https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai Volcano Impact Model Observation Comparison (HTHH-MOC) Project: Experiment Protocol and Model Descriptions

Yunqian Zhu[1,2], Hideharu Akiyoshi[3], Valentina Aquila[4], Elisabeth Asher[1,5], Ewa M. Bednarz[1,2], Slimane Bekki[6], Christoph Brühl[7], Amy H. Butler[2], Parker Case[8], Simon Chabrillat[9], Gabriel Chiodo[10], Margot Clyne[11,12], Lola Falletti[6], Peter R. Colarco[8], Eric Fleming[8,13], Andrin Jörimann[10,36], Mahesh Kovilakam[15], Gerbrand Koren[16], Ales Kuchar[17], Nicolas Lebas[14], Qing Liang[8], Cheng-Cheng Liu[12], Graham Mann[18], Michael Manyin[8,13], Marion Marchand[6], Olaf Morgenstern[19,20*], Paul Newman[8], Luke D. Oman[8], Freja F. Østerstrøm[21,22], Yifeng Peng[23], David Plummer[24], Ilaria Quaglia[25], William Randel[25], Samuel Rémy[26], Takashi Sekiya[27], Stephen Steenrod[8,28], Timofei Sukhodolov[36], Simone Tilmes[25], Kostas Tsigaridis[29,30], Rei Ueyama[31], Daniele Visioni[32], Xinyue Wang[11], Shingo Watanabe[27], Yousuke Yamashita[3], Pengfei Yu[33], Wandi Yu[34], Jun Zhang[25], Zhihong Zhuo[35]

1. Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences (CIRES), University of Colorado Boulder, USA
2. NOAA Chemical Sciences Laboratory, Boulder, USA
3. National Institute for Environmental Studies, Tsukuba, Japan
4. American University, Department of Environmental Science, Washington, DC, USA
5. NOAA Global Monitoring Laboratory, Boulder, USA
6. LATMOS, UVSQ, CNRS, INU, Sorbonne Université, Paris, France
7. Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, Mainz, Germany
8. NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Maryland, USA
9. Royal Belgian Institute for Space Aeronomy (BIRA-IASB), Brussels, Belgium
10. Institute for Particle Physics and Astrophysics, ETH Zürich, Switzerland
11. Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA
12. LASP, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA
13. Science Systems and Applications, Inc., Lanham, MD, USA
14. LOCEAN/IPSL, Sorbonne Université, CNRS, IRD, MNHN, Paris, France
15. NASA Langley Research Center, VA, USA
16. Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands
17. BOKU University, Vienna, Austria
18. School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds
19. National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA), Wellington, New Zealand
20. School of Physical and Chemical Sciences, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand
21. School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA
22. Department of Chemistry, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark
23. Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, China
24. Climate Research Division, Environment and Climate Change Canada, Montréal, Canada
25. NCAR ACOM, Boulder, USA
26. HYGEOS, Lille, France

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

27. Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology (JAMSTEC), Yokohama, Japan
28. University of Maryland-Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA
29. Center for Climate Systems Research, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA.
30. NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, New York, NY, USA.
31. NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA
32. Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY
33. Jinan University, Guangzhou, China
34. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, USA
35. Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Quebec in Montreal, Montreal (Quebec), Canada
36. Physikalisch-Meteorologisches Observatorium Davos and World Radiation Center, Davos, Switzerland

* now at: German Meteorological Service (DWD), Offenbach, Germany

Correspondence to: Yunqian Zhu yunqian.zhu@colorado.edu

Abstract:

The 2022 Hunga volcanic eruption injected a significant amount of water vapor and a moderate amount of sulfur dioxide into the stratosphere causing observable responses in the climate system. We have developed a model-observation comparison project to investigate the evolution of volcanic water and aerosols, and their impacts on atmospheric dynamics, chemistry, and climate, using several state-of-the-art chemistry climate models. The project goals are: 1. Evaluate the current chemistry-climate models to quantify their performance in comparison to observations; and 2. Understand atmospheric responses in the Earth system after this exceptional event and investigate the potential impacts in the projected future. To achieve these goals, we designed specific experiments for direct comparisons to observations, for example from balloons and the Microwave Limb Sounder satellite instrument. Experiment 1 is a free-running ensemble experiment from 2022 to 2031. Experiment 2 is a nudged-run experiment from 2022 to 2023 using observed meteorology. To allow participation of more climate models with varying complexities of aerosol simulation, we include two sets of simulations in Experiment 2: Experiment 2a is designed for models with internally-generated aerosol while Experiment 2b is designed for models using prescribed aerosol surface area density. We take model results from the previously developed Tonga-MIP to fulfill Experiment 3, which focuses on the initial dispersion and microphysical evolution of aerosol and water plumes. Experiment 4 is designed to understand the climate impact on the mesosphere from 2022-2027, for which the experiment design is the same as Experiment 1 but for models that resolve the upper stratosphere and mesosphere.

1. Introduction and motivations of this project

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

The Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai (HTHH) Impacts activity was established in the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) Atmosphere Processes And their Role in Climate (APARC) as a limited-term focused cross-activity with a duration of three years. It aims to assess the impacts of the 15 January 2022 Hunga volcanic eruption and produce an assessment to document the Hunga impact on the climate system. The Hunga eruption injected an unprecedented amount of water (H_2O) and moderate sulfur dioxide (SO_2) into the stratosphere (Millan et al., 2022), presenting a unique opportunity to understand the impacts on the stratosphere of a large-magnitude explosive phreatomagmatic eruption. The wide range of satellite observations of the stratospheric water and sulfate plumes, global transport and dispersion of volcanic materials, and unusual chemical and temperature signals are helpful in assessing model representations of stratospheric chemistry, aerosol, and dynamics. For example, the Aura Microwave Limb Sounder (MLS) observed ~150 Tg of water injected by the Hunga eruption (Millan et al., 2022), which slowly decayed due to the polar stratospheric cloud (PSC) dehydration process and stratosphere-troposphere exchange (Fleming et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2024). Large aerosol optical depth are observed by Ozone Mapping and Profiler Suite (OMPS) (Taha et al., 2022), due to fast formation of sulfate (Zhu et al., 2022) and the high optical efficiency of Hunga aerosol particles (Li et al., 2024). Unlike the stratospheric warming patterns observed from previous large volcanic eruptions (El Chichón in 1982 and Pinatubo in 1991), global stratospheric temperatures decreased by 0.5 to 1.0 K in the first two years following the Hunga eruption, largely due to radiative cooling from injected water vapor (Randel et al., 2024). Satellite observations in June, July, August 2022 reveal reduced lower stratospheric ozone (O_3) over the SH midlatitudes and subtropics, with high levels near the equator, exceeding previous variability. These ozone anomalies coincide with a weakening of the Brewer-Dobson circulation during this period (Wang et al., 2023). Changes in stratospheric winds also influence the mesosphere, leading to a stronger mesospheric circulation and corresponding temperature changes (Yu et al., 2023). These observed phenomena provide a unique opportunity to test the ability of chemistry-climate models to simulate the evolution of volcanic aerosols combined with such a large amount of water vapor, as well as understand how volcanic water vapor and aerosols modify radiative balances and stratospheric ozone.

The APARC HTHH Impacts activity aims to provide a benchmark analysis of the eruption impacts so far, and projections of eruption climate impacts over the next few years. To facilitate the success of this activity, we designed a multi-model evaluation project, the Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai Volcano Impact Model Observation Comparison (HTHH-MOC) Project. The HTHH-MOC provides a foundation for a coordinated multi-model evaluation of global chemistry-climate models' performance in response to the Hunga volcanic eruption. It defines a set of perturbation experiments, where volcanic forcings—injected water vapor and aerosol concentrations—are consistently applied across participating model members. HTHH-MOC aims to assess how reliably global chemistry-climate models simulate the climate responses to this unprecedented volcanic forcing. This project enhances our confidence in attributing and interpreting observations following the Hunga eruption. The scientific questions related to the HTHH-MOC are: How does the Hunga volcanic plumes' transport relate to or impact stratospheric dynamics (such as Brewer-Dobson circulation, polar vortex and the Quasi-Biennial Oscillation) and upper atmosphere? What are the chemical impacts of the Hunga eruption in the stratosphere and mesosphere? What and how long is the radiative effect of the Hunga eruption? Does Hunga impact the tropospheric/surface climate?

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

Therefore, the HTHH-MOC project is focused on evaluating global chemistry-climate models regarding the following three science themes: (1) plume evolution, dispersion, and large-scale transport; (2) impacts on stratospheric chemistry and the ozone layer; and (3) radiative forcing from the eruption and surface climate impacts. Besides the HTHH-MOC project, the assessment also includes analysis of observations and models that are not global climate models. In the following paragraph, we describe the HTHH-MOC experiment design and participating models.

2. Experiment Design

There are four experiments designed to fulfill the scientific goals. Each experiment includes four kinds of simulations with different volcanic injections, to explore the separate impacts of volcanic water and aerosols during the post-eruption period: a) Control case (no eruption); b) H_2O (~150 Tg) & SO_2 (0.5 Tg); c) Only H_2O (~150 Tg). d) Only SO_2 (0.5 Tg). Simulations with the injection of SO_2 only (d) are optional and designed for aerosol-focused models. The SO_2 and water injections are prescribed based on Millan et al. (2022) and Carn et al. (2023). Note that ~150 Tg of water is not the injection amount but the amount retained after the first couple of days. This is because some models form ice particles that fall out of the stratosphere due to large H_2O supersaturation during the initial injection (Zhu et al., 2022); these models will have to inject more H_2O to counterbalance the ice formation (see **Table 7**). The only requirement is that the model should have reasonable comparison to the MLS observations for water vapor as shown in **Figure 1**. Aside from retaining ~150 Tg of water, the water vapor enhancement should be near 10 hPa to 50 hPa, and most of the water vapor should be located between 10˚N and 30˚S by March 2022.

The first experiment (**Exp1**) is a free-running ensemble simulation covering the period from 2022 to 2031. The experiment has been designed to answer questions on: 1. Understanding the long-term evolution of Hunga water vapor and aerosols in free-running models; 2. Quantifying Hunga effects on stratospheric temperatures, dynamics, and transport; 3. Understanding the impact of dynamic changes on ozone chemistry; 4. Quantifying the net radiative forcings; 5. Estimating surface impacts (e.g., temperature, El Niño-Southern Oscillation, monsoon precipitation, etc.). Simulations with free-running meteorology are required to properly understand the impacts of the eruption on atmospheric dynamics and transport processes, and the resulting impacts of those on chemical species (e.g., ozone) and surface climate. Since coupling of the atmosphere with ocean and land processes is required to fully simulate many aspects of the surface impacts, the use of coupled atmosphere, ocean, and land models is recommended. However, since such a fully interactive set up imposes additional computing requirements, an alternative model set up with fixed sea-surface temperatures (SSTs) and sea-ice is also allowed. In that case, the prescribed climatological SSTs and sea-ice data are obtained by averaging SST during the past decade (2012-2021), with the same data imposed in both the H_2O+SO_2 (b) and control (a) simulations. It is important to note that both initial and boundary conditions in a model come with uncertainties, and model processes are simplified. Therefore, model simulations are influenced by the characteristics of the model itself and the background state of the atmospheric system (Jones et al. , 2016; Brodowsky et al., 2021). To address some of the inherent uncertainties and reduce contribution of interannual variability to the forced response, we use a large ensemble of simulations with slightly varied initial conditions.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

Since some aspects of the response, e.g., impacts on the radiative forcing, may be too noisy from free-running model simulations even with large ensembles, we have also designed the second experiment which uses nudged temperature and meteorology to reduce the contribution of interannual variability and thus isolate chemical changes and their radiative forcing. Experiment 2 (**Exp2**) is a two-year simulation that runs from 2022 to 2023 with nudged winds and/or temperature to answer questions on H_2O and aerosol evolution; quantification of the net radiative forcings; and impacts on mid-latitude and polar ozone chemistry. **Exp2** has two distinct realizations: Experiment 2a (**Exp2a**) and Experiment 2b (**Exp2b**). The models participating in **Exp2a** all have a prognostic aerosol module, but vary in the complexity of their representation of aerosol microphysics (i.e., bulk, modal, or sectional). Models participating in **Exp2b** use prescribed aerosol surface area density (SAD) and radiative properties as input to the models (Jörimann et al., 2024). The prescribed aerosol properties are calculated using Global sSpace-based Stratospheric Aerosol Climatology (GloSSAC; Thomason et al., 2018; Kovilakam et al., 2020, 2023) version 2.22 aerosol data from 1979-2023. Note that for the period after the Hunga eruption, GloSSAC uses the Stratospheric Aerosol and Gas Experiment (SAGEIII/ISS) version 5.3 interpolated along the time axis and the Optical Spectrograph and InfraRed Imager System (OSIRIS) version 7.3 to fill in any missing data poleward of 60˚ N/S due to the unavailability of the Cloud-Aerosol Lidar and Infrared Pathfinder Satellite Observations (CALIPSO) data since January 2022. Therefore, when conducting analyses north/south of 60˚N/S it should be noted that the aerosols may be underestimated due to the OSIRIS instrument retrieval biases. We ask for the models to check their initial chemical fields against MLS to see if the models are qualified to evaluate their ozone chemistry. The nudged runs of **Exp2** enable isolation of the chemical impact of the Hunga eruption from the volcanically induced changes in dynamics by comparing the runs with and without H_2O+SO_2 injection. The net radiative effect anomaly due to water and sulfate aerosol can also be calculated by comparing the control run (a) with the H_2O+SO_2 injection run (b).

The third experiment (**Exp3**) is designed to explore the plume evolution between 1 day and up to 1 or 2 months after the eruption, including plume microphysics and chemistry. This experiment is adopted from TongaMIP (designed by Clyne et al., 2024), which has both free-running and nudged simulations to study the Hunga plume during the first three months after the eruption. All models are requested to inject 150 Tg of water but the retaining of the water varies between models, while other experiments here ask to retain ~150 Tg of water in the stratosphere. This is because for other experiments, our goal is to reproduce the long-term observations first and then to understand the Hunga climate impact; while **Exp3** is designed to understand the differences in physics processes (i.e., cloud and aerosol physics and sulfur chemistry) between models, expanding on findings from prior model intercomparison (Clyne et al., 2021; Quaglia et al., 2023) with upgraded and additional models. These experiments are detailed in Clyne et al. (2024).

The fourth experiment **(Exp4)** is a free-running ensemble simulation to understand climate impacts on the mesosphere and ionosphere from 2022-2027, such as gravity wave drag, temperature changes, polar mesospheric clouds (PMCs), and atmospheric circulation. This experiment uses the first 5 years of **Exp1** and is limited to the models resolving the upper atmosphere.

Table 1 shows the forcings and emissions data used for all experiments except for Experiment 3 (**Exp3**). **Table 2** shows the settings specific to each experiment. For volcanic injection for **Exp1, 2** and **4**, we recommend the injections of H_2O and SO_2 at 4 UTC on Jan 15,

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

2022. All the models are required to retain a similar amount of water as observed by MLS (~ 150 Tg). The models are recommended to compare with the MLS evolution for validation (**Figure 1**). The goal is to retain the same amount of water and similar altitude to start with, so we can analyze the water's impact on the stratosphere and climate. If injecting 25-30 km cannot retain 150 Tg, models can inject higher than 30 km. The SO_2 injection is required to be 0.5 Tg for all models. The injection locations are not required to be co-injected with H_2O.

The data analysis of this project is designed to do inter-model comparisons, as well as inter-experiment comparisons. For example, the comparisons between **Exp2a** and **Exp2b** can help to understand how well we simulate the sulfate SAD and the importance of SAD variation for stratospheric ozone chemistry. Comparing **Exp1** and **Exp2** for the same period can help understand radiative forcing and radiative effects. In addition, large (10-20) member ensembles are requested for free-running simulations to better quantify the role of internal variability in the climate response.

Table 1. Summary of forcings and emissions data used in each experiment.

Spin-up*	5 years nudged runs
Degassing** and eruptive volcano source	Need both degassing and eruptive volcanic input for 5 year spin-up. Degassing continues during the experiment runs (e.g. 10 years for **Exp1**, 2 years for **Exp2**). recommended references: Volcanic degassing Carn et al. (2017); Eruptive volcanoes (Neely III, & Schmidt (2016) https://archive.researchdata.leeds.ac.uk/96/ or Carn et al. (2017); Assume no more explosive volcanoes after Hunga.
Surface emission	Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 6 (CMIP6) emissions follow SSP2-4.5 (Gidden et al., 2019), which adopts an intermediate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions: CO_2 emissions around current levels before beginning to decline by 2050.
Chemical initialization	Stratospheric chemistry fields (such as O_3, H_2O) at the beginning of 2022 should be compared with MLS observations for validation if the model participates in evaluation of the Hunga stratospheric chemistry impact.

* 5 years is enough to reach sulfate equilibrium in the stratosphere; water may take 7 years (each model should adjust the spin-up time according to model features). ** Recommended degassing volcanic emissions injected at the cone altitude, constant flux based on Carn et al. (2017). Database is updated through 2022 here: https://doi.org/10.5067/MEASURES/SO2/DATA406.

Table 2. Experiment design

Experiment	Meteorology	period	aerosol treatment	QBO	SST	Ensemble members
Exp1	Free run starts Feb 1.	10 years 2022-2031	model simulated aerosol or	Internal generated (Nudge if model doesn't	Fixed (climatology = mean of monthly average during the past decade (2012-2021), repeating annually) This applies to spin-up time too.	10-20
	(i.e. nudge until Jan 31)		prescribed	generate)	Coupled ocean (optional) initialize with observed ocean state (see section 3 for individual model descriptions)	10-20
Exp2a	Nudged wind only and/or nudged T and wind*	2 years 2022-2023	model simulated aerosol	nudged	Observed SST	-

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

Exp2b	Nudged wind only and/or nudged T and wind*	2 years 2022-2023	prescribed	nudged	Observed SST	-
Exp3 (Tonga-MIP)	Both free run and nudged runs are conducted	3 months after the eruption	model simulated aerosol	not specified	not specified	-
Exp4	same as Exp1	5 years 2022-2027	same as Exp1	same as Exp1	same as Exp1	same as Exp1



Figure 1. Monthly average water vapor perturbation after the Hunga eruption from MLS. Panels (a-c) show the observed dispersion of the H_2O enhancement in 2022 in the months of (a) March, (b) June, and (c) September.

3. Model output

The model output covers variables based on the Chemistry-Climate Modeling Initiative (CCMI) output list with some additions specific to this study. The detailed list is provided in the **Supplementary Excel Table**. We have requested that all models generate the same variable names, units, ordering of dimensions (longitude from 0˚E to 360˚E; latitude from 90˚S to 90˚N; pressure levels from 1000 hPa to 0.03 hPa or altitude from 0 meter to 85,000 meter), and file name structure (e.g. 'variable_domain_modelname_experimentname.nc' or 'domain_modelname_experimentname.variable.nc'). The examples of Experiment_name are: HTHHMOC-Exp1, HTHHMOC-Exp1and4. The example file names are: Monthlymean_WACCM6MAM_HTHHMOC-Exp1and4-NoVolc-fixedSST.ensemble001.O3.nc or O3_Dailymean_WACCM6MAM_HTHHMOC-Exp1and4-H2Oonly-fixedSST.ensemble001.nc.

The 3D model output is requested on both model levels (hybrid pressure or height) and interpolated to CMIP6 plev39 grid (plev39: 1000, 925, 850, 700, 600, 500, 400, 300, 250, 200, 170, 150, 130, 115, 100, 90, 80, 70, 50, 30, 20, 15, 10, 7, 5, 3, 2, 1.5, 1 0, 0.7, 0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2, 0.15, 0.1, 0.07, 0.05, 0.03 hPa) and for Mesospheric analysis (**Exp4**) adding 0.02, 0.01, 0.007, 0.005, 0.003, 0.001 above the plev39 grid.

Monthly mean output is requested for all variables for both **Exp1** and **Exp4**, with some fields (specified in the Excel sheet) as daily mean. Some of the fields requested as daily means are specified, either as surface fields or at reduced number of pressure levels. Daily mean output is requested for all variables for **Exp2**.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

The model output (~33 TB) is archived at the JASMIN workspace (jasmin.ac.uk). JASMIN provides large storage space and compute facilities to facilitate the data archiving and post data analysis of this project. This reduces the need for data transfers and allows reproducible computational workflows. Seddon et al (2023) described the facility in detail. Our next phase is to publicly release the data by transferring the data to the Centre for Environmental Data Analysis (CEDA) archiving system.

4. Model Descriptions and the Hunga Volcanic Injection Specification

As part of the three-year Hunga Impact activity, this project is highly time-sensitive. We designed the timeline for each experiment (**Figure 2**) to facilitate the completion of the 2025 Hunga Impact assessment. However, the JASMIN workspace will remain open for the uploading of modeling data after the deadline denoted in **Figure 2** until 2025**.**

This paper only includes model descriptions for those models that submitted the output following the assessment timeline. The model setup follows the protocols listed in Section 2 unless specified below. **Tables 4-7** provide key information on the participant models, which are detailed described in the following paragraphs for each model.

Three models participated only in **Exp3** (Tonga-MIP) and not in the other experiments: for the descriptions of these three models (MIROC-ES2H, SOCOLv4, and GA4 UM-UKCA) we refer to Clyne et al. (2024).



Figure 2. The timeline designed for HTHH-MOC in order to cooperate with the APARC HTHH Impact assessment.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

300 **Table 4. Participating models and contact information**

Model name	Description reference paper	Institutions (**that develop the model**)	Primary contact **(who runs the model)**	Emails
CAM5/CARMA	Yu et al. (2015)	CU Boulder Jinan Univ.	Pengfei Yu Yifeng Peng	pengfei.yu@colorado.edu pengyf16@lzu.edu.cn
CCSRNIES-MIROC3.2	Akiyoshi et al. (2023), Akiyoshi et al. (2016)	NIES	Yousuke Yamashita Hideharu Akiyoshi	yamashita.yosuke@nies.go.jp hakiyosi@nies.go.jp
CMAM	Jonsson et al. (2004), Scinocca et al. (2008)	CCCma, Environment and Climate Change Canada	David Plummer	david.plummer@ec.gc.ca
EMAC MPIC	Schallock et al. (2023)	MPI-C, -M, DLR	Christoph Brühl	christoph.bruehl@mpic.de
GA4 UM-UKCA	Dhomse et al. (2020)	Univ. Leeds	Graham Mann, Sandip Dhomse	G.W.Mann@leeds.ac.uk, S.S.Dhomse@leeds.ac.uk
GEOSCCM	Nielsen et al. (2017)	NASA	Peter Colarco	peter.r.colarco@nasa.gov
GEOS/CARMA	Nielsen et al. (2017)	NASA	Parker Case	parker.a.case@nasa.gov
GSFC2D	Fleming et al. (2020)	NASA	Eric Fleming	eric.l.fleming@nasa.gov
IFS-COMPO Cy49R1	Huijnen et al. (GMD, 2016), Rémy et al. (GMD, 2022)	ECMWF and team CAMS2_35	Simon Chabrillat Samuel Rémy	Simon.chabrillat@aeronomie.be sr@hygeos.com
LMDZ6.2-LR-STRATAER/LMDZ6.2-LR-STRATAER-REPROBUS	O. Boucher et al. 2020, Marchand et al., 2012	CNRS, Sorbonne Univerité, IPSL, LATMOS, LOCEAN	Marion Marchand, Slimane Bekki, Nicolas Lebas, Lola Falletti	marion.marchand@latmos.ipsl.fr, slimane.bekki@latmos.ipsl.fr, nicolas.lebas@locean.ipsl.fr, lola.falletti@latmos.ipsl.fr
MIROC-CHASER	Sekiya et al. (2016)	JAMSTEC	Shingo Watanabe, Takashi Sekiya	wnabe@jamstec.go.jp, tsekiya@jamstec.go.jp
MIROC-ES2H	Tatebe et al. (2019), Kawamiya et al. (2020)	JAMSTEC and NIES	Shingo Watanabe, Takashi Sekiya, Tatsuya Nagashima, Kengo Sudo	wnabe@jamstec.go.jp, tsekiya@jamstec.go.jp, nagashima.tatsuya@nies.go.jp, kengo@nagoya-u.jp
SOCOLv4	Sukhodolov et al. (2021)	PMOD/WRC and ETH-Zurich	Timofei Sukhodolov	timofei.sukhodolov@pmodwrc.ch
WACCM6/CARMA	Tilmes et al. (2023)	NCAR	Simone Tilmes Cheng-Cheng Liu Yunqian Zhu Margot Clyne (Exp 3)	tilmes@ucar.edu chengcheng.liu@lasp.colorado.edu yunqian.zhu@noaa.gov margot.clyne@colorado.edu
WACCM6/MAM	Mills et al. (2016)	NCAR	Xinyue Wang Simone Tilmes Jun Zhang Wandi Yu	xinyuew@colorado.edu tilmes@ucar.edu jzhan166@ucar.edu yu44@llnl.gov

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

	Zhihong Zhuo Ewa Bednarz Margot Clyne (Exp 3)	zhuo.zhihong@uqam.ca ewa.bednarz@noaa.gov margot.clyne@colorado.edu

Table 5. Participating models for each experiment.

Model names	Exp1	Exp1/4 (coupled ocean)	Exp2a	Exp2b	Exp3 (Tonga-MIP)	Exp4
CAM5/CARMA			**X**			
CCSRNIES-MIROC3.2				**X**		
CMAM	**X** (H2O-only)					**X** (H2O-only)
EMAC MPIC			**X**			
GA4 UM-UKCA					**X**	
GEOSCCM	**X**		**X**		**X**	
GEOS/CARMA			**X**			
GSFC2D	**X**			**X**		**X**
IFS-COMPO			**X**			
LMDZ6.2-LR-STRATAER			**X**		**X**	
LMDZ6.2-LR-STRATAER-REPROBUS			**X**		**X**	
MIROC-CHASER	**X**		**X**			
MIROC-ES2H					**X**	
SOCOLv4					**X**	
WACCM6/CARMA			**X**		**X**	
WACCM6/MAM	**X**	**X**	**X**		**X**	**X**

Table 6. Model resolutions and schemes used for experiments except for Exp3 (Tonga-MIP)

Model names	Horizontal resolution	nlevels	Model Top	Vertical resolution in the stratosphere	Aerosol scheme	Specified dynamic source	QBO for free run	Chemistry package (tropospheric chemistry included?)
CAM5/CARMA	~2 deg	56	45 km	1-4 km	CARMA sectional(20 bins)	GEOS5	-	MOZART (yes)
CCSRNIES-MIROC3.2	T42	34	0.01 hPa	1-3 km	None	MERRA-2	nudged	full strat; no tropo
CMAM	T47	80	0.0006 hPa	0.8 - 2.5 km	None	ERA5	nudged	stratospheric + methane-NOx in troposphere
EMAC MPIC	T63	90	0.01 hPa	0.5km in LS	GMXE, modal	ERA-5	Internal but slightly nudged	MECCA, simplified troposphere

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

GEOSCCM	c90 (~1 deg)	72	0.01 hPa	~1 km	GOCART (Bulk)	MERRA-2/GEOS-FP	Internal generated	GMI (yes)
GEOS/CARMA	c90 (~1 deg)	72	0.01 hPa	~1 km	CARMA (sectional 24 bins)	MERRA-2/GEOS-FP	Internal generated	GMI (yes)
GSFC2D	4°	76	.002 hPa (~ 92 km)	1km	Prescribed only	MERRA-2	Internal generated	full strat; partial trop
IFS-COMPO	T_L511 (~40km)	137	0.01 hPa	0.5-1.5 km	Bulk	ERA5	-	BASCOE (strato) + CB05 (tropo)
LMDZ6.2-LR-STRATAER	2.5° × 1.3°	79	80km	1-5 km	S3A(sectional 36 bins)	ERA5	Internal generated	No
LMDZ6.2-LR-STRATAER-REPROBUS	2.5° × 1.3°	79	80km	1-5 km	S3A(sectional 36 bins)	ERA5	Internal generated	REPROBUS
MIROC-CHASER	T85	81	0.004 hPa	0.7-1.2 km	MAM3	MERRA-2	Internal generated	troposphere-stratosphere chemistry
WACCM6/CARMA	~1 deg	70	140 km	1-2 km	Sectional (20 bins)	MERRA-2	Internal generated	MOZART (yes)
WACCM6/MAM	~1 deg	70	140 km	1-2 km	MAM4	MERRA-2	Internal generated	MOZART (yes)

Table 7. Hunga volcanic injection profile for experiments except for Exp3 (Tonga-MIP)

Model names	Data and duration	H_2O amount (left after a week)	H_2O altitude	H_2O location/area	SO_2 amount	SO_2 altitude	SO_2 location/area
CAM5/CARMA	Jan 15, 6 hrs	150 Tg (~135 Tg)	25-35 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E	0.5 Tg	20-28 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E
CCSRNIES-MIROC3.2	Jan 15, instantly	150 Tg (~150 Tg)	12.0-27.6 hPa	181.4–187.0°E, 14.0–22.3°S	-	-	-
CMAM	Feb 20, 5 days	150 Tg (~150 Tg)	near 25.5 km	zonally average	-	-	-
EMAC MPIC	Jan 16, 12hrs	136 Tg (~130 Tg)	Gaussian centered at 21.5hPa	23-19°S, 177-173°W	0.4 Tg based on obs.	23-27 km based on obs.	30°S-5°N, 90-120°W (330°)
GEOSCCM	Jan 15, 6 hrs	750 Tg (~150 Tg)	25-30 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E	0.5 Tg	25-30 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

GEOS/CARMA	Jan 15, 6 hrs	750 Tg (~150 Tg)	25-30 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E	0.5 Tg	25-30 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E
GSFC2D	use MLS H_2O profile until March 1	~150 Tg (~150 Tg)	-	zonally average	-	-	-
IFS-COMPO	Jan 15, 3 hrs	190 Tg (~150 Tg)	25-30 km	400 km by 200 km centered 20˚S and 175˚W	0.5 Tg	25-30 km	400 km by 200 km centered 20˚S and 175˚W
LMDZ6.2-LR-STRATAER	Jan 15, 1 day	150 Tg (~150 Tg)	Gaussian centered at 27.5 km and standard deviation of 2.5 km	22°-14°S, 182-186°E	0.5 Tg	Gaussian centered at 27.5 km and standard deviation of 2.5 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E
LMDZ6.2-LR-STRATAER-REPROBUS	Jan 15, 1 day	150 Tg (~150 Tg)	Gaussian centered at 27.5 km and standard deviation of 2.5 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E	0.5 Tg	Gaussian centered at 27.5 km and standard deviation of 2.5 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E
MIROC-CHASER	Jan 15 4 UTC, 6 hours	186 Tg (~150 Tg)	25-30 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E	0.5 Tg	25-30 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E
WACCM6/CARMA	Jan 15, 6 hours	150 Tg (~135 Tg)	25-35 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E	0.5 Tg	20-28 km	22-14°S, 182-186°E
WACCM6/MAM	Jan 15, 6 hours	150 Tg (~150 Tg)	25-35km	22-6°S,182.5 -202.5°E	0.5 Tg	26.5-36 km	22-6°S,182.5 -202.5°E

4.1 CAM5/CARMA

The atmospheric component of the Community Atmosphere Model version 5 (CAM5) (Lamarque et al., 2012) is the atmospheric component of the Community Earth System Model, version 1 (CESM1.2.2, Hurrell et al., 2013), with a top at around 45 km. CAM5 has a horizontal resolution of 1.9° latitude × 2.5° longitude, utilizing the finite volume dynamical core (Lin & Rood, 1996). The model has 56 vertical levels, with a vertical resolution ~1 km in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere. The modeled winds and temperatures were nudged to the 3-hour Goddard Earth Observing System 5 (GEOS-5) reanalysis data set (Molod et al., 2015) every time step (30 min) by 1% (i.e., a 50 h Newtonian relaxation time scale). The aerosol is interactively simulated using a sectional aerosol microphysics model, the Community Aerosol and Radiation Model for Atmospheres (CARMA, Yu et al., 2015). The model uses the Model for Ozone and Related Chemical Tracers (MOZART) chemistry that is used for both tropospheric (Emmons et al., 2010) and stratospheric chemistry (English et al., 2011; Mills et al., 2016). The volcanic

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

emissions from continuously degassing volcanoes uses the emission inventory RCP8.5 and FINNv1.5. No volcanic eruptions except the Hunga 2022 eruption are included.

The initial volcanic injection altitude and area are determined by validating the water and aerosol transportation in months shown in **Figure 1** following the tests in Zhu et al. (2022), Wang et al. (2023) and Zhang et al. (2024). In these simulations, the H_2O is injected at 25 to 35 km altitude and SO_2 injected at 20 to 28 km altitude. The injection latitude ranges from 22°S to 14°S, and longitude ranges from 182°E to 186°E (Zhu et al., 2022). The initial injection of H_2O is 150 Tg, with ~ 135 Tg left after the first week following the eruption.

4.2 CCSRNIES-MIROC3.2

The Center for Climate System Research/National Institute for Environmental Studies - Model for Interdisciplinary Research on Climate version 3.2 Chemistry Climate Model (CCSRNIES-MIROC3.2 CCM) (Akiyoshi et al. 2023) was developed based on versions 3.2 of the MIROC atmospheric general circulation model (AGCM), incorporating a stratospheric chemistry module that was developed at National Institute for Environmental Studies (NIES) and the University of Tokyo. The model has a horizontal resolution of T42 (2.8° latitude × 2.8° longitude) and 34 vertical levels, with a vertical resolution ~1 km in the lower stratosphere/upper troposphere and ~3 km in the upper stratosphere and mesosphere. The top level is located at 0.01 hPa (approximately 80 km).

The chemistry in the CCSRNIES-MIROC3.2 CCM is a stratospheric chemistry module including 42 photolysis reactions, 142 gas-phase chemical reactions and 13 heterogeneous reactions for multiple aerosol types (Akiyoshi et al., 2023). Tropospheric chemistry is not included, but the stratospheric chemistry scheme is used for both the troposphere and mesosphere.

In the CCSRNIES-MIROC3.2 CCM, only **Exp2b** can be performed. The atmospheric temperature and horizontal winds are nudged toward Modern-Era Retrospective analysis for Research and Applications Version 2 (MERRA-2) reanalysis (Gelaro et al., 2017) with a 1-day relaxation using instant values at 6-hour interval (Akiyoshi et al., 2016). The HadISST data is used during the simulation.

The CCSRNIES-MIROC3.2 CCM does not have any microphysics scheme for volcanic aerosols. The surface area and spectral optical parameters of extinction, single scattering albedo, and asymmetric factor for Hunga aerosols were prescribed in the model from the GloSSAC version 2.22 aerosol data (Jörimann et al., 2024). H_2O was injected instantly on 15 January 2022 at the 12 grids of the model in the region 181.4°E–187.0°E in longitude, 14.0°S–22.3°S in latitude, and 12.0 hPa–27.6 hPa in pressure level. A uniform number density of 1.709×10^{15} molecules/cm^3 H_2O was injected in each of the 12 grids which amounts to ~150 Tg.

4.3 CMAM

The Canadian Middle Atmosphere Model (CMAM) is based on a vertically extended version of CanAM3.1, the third generation Canadian Atmospheric Model (Scinocca et al., 2008). Compared to the standard configuration of CanAM3.1, for CMAM the model top was raised to 0.0006 hPa (approximately 95 km) and the parameterization of non-orographic gravity wave drag (Scinocca, 2003) and additional radiative processes important in the middle atmosphere (Fomichev et al., 2004) have been included. The gas-phase chemistry includes a comprehensive description of the inorganic Ox, NOx, HOx, ClOx and BrOx families, along with CH_4, N_2O, six chlorine containing halocarbons, CH_3Br and, to account for an additional 5 ppt of bromine from short-lived source gases, CH_2Br_2 and $CHBr_3$ (Jonsson et al., 2004). A prognostic description of,

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

and associated heterogeneous chemical reactions on water ice PSCs (PSC Type II) and liquid ternary solution (PSC Type Ib) particles is included, although gravitational settling (dehydration/denitrification) is not calculated and species return to the gas phase when conditions no longer support the existence of PSC particles.

The simulations for the HTHH-MOC simulations were performed at T47 spectral resolution (approximately 3.8° resolution on the linear transform grid used for the model physics), with 80 vertical levels giving a vertical resolution of approximately 0.8 km at 100 hPa, increasing to 2.3 km above 0.1 hPa. The CMAM does not internally generate a QBO, so the zonal winds in the equatorial region were nudged towards a dataset based on observed variations up to December 2023, constructed using the method of Naujokat (1986) and extended into the future by repeating a historical period that is congruent with the observed QBO in late 2023. Water vapor from the Hunga eruption was added as a zonally average perturbation to the model water over five days from 00 UTC on February 20, 2022. The spatial distribution of the anomaly was designed to reproduce the water vapor anomaly observed in mid-February by the The Atmospheric Chemistry Experiment - Fourier Transform Spectrometer (ACE-FTS) (Bernath et al., 2005) satellite (Patrick Sheese, personal communication), with a maximum value of 13.3 ppm at 17°S and 25.5 km and producing an anomaly of ~150 Tg H_2O in the stratosphere.

4.4 EMAC MPIC

The chemistry-climate model EMAC (ECHAM5/MESSy Atmospheric Chemistry) consists of the European Centre Hamburg general circulation model (ECHAM5) and the Modular Earth Submodel System (MESSy) (e.g., Jöckel et al., 2010). Here we use the version of Schallock et al. (2023) in horizontal resolution T63 (1.87°x 1.87°) with 90 levels between the surface and 0.01 hPa.

Vorticity, divergence, and temperatures between boundary layer and 100 hPa are nudged to the reanalysis ERA5 (Hersbach et al., 2020), as well as surface pressure. SSTs and sea ice cover are prescribed by ERA5 data. The model can generate an internal QBO but for comparison with observations it was slightly nudged to the Singapore data compiled by Free University of Berlin and Karlsruhe Institute of Technology.

The model contains gas-phase and heterogeneous chemistry on PSCs and interactive aerosols. Surface mixing ratios of chlorine- and bromine-containing halocarbons and other long-lived gases are nudged to Advanced Global Atmospheric Gases Experiment (AGAGE) observations. The microphysical modal aerosol module contains four soluble and three insoluble modes for sulfate, nitrate, dust, organic and black carbon, and aerosol water (Pringle et al., 2010). The instantaneous radiative forcing by tropospheric and stratospheric aerosols can be calculated online by multiple calls of the radiation module. Volcanoes injecting material into the stratosphere are considered as in Schallock et al. (2023) using the perturbations of stratospheric SO_2 observed by the Michelson Interferometer for Passive Atmospheric Sounding (MIPAS) and aerosol extinction observed by OSIRIS. This method, based typically on data of a 10-day period, distributes the injected SO_2 over a larger volume than typical point source approaches using the same integrated mass (see also Kohl et al., 2024). For Hunga this method has the disadvantage that H_2O and SO_2 are not co-injected since H_2O is injected in 12 hours in a slab consisting of four horizontal boxes and a Gaussian vertical distribution centered at 21.5 hPa. For **Exp2a** we continue the 30-year transient simulation presented in Schallock et al. (2023) with and without Hunga Tonga. The simulated H_2O-perturbation is consistent with **Figure 1**. The SO_2 injection is

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

derived based on the extinction from the OSIRIS observation averaged over about 10 days (**Figure 3**) (Bruehl et al., 2023).



Figure 3. The SO_2 perturbation from Hunga derived from extinction observed by OSIRIS averaged over about 10 days, i.e., including several snapshots of the westward moving plume. Note that the colorbars are not the same in each panel.

4.5 GEOSCCM

The NASA Goddard Earth Observing System Chemistry-Climate Model (GEOSCCM) is based on the GEOS Earth system model (Reinecker et al. 2008, Molod et al. 2015). For the HTHH-MOC experiments the model is run on a cubed-sphere horizontal grid at a C90 resolution (~100 km) with 72 vertical hybrid-sigma levels from the surface to 0.01 hPa (~80 km). Dynamics are solved using the finite-volume dynamical core (Putman and Lin, 2007). Deep and shallow convection are parameterized using the Grell-Freitas (2014) and Park-Bretherton (2009) schemes, respectively, and moist physics is from Bacmeister et al. (2006). The turbulence parameterization is based on the non-local scheme of Lock et al. (2000). Shortwave and longwave radiative fluxes are computed in 30 bands using the Rapid Radiative Transfer Model for GCMs (RRTMG, Iacono et al. 2008).

Stratospheric and tropospheric chemistry are from the Global Modeling Initiative (GMI) mechanism (Duncan et al., 2007; Strahan et al., 2007; Nielsen et al., 2017), updated here to include reactions for sulfur species. The GMI mechanism in GEOSCCM has been extensively evaluated for its stratospheric ozone-related photochemistry and transport in various model intercomparisons, including Stratosphere-troposphere Processes and their Role in Climate (SPARC) Chemistry Climate Model Validation (CCMVal), CCMVal-2, and the CCMI (SPARC-CCMVal, 2010; Eyring et al., 2010, 2013; Morgenstern et al., 2017). Aerosol species are

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

simulated by the Goddard Chemistry, Aerosol, Radiation, and Transport, second generation (GOCART-2G), module (Collow et al. 2024), which includes a sectional approach for dust (five bins), sea salt (five bins), and nitrate (three bins), and a bulk approach for sulfate (dimethyl sulfide, SO_2, methanesulfonic acid, and SO_4^{2-}) aerosol and carbonaceous species (hydrophobic and hydrophilic modes of "white" and "brown" organics and black carbon).

For the GEOSCCM simulations performed with the GOCART-2G module we use the nominal GOCART-2G sulfate mechanism, updated here to use the online hydroxyl (OH) radical, nitrate (NO_3) radical, and hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2) from the GMI mechanism instead of climatological fields provided from offline files (Collow et al., 2024). While not a full coupling to the GMI sulfur cycle it nevertheless allows the GOCART-2G sulfate mechanism to have the impact of the Hunga water vapor perturbation on the oxidants. A second "instance" of the GOCART-2G sulfate mechanism is run that is specifically for the volcanic SO_2 and resultant sulfate from the Hunga eruption. This allows us to track the eruptive volcanic aerosol separately from the nominal sulfate instance that sees mainly tropospheric sources. We assign this volcanic instance optical properties consistent with SAGE retrievals of the sulfate aerosol properties, using an effective radius of 0.4 microns. We find that 750 Tg of H_2O is needed in the initial injection to provide a residual ~150 Tg of water in the stratosphere after a week. All other injection parameters follow the protocol. The model spinup was performed by "replaying" to the MERRA-2 meteorology (Gelaro et al. 2017), and is used throughout the **Exp2a** results.

4.6 GEOS/CARMA

A second configuration of the GEOSCCM, coupled to the sectional aerosol microphysics package CARMA, also simulated the eruption (GEOS/CARMA). This configuration is the same as above except for the aerosol package and its coupling to the GMI chemistry mechanism. For this version of GEOSCCM, we use the configuration of CARMA described in Case et al. (2023). This configuration uses 24 size bins, spread logarithmically in volume between 0.25nm and 6.7µm in radius and simulates the nucleation, condensational growth, evaporation, coagulation, and settling of sulfate aerosols in these simulations following the mechanism of English et al. (2013). For these simulations, CARMA is fully coupled to the GMI sulfur cycle by the production (i.e., oxidation of SO_2, evaporation of sulfate aerosols) and loss (i.e., nucleation and condensation of sulfate aerosols) of sulfuric acid (H_2SO_4) vapor. Optical properties for the CARMA aerosols are calculated based on the interactively calculated aerosol size distribution. The same injection parameters for GEOSCCM described above are used by this configuration. This model configuration contributed to **Exp2a** and "replayed" to MERRA-2 meteorology as above.

4.7 GSFC2D

The NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center two-dimensional (2D) chemistry-climate model (GSFC2D) has a domain extending from the surface to ~92 km (0.002 hPa). The model has 76 levels, with 1 km vertical resolution from the surface to the lower mesosphere (60 km) and 2 km resolution above (60-92 km). The horizontal resolution is 4° latitude, and the model uses a 2D (latitude-altitude) finite volume dynamical core (Lin & Rood, 1996) for advective transport. The model has detailed stratospheric chemistry and reduced tropospheric chemistry, with a diurnal cycle computed for all constituents each day (Fleming et al., 2024). The model uses prescribed zonal mean surface temperature as a function of latitude and season based on a multi-year average of MERRA-2 data (Gelaro et al., 2017). Zonal mean latent heating, tropospheric water

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

vapor, and cloud radiative properties as a function of latitude, altitude, and season are also prescribed (Fleming et al., 2020).

For the free-running simulations, the model planetary wave parameterization (Bacmeister et al., 1995; Fleming et al., 2024) uses lower boundary conditions (750 hPa, ~2 km) of geopotential height amplitude and phase for zonal wave numbers 1–4. These are derived as a function of latitude and season using: 1) a 30-year average (1991–2020) of MERRA-2 data for the standard yearly-repeating climatological-dynamics simulations ("Clim-NoQBO"); and 2) individual years of MERRA-2 data (1980-2020) randomly rearranged in time to generate interannual variations in stratospheric dynamics ("ensemble1", "ensemble2",…"ensemble10"). For the inter-annually varying dynamics simulations, the model includes an internally generated QBO (Fleming et al., 2024).

For experiments that include the Hunga volcanic aerosols, the simulations go through the end of 2023, using prescribed aerosol properties for 2022-2023 from both the GloSSAC data set and derived from the OMPS-LP data (Taha et al., 2021, 2022). For experiments that include the Hunga H_2O injection, Aura/MLS observations are used to derive a daily zonal mean Hunga water vapor anomaly in latitude-altitude, which is added to the baseline H_2O (no volcano) through the end of February 2022. This combined water vapor field is then fully model computed starting 1 March 2022 through the end of 2031.

For **Exp2b**, the model zonal mean temperature and transport fields are computed from the MERRA-2 reanalysis data. These are input into the model and used as prescribed fields (no nudging is done).

4.8 IFS-COMPO

The Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service (CAMS) provides daily global analysis and 5-day forecasts of atmospheric composition (aerosols, trace gases, and GHGs) (Peuch et al. 2022). CAMS is coordinated by the European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) and uses, for its global component, the Integrated Forecasting System (IFS), with extensions to represent aerosols, trace, and GHGs, being called "IFS-COMPO" (also previously known as "C-IFS", Flemming et al. 2015). IFS-COMPO is composed of IFS(AER) for aerosols, as described in Remy et al. (2022) while the atmospheric chemistry is based on the chemistry module as described in Williams et al. (2022) for the troposphere (IFS-CB05) and Huijnen et al. (2016) for the stratosphere (IFS-CBA). The stratospheric chemistry module of IFS-COMPO is derived from the Belgian Assimilation System for Chemical ObErvations (BASCOE, Errera et al 2019). IFS-COMPO stratospheric chemistry is used since the operational implementation of cycle 48R1 on June 27, 2023 (Eskes et al., 2024).

The aerosol component of IFS-COMPO is a bulk aerosol scheme for all species except sea salt aerosol and desert dust, for which a sectional approach is preferred, with three bins for each of these two species. Since the implementation of operational cycle 48R1 in June 2023, the prognostic species are sea salt, desert dust, organic matter (OM), black carbon (BC), sulfate, nitrate, ammonium, and secondary organic aerosols (SOA).

For **Exp2a**, cycle 49R1 IFS-COMPO has been used, which will become operational for CAMS production in November 2024, at a resolution of TL511 (~40 km grid cell) over 137 model levels from surface to 0.01 hPa. Cycle 49R1 IFS-COMPO integrates a number of updates of tropospheric and stratospheric aerosols and chemistry. The most relevant aspect for this work concerns the representation of stratospheric aerosols, which has been revisited with the implementation of a coupling to the stratospheric chemistry through a simplified stratospheric

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

sulfur cycle including nucleation/condensation and evaporation processes, as shown in **Figure 4**. Direct injection of water vapor into the stratosphere is expected to enhance the nucleation and condensation of sulfate through the reaction with SO_3 and production of gas-phase H_2SO_4.

The volcanic injection takes place between 3 and 6 UTC on January 15, 2022, with a uniform vertical distribution between 25 and 30 km of altitude, over a rectangular region of 400 km (latitude) x 200 km (longitude) centered on the coordinates of the Hunga volcano. The injected quantities are 0.5 Tg SO_2 and 190 Tg H_2O.



Figure 4. Architecture of the stratospheric extension of IFS(AER) and its coupling with IFS(CBA) and IFS(CB05), with existing and new processes implemented in cycle 49R1 of IFS-COMPO. *hν* represents photolysis and the volcano symbols represent direct injections by volcanic eruptions. Sedimentation is indicated as a new process because it has been revisited.

4.9 LMDZ6.2-LR-STRATAER and LMDZ6.2-LR-STRATAER-REPROBUS

The Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace Climate Modelling Centre (IPSL CMC, see https://cmc.ipsl.fr) has set up a new version of its climate model in the runup of CMIP6. Further description of the IPSL-CM6A-LR climate model can be found in Boucher et al. (2020) and in Lurton et al. (2020). New development of the model is now ongoing to prepare the IPSLCM7 version.

The IPSLCM7 climate model is using the general circulation model named LMDZ for *Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique-Zoom* (Hourdin et al., 2006). The LMDZ version used for this study is based on a regular horizontal grid with 144 points regularly spaced in longitude and 142 in latitude, corresponding to a resolution of 2.5° × 1.3°. The model has 79 vertical layers and extends up to 80 km, which makes it a “high-top” model. The model shows a self-generated quasi-biennial oscillation (QBO) whose period has been tuned to the observed one for the present-day climate (Boucher et al., 2020).

The aerosol is interactively simulated in the STRATAER module using a sectional scheme with 36 size bins. STRATAER is an improved version of the Sectional Stratospheric Sulfate Aerosol (S3A) module (Kleinschmitt et al., 2017). It now takes into account the photolytic conversion of H_2SO_4 into SO_2 in the upper stratosphere (Mills et al., 2005). The size-

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

dependent composition of H_2SO_4/H_2O aerosols is now computed iteratively to ensure that the surface tension, density, and composition are consistent in the calculation of the Kelvin effect. The surface tension, density, H_2SO_4 vapor pressure, and nucleation rates are calculated based on Vehkamäki et al. (2002). The version of the LMDZ6.2-LR-STRATAER atmospheric model used in the HTHH Impact project accounts for the stratospheric H_2O source from methane oxidation. The chemistry is simulated using the REPROBUS (*REactive Processes Ruling the Ozone BUdget in the Stratosphere*) chemistry module that includes 55 chemical species and a comprehensive description of the stratospheric chemistry (Marchand et al., 2012, Lefèvre et al., 1994, Lefèvre et al., 1998).

For **Exp2a**, the H_2O and SO_2 is injected at 27.5 km altitude using a Gaussian distribution and standard deviation of 2.5 km. The injection latitude ranges from 22°S to 14°S, and longitude ranges from 182°E to 186°E. The injections of H_2O and SO_2 are 150 Tg and 0.5 Tg, respectively.

4.10 MIROC-CHASER

The Model for Interdisciplinary Research On Climate - CHemical Atmospheric general circulation model for Study of atmospheric Environment and Radiative forcing (MIROC-CHASER) version 6 (Sekiya et al. 2016) is a chemistry climate model, with a top at around 0.004 hPa. The present version of MIROC-CHASER is built on MIROC6 (Tatebe et al. 2019) and has a spectral horizontal resolution of T85 (1.4° latitude × 1.4° longitude). The model has 81 vertical levels, with a vertical resolution 0.7 km in the lower stratosphere, ~1.2 km in the upper stratosphere, and ~3 km in the lower mesosphere. In the free-running simulations, the model generates QBO internally. The ensemble members have different initial conditions (January 1, 2022), which are generated using slightly different nudging relaxation time during the spin-up. The aerosols are interactively simulated using a three-mode modal aerosol module (Seikiya et al. 2016). The chemistry uses comprehensive troposphere-stratosphere chemistry (Watanabe et al. 2011). The volcanic emission from continuously degassing volcanoes uses the emission inventory of Fioletov et al. (2022). For the explosive volcanic eruptions during the spin-up time, explosive volcanic emissions follow Carn (2022).

For **Exp1** fixed SST simulations, the model uses the observed SST from 10-year climatological mean from 2012 to 2021.

For **Exp2a**, the atmospheric temperature and winds are nudged to MERRA-2 reanalysis with a 12-hour relaxation using 3-hour meteorology. The observed SST uses the NOAA 1/4° Daily Optimum Interpolation Sea Surface Temperature (OISST) from 2022 to 2023 (Huang et al. 2020).

The initial volcanic injection altitude and area are not tuned but follow the experimental protocol. For **Exp1** and **Exp2a**, the H_2O and SO_2 are injected at 25 to 30 km altitude. The injection latitude ranges from 22°S to 14°S, and longitude ranges from 182°E to 186°E. The initial injection of H_2O is 186 Tg, with ~150 Tg left after the first week following the eruption. The large initial H_2O injection is necessary to keep 150 Tg in the stratosphere as requested by the experimental protocol, because a large amount of ice clouds generates and falls to the troposphere soon after the eruption.

4.11 WACCM6/MAM4

The Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model version 6 (WACCM6; Gettelman et al. 2019) is the high-top version of the atmospheric component of the Community Earth System Model, version 2 (CESM2), with a top at around 140 km. WACCM6 has a horizontal resolution of 0.9° latitude × 1.25° longitude, utilizing the finite volume dynamical core (Lin & Rood,

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

1996). The model has 70 vertical levels, with a vertical resolution ~1 km in the lower stratosphere, ~1.75 km in the upper stratosphere, and ~3.5 km in the upper mesosphere and lower thermosphere (Garcia et al., 2017). In the free-running simulations, the model generates QBO internally (Mills et al., 2017; Gettelman et al. 2019). The ensemble members differ in the last date of nudging (from January 27 to February 5, 2022). The aerosol is interactively simulated using a four-mode modal aerosol module (MAM4; Liu et al., 2012, 2016; Mills et al., 2016), in which we used the Vehkamäki nucleation scheme (Vehkamäki et al., 2002). The chemistry uses comprehensive troposphere-stratosphere-mesosphere-lower-thermosphere (TSMLT) chemistry (Gettelman et al. 2019). The volcanic emissions from continuously degassing volcanoes use the emission inventory of Andres and Kasgnoc (1998). For the explosive volcanic eruptions during the spin-up time, explosive volcanic emissions follow Mills et al. (2016) and Neely III and Schmidt (2016) with updates until 2022.

For **Exp1** and **Exp4** with the coupled ocean simulation, the ocean and sea-ice are initialized on January 3, 2022 with output from a standalone ocean model forced by atmospheric state fields and fluxes from the Japanese 55-year Reanalysis (Tsujino et al., 2018). To accurately simulate the early plume structure and evolution, the winds and temperatures in WACCM are nudged toward the Analysis for Research and Applications, MERRA-2 meteorological data (Gelaro et al., 2017) throughout January 2022. After February 1, 2022, the model is free-running to capture fully-coupled variability. For the fixed SST simulation, the model uses the 10-year climatology SST from 2012 to 2021.

For **Exp2**, the atmospheric temperature and winds are nudged to MERRA-2 reanalysis with a 12-hour relaxation using 3-hour meteorology (Davis et al., 2022). The observed SST uses 10-year climatological mean from 2012 to 2021.

The initial volcanic injection altitude and area are the same as described for section 4.1 CAM5/CARMA.

4.12 WACCM6/CARMA

WACCM6/CARMA only performed **Exp2** and used a configuration similar to WACCM6/MAM4 with the same horizontal and vertical resolution, SSTs, and meteorological nudging. Differences compared to WACCM6/MAM4 are the chemistry and aerosol configuration used. WACCM6/CARMA used the middle atmosphere chemistry with limited chemistry in the troposphere and comprehensive chemistry in the stratosphere, mesosphere and lower thermosphere (Davis et al., 2022). Furthermore, we use the Community Aerosol and Radiation Model for Atmospheres (CARMA, Tilmes et al. 2023, based on Yu et al., 2015 with some updates) as the aerosol module, in which we used the Vehkamäki nucleation scheme (Vehkamäki et al., 2002). CARMA defines 20 mass bins and tracks the dry mass of the particles and assumes particle water is in equilibrium with the environmental water vapor. The approximate radius ranges from 0.2 nm to 1.3 μm in radius for the pure sulfate group that sulfate homogeneous nucleation occurs in, and ranges from 0.05 to 8.7 μm in the mixed group that tracks all major tropospheric aerosol types (i.e. black carbon, organic carbon, sea salt, dust, sulfate).

The initial volcanic injection altitude and area are determined by validating the water and aerosol transportation in the first six months against MLS and OMPS observations. In these

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

simulations, the H_2O is injected to 25 to 35 km altitude following Zhu et al. (2022), while the SO_2 is injected 82% of the total mass to 26.5-28 km and 18% to 28-36 km altitude. The injection latitude ranges from 22°S to 6°S, and longitude ranges from 182.5°E to 202.5°E.

5. Summary

A multi-model observation comparison project is designed to evaluate the impact of the 2022 Hunga eruption. Four experiments are designed to cover various research interests for this eruption, including sulfate and water plume dispersion and transport, dynamical and chemical responses in the stratosphere, and climate impact. The project will not only benefit the Hunga Impact assessment, but also benchmark the model performance on simulating stratospheric explosive volcanic eruption events. These events have a potentially large impact on the Earth system, especially on the stratospheric ozone layer and radiative balance.

Code/Data availability

GloSSAC: DOI (10.5067/GloSSAC-L3-V2.2).

Author Contributions:

Y.Z. Concept design, Project Administration, Experiment design, data archive, WACCM models setup;
E.A. provides NOAA balloon aerosol and water vapor observations for experiments
E.B. and S.T. and J.Z. Experiment design, conducts experiments using WACCM6MAM;
A.B. Experiment design, Data archive;
A.J. Experiment 2b prescribed fields preparation;
M.K. provides GloSSAC data for Exp 2b;
Takashi S. and S.W.: S.W. conducted all MIROC-CHASER experiments, data post-processing, data archive under supervision of Takashi S., who developed the aerosol microphysics scheme of the model.
X.W. and W.Y. Conducts experiment using WACCM6MAM;
Z.Z. Conducts experiment using WACCM6MAM, WACCM6MAM data post-processing, data archive;
N.L. and S.B.: Conducts experiment using IPSL7-STRATAER, data post-processing and archive
M.M. and L.F.: Conducts experiment using IPSL7-STRATAER-REPROBUS, data post-processing and archive
S.R. and S.C. Conducts experiments using IFS-COMPO
M.C. Experiment design, Tonga-MIP lead;
F.F.Ø., G.K., O.M. contributed to experiment design
C.B. Conducts experiment using EMAC
I.Q., V.A., R.U. and A.K. Model output inspection and evaluation
E.F. Conducts experiments using GSFC2D, data post-processing, and data archive.
D.P. Contributed to experiment design and conducted experiments using CMAM and data post-processing
P.R.C., L.D.O., Q.L., M.M., and S.S. Contributed to experiment design and conducted experiments with the NASA GEOS CCM
P.C. and P.R.C. Contributed to experiment design and conducted experiments with the NASA GEOS CARMA model

H.A. and Y.Y. Conducts experiment using CCSRNIES-MIROC3.2, data post-processing and archive

D.V. contributed to experiment design and assisted E.B. with variables request

W.R. and P.N. concept design

G.M. concept design and in charge of JASMIN data archiving

P.Y. and Y.P. conduct experiments using CAM5CARMA and data post-processing

S.T. and C.-C. L. conduct experiments using WACCM6CARMA and data post-processing

Competing interests

We declare at least one of the co-authors is on the editorial board of GMD.

Acknowledgement:

We acknowledge Michelle Santee, Martyn Chipperfield, Allegra Legrande, Thomas Peter, Myriam Khodri for their valuable input for this project.

This research has been supported by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (grant nos. 03- 01-07-001, NA17OAR4320101, and NA22OAR4320151). NCAR's Community Earth System Model project is supported by the National Center for Atmospheric Research, which is a major facility sponsored by the NSF under Cooperative Agreement No. 1852977.

W.Y.'s work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. TS and SW were supported by MEXT-Program for the advanced studies of climate change projection (SENTAN) Grant Number JPMXD0722681344 and their MIROC-CHASER and MIROC-ES2H simulations were conducted using the Earth Simulator at JAMSTEC. IFS-Compo is supported by the Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service (CAMS), which is one of six services that form Copernicus, the European Union's Earth observation programme.

The IPSLCM7 model experiments were performed using the high-performance computing (HPC) resources of TGCC (Très Grand Centre de Calcul) under allocations 2024-A0170102201 (project gen2201) provided by GENCI (Grand Équipement National de Calcul Intensif). This study benefited from the ESPRI (Ensemble de Services Pour la Recherche l'IPSL) computing and data centre (https://mesocentre.ipsl.fr) which is supported by CNRS, Sorbonne Université, École Polytechnique and CNES.

V.A. is supported by the NASA NNH22ZDA001N-ACMAP and NNH19ZDA001N-IDS programs.

F.F.Ø. acknowledge support from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant 891186.

R.U. is supported by NASA Upper Atmospheric Composition Observations and Aura Science Team programs as well as through the NASA Internal Scientist Funding Model.

P.R.C., L.D.O., Q.L, S.S., M.M., and P.C. are supported by the NASA Modeling Analysis and Prediction program (program manager: David Considine, NASA HQ) through the NASA Internal Scientist Funding Model. P.C. is additionally supported by the NASA Postdoctoral Program. GEOS CCM and GEOS CARMA simulations were performed at the NASA Center for Climate Simulation.

H.A. and Y.Y were supported by KAKENHI (JP24K00700 and JP24H00751) of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology, Japan, and NEC SX-AURORA TSUBASA at NIES were used to perform CCSRNIES-MIROC3.2 simulations.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

References:

Akiyoshi, H., M. Kadowaki, Y. Yamashita, T. Nagatomo (2023), Dependence of column ozone on future ODSs and GHGs in the variability of 500-ensemble members. Sci. Rep. 13, 320(1–12). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-27635-y

Akiyoshi, H., T. Nakamura, T. Miyasaka, M. Shiotani, and M. Suzuki (2016), A nudged chemistry-climate model simulation of chemical constituent distribution at northern high-latitude stratosphere observed by SMILES and MLS during the 2009/2010 stratospheric sudden warming, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 121, 1361-1380, doi:10.1002/2015JD023334

Andres, R. J., and A. D. Kasgnoc (1998), A time-averaged inventory of subaerial volcanic sulfur emissions, J. Geophys. Res., 103(D19), 25,251–25,261, doi:10.1029/98JD02091.

Bacmeister, J. T., Schoeberl, M. R., Summers, M. E., Rosenfield, J. E., & Zhu, X. (1995). Descent of long-lived trace gases in the winter polar vortex. Journal of Geophysical Research, 100(D6), 11669–11684. https://doi.org/10.1029/94jd02958

Bacmeister, J. T., Suarez, M. J., & Robertson, F. R. (2006). Rain reevaporation, boundary layer–convection interactions, and Pacific rainfall patterns in an AGCM. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, *63*(12), 3383-3403.

Bernath, P. F., McElroy, C. T., Abrams, M. C., Boone, C. D., Butler, M., Camy-Peyret, C., Carleer, M., Clerbaux, C., Coheur, P.-F., Colin, R., DeCola, P., DeMazière, M., Drummond, J. R., Dufour, D., Evans, W. F. J., Fast, H., Fussen, D., Gilbert, K., Jennings, D. E., Llewellyn, E. J., Lowe, R. P., Mahieu, E., McConnell, J. C., McHugh, M., McLeod, S. D., Michaud, R., Midwinter, C., Nassar, R., Nichitiu, F., Nowlan, C., Rinsland, C. P., Rochon, Y. J., Rowlands, N., Semeniuk, K., Simon, P., Skelton, R., Sloan, J. J., Soucy, M.-A., Strong, K., Tremblay, P., Turnbull, D., Walker, K. A., Walkty, I., Wardle, D. A., Wehrle, V., Zander, R., and Zou, J., Atmospheric Chemistry Experiment (ACE): Mission overview, Geophysical Research Letters, 32, https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL022386, 2005.

Boucher O., Servonnat, J., Albright, A. L., Aumont, O., Balkanski, Y., Bastrikov, V., et al. (2020). Presentation and evaluation of the IPSL-CM6A-LR climate model. Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, 12, e2019MS002010. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS002010.

Bretherton, C. S., & Park, S. (2009). A new moist turbulence parameterization in the Community Atmosphere Model. *Journal of Climate*, *22*(12), 3422-3448.

Brodowsky, C., Sukhodolov, T., Feinberg, A., Höpfner, M., Peter, T., Stenke, A., & Rozanov, E. (2021). Modeling the sulfate aerosol evolution after recent moderate volcanic activity, 2008–2012. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 126, e2021JD035472. https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JD035472

Bruehl, C., Lelieveld, J., Schallock, J., & Rieger, L. A. (2023, December). Chemistry Climate Model Studies on the Effect of the Hunga Tonga Eruption on stratospheric Ozone in mid and high Latitudes in 2022. In *AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts* (Vol. 2023, No. 2235, pp. A21B-2235).

Carn, S., Clarisse, L., and Prata, A.: Multi-decadal satellite measurements of global volcanic degassing, J. Volcanol. Geoth. Res., 311, 99–134, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2016.01.002, 2016.

Carn, S., Fioletov, V., McLinden, C. et al. A decade of global volcanic SO_2 emissions measured from space. Sci Rep 7, 44095 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1038/srep44095

Carn, S. (2022), Multi-Satellite Volcanic Sulfur Dioxide L4 Long-Term Global Database V4, Greenbelt, MD, USA, Goddard Earth Science Data and Information Services Center (GES DISC), Accessed: [6/9/2024], 10.5067/MEASURES/SO2/DATA405

Case, P., Colarco, P. R., Toon, B., Aquila, V., & Keller, C. A. (2023). Interactive stratospheric aerosol microphysics-chemistry simulations of the 1991 Pinatubo volcanic aerosols with newly coupled sectional aerosol and stratosphere-troposphere chemistry modules in the NASA GEOS Chemistry-Climate Model (CCM). *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, *15*(8), e2022MS003147.

Clyne, M., Lamarque, J.-F., Mills, M. J., Khodri, M., Ball, W., Bekki, S., Dhomse, S. S., Lebas, N., Mann, G., Marshall, L., Niemeier, U., Poulain, V., Robock, A., Rozanov, E., Schmidt, A., Stenke, A., Sukhodolov, T., Timmreck, C., Toohey, M., Tummon, F., Zanchettin, D., Zhu, Y., and Toon, O. B.: Model physics and chemistry causing intermodel disagreement within the VolMIP-Tambora Interactive Stratospheric Aerosol ensemble, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 21, 3317–3343, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-3317-2021 , 2021.

Clyne, M.: Modeling the Role of Volcanoes in the Climate System – Chapter 4: Tonga-MIP, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, 31487034, 153 pp., 2024.

A. Collow, P. Colarco, A. da Silva, V. Buchard, H. Bian, M. Chin, S. Das, R. Govindaraju, D. Kim, V. Aquila: Benchmarking GOCART-2G in the Goddard Earth Observing System (GEOS), Geoscientific Model Development, 17, 1443–1468, doi: 10.5194/gmd-17-1443-2024 (2024).

Davis, N. A., Callaghan, P., Simpson, I. R., and Tilmes, S.: Specified dynamics scheme impacts on wave-mean flow dynamics, convection, and tracer transport in CESM2 (WACCM6), Atmos.Chem. Phys., 22, 197–214, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-197-2022, 2022.

Dhomse, S. S., Mann, G. W., Antuña Marrero, J. C., Shallcross, S. E., Chipperfield, M. P., Carslaw, K. S., Marshall, L., Abraham, N. L., and Johnson, C. E.: Evaluating the simulated radiative forcings, aerosol properties, and stratospheric warmings from the 1963 Mt Agung, 1982 El Chichón, and 1991 Mt Pinatubo volcanic aerosol clouds, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 20, 13627–13654, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-13627-2020, 2020.

Duncan, B. N., Logan, J. A., Bey, I., Megretskaia, I. A., Yantosca, R. M., Novelli, P. C., ... & Rinsland, C. P. (2007). Global budget of CO, 1988–1997: Source estimates and validation with a global model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *112*(D22).

English, J. M., Toon, O. B., Mills, M. J., and Yu, F.: Microphysical simulations of new particle formation in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 9303-9322, 10.5194/acp-11-9303-2011, 2011.

English, J. M., Toon, O. B., & Mills, M. J. (2013). Microphysical simulations of large volcanic eruptions: Pinatubo and Toba. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *118*(4), 1880-1895.

Errera, Q., Chabrillat, S., Christophe, Y., Debosscher, J., Hubert, D., Lahoz, W., Santee, M. L., Shiotani, M., Skachko, S., von Clarmann, T., and Walker, K.: Technical note: Reanalysis of Aura MLS chemical observations, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 19, 13647–13679, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-13647-2019, 2019.

Eskes, H., Tsikerdekis, A., Ades, M., Alexe, M., Benedictow, A. C., Bennouna, Y., Blake, L., Bouarar, I., Chabrillat, S., Engelen, R., Errera, Q., Flemming, J., Garrigues, S., Griesfeller, J., Huijnen, V., Ilić, L., Inness, A., Kapsomenakis, J., Kipling, Z., Langerock, B., Mortier, A., Parrington, M., Pison, I., Pitkänen, M., Remy, S., Richter, A., Schoenhardt, A., Schulz, M., Thouret, V., Warneke, T., Zerefos, C., and Peuch, V.-H.: Technical note: Evaluation of the Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service Cy48R1 upgrade of June 2023, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 24, 9475–9514, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-24-9475-2024, 2024.

Eyring, V., Cionni, I., Bodeker, G. E., Charlton-Perez, A. J., Kinnison, D. E., Scinocca, J. F., ... & Yamashita, Y. (2010). Multi-model assessment of stratospheric ozone return dates and ozone recovery in CCMVal-2 models. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *10*(19), 9451-9472. https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-9451-2010

Fioletov, V., McLinden, C. A., Griffin, D., Abboud, I., Krotkov, N., Leonard, P. J. T., Li, C., Joiner, J., Theys, N., and Carn, S. (2022), Multi-Satellite Air Quality Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) Database Long-Term L4 Global V2, Edited by Peter Leonard, Greenbelt, MD, USA, Goddard Earth Science Data and Information Services Center (GES DISC), Accessed: [6/9/2024], 10.5067/MEASURES/SO2/DATA406

Fleming, E. L., Newman, P. A., Liang, Q., & Daniel, J. S. (2020). The impact of continuing CFC-11 emissions on stratospheric ozone. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 125(3), e2019JD031849. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019jd031849

Fleming, E. L., Newman, P. A., Liang, Q., & Oman, L. D. (2024). Stratospheric temperature and ozone impacts of the Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai water vapor injection. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 129(1), e2023JD039298. https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JD039298

Flemming, J., Huijnen, V., Arteta, J., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A., Blechschmidt, A.-M., Diamantakis, M., Engelen, R. J., Gaudel, A., Inness, A., Jones, L., Josse, B., Katragkou, E., Marecal, V., Peuch, V.-H., Richter, A., Schultz, M. G., Stein, O., and Tsikerdekis, A.: Tropospheric chemistry in the Integrated Forecasting System of ECMWF, Geosci. Model Dev., 8, 975–1003, 2015.685 https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-8-975-2015

Fomichev, V. I., Fu, C., de Grandpre, J., Beagley, S. R., Ogibalov, V. P., and McConnell, J. C.: Model thermal response to minor radiative energy sources and sinks in the middle atmosphere, J. Geophys. Res., 109, D19107, doi:10.1029/2004JD004892, 2004.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

Gelaro, R., and Coauthors, 2017: The Modern-Era Retrospective Analysis for Research and Applications, Version 2 (MERRA-2). J. Climate, 30, 5419–5454, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0758.1.

Gettelman, A., Mills, M. J., Kinnison, D. E., Garcia, R. R., Smith, A. K., Marsh, D. R., Tilmes, S., Vitt, F., Bardeen, C. G., McInerney, J., Liu, H.-L., Solomon, S. C., Polvani, L. M., Emmons, L. K., Lamarque, J.-F., Richter, J. H., Glanville, A. S., Bacmeister, J. T., Phillips, A. S., Neale, R. B., Simpson, I. R., DuVivier, A. K., Hodzic, A., and Randel, W. J.: The Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model Version6 (WACCM6), J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 124, 12380–12403, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD030943, 2019.

Gidden, M. J., Riahi, K., Smith, S. J., Fujimori, S., Luderer, G., Kriegler, E., ... & Takahashi, K. (2019). Global emissions pathways under different socioeconomic scenarios for use in CMIP6: a dataset of harmonized emissions trajectories through the end of the century. Geoscientific model development, 12(4), 1443-1475. https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-1443-2019

Grell, G. A., & Freitas, S. R. (2014). A scale and aerosol aware stochastic convective parameterization for weather and air quality modeling. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *14*(10), 5233-5250. https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-5233-2014

Hersbach H, Bell B, Berrisford P, et al. (2020). The ERA5 global reanalysis. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 146: 1999–2049. https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803

Hourdin, F., Musat, I., Bony, S., Braconnot, P., Codron, F., Dufresne, J.-L., Fairhead, L., Filiberti, M.-A., Friedlingstein, P., Grandpeix, J.-Y., Krinner, G., Levan, P., Li, Z.-X., and Lott, F.. The LMDZ4 general circulation model : climate performance and sensitivity to parametrized physics with emphasis on tropical convection. Climate Dynamics, 27 :787–813, 2006.

Huang, B., C. Liu, V. Banzon, E. Freeman, G. Graham, B. Hankins, T. Smith, and H.-M. Zhang, 2020: Improvements of the Daily Optimum Interpolation Sea Surface Temperature (DOISST) Version 2.1, Journal of Climate, 34, 2923-2939. doi: 10.1175/JCLI-D-20-0166.1

Huijnen, V., Flemming, J., Chabrillat, S., Errera, Q., Christophe, Y., Blechschmidt, A.-M., Richter, A., and Eskes, H.: C-IFS-CB05-BASCOE: stratospheric chemistry in the Integrated Forecasting System of ECMWF, Geoscientific Model Development, 9, 3071–3091, 2016.705

Hurrell, J. W., et al. (2013), The community Earth system model: A framework for collaborative research, Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc., doi:10.1175/ BAMS-D-12-00121.

Iacono, M. J., Delamere, J. S., Mlawer, E. J., Shephard, M. W., Clough, S. A., & Collins, W. D. (2008). Radiative forcing by long-lived greenhouse gases: Calculations with the AER radiative transfer models. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *113*(D13).

Jöckel, P., Kerkweg, A., Pozzer, A., Sander, R., Tost, H., Riede, H., Baumgaertner, A., Gromov, S., and Kern, B.: Development cycle 2 of the Modular Earth Submodel System (MESSy2), Geosci. Model Dev., 3, 717–752, 2010.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

Jones, A. C., J. M. Haywood, A. Jones, V. Aquila. Sensitivity of volcanic aerosol dispersion to meteorological conditions: a Pinatubo case study, J. Geophys. Res., 121(12), 6892-6908, doi: 10.1002/2016JD025001, 2016.

Jonsson, A. I., de Grandpré, J., Fomichev, V. I., McConnell, J. C., and Beagley, S. R., Doubled CO_2-induced cooling in the middle atmosphere: Photochemical analysis of the ozone radiative feedback, J. Geophys. Res., 109, D24103, doi:10.1029/2004JD005093, 2004.

Kawamiya, M., Hajima, T., Tachiiri, K. et al. Two decades of Earth system modeling with an emphasis on Model for Interdisciplinary Research on Climate (MIROC). Prog Earth Planet Sci 7, 64. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-020-00369-5, (2020).

Kleinschmitt, C., Boucher, O., Bekki, S., Lott, F., and Platt, U.: The Sectional Stratospheric Sulfate Aerosol module (S3A-v1) within the LMDZ general circulation model: description and evaluation against stratospheric aerosol observations, Geosci. Model Dev., 10, 3359–3378, 2017, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-3359-2017.

Kohl, M., C. Brühl, J. Schallock, H. Tost, P. Jöckel, A. Jost, S. Beirle, M. Höpfner, and A. Pozzer (2024). New submodel for emissions from Explosive Volcanic ERuptions (EVER v1.1) within the Modular Earth Submodel System (MESSy, version 2.55.1), https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-2200.

Lamarque, J.-F., et al. (2012), CAM-chem: Description and evaluation of interactive atmospheric chemistry in the Community Earth System Model, Geosci. Model Dev., 5(2), 369–411, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-369-2012.

Lefèvre, F., Brasseur, G. P., Folkins, I., Smith, A. K., and Simon, P.: Chemistry of the 1991–1992 stratospheric winter: Three-dimensional model simulations, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 99, 8183–8195, https://doi.org/10.1029/93JD03476, 1994.

Lefèvre, F., Figarol, F., Carslaw, K. S., and Peter, T.: The 1997 Arctic Ozone depletion quantified from three-dimensional model simulations, Geophys. Res. Lett., 25, 2425–2428, https://doi.org/10.1029/98GL51812, 1998.

Li, C., Peng, Y., Asher, E., Baron, A. A., Todt, M., Thornberry, T. D., et al. (2024). Microphysical simulation of the 2022 Hunga volcano eruption using a sectional aerosol model. Geophysical Research Letters, 51, e2024GL108522. https://doi.org/10.1029/2024GL108522

Lin, S. J., & Rood, R. B. (1996). Multidimensional flux-form semi-Lagrangian transport schemes. Monthly weather review, 124(9), 2046-2070. https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1996)124%3C2046:MFFSLT%3E2.0.CO;2

Liu, X., Easter, R. C., Ghan, S. J., Zaveri, R., Rasch, P., Shi, X., Lamarque, J.-F., Gettelman, A., Morrison, H., Vitt, F., Conley, A., Park, S., Neale, R., Hannay, C., Ekman, A. M. L., Hess, P., Mahowald, N., Collins,W., Iacono, M. J., Bretherton, C. S., Flanner, M. G., and Mitchell, D.: Toward a minimal representation of aerosols in climate models: description and evaluation in the Community Atmosphere Model CAM5, Geosci. Model Dev., 5, 709–739, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-709-2012, 2012.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

Liu, X., Ma, P.-L., Wang, H., Tilmes, S., Singh, B., Easter, R. C., Ghan, S. J., and Rasch, P. J.: Description and evaluation of a new four-mode version of the Modal Aerosol Module (MAM4) within version 5.3 of the Community Atmosphere Model, Geosci. Model Dev., 9, 505–522, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-505-2016, 2016.

Lock, A. P., Brown, A. R., Bush, M. R., Martin, G. M., & Smith, R. N. B. (2000). A new boundary layer mixing scheme. Part I: Scheme description and single-column model tests. *Monthly weather review*, *128*(9), 3187-3199.

Lurton, T., Balkanski, Y., Bastrikov, V., Bekki, S., Bopp, L., Braconnot, P., et al. (2020). Implementation of the CMIP6 forcing data in the IPSL-CM6A-LR model. Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, 12, e2019MS001940. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001940

Marchand, M., Keckhut, P., Lefebvre, S., Claud, C., Cugnet, D., Hauchecorne, A., et al. (2012). Dynamical amplification of the stratospheric solar response simulated with the Chemistry-Climate Model LMDz-Reprobus. Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 75–76, 147–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2011.11.008

Mills, M. J., O. B. Toon, V. Vaida, P. E. Hintze, H. G. Kjaergaard, D. P. Schofield, and T. W. Robinson (2005), Photolysis of sulfuric acid vapor by visible light as a source of the polar stratospheric CN layer, J. Geophys. Res., 110, D08201, doi:10.1029/2004JD005519.

Mills, M. J., Schmidt, A., Easter, R., Solomon, S., Kinnison, D. E., Ghan, S. J., Neely, R. R., Marsh, D. R., Conley, A., Bardeen, C. G., and Gettelman, A.: Global volcanic aerosol properties derived from emissions, 1990–2014, using CESM1(WACCM), J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 121, 2332–2348, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD024290, 2016.

Mills, M. J., Richter, J. H., Tilmes, S., Kravitz, B., Mac-Martin, D. G., Glanville, A. A., Tribbia, J. J., Lamarque, J.-F., Vitt, F., Schmidt, A., Gettelman, A., Hannay, C., Bacmeister, J. T., and Kinnison, D. E.: Radiative and chemical response to interactive stratospheric sulfate aerosols in fully coupled CESM1(WACCM), J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 122, 13061–13078, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027006, 2017.

Molod, A., Takacs, L., Suarez, M., and Bacmeister, J.: Development of the GEOS-5 atmospheric general circulation model: evolution from MERRA to MERRA2, Geosci. Model Dev., 8, 1339-1356, 10.5194/gmd-8-1339-2015, 2015.

Morgenstern, O., Hegglin, M. I., Rozanov, E., O'Connor, F. M., Abraham, N. L., Akiyoshi, H., ... & Zeng, G. (2017). Review of the global models used within phase 1 of the Chemistry–Climate Model Initiative (CCMI). *Geoscientific Model Development*, *10*(2), 639-671.

Naujokat, B., An update of the observed Quasi-Biennial Oscillation of the stratospheric winds over the tropics, J. Atmos. Sci., 43, 1873 - 1877, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1986)043<1873:AUOTOQ>2.0.CO;2, 1986.

Neely III, Ryan R. and Schmidt, Anja (2016) *VolcanEESM: Global volcanic sulphur dioxide (SO2) emissions database from 1850 to present.* Centre for Environmental Data Analysis. [Dataset] https://doi.org/10.5285/76ebdc0b-0eed-4f70-b89e-55e606bcd568

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

Nielsen, J. E., Pawson, S., Molod, A., Auer, B., Da Silva, A. M., Douglass, A. R., ... & Wargan, K. (2017). Chemical mechanisms and their applications in the Goddard Earth Observing System (GEOS) earth system model. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, *9*(8), 3019-3044.

Peuch, V.-H., Engelen, R., Rixen, M., Dee, D., Flemming, J., Suttie, M., Ades, M., Agusti-Panareda, A., Ananasso, C., Andersson, E., Armstrong, D., Barre, J., Bousserez, N., Dominguez, J. J., Garrigues, S., Inness, A., Jones, L., Kipling, Z., Letertre-Danczak, J., Parrington, M., Razinger, M., Ribas, R., Vermoote, S., Yang, X., Simmons, A., de Marcilla, J. G., and Thepaut, J.-N.: The Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service: From Research to Operations, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 103, E2650 – E2668, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-21-0314.1, 2022.

Pringle, K. J., Tost, H., Message, S., Steil, B., Giannadaki, D., Nenes, A., Fountoukis, C., Stier, P., Vignati, E., and Lelieveld, J.: Description and evaluation of GMXe: a new aerosol submodel for global simulations (v1), Geosci. Model Dev., 3, 391–412, 2010.

Putman, W. M., & Lin, S. J. (2007). Finite-volume transport on various cubed-sphere grids. *Journal of Computational Physics*, *227*(1), 55-78.

Quaglia, I., Timmreck, C., Niemeier, U., Visioni, D., Pitari, G., Brodowsky, C., Brühl, C., Dhomse, S. S., Franke, H., Laakso, A., Mann, G. W., Rozanov, E., and Sukhodolov, T.: Interactive stratospheric aerosol models' response to different amounts and altitudes of SO2 injection during the 1991 Pinatubo eruption, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 23, 921–948, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-23-921-2023, 2023.

Randel et al (2024): Randel, William J., Xinyue Wang, Jon Starr, Rolando R. Garcia, and Douglas Edward Kinnison. "Long-term temperature impacts of the Hunga volcanic eruption in the stratosphere and above." ESS Open Archive eprints 815 (2024): 172249118-81591303.

Reinecker, M., Suarez, M., Todling, R., Bacmeister, J., Takacs, L., & Liu, H. (2008). The GEOS-5 data assimilation system-documentation of versions 5.0. 1, 5.1. 0 (No. NASA Tech Rep TM-2007, 104606).

Rémy, S., Kipling, Z., Huijnen, V., Flemming, J., Nabat, P., Michou, M., Ades, M., Engelen, R., and Peuch, V.-H.: Description and evaluation of the tropospheric aerosol scheme in the Integrated Forecasting System (IFS-AER, cycle 47R1) of ECMWF, Geoscientific Model Development, 15, 4881–4912, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-4881-2022, 2022.

Schallock, J., C. Brühl, C. Bingen, M. Höpfner, L. Rieger, and J. Lelieveld (2023), Reconstructing volcanic radiative forcing since 1990, using a comprehensive emission inventory and spatially resolved sulfur injections from satellite data in a chemistry-climate model, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 23, 1169–1207.

Scinocca, J. F.: An Accurate Spectral Non-Orographic Gravity Wave Parameterization for General Circulation Models, J. Atmos. Sci., 60, 667–682, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(2003)060%3C0667:AASNGW%3E2.0.CO;2, 2003.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

Scinocca, J. F., McFarlane, N. A., Lazare, M, Li, J., and Plummer, D., Technical Note: The CCCma third generation AGCM and its extension into the middle atmosphere, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 8, 7055–7074, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-7055-2008, 2008.

Seddon, J., Stephens, A., Mizielinski, M. S., Vidale, P. L., and Roberts, M. J.: Technology to aid the analysis of large-volume multi-institute climate model output at a central analysis facility (PRIMAVERA Data Management Tool V2.10), Geosci. Model Dev., 16, 6689–6700, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-16-6689-2023, 2023.

Sekiya, T., K. Sudo, and T. Nagai (2016), Evolution of stratospheric sulfate aerosol from the 1991 Pinatubo eruption: Roles of aerosol microphysical processes, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 121, 2911–2938, doi:10.1002/2015JD024313.

Strahan, S. E., Duncan, B. N., & Hoor, P. (2007). Observationally derived transport diagnostics for the lowermost stratosphere and their application to the GMI chemistry and transport model. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *7*(9), 2435-2445.

Sukhodolov, T., Egorova, T., Stenke, A., Ball, W. T., Brodowsky, C., Chiodo, G., Feinberg, A., Friedel, M., Karagodin-Doyennel, A., Peter, T., Sedlacek, J., Vattioni, S., and Rozanov, E.: Atmosphere ocean aerosol chemistry climate model SOCOLv4.0: description and evaluation, Geosci. Model Dev., 14, 5525–5560, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-5525-2021 , 2021.

Taha, G., et al. (2021), OMPS LP Version 2.0 multi-wavelength aerosol extinction coefficient retrieval algorithm, Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 14, https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-14-1015-2021

Taha, G., et al. "Tracking the 2022 Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai aerosol cloud in the upper and middle stratosphere using space-based observations." Geophysical Research Letters 49.19 (2022): e2022GL100091.

Tilmes, S., Mills, M. J., Zhu, Y., Bardeen, C. G., Vitt, F., Yu, P., Fillmore, D., Liu, X., Toon, B., and Deshler, T.: Description and performance of a sectional aerosol microphysical model in the Community Earth System Model (CESM2), Geosci. Model Dev., 16, 6087-6125, 10.5194/gmd-16-6087-2023, 2023. doi: 10.5194/gmd-16-6087-2023

Tatebe, H., Ogura, T., Nitta, T., Komuro, Y., Ogochi, K., Takemura, T., Sudo, K., Sekiguchi, M., Abe, M., Saito, F., Chikira, M., Watanabe, S., Mori, M., Hirota, N., Kawatani, Y., Mochizuki, T., Yoshimura, K., Takata, K., O'ishi, R., Yamazaki, D., Suzuki, T., Kurogi, M., Kataoka, T., Watanabe, M., and Kimoto, M.: Description and basic evaluation of simulated mean state, internal variability, and climate sensitivity in MIROC6, Geosci. Model Dev., 12, 2727–2765, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-2727-2019, 2019.

Tsujino, H. et al. JRA-55 based surface dataset for driving ocean–sea-ice models (JRA55-do). Ocean Modell. 130, 79–139 (2018).

Thomason, L. W., N. Ernest, L. Millán, L. Rieger, A. Bourassa, J.-P. Vernier, G. Manney, T. Peter, B. Luo, and F. Arfeuille (2018), A global, space-based stratospheric aerosol climatology: 1979 to 2016, submitted to Earth System Science Data, 10, 469–492, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-10-469-2018.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

Kovilakam, M., Thomason, L. W., Ernest, N., Rieger, L., Bourassa, A., and Millán, L. (2020), The Global Space-based Stratospheric Aerosol Climatology (version 2.0): 1979–2018, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 12, 2607–2634, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-2607-2020.

Kovilakam, M., Thomason, L., and Knepp, T.: SAGE III/ISS aerosol/cloud categorization and its impact on GloSSAC, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 16, 2709–2731, https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-16-2709-2023, 2023.

Vehkamäki, H., Kulmala, M., Napari, I., Lehtinen, K. E., Timmreck, C., Noppel, M., and Laaksonen, A.: An improved parameterization for sulfuric acid-water nucleation rates for tropospheric and stratospheric conditions, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 107, AAC 3- 1–AAC 3-10, https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JD002184, 2002.

Wang, X., Randel, W., Zhu, Y., Tilmes, S., Starr, J., Yu, W., et al. (2023). Stratospheric climate anomalies and ozone loss caused by the Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai volcanic eruption. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 128, e2023JD039480. https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JD039480

Watanabe, S., Hajima, T., Sudo, K., Nagashima, T., Takemura, T., Okajima, H., Nozawa, T., Kawase, H., Abe, M., Yokohata, T., Ise, T., Sato, H., Kato, E., Takata, K., Emori, S., and Kawamiya, M.: MIROC-ESM 2010: model description and basic results of CMIP5-20c3m experiments, Geosci. Model Dev., 4, 845–872, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-4-845-2011, 2011.

Williams, J. E., Huijnen, V., Bouarar, I., Meziane, M., Schreurs, T., Pelletier, S., Marecal, V., Josse, B., and Flemming, J.: Regional evaluation of the performance of the global CAMS chemical modeling system over the United States (IFS cycle 47r1), Geoscientific Model Development, 15, 4657–4687, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-4657-2022, 2022.

Yu, P., O. B. Toon, C. G. Bardeen, M. J. Mills, T. Fan, J. M. English, and R. R. Neely (2015), Evaluations of tropospheric aerosol properties simulated by the community earth system model with a sectional aerosol microphysics scheme, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 7, 865–914, doi:10.1002/2014MS000421.

Yu, W., Garcia, R., Yue, J., Smith, A., Wang, X., Randel, W., ... & Mlynczak, M. (2023). Mesospheric temperature and circulation response to the Hunga Tonga-Hunga-Ha'apai volcanic eruption. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 128(21), e2023JD039636.

Zhang, J., Kinnison, D., Zhu, Y., Wang, X., Tilmes, S., Dube, K., & Randel, W. (2024). Chemistry contribution to stratospheric ozone depletion after the unprecedented water-rich Hunga Tonga eruption. Geophysical Research Letters, 51, e2023GL105762. https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GL105762

Zhou, X., S.S. Dhomse, W. Feng, G. Mann, S. Heddell, H. Pumphrey, B.J. Kerridge, B. Latter, R. Siddans, L. Ventress, R. Querel, P. Smale, E. Asher, E.G. Hall, S. Bekki and M.P. Chipperfield (2024), Antarctic vortex dehydration in 2023 as a substantial removal pathway for Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai water vapour, Geophysical Research Letters, 51, e2023GL107630, doi:10.1029/2023GL107630.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3412
Preprint. Discussion started: 18 November 2024

Zhu, Y., Bardeen, C.G., Tilmes, S. et al. Perturbations in stratospheric aerosol evolution due to the water-rich plume of the 2022 Hunga-Tonga eruption. Commun Earth Environ 3, 248 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-022-00580-w