Influence of anthropogenic aerosol on multi-decadal variations of historical climate Laura Wilcox^{1,2} | Ellie Highwood²



NATURAL ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH COUNCIL

l.j.wilcox@reading.ac.uk

1. NCAS-Climate, University of Reading 2. Department of Meteorology, University of Reading

The indirect effect may account for up to 2/3 of aerosol forced changes in precipitation, and almost all aerosol induced cooling [1]. However, this is strongly model-dependent e.g. [2].

CMIP5 provides an unprecedented number of models with an indirect effect

•Do models with an indirect effect better reproduce historical trends? A subset of CMIP5 models have made anthropogenic aerosol single forcing runs available

• Does aerosol play a key role in temperature and precipitation change?

CMIP5 models show a diverse climate response to aerosol forcing

• How much of this range is due to diversity in the model aerosol,

Diversity in aerosol load and distribution





and how much is due to a diversity in the models' response to aerosol changes?

Aerosol contribution to historical trends



Figure 1: (*a*): Non-linear trends from single forcing runs and observations for global-mean annual-mean near-surface temperature. Solid lines show the ensemble mean for each run, shading shows the range of the realisations from individual models. (b): Contributions from AA, natural, and GHG forcing to the trend. Hatching where natural and AA forcing are positive.

- •Linear sum of single forcing time series gives excellent approximation of all forcing temperature
- Anthropogenic aerosol (AA) forcing accounts for >50% of the trend in the decade centred on 1950
- AA and natural forcing accounts for >50% of the trend from 1940-1970

Figure 4: Historical-mean mass load of dust from (a): HadGEM2-ES, (b): MIROC4h, and of black carbon from (c): HadGEM2-ES, (d): MIROC-ESM-CHEM.

- Considerable diversity in load and distribution of both natural and anthropogenic aerosol
- Diversity in aerosol categorisation across modelling centres

Diversity in sensitivity to aerosol









Figure 2: (a): Non-linear trends from single forcing runs and observations for the analysis of the formation of the second secon hemispheric temperature difference. Solid lines show the $e^{h_{s}^{0}}e^{h_{s}}$ range of the realisations from individual models. (b): Contribution trend. Hatching where natural and AA forcing are positive⁸⁰⁻ •All forcings shows a near cancellation

▶ Variability reflects AA time series 🚆 •>50% of trend driven by AA prior to 19

The importance of the in



Figure 5: Comparison of the temperature-precipitation relationship for simulations with different forcings from (a): CSIRO-Mk3.6.0, and (b): IPSL-CM5A-LR.

• Precipitation increases linearly with temperature under GHG forcing •In many models (e.g. Fig. 5(a)), when all forcings are included in simulations, this relationship becomes bi-modal, and precipitation changes are reduced

•AA forcing is the dominant cause of this difference [3] • This response pattern is not present in some models (e.g. Fig 5(b)), suggesting they may be less sensitive to AA forcing.



Figure 3: Non-linear trends in (a): global-mean annual-mean near-surface temperature; (b): annual-mean *inter-hemispheric temperature difference*

SA: models with the direct and indirect effects **SD**: models with the direct effect only

• Better representation of trend magnitude and variability in SA vs. SD

Learn more:

Wilcox et al., (2013). Environmental Research Letters, 8, 024033.

Figure 6: Response of (a): droplet radius and (b): latent heat flux to changes in sulphate load. Colours show model means, grey shows the individual ensemble members.

• Consistent with the precipitation response to temperature, IPSL-CM5A-LR can also be seen to have muted shortwave and heat flux responses to changes in sulphate load, relative to other models

Next steps:

• Regional case studies

• Quantify model diversity in aerosol and water cycle variables • Quantify sensitivity of the response of water cycle variables to aerosol changes

• Identification of aerosol-sensitive regions

[1] Levy et al., (2013). Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres, **118**, 4521-4532. [2] Shindell et al., (2012). Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, **12**, 6969-6982. [3] Wu et al., (2013). *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 807-810.



www.met.reading.ac.uk/~laura

