

1 A review of the relevance of the ‘CLOUD’ results
2 and other recent observations to the possible effect of
3 cosmic rays on the terrestrial climate.

4 A. D. Erlykin ^{1,3}, T. Sloan ² and A. W. Wolfendale ³

(1) P.N.Lebedev Physical Institute, Leninsky prosp., Moscow, Russia

corresponding author: tel.+74991358737, e-mail: erlykin@sci.lebedev.ru

(2) Physics Department, University of Lancaster, Lancaster, UK

(3) Department of Physics, Durham University, Durham, UK

5 November 5, 2018

6 **Abstract**

7 The problem of the contribution of cosmic rays to climate change is a contin-
8 uing one and one of importance. In principle, at least, the recent results from the
9 CLOUD project at CERN provide information about the role of ionizing particles
10 in ‘sensitizing’ atmospheric aerosols which might, later, give rise to cloud droplets.
11 Our analysis shows that, although important in cloud physics the results do not
12 lead to the conclusion that cosmic rays affect atmospheric clouds significantly, at

13 least if H_2SO_4 is the dominant source of aerosols in the atmosphere. An analysis
14 of the very recent studies of stratospheric aerosol changes following a giant Solar
15 Energetic Particles event shows a similar negligible effect. Recent measurements
16 of the cosmic ray intensity show that a former decrease with time has been re-
17 versed. Thus, even if cosmic rays enhanced cloud production, there would be a
18 small Global Cooling, not Warming.

19 **1 Introduction**

20 There is, by now, a wealth of literature on the relevance of cosmic rays (CR) to climate
21 change. Examples favouring a significant effect are: Svensmark and Friis-Christensen
22 (1997), Palle Bago and Butler (2000) and Svensmark (2007). Those against include
23 Sloan and Wolfendale (2008) and Erlykin et al. (2009 a,b). The essence of the claim is
24 that CR ions cause the nucleation of aerosols from trace condensable vapours, leading,
25 via the growth of the aerosols, to cloud condensation nucleus (CCN) status and thereby
26 to the water droplet stage. A separate aspect concerns the time variability of the
27 CR intensity: recent work by 'CLOUD' (Kirkby et al., 2011) relating to laboratory
28 experiments on the initial stages of cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) have relevance
29 to the claim and stratospheric nuclei (Mironova et al., 2012) caused by CR in the
30 stratosphere are potentially important. Both studies will be examined here.

31 In CLOUD, the nuclei are studied in a large 'chamber' and ionizing particles come
32 from an accelerator under carefully controlled conditions. Sulfuric acid vapour is studied
33 in detail in that this is considered by Kirkby et al to be 'the primary vapour responsible

34 for atmospheric nucleation’.

35 **2 Aerosols**

36 The mechanism by which cloud droplets form is one of some complexity and firstly
37 we examine the process. Following Carslaw et al. (2002) the following stages can be
38 identified.

39 1. For H_2O and H_2SO_4 vapours there can be condensation (and evaporation) leading
40 to cluster nucleation, (ultra-fine condensation nuclei, UCN), the result being ‘subcritical
41 embryos’ of $<1\text{-}2$ nm diameter.

42 2. Condensation can occur yielding condensation nuclei (CN) - ‘critical embryos’ of
43 diameter $\sim 1\text{-}2$ nm.

44 3. Condensation and coagulation can then yield charged condensation nuclei of diameter
45 ~ 100 nm.

46 4. Activation follows and cloud droplets (CD), of diameter $10\text{-}20$ μm , may then appear.

47 It will be apparent that different experiments will be responsive to different steps in
48 the above: UCN, CN, CCN and CD. It is also clear that many (often the majority)
49 of the UCN will not survive to CD.

50 In the CLOUD experiment, we assume that we are dealing largely with UCN and
51 CN.

52 The stratospheric results relate to CCN, aerosols which are recognised by their
53 extinction at wavelengths of 756 nm (satellite studies), and by other wavelengths (eg
54 in some cases at 360 nm).

55 It is usually assumed (eg Kirkby et al, 2011) that sulfuric acid and ammonia are
56 most relevant in the atmosphere and their effects have been examined in the CLOUD
57 experiment, to be described next.

58 **3 CLOUD.**

59 The main results from CLOUD, of relevance here, are:

60 (i) ‘Atmospherically relevant ammonia’ mixing ratios of 100 parts per trillion by
61 volume increase the nucleation rate of sulphuric acid particles more than 100-
62 1000-fold. Of main importance to the present work, ions increase the nucleation
63 rate by a factor of between 2 and 10 for ground level Galactic CR intensities.

64 (ii) The ion-induced nucleation can occur in the mid-troposphere but is negligible in
65 the ‘boundary layer’, ie below about 3km altitude. (a fact remarked on by the
66 CLOUD authors).

67 Specifically, using the temperature dependence of the nucleation rate, CR - will
68 only be relevant for Polar altitudes above about 4 km and Equatorial altitudes
69 above about 8 km, using the universally available temperature, altitude, latitude
70 data. Thus, the boundary layer will be unaffected by CR-induced aerosols, at
71 least for those involved in the CLOUD project, which are thought to be the ones
72 of major importance (an assumption that needs further analysis).

73 (iii) There is a dramatic increase in nucleation rate with falling temperature (typically
74 a factor 10^4 in going from 292°K to 248°K), a result due to the change of saturation

75 vapour pressure with temperature.

76 **4 Discussion of the CLOUD Aerosol Results.**

77 **4.1 General Remarks.**

78 Although aerosols are without doubt involved in the generation of CCN, their very
79 uneven distribution across the Globe, for example, NOAA aerosol maps, (NOAA, 2012),
80 in comparison with cloud cover, means that their effect is not straightforward. Their
81 altitude dependence is a matter of importance and this will be examined. Early work
82 by Elterman (1968) showed a slow fall in aerosol density with increasing height: at low
83 altitudes the mean attenuation coefficient was found to be about $3 \cdot 10^{-2} km^{-1}$. More
84 recently Hervig and Deshler (2002) have analysed comprehensive satellite- and balloon-
85 borne data from the standpoint of the altitude variation of aerosols in 4 size ranges,
86 from 386-1020 nm. The data relate to profiles over Laramie, Wyoming for 1984 to 1999.
87 It is found that the density of aerosols is about constant with height from 12 km (their
88 lowest value) to 20 km, after which it falls by a factor of 100 at 30 km. The relevance
89 of this result will become clear later.

90 Of interest to Cloud Cover is the reported slow increase of atmospheric aerosol
91 density with time (4% - 8% y^{-1} in the mid-latitude lower stratosphere, eg Liu et al.,
92 2012).

93 **4.2 Temperature dependence of nucleation.**

94 In the lower troposphere (the ‘boundary layer’) the temperature is too high for nucle-
95 ation to have any relevance to the CR, CC problem as already remarked. Since this
96 is the region (LCC: ‘low cloud cover’) where Svensmark and Friis-Christensen (1997)
97 and others (eg Palle Bago and Butler, 2000), found the only evidence for CC,CR
98 correlation then there is clearly no support for the CR, CC hypothesis. In the upper
99 troposphere, where the temperature is lower - typically, at 7.5km, the mean height
100 of the high cloud cover (HCC) band, with $\langle T \rangle \simeq 235\text{K}$, the nucleation rate will be
101 very high (from the CLOUD results) and a big CR, CC correlation would be expected.
102 However, analyses such as our own, Erlykin et al. (2009a) shows no correlation at all
103 for the HCC; this is despite the magnitude of the CR intensity (and its variation) being
104 higher there, as well as the nucleation rate being predicted to be so high.

105 The dramatic temperature dependance of the nucleation rate would have other
106 detectable effects on the measured CR, CC correlation even if present at altitudes where
107 the temperatures are low enough for the predicted nucleation to be significant. Thus,
108 there would be a strong latitude dependence due to the mean atmospheric temperature
109 being a function of latitude; for example, at an altitude of 6km, $\langle T \rangle \sim 263^\circ\text{K}$ at
110 the Equator, 243°K at latitude 45° and 220°K at latitude 80° . Taken at face value
111 the CLOUD results would indicate an increase in nucleation rate of about 3 orders of
112 magnitude in going from the Equator to a latitude of 80° . Even allowing for various
113 reductions due to ‘sinks’ (Kirkby, 2012, private communication) a big change should
114 surely follow.

115 A search for the latitude dependence of the CR, LCC correlation, or the related
116 dependence on the CR vertical rigidity cut-off (VRCO), gave negative results (Sloan
117 and Wolfendale, 2008) and, indeed, this was one of the first demonstrations of the lack
118 of a genuine CR, (L)CC correlation. A latitude dependence of the correlation was not
119 detected at any altitude, in fact. Thus, the expected big change with latitude for H₂SO₄
120 nucleation anywhere is not observed.

121 **5 Aerosols in the Stratosphere**

122 **5.1 Ozone losses**

123 If CR are going to have an atmospheric effect anywhere it is surely in the stratosphere,
124 where the CR intensities are so much higher than at ground level. This is particularly
125 so for Solar Energetic Particles, 'SEP', events, where many of the protons (and heavier
126 nuclei) lose all their energy in the stratosphere.

127 The influence of SEP on the ozone layer has been a topical subject for some years.
128 Jackman et al. (1999) and others studied the effect of large SEP for the period 1965
129 to 1995 with positive results. They showed that the very large events of August 1972
130 and October 1989 caused large increases in long-lived NO_x constituents and that they
131 caused direct ozone losses. Complications included differences between the seasons for
132 impacts on polar ozone.

133 Relevant work has been reported by Lu (2009). This worker claimed a correlation
134 between CR and the polar ozone loss (hole) over Antarctica for the period 1980 - 2007
135 and predicted a severe loss in 2008-9. In fact, this loss was not observed.

136 Our own analysis of yearly sunspot numbers and the area of the Antarctic ozone
137 hole (the data coming from the NOAA, National Weather Service, 2012) shows no
138 correlation between them for the period for which there is accurate data: 1992 - 2011.
139 Specifically, the correlation coefficient is 0.022, with a chance probability of a random
140 association of 0.925. However, the above does not mean that there is no ozone-effect
141 at all; for example, Seppala et al. (2009) claim that large SEP events cause changes in
142 polar surface temperatures. There is, though, the standard problem of distinguishing
143 between CR- and Solar Intensity-induced effects; Lockwood (2012) makes the case for
144 the latter.

145 **5.2 Stratospheric aerosols.**

146 Of greater relevance in the present work is the effects of SEPs on aerosols in the strato-
147 sphere. Here, the work of Mironova et al. (2012) is important.

148 These workers concentrated on the effect on polar stratospheric aerosols of the ex-
149 treme SEP event of 20 January 2005. They found evidence for the production of a
150 3-day 'burst' of new particles and for the growth of pre-existing ultra-fine particles in
151 the height range 10-20 km. Presumably these aerosols are in the size region exceeding
152 100 nm by their diameter. The evidence was only for limited longitude ranges (mainly
153 in the N hemisphere, for the latitude studied, which was 66°-73°N). Our remarks on
154 this interesting result are as follows.

155 (1) The Polar Stratospheric Clouds (PSC), which may manifest the presence of new
156 aerosols, only occur when the ambient temperature is low enough (less than

157 about 200°K).

158 (2) Inspection of other data (eg Mironova, 2011) shows that the frequency of tem-
159 peratures low enough to allow PSC formation (by whatever mechanism) has a
160 dramatic time variation. Specifically, the PSC at Sodankyla, (67°N, 27°E) only
161 occurred in January and February, and occasionally in March. From 1965 to 2005
162 the January temperature was low enough for PSC for a percentage of the time
163 varying from zero to 64%. The value for January 2005 was 40% and that for
164 February 2005, the highest recorded in the 40 year period in question, was 80%.
165 The search for an 11-year correlation of PSC is bedevilled by the concentration
166 of PSC in the winter months, but for the 4 solar cycles reported by Mironova
167 (2011) there is no evidence at all of higher rates for higher CR intensities and
168 the equivalent for low CR intensities. PSC therefore require very special thermal
169 condition.

170 As an upper limit for the generation of (new) clouds in the stratosphere we note
171 that the actual percentages of the fraction of the 40-year period when such clouds
172 can occur are 15% for any cloud at all and 1% for PSC to form with a 50%
173 probability.

174 (3) The chance probability of an increase in stratospheric extinction (quickly) fol-
175 lowing a CR event (SEP) cannot yet be evaluated: only one such coincidence
176 has been detected. Even this event was complicated; the apparent SEP-initiated
177 'burst' of aerosols was followed by (it is thought, unassociated) new clouds; there
178 was a burst of PSC some 5 days after the onset of the SEP. This burst of PSC

179 was associated with a big reduction in temperature (a fall of 15°C) which was
180 presumably of 'natural causes' - the influx of very cold air.

181 (4) Comparison of the mean longitudinal profile of the extinction coefficient for the
182 2005 event with those available for November 1978 to January 2009 (McCormick
183 et al., 1982) - another period of very low atmospheric temperature - is relevant.
184 Surprisingly, the 2005 event did not show a greater extinction magnitude at the
185 greatest altitudes, such as would have been expected for CR-initiation, the CR
186 intensity increasing with altitude for the SEP event, but the aerosol density being
187 constant (see §4.1).

188 The implication of the forgoing is that even if the SEP event genuinely initiated a burst
189 of aerosols, and that this burst could cause new clouds, then averaged over time (see
190 (2) above) the effect of the stratospheric clouds will be very small and tropospheric
191 implications largely absent. Thus, there is no evidence that SEP have a significant
192 tropospheric climate effect, at least by way of CR ionization in the stratosphere.

193 **6 CR, Climate correlations in the lower atmosphere.**

194 That there might actually be a small, but spatially variable, effect of CR on Climate was
195 shown by Voiculescu et al. (2006) who found evidence for a small CR, CC correlation for
196 limited regions of the Globe from an analysis in which a distinction was made between
197 CC changes initiated by solar UV and by CR. It was found that some 20% - 30% of
198 the Earth's surface showed a negative correlation for the low cloud cover (LCC) and
199 positive for the middle cloud cover (MCC). There is a complication, however, in that

200 Erlykin et al. (2009b) claimed that both were due to convective flows of atmospheric
201 air arising from changes in the solar irradiance and not due to CR at all.

202 It is relevant to point out that case for regional differences in climate change and
203 correlations has been summarised by Lockwood (2012). This work related to solar-
204 induced changes. Marked differences were found across the Globe but the integrated
205 effect was much less than the change due to anthropogenic sources.

206 Small effects of CR-induced droplet charging on cloud formation have been reported
207 by Harrison and Ambaum (2008).

208 **7 The Cosmic Ray Intensity.**

209 The early claims for a CR, CC correlation and its relevance to Global Warming relied
210 on the CR intensity having fallen since records began: CR cause clouds and reduced
211 clouds cause the warming. However, as we have shown elsewhere (Sloan and Wolfendale,
212 2011) the rate of CR fall was becoming smaller as the mean Global temperature was
213 increasing rather rapidly. Furthermore, the neutron monitor (NM) data shows that the
214 (smoothed) CR intensity ‘bottomed out’ in the 1980s and has since increased.

215 We have examined neutron monitor records of the ground level CR intensity from
216 Oulu, Moscow and Jungfraujoch (references given under names). The values of the
217 vertical rigidity cut-off ($VRCO$) are, respectively, 0.8, 2.3 and 4.5 GV. These values,
218 particularly that for the Jungfraujoch can be regarded as representative for the Globe;
219 this follows from the fact that for the region occupied largely by the Low Cloud Cover,
220 $\langle VRCO \rangle \simeq 4.5$ GV. Furthermore, for the region (mainly Europe) where Voiculescu et

221 al. (2006) find evidence for a finite CR,LCC correlation, again $\langle VRCO \rangle \simeq 4.5$ GV.

222 Figure 1 shows the time-series of the 3 sets of CR intensities. 4-degree polynomial
223 fits have been made to each Solar Cycle, as shown. In order to examine the change of
224 CR intensity with time, in the presence of the 11-year Solar Cycle (or, more accurately,
225 the rate of rise) we examine the CR intensities (NM rates) at the same point on each
226 Solar Cycle, specifically, the maximum and the minimum. It is apparent that each of
227 the 7 datum years the data are reasonably consistent and no *VRCO*-dependence is
228 apparent.

229 Further inspection shows that the rates of increase of the maximum NM rates are
230 increasing linearly for the whole period. Those for the minima have fallen slightly before
231 increasing rapidly. Figure 1 (upper panel) shows that the peak NM rates (CR intensity)
232 have been increasing since about 1990 and the lower panel gives some evidence that
233 there has been a steady upward change of the rate of increase of the maximum intensity
234 and an irregular, but latterly high rate of increase of the CR intensity minima. Taken
235 overall, from 1970 onwards, the rate of increase has been $2.6 \pm 0.6\%$ per decade (a
236 correlation coefficient of 0.69 and chance probability 0.087).

237 The interpretation is interesting in its own right but mainly beyond the scope of the
238 present work. Suffice it to say that there is a wealth of evidence pointing to important
239 changes in solar properties in the period 1980 - 1990. Thus, there was a rise before,
240 and rapid fall after in the Solar magnetic moment (eg Obridko and Shelting, 2009).
241 Karam (2003) summarised the somewhat earlier data for solar ion flux, flow speed and
242 ion density (all at 1AU) and found the same result: an increase until the 1980s and a
243 fall thereafter.

244 Finally, in this area, it should be pointed out that the increase in CR ionization
245 in the atmosphere above ground level is higher. Using the data of Bazilevskaya et al.
246 (2008), from the CR peak in 1987 to that in 1997 the increase for Mirny (0.1 GV) is
247 $14 \pm 4\%$ for 8.2km altitude and $18 \pm 4\%$ for 5 km altitude. For the next cycle, (1997 to
248 2009) the values are $21 \pm 5\%$ for 8.2km and $29 \pm 6\%$ for 5km. For Murmansk (cut-off
249 rigidity 0.5 GV) the corresponding values are $2 \pm 1\%$ and $11 \pm 3\%$ for 8.2km altitude
250 and $5 \pm 2\%$ and $13 \pm 3\%$ for 5km. The increases for the CR minima, from 1990 to 2002,
251 are $25 \pm 5\%$ (8.2km) and $19 \pm 4\%$ (5km) for Mirny and $14 \pm 3\%$ (8.2km) and $11 \pm 3\%$
252 (5km) for Murmansk.

253 There is no doubt that the CR intensity has been increasing significantly since the
254 1980s.

255 That an increase is not unreasonable can be seen from studies of past sunspot
256 records, the CR intensity being modulated by solar phenomena related strongly to
257 sunspots. Inspection of past sunspot records back to the commencement of telescopic
258 observations in the early 1600s shows slow upward (and downward) movements of
259 the smoothed SSN. Thus, slow changes in the (strongly correlated) CR intensity
260 would occur. Although prediction of the future trend in the CR intensity is hazardous,
261 inspection of the sunspot data shows that after a peak the next higher SSN (ie lower
262 CR intensity) can be 30-100 years away. Thus, it would not be surprising if the present
263 rise in the smoothed CR intensity continued for several decades to come.

264 8 Discussion and Conclusions.

265 It is clear that the new results from CLOUD relating to aerosols indicate that although
266 there could be a CR, Climate correlation by way of nucleation of aerosols, in the lower
267 troposphere it should be very small indeed (a consequence of the ‘high’ temperatures
268 there). All pervading in the aerosol arguments, however, is the uncertain removal
269 mechanisms which interpose themselves between the ultrafine condensation nuclei and
270 embryos, all less than about 2nm in diameter (UCN,CN) and the condensation nuclei
271 of 100nm and beyond (CCN,CD) stages (see §1). In this context, Pierce and Adams
272 (2009) quote loss factor (for CN to CCN) between 10 and 20 in the best case. New
273 CLOUD studies are relating to the effect of aerosols other than those of H_2SO_4 and
274 ammonia which may be important in the atmosphere.

275 The fact that the CR intensity is rising again strongly militates further against a
276 CR/Global Warming connection (in the absence of unphysically long phase lags).

277 There are other arguments against a CR/Climate correlation, not referred to above.
278 These include a lack of atmospheric changes following nuclear explosions, nuclear ac-
279 cidents and natural radon variations (Erlykin et al., 2009a) and the non-observation
280 of correlations for the type of cloud that should be responsive (if anything is) to CR
281 ionization changes (Erlykin et al., 2009c).

282 Acknowledgements

283 We acknowledge the NMDB database (*www.nmdb.eu*), founded under the European
284 Union FP7 programme (contract no. 213007) for providing data and also the staff of
285 IGY JUNG monitor.

286 The authors are grateful to Professors Giles Harrison, Jasper Kirkby, Irina Mironova,
287 Ilya Usoskin and Dr. Rolf Buetikofer for helpful correspondence.

288 We are grateful to the John C. Taylor Charitable Foundation for financial support.

289 **References**

290 Arnold F (2008) *Atmospheric ions and aerosol formation*. Space Sci. Rev. 137, 225-239

291 Bazilevskaya GA, Usoskin IG, Flückiger EO et al. (2008) *Cosmic ray induced ion pro-*
292 *duction in the atmosphere*. Space Sci. Rev. 137, 149-173

293 Carslaw KS, Harrison RG, Kirkby J. (2002) *Cosmic rays, clouds and climate*. Science
294 298, 1732-1737

295 Elterman L, 1968, Air Force Cambridge Labs., AFCRL, 68-0153

296 Erlykin AD, Gyalai G, Kudela K et al. (2009a) *Some aspects of ionization and cloud*
297 *cover, cosmic ray correlation problem*. J.Atmos. and Solar-Terr. Phys. 71, 823-829

298 Erlykin AD, Gyalai G, Kudela K et al. (2009b) *On the correlation between cosmic ray*
299 *intensity and cloud cover*. J.Atmos. and Solar-Terr. Phys. 71, 1794-1806

300 Erlykin AD, Sloan T, Wolfendale AW (2009c) *The search for cosmic ray effects on*
301 *clouds*. J.Atmos. and Solar-Terr. Phys. 71, 955-958

302 Harrison RG, Ambaum MHP (2008), *Enhancement of cloud formation by droplet charg-*
303 *ing*. Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 464, 2561-2573

304 Hervig M, Deshler T (2002) *Evaluation of aerosol measurements from SAGE II, HALOE*
305 *and balloonborne optical particle counters*. J. Geophys. Res. 107, 4031-4042

306 Jackman CH, Fleming EL, Vitt FM, Considine DB (1999) *The influence of solar proton*
307 *events on the ozone layer*. Adv. Space Res. 24, 625-630

308 Jungfraujoch (2012): <http://www.nmdb.eu/nest/search.php>

309 Karam PA (2003) *Inconstant Sun: how solar evolution has affected cosmic and ultravi-*
310 *olet radiation exposure over the history of life on Earth.* Health Physics 84, 322-333

311 Kirkby J, Curtius j, Almeida J et al. (2011) *Role of sulfuric acid, ammonia and galactic*
312 *cosmic rays in atmospheric aerosol nucleation.* Nature 476, 429-433

313 Liu Y, Zhao X, Li W, Zhou X (2012) *Background stratospheric aerosol variations de-*
314 *duced from satellite observations.* J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol. 51, 799-812

315 Lockwood M. (2012) *Solar influence on global and regional climates.* Surveys in Geo-
316 phys. 33, 503-534

317 Lu Q-B. (2009) *Correlation between cosmic rays and ozone depletion.* Phys. Rev. Lett.
318 102, 118501(4pp)

319 McCormick MP, Steele HM, Hamill P et al. (1982), *Polar stratospheric cloud sightings*
320 *by SAM II.* J. Atmos. Sci. 39, 1387-1397

321 Mironova IA (2011), COST Action ES1005

322 Mironova IA, Usoskin IG, Kovaltsov GA, Petelina SV (2012), *Possible effect of extreme*
323 *solar energetic particle event of 20 January 2005 on polar stratospheric aerosols: direct*
324 *observational evidence.* Atmos. Chem. Phys. 12, 769-778

325 Moscow (2012): <http://helios.izmiran.rssi.ru/cosray/main.htm>

326 NOAA National Weather Service (2012) Climate Prediction Centre -
327 aerosol optical thickness: <http://www.nws.noaa.gov>

328 Obridko VN, Shelting BD (2009) *Anomalies in evolution of global and large- scale solar*
329 *magnetic fields as the precursor of several upcoming low solar cycles.* Astron. Lett. 35,
330 247-252

331 Oulu (2012): <http://cr0.izmiran.rssi.ru/oulu/main.htm>

332 Palle Bago E, Butler CJ (2000) *The influence of cosmic rays on terrestrial clouds and*
333 *global warming*. Astron. Geophys. 41, 4.18-4.22

334 Pierce JR, Adams PJ (2009) *Uncertainty in global CCN concentrations from uncertain*
335 *aerosol nucleation and primary emission rates*. Atmos. Chem. Phys. 9, 1339-1356

336 Seppälä A, Randall CE, Clilverd MA et al. (2009) *Geomagnetic activity and polar sur-*
337 *face air temperature variability*, J. Geophys. Res. 114, A10312(10pp)

338 Sloan T, Wolfendale AW (2008) *Testing the proposed causal link between cosmic rays*
339 *and cloud cover*. Env. Res. Lett. 3, 024001(6pp)

340 Sloan T, Wolfendale AW (2011) *The contribution of cosmic rays to global warming*. J.
341 Atmos. Solar-Terr. Phys. 73, 2352-2355

342 Svensmark H, Friis-Christensen E (1997) *Variation of cosmic ray flux and global cloud*
343 *coverage - a missing link in solar-climate relationship*. J. Atmos. Sol. Terr. Phys. 59,
344 1225-1232

345 Svensmark H (2007) *Cosmoclimateology: a new theory emerges*. News and Rev. in As-
346 tron. Geophys. 48, 1.18-1.24

347 Voiculescu M, Usoskin IG, Mursula K (2006) *Different response of clouds to solar input*.
348 Geophys. Res. Lett., 33, L21802(5pp)




Figure 1: The counting rate of Jungfrauoch (Jungfrauoch, 2012), Moscow (Moscow, 2012) and Oulu (Oulu, 2012) Neutron Monitors (upper panel), and the different rates of increase of the NM counts from peak to peak (open symbols) and minimum to minimum (filled symbols) (lower panel). Smooth full lines in the upper panel are 4-degree polynomial fits. The extent to which the smoothed CR intensity has been increasing for the last 20 years can be seen in the lower panel. The increase is marked; that for the higher, important, atmospheric levels, is higher (see text).