

Author's Response

Response to Anonymous Referee #1 of "Uncertainty and detectability of climate surface response to large volcanic eruptions".

Major comments:

- The main new contribution seems to be the inclusion of the many reanalyses. However, I doubt how much additional information the reanalyses provide when we already have the observations of both surface temperature and pressure. If the models do not get the impact of the eruptions right then why should the reanalysis products which are based on models be better than the observations?

One major aim of the paper is to measure the uncertainty in the reanalysis products. This kind of direct comparison of the volcanic response between all reanalysis products and the observations has never been done before and will contribute to the S-RIP report. Reanalyses are used to build a complete picture of the atmospheric (and other components) system. Thereby forcing the stratospheric and tropospheric state to be in the direction of that observe during a volcano will filter through to land surfaces being better as well. So we would expect it to be better than models. Part of this paper is to identify the differences in the reanalysis so that researchers who use them know which ones to use, and which to avoid. We also provide a systematic comparison of reanalysis, obs and models looking at both radiative and dynamical response. By revisiting the widely accepted view of the dynamical and radiative response, we conclude that they are not as robust as often stated and show that identifying the effect of volcanic eruptions is still an issue.

- The Introduction is very brief. I think the authors need to discuss the difference between the tropical radiative response and the extra-tropical dynamical response already here. There should also be a more detailed discussion of previous work in these two separate areas.

The introduction was adapted to include the difference between radiative and dynamical response to volcanic eruptions. Also added a discussion of the novelty of the paper already in the introduction.

Minor comments

- page 4, l24: Is Adams et al. 2006 the right reference?

Changed to Adams et al., 2003

- Fig. 5: I think this figure is hard to understand. It is said in the caption that the blue lines are for the winter after Pinatubo and El Chichon, but there seems to be more than two blue lines in the plot. I also wonder what the histogram tells us. Should it indicate the significance? But it is not for the same source as the other data so how can they be compared?

The caption of Figure 5 was changed. The histogram shows the distribution of the NAO index for the observations. This can not directly to the distribution of the reanalysis products but is very similar. Therefore the histogram acts as a measure of the strength of the NAO response after the eruptions.

- Fig. 8: The same here. Also, now it is said that the orange curves show the NAO signal. Should it be the TAS?

The caption of Figure 8 was changed. The distribution of TAS anomalies of the observations and reanalysis products are very similar. Therefore the histogram acts as a measure of the strength of the TAS response after the eruptions.

- page 7, l23: It would be interesting to see results when more weaker eruptions are included.

The NAO response after weaker eruptions is shown in Figure S4 of the supplement. After the eruption of Fernandina in 1968, with a similar AOD to e.g. Fuego in 1974, a strong negative NAO was found. Therefore by including weaker eruptions still we would not find a robust NAO signal.

- page 8: It should be mentioned in the beginning of section 3.2 that this deals with the annual mean response.

Done

- page 9, l25. If the solar signal does not add anything why not begin the discussion with the two-signal ROF?
- page 10, lines 3-12: The discussion of the sampling of El-Nino events is unclear.
- Section 2.4: The description of the fingerprint method is very brief and impossible to understand without reading the references. In this way this analysis is different from the rest of the paper. Perhaps the fingerprint analysis could be deleted?

We excluded the fingerprint analysis.

- page 11: l14: Is there a cooling signal in Europe in summer?

There is a minor but in general not significant summer cooling in Europe following volcanic eruptions with a maximum over Scandinavia. This was not explicitly shown by our analysis but found by e.g. Fischer et al., 2007.

Response to Anonymous Referee #2 of "Uncertainty and detectability of climate surface response to large volcanic eruptions".

Major comments:

- However the results as presented do not appear sufficiently novel. More needs to be done to place them in the context of previous findings, such as those by Stenchikov et al, Christiansen 2008, Hegel et al 2011, Driscoll et al 2012.

One major aim of the paper is to measure the uncertainty in the reanalysis products. This kind of direct comparison of the volcanic response between all reanalysis products and the observations has never been done before and will contribute to the S-RIP report. Reanalyses are used to build a complete picture of the atmospheric (and other components) system. Thereby forcing the stratospheric and tropospheric state to be in the direction of that observed during a volcano will filter through to land surfaces being better as well. So we would expect it to be better than models. Part of this paper is to identify the differences in the reanalysis so that researchers who use them know which ones to use, and which to avoid. We also provide a systematic comparison of reanalysis, obs and models looking at both radiative and dynamical response. By revisiting the widely accepted view of the dynamical and radiative response, we conclude that they are not as robust as often stated and show that identifying the effect of volcanic eruptions is still an issue.

- In particular I do not see what more the detection and attribution results add to the large body of literature which has already reached similar conclusions with the same models and observations and very similar techniques, papers such as Ribes et al 2013, Jones et al 2013, Gillet et al 2013 all of which seem to show very similar results to those in figure 10.

We excluded the detection and attribution analysis.

Minor comments:

- Lehner et al 2016, have conducted a similar study analysing the effect of ENSO on detection and attribution results. Since a possible ENSO bias is mentioned throughout this article a discussion of the results found in Lehner et al 2016 should be included.
- In the methods more details should be added to the meaning of the RCT test, since as it stands it is difficult to interpret the lower panel of figure 10.
- Why are the anomalies with respect to 1880-1919 on figure 11?

We applied a ENSO removal technique to get more robust results. Since we excluded the detection and attribution analysis, the minor comments are negligible.

Response to Karsten Haustein of “Uncertainty and detectability of climate surface response to large volcanic eruptions”.

According to the results of Lehner et al., 2016 we included a technique to remove the impact of ENSO to support the robustness of our results. We excluded the fingerprint analysis to get a consistent and clearer picture of our results. We therefore changed the title of the paper to: “Revisiting the observed climate surface response to large volcanic eruptions”.

Summary

We thank the reviewers for the in-depth assessment of our paper. The manuscript has been revised accordingly, with most points being taken into account as per the reviewer suggestions.

- In particular, we emphasized the main results of the paper compared to previous studies by extending the introduction and discussion.
- We included a technique to remove the impact of ENSO to support the robustness of our results. Because of the more sophisticated analysis technique, we updated all Figures except Figure 1 and Figure 2.
- We used a newer version of the NOAA-20CR reanalysis product (v2c).
- We excluded the detection and attribution analysis to get a consistent and clearer picture of our results.
- We changed the title of the paper to: “Revisiting the observed climate surface response to large volcanic eruptions”

~~Uncertainty and detectability of~~ Revisiting the observed climate surface response to large volcanic eruptions

Fabian Wunderlich^{1,2} and Daniel M. Mitchell¹

¹Atmospheric, Oceanic and Planetary Physics, University of Oxford, UK

²Now at Institute of Meteorology, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

Correspondence to: F. Wunderlich, Institute of Meteorology, Freie Universität Berlin, Carl-Heinrich-Becker-Weg 6-10, 12165 Berlin, Germany. (fabian.wunderlich@met.fu-berlin.de)

Abstract. In light of the range in presently available observational, reanalysis and model data, we revisit the surface climate response to large tropical volcanic eruptions from the end of the 19th century until present. We focus on the dynamical driven response of the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) and the radiative driven tropical temperature response. Using ten different reanalysis products and the Hadley Centre Sea Level Pressure observational dataset (HadSLP2) we confirm a positive tendency in the phase of the NAO during boreal winters following large volcanic eruptions, although conclude that it is not as clear cut as the current literature suggests. Especially during poorly observed periods where higher uncertainties produce a less robust signal. The phase of the NAO leads to a dynamically driven warm anomaly over Northern Europe ~~At the same time, there is a in winter. The~~ general cooling of the ~~tropical surface temperatures due to the~~ surface temperature due to reduced incoming shortwave radiation ~~The magnitude of this cooling is uncertain and is hard to isolate using observational data alone (mainly due to the presence of El Nio). Therefore we use regression based detection and attribution techniques to investigate the volcanic temperature signal with eight Coupled Model Inter-comparison Project phase 5 (CMIP5) models. In all models the volcanic signal can be detected but a general overestimation of the surface cooling is found. The enhanced surface cooling in models is likely driven, in part, by an over-absorption of SW radiation in the lower stratosphere, but aliasing with El Nio events is also an issue and further process based studies are necessary to confirm these~~ is therefore disurbed by dynamical impacts.

10 In the tropics, where less dynamical driven influences are present, we confirm a predominant cooling after most but not after all eruptions. The observation, reanalysis and model datasets agree well with the in strength of the tropical response. But due to the high uncertainty of the model response, no clear tropical cooling signal was found.

1 Introduction

Understanding of the atmospheric naturally-forced variability is a key issue to estimate the human induced contribution to the recent climate change. Large volcanic eruptions can have an impact on the climate over several years (Robock, 2000). The injected aerosols into the lower stratosphere influence the radiation balance, resulting in a cooling of the tropical surface temperature (Humphreys, 1913, 1940) and a heating in the tropical lower stratosphere (Labitzke and McCormick, 1982; Parker and Brownscombe, 1983). For the eruption of Mt. Pinatubo in June 1991, which was the strongest tropical eruption in the satellite era, the lower tropical stratosphere was warmed up to 3 K (Mitchell et al., 2014; Fujiwara et al., 2015). The

cooling signal on the surface is less pronounced and therefore more difficult to separate from other internal and external climate variability. To perform this separation Mitchell et al. (2014) and Fujiwara et al. (2015) used multiple linear regression with nine reanalysis datasets (ERA-Interim, ERA-40, JRA-25, JRA-55, MERRA, NCEP-R1, NCEP-CFSR, NCEP-R2 and ~~NCEP-20CR~~NOAA-20CR). A good agreement between most reanalysis datasets for the temperature response in the stratosphere was found. Uncertainties which arise from variability of the differences between the reanalysis models are currently being assessed in the Stratospheric and tropospheric Processes And their Role in Climate - Model inter comparison Project (SPARC-RIP; ~~;-~~) (Fujiwara and Jackson, 2013). The agreement between the reanalysis datasets in the troposphere is strong but no clear tropospheric cooling could be found, taking into account all large tropical eruptions after 1960 (Fujiwara et al., 2015).

~~The purpose of this study is two fold. Firstly we examine the dynamical driven~~ A factor which contributes to the uncertainty of the tropospheric cooling is a winter warming signal over Europe. The stratospheric polar vortex in boreal winter is strengthened due to weaker wave flux from the troposphere into the stratosphere and ozone losses in the high latitudes of the stratosphere (Stenchikov et al., 2002). This strengthening of the polar vortex can lead to descending wind anomalies into the troposphere and intensify the westerly winds near the surface (Baldwin and Dunkerton, 1999). With a strengthening of the polar vortex comes

a shift of the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) variability following towards a positive state, leading to anomalous advection of warm air from the Atlantic to Europe (Thompson and Wallace, 2001). On a global scale the dynamically driven warming weakens the radiative driven cooling after large volcanic eruptions, including the uncertainty in observations and reanalysis to assess if the signal is robust, given newly available data sets. We then consider the radiative response for the same reason, but using detection and attribution techniques. hence the interplay between the two is important to consider.

While studies have looked at the volcanic response on the NAO and tropical surface before, here we investigate both in conjunction, assessing the variability of the NAO and the general temperature response following volcanic eruptions. We test the robustness of previous studies by including observations and all available reanalysis products to examine the uncertainty of the radiative and dynamical response to volcanic eruptions. Our results are also informed by the latest coupled climate models. The analysis of the uncertainty in the reanalysis products will contribute to the SPARC-RIP report, comparing the representation of various atmospheric modes in reanalysis.

The remainder of this paper is as follows. Datasets and methods used in this study are described in section 2, followed by the results in section 3 and the discussion and summary in section 4.

2 Data and analysis method

In this study we use near surface monthly mean Temperature of Air at the Surface (TAS) and sea level pressure data from ten available reanalyses (Table 1). Furthermore we analyse the TAS fields of the CMIP5 historical model experiments provided by the World Climate Research Programme (Taylor et al., 2012).

For comparison of the temperature we use the Met Office Hadley Centre HadCRUT4 dataset, available with 100 ensemble members covering the period 1850 until present (Morice et al., 2012). This product has a global coverage with a resolution of

5°x5° but it includes missing data depending on the observational data base. The provided data are anomalies referring to the mean climatology between 1961-1990 based on the relatively small number of missing data during this period.

To ~~compare with sea level pressure data~~ investigate the dynamical impact of the volcanic eruptions during boreal winter we make use of sea level pressure observations from the Hadley Centre Sea Level Pressure dataset (HadSLP2) (Allan and Ansell, 2006). This product does not contain missing data because of an applied interpolation procedure, which can cause uncertainties, specially in less covered regions like the Arctic, Antarctic or deserts. The spatial resolution of 5°x5° is equal to the temperature product but the data includes the period 1850 until 2004. However, an updated version is available using NCEP/NCAR reanalysis fields from 2005 until present, named HadSLP2r (Kalnay et al., 1996). The mean values for both dataset are homogeneous but the variance is higher in HadSLP2r. Nevertheless we consider this adding of the dataset as justified since we use the updated period only for the calculation of the climatology, significance testing and for the Empirical Orthogonal Function (EOF) analysis in order to calculate the NAO time series (Thompson and Wallace, 1998).

2.1 Reanalysis Data

All reanalysis datasets span at least the period from 1979 until 2012 except two ECMWF products: ERA-20C (20th century reanalysis product) (Poli et al., 2013), which ends in December 2010 and ERA-40 (Uppala et al., 2005), which ends in August 2002. To be able to compare all reanalysis over the same temporal region, we extend the ~~ERA20C~~ ERA-20C and ERA-40 datasets until 2012 with data of the ERA-Interim reanalysis. ERA-Interim provides some advantages to the ERA-40 version including an improved data assimilation and a better representation of the stratospheric circulation (Dee et al., 2011). Since we use this added data just indirectly for calculations of climatology, anomaly fields and the EOF, the differences which would arise by using a full period consideration are negligible.

Both reanalysis products of the Japan Meteorological Agency (JMA) are used for the study. JRA-25 ends in 2004 but the data until present is available from the JMA Climate Data Assimilation System (JCDAS) with the same system as JRA-25 (Onogi et al., 2007). The subsequent JMA product is called JRA-55 and covers a longer period beginning from 1958. Several improvements have made in comparison to the previous product such as a significant reduction of the large temperature bias in the lower stratosphere by using a new radiation scheme (Ebita et al., 2011).

The MERRA reanalysis obtained from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is focused on the correct simulation of the hydrological cycle and is the only reanalysis used which does not represent the analysis field with spectral coefficients (Rienecker et al., 2011).

The first reanalysis project was operated by the National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP), called NCEP-R1 (Kalnay et al., 1996) and has been updated with the NCEP-R2 product (Kanamitsu et al., 2002). A more sophisticated and recent reanalysis product of NCEP is the Climate Forecast System Reanalysis (NCEP-CFSR) (Saha et al., 2010).

Most products include a period beginning from the late 20th century, which means that just the last two large tropical eruptions of Mt. Pinatubo and El Chichón can be considered for the analysis. Due to the large number of individual ensemble members and the long time series beginning in ~~1871~~ 1851, the NOAA-CIRES 20th Century Reanalysis (~~NCEP-20CR~~ Version 2c (NOAA-20CR)) is the main product used in this study (Compo et al., 2011). The assimilation scheme of the ~~NCEP-20CR~~

[NOAA-20CR](#) reanalysis product uses an ensemble Kalman Filter in streams of 5 years. Each stream has 56 members.

The ERA-20C product starts in 1900 and includes most of the period which we investigated. The assimilation of these long datasets only include surface observation data, in contrast to the other products assimilating also satellite and radio-sonde measurements. The reanalysis datasets are generally in good agreement with surface observation data, specially for sea level pressure and near surface temperature data, used in this study (Simmons et al., 2004; Makshtas et al., 2007; Lindsay et al., 2014). ~~A warm bias of the arctic winter temperature in the NCEP-20CR dataset due to less sea ice concentration at coastal regions was reported by~~. NCEP-R1 and JRA-25 show differences in the sea level pressure field over Greenland and MERRA generally over mountain areas likely because of distinguish surface pressure reduction methods (Lindsay et al., 2014). Since we use just anomaly fields for our calculations, this should not affect the results significantly.

10 2.2 CMIP5 models

The model data are obtained from the historic simulations of the CMIP5 models which include simulations with just volcanic forcing (Table 2). ~~For the detection and attribution analysis we use the simulations with separately forced anthropogenic, solar and volcanic forcing. The Mark 3.6 model of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO-Mk3.6) does not include a single simulation for the solar forcing. Therefore we subtract the volcanic simulation from the simulation with just natural forcing, in order to receive a solar-only signal.~~ All models except the coupled-physical model of the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (GFDL-CM3) start from the beginning of 1850 and have at least three ensemble members. The advantages of the GFDL-CM3 model is a sophisticated interaction scheme between aerosols and clouds and a focus on coupling between the troposphere and stratosphere (Donner et al., 2011). The Community Climate System Model 4 (CCSM4) and the Community Earth System Model version 1 with Community Atmospheric Model version 5 (CESM1-CAM5) models use the aerosol optical depths description of Ammann et al. (2007). All other models use the updated version of the Sato et al. (1993) description. CESM1-CAM5 includes the direct and indirect effects of aerosols (Meehl et al., 2013), while CCSM4 just provides the direct effects. These models show a good reproduction of the ENSO due to an improved deep convection scheme in the atmosphere component (Gent et al., 2011).

The ModelE2 version of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS-E2) provides four different simulations with just volcanic forcing (Schmidt et al., 2014). They differ by using distinguished ocean models and whether the models include interactive chemistry and parametrization of indirect aerosol effects. GISS-E2-R uses the Russell ocean model (Hansen et al., 2007) and GISS-E2-H uses the Hybrid Coordinate Ocean Model (HYCOM) (Sun and Bleck, 2006). Both realizations are available in a version with non-interactive chemistry (NINT), comparable to the prior CMIP3 simulation, but with a tuned aerosol indirect effect following Hansen et al. (2005) and a version with Tracers of Chemistry, Aerosols and their Direct and Indirect effects (TCADI) including interactive chemistry and a parametrization of the first indirect aerosol effects (Menon et al., 2010).

2.3 Choice of volcanoes

Not all studies which concentrate on the large-scale impact of volcanic eruptions use the same criteria for the choice of which eruption should be considered for a composite analysis. The volcanic explosivity index (VEI) introduced by Newhall and Self

(1982) is a very frequently used measurement for the strength of the eruption (Robock, 2000). The calculation of the index is restricted to volcanic measurements but does account for the height of the eruption column. In Figure 1 all volcanic eruptions since the 19th century with a VEI-index of at least 5 are shown. Additionally volcanoes are included which in other studies are considered to have an impact on the climate but just reached a VEI-index of 4. The size of the triangle of each eruption indicate the respective VEI-index. The colour ~~show~~ shows the phase of the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) in the first winter after the eruption. The last three tropical eruptions of Mt. Agung in 1963, El Chichón in 1982 and Mt. Pinatubo in 1991 were followed by an El Niño event, suggesting a possible connection between large tropical volcanic eruptions and ENSO (Adams et al., 2003). ~~It may also be~~ Since most studies assume that the events are coincidental, ~~but either way, it makes the analysis harder to interpret~~ we remove the effects of ENSO with a linear regression (see Methods).

Climate models represent volcanic eruption by an increase of the atmospheric aerosols due to the ejected material. Most models use the updated version of the so called Sato-Index (Sato et al., 1993). This index shows the aerosol optical depth (AOD) at wavelength 550 nm and is available as a zonal mean with global coverage and a meridional resolution of around 8°. In Figure 2 the tropical (30°S-30°N) AOD is plotted. As expected from the chosen region the values of low latitude eruptions are generally more pronounced than the extratropical eruptions. The tropical region is characterised by rising air in the stratosphere which lift the aerosols into higher levels. The residual stratospheric meridional circulation transports the aerosols to high latitudes (Trepte and Hitchman, 1992). A volcanic eruption in higher latitudes is expected to have less influence on the climate system because the downward flow in the stratospheric extratropics avoids rising aerosols in higher levels. Nevertheless some studies could show that also extratropical volcanic eruptions can have a significant large scale impact on climate but usually just on the hemisphere where the eruption took place (Graf and Timmreck, 2001; Oman et al., 2005). Since we focus on both the particular impact of the eruption on the NAO and the global temperature response, we consider the AOD in the tropical middle and upper stratosphere. In Figure 2 we draw a threshold at 0.05 nm in order to distinguish which volcanoes likely have a strong impact on the global climate. Therefore we choose the eruption of Krakatau in August 1883, Santa María in October 1902, Mt. Agung in March 1963, El Chichón in April 1982 and Mt. Pinatubo in June 1991 for our analysis.

2.4 Methods

For the calculation of the NAO we use the leading EOF between 0°-70°W and 35°N-80°N during the period 1979-2012 (Thompson and Wallace, 1998; Baldwin et al., 2008). We consider the SLP anomalies of the two winters following the eruption as volcanic influenced, except in the case of Santa María which erupted so late during the year that the full influence on the winter circulation is unlikely. The anomalies are calculated with respect to the mean for the years 1979-2012, excluding the following two years after the eruptions of El Chichón and Mt. Pinatubo. The analysis of the temperature fields will be compared to the HadCRUT4 dataset, consisting of anomalies relative to the 1961-1990 reference period (Morice et al., 2012). Since the HadCRUT4 dataset contains missing data, we just use the gridpoints and timesteps of the reanalysis products with non-missing values in the observational record. This ensures that all datasets can be compared directly. As some reanalysis products start in 1979 we just consider the five reanalysis datasets which include this reference period (ERA-20C, ERA-40, JRA-55, NCEP-R1, and ~~NCEP-20CR~~ NOAA-20CR).

After removing the mean seasonal cycle we subtract the data with a 10 year running mean to remove any further trend. To make sure that the running mean is not influenced by the considered year, we average over the 60 months before the year and the 60 months after the considered year. ~~To investigate the volcanic influence on the temperature field we average over the first and the second twelve months following the eruption. The TAS preprocessing of the CMIP5 model means for the detection and attribution analysis is equal to the missing value consideration in .~~ In this study we use means over the tropical region from 30°S to 30°N, averaged over a period of three years in order to minimize a possible bias towards ENSO signals. By using models with just single forcings (e.g. anthropogenic or volcanic), a characteristic response pattern, called fingerprint can be found. A frequently used assumption is, that every fingerprint can be combined in a linear regression model in order to best fit the observations. By taking uncertainties of the observations and the model simulated response into account, the total least square algorithm (TLS) is applied to minimise the orthogonal distance to the best fit. The internal climate variability must be derived from control runs of the model or inter-ensemble differences from the ensemble mean in order to estimate the climate noise covariance (pseudo-observations). We use both derivations and furthermore overlap noise segments by shifting the periods by 10 years. Therefore we can maximise the number of pseudo-observations. Both, temperature and NAO response can be influenced significantly by the occurrence of ENSO phenomena (Lehner et al., 2016). To remove the effects of ENSO we calculate a monthly linear regression on the Niño 3.4 SST index. This seasonal dependent ENSO pattern is then subtracted from the data. The significance of the resulting anomaly field is calculated with a Monte Carlo test assuming independence between the volcanic eruption events.

~~Due to the high amount of data, the calculation of the noise covariance normally demands a reduction of the dimensionality. Most studies calculate an EOF-based pseudo-inverse with the disadvantage that the number of EOF's is limited and the result depends on the chosen truncation. propose a solution of this issue by introducing the Regularized Optimal Fingerprint (ROF) technique with a well-conditioned estimator of the covariance matrix. Using this technique the resulting regression coefficients, called scaling factors are not dependent on the truncation. Each forcing corresponds to the best fit amplitude of the simulated signals. A signal is detected in the observations if the scaling factor and 5-95uncertainty range is different from zero. A detected signal which does not include a scaling factor of one is either overestimated, when the factor is between zero and one or underestimated, when the factor is bigger than one. The uncertainty of the scaling factors is determined with a residual consistency test (RCT) using Monte Carlo simulation.~~

3 Results

3.1 Pressure and NAO response

To analyse the NAO response to large volcanic eruptions we use surface pressure data of all available reanalysis products. Since MERRA, ERA-Interim, JRA25, NCEP-R2 and NCEP-CFSR start in 1979 with the beginning of continuous satellite observations we use the years 1979-2012 as our reference period. Two tropical eruptions had a significant impact on the climate system during this period, El Chichón in 1982 and Mt. Pinatubo in 1991. Figure 3 shows the mean SLP anomaly in the first two post volcanic winters after El Chichón and Mt. Pinatubo over the extratropical Northern Hemisphere in observation

and for the multi-reanalysis mean. ~~The significance is calculated with a Monte Carlo test assuming independence between the volcanic eruption events.~~

The response pattern is captured well in all reanalysis products. Since the assimilation of surface pressure data is essential for reanalysis products, the difference between the individual products and the observations is expected to be small (Kalnay et al., 1996). Over the Arctic region a higher level of observational uncertainty is apparent due to the decreased number of assimilated measurements than in the middle latitudes. Low pressure anomalies over the Arctic region are observed, bordered by a positive signal with the centre over Europe. ~~Also negative anomalies can be seen over the North Pacific, likely due to the sampling of El Nio events or due to increased wave reflection during winters with a strong polar vortex.~~ Differences between the reanalysis products are weak but can be seen mainly above mountain areas, e.g. Rocky Mountains (Supplementary Information, Figures S1,S2), likely due to different pressure reduction techniques. ~~The NCEP-20CR~~ (Lindsay et al., 2014). Also the NOAA-20CR reanalysis product is in good agreement ~~with other reanalysis datasets.~~ NOAA-20CR is found to capture well the stratospheric temperature response to volcanic eruptions but with a slightly lower amplitude in comparison to other reanalysis products (Mitchell et al., 2014; Fujiwara et al., 2015). At the surface the ~~NCEP-20CR~~ NOAA-20CR does not show major differences of the pressure response after the eruption of Mt. Pinatubo and El Chichón (Figures S1,S2).

In comparison to an expected positive NAO, in the first winter the high SLP anomaly is shifted towards Central Europe and therefore the negative centre is shifted northwards (Hurrell and Deser, 2009; Hurrell, 1995). Fujiwara et al. (2015) showed that the eruption of Mt. Pinatubo influences the stratospheric temperature and circulation stronger than the eruption of El Chichón. Therefore it is expected that the surface pressure signal is dominated by the response to the eruption of Mt. Pinatubo. Probably due to the east phase of the quasi-biennial oscillation (QBO) in the first winter after the eruption of Mt. Pinatubo the volcanic signal on the SLP was weakened (Stenchikov et al., 2002). In contrast, the response of the second winter (Figure 3 b,d) shows a more NAO like pattern over the North Atlantic with significant positive anomalies in the region of the Azores. A sample of only two single events is not a robust data basis to make general conclusions. Hence, we use the ~~NCEP-20CR~~ NOAA-20CR product which agrees well with the other reanalysis products, considering the SLP response after the eruption of Mt. Pinatubo and El Chichón (Figures S1,S2) and contains a longer period between ~~1871-2012~~ 1851-2012. During this period five major tropical eruptions took place: Krakatau, Santa María, Mt. Agung, El Chichón and Mt. Pinatubo. The mean SLP response to these five eruptions is shown in Figure 4. The pattern in the North Atlantic region is similar to the mean over the last two eruptions but the pressure anomaly gradient is ~~much~~ smaller, with a predominantly significant response pattern in the first winter. In general, the average pressure anomaly field ~~indeiates~~ indicates a shift towards a positive NAO in the first winter after the eruption. A significant mean NAO signal could be found by Christiansen (2008) and ~~D12~~ Driscoll et al. (2012), taking into account tropical and extratropical eruptions. We calculated the monthly winter NAO index (~~see Methods~~) of just the tropical eruptions and show the index individually for every eruption in Figure 5. The observation data is shown by crosses and all reanalysis data is shown by blue ranges. The orange ranges indicate the NAO index of the 56 ~~NCEP-20CR~~ NOAA-20CR ensemble members (95% ensemble spread).

The spread of the reanalysis products is small showing high agreement between the individual reanalysis products. ~~In most cases the observations agree~~ The observations agree well with the reanalysis data but in some cases the reanalysis NAO

response can differ from the observational signal (e.g. ~~El Chichón eruption~~ in December and January after the eruption of El Chichón). Especially with higher uncertainty of the observation data in the post satellite era, the differences of the NAO index ~~to the reanalysis data are bigger and the error bars of the ensemble spread are generally wider~~ between the individual members of NOAA-20CR are increased, indicated by a wider spread of the error bar. Therefore some ensemble members can differ with
5 the corresponding observations by strength and even sign of the NAO phase (e.g. Santa María in December, ~~Mt. Agung in February~~).

Consistent with Jones et al. (2003) there is no evidence for a positive NAO shift due to the volcanic eruptions in particular months and in the second winter after the eruption (Figures S3). The response in the mean winter NAO is not clear. In the first winter after the ~~three eruptions of Krakatau, eruptions of~~ El Chichón and Mt. Pinatubo a ~~clear strong~~ positive NAO phase
10 could be found. Relative to the distribution shown with gray bars, a moderate positive NAO was present following the eruption of Krakatau. For the eruption of Santa María we do not use the first winter after the eruption because the volcano erupted so late during the year that an influence of the injected aerosols to the stratospheric circulation is unlikely. In the winter 1903/04 a NAO-index around zero was found. This agrees with the results of Christiansen (2008) and ~~D12~~Driscoll et al. (2012). In the winter directly after the eruption (1902/03) a strong positive NAO was found (Christiansen, 2008). In the winter after the
15 eruption of Mt. Agung we found a negative NAO. Most of the aerosols after the eruption of Mt. Agung were concentrated in the Southern Hemisphere (Figure 2), which reduces the impact on the boreal stratosphere in winter. Therefore we conclude that we do not find a significant positive NAO response to volcanic eruptions with taking just the strongest five tropical eruptions from the end of the 19th century until present. We confirm that the NAO generally shifts towards a positive state in Figure 4 and in Figure 5d) but exceptions like Mt. Agung or Fernandina are found (Figure S4). Responsible for these exceptions can
20 be disturbances of the polar vortex which descend downwards and influence the NAO over a short time scale of some weeks (Baldwin and Dunkerton, 1999). The positive NAO response to volcanic eruptions leads to a positive temperature anomaly over Northern Europe in winter (Robock and Mao, 1992, 1995; Fischer et al., 2007). This warming disagrees with the radiative driven cooling of the troposphere following the eruptions. Therefore just dynamically driven effects like circulation changes could explain this response. It is important to understand these dynamical driven effects in order to understand the total volcanic
25 signal. The studies of Stenchikov et al. (2006) and ~~D12~~Driscoll et al. (2012) could show that general circulation models are generally not able to reproduce this secondary effects and hence it is questionable if they reproduce the temperature response well. Only a subset of models show an associated warming over Northern Eurasia but much weaker than the observations (Driscoll et al., 2012; Gillett and Fyfe, 2013).

3.2 Temperature response

30 ~~The Figure 6 shows the~~ TAS anomaly composites over the last three large volcanic eruptions of the reanalysis products in comparison to the observation data are shown in Figure 6. The temperature anomalies are calculated over the whole first or second year after the eruption. We note here that, due to the observational anomalies respective to the period 1961-1990, we only consider the five reanalysis products which include this period. ~~To remove a further trend we subtracted an adopted running mean (see Methods)~~ Influences due to ENSO and temperature trends are removed. We find a significant warming over Northern

Europe which is consistent ~~to~~ with the expected winter warming over this region. The warming over Siberia and the cooling in the Middle East suggests a positive NAO response following volcanic eruptions (Thompson and Wallace, 1998). The ~~significant temperature response in the first year after the eruption over the Pacific region is very similar to the temperature pattern during EL-Niño events, hence it is likely a cause of the sampling of positive ENSO phases following all three eruptions.~~ The expected

5 ~~global cooling in the first years after the eruption is not obviously due to the overwhelming ENSO warming over the Pacific. An early study of shows a general cooling by removing the ENSO signal. A predominant but generally not significant cooling is present especially in the~~ cooling over Alaska and North Canada and the warming over Southeastern United States and North Pacific suggest a negative Pacific/North American teleconnection pattern (PNA). This is consistent to a stronger polar vortex in boreal winter due to less wave propagation into the stratosphere (Garfinkel and Hartmann, 2008). The reanalysis mean shows

10 a general cooling over sea areas, which is significant over the tropical Pacific and Southern Indian Ocean. The HadCRUT4 dataset shows a similar temperature anomaly pattern in high latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere. The cooling over the oceans is less pronounced in the observation dataset. The second year after the eruption, when the signal is much less influenced by ENSO events. ~~eruptions shows cooling over most continental and ocean areas with exceptions over Northern Siberia and the Eastern Pacific.~~

15 To assess a larger sample of eruption events we expand the considered period and include the early eruptions of Krakatau and Santa María. During the period after this eruptions much less observation data is available, especially over continental areas. In Figure 7a,b we averaged over at least four of five years after the volcanic eruptions. The results are similar to those of Figure 6. To be able to evaluate the effect of the volcanic eruptions over less observed areas we calculated the mean temperature response for all five eruptions with the ~~NCEP-20CR-NOAA-20CR~~ product without missing data consideration (Figure 7c,d). Also the

20 consideration of five independent eruptions confirms the significant warming over Northern Europe due to the shift of the NAO towards a positive state. The response of the second year after the eruptions, with almost absent ENSO influences shows a significant cooling over the Central Atlantic and over the Western Pacific ~~strongest cooling signals are found in areas with sparse observations. Therefore, these signals highly depends on the reanalysis configuration.~~ In the tropics a general cooling is found over land and sea areas with exception over the Eastern Pacific ~~with minor and not significant warming in the second year~~

25 after the eruptions. This would confirm that the cooling after large volcanic eruptions is strongest in the tropics ~~D12~~ (Driscoll et al., 2012). For this reason we focus in the following on the TAS signal in the tropical region (30°N-30°S). Figure 8 shows the mean anomalies of the tropical temperature in the first and second year after the eruptions, relative to the climatology of 1961-1990 ~~(with removed trend).~~ The reanalysis and observation data are generally in good agreement, except in the first year after the eruption of Krakatau and Mt. Pinatubo, with a ~~significant~~ separation of the ~~anomaly spreads. Relative~~

30 ~~to the sparsity of observations in the late 19th century these differences are reasonable~~ reanalysis anomaly spread and the mean temperature reponse in the observational record. This shows that the spread of the reanalysis products does not account for the whole range of uncertainty present in the observations. A general cooling of the tropical TAS response is not ~~clearly~~ always visible in the observation and reanalysis data. After the eruption of ~~El Chichón just Mt. Agung~~ negative and positive anomalies in both post volcanic years ~~the first winter after the eruption~~ are found. ~~Also the~~ The second year after the eruption of El Chichón

35 was characterized by a warming of the tropics. The study of Fujiwara et al. (2015) did not show a clear temperature signal in

the tropical troposphere after the eruption of El Chichón. The eruption of Mt. Pinatubo was the strongest in the 20th century and caused a cooling around 0.1 to 0.2 K, according to the observation and reanalysis data. In the first year after the eruption of Krakatau the cooling was just weak, regarding the TAS anomaly distribution, shown with gray bars. We generally find a cooling of the tropical temperature following large volcanic eruptions. The global mean reponse is less robust due to the impact of dynamical warming especially over Europe and the high uncertainty range of the NOAA-20C dataset after the eruption of Krakatau and Santa Mafa (Figure S6).

The historical simulations of the CMIP5 models involve far higher range of TAS responses than the observations. Most simulations with just volcanic forcing show a negative temperature signal. But due to the large spread of simulated TAS response just the eruptions of Mt. Pinatubo shows a significant tropical cooling. For consistency we calculated the anomalies relative to the same period as the observation and reanalysis data. This period (1961-1990) was highly influenced by volcanic activity. By calculating anomalies relative to a non-volcanic influenced period (e.g. 1931-1960) we found that all simulations with just volcanic forcing show a negative TAS response after both years of all five eruptions (not shown). The mean TAS response to the eruptions of the historical simulations including also anthropogenic and other natural forcing agrees well with the simulation with just volcanic forcing. In most cases the mean response of the historical simulations (indicated by the dot between the whiskers) is colder than the TAS signal of the observation or reanalysis data. But due to the large spread of simulated TAS response, the results are not statistically significant. Nevertheless a tendency for the models to simulate a colder volcanic response than observed may be supposed. Since we did not apply a regression technique to the observation and reanalysis data, we can not assume that the TAS response is not influenced by anthropogenic or other natural forcings, including internal variability such as the El Nino signal. Instead we use detection and attribution techniques to regress the volcanic forcing directly onto the observed temperature. With this method we separate the volcanic signal directly from other forcings.

3.3 Detection and Attribution

Figure ?? shows the time-series of three-yearly averaged, separately forced CMIP5 simulations of TAS anomalies averaged over the tropical region (30°N-30°S) along with the observations. A characteristic increase of the TAS anomalies in the observational record and the anthropogenic historical simulations of the CMIP5 models is shown (black and blue lines, respectively). The volcanic simulations indicate no dominant trend but with strong negative signals following all five volcanic eruptions, whereas the solar simulations indicate a weak signal around the zero line. The results do not differ essentially from previous studies using global averages instead of tropical, although here the solar and volcanic signals are separated. The TAS anomaly differences between the models will not be discussed in detail but all model time series can be found in the Supplementary Information (Figure S6). The strong negative temperature bias in the versions with Tracers of Chemistry, Aerosols and their Direct and Indirect effects (TCADI) of the GISS models after the eruption of Mt. Agung could be a cause of a different consideration of the chemical response to volcanic eruptions. The consideration of interactive chemistry could lead to feedback processes which cause a longer influence of the ejected material to the atmosphere. We applied the ROF technique to a three forcing analysis using the anthropogenic, solar and volcanic simulations. Results were sporadic, and this is because the solar signal is very weak, and leads to the regression model not fitting all relevant forced response patterns correctly. As such, we choose to

exclude the solar signal from our ROF analysis. A signal-to-noise calculation on the solar-only simulations is low, and therefore we conclude that the solar signal on surface tropical climate is not detected (in agreement with). We therefore continue using a two-signal ROF analysis of anthropogenic and volcanic forcing. Note that including the solar and volcanic signal into one 'natural' forcing yields very similar results. Figure ?? shows the scaling factors, their uncertainties and the residual consistency test (RCT) of anthropogenic and volcanic forcings of all individual models and the multimodel mean.

With the exception of CSIRO-Mk3.6, all models and the multimodel mean have detectable volcanic signals. Three models and the multimodel mean show a significant overestimation of the volcanic signal and none of the models show an underestimation. We used the natural forcing instead of just the volcanic and provided very similar results. Since we use just the tropical region, the sampling of El Niño events could be biased by a warming over the Pacific. The variability due to ENSO phases is included in our control runs and intra-ensemble mean differences, which are used in the ROF analysis. When we provide the same analysis for the global coverage (instead of only 30°S-30°N) every model has a detectable volcanic signal and almost all models show an overestimation of the volcanic signal with a mean scaling factor best estimate of about 0.5 (Figure S7). This suggests that a sampling of El Niño events is only partially responsible for the overestimation of the surface volcanic signal. It is also the case that the models have too large temperature response to volcanic eruptions in the lower tropical stratosphere, suggesting that more solar radiation is absorbed in this region, and therefore less gets to the surface (and hence further cooling in the models). The results for the anthropogenic forcings show that most models underestimate and some overestimate the anthropogenic influence on the tropical surface temperature. The mean response shows a small underestimation of the anthropogenic signal in the model. The underestimation of the anthropogenic signal of both GISS-TCAD1 models might be influenced by the cold bias of the temperature after the Mt. Agung eruption. This cold bias counteracts the warm bias due to anthropogenic forcing, which makes an enhanced warming necessary in order to best fit the observations. To represent the best fit forcing patterns, consistent with observations, the mean volcanic and anthropogenic signals are multiplied by their corresponding scaling factor (Figure ??). Focusing on the volcanic signal, there is a lower mean TAS response than expected from Figure ?. The mean cooling of around 0.1 K is consistent to the results of the reanalysis and observation data in Figure 8. Studies which evaluate the entire natural forcing show a strong cooling after strong volcanic eruptions. Therefore also the TAS signal due to natural forcing could be overestimated by the models. The anthropogenic forcing signal follows the warming of the observational record in tendency and strength quite well and is consistent to the results found in the last IPCC report [simulations with just volcanic forcing](#).

4 Conclusion and Discussion

In this study we investigated the uncertainty in surface climate response to strong volcanic eruptions. The most up-to-date available reanalysis products, GCMs and the newest observation datasets are used to best evaluate the radiative driven tropical temperature response and the dynamical driven NAO response following eruptions. Given the availability of these new datasets, it is timely to revisit the surface response to test the robustness of past studies of volcanic influences on climate. A summary of volcanic eruption intensity, and occurrence of El Niño events is present in Figure 1 from 1880-present.

The shift of the NAO towards a positive state in boreal winter due to an intensification of the polar vortex was noted in some observational studies (e.g., Shindell et al., 2004) but only some models with a good representation of the stratosphere are able to reproduce the associated winter warming over Eurasia (Kirchner et al., 1999). The CMIP5 models generally fail or underestimate the impact of the volcanic eruptions on the Northern Hemispheric circulation $D12$ (Driscoll et al., 2012). This shows that the dynamical mechanism is still not fully understood (Graf et al., 2007). Conditional on the injected material into the stratosphere, we selected the strongest five tropical volcanic eruptions from the end of the 19th century until present for our analysis. They are expected to have the biggest impact on the atmosphere.

We showed that a positive NAO phase is likely to be present during the first post volcanic winter, but uncertainties still remain because not all winters following large tropical volcanic eruptions show a positive NAO (e.g. Mt. Agung and Fernandina). Also none of the particular winter months show a significant shift of the NAO after the eruptions. By taking into account all available reanalysis datasets and the HadSLP2 observation data we have seen that there is a general agreement between the datasets. It is known that the atmospheric condition after the volcanic eruption is a big source of uncertainty for the impact of eruptions on the NAO. The QBO phase (Holton and Tan, 1982; Stenchikov et al., 2004), an El Niño or La Niña event (Moron and Plaut, 2003; Manzini et al., 2006; García-Herrera et al., 2006; Calvo et al., 2009) as well as the solar variability (Lean et al., 1995; Haigh, 2002; Gray et al., 2013) can influence the NAO phase directly or indirectly by modulating the stratospheric winter circulation in the Northern Hemisphere. A more robust indicator for the strengthening of the dynamical driven influence of the volcanic eruption is the characteristic winter warming over Northern Europe (Shindell et al., 2004; Fischer et al., 2007). By averaging over the whole first year after the eruption we still could find a significant positive signal in Northern Europe due to the winter warming. This means that the general decrease of the surface temperature due to the injected aerosols is overwhelmed by this dynamical effect at mid-latitudes. This contributes to the fact that the strength of the radiative driven cooling is still uncertain. ~~To evaluate the cooling effect qualitatively it is necessary to separate the volcanic impact on the surface temperature from other signals. This can be done by applying regression techniques directly to observations or reanalysis products. The disadvantage is that no noise is considered for the individual regressor variables. Instead we used detection and attribution with all available CMIP5 simulations which just include volcanic forcing in order to separate the volcanic signal from solar or anthropogenic forcings. We showed that the tropical surface temperature response to solar forcing is not detectable in any model. The multi-model mean shows an overestimation of the volcanic signal with a mean scaling factor of around 0.5. This means, that the cooling of the mean surface temperature is much less pronounced than suggested from the model simulations. This apparent overestimation was hypothesised to be due to aliasing of volcanoes with El Nio events in the observations (if indeed the El Nio events are not themselves a response to volcanic eruptions), and a too strong tropical stratospheric response in models (resulting in less solar radiation reaching the surface) not completely determined. The less dynamical influenced tropical response to volcanic eruptions show a general cooling mainly over ocean areas. Nevertheless, considering the first two years after the eruption of Mt. Agung and El Chichón no clear tropical cooling in both reanalysis and observation data is found. The model response to the eruptions shows a large uncertainty spread, suggesting a high dependence of the climate response on the atmospheric state during and after the eruption.~~

Acknowledgements. We thank Prof Lesley Gray and [Qiuzi Han Wen](#) for insightful comments. We also thank ~~Qiuzi Han Wen for providing the program code of the optimal fingerprint techniques and for helpful comments on~~ [Karsten Hauste](#)in, [Gil Compo](#) and two anonymous reviewers. [JRA-55](#) monthly mean data were provided by the Japan Meteorological Agency via the JMA Data Dissemination System (JDDS). The [JRA-25](#) data were provided by the JMA and CRIEPI. [JCDAS](#) is a successor of [JRA-25](#) using the same system provided by JMA.

5 The [NCEP-1](#) and [NCEP-2](#) reanalysis data were provided by the NOAA/OAR/ESRL PSD. The [ERA-40](#), [ERA-Interim](#) and [ERA-20C](#) data were provided by the ECMWF through their website. The [MERRA](#) data were provided by NASA/GSFC/GMAO. The [NCEP-CFSR](#) data were provided through NOAA/NCDC. Support for the ~~work~~ [Twentieth Century Reanalysis Project](#) version 2c dataset is provided by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science Biological and Environmental Research (BER), and by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Climate Program Office. We acknowledge the Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison and the World

10 [Climate Research Programme's Working Group on Coupled Modelling](#), which is responsible for CMIP, and we thank the climate modeling groups for producing and making available their model output.

References

- Adams, J. B., Mann, M. E., and Ammann, C. M.: Proxy evidence for an El Niño-like response to volcanic forcing, *Nature*, 426, 274–278, 2003.
- Allan, R. and Ansell, T.: A new globally-complete monthly historical gridded mean sea level pressure data set (HadSLP2): 1850-2004 ., *Journal of Climate*, 19, 5816–5842, doi:10.1175/JCLI3937.1, 2006.
- 5 Ammann, C. M., Joos, F., Schimel, D. S., Otto-Bliesner, B. L., and Tomas, R. a.: Solar influence on climate during the past millennium: results from transient simulations with the NCAR Climate System Model., *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 104, 3713–3718, doi:10.1073/pnas.0605064103, 2007.
- Baldwin, M., Stephenson, D., and Jolliffe, I.: Spatial weighting and iterative projection methods for EOFs, *Journal of Climate*, 22, 234–243, *doi:10.1175/2008JCLI2147.1*, 2008.
- 10 Baldwin, M. P. and Dunkerton, T. J.: Propagation of the Arctic Oscillation from the stratosphere to the troposphere, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 104, 30 937–30 946, doi:10.1029/1999JD900445, 1999.
- Calvo, N., Giorgetta, M. a., Garcia-Herrera, R., and Manzini, E.: Nonlinearity of the combined warm ENSO and QBO effects on the Northern Hemisphere polar vortex in MAECHAM5 simulations, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 114, D13 109, doi:10.1029/2008JD011445, *doi:10.1029/2008JD011445*, 2009.
- 15 Christiansen, B.: Volcanic eruptions, large-scale modes in the Northern Hemisphere, and the El Niño-Southern Oscillation, *Journal of Climate*, 21, 910–922, doi:10.1175/2007JCLI1657.1, 2008.
- Compo, G. P., Whitaker, J. S., Sardeshmukh, P. D., Matsui, N., Allan, R. J., Yin, X., Gleason, B. E., Vose, R. S., Rutledge, G., Bessemoulin, P., BroNnimann, S., Brunet, M., Crouthamel, R. I., Grant, a. N., Groisman, P. Y., Jones, P. D., Kruk, M. C., Kruger, a. C., Marshall, G. J., *doi:10.1002/qj.776*, 2011.
- 20 Maugeri, M., Mok, H. Y., Nordli, O., Ross, T. F., Trigo, R. M., Wang, X. L., Woodruff, S. D., and Worley, S. J.: The Twentieth Century Reanalysis Project, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 137, 1–28, doi:10.1002/qj.776, 2011.
- Cook, E. R., D'Arrigo, R. D., and Anchukaitis, K. J.: Tree ring 500 year ENSO index reconstructions, *IGBP PAGES/World Data Center for Paleoclimatology Data Contribution, Series # 2*, 2009.
- Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., Bauer, P., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A. C. M., van de Berg, L., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Delsol, C., Dragani, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A. J., Haimberger, L., Healy, S. B., Hersbach, H., Hólm, E. V., Isaksen, L., Kå llberg, P., Köhler, M., Matricardi, M., McNally, A. P., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Morcrette, J.-J., Park, B.-K., Peubey, C., de Rosnay, P., Tavolato, C., Thépaut, J.-N., and Vitart, F.: The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 137, 553–597, doi:10.1002/qj.828, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/qj.828>, 2011.
- 25 Donner, L. J., Wyman, B. L., Hemler, R. S., Horowitz, L. W., Ming, Y., Zhao, M., Golaz, J. C., Ginoux, P., Lin, S. J., Schwarzkopf, M. D., Austin, J., Alaka, G., Cooke, W. F., Delworth, T. L., Freidenreich, S. M., Gordon, C. T., Griffies, S. M., Held, I. M., Hurlin, W. J., Klein, S. a., Knutson, T. R., Langenhorst, A. R., Lee, H. C., Lin, Y., Magi, B. I., Malyshev, S. L., Milly, P. C. D., Naik, V., Nath, M. J., Pincus, R., Ploshay, J. J., Ramaswamy, V., Seman, C. J., Shevliakova, E., Sirutis, J. J., Stern, W. F., Stouffer, R. J., Wilson, R. J., Winton, M., Wittenberg, A. T., and Zeng, F.: The dynamical core, physical parameterizations, and basic simulation characteristics of the atmospheric component AM3 of the GFDL global coupled model CM3, *Journal of Climate*, 24, 3484–3519, doi:10.1175/2011JCLI3955.1, 2011.
- 30 Driscoll, S., Bozzo, A., Gray, L. J., Robock, A., and Stenchikov, G.: Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 5 (CMIP5) simulations of climate following volcanic eruptions, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 117, D17 105, doi:10.1029/2012JD017607, 2012.

- Ebita, A., Kobayashi, S., Ota, Y., Moriya, M., Kumabe, R., Onogi, K., Harada, Y., Yasui, S., Miyaoka, K., Takahashi, K., Kamahori, H., Kobayashi, C., Endo, H., Soma, M., Oikawa, Y., and Ishimizu, T.: The Japanese 55-year Reanalysis "JRA-55": An Interim Report, SOLA, 7, 149–152, doi:10.2151/sola.2011-038, 2011.
- Fischer, E. M., Luterbacher, J., Zorita, E., Tett, S. F. B., Casty, C., and Wanner, H.: European climate response to tropical volcanic eruptions over the last half millennium, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, L05 707, doi:10.1029/2006GL027992, 2007.
- 5 Fujiwara, M. and Jackson, D.: SPARC Reanalysis Intercomparison Project (S-RIP) Planning Meeting 29 April–1 May, 2013, Exeter, UK, SPARC, p. 52, 2013.
- Fujiwara, M., Hibino, T., Mehta, S. M., Gray, L. J., Mitchell, D. M., and Anstey, J.: Global temperature response to the major volcanic eruptions in multiple reanalysis datasets, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2015.
- 10 García-Herrera, R., Calvo, N., Garcia, R. R., and Giorgetta, M. a.: Propagation of ENSO temperature signals into the middle atmosphere: A comparison of two general circulation models and ERA-40 reanalysis data, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 111, D06 101, doi:10.1029/2005JD006061, 2006.
- Garfinkel, C. and Hartmann, D.: Different ENSO teleconnections and their effects on the stratospheric polar vortex, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 113, 2008.
- 15 Gent, P. R., Danabasoglu, G., Donner, L. J., Holland, M. M., Hunke, E. C., Jayne, S. R., Lawrence, D. M., Neale, R. B., Rasch, P. J., Vertenstein, M., Worley, P. H., Yang, Z. L., and Zhang, M.: The community climate system model version 4, *Journal of Climate*, 24, 4973–4991, doi:10.1175/2011JCLI4083.1, 2011.
- Gillett, N. P. and Fyfe, J. C.: Annular mode changes in the CMIP5 simulations, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40, 1189–1193, doi:10.1002/grl.50249, 2013.
- 20 Graf, H.-F. and Timmreck, C.: A general climate model simulation of the aerosol radiative effects of the Laacher See eruption (10,900 B.C.), *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 106, 14,747–14,756, doi:10.1029/2001JD900152, 2001.
- Graf, H.-F., Li, Q., and Giorgetta, M. a.: Volcanic effects on climate: revisiting the mechanisms, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions*, 7, 4503–4511, doi:10.5194/acpd-7-3941-2007, 2007.
- Gray, L. J., Scaife, A. A., Mitchell, D. M., Osprey, S., Ineson, S., Hardiman, S., Butchart, N., Knight, J., Sutton, R., and Kodera, K.: A lagged response to the 11 year solar cycle in observed winter Atlantic/European weather patterns, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118, 2013.
- 25 Haigh, J. D.: The effects of solar variability on the Earth's climate, *The Royal Society*, 361, 95–111, doi:10.1098/rsta.2002.1111, 2002.
- Hansen, J., Sato, M., Ruedy, R., Nazarenko, L., Lacis, A., Schmidt, G. A., Russell, G., Aleinov, I., Bauer, M., Bauer, S., Bell, N., Cairns, B., Canuto, V., Chandler, M., Cheng, Y., Del Genio, A., Faluvegi, G., Fleming, E., Friend, A., Hall, T., Jackman, C., Kelley, M., Kiang, N., Koch, D., Lean, J., Lerner, J., Lo, K., Menon, S., Miller, R., Minnis, P., Novakov, T., Oinas, V., Perlwitz, J., Perlwitz, J., Rind, D., Romanou, A., Shindell, D., Stone, P., Sun, S., Tausnev, N., Thresher, D., Wielicki, B., Wong, T., Yao, M., and Zhang, S.: Efficacy of climate forcings, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 110, D18 104, doi:10.1029/2005JD005776, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2005JD005776>, 2005.
- 30 Hansen, J., Sato, M., Ruedy, R., Kharecha, P., Lacis, A., Miller, R., Nazarenko, L., Lo, K., Schmidt, G., Russell, G., Aleinov, I., Bauer, S., Baum, E., Cairns, B., Canuto, V., Chandler, M., Cheng, Y., Cohen, A., Del Genio, A., and Faluvegi, G.: Climate simulations for 1880-2003 with GISS modelE, *Climate Dynamics*, 29, 661–696, doi:10.1007/s00382-007-0255-8, 2007.
- Holton, J. R. and Tan, H. C.: The quasi-biennial oscillation in the Northern Hemisphere lower stratosphere, *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan*, 60, 140–148, 1982.

- Humphreys, W. J.: Volcanic dust and other factors in the production of climatic changes, and their possible relation to ice gases, *Journal of The Franklin Institute*, Aug., 131–172, 1913.
- Humphreys, W. J.: *Physics of the Air*, Dover, Mineola, NY, Dover, Mineola, New York, 1940.
- Hurrell, J. W.: Decadal Trends in the North Atlantic Oscillation: Regional Temperatures and Precipitation, *Science*, 269, 676–679, 1995.
- 5 Hurrell, J. W. and Deser, C.: North Atlantic climate variability: The role of the North Atlantic Oscillation, *Journal of Marine Systems*, 78, 28–41, doi:10.1016/j.jmarsys.2008.11.026, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2008.11.026>, 2009.
- Jones, P., Moberg, A., Osborn, T., and Briffa, K.: Surface Climate Responses to Explosive Volcanic Eruptions Seen in Long European Temperature Records and Mid-to-High Latitude Tree-Ring Density Around the Northern Hemisphere, *Geophysical Monograph Series*, 139, 239–254, 2003.
- 10 Kalnay, E., Kanamitsu, M., Kistler, R., Collins, W., Deaven, D., Gandin, L., Iredell, M., Saha, S., White, G., Woollen, J., Zhu, Y., Leetmaa, A., Reynolds, R., Chelliah, M., Ebisuzaki, W., Higgins, W., Janowiak, J., Mo, K. C., Ropelewski, C., Wang, J., Jenne, R., and Joseph, D.: The NCEP/NCAR 40-Year Reanalysis Project, doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(1996\)077<0437:TNYRP>2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1996)077<0437:TNYRP>2.0.CO;2), 1996.
- Kanamitsu, M., Ebisuzaki, W., Woollen, J., Yang, S.-K., Hnilo, J. J., Fiorino, M., and Potter, G. L.: NCEP–DOE AMIP-II Reanalysis (R-2), *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 83, 1631–1643, doi:10.1175/BAMS-83-11-1631, [http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/](http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/BAMS-83-11-1631)
- 15 10.1175/BAMS-83-11-1631, 2002.
- Kirchner, I., Stenchikov, G. L., Graf, H. F., Robock, A., and Antuña, J. C.: Climate model simulation of winter warming and summer cooling following the 1991 Mount Pinatubo volcanic eruption, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 104, 19 039–19 055, 1999.
- Labitzke, K. and McCormick, M. P.: Stratospheric temperature increase due to Pinatubo aerosol, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 19, 1982.
- Lean, J., Beer, J., and Bradley, R.: Reconstruction of solar irradiance since 1610: Implications for climate change, *Geophysical Research*
- 20 *Letters*, 22, 3195–3198, doi:10.1029/95GL03093, 1995.
- Lehner, F., Schurer, A. P., Hegerl, G. C., Deser, C., and Frölicher, T. L.: The importance of ENSO phase during volcanic eruptions for detection and attribution, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43, 2851–2858, 2016.
- Lindsay, R., Wensnahan, M., Schweiger, A., and Zhang, J.: Evaluation of Seven Different Atmospheric Reanalysis Products in the Arctic, *Journal of Climate*, 27, 2588–2606, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-13-00014, 2014.
- 25 Makstas, A., Atkinson, D., Kulakov, M., Shutilin, S., Krishfield, R., and Proshutinsky, A.: Atmospheric forcing validation for modeling the central Arctic, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, L20 706, doi:10.1029/2007GL031378, 2007.
- Manzini, E., Giorgetta, M. A., Esch, M., Kornbluh, L., and Roeckner, E.: The Influence of Sea Surface Temperatures on the Northern Winter Stratosphere: Ensemble Simulations with the MAECHAM5 Model, *Journal of Climate*, 19, 3863–3881, doi:10.1175/JCLI3826.1, 2006.
- Meehl, G. A., Hu, A., Arblaster, J. M., Fasullo, J., and Trenberth, K. E.: Externally Forced and Internally Generated Decadal Climate
- 30 *Variability Associated with the Interdecadal Pacific Oscillation*, *Journal of Climate*, 26, 7298–7310, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00548.1, 2013.
- Menon, S., Koch, D., Beig, G., Sahu, S., Fasullo, J., and Orlikowski, D.: Black carbon aerosols and the third polar ice cap, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10, 4559–4571, doi:10.5194/acp-10-4559-2010, <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/10/4559/2010/>, 2010.
- Mitchell, D., Gray, L., Fujiwara, M., Hibino, T., Anstey, J., Ebisuzaki, W., Harada, Y., Long, C., Misios, S., Stott, P., and Tan, D.: Signatures of
- 35 naturally induced variability in the atmosphere using multiple reanalysis datasets, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, doi:10.1002/qj.2492, 2014.

- Morice, C. P., Kennedy, J. J., Rayner, N. A., and Jones, P. D.: Quantifying uncertainties in global and regional temperature change using an ensemble of observational estimates: The HadCRUT4 dataset, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 117, D0810, doi:10.1029/2011JD017187, 2012.
- Moron, V. and Plaut, G.: The impact of El Niño-southern oscillation upon weather regimes over Europe and the North Atlantic during boreal winter, *International Journal of Climatology*, 23, 363–379, doi:10.1002/joc.890, 2003.
- Newhall, C. G. and Self, S.: The Volcanic Explosivity Index (VEI): An Estimate of Explosive Magnitude for Historical Volcanism, *History of Geophysics: Volume 2*, 87, 1231–1238, doi:10.1029/JC087iC02p01231, 1982.
- Oman, L., Robock, A., Stenchikov, G., Schmidt, G. A., and Ruedy, R.: Climatic response to high-latitude volcanic eruptions, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 110, D13 103, doi:10.1029/2004JD005487, 2005.
- 10 Onogi, K., Tsutsui, J., Koide, H., Sakamoto, M., Kobayashi, S., Hatsushika, H., Matsumoto, T., Yamazaki, N., Kamahori, H., Takahashi, K., Kadokura, S., Wada, K., Kato, K., Oyama, R., Ose, T., Mannoji, N., and Taira, R.: The JRA-25 Reanalysis, *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 85, 369–432, doi:10.2151/jmsj.85.369, 2007.
- Parker, D. E. and Brownscombe, J. K. L.: Stratospheric warming following the El Chichón volcanic eruption, *Nature*, 301, 406–408, 1983.
- Poli, P., Hersbach, H., Tan, D., Dee, D., Thépaut, J.-N., Simmons, A., Peubey, C., Laloyaux, P., Komori, T., Berrisford, P., Dragani, R., Trémolet, Y., Holm, E., Bonavita, M., Isaksen, L., and Fisher, M.: The data assimilation system and initial performance evaluation of the ECMWF pilot reanalysis of the 20th-century assimilating surface observations only (ERA-20C), *ERA Report Series*, 14, ECMWF, 2013.
- 15 Rienecker, M. M., Suarez, M. J., Gelaro, R., Todling, R., Bacmeister, J., Liu, E., Bosilovich, M. G., Schubert, S. D., Takacs, L., Kim, G.-K., Bloom, S., Chen, J., Collins, D., Conaty, A., da Silva, A., Gu, W., Joiner, J., Koster, R. D., Lucchesi, R., Molod, A., Owens, T., Pawson, S., Pegion, P., Redder, C. R., Reichle, R., Robertson, F. R., Ruddick, A. G., Sienkiewicz, M., and Woollen, J.: MERRA: NASA's Modern-Era Retrospective Analysis for Research and Applications, *Journal of Climate*, 24, 3624–3648, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00015.1, <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00015.1>, 2011.
- Robock, A.: Volcanic eruptions and climate, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 38, 191–219, doi:10.1029/2007rg000232, <http://www.agu.org/pubs/crossref/2007/2007RG000232.shtml>, 2000.
- Robock, A. and Mao, J.: Winter warming from large volcanic eruptions, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 19, 2405–2408, doi:10.1029/92GL02627, 1992.
- 25 Robock, A. and Mao, J.: The Volcanic Signal in Surface Temperature Observations, *Journal of Climate*, 8, 1086–1103, 1995.
- Rotstayn, L. D., Collier, M. A., Dix, M. R., Feng, Y., Gordon, H. B., O'Farrell, S. P., Smith, I. N., and Syktus, J.: Improved simulation of Australian climate and ENSO-related rainfall variability in a global climate model with an interactive aerosol treatment, *International Journal of Climatology*, 30, 1067–1088, doi:10.1002/joc.1952, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/joc.1952>, 2010.
- 30 Saha, S., Moorthi, S., Pan, H.-L., Wu, X., Wang, J., Nadiga, S., Tripp, P., Kistler, R., Woollen, J., Behringer, D., Liu, H., Stokes, D., Grumbine, R., Gayno, G., Wang, J., Hou, Y.-T., Chuang, H.-Y., Juang, H.-M. H., Sela, J., Iredell, M., Treadon, R., Kleist, D., Van Delst, P., Keyser, D., Derber, J., Ek, M., Meng, J., Wei, H., Yang, R., Lord, S., Van Den Dool, H., Kumar, A., Wang, W., Long, C., Chelliah, M., Xue, Y., Huang, B., Schemm, J.-K., Ebisuzaki, W., Lin, R., Xie, P., Chen, M., Zhou, S., Higgins, W., Zou, C.-Z., Liu, Q., Chen, Y., Han, Y., Cucurull, L., Reynolds, R. W., Rutledge, G., and Goldberg, M.: The NCEP Climate Forecast System Reanalysis, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 91, 1015–1057, doi:10.1175/2010BAMS3001.1, <http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/2010BAMS3001.1>, 2010.
- 35 Sato, M., Hansen, J. E., McCormick, M. P., and Pollack, J. B.: Stratospheric Aerosol Optical Depths, 1850-1990, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 98, 987–994, doi:10.1029/93JD02553, 1993.

- Schmidt, G. a., Kelley, M., Nazarenko, L., Ruedy, R., Russell, G. L., Aleinov, I., Bauer, M., Bauer, S. E., Bhat, M. K., Bleck, R., Canuto, V., Chen, Y.-h., Cheng, Y., Clune, T. L., Genio, A. D., Fainchtein, R. D., Faluvegi, G., Hansen, J. E., Healy, R. J., Kiang, N. Y., Koch, D., Lakis, A. a., Legrande, A. N., Lerner, J., Lo, K. K., Matthews, E. E., Menon, S., Miller, R. L., Oinas, V., and Oloso, A. O.: Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems contributions to the CMIP5 archive, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 6, 141–184, doi:10.1002/2013MS000265., 2014.
- 5 Shindell, D. T., Schmidt, G. A., Mann, M. E., and Faluvegi, G.: Dynamic winter climate response to large tropical volcanic eruptions since 1600, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 109, D05 104, doi:10.1029/2003JD004151, 2004.
- Simkin, T. and Siebert, L.: *Volcanoes of the World: A Regional Directory, Gazetteer, and Chronology of Volcanism During the Last 10,000 Years*, Geoscience Press, Tucson, Arizona, 1994.
- 10 Simmons, A. J., Jones, P. D., da Costa Bechtold, V., Beljaars, A. C. M., Kå llberg, P. W., Saarinen, S., Uppala, S. M., Viterbo, P., and Wedi, N.: Comparison of trends and low-frequency variability in CRU, ERA-40, and NCEP/NCAR analyses of surface air temperature, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 109, doi:10.1029/2004JD005306, 2004.
- Stenchikov, G., Robock, A., Ramaswamy, V., Schwarzkopf, M. D., Hamilton, K., and Ramachandran, S.: Arctic Oscillation response to the 1991 Mount Pinatubo eruption: Effects of volcanic aerosols and ozone depletion, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 107, D24, 4803, doi:10.1029/2002JD002090, 2002.
- 15 Stenchikov, G., Hamilton, K., Robock, A., Ramaswamy, V., and Schwarzkopf, M. D.: Arctic oscillation response to the 1991 Pinatubo eruption in the SKYHI general circulation model with a realistic quasi-biennial oscillation, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 109, doi:10.1029/2003JD003699, 2004.
- Stenchikov, G., Hamilton, K., Stouffer, R. J., Robock, A., Ramaswamy, V., Santer, B., and Graf, H. F.: Arctic Oscillation response to volcanic eruptions in the IPCC AR4 climate models, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 111, D07 107, doi:10.1029/2005JD006286, 2006.
- 20 Stenchikov, G. L., Kirchner, I., Robock, A., Graf, H.-F., Antuña, J. C., Grainger, R. G., Lambert, A., and Thomason, L.: Radiative forcing from the 1991 Mount Pinatubo volcanic eruption, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 103, 13 837–13 857, 1998.
- Sun, S. and Bleck, R.: Multi-century simulations with the coupled GISS-HYCOM climate model: control experiments, *Climate Dynamics*, 26, 407–428, doi:10.1007/s00382-005-0091-7, 2006.
- 25 Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J., and Meehl, G. A.: An overview of CMIP5 and the experiment design, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93(4), 485–498, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1, 2012.
- Thompson, D. W. and Wallace, J. M.: Regional climate impacts of the Northern Hemisphere annular mode, *Science*, 293, 85–89, 2001.
- Thompson, D. W. J. and Wallace, J. M.: The Arctic Oscillation signature in the wintertime geopotential height and temperature fields, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 25, 1297–1300, doi:10.1029/98GL00950, 1998.
- 30 Trepte, C. R. and Hitchman, M. H.: Tropical stratospheric circulation deduced from satellite aerosol data, *Nature*, 355, 626–628, 1992.
- Uppala, S. M., Kå llberg, P. W., Simmons, A. J., Andrae, U., Bechtold, V. D. C., Fiorino, M., Gibson, J. K., Haseler, J., Hernandez, A., Kelly, G. A., Li, X., Onogi, K., Saarinen, S., Sokka, N., Allan, R. P., Andersson, E., Arpe, K., Balmaseda, M. A., Beljaars, A. C. M., Berg, L. V. D., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Caires, S., Chevallier, F., Dethof, A., Dragosavac, M., Fisher, M., Fuentes, M., Hagemann, S., Hó lm, E., Hoskins, B. J., Isaksen, L., Janssen, P. A. E. M., Jenne, R., McNally, A. P., Mahfouf, J.-F., Morcrette, J.-J., Rayner, N. A., Saunders, R. W., Simon, P., Sterl, A., Trenberth, K. E., Untch, A., Vasiljevic, D., Viterbo, P., and Woollen, J.: The ERA-40 re-analysis, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 131, 2961–3012, doi:10.1256/qj.04.176, <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1256/qj.04.176>, 2005.
- 35 Wolter, K. and Timlin, M. S.: El Niño/Southern Oscillation behaviour since 1871 as diagnosed in an extended multivariate ENSO index (MEI.ext), *International Journal of Climatology*, 31, 1074–1087, doi:10.1002/joc.2336, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/joc.2336>, 2011.

Large Volcanic Eruptions since the 19th century




Figure 1. Large volcanic eruptions since the 19th century. The size of the triangle indicates the volcanic explosivity index (VEI) (Newhall and Self, 1982), from Simkin and Siebert (1994) and the Smithsonian Institution (www.volcano.si.edu). The filled colour shows the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) event in the first winter after the eruption from Cook et al. (2009) until 1870 and from Wolter and Timlin (2011) from 1871 until present. In the case of Fuego, Santa María, Babuyan Claro and Galunggung the second winter after the eruption is considered for the definition of the ENSO phase.

Tropical three year mean-TAS variations in K (1862-2005) with respect to 1880-1919 for the CMIP5 historicalMisc experiments with just volcanic forcing in red, solar forcing in yellow and just anthropogenic forcing in blue of every model (Table 2). The black solid line shows HadCRUT4 observation data. Light color lines are ensemble means of every model and solid lines show the multimodel mean. Gray triangles indicate large tropical volcanic eruptions:

- Sealing factors best estimates (diamond) and confidence interval of tropical TAS (1862-2005) for all different CMIP5 models (Table 2) and multimodel mean calculated using the ROF method. The p values of the confidence interval, produced with a RCT, are shown in the lower panel:

- Tropical rescaled three year mean-TAS variations in K (1862-2005) with respect to 1880-1919 for the CMIP5 historicalMisc experiments with just volcanic forcing in red and just anthropogenic forcing in blue. The rescaling uncertainties due to the confidence interval are shown in lightred and lightblue respectively. The black solid line shows HadCRUT4 observation data. Gray triangles indicate volcanic eruptions:




Figure 2. Tropical averaged Stratospheric Aerosol Optical Depth (AOD) at 550nm for the altitude region 20-25 km from Sato et al. (1993), updated dataset from data.giss.nasa.gov/modelerforce/strataer/. All volcanic eruptions from Figure 1 for the period 1870 until present are included. They are indicated with a gray line corresponding to the eruption time and the name of the volcano. The green line is the mean AOD for the Northern Hemisphere and the blue line shows the mean AOD for the Southern Hemisphere.






Figure 3. Observed and ~~multireanalysis-mean~~ multi-reanalysis mean SLP anomalies (hPa) in the Northern Hemisphere in the first two post volcanic winters (DJF) averaged over the two volcanic eruptions of Mt. Pinatubo (1991) and El Chichón (1982). Anomalies are calculated with respect to the mean for the years 1979-2012, excluding the following two years after the eruptions. Single diagonal lines correspond to the 90% and double diagonal lines to the 95% confidence level obtained with a Monte Carlo test of two independent samples. a) Shows the mean anomaly for the ~~HadSLP~~ HadSLP2 observation data for the first and b) for the second winter after the eruptions. c) and d) show respectively the mean anomaly of all 10 reanalysis datasets (Table 1).


a) HadSLP2, 1st Winter (DJF)



b) HadSLP2, 2nd Winter (DJF)



c) NOAA 20CR, 1st Winter (DJF)



d) NOAA 20CR, 2nd Winter (DJF)





Figure 4. As Figure 3 but for just ~~NCEP-20CR~~ NOAA-20CR data and HadSLP2 data, averaged over all five post volcanic winters.




Figure 5. Monthly North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) index of the first winter after five volcanic eruptions (a-c) and the winter mean (d), calculated with HadSLP2 observation data and reanalysis data. All data is calculated with respect to the mean for the years 1979-2012, excluding the following two years after the two eruption. The EOF is calculated over the period 1979-2012 for every product separately. The histogram shows the NAO index of the 163 years of observation data (1850-2012). Black crosses show the results of the HadSLP2 data. The blue lines show the reanalysis data spread of the NAO index for the winter after [Mt. Pinatubo and El Chichon](#) eruptions except [Krakatau](#). The orange lines show the 95% ensemble spread of the NAO after all five volcanic eruptions calculated with the [NCEP-20CR-NOAA-20CR](#) dataset.




Figure 6. Observed and ~~multireanalysis-mean~~ multi-reanalysis mean TAS anomalies (K) averaged over the first year (a and c) and second year (b and d) after the eruption and over the three volcanic eruptions Mt. Pinatubo (1991), El Chichón (1982) and Mt. Agung (1963). a) and b) show the mean anomaly for the HadCRUT4 observations and c) and d) show respectively the mean anomaly of the five reanalysis datasets, containing this period (Table 1). Anomalies are calculated with respect to the average over the years 1961-1990, consistent to the HadCRUT4 dataset. ~~Trends are removed with a adapted 10-year running mean.~~ Single diagonal lines correspond to the 90% and double diagonal lines to the 95% confidence level obtained ~~with by~~ a Monte Carlo test of ~~two~~ three independent samples.




Figure 7. As Figure 6 but for just HadCRUT4 data in a-b averaged over at least four of five eruptions and ~~NCEP-20CR~~ NOAA-20CR data without missing data consideration, averaged over all five post volcanic years.




Figure 8. Tropical TAS anomalies (K) averaged over the region 30°S - 30°N and over the first year (a) and second year (b) after five volcanic eruptions, calculated with HadCRUT4 observation data and reanalysis data. Anomalies are calculated with respect to the average over the years 1961-1990, consistent to the HadCRUT4 dataset. Trends are removed with a adapted 10-year running mean. The histogram shows the anomalies of 153 years of observation data (1855-2007). The first five and last five years are left out because of the trend removal. The blue lines show the reanalysis data spread of the TAS anomalies for the years after Mt. Pinatubo all eruptions except Krakatau and El Chichon Santa María. The orange lines show the 90% ensemble spread of the NAO-TAS after all five volcanic eruptions calculated with the NCEP-20CR-NOAA-20CR dataset. The mean response is indicated by the dot between the whiskers.

Table 1. Reanalysis products used in this study

Reanalysis Name	Reanalysis Resolution	Ensemble members	Time span	Volcanic aerosol changes	Reference
NASA MERRA	2/3° Lat x 1/2° Lon, L72	1	Jan 1979 - present	no	Rienecker et al. (2011)
ERA-40	T159, L60	1	Sept 1957 - Aug 2002	no	Uppala et al. (2005)
ERA-Interim	T255, L60	1	Jan 1979 - present	no	Dee et al. (2011)
ERA-20C	T159, L91	1	Jan 1900 - Dec 2010	no	Poli et al. (2013)
JRA25/JCDAS	T106, L40	1	Jan 1979 - Jan 2014	no	Onogi et al. (2007)
JRA55	T319, L60	1	Jan 1958 - present	no	Ebita et al. (2011)
NCEP-1 (R-1)	T62, L28	1	Jan 1948 - present	no	Kalnay et al. (1996)
NCEP-2 (R-2)	T62, L28	1	Jan 1979 - near present	no	Kanamitsu et al. (2002)
NCEP-CFSR / CFSv2	T382, L64	1	Jan 1979 - present	yes	Saha et al. (2010)
NOAA-CIRES 20th Century Reanalysis (v2c)	T62, L28	56	Jan 1871 1851 - Dec 2012 2014	yes	Compo et al. (2011)

Table 2. CMIP5 models used in this study

Model Name	Model Resolution	Ensemble members	Time span	Volcanic aerosol changes	Reference
CCSM4	0.9° Lat x 1.25° Lon, L26	3	Jan 1850 - Dec 2005	A07 ^a	Gent et al. (2011)
CESM1-CAM5	0.9° Lat x 1.25° Lon, L30	3	Jan 1850 - Dec 2005	A07	Meehl et al. (2013)
CSIRO-Mk3-6-0	T63, L18	5	Jan 1850 - Dec 2012	S93 ^b	Rotstayn et al. (2010)
GFDL-ESM2M	C48, L48	1	Jan 1860 - Dec 2005	S93 / S98 ^c	Donner et al. (2011)
GISS-E2-H NINT	2° Lat x 2.5° Lon, L40	5	Jan 1850 - Dec 2005	S93	Schmidt et al. (2014)
GISS-E2-H TCADI	2° Lat x 2.5° Lon, L40	5	Jan 1850 - Dec 2012	S93	Schmidt et al. (2014)
GISS-E2-R NINT	2° Lat x 2.5° Lon, L40	5	Jan 1850 - Dec 2005	S93	Schmidt et al. (2014)
GISS-E2-R TCADI	2° Lat x 2.5° Lon, L40	5	Jan 1850 - Dec 2012	S93	Schmidt et al. (2014)

^a Ammann et al. (2007), ^b Sato et al. (1993), ^c Stenchikov et al. (1998).