as on the
capabilities of the Resolute Bay radar itself. Following this, recently this radar system was carefully calibrated using cosmic noise variations with the additional help of a commercially available calibrated noise source (Swarnalingam and Hocking, 2006, 2007). The calibrated PMSE echoes at this site indicate that PMSE strength at this location is indeed weak compared with the results of radar calibration and signal processing (e.g., Kelley and Ulwick, 1988; Hoppe et al., 1988; Röttger and La Hoz, 1990; Inhester et al., 1990; Hocking and Röttger, 1997; Röttger, 2001). Furthermore, these experiments were not obtained using a common standard method of radar calibration and signal processing (e.g., Kelley and Ulwick, 1988; Hoppe et al., 1988; Röttger and La Hoz, 1990; Inhester et al., 1990; Hocking and Röttger, 1997; Röttger, 2001). In order to understand the geographical distribution and hence the latitudinal and longitudinal dependence of PMSE, there is a need to monitor them with commonly designed radars that share a standard method of absolute calibration and signal processing. The importance of this concept was proposed by Woodman (2003) as a resolution at the Tenth International Workshop on Technical and Scientific Aspects of MST Radar held in Peru in May 2003. Following this, radars from the SKiYMET meteor radar network were used for the first time for such a study during the boreal summer of 2005.

The SKiYMET radar network consists of a number of near identical radars spread across large geographical regions in the northern and southern hemispheres. As the first stage of this study, radars located at Yellowknife in Canada (62.5°N, 114.3°W) and Andenes in Norway (69.3°N, 16.0°E) were used to observe PMSE. In addition to these, a design employing a four-antenna Quartet-Mode radar at Resolute Bay (75.0°N, 95.0°W) was also involved in this study. In this paper, we present the results of thirteen days of SKiYMET observation at Yellowknife (in the interval of 1–21 July 2005), four days of SKiYMET observation at Andenes (in the interval of 1–21 July 2005) and nine days of the Quartet-Mode radar observation at Resolute Bay (in the interval of 11–21 July 2005). The experiments were run for periods of 2–6 hours on a daily basis, covering both day and night. The results are compared with PMSE observations from two traditional MST radars (the Resolute Bay VHF radar and the ALWIN radar) located at Resolute Bay and Andenes, respectively. Data for these two traditional radars were collected continuously in the interval 1–31 July 2005. We consider that these experiments with the SKiYMET radars at Yellowknife and Andenes will be a prelude to more extensive experiments using other existing SKiYMET (and similar) systems.

3. Experiment setup and noise calibration

The SKiYMET radar is an all-sky interferometric meteor radar originally intended to observe winds in the mesosphere region using radio scatter from meteor trails. In general, the SKiYMET radar uses a single 3-element crossed Yagi antenna for transmission and five independent 2-element crossed Yagi antennas for reception. At Yellowknife, the system operates at 35.65 MHz with a 6 kW transmitter peak power, and at Andenes it operates at 32.55 MHz with a 12 kW transmitter peak power. Both radars have a vertical resolution of 2 km. In order to use SKiYMET radars to study PMSE, they were electronically modified to operate like traditional coherent radars, by coherently adding the signals on all five receivers after compensating for phase delays in each channel. As a result, the receiver polar diagram has nine grating lobes, each with a moderate width of 5° half-power-half-width (HPHW). One lobe points vertically, four point 30° off-vertical and another four point 42° off-vertical. Fig. 1 shows the receiver polar diagram of the Yellowknife SKiYMET radar system (upper panel). It is plotted in sin(θ) · sin(φ) coordinates, where θ and φ refer to the off-vertical and azimuthal angles, respectively. The lower panel of the figure shows the projection of the nine grating lobes (HPFW) of this radar into the sky (at 14:00 ST). While the white dot in the center refers the geographic north pole, the white dash–dash line shows the path of the centroid of this radar in a sidereal day.

No traditional SKiYMET radar is located at Resolute Bay, but instead we used a so-called Quartet-Mode radar, comprising four 2-element Yagi antennas at the corners of square with sides of length λ/2. This is embedded within the existing Main-Mode radar antenna array. The Quartet-Mode radar uses a wider beam (35° HPHW) for both transmission and reception in the vertical direction (monostatic mode).

The recent calibration work at Resolute Bay by Swarnalingam and Hocking (2006) involved comparing the diurnal variation of cosmic noise power (also called sky noise) against the recorded

![Image](347x287 to 501x411)

**Fig. 1.** Upper panel shows a 3D view of the reception polar diagrams plotted for the SKiYMET radar system located at Yellowknife. The lower panel shows the sky noise temperature for the northern hemisphere at 35.65 MHz (the operational frequency of the Yellowknife SKiYMET radar). The sky noise temperature is plotted in right ascension—declination coordinates with the geographic north pole at the center (white dot). The yellow circles show projections of the nine grating lobes (HPFW) of the Yellowknife SKiYMET radar into the sky. The white dash–dash line shows the path of the centroid of this radar in a sidereal day.
ruler power (in arbitrary digital units), and then developing a
conversion constant between these two powers. Since the path-
ways to the radar receiver for both the backscattered signal and
the cosmic noise are the same, the same conversion constant can
be used to estimate the absolute signal strength of the back-
scattered power. The advantage of this calibration method is that
it can be directly applied to any MST radar anywhere in the world
as long as the cosmic noise variation above the site is known.
Detailed discussions of this method can be found in Swarnalingam
and Hocking (2007) and Swarnalingam et al. (2009). However, for
completeness we briefly describe the method here. (Following the
calibration work at Resolute Bay, the method was also used by
Kirkwood et al. (2007) to compare PMSE strengths at Kiruna
(68°N) and Wasa (73°S), Antarctica.)

In order to calibrate all other radars which were involved in
this study we applied the same method at each location
independently. In a radar system, the total noise power that
reaches the radar receiver (\(P_{\text{rx}}\)) and the true sky noise power
detected by the antenna array (\(P_{\text{sky}}\)), for times when the
transmitter is turned off, can be linked through a linear relation-
ship as follows:

\[
P_{\text{rx}} = e^b (P_{\text{sky}} + N_{\text{loc}}) + (1 - e^b) N_{\text{lin}}
\]

(1)

where \(e^b\) is the system efficiency for reception. The quantity \(N_{\text{loc}}\)
refers to the local noise power that originates in the surrounding
area, mainly due to human activities. While the diurnal variation
of \(P_{\text{sky}}\) depends on local sidereal time, \(N_{\text{loc}}\) remains approximately
constant. \(N_{\text{lin}}\) refers to the transmission line noise. The noise
power \(P_{\text{rx}}\) is thus fed into the receiver, and consequently recorded
in the computer in arbitrary digital units. However, an additional
constant noise power \(N_{\text{rx}}\) is also detected directly by the receiver
due to various pieces of equipment inside the receiver building
and also due to internal noise within the receiver itself. The
relationship between the input received by the receiver and the
recorded power (\(P_{\text{rec}}\)) can be written as

\[
P_{\text{rec}} = \frac{G_S}{N \cdot M \cdot L} (P_{\text{rx}} + N_{\text{rx}})
\]

(2)

where \(G_S\) is the conversion factor between Watts and digital units.
\(N\) and \(M\) represent the actual number of coherent integrations and
number of bits used in the pulse-coding, respectively. These
quantities appear in Eq. (2) as a result of coherent averaging
(Swarnalingam, 2007; Swarnalingam et al., 2009).

\(L\) was introduced to handle the situation in which comple-
mentary codes are used. In such situations confusion may
arise with the actual value of \(M\). In complementary codes, each
code will contain a pair of elements such that the second element
is the complement of the first element (Schmidt et al., 1979).
Therefore, the actual number of pulses are two times \(M\). In order
to generalize the above equation to be valid regardless of the
chosen pulse-coding, the parameter \(L\) is introduced. It corresponds
to the number of elements of codes. It will take a value 2 if
complementary codes were used, otherwise it stays as 1.

Combining Eqs. (1) and (2) will lead to the final calibration
equation:

\[
P_{\text{rec}} = \frac{G_S}{N \cdot M \cdot L} \left( P_{\text{sky}} + N_{\text{loc}} + \frac{(1 - e^b)}{e^b} N_{\text{lin}} + N_{\text{rx}} \right)
\]

(3)

where \(G_S = (G_S \cdot e^b)\). By comparing the variation of \(P_{\text{rec}}\) against
\(P_{\text{sky}}\), and applying a linear regression fit, we can determine \(G_S\).

The cosmic power variation above the radar site can be
calculated from sky survey maps available close to the radar
operational frequency. Currently two main sky surveys close to
our radar operational frequencies are available. The first one at
30 MHz was published by Cane (1978) and the other at 22 MHz
was published by Roger et al. (1999). Although both surveys cover
more than 90% of the northern hemisphere, we have decided to
use the second one since it has better angular resolution. The
map’s sky noise temperature values were transferred to radar
frequency equivalent temperatures by assuming that the cosmic
radiation decreases with frequency by a power law of mean
spectral index \(\beta = 2.50\). The actual value of \(\beta\) has been a subject of
debate in the literature, but it is now widely accepted that its
value is very close to 2.50, especially for the VHF range (e.g.,
Bridle, 1967; Sironi, 1974; Webster, 1974; Haslam et al., 1981).

Nevertheless, in order to get the most accurate value for \(\beta\) we have
performed our own analysis and comparison, especially in the
northern mid and high latitude region, by comparing five surveys
within the frequency range 22–178 MHz (Swarnalingam, 2007).
The five surveys that were used in our analysis were at 22 MHz by
Roger et al. (1999), 30 MHz by Cane (1978), 45 MHz by Campistron
et al. (2002), 85 MHz by Landecker and Wielebinski (1970) and
178 MHz by Turtle and Baldwin (1962). Based on this comparison,
it was found that the Roger et al. (1999) 22 MHz survey maintains
a \(\beta\) value of 2.50 with respect to the other surveys. The error is
only 1% if the 30 MHz survey is excluded, otherwise the possible
error is about 5%. Therefore, in our calibration work it was decided
to use \(\beta = 2.50\). Furthermore, our estimated value for \(\beta\) is in good
agreement with the \(\beta\) used by Campistron et al. (2002) and Roger
et al. (1999).

A two dimensional convolution between the radar polar
diagram and the equivalent sky noise temperature was then
carefully applied, in order to calculate the sky noise temperature
diurnal variations. However, possible ionospheric absorption has
to be considered in the estimation of \(G_S\). For the SKYMET and
ALWIN radars this was taken into account by comparing the
experiment days with the nearest riometer data (available at:
http://www.dcs.lancs.ac.uk/ijono/cgi-bin/riometers). We com-
pared each sidereal day of sky noise collected by the radar with
the baseline curve for the geographically closest riometer at the
frequency closest to our own. From this comparison, we were able
to identify the absorption signatures, which are typically on
a relatively short time scale compared with the quiet day
curve. The sky noise collected by radar during these time intervals
were eliminated in our calibration procedure. Elimination of short
time interval of data would not affect our final calibration results,
since our procedure uses many sidereal days of sky noise data
(see Swarnalingam et al., 2009, Figs. 2 and 3). For the Resolute Bay
radar, we used quiet day noise variations that were identified from
a large data set collected by radar (the Resolute Bay radar has
been continuously operated both in summer and winter seasons
starting from 1997). For the calibration work presented here,
twelve days of data were selected in the interval of 26–30 June,
1–7 July, 23–27 July and 26–30 August from the data collected
during the 2005 boreal summer.

4. Calculation of PMSE backscatter cross-sections

For all five radars, the received PMSE peak power \(P_R\) in Watts
was estimated using the corresponding \(G_S\) (or \(G_S^*\)) values, after
removing the background noise, which are the sum of the second,
third and fourth terms in Eq. (3). Consequently, the PMSE
backscatter cross-sections for these radars were calculated. The
backscatter cross-section (\(\eta\)), which can be considered as the total
isotropically scattered power with an intensity equal to that of the
observed backscattered radiation, per unit solid angle, per unit
incident power density and per unit volume of scatterer, is given by

$$\eta = \frac{P_t e^T e^R}{\frac{8\pi^2}{h^2} \int_{\phi=0}^{\pi/2} \int_{\theta=0}^{\pi/2} G_r(\theta, \phi) A_e(\theta, \phi) h^2 \sin(\theta) d\theta d\phi}$$

where $P_t$ is the transmitted peak power, $e^T$ is the system efficiency in transmission, $e^R$ is the system efficiency in reception (as indicated in the calibration equations), $h$ is the echo backscatter height, $AR$ is the vertical range resolution, $G_r(\theta, \phi)$ is the antenna gain in transmission, and $A_e(\theta, \phi)$ is the antenna effective area in reception. However, for narrower and moderate beam width radars, the above equation can be safely approximated as follows (see Hocking, 1985):

$$\eta = \frac{32\pi(2 \ln 2) h^2 P_R}{G_{TM} A_{RM}(\theta_{1/2})^2 e^T e^R P_t (AR - 2)}$$

where $G_{TM}$ is the transmitter antenna gain in the vertical direction, $A_{RM}$ is the effective area of the receiver array in vertical direction and $(\theta_{1/2})$ is the HPHW of receiver beam. Care was taken in the estimation of antenna gain as well as system efficiency in determining transmission strengths for all radars used in this study. The antenna gain was carefully calculated using a simulation model, which replicated the exact antenna array structure of each radar system (Swarnalingam et al., 2007; Swarnalingam et al., 2009). The upper portion of Table 1 shows system specifications and the experimental details of the five radars that have been used in our study.

4.1. Comparing SKiYMET radar results

For the SKiYMET radars, a 512 point coherent integration was applied, giving an effective sampling rate of 0.48 s. Following this, a 42 point incoherent averaging procedure was used. Since Eq. (5) assumes not only volume filling but also isotropically scattered power, special care was taken in the backscatter cross-section estimations, especially with the SKiYMET radars. With regard to the SKiYMET radar, we take advantage of the fact that PMSE echoes originating in the height range 80–90 km will appear in the off-vertical beams at range 92–104 km, and hence will not be confused with the main beam echoes. Furthermore, spectra recorded with the off-vertical beam show Doppler shifts due to horizontal wind motion, and will be suppressed by our large amount of coherent integration. These facts are important to recognize for radar calibration and PMSE backscatter cross-section estimation. While the sky noise is recorded in all nine beams, PMSE echoes at ranges 80–90 km are only significant in the vertical beam.

Fig. 2 shows examples of same day PMSE observations conducted at Yellowknife, Andenes and Resolute Bay. The figure shows the calculated backscatter cross-sections for the data collected on 15 July 2005 at these three locations, plotted in logarithmic scale. The first two panels show the PMSE structure observed by two SKiYMET radars located at Yellowknife (11:30–12:15 UT first panel) and Andenes (07:00–07:50 UT second panel). The third and fourth panels show the PMSE structures observed by the ALWIN radar (06:00–08:00 UT) and Resolute Bay (00:00–04:00 UT) on the same day. Note that two SKiYMET radars are nearly identical in configuration (see Table 1). As we will see shortly (in Fig. 4), we also calculated the backscatter cross-section distributions for these two radars for the data collected during our experiment period. We found that the mean backscatter cross-section values of the two SKiYMET radars at Yellowknife and Andenes were very close. While Yellowknife recorded a median of $1.18 \times 10^{-13}$ m$^{-1}$ and geometric mean of $1.38 \times 10^{-13}$ m$^{-1}$, the SKiYMET at Andenes recorded a median of $1.71 \times 10^{-13}$ m$^{-1}$ and geometric mean of $2.09 \times 10^{-13}$ m$^{-1}$.

4.2. Comparing Resolute Bay results with ALWIN

The signal processing for the Resolute Bay VHF radar and the Andenes ALWIN radar remain the same as in previous PMSE experiments. In the case of the Resolute Bay radars (both the Main-Mode and Quartet-Mode), 8 bit complementary coded signals were transmitted and then 16 point coherent integration was applied on received echoes. For the ALWIN radar, 16 bit complementary coded signals were transmitted and a 32 point integration was applied. Note that the Resolute Bay (Main-Mode) and ALWIN have similar radar designs. Fig. 3 compares the calculated PMSE backscatter cross-sections at these two radars for the interval 17–19 July 2005. It can be seen in the figure that the PMSE backscatter cross-section values for the Resolute Bay (Main-Mode) radar are significantly lower compared with the backscatter cross-sections calculated for ALWIN.

Eq. (5) for backscatter cross-section is valid for all radars from moderate to narrow beam widths. It may break down with very wide radar beam width, and this may be an issue for the Quartet-Mode, but the errors will be slight. A more important issue here is the possible underestimation of backscatter cross-section due to
For SKiYMET of scatterers with mean aspect angle, that the echoes are aspect sensitive. While a strong aspect nature during 1998–2008 (Swarnalingam and Hocking, 2009). We found study for a decade long data collected by the Main-Mode radar. In order to examine this, we have carried out aspect-sensitivity between the received power and the back-scatter cross-section. Anisotropic, the degree of anisotropy will impact the relation observed PMSE structure at Andenes during the same interval. Radar during 17–19 July 2005. The upper panel shows height-time contour plot for Fig. 3.

For SKiYMET $\eta_y$ is included in $C_\eta$. The measurements from the wider beam Quartet-Mode radar. Following this, we estimated the effective beam width for the Quartet-Mode radar using the method described by Hocking (1987),

$$\sin^{-2}(\theta_{\text{eff 1/2}}) = \sin^{-2}(\theta_{1/2}^r) + \sin^{-2}(\theta_{1/2})$$

where $\theta_{1/2}$ is HPHW of the backscatter polar diagram of the scatterers, $\theta_{1/2}^r$ is two-way HPHW of radar and $\theta_{\text{eff 1/2}}$ is the resultant effective HPHW of the combined two-way polar diagram. From our calculations, it was found that the Quartet-Mode radar has a one-way effective beam width $\theta_{\text{eff 1/2}} = 10^\circ$. The backscatter cross-sections for the Quartet-Mode were then estimated using the effective beam width, and it was found that the values are comparable with the values of Main-Mode radar. A contour plot for the estimated backscatter cross-sections on 15 July 2005 in the Quartet-Mode radar (00:00–03:45 UT) is shown in the bottom panel of Fig. 2. As discussed in Section 4.1, the figure also shows the same day PMSE observations (15 July 2005) from the two SKiYMET radars (the first two panels) and ALWIN radar (third panel).

Finally, Fig. 4 shows the logarithmic histograms of the calculated backscatter cross-sections for the five radars. In this study, for each radar, all experimental days were included regardless of whether PMSE appeared or not on that radar. For each pre-determined time bin (2 min), the maximum radar returns from the height range 80–90 km were considered, and the distributions of backscatter cross-section were calculated for all five radars after careful noise substraction. It can be seen from the figure that the calculated backscatter cross-section were comparable for the Resolute Bay Main-Mode radar and Quartet-Mode radar. While the Main-Mode recorded a median of $3.02 \times 10^{-15} \text{ m}^{-1}$ the Quartet-Mode recorded $2.74 \times 10^{-15} \text{ m}^{-1}$. On the other hand, the ALWIN radar recorded a median of $3.51 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^{-1}$.

5. Discussions

While Fig. 4 compares the calculated backscatter cross-section distributions for all five radars, the lower portion of Table 1 summarizes the median, geometric mean, 10th and 90th percentile values of the distributions. The SKiYMET radars at Yellowknife and Andenes recorded almost the same range of backscatter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (MHz)</th>
<th>Yellowknife (SKiYMET)</th>
<th>Andenes (SKiYMET)</th>
<th>Resolute Bay (Quartet)</th>
<th>Resolute Bay (Main)</th>
<th>Andenes (ALWIN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power (kW)</td>
<td>35.65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR (m)</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (MHz)</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF (Hz)</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_y$ (%)</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{G}_{\text{HPHW}}$ (deg)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16-point</td>
<td>16-point</td>
<td>16-point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>8-bit</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>8-bit</td>
<td>16-bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent integration</td>
<td>512-point</td>
<td>16-point</td>
<td>512-point</td>
<td>16-point</td>
<td>32-point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median of $\eta$ (m$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>1.38E–13</td>
<td>1.71E–13</td>
<td>2.74E–15</td>
<td>3.02E–15</td>
<td>3.51E–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometric mean of $\eta$ (m$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>1.38E–13</td>
<td>2.09E–13</td>
<td>3.71E–15</td>
<td>4.38E–15</td>
<td>3.18E–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90th Percentile of $\eta$ (m$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>7.70E–13</td>
<td>7.41E–13</td>
<td>2.03E–14</td>
<td>4.23E–14</td>
<td>1.64E–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Percentile of $\eta$ (m$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>3.53E–14</td>
<td>6.54E–14</td>
<td>1.25E–15</td>
<td>9.84E–16</td>
<td>5.63E–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_\eta^2$ (using median)</td>
<td>2.51E + 15</td>
<td>1.35E + 15</td>
<td>2.23E + 14</td>
<td>2.47E + 14</td>
<td>3.29E + 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: A summary of the system and experimental parameters (upper part), the calculated backscatter cross-section range values and the equivalent $C_\eta^2$ values (lower part) for the five radars used in this study.
The electron density structure function constant, which is denoted by $C_2^N$, is a measure of degree of electron density fluctuation and thus an ideal parameter to compare our results

$$C_2^N = \frac{\langle \Delta n / N \rangle^2}{\Delta N}$$

where $C_2^N$ is the refractive index structure constant, and equal to $(\eta/0.38)^{1/3}$. The quantity $\langle \Delta n / N \rangle$ is equal to $-\tau_r \lambda / (2\pi)$ at VHF, where $\tau_r$ is the classical electron radius (see Hocking and Vincent, 1982).

PMSE backscatter cross-section values for the five radars were converted into the equivalent $C_2^N$ values. It was found that $C_2^N$ for Resolute Bay is a factor of 10 lower than that for Yellowknife and Andenes (see Table 1). Note that if the radar volume filling condition was not satisfied during the experiments, Eq. (4) would lead to an underestimation in our backscatter cross-section values, and hence under estimation of $C_2^N$ values. Since the SKiYMET radars have a larger radar volume compared with the Resolute Bay Main-Mode radar and the ALWIN radar by a factor of 17, such scenarios will have greatest impact on SKiYMET radar estimations. Therefore, we can safely say that the strength of PMSE at Resolute Bay is significantly lower compared with strengths at Yellowknife and Andenes.

The Resolute Bay site is located close to both the magnetic north pole (82.7 N, 114.4 W) and geomagnetic north pole (79.7 N, 71.8 W), and this may play an important role in determining the strength of the PMSE. We recall here an important point discussed by Morris et al. (2005), that PMSE are influenced by electron precipitation, which is more prevalent in the auroral oval. Furthermore, the dependence of PMSE on the background electron number density was investigated by Rapp et al. (2002), and they estimated that a minimum of 300–500 electrons per cm$^3$ are necessary for PMSE to exist. The relationship between PMSE and electron precipitation has not yet been investigated in detail at various locations. Precipitation could play an important role, especially in determining PMSE strengths as a function of latitude and longitude. The formation of electron density gradients by electron precipitation may perhaps be more important than the general electron density increase itself.

We also investigated the level of geomagnetic activity by comparing $K_p$ index values from College (64 N, 147 W) and Tromsø (70 N, 19 E), which are close to Yellowknife and Andenes respectively, and also from Longyearbyen (78.2 N, 15.8 E). During our PMSE experimental days, the $K_p$ index reached a value 6 or higher on many occasions at College and Tromsø (9 days), and also at Longyearbyen (5 days). Note that while the radar sites at Yellowknife, Andenes and Longyearbyen are sometimes located under the auroral oval (depending on diurnal time and level of magnetic activity), the Resolute Bay radar remains a true polar cap site for both the lowest and highest $K_p$ index values (see Morris et al., 2005). These results are also consistent with the fact that PMSE have high occurrence rates at Longyearbyen (geomagnetic latitude 75 N) compared with at Resolute Bay (see Lübken et al., 2004).

6. Conclusions

New studies of PMSE with five radars (two SKYMET radars, two MST narrow beam radars and a MST wider beam radar) at three northern hemisphere locations have been presented. The two SKYMET radars (located at Yellowknife and Andenes) are near identical radars. The two MST narrow beam radars (located at Resolute Bay and Andenes) have similar design. By
applying the same method of noise calibration and signal processing, the calibrated PMSE signal strengths at these sites were compared using the data collected during the boreal summer of 2005. Comparison of the two SKYMET radar backscatter cross-sections shows that the PMSE strengths at Yellowknife and Andenes are similar. Comparison of two MST radar backscatter cross-sections shows that PMSE strength at Resolute Bay is significantly lower than Andenes. Furthermore, we compared the electron density fluctuations at these three locations using the electron density structure function constant ($C_n$). While electron density fluctuations at Yellowknife and Andenes look to be similar, the fluctuations at Resolute Bay are significantly weaker. This could be due to the fact that the radar site is located closer to the magnetic and geomagnetic north poles and is never located under the auroral oval, even for high or low $K_p$ levels. Our results also show that SKYMET (and similar) radars can be useful for PMSE studies, and this will allow more extensive network of such radars to be utilized further for this purpose in the future.
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