AUTHOR QUERY FORM

ELSEVIER	Book: LETCHER-9780444635242 Chapter: 26	Please e-mail your responses and any corrections to: E-mail: p.chandramohan@elsevier.com
--	--	--

Dear Author,

Any queries or remarks that have arisen during the processing of your manuscript are listed below and are highlighted by flags in the proof. (AU indicates author queries; ED indicates editor queries; and TS/TY indicates typesetter queries.) Please check your proof carefully and answer all AU queries. Mark all corrections and query answers at the appropriate place in the proof using on-screen annotation in the PDF file. For a written tutorial on how to annotate PDFs, click http://www.elsevier.com/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/98953/Annotating-PDFs-Adobe-Reader-9-X-or-XI.pdf. A video tutorial is also available at <http://www.screencast.com/t/9OIDFhihgE9a>. Alternatively, you may compile them in a separate list and tick off below to indicate that you have answered the query.

Please return your input as instructed by the project manager.

Location in Chapter	Query / Remark	
AU:1 , page 419	As per style all affiliations need to have the following details: “Department/Institute/City/State/Country”. Hence provide the department detail if any.	☐
AU:2 , NPI	Please provide keywords.	☐
AU:3 , page 421	The word “tropause” has been edited as “tropopause” in the sentence “A significant amount of volcanic aerosols penetrated...”. Please confirm the edit made.	☐
AU:4 , page 425	The abbreviation “QBO” has been defined as “Quasi Biannual Oscillation” as well as “quasi-biennial oscillation”. Please check if the representation should be made consistent in the article.	☐
AU:5 , page 431	Kindly suggest whether the phrase “north of 30 N” can be edited as “north of 30°”.	☐
AU:6 , page 442	Kindly check the word “Pinatubo” for clarity in the sentence “The maximum sea ice extent...”.	☐
AU:7 , page 429	Kindly check figure 5 caption for clarity.	☐
AU:8 , page 444	As Refs [33] and [45] were identical, the latter has been removed from the reference list and subsequent references have been renumbered.	☐

c0026 THE ROLE OF VOLCANIC
ACTIVITY IN CLIMATE AND
GLOBAL CHANGE

26

[AU1]

Georgiy Stenchikov
King Abdullah University of Science and Technology Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

CHAPTER OUTLINE

1. Introduction	419
2. Aerosol Loading, Spatial Distribution and Radiative Effect	421
3. Volcanoes and Climate	425
4. Summary	442
References	443

s0010 1. INTRODUCTION

p0010 Volcanic activity is an important natural cause of climate variations because tracer constituents of volcanic origin impact the atmospheric chemical composition and optical properties. We focus here on the recent period of the Earth’s history and do not consider the cumulative effect of the ancient volcanic degassing that formed the core of the Earth’s atmosphere billions of years ago. At present, a weak volcanic activity results in gas and particle effusions in the troposphere (lower part of atmosphere), which constitute, on average, the larger portion of volcanic mass flux into the atmosphere. However, the products of tropospheric volcanic emissions are short lived and contribute only moderately to the emissions from large anthropogenic and natural tropospheric sources. This study focuses instead on the effects on climate of the Earth’s explosive volcanism. Strong volcanic eruptions with a volcanic explosivity index (VEI) [1] equal to or greater than 4 could inject volcanic ash and sulphur-rich gases into the clean lower stratosphere at an altitude about 25 km–30 km, increasing their concentration there by two to three orders of magnitude in comparison with the background level. The flood lava eruptions may also have significant climatic impact as they could maintain activity for extended time. The well-known Laki eruption in Iceland in 1783 erupted for eight months, injecting sulphur-containing gases both in the troposphere and in the lower stratosphere. Although tropospheric emissions produced a vast environmental effect, the long-term climate effects were mostly caused by the long-lived stratospheric aerosols that were formed by about 10 explosive events during the course of the eruption.

p0015 Chemical transformations and gas-to-particle conversion of volcanic tracers form a volcanic aerosol layer that remains in the stratosphere for two to three years after an eruption, thereby impacting the Earth’s climate because volcanic aerosols cool the surface and the troposphere by reflecting solar

radiation, and warm the lower stratosphere, absorbing thermal IR and solar near-IR radiation [2]. Fig. 1 shows stratospheric optical depth for the visible wavelength of 0.55 μm . It roughly characterizes the portion of scattered solar light. Three major explosive eruptions occurred in the second part of the twentieth century, as depicted in Fig. 1: Agung of 1963, El Chichon of 1982 and Pinatubo of 1991.

f0010 **FIGURE 1**

The total normal optical depth τ of stratospheric aerosols for the Pinatubo period for the visible wavelength of 0.55 μm as a function of time in years. It causes attenuation of direct solar visible light with a factor of $\exp(-\tau/\cos \zeta)$, where $\cos \zeta$ is a cosine of zenith angle. Note: Optical depth is defined as the negative natural logarithm of the fraction of radiation (e.g. light) that is not scattered or absorbed. It is a dimensionless quantity.

p0020 Volcanic eruptions, like the Mt. Pinatubo eruption in 1991, with global visible optical depth maximizing of about 0.16, cause perturbations of the globally averaged radiative balance at the top of the atmosphere reaching -3 W m^{-2} and cause a decrease of global surface air temperature of about 0.5 K. The radiative impact of volcanic aerosols also produces changes in atmospheric circulation, forcing a positive phase of the Arctic Oscillation (AO) and counterintuitive boreal winter warming in middle and high latitudes over Eurasia and North America [3–8]. In addition, stratospheric aerosols

2. AEROSOL LOADING, SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION AND RADIATIVE EFFECT 421

affect stratospheric chemistry serving as surfaces for heterogeneous reactions liberating anthropogenic chlorine and causing ozone depletion.

p0025 It was traditionally believed that volcanic impacts produced mainly short-term transient climate perturbations. However, the ocean integrates volcanic radiative cooling, and different components of the ocean respond over a wide range of timescales. Volcanically induced tropospheric temperature anomalies vanish in about 7 years–10 years, while volcanically induced sea ice extent and volume changes have a relaxation timescale closer to a decade. Volcanically induced changes in interior ocean temperature, the meridional overturning circulation and steric height have even longer relaxation times, from several decades to a century. Because of their various impacts on climate systems, volcanic eruptions play a role of natural tests, providing an independent means of assessing multiple climate feedback mechanisms and climate sensitivity [7–11].

p0030 There are several excellent reviews devoted to volcanic impacts on climate and weather written before the first edition of this book [12–19] and more recently [20]. The present study provides an overview of available observations of volcanic aerosols and discusses their radiative forcing and large-scale effects on climate. It focuses on recently discovered forced stratosphere-troposphere dynamic interaction (recently discussed intensively in literature) and long-term ocean response to volcanic forcing, and aims to add information to that already presented in the previous reviews.

s0015 2. AEROSOL LOADING, SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION AND RADIATIVE EFFECT

p0035 Volcanic emissions comprised of gases (H_2O , CO_2 , N_2 , SO_2 , H_2S) and solid (mostly silicate) particles, are usually referred to as volcanic ash. Volcanic ash particles are relatively large, exceeding two microns in diameter, and therefore deposit relatively quickly, i.e. within a few weeks. They are responsible for short-term regional-to-continental perturbations of the Earth's radiative balance and meteorological parameters. H_2O , CO_2 and N_2 are abundant in the Earth's atmosphere, so individual volcanic perturbations of their concentrations are negligible. But SO_2 and H_2S , which quickly oxidize to SO_2 if erupted in the stratosphere, could significantly affect stratospheric chemical composition and optical properties. SO_2 gas absorbs UV and IR radiation, producing very strong localized stratospheric heating [21–23]. However, it completely disappears in about half a year and the major long-term impact of volcanic eruptions on climate is due to long-lived sulphate aerosols formed by oxidizing of SO_2 with a characteristic conversion time of about 35 days. Sulphate volcanic aerosols (submicron droplets of highly concentrated sulphuric acid) are transported globally by the Brewer–Dobson stratospheric circulation and eventually fall out in two to three years. A significant amount of volcanic aerosols penetrated to the

[AU3] troposphere through the tropopause folds is washed out in storm tracks. Aerosols deposited in downward branches of the Brewer–Dobson circulation in the polar regions are preserved in the polar ice sheets, recording the history of the Earth's explosive volcanism for thousands of years [24–26]. However, the atmospheric loadings calculated using volcanic time series from high-latitude ice records suffer from uncertainties in observation data and poor understanding of atmospheric transport and deposition processes. The global instrumental observations of volcanic aerosols have been conducted during the last 25 years by a number of remote sensing platforms. Total Ozone Mapping Spectrometer (TOMS) instrumentation onboard the Nimbus-7 provided SO_2 loadings from November 1978 until May 6, 1993 [27]. Prata et al. [28] recently developed a new retrieval technique to obtain SO_2 loadings from TOMS data. The Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) provides aerosol optical depth over oceans with 1-km spatial resolution in several visible and near-IR wavebands. However, column observations are not sufficient to reliably separate tropospheric and stratospheric aerosols.

422 CHAPTER 26 THE ROLE OF VOLCANIC ACTIVITY IN CLIMATE AND GLOBAL CHANGE

p0040 The Stratospheric Aerosol and Gas Experiment (SAGE) and Stratospheric Aerosol Measurement (SAM) projects have provided more than 20 years of vertically resolved stratospheric aerosol spectral extinction, the longest such record. The 3-D observations are most valuable to understand stratospheric aerosols transformations and transport. However, there are significant gaps in the temporal-spatial coverage, e.g. the eruption of El Chichón in 1982 (the second most important in the twentieth century after Mt. Pinatubo) is not covered by SAGE observations because the SAGE I instrument failed in 1981, and SAGE II was only launched in 1984. Fortunately, instruments aboard the Stratosphere Mesosphere Explorer (SME) fill the gap of 1982–1984 in 3-D aerosol observations. The saturation periods when the SAGE instrument could not see the direct sunlight through the dense areas of aerosol cloud also could be partially reconstructed using lidar and mission observations [29,30]. It is important to utilize observations from the multiple platforms to improve data coverage, e.g. combining SAGE II and Polar Ozone and Aerosol Measurement (POAM) data could help to fill in the polar regions. Randall et al. [31,32] have extensively compared the POAM and SAGE data and normalized them, combining them into a consistent data set.

p0045 Cryogenic Limb Array Etalon Spectrometer (CLAES), Improved Stratospheric and Mesospheric Sounder (ISAMS), and Halogen Occultation Experiment (HALOE) instruments launched on the Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite (UARS) provide additional information for the post-Pinatubo period. These instruments measure the aerosol volume extinction (HALOE) and volume emission (CLAES, ISAMS) in the near-IR and IR bands. These three infrared instruments provide better horizontal coverage than SAGE but do not penetrate lower than the 100 hPa level. They started operating in September 1991. CLAES and ISAMS stopped working after 20 months. The SAGE III instrument aboard the Russian Meteor III-3M satellite continued the outstanding SAGE aerosol data record [33,34] from 2001 to 2007. The new Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) and Multiangle Imaging SpectroRadiometer (MISR) instruments have superior spatial and spectral resolutions but mostly focus on the tropospheric aerosols and surface characteristics, providing column average observations.

p0050 Available satellite and ground-based observations were used to construct volcanic aerosol spatiotemporal distribution and optical properties [2,35–40]. Hansen [38] improved a Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) volcanic aerosols data set for 1850–1999, providing zonal mean vertically resolved aerosol optical depth for visible wavelength and column average effective radii. Amman et al. [35] developed a similar data set of total aerosol optical depth based on evaluated atmospheric loadings distributed employing a seasonally varying diffusion-type parameterization that also could be used for paleoclimate applications (if aerosol loadings are available). Amman et al. [35], however, used a fixed effective radius of 0.42 μm for calculating aerosol optical properties and, in general, provided higher values of optical depth than in Hansen [38]. Stenchikov et al. [40] used UARS observations to modified effective radii from Hansen [38], implementing its variations with altitude, especially at the top of the aerosol layer where particles became very small. They conducted Mie calculations for the entire period since 1850 and implemented these aerosol characteristics in the new Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (GFDL) climate model. The sensitivity calculations with different effective radii show that total optical depth varies as much as 20% when effective radius changes are in the reasonable range. The study of Bauman et al. [36,37] provides a new approach for calculating aerosol optical characteristics using SAGE and UARS data. Bingen et al. [41,42] have calculated stratospheric aerosols size distribution parameters using SAGE II data. A new partly reconstructed and partly hypothesized climate forcing time series for 500 years, which includes greenhouse gas (GHG) and volcanic effects, was developed by Robertson et al. [43].

2. AEROSOL LOADING, SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION AND RADIATIVE EFFECT 423

p0055 Aerosol optical properties include aerosol optical depth (see Fig. 1), single scattering albedo (to characterize aerosol absorptivity) and asymmetry parameter (to define the scattering anisotropy). Using these aerosol radiative characteristics one can evaluate aerosol radiative effect on climate system – aerosol radiative forcing at the top of the atmosphere. Fig. 2 shows the total forcing and its short-wave (SW) and long-wave (LW) components. Increase of reflected SW radiation ranges from 3 W m^{-2} to 5 W m^{-2} but is compensated by aerosol absorption of outgoing LW radiation, so total maximum cooling of the system ranges from 2 W m^{-2} to 3 W m^{-2} .

f0015 **FIGURE 2**

Volcanic aerosol total, short-wave (SW) and long-wave (LW) radiative forcing (W m^{-2}) at the top of the atmosphere for all-sky conditions. Positive sign of the forcing corresponds to heating the climate system.

p0060 Unfortunately, the above ‘empirical’ estimates of radiative forcing carry some level of uncertainty due to insufficient observations of aerosol optical properties, their spatial distribution and aerosol abundance. This hampers our ability to assess climate perturbations from volcanic impacts and quantify the associated important climate mechanisms. During the period since 2009, when the first edition of this book was published, a few attempts were made to improve this input information.

424 CHAPTER 26 THE ROLE OF VOLCANIC ACTIVITY IN CLIMATE AND GLOBAL CHANGE

- p0065 Arfeuille et al. [44] used an improved ‘gap-filled’ SAGE II Version 6 aerosol product [33] to calculate volcanic aerosol characteristics after the 1991 Pinatubo eruption. They compared several approaches of calculating aerosol optical characteristics including that proposed by Stenchikov et al. [2], and built an aerosol data set with high vertical resolution that captures fine structures missing from the data set constructed in Stenchikov et al. [2]. However, they failed to conserve the observed total aerosol optical depth in their calculations and did not provide the aerosol radiative forcing for comparison. Their general circulation model (GCM) calculations, using these data, significantly overestimated the stratospheric temperature responses. This once more emphasizes the difficulties of building precalculated aerosol data sets and the limitations of existing observations.
- p0070 Another approach, which potentially could shed light on the physical mechanisms governing the development of volcanic plumes and help to resolve some of the problems, is based on GCM simulations interactively accounting for the development of the stratospheric volcanic aerosol layer [45–50].
- p0075 Timmreck et al. [49], Oman et al. [48] and Aquila et al. [45] used so-called ‘bulk’ aerosol models when they calculated SO₂ to sulphate conversion and tracked their bulk concentration. The aerosol size distributions were prescribed and optical properties were precalculated. This approach provided a spatiotemporal evolution of an aerosol cloud that is in reasonable agreement with observations; e.g. it showed that on their way to the pole a significant amount of volcanic aerosols are deposited in the midlatitude storm tracks [51], despite the widespread belief that they mostly subside to the pole troposphere in the downward branches of the Brewer–Dobson circulation. Aquila et al. [45], in the NASA GEOS-5 GCM, specifically studied the effect of aerosol radiative feedback on dispersion of the aerosol cloud after the Pinatubo eruption. Their simulations exhibited quite realistic features although underestimated transport of the aerosol plume into the southern hemisphere. They found that aerosol has been transported from the equatorial reservoir to the north through a lower stratospheric pathway and to the southern hemisphere through a middle stratosphere pathway.
- p0080 Next in their physical complexity and computational efficiency, modal aerosol models approximate the aerosol number-density distributions with a few log-normal modes with the prescribed width and varying modal radii, accounting for coagulation, condensation growth and size-dependent gravitational settling [47,50].
- p0085 Niemeier et al. [47] used the Max Planck for Meteorology (MAECHAM5) model to calculate responses to the Pinatubo and hypothetical 10x Pinatubo eruptions accounting both for sulphate and ash aerosols. They were able to obtain fairly realistic spatiotemporal evolution of volcanic cloud and aerosol size distribution. Because of strong absorption, ash increases stratospheric heating by 20 K d⁻¹ (where d refers to day) within the ash layer and has a strong impact at the initial stage of the volcanic cloud evolution during the first month after the eruption. But large ash particles rapidly subside, separate from the sulphate layer and do not significantly affect the long-term evolution of a volcanic plume.
- p0090 The aerosol sectional microphysical models are the most accurate but computationally demanding. English et al. [46] simulated the Pinatubo, hypothetical 10x Pinatubo and Toba (100x Pinatubo) eruptions employing the Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model (WACCM [52]) coupled with the aerosol microphysical module based on the sectional Community Aerosol and Radiation Model for Atmospheres (CARMA [53]), which is assumed to be the best available tool for microphysical calculation within a general circulation model. This is a remarkable exercise despite that they did not account for the radiative effect of aerosols on the atmospheric circulation. This supposedly produces a

moderate effect for the Pinatubo-size eruption but is crucially important for the Toba super-eruption case [54]. We therefore focus here on the simulation of the Pinatubo eruption, especially because this could teach us of the model deficiencies, as the results could be compared with observations. It appears that WACCM/CARMA were able to quite reliably describe the building of the Pinatubo aerosol layer and predicted correct timing when particles reach maximum size in about six months after the eruption, but overestimate the rate of decline of the particle size during the following three years. This could be an effect of neglecting aerosol radiative feedback on circulation, lack of interactive quasi-biannual oscillation (QBO), or caused by a too fast poleward aerosol transport, which is a known deficiency of the relatively coarse resolution GCMs [48]. The total optical depth, which is most important for assessing a volcanic climate impact, shows similar features picking the correct time but declining too rapidly. The model overestimates the descent of the aerosol equatorial reservoir, decreasing the altitudes at which most of the aerosol is transported to poles. The simulated volcanic plume in the southern hemisphere is weaker than observed. The model overestimates the optical depth at 1.024 μm and places too much aerosols in high latitudes where they deposit more rapidly. Overall, despite exiting achievements on the way of interactive simulation of volcanic plumes, they are still far from producing completely reliable results.

s0020 3. VOLCANOES AND CLIMATE

p0095 The perturbations of the Earth's radiative balance caused by strong volcanic eruptions dominate other forcings for two to three years. Their effect is seen in the atmosphere for about five to seven years, and, as was recently discovered, for much longer in oceans [55–60]. Volcanic perturbations have been used for years as natural experiments to test models and to study climate sensitivity and feedback mechanisms. Many of these studies have focused on simulating the aftermath of the Mt. Pinatubo eruption in the Philippines at 15.1°N, 120.4°E in June 1991 that was both the largest eruption of the twentieth century and the eruption for which the stratospheric aerosol has been best observed [61–67]. During this eruption about 17 Tg (17×10^{12} g) of SO₂ were injected into the lower stratosphere and subsequently converted into sulphate aerosols. There are three main foci of such studies addressed in the present study: analysis of the simulation of atmospheric temperature and precipitation response; simulation of the response of the extratropical circulation in the northern hemisphere (NH) winter season; and, as recently emerged, analysis of volcanic impact on ocean.

p0100 The use of volcanic simulations as tests of model climate feedback and sensitivity is somewhat hampered by weather and climate fluctuations because any climate anomalies observed in the aftermath of these eruptions will also reflect other internally generated variability in the atmosphere-ocean system (e.g. El Niño/Southern Oscillation (ENSO), si-biennial oscillation (QBO), or chaotic weather changes). Due to limited observations one has se models to better understand the physical processes forced in the climate system by volcanic impacts. With model simulations, one can perform multiple realizations to clearly isolate the volcanic climate signal, but the real-world data are limited to the single realization during the period since quasi-global instrumental records have been available.

p0105 Models of different complexity were traditionally used to analyze volcanic climate impacts. Those models might simplify description of atmospheric and/or ocean processes [68] or mimic radiative effect of volcanic aerosol by decreasing of solar constant [69]. In the present study, to illustrate mechanisms of volcanic impacts on climate, a comprehensive coupled climate model, CM2.1, is used. Developed at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA)

426 CHAPTER 26 THE ROLE OF VOLCANIC ACTIVITY IN CLIMATE AND GLOBAL CHANGE

Geophysical Fluid Dynamic Laboratory (GFDL), CM2.1 was used in the IPCC AR4 study [56,70]. This model calculates both atmosphere and ocean, and accounts interactively for volcanic aerosol radiative forcing. It is composed of four component models: atmosphere, land, sea ice and ocean. The coupling between the component models occurs at 2-h intervals. The atmospheric model has a grid spacing of 2.5° longitude by 2° latitude and 24 vertical levels. The dynamical core is based on the finite volume scheme of Lin [71]. The model contains a completely updated suite of model physics compared to the previous GFDL climate model, including new cloud prediction and boundary layer schemes, and diurnally varying solar insolation. The radiation code allows for explicit treatment of numerous radiatively important trace gases (including tropospheric and stratospheric ozone, halocarbons etc.), a variety of natural and anthropogenic aerosols (including black carbon, organic carbon, tropospheric sulphate aerosols and volcanic aerosols), and dust particles. Aerosols in the model do not interact with the cloud scheme, so that indirect aerosol effects on climate are not considered. The land model is described in Milly and Shmakin [72]. Surface water is routed instantaneously to ocean destination points on the basis of specified drainage basins. The land cover type in the model uses a classification scheme with 10 different land cover types. The ocean model [73,74] has a nominal grid spacing of 1° in latitude and longitude, with meridional grid spacing decreasing in the tropics to $1/3^\circ$ near the equator, and uses a tripolar grid to avoid polar filtering over the Arctic. The model has 50 vertical levels, including 22 levels with 10-m thickness each in the top 220 m. A novel aspect is the use of a true freshwater-flux boundary condition. The sea ice model is a dynamical model with three vertical layers and five ice thickness categories. It uses the elastic-viscous-plastic rheology to calculate ice internal stresses, and a modified Semtner three-layer scheme for thermodynamics [75]. The aerosol optical characteristics were calculated following Stenchikov et al. [2] using optical depth from Sato et al. [39] and Hansen [38]. The aerosol size distribution was assumed lognormal with fixed width of $1.8 \mu\text{m}$ [40].

p0110 In this study, various volcanic impacts on climate are illustrated using results from the model experiments and available observations. In each case, twin ensembles of volcano and control runs are conducted, and the response of the climate system calculated to volcanic forcing as the ensemble mean over the volcano runs minus the ensemble mean over the control runs. The variability within ensembles is used to estimate the statistical significance of climate signals.

s0025 3.1 TROPOSPHERIC COOLING AND STRATOSPHERIC WARMING

p0115 The analysis for the Pinatubo case is easier than for other big eruptions because aerosols were well observed and the climate responses were relatively well documented. However, Pinatubo erupted in an El Niño year and both volcanic and SST effects overlapped at least in the troposphere. ENSO events that occurred near the times of volcanic eruptions could either mask or enhance the volcanic signal. Adams et al. [76] even argued that changing atmospheric circulation caused by volcanic eruptions could cause El Niño. Santer et al. [77] conducted a comprehensive analysis of the ENSO effect on the modelled and observed global temperature trends. Shindell et al. [4] addressed the issue of interfering volcanic and ENSO signals by specific sampling of eruptions so the SST signal will average out in the composite. Yang and Schlesinger [78,79] used singular value decomposition (SVD) analysis to separate spatial patterns of the ENSO and volcanic signals in the model simulations and observations. They showed that ENSO signal is relatively weak over Eurasia but strong over North America, contributing about 50% of the responses after the 1991 Mt. Pinatubo eruption.

p0120 The ENSO variability issue is addressed in the present study by comparing simulated and observed responses after extracting the El Niño contribution from the tropospheric temperature. Santer et al. [77] developed an iterative regression procedure to separate a volcanic effect from an El Niño signal using microwave sounding unit (MSU) brightness temperature observations from the lower tropospheric channel 2LT [80]. The globally averaged synthetic 2LT temperature for the Pinatubo ensemble runs is calculated using model output and compared with the response from Santer et al. [77]. The simulated anomaly is calculated with respect to the mean over the corresponding control segments that have the same developing El Niños as in the perturbed runs. It is probably an ideal way to remove the El Niño effect from the simulations because the exact El Niño signal that would have developed in the model if the volcanic eruption did not occur is subtracted. This procedure, however, only works well for the initial El Niño when perturbed runs ‘remember’ their oceanic initial conditions. Fig. 3 shows a comparison of synthetic ENSO-subtracted anomaly with the observed anomaly from Santer et al. [77] with ENSO removed statistically. Yellow shading shows doubled standard deviation variability for the 10-member ensemble mean. The observed MSU 2LT anomaly itself has much higher variability (not shown) because there is only one natural realization. Thus, the simulated Pinatubo signal in the lower tropospheric temperature reaches -0.7 K; it is statistically significant at 99% confidence level, and the

f0020 **FIGURE 3**

The observed Lower Tropospheric MSU 2LT temperature anomaly (K) caused by the Pinatubo eruption from Santer et al. [77] with ENSO effect removed, and the simulated synthetic 2LT ensemble mean temperature anomaly (K) calculated from the Pinatubo ensemble with the El Niño 1991 effect removed; yellow (light grey in print versions) shading shows $\pm 2\sigma$ ensemble mean variability.

difference between simulated and observed responses is below the variability range. The lower tropospheric temperature anomaly reduces below the noise level in about seven years, which corresponds approximately to the thermal response time of the ocean mixed layer [81].

p0125

For the lower stratosphere, a similar comparison was conducted as for the lower troposphere, but without removing ENSO because its effect in the lower stratosphere is fairly small. However, the stratospheric response to volcanic forcing might be affected by the phase of a QBO [7,82]. Fig. 4 compares the simulated synthetic MSU channel 4 temperature for the lower stratosphere with the MSU 4 observations. The stratospheric warming is produced by aerosol IR and near-IR absorption. Ramaswamy et al. [83] discussed that the MSU lower stratospheric temperature tends to level in a few years after the Pinatubo eruption; therefore we calculate the anomalies in Fig. 4 with respect to the 1994–1999 mean both in the model and in the observation. The yellow shading shows the $\pm 2\sigma$ ensemble mean variability. The simulated signal compares well with the observation albeit slightly overestimates the stratospheric warming in the second year after the eruption. In the real world, the observed signal could be offset by the easterly phase of QBO in 1992/1993 but not in the model, which lacks QBO. The atmospheric response in the lower stratosphere follows the volcanic forcing and disappears in three years, as expected, when volcanic radiative forcing vanishes.

f0025

FIGURE 4

The observed MSU 4 Lower Stratospheric temperature anomaly (K) caused by the Pinatubo eruption, and the simulated synthetic channel 4 ensemble mean temperature anomaly (K) calculated from the Pinatubo ensemble; yellow (light grey in print versions) shading shows $\pm 2\sigma$ ensemble mean variability.

s0030 3.2 EFFECT ON HYDROLOGICAL CYCLE

p0130 Precipitation is more sensitive to variations of solar short-wave radiation than thermal IR radiation because SW radiation directly affects the surface energy budget and links to global precipitation changes through evaporation. Therefore, one could expect that volcanic aerosols might decrease global precipitation for the period of two to three years when volcanic SW radiative forcing remains significant. This effect was detected in observations [84] and in model simulations [85,86]. The Pinatubo case study analysis shows that in the ensemble mean results the global precipitation anomalies (Fig. 5) could be seen for almost five to six years because ocean cools and sea surface temperature (SST) relaxes for about seven years and affects the global hydrologic cycle. The precipitation anomalies over land and over ocean have different dynamics. The land precipitation drops during the first year because of rapid land radiative cooling. The ocean cooling and decrease of precipitation over ocean are delayed and reach maximum values in three to four years after the eruption when the sea surface temperature is coldest. The cold SST tends to shift precipitation over land and the land precipitation goes up, compensating in part the decrease of precipitation over ocean. Geographically, the precipitation anomalies are located in low-latitude monsoon regions and could cause significant disruptions of food production in those regions with very high population density. It must be emphasized that ENSO contributes significantly to the observed precipitation anomalies. When ENSO signal is removed in the model results the amplitude of the precipitation anomalies significantly decreases although temporal behaviour does not change qualitatively.

f0030 **FIGURE 5**

[AU7] Plot of the ensemble mean precipitation anomaly in (mm d⁻¹) against time caused by the Pinatubo eruption averaged over ocean, land and globally, calculated with respect to a climatological mean.

430 CHAPTER 26 THE ROLE OF VOLCANIC ACTIVITY IN CLIMATE AND GLOBAL CHANGE

p0135 Joseph and Zeng [87] employed a coupled atmosphere-ocean-land-vegetation model of intermediate complexity to study the volcanic aerosol effect on tropical precipitation. They found that the precipitation response over the ocean is slower and weaker than over the land due to the ocean's larger thermal capacity. This land/ocean difference in thermal capacities generates a temperature contrast during the relaxation process that affects precipitation. However, in their model this leads to reduction of rainfall in tropical regions for about two years after an eruption. In contrast with these results, Anchukaitis et al. [88] used well-validated proxy reconstructions of Asian droughts and pluvials to reveal significantly wetter conditions in the year of an eruption over mainland southeast Asia and drier conditions in central Asia. A recent study [89] employed both the model output and observations to examine robust features of the global precipitation response. In agreement with our results they found that the response over oceans remains significant for five years (compare with Fig. 5). The response over land declines in three years. In the tropics, climatologically wet regions become drier, and climatologically dry regions become wetter.

s0035 3.3 VOLCANIC EFFECT ON ATMOSPHERIC CIRCULATION

p0140 In the two years following major eruptions, the NH winter tropospheric circulation has typically been observed to display features characteristic of an anomalously positive AO index situation. This has a zonal-mean expression with low pressure at high latitudes and a ring of anomalously high pressure in the midlatitudes. This basic zonal-mean pattern is modulated by a very strong regional structure with an intensified high-pressure anomaly over the North Atlantic and Mediterranean sectors called North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO). Consistent with this are poleward shifts in the Atlantic storm track and an increased flow of warm air to Northern Europe and Asia, where anomalously high winter surface temperatures are observed [7,8,40]. It seems that only low-latitude volcanic eruptions could affect the AO/NAO phase and the AO/NAO remain fairly insensitive to the high-latitude NH eruptions [90].

p0145 The mechanisms that govern the climate response to volcanic impacts very likely play an important role in global climate change [4,40,91]. The northern polar circulation modes (NAO/AO) experienced significant climate variations during the recent two decades and also are sensitive to volcanic forcing. The southern annular mode (SAM similar to AO) shows recently a very significant climate trend but is not sensitive to volcanic forcing [92]. Supposedly, dynamics of the annular mode in the southern hemisphere are different than in the northern hemisphere and, to a great extent, are controlled by ocean processes and stratospheric ozone variations. In the present study, discussion is limited to NAO/AO.

p0150 The most robust effect on atmospheric temperature produced by volcanic aerosols is in the lower stratosphere. It is known that low-latitude explosive eruptions produce anomalously warm tropical lower stratospheric conditions and, in the NH winter, an anomalously cold and intense polar vortex. The tropical temperature anomalies at 50 hPa (Fig. 6) are a direct response to the enhanced absorption of terrestrial IR and solar near-IR radiation by the aerosols. The high-latitude winter perturbations at 50 hPa are a dynamical response to the strengthening of the polar vortex or polar night jet. This is due to stronger thermal wind produced by increasing of the equator-to-pole temperature gradient in the lower stratosphere [6,82,93–97].

f0035 **FIGURE 6**

Zonal and ensemble mean stratospheric temperature anomaly (K) at 50 hPa (at about 25 km) calculated with respect to control experiment.

p0155 The strengthening of the polar jet is amplified by a positive feedback between the polar NH winter vortex and vertical propagation of planetary waves. The stronger vortex reflects planetary waves decreasing deceleration and preserving axial symmetry of the flow. Stenchikov et al. [8] also found that tropospheric cooling caused by volcanic aerosols can affect storminess and generation of planetary waves in the troposphere. This tends to decrease the flux of wave activity and negative angular momentum from the troposphere into the polar stratosphere, reducing wave drag on the vortex. To show this, Stenchikov et al. [8] conducted experiments with only solar, mostly tropospheric and surface cooling (no stratospheric warming). In these experiments, a positive phase of the AO was also produced because aerosol-induced tropospheric cooling in the subtropics decreases the meridional temperature gradient in the winter troposphere between 30°N and 60°N. The corresponding reduction of mean zonal energy and amplitudes of planetary waves in the troposphere decreases wave activity flux into the lower stratosphere. The resulting strengthening of the polar vortex forces a positive phase of the AO.

p0160 The high-latitude eruptions cannot warm lower stratosphere, and cannot cool subtropics as much as can low-latitude eruptions. Oman et al. [90] used GISS Model-E to simulate a climate impact of the 1912 Katmai eruption in Alaska. They calculated a 20-member ensemble of simulations and found that [AU5] the volcanic aerosol cloud spread mostly north of 30°N could not produce a significant winter warming pattern even if it produced a higher hemispheric optical depth than that of the 1991 Pinatubo eruption.

432 CHAPTER 26 THE ROLE OF VOLCANIC ACTIVITY IN CLIMATE AND GLOBAL CHANGE

p0165 Stenchikov et al. [8] also partitioned the dynamic effect of polar stratospheric ozone loss, caused by heterogeneous chemistry initiated by volcanic aerosols in the post-Pinatubo period. They found that ozone depletion caused a positive phase of the AO in late winter and early spring by cooling the lower stratosphere in high latitudes, strengthening the polar night jet and delaying the final warming.

p0170 With respect to the dynamical mechanisms through which perturbations of the stratospheric annular circulation can influence tropospheric annular modes, Song and Robinson [98] pointed out that tropospheric westerlies can be strengthened by changes of planetary wave vertical propagation and/or reflection within the stratosphere and associated wave-zonal flow interaction [93,97,99], downward control or the nonlinear effect of baroclinic eddies [100–103]. All these mechanisms could play a role in shaping tropospheric dynamic response to volcanic forcing. The diagram in Fig. 7 schematically shows the processes involved in the AO/NAO sensitivity to volcanic forcing.

f0040 **FIGURE 7**

Schematic diagram depicting how the stratospheric and tropospheric gradient mechanisms are triggered by volcanic aerosol clouds in the tropical stratosphere. The wave feedback mechanism amplifies the response.

p0175 The up-to-date climate models formally include all those processes shown in Fig. 7 but cannot produce the observed amplitude of the AO/NAO variability [40,91]. Shindell et al. [6] reported that the GCM has to well resolve processes in the middle atmosphere in order to reproduce stratospheric influence to the troposphere. Stenchikov et al. [40] composited responses from nine volcanic eruptions using observations and IPCC AR4 model runs. They showed that all models produce a stronger polar vortex in the NH as a response to volcanic forcing but the dynamic signal penetrated to the troposphere is much weaker in the models than in observations. Fig. 8 shows simulations by different models in the course of the IPCC AR4 study, and observed winter warming from Stenchikov et al. [40] that was caused by a poleward shift of tropospheric jet and more intensive transport of heat from ocean to land. The model tends to produce winter warming but significantly underestimates it.

FIGURE 8 Surface winter (December, January, February) air temperature anomalies (K) composited for nine major volcanic eruptions from 1883 until present and averaged for two seasons and all available ensemble members: IPCC AR4 model simulations (a–g); observations from HadCRUT2v data set (h). Hatching shows the areas with at least 90% confidence level calculated using a two-tailed local t-test.

434 CHAPTER 26 THE ROLE OF VOLCANIC ACTIVITY IN CLIMATE AND GLOBAL CHANGE

p0180 It should be mentioned that the dynamic response to volcanic forcing could interact with the QBO that modulates the strength of polar vortex – it weakens and destabilizes the polar vortex in its easterly phase and makes it stronger and more stable in its westerly phase. The Mt. Pinatubo eruption of 1991 again provides a unique opportunity to test this interaction because in the winter of 1991/92 the QBO was in its easterly phase and in the winter of 1992/93 in its westerly phase. Stenchikov et al. [7] developed a version of the SKYHI troposphere-stratosphere-mesosphere model that effectively assimilates observed zonal mean winds in the tropical stratosphere to simulate a very realistic QBO and performed an ensemble of 24 simulations for the period June 1, 1991, to May 31, 1993. The model produced a reasonably realistic representation of the positive AO response in boreal winter that is usually observed after major eruptions. Detailed analysis shows that the aerosol perturbations to the tropospheric winter circulation are affected significantly by the phase of the QBO, with a westerly QBO phase in the lower stratosphere resulting in an enhancement of the aerosol effect on the AO. Improved quantification of the QBO effect on climate sensitivity helps to better understand mechanisms of the stratospheric contribution to natural and externally forced climate variability.

p0185 Driscoll et al. [104] have revisited the Volcano-to-AO connection using model output from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 5 (CMIP5 [105,106]) conducted in the scope of the IPCC AR5 [107,108]. They have analyzed simulations from 13 CMIP5 models that represent tropical eruptions from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and separately sampled the best-observed volcanoes from the second part of the twentieth century. They mentioned that the volcanic aerosol representation did not change significantly since IPCC AR4 [40] and has quite coarse latitudinal resolution in the number of models. The general findings for new CMIP5 simulations are quite similar to those formulated in Boer et al. [9]. The new models are generally unable to produce the observed strength of the volcanic ‘winter warming’ effect. They underestimate the strength of the post-volcanic polar vortex and tend to overestimate the cooling of the tropical troposphere. The latter suggests that volcanic forcing in the current models is at its upper bound and could not be blamed for insufficient dynamic response in the high latitudes. The reason is probably model deficiencies that have yet to be rectified.

s0040 3.4 VOLCANIC IMPACT ON OCEAN HEAT CONTENT AND SEA LEVEL

p0190 The Earth’s oceans comprise almost the entire thermal capacity of the climate system. Their thermal inertia delays full-scale response of the Earth’s surface temperature to greenhouse warming [109]. The rate at which heat accumulates in oceans is an important characteristic of global warming and ultimately defines a climate transient sensitivity (e.g. [110]). It is a complex process that involves slow energy diffusion and large-scale transport in meridional overturning circulation (MOC), as well as faster vertical mixing by seasonal thermohaline convection and by wind-driven gyres.

p0195 Observations and model simulations show that the ocean warming effect of the relatively steadily developing anthropogenic forcings is offset by the sporadic cooling caused by major explosive volcanic eruptions [55,57,58]. Delworth et al. [56] conducted a series of historic runs from 1860 to 2000 in the framework of the IPCC AR4 study using GFDL CM2.1, and partitioning contributions of different forcings. Fig. 9 shows the ensemble mean ocean heat content anomalies in the 0 m–3000 m depth range for a subset of the runs from Delworth et al. [56], calculated accounting for all the time

varying forcing agents ('ALL') and for volcanic and solar forcings only ('NATURAL'). However, the solar effect for this period is small compared to the volcanic effect. The 'ALL' compares well with the Levitus et al. [111] and Willis et al. [112] observations shown in Fig. 9, and, even better, with the improved analyses from Carton and Santorelli [113] and Dominigues et al. [114] (not shown). Both 'ALL' and 'NATURAL' anomalies are highly statistically significant and far exceed the 'CONTROL' variability shown by yellow shading. The cumulative cooling effect of natural forcings reaches 10^{23} J by year 2000, which is right between the estimates obtained by Church et al. [55] and Gleckler et al. [57] who conducted similar analyses, and offsets about one-third of 'ALL' minus 'NATURAL' ocean warming. The volcanic signal exceeds two standard deviations of unforced variability (yellow shading) throughout the entire run since the Krakatau eruption in 1883. This result suggests that the observed frequency and strength of the Earth's explosive volcanism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries [1] was sufficient to produce a 'quasi-permanent' signature in the global oceans. Also, ocean warming (cooling) causes expansion (contraction) of water and therefore affects sea level or, so-called, thermosteric height. This effect comprises a significant portion of the observed contemporary sea level rise.

f0050 **FIGURE 9**

The ensemble mean ocean heat content anomalies in the 0 m–3000 m ocean layer. 'ALL' refers to the ensemble mean calculated with all the time varying forcing agents: well-mixed greenhouse gases, anthropogenic aerosols, stratospheric and tropospheric ozone, land use, solar irradiance and volcanic aerosols. 'NATURAL' refers to the ensemble calculated accounting for volcanic and solar forcings only. The red (dark grey in print versions) and purple (very dark grey in print versions) circles depict observational estimates based on, respectively, over 0 m–3000 m layer [111] and over 0 m–750 m layer [112]. Constant offsets have been added to the observed values so that their means are the same as the model results over the period of overlap. The green (grey in print versions) triangles along the time axes denote the times of major volcanic eruptions. The yellow (light grey in print versions) shading shows plus or minus two standard deviations of ocean heat content estimated from a 2000-year control run of the climate model with forcings fixed at the 1860 level.

p0200 To better quantify volcanic impact on ocean, Stenchikov et al. [59,60] calculated a 10-member ensemble of volcano and control 20-year experiments for the Pinatubo period 1991–2010. They found that in contrast to the atmospheric temperature responses, the ocean heat content and the steric height remain well above noise level for decades. Figs 10 and 11 show anomalies of the global ocean heat content and the steric height for the Pinatubo ensembles calculated for the whole-depth ocean and for the upper 300-m layer. Shading depicts the ‘two-sigma’ ensemble mean variability. The ocean integrates the surface radiative cooling from the volcanic eruption. Since the volcanic aerosols and associated cooling persist for about three years, the anomalies in Figs 10 and 11 reach their maximum value after about this time when the volcanic radiative forcing vanishes. The maximum heat content and sea level decrease in our Pinatubo simulation is 5×10^{22} J and 9 mm, respectively.

p0205 The characteristic time, defined as e-folding time for ocean heat content or steric height, is about 40 years–50 years. Assuming that the complete relaxation requires two to three relaxation times, this might take more than a century, and that length of time is sufficiently long for another strong eruption to happen. Therefore, the ‘volcanic’ cold anomaly in the ocean never disappears at the present frequency of the Earth’s explosive volcanism.

f0055 **FIGURE 10** The global and ensemble mean ocean heat content (10^{22} J) anomaly for 300 m and whole depth ocean for the Pinatubo ensemble calculated with respect to ensemble control.

f0060 **FIGURE 11**

The global and ensemble mean thermosteric height anomalies (mm) for 300 m and whole depth ocean for the Pinatubo ensemble calculated with respect to ensemble control. The labels along the x-axis and y-axis should appear as Level/mm and Time/years, respectively.

s0045 3.5 STRENGTHENING THE OVERTURNING CIRCULATION

p0210 The short-wave cooling from volcanic aerosol results in a cold surface temperature anomaly that develops during the first three years until volcanic aerosols vanish. Cold surface water is gradually transferred into the deeper ocean layers. A volcanically induced cooling leads to reduced precipitation and river runoff at high latitudes of the northern hemisphere, thereby leading to more saline (and hence denser) upper ocean conditions in the higher latitudes of the NH. Both these factors (colder ocean temperature and enhanced salinity) destabilize the water column, making them more prone to ocean convection. The increased ocean convection tends to enhance the MOC. Further, an enhanced positive phase of the Arctic Oscillation also leads to an MOC increase [115].

p0215 As a result, the meridional overturning circulation increases in response to the volcanic forcing (see Fig. 12). The maximum increase is 1.8 Sv or about 10% (here Sv refers to Sverdrup and $1 \text{ Sv} = 10^6 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$). The MOC has inherent decadal timescales of adjustment and is thus maximum at some 5 years–15 years after the volcanic eruptions. An increase in MOC also could cause in part the asymmetry of the ocean temperature response in the high northern and southern latitudes.

p0220 The simulations show a tendency for cooling of the deepwaters in the Southern Ocean and warming in the deepwaters of the Northern Ocean. This asymmetry also could be caused in part by the redistribution of ocean salinity, the forced positive phase of the Arctic Oscillation during a few years following a volcanic eruption, and by a significant increase of sea ice extent and volume in the northern hemisphere.

f0065 **FIGURE 12**
The five-year means MOC anomalies (Sverdrup Sv) from the Pinatubo ensemble averaged zonally over Atlantic basin (a–d) and over the globe (e–h).

s0050 **3.6 VOLCANIC IMPACT ON SEA ICE**

p0225 The effect of volcanic forcing on the sea ice extent in the NH is of great interest because significant loss of perennial sea ice under global warming is occurring in the NH. Therefore, it is very important to better understand what factors could affect them most. Figs 13 and 14 show the anomaly of the northern hemispheric mean annual maximum and minimum ice extent and mass for the Pinatubo runs. The maximum sea ice extent anomalies reach $0.6 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$ in the Pinatubo run – it takes at least five years to develop. So, sea ice extent responds more strongly not to the radiative forcing but to ocean temperature and circulation. The sea ice extent relaxes to zero for a decade. It must be mentioned that both observed and simulated ice extent anomalies are not statistically significant, though in simulations they exceed one standard deviation. The minimum ice extent is more sensitive to radiative cooling and ocean temperature, therefore its anomaly is stronger than the anomaly of the maximum ice extent reaching $0.9 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$. It builds up in three years when the strongest ocean cooling develops and then declines for about 10 years.

f0070 **FIGURE 13**
The northern hemisphere anomalies of maximum and minimum ice extent (10^6 km^2) for the Pinatubo ensemble.

f0075 **FIGURE 14**

The northern hemisphere anomalies of maximum and minimum ice mass (10^{15} kg) for the Pinatubo ensemble.

p0230 Ding et al. [116] examined output from eight CMIP5 models to test the findings, discussed above in this section, which were based on our own simulations [59,60] from one particular model. It appears that the results from the CMIP5 project are largely consistent with Stenchikov et al. [59,60]. Ding et al. [116] considered 36 historic simulations for the period that includes the largest eruptions of Krakatau, Santa Maria, Agung, El Chichon and Pinatubo in the last 135 years. The list of models included in the comparison comprises:

- u0010 The National Centre for Atmospheric Research Community Climate System Model, version 4 (CCSM4)
- u0015 Three GFDL models including Climate Model version 3 (CM3), the Earth System Model with MOM4.1 ocean component (ESM2M), and the Earth System Model that uses the Generalized Ocean Layered Dynamics isopycnal coordinate ocean model (ESM2G)
- u0020 Two Hadley Centre models: The Hadley Centre coupled model version 3 (HadCM3) and the Hadley Centre Global Environmental model version 2 – Earth System (HadGEM2-ES)
- u0025 The Max Planck Institute – Earth System Model – Low Resolution (MPI-ESM-LR) known as ECHAM6
- u0030 The Japanese Meteorological Research Institute Coupled General Circulation Model version 3 (MRI-CGCM3)

p0260 Ding et al. [116] found that all models consistently show an annual average reduction of the surface incoming solar radiation by 1 W m^{-2} – 5 W m^{-2} . The global sea surface temperature decreases by 0.1 K–0.3 K. The cool SST signal penetrates in the deep ocean, decreasing temperature in the upper 1000-m layer by roughly 0.03 K. Sea ice extent and mass grow by 5%. Both the deep-ocean and sea ice anomalies persist per decades. Most of the models show strengthening of AMOC with respect to volcanic forcing. The models with the larger AMOC variability (ESM2M, ESM2G, CM3, MPI-ESM-LR, MRI-CGCM3) exhibit the highest AMOC sensitivity. ESM2M and ESM2G are the only models that show warming of the subsurface ocean in the high northern latitudes associated with the strengthening of ocean convection due to increasing salinity.

p0265 Iwi et al. [117] also found that change of hydrological cycle and increase of salinity in the high northern latitudes, caused by a volcanic impact, is a driving mechanism of the AMOC intensification. Ottera et al. [118] suggested that volcanic impacts could even synchronize the long-term AMOC variability. Gregory et al. [119] stressed the importance of accounting for preindustrial volcanic forcing to correctly estimate the historical ocean thermal expansion. Balmaseda et al. [120] analyzed ocean heat content (OHC) for the period of 1958–2009 using the improved European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecast ocean reanalysis system 4 (ORAS4 [121]). They report the magnitude of volcanic impacts on OHC that is consistent with our model results and emphasized the role of the deeper ocean layers below 700 m in overall ocean heat uptake and its variability.

s0055 3.7 EFFECT OF SMALL VOLCANOES, CLIMATE HIATUS AND GEOENGINEERING ANALOGUES

p0270 Since the first edition of this book in 2009 two new topics have emerged that have stimulated significant interest and that require more accurate reassessment of climate, microphysical, chemical, and radiative impact of volcanoes of different magnitudes. These topics are of great societal and scientific importance and well deserve a separate full-scale discussion, which is not exactly relevant to the main subject of the current chapter, but we find it useful to briefly mention them in order to put their recent debates in the context of the processes and physical mechanisms discussed here.

p0275 The first topic is related to so-called ‘climate hiatus’ – the observed slowing of global warming since about 2000, despite continued emission of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere [122]. The suggested mechanisms include natural variability associated with increased ocean heat uptake [120,123] and cooling forced by small volcanic eruptions [124–127]. The latter refers to eruptions of Kasatochi in August of 2008, Sarychev in June 2009 and Nabro in June 2011. They were the most significant recent events, however, 15–20 times weaker than Pinatubo. Scaling the observed tropospheric response to Pinatubo (see Fig. 3) we can expect that their maximum global tropospheric cooling effect should not exceed 0.03 K–0.04 K, which is below the natural variability level. More accurate calculations using global models gave estimates ranging from 0.07 K [124,127] to 0.02 K [125]. Therefore, despite that these signals could be detected using a rectified statistical technique [126], it is unlikely that small volcanic eruptions of the twenty-first century could be a primary cause of the climate hiatus.

p0280 The second topic is related to solar geoengineering that has been suggested to reduce damage from the anthropogenic climate change [128,129]. Here we solely focus on the technique that is based on deliberate SO_2 injection into the stratosphere. Similarly to volcanic eruptions, SO_2 will be oxidized to produce a permanent sulphate aerosol cloud that reflects solar radiation and therefore diminishes the

442 CHAPTER 26 THE ROLE OF VOLCANIC ACTIVITY IN CLIMATE AND GLOBAL CHANGE

warming effect of greenhouse gases. This technique is economically and technically quite feasible and has an important advantage above other proposed schemes, as volcanic eruptions provide a natural analogue that helps to better understand and predict possible side effects (e.g. [130–132]). Therefore, understanding of all aspects of stratospheric aerosol microphysics [133], impact on chemical composition [134,135] of the stratosphere, stratospheric circulation [45,136], and tropospheric climate [137–139], which we gain from investigating climate consequences of volcanic eruptions, could be and should be employed for a feasibility assessment of solar geoengineering schemes. The analogy of geoengineering with volcanic eruptions is not complete as it is assumed that the geoengineered stratospheric aerosol layer will provide a quasi-permanent radiative forcing unlike sporadic volcanic forcing. But, similar to volcanic studies, the effect of this forcing on atmospheric circulation, hydrological cycle and ocean heat uptake is of primary interest.

s0060 4. SUMMARY

p0285 Volcanic eruptions force all elements of the climate system, producing long-term climate signals in ocean. In the atmosphere, however, volcanic signals are masked by meteorological noise in about seven years in the model ensembles and much earlier in the real world. Radiative forcing produced by explosive volcanic events that have occurred in historic periods lasts for about three years. The volcanically induced tropospheric temperature anomalies reduce below noise for approximately seven years. The sea ice responds on the decadal time scale. Deep ocean temperature, sea level, salinity and MOC have relaxation times of several decades to a century. Volcanic eruptions produce long-term impacts on the ocean's subsurface temperature and steric height that accumulate at the current frequency of explosive volcanic events. The vertical distribution of the ocean temperature change signal is asymmetric at high latitudes. A cooling signal penetrates to depth at high southern latitudes, while a warming signal penetrates to depth at high latitudes of the northern hemisphere. This asymmetry is caused in part by an increase in MOC. The decrease of ocean steric height in our simulations, caused by the Pinatubo eruption, reaches 9 mm in comparison with 5 mm estimated by Church et al. [55] from observations. The ocean heat content decreases by 5×10^{22} J. The maximum sea ice extent and ice mass increases in the Pinatubo are of the order of 0.5×10^6 km and 21.0×10^{15} kg, respectively. This corresponds to 3% and 5% of the model 'control' maximum extent and mass in the Pinatubo runs. The simulated minimum ice extent is more sensitive to volcanic forcing than the maximum ice extent. The Atlantic MOC strengthens in the Pinatubo runs very significantly by 1.8 Sv or 9% of its maximum value.

p0290 Atmospheric temperature anomalies forced by the Pinatubo eruption in the troposphere and lower stratosphere are well reproduced by the models. However, forced AO/NAO responses are underestimated and observed sea level and ocean heat content anomalies are overestimated by all models. Nevertheless, all model results and observations suggest that volcanoes could produce long-lasting impact on ocean heat content and thermosteric level that, in fact, could affect estimates of current climate trends. The quasi-periodic nature of volcanic cooling facilitates ocean vertical mixing and might have an important effect on the thermal structure of the deep ocean. Therefore, it has to be realistically implemented in climate models for calculating 'quasi-equilibrium' initial conditions, climate reconstructions and for future climate projections.

p0295 From our evidence the volcanic activity for the historic period has cooled climate and delayed the ocean heat content growth, which is the most robust signature of the Earth's global warming, by about

30%. The relatively weak explosive volcanism of the twenty-first century is unlikely to cause any significant climate effect and would not be considered as a primary cause of the climate hiatus observed in the recent decade that is, most probably, associated with natural climate variability.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Simkin, *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* 21 (1993) 427–452.
- [2] G.L. Stenchikov, I. Kirchner, A. Robock, H.-F. Graf, J.C. Antuña, R.G. Grainger, A. Lambert, L. Thomason, *J. Geophys. Res.* 103 (1998) 13837–13857.
- [3] M. Collins, Volcanism and the earth's atmosphere, in: A. Robock, C. Oppenheimer (Eds.), *Predictions of Climate Following Volcanic Eruptions*, American Geophysical Union, Washington, DC, 2003, pp. 283–300.
- [4] D. Shindell, G. Schmidt, M. Mann, G. Faluvegi, *J. Geophys. Res.* 109 (2004) D05104.
- [5] D. Shindell, G. Schmidt, R. Miller, M. Mann, *J. Clim.* 16 (2003) 4094–4107.
- [6] D.T. Shindell, G.A. Schmidt, R.L. Miller, D. Rind, *J. Geophys. Res.* 106 (2001) 7193–7210.
- [7] G. Stenchikov, K. Hamilton, A. Robock, V. Ramaswamy, M.D. Schwarzkopf, *J. Geophys. Res.* 109 (2004) D03112.
- [8] G. Stenchikov, A. Robock, V. Ramaswamy, M.D. Schwarzkopf, K. Hamilton, S. Ramachandran, *J. Geophys. Res.* 107 (2002) 4803.
- [9] G.J. Boer, M. Stowasser, K. Hamilton, *Clim. Dyn.* 28 (2007) 481–502.
- [10] B.J. Soden, R.T. Wetherald, G.L. Stenchikov, A. Robock, *Science* 296 (2002) 727–730.
- [11] T.M.L. Wigley, C.M. Ammann, B.D. Santer, S.C.B. Raper, *J. Geophys. Res.* 110 (2005) D09107.
- [12] M.L. Asaturov, M.I. Budyko, K.Y. Vinnikov, P.Y. Groisman, A.S. Kabanov, I.L. Karol, M.P. Kolomeev, Z.I. Pivovarova, E.V. Rozanov, S.S. Khmelevtsov, *Volcanic Stratospheric Aerosols and Climate* (In Russian), Gidrometeoizdat, St. Petersburg, Russia, 1986, pp. 256.
- [13] H.W. Elsaesser, *Isolating the Climatologic Effects of Volcanoes*. Report UCRL-89161, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, 1983.
- [14] K.Y. Kondratyev, *Volcanoes and Climate*. WCP-54, WMO/TD-166, World Meteorol. Org., Geneva, 1988.
- [15] K.Y. Kondratyev, I. Galindo, in: A. Deepak (Ed.), *Volcanic Activity and Climate*, 1997. Hampton, VA, pp. 382.
- [16] H.H. Lamb, *Philos. Trans. R Soc. London Ser. A* 266 (1970) 425–533.
- [17] A. Robock, *Rev. Geophys.* 38 (2000) 191–219.
- [18] O.B. Toon, NASA conference publication 2240, in: A. Deepak (Ed.), *Volcanoes and climate*, in *Atmospheric Effects and Potential Climatic Impact of the 1980 Eruptions of Mount St. Helens*, 1982, pp. 15–36.
- [19] O.B. Toon, J.B. Pollack, *Am. Sci.* 68 (1980) 268–278.
- [20] C. Timmreck, *WIREs Clim. Change* 3 (2012) 545–564.
- [21] M.F. Gerstell, J. Crisp, D. Crisp, *J. Clim.* 8 (1995) 1060–1070.
- [22] D.J. Lary, M. Balluch, S. Bekki, Q. J. R Meteorol. Soc. 120 (1994) 1683–1688.
- [23] W. Zhong, J. Haigh, R. Toumi, S. Bekki, Q. J. R Meteorol. Soc. 122 (1996) 1459–1466.
- [24] D. Budner, J. Cole-Dai, Volcanism and the earth's Atmosphere, in: A. Robock, C. Oppenheimer (Eds.), *The Number and Magnitudes of Large Explosive Volcanic Eruptions between 904 and 1865 A.D.: Quantitative Evidence from a New South Pole Ice Core*, American Geophysical Union, Washington, DC, 2003, pp. 165–176.
- [25] E. Mosley-Thompson, T.A. Mashiotto, L.G. Thompson, Volcanism and the earth's atmosphere, in: A. Robock, C. Oppenheimer (Eds.), *High Resolution Ice Core Records of Late Holocene Volcanism: Current and Future Contributions from the Greenland PARCA Cores*, American Geophysical Union, Washington, DC, 2003, pp. 153–164.

444 CHAPTER 26 THE ROLE OF VOLCANIC ACTIVITY IN CLIMATE AND GLOBAL CHANGE

- [26] K. Yalcin, C. Wake, M. Germani, J. Geophys. Res. 107 (2002) 4012.
- [27] A.J. Krueger, S.J. Schaefer, N.A. Krotkov, G. Bluth, S. Barker, Geophys. Monogr. 116 (2000) 25–43.
- [28] A. Prata, W. Rose, S. Self, D. O'Brien, Volcanism and the earth's atmosphere, in: A. Robock, C. Oppenheimer (Eds.), Global, Long-term Sulphur Dioxide Measurements from TOVS Data: A New Tool for Studying Explosive Volcanism and Climate, American Geophysical Union, Washington, DC, 2003, pp. 75–92.
- [29] J.C. Antuña, A. Robock, G.L. Stenchikov, L.W. Thomason, J.E. Barnes, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. 107 (2002).
- [30] J.C. Antuña, A. Robock, G.L. Stenchikov, J. Zhou, C. David, J. Barnes, L. Thomason, J. Geophys. Res. 108 (2003) 4624.
- [31] C.E. Randall, R.M. Bevilacqua, J.D. Lumpe, K.W. Hoppel, J. Geophys. Res. 106 (2001) 27,525–27,536.
- [32] C.E. Randall, R.M. Bevilacqua, J.D. Lumpe, K.W. Hoppel, D.W. Rusch, E.P. Shettle, J. Geophys. Res. 105 (2000) 3929–3942.
- [AU8] [33] L. Thomason, T. Peter, SPARC: Assessment of Stratospheric Aerosol Properties (ASAP). WCRP-124, WMO/TD-1295, SPARC Report 4, World Climate Research Program, 2006.
- [34] L.W. Thomason, G. Taha, Geophys. Res. Lett. 30 (2003) 1631.
- [35] C. Amman, G. Meehl, W. Washington, C. Zender, Geophys. Res. Lett. 30 (2003) 1657.
- [36] J. Bauman, P. Russell, M. Geller, P. Hamill, J. Geophys. Res. 108 (2003) 4382.
- [37] J. Bauman, P. Russell, M. Geller, P. Hamill, J. Geophys. Res. 108 (2003) 4383.
- [38] J. Hansen, J. Geophys. Res. 107 (2002) 4347.
- [39] M. Sato, J. Hansen, M.P. McCormick, J. Pollack, J. Geophys. Res. 98 (1993) 22,987–22,994.
- [40] G. Stenchikov, K. Hamilton, R.J. Stouffer, A. Robock, V. Ramaswamy, B. Santer, H.F. Graf, J. Geophys. Res. 111 (2006) D07107.
- [41] C. Bingen, D. Fussen, F. Vanhellemont, J. Geophys. Res. 109 (2004) D06201.
- [42] C. Bingen, D. Fussen, F. Vanhellemont, J. Geophys. Res. 109 (2004) D06202.
- [43] A. Robertson, J. Overpeck, D. Rind, E. Mosley-Thomson, G. Zelinski, J. Lean, D. Koch, J. Penner, I. Tegen, R. Healy, J. Geophys. Res. 106 (2001) 14,783–14,803.
- [44] F. Arfeuille, B.P. Luo, P. Heckendorn, D. Weisenstein, J.X. Sheng, E. Rozanov, M. Schraner, S. Brönnimann, L.W. Thomason, T. Peter, Atmos. Chem. Phys. 13 (2013) 11221–11234.
- [45] V. Aquila, L.D. Oman, R.S. Stolarski, P.R. Colarco, P.A. Newman, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. 117 (2012) D06216.
- [46] J.M. English, O.B. Toon, M.J. Mills, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. 118 (2013) 1880–1895.
- [47] U. Niemeier, C. Timmreck, H.F. Graf, S. Kinne, S. Rast, S. Self, Atmos. Chem. Phys. 9 (2009) 9043–9057.
- [48] L. Oman, A. Robock, G. Stenchikov, T. Thordarson, D. Koch, D. Shindell, C. Gao, J. Geophys. Res. 111 (2006) D12209.
- [49] C. Timmreck, H.-F. Graf, I. Kirchner, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. 104 (1999) 9337–9359.
- [50] M. Toohey, K. Krüger, U. Niemeier, C. Timmreck, Atmos. Chem. Phys. 11 (2011) 12351–12367.
- [51] C.H. Gao, L. Oman, A. Robock, G.L. Stenchikov, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. 112 (2007) D09109.
- [52] R.R. Garcia, D.R. Marsh, D.E. Kinnison, B.A. Boville, F. Sassi, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. 112 (2007) D09301.
- [53] O.B. Toon, R.P. Turco, D. Westphal, R. Malone, M.S. Liu, J. Atmos. Sci. 45 (1988) 2123–2143.
- [54] A. Robock, C.M. Ammann, L. Oman, D. Shindell, S. Levis, G. Stenchikov, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. 114 (2009) D10107.
- [55] J. Church, N. White, J. Arblaster, Nature 438 (2005) 74–77.
- [56] T.L. Delworth, V. Ramaswamy, G.L. Stenchikov, Geophys. Res. Lett. 32 (2005) L24709.
- [57] P.J. Gleckler, T.M.L. Wigley, B.D. Santer, J.M. Gregory, K. AchutaRao, K.E. Taylor, Nature 439 (2006), 675–675.

- [58] J. Gregory, J. Lowe, S. Tett, *J. Clim.* 19 (2006) 4576–4591.
- [59] G. Stenchikov, V. Ramaswamy, T. Delworth, in: *Impact of Big Tambora Eruption on ENSO, Ocean Heat Uptake, and Sea Level*, PP31E-07, Presented at 2007 Fall AGU Meeting, San Francisco, CA, 2007.
- [60] G. Stenchikov, T.L. Delworth, V. Ramaswamy, R.J. Stouffer, A. Wittenberg, F. Zeng, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* 114 (2009) D16104.
- [61] A.J. Baran, J.S. Foot, *J. Geophys. Res.* 99 (1994) 25673–25679.
- [62] J.E. Barnes, D.J. Hoffman, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 24 (1997) 1923–1926.
- [63] G.J.S. Bluth, S.D. Doiron, A.J. Krueger, L.S. Walter, C.C. Schnetzler, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 19 (1992) 151–154.
- [64] G.J.S. Bluth, W.I. Rose, I.E. Sprod, A.J. Krueger, *J. Geol.* 105 (1997) 671–683.
- [65] A. Lambert, R.G. Grainger, J.J. Remedios, C.D. Rogers, M. Corney, F.W. Taylor, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 20 (1993) 1287–1290.
- [66] W.G. Read, L. Froidevaux, J.W. Waters, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 20 (1993) 1299–1302.
- [67] P. Minnis, E.F. Harrison, L.L. Stowe, G.G. Gibson, F.M. Denn, D.R. Doelling, W.L. Smith Jr., *Science* 259 (1993) 1411–1415.
- [68] T. Crowley, *Science* 289 (2000) 270–277.
- [69] A. Broccoli, K. Dixon, T. Delworth, T. Knutson, R. Stouffer, *J. Geophys. Res.* 108 (2003) 4798.
- [70] GFDL, CM2.x References, 2006. Available from: <http://nomads.gfdl.noaa.gov/CM2.X/references>.
- [71] S.-J. Lin, *Mon. Weather Rev.* 132 (2004) 2293–2307.
- [72] P.C.D. Milly, A.B. Shmakin, *J. Hydrometeorol* 3 (2002) 283–299.
- [73] A. Gnanadesikan, K.W. Dixon, S.M. Griffies, V. Balaji, M. Barreiro, J.A. Beesley, W.F. Cooke, T.L. Delworth, R. Gerdes, M.J. Harrison, I.M. Held, W.J. Hurlin, H.C. Lee, Z. Liang, G. Nong, R.C. Pacanowski, A. Rosati, J. Russell, B.L. Samuels, Q. Song, M.J. Spelman, R.J. Stouffer, C.O. Sweeney, G. Vecchi, M. Winton, A.T. Wittenberg, F. Zeng, R. Zhang, J.P. Dunne, *J. Clim.* 19 (2006) 675–697.
- [74] S.M. Griffies, A. Gnanadesikan, K.W. Dixon, J.P. Dunne, R. Gerdes, M.J. Harrison, A. Rosati, J.L. Russell, B.L. Samuels, M.J. Spelman, M. Winton, R. Zhang, *Ocean Sci.* 1 (2005) 45–79.
- [75] M. Winton, *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.* 17 (2000) 525–531.
- [76] J.B. Adams, M.E. Mann, C.M. Ammann, *Nature* 426 (2003) 274–278.
- [77] B.D. Santer, T.M.L. Wigley, C. Doutriaux, J.S. Boyle, J.E. Hansen, P.D. Jones, G.A. Meehl, E. Roeckner, S. Sengupta, K.E. Taylor, *J. Geophys. Res.* 106 (2001) 28033–28059.
- [78] F. Yang, M. Schlesinger, *J. Geophys. Res.* 106 (2001) 14,757–14,770.
- [79] F. Yang, M. Schlesinger, *J. Geophys. Res.* 107 (2002) 4073.
- [80] J.R. Christy, R.W. Spencer, W.D. Braswell, *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.* 17 (2000) 1153–1170.
- [81] S. Manabe, R.J. Stouffer, *J. Geophys. Res.* 85 (1980) 5529–5554.
- [82] I. Kirchner, G. Stenchikov, H. Graf, A. Robock, J. Antuña, *J. Geophys. Res.* 104 (1999) 19,039–19,055.
- [83] V. Ramaswamy, M.D. Schwarzkopf, W. Randel, B. Santer, B.J. Soden, G. Stenchikov, *Science* 311 (2006) 1138–1141.
- [84] K. Trenberth, A. Dai, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 34 (2007) L15702.
- [85] L. Oman, A. Robock, G.L. Stenchikov, T. Thordarson, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 33 (2006) L18711.
- [86] A. Robock, Y. Liu, *J. Clim.* 7 (1994) 44–55.
- [87] R. Joseph, N. Zeng, *J. Clim.* 24 (2011) 2045–2060.
- [88] K.J. Anchukaitis, B.M. Buckley, E.R. Cook, B.I. Cook, R.D. D’Arrigo, C.M. Ammann, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 37 (2010) L22703.
- [89] C.E. Iles, G.C. Hegerl, A.P. Schurer, X. Zhang, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* 118 (2013) 8770–8786.
- [90] L. Oman, A. Robock, G. Stenchikov, G.A. Schmidt, R. Ruedy, *J. Geophys. Res.* 110 (2005) D13103.
- [91] R.L. Miller, G.A. Schmidt, D. Shindell, *J. Geophys. Res.* 111 (2006) D18101.
- [92] A. Robock, T. Adams, M. Moore, L. Oman, G. Stenchikov, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 34 (2007) L23710.

446 CHAPTER 26 THE ROLE OF VOLCANIC ACTIVITY IN CLIMATE AND GLOBAL CHANGE

- [93] K. Kodera, *J. Geophys. Res.* 99 (1994) 1273–1282.
- [94] K. Kodera, Y. Kuroda, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 27 (2000) 3349–3352.
- [95] K. Kodera, Y. Kuroda, *J. Geophys. Res.* 105 (2000) 12,361–12,370.
- [96] Y. Ohhashi, K. Yamazaki, *J. Meteorol. Soc. Jpn.* 77 (1999) 495–511.
- [97] J. Perlwitz, H.-F. Graf, *J. Clim.* 8 (1995) 2281–2295.
- [98] Y. Song, W.A. Robinson, *J. Atmos. Sci.* 61 (2004) 1711–1725.
- [99] J. Perlwitz, N. Harnik, *J. Clim.* 16 (2003) 3011–3026.
- [100] R. Black, *J. Clim.* 15 (2002) 268–277.
- [101] R.X. Black, B.A. McDaniel, *J. Clim.* 17 (2004) 3990–4004.
- [102] P.H. Haynes, M.E. McIntyre, T.G. Shepherd, C.J. Marks, K.P. Shine, *J. Atmos. Sci.* 48 (1991).
- [103] V. Limpasuvan, D.J.W. Thompson, D.L. Hartmann, *J. Clim.* 17 (2004) 2584–2596.
- [104] S. Driscoll, A. Bozzo, L.J. Gray, A. Robock, G. Stenchikov, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* 117 (2012) D17105.
- [105] K.E. Taylor, R.J. Stouffer, G.A. Meehl, *Bull. Am. Met Soc.* 93 (2012) 485–498.
- [106] CMIP5, CMIP5 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project, 2013. Available from: <http://cmip-pcmdi.llnl.gov/cmip5/>.
- [107] IPCC, *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Working Group I Contribution to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2013, pp. 1308 plus annexes.
- [108] IPCC, *IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5)*, 2014. Available from: <http://www.ipcc.ch/index.htm>.
- [109] G. Meehl, W. Washington, W. Collins, J. Arblaster, A. Hu, L. Buja, W. Strand, H. Teng, *Science* 307 (2005) 1769–1772.
- [110] T.M. Merlis, I.M. Held, G.L. Stenchikov, F.R. Zeng, L.W. Horowitz, *J. Clim.* 27 (2014) 7781–7795.
- [111] S. Levitus, J. Antonov, T. Boyer, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 32 (2005) L02604.
- [112] J.K. Willis, D. Roemmich, B. Cornuelle, *J. Geophys. Res.* 109 (2004) C12036.
- [113] J.A. Carton, A. Santorelli, *J. Clim.* 21 (2008) 6015–6035.
- [114] C. Domingues, J. Church, N. White, P. Gleckler, S. Wijffels, P. Barker, J. Dunn, *Nature* 453 (2008) 1090–1093.
- [115] T.L. Delworth, K.W. Dixon, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 33 (2006) L02606.
- [116] Y. Ding, J.A. Carton, G.A. Chepurin, G. Stenchikov, A. Robock, L.T. Sentman, J.P. Krasting, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans* 119 (2014) 5622–5637.
- [117] A.M. Iwi, L. Hermanson, K. Haines, R.T. Sutton, *J. Clim.* 25 (2012) 3039–3051.
- [118] O.H. Ottera, M. Bentsen, H. Drange, L. Suo, *Nat. Geosci.* 3 (2010) 688–694.
- [119] J.M. Gregory, D. Bi, M.A. Collier, M.R. Dix, A.C. Hirst, A. Hu, M. Huber, R. Knutti, S.J. Marsland, M. Meinshausen, H.A. Rashid, L.D. Rotstayn, A. Schurer, J.A. Church, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 40 (2013) 1600–1604.
- [120] M.A. Balmaseda, K.E. Trenberth, E. Kallen, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 40 (2013) 1754–1759.
- [121] M.A. Balmaseda, K. Mogensen, A.T. Weaver, *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* 139 (2013) 1132–1161.
- [122] D.R. Easterling, M.F. Wehner, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 36 (2009) L08706.
- [123] G.A. Meehl, J.M. Arblaster, J.T. Fasullo, A. Hu, K.E. Trenberth, *Nat. Clim. Change* 1 (2011) 360–364.
- [124] J.C. Fyfe, K. von Salzen, J.N.S. Cole, N.P. Gillett, J.P. Vernier, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 40 (2013) 584–588.
- [125] J.M. Haywood, A. Jones, G.S. Jones, *Atmos. Sci. Lett.* 15 (2014) 92–96.
- [126] B.D. Santer, C. Bonfils, J.F. Painter, M.D. Zelinka, C. Mears, S. Solomon, G.A. Schmidt, J.C. Fyfe, J.N.S. Cole, L. Nazarenko, K.E. Taylor, F.J. Wentz, *Nat. Geosci.* 7 (2014) 185–189.
- [127] S. Solomon, J.S. Daniel, R.R. Neely, J.P. Vernier, E.G. Dutton, L.W. Thomason, *Science* 333 (2011) 866–870.
- [128] P. Crutzen, *Clim. Change* 77 (2006) 211–220.
- [129] T.M.L. Wigley, *Science* 314 (2006) 452–454.

- [130] B. Govindasamy, K. Caldeira, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 27 (2000) 2141–2144.
- [131] B. Kravitz, A. Robock, O. Boucher, H. Schmidt, K.E. Taylor, G. Stenchikov, M. Schulz, *Atmos. Sci. Lett.* 12 (2011) 162–167.
- [132] A. Robock, M. Bunzl, B. Kravitz, G.L. Stenchikov, *Science* 327 (2010) 530–531.
- [133] P. Heckendorn, D. Weisenstein, S. Fueglistaler, B.P. Luo, E. Rozanov, M. Schraner, L.W. Thomason, T. Peter, *Environ. Res. Lett.* 4 (2009) 045108.
- [134] G. Pitari, V. Aquila, B. Kravitz, A. Robock, S. Watanabe, I. Cionni, N. De Luca, G. Di Genova, E. Mancini, S. Tilmes, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* 119 (2014) 2629–2653.
- [135] S. Tilmes, R.R. Garcia, D.E. Kinnison, A. Gettelman, P.J. Rasch, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* 114 (2009) D12305.
- [136] V. Aquila, C.I. Garfinkel, P.A. Newman, L.D. Oman, D.W. Waugh, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 41 (2014) 1738–1744.
- [137] J.M. Haywood, A. Jones, N. Bellouin, D. Stephenson, *Nat. Clim. Change* 3 (2013) 660–665.
- [138] B. Kravitz, K. Caldeira, O. Boucher, A. Robock, P.J. Rasch, K. Alterskjaer, D.B. Karam, J.N.S. Cole, C.L. Curry, J.M. Haywood, P.J. Irvine, D.Y. Ji, A. Jones, J.E. Kristjansson, D.J. Lunt, J.C. Moore, U. Niemeier, H. Schmidt, M. Schulz, B. Singh, S. Tilmes, S. Watanabe, S.T. Yang, J.H. Yoon, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* 118 (2013) 8320–8332.
- [139] S. Tilmes, J. Fasullo, J.F. Lamarque, D.R. Marsh, M. Mills, K. Alterskjaer, H. Muri, J.E. Kristjansson, O. Boucher, M. Schulz, J.N.S. Cole, C.L. Curry, A. Jones, J. Haywood, P.J. Irvine, D.Y. Ji, J.C. Moore, D.B. Karam, B. Kravitz, P.J. Rasch, B. Singh, J.H. Yoon, U. Niemeier, H. Schmidt, A. Robock, S.T. Yang, S. Watanabe, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* 118 (2013) 11036–11058.

Abstract:

Explosive volcanic eruptions are magnificent events that in many ways affect the Earth's natural processes and climate. They cause sporadic perturbations of the planet's energy balance, activating complex climate feedbacks and providing unique opportunities to better quantify those processes. We know that explosive eruptions cause cooling in the atmosphere for a few years, but we have just recently realized that volcanic signals can be seen in the subsurface ocean for decades. The volcanic forcing of the previous two centuries offsets the ocean heat uptake and diminishes global warming by about 30%. The explosive volcanism of the twenty-first century is unlikely to either cause any significant climate signal or to delay the pace of global warming. The recent interest in dynamic, microphysical, chemical, and climate impacts of volcanic eruptions is also excited by the fact that these impacts provide a natural analogue for climate geoengineering schemes involving deliberate development of an artificial aerosol layer in the lower stratosphere to counteract global warming. In this chapter we aim to discuss these recently discovered volcanic effects and specifically pay attention to how we can learn about the hidden Earth-system mechanisms activated by explosive volcanic eruptions. To demonstrate these effects we use our own model results when possible along with available observations, as well as review closely related recent publications.

[AU2]