

Radiative forcing by super-volcano eruptions

Eirik Rolland Enger¹, Rune Grand Graversen², and Audun Theodorsen¹


¹UiT The Arctic University of Norway


²Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute



March 05, 2024


Abstract

We investigate the climatic effects of volcanic eruptions spanning from Mt. Pinatubo-sized events to super-volcanoes. The study is based on ensemble simulations in the Community Earth System Model Version 2 (CESM2) climate model using the Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model Version 6 (WACCM6) atmosphere model. Our analysis focuses on the impact of different SO_2 -amount injections on stratospheric aerosol optical depth (AOD), effective radiative forcing (RF), and global temperature anomalies. Unlike the traditional linear models used for smaller eruptions, our results reveal a non-linear relationship between RF and AOD for larger eruptions. We also uncover a notable time-dependent decrease in aerosol forcing efficiency across all eruption magnitudes during the first post-eruption year. In addition, the study reveals that larger as compared to medium-sized eruption events produce a delayed and sharper peak in AOD, and a longer-lasting temperature response while the time evolution of RF remains similar between the two eruption types. When including the results of previous studies, we find that relating SO_2 to any other parameter is inconsistent across models compared to the relationships between AOD, RF, and temperature anomaly. Thus, we expect the largest uncertainty in model codes to relate to the chemistry and physics of SO_2 evolution. Finally, we find that the peak RF approaches a limiting value, and that the peak temperature response follows linearly, effectively bounding the temperature anomaly to at most ~ 12 K.









Radiative forcing by super-volcano eruptions

Eirik R. Enger¹, Rune Graverson¹, Audun Theodorsen¹

¹UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway

Key Points:

- The linear RF dependence on AOD breaks down for eruptions larger than Mt. Pinatubo
- The RF to AOD ratio has a time-after-eruption dependence on eruption latitude
- Temperature and RF peak values has a linear dependence and reaches an upper limit

Abstract

We investigate the climatic effects of volcanic eruptions spanning from Mt. Pinatubo-sized events to super-volcanoes. The study is based on ensemble simulations in the Community Earth System Model Version 2 (CESM2) climate model using the Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model Version 6 (WACCM6) atmosphere model. Our analysis focuses on the impact of different SO₂-amount injections on stratospheric aerosol optical depth (AOD), effective radiative forcing (RF), and global temperature anomalies. Unlike the traditional linear models used for smaller eruptions, our results reveal a non-linear relationship between RF and AOD for larger eruptions. We also uncover a notable time-dependent decrease in aerosol forcing efficiency across all eruption magnitudes during the first post-eruption year. In addition, the study reveals that larger as compared to medium-sized eruption events produce a delayed and sharper peak in AOD, and a longer-lasting temperature response while the time evolution of RF remains similar between the two eruption types. When including the results of previous studies, we find that relating SO₂ to any other parameter is inconsistent across models compared to the relationships between AOD, RF, and temperature anomaly. Thus, we expect the largest uncertainty in model codes to relate to the chemistry and physics of SO₂ evolution. Finally, we find that the peak RF approaches a limiting value, and that the peak temperature response follows linearly, effectively bounding the temperature anomaly to at most ~ -12 K.

Plain Language Summary

Volcanic eruptions can have a significant impact on the Earth's climate. Eruptions large enough that the aerosols they emit reach the stratosphere cause a cooling effect by reflecting sunlight. Typically, an eruption is measured by its impact on the opacity of the stratosphere and the change in the energy balance at the top of the atmosphere. The two measures are often assumed to be linearly related, but the linearity is tested only against eruptions seen in the last two millennia. We use a coupled climate model to simulate the impact of eruptions of sizes up to the largest known eruptions. The smallest eruptions we simulate are still large enough to cause global climate effects. We find a clear non-linear relationship for eruptions larger than the ones seen in the past two millennia. Our simulations and supporting data shows that the eruption latitude significantly influences the development of the relationship between energy imbalance and stratospheric opacity with time after the eruption. Additionally, we find evidence that the peak energy imbalance reaches a limit, and that the peak temperature response follows linearly with the peak energy imbalance, also reaching a limiting value.

1 Introduction

Effective radiative forcing (RF) and stratospheric aerosol optical depth (AOD) are crucial metrics representing the energy imbalance at top-of-the-atmosphere (TOA) and the stratospheric opacity due to aerosol scattering, respectively. They are extensively used to quantify the impact of major volcanic eruptions. The assumption of a linear dependency of RF on AOD is commonly adopted (Myhre et al., 2013; Andersson et al., 2015), and applying such a linear relationship has yielded reasonably accurate estimates in climate model simulations of volcanic eruptions (Mills et al., 2017; Hansen et al., 2005; Gregory et al., 2016; Marshall et al., 2020; Pitari et al., 2016). Yet, a wide spread in the estimated aerosol forcing efficiencies (RF normalised by AOD) exists among studies, spanning approximately from $\sim -15 \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$ (Pitari et al., 2016) to $\sim -25 \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$ (Myhre et al., 2013). Additionally, these estimates are predominantly based on small eruptions with AOD values up to at most ~ 0.7 .

Although H₂O, N₂, and CO₂ are the most abundant gases emitted by volcanoes (Robock, 2000), sulphur species such as SO₂ provide a greater influence due to the com-

paratively high background concentrations of the former gases in the atmosphere. The transformation of SO_2 molecules through reactions with OH and H_2O leads to the formation of sulphuric acid (H_2SO_4) (Robock, 2000), which scatters sunlight thereby elevating planetary albedo and reducing the RF. As the conversion from SO_2 to H_2SO_4 occurs over weeks (Robock, 2000), the peak RF experiences a slight delay from the eruption’s peak SO_2 injection. The lifetime of the H_2SO_4 aerosols in the stratosphere depends on various factors, including latitude (Marshall et al., 2019; Toohey et al., 2019), volcanic plume height (Marshall et al., 2019), aerosol size (Marshall et al., 2019), the quasi-biennial oscillation phase (Pitari et al., 2016) and the season of the year (determining to which hemisphere aerosols are transported) (Toohey et al., 2011, 2019). In the case of tropical eruptions, aerosols are typically transported poleward in the stratosphere and descend back to mid-latitude troposphere within one to two years (Robock, 2000). Upon descending below the tropopause, these aerosols are readily removed by wet deposition (Liu et al., 2012).

Before the current era of significant anthropogenic climate forcing, volcanic eruptions were the primary forcing mechanism dictating Earth’s climate variability during the Holocene period (Sigl et al., 2022). Despite this substantial impact, few climate-model experiments have included volcanic forcing when simulating climate evolution during the Holocene (Sigl et al., 2022), likely implying an exaggerated positive forcing (Gregory et al., 2016; Solomon et al., 2011). This absence of persistent cooling is one of several factors that have been suggested to contribute to the common disparity between simulated and observed global warming (Andersson et al., 2015). Despite extensive attention on understanding the way volcanic eruptions influence climate, questions regarding aerosol particle processes—such as growth and creation rates when OH is scarce—remain unanswered (e.g. Robock, 2000; Zanchettin et al., 2019; Marshall et al., 2020, 2022). These processes impact aerosol scattering efficiency and potentially the RF to AOD relationship. Marshall et al. (2020) observe higher aerosol forcing efficiency in post-eruption years 2 and 3 compared to year 1, and attribute this post-eruption increase in aerosol forcing efficiency to strong spatial concentration in the initial year and subsequent distribution of aerosols over a larger area. This spatial redistribution increases the albedo per global mean AOD thereby causing a stronger RF to AOD ratio (Marshall et al., 2020).

Previous studies of both Mt. Pinatubo (Mills et al., 2017; Hansen et al., 2005) and volcanoes within the instrumental era (Gregory et al., 2016) have been used to estimate the relationship between the RF energy imbalance and change in AOD caused by volcanic eruptions. While Myhre et al. (2013) employ a formula scaling RF by AOD to obtain $-25 \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$, recent literature reports estimates down to $-19.0(5) \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$ (Gregory et al., 2016) and $-18.3(10) \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$ (Mills et al., 2017). Synthetic volcano simulations in Marshall et al. (2020) yield a scaling factor of $-20.5(2) \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$ across an ensemble of 82 simulations featuring varying injection heights and latitudes of volcanic emissions, with injected SO_2 ranging from 10 to 100 Tg(SO_2).

A similar simulation setup, albeit with notable differences, was conducted by Niemeier and Timmreck (2015), involving an ensemble of 14 levels of injected sulphur spanning between 1 Tg(S)yr^{-1} ($2 \text{ Tg(SO}_2\text{)yr}^{-1}$) and 100 Tg(S)yr^{-1} ($200 \text{ Tg(SO}_2\text{)yr}^{-1}$). These geo-engineering simulations maintained continuous sulphur injections, running until a steady sulphur level was achieved. Results indicated an inverse exponential relationship between RF and injected SO_2 rate, converging to -65 Wm^{-2} (Eq. 1). Even the $100\times$ Mt. Pinatubo super-volcano simulation by Jones et al. (2005), which obtained a peak RF of -60 Wm^{-2} , is below the suggested limit of -65 Wm^{-2} . Moreover, Timmreck et al. (2010) find a peak RF anomaly of -18 Wm^{-2} from a 1700 Tg(SO_2) eruption simulation, which corresponds well with the function estimated by Niemeier and Timmreck (2015) at the given SO_2 level. Several studies have demonstrated a linear relationship of approximately $-20 \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$ between RF and AOD, although substantial variability exists in the slope among studies (Mills et al., 2017; Hansen et al., 2005; Gregory et al., 2016; Marshall et al., 2020; Pitari

et al., 2016). Moreover, a time-after-eruption dependence on the RF to AOD ratio is found in Marshall et al. (2020), whereas Niemeier and Timmreck (2015) revealed a non-linear relationship between RF and injected SO₂ rate. Thus, a consensus on the relationship between injected SO₂, AOD, and RF has yet to be established.

One avenue that has garnered considerable attention is comparing the magnitude of volcanic or volcano-like forcings to increased CO₂ levels. Several studies explore the connection between volcanic forcing and the climate sensitivity to a doubling of CO₂ (Boer et al., 2007; Marvel et al., 2016; Merlis et al., 2014; Ollila, 2016; Richardson et al., 2019; Salvi et al., 2022; Wigley et al., 2005). The comparison of forcing from volcanoes and CO₂ aims to mitigate the large uncertainty in estimates of the sensitivity of the real climate system. Inferring climate sensitivity from volcanic eruption events has been attempted as a way to constrain the sensitivity (Boer et al., 2007) by assuming that volcanic and CO₂ forcings produce similar feedbacks (Pauling et al., 2023). Earlier studies suggest the potential for constraining equilibrium climate sensitivity (ECS) using volcanoes (Bender et al., 2010), provided that ECS is constrained by effective radiative forcing (ERF) rather than instantaneous radiative forcing (IRF), as ERF accounts for rapid atmospheric adjustments in contrast to IRF (Richardson et al., 2019). However, other studies refute this approach, pointing out that different sensitivities of volcanic forcing and CO₂ doubling seem to exist (Douglass et al., 2006), or that constraining the ECS by ERF lacks accuracy due to the precision of climate simulations (Boer et al., 2007; Salvi et al., 2022). Although ERF offers a more suitable indicator of forcing than IRF (Marvel et al., 2016; Richardson et al., 2019), more recent studies conclude that ECS cannot be constrained from volcanic eruption events (Pauling et al., 2023).

Employing eruptions in the medium to super-volcano size enhances the signal-to-noise ratio without necessitating an extensive and computationally expensive ensemble, and as such, is a tempting way to mimic a large ensemble of smaller volcanic eruptions. However, the AOD, RF, and temperature signatures are not necessarily a simple scaling of that of smaller volcanic eruptions. Previous studies have simulated super-volcanoes using AOD as the input forcing, where the AOD was that of Mt. Pinatubo scaled by a factor of one hundred (Jones et al., 2005). This approach may yield incorrect results, both because the peak of the AOD may be too small or too big, but also because the evolution of the AOD could be inappropriate. Likewise, a different AOD evolution may be found from similar size eruptions, but at different latitudes. To investigate this issue, our simulations are based on four levels of injected SO₂ covering three orders of magnitude and the inclusion of one high latitude eruption of the second largest injected SO₂ case.

We conducted ensemble simulations of volcanic eruptions in the Community Earth System Model Version 2 (CESM2) coupled with the Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model Version 6 (WACCM6). The ensembles span four different levels of injected SO₂: 26 Tg(SO₂), 400 Tg(SO₂), 1629 Tg(SO₂) and 3000 Tg(SO₂). Details regarding the experimental setup are provided in section 2. Our findings reveal non-linear RF to AOD dependencies for medium to super-volcano size eruptions. Additionally, we observe a time-dependent variation in the RF to AOD ratio, detailed in section 3 and discussed in section 4. Furthermore, our data, along with insights from previous studies, suggest that the RF dependency on injected SO₂ identified by Niemeier and Timmreck (2015) acts as a lower boundary. Our conclusions are presented in section 5.

2 Method

2.1 Model

We use the CESM2 (Danabasoglu et al., 2020) in conjunction with the WACCM6 (Gettelman et al., 2019) and the fully dynamical ocean component Parallel Ocean Program version 2 (POP2) (R. Smith et al., 2010; Danabasoglu et al., 2020). The atmosphere

Table 1. Simulations done with the CESM2^a

| Ensemble name | Tg(SO ₂) | Lat [°N] | Lon [°E] | Alt [km] | Eruption months |
|---------------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| C2W↑↑ | 3000 | 0 | 1 | 18–20 | May, Nov |
| C2WN↑ | 1629 | 56 | 287.7 | 18–20 | Feb, Aug |
| C2W↑ | 1629 | 0 | 1 | 18–20 | Feb,May,Aug,Nov |
| C2W– | 400 | 0 | 1 | 18–20 | Feb,May,Aug,Nov |
| C2W↓ | 26 | 0 | 1 | 18–20 | Feb,May,Aug,Nov |

^aThe ensembles C2WN↑ and C2W↑ have the same eruption magnitude, but while C2W↑ is located at the equator, C2WN↑ is located at a high northern latitude. C2W↑↑, C2W– and C2W↓ are located at the equator, but with different magnitudes compared to C2W↑. The three smallest tropical ensembles have four members, indicated by the number of eruption months, while the northern latitude and the extra large super-volcano ensemble consists of two members.

162 model was run at a nominal 2° resolution with 70 vertical levels in the middle atmosphere
163 (MA) configuration.

164 The WACCM6 version employed in the MA configuration uses the three mode ver-
165 sion of the Modal Aerosol Module (MAM3) (Gettelman et al., 2019), a simplified and
166 computationally efficient default setting within the Community Atmosphere Model ver-
167 sion 5 (CAM5) (Liu et al., 2016), as described in Liu et al. (2012). The MAM3 was de-
168 veloped from MAM7 and features the modes Aitken, accumulation, and coarse (Liu et
169 al., 2016).

170 2.2 Simulations

171 Appendix A provides a description of the simulation setup and utilised output vari-
172 ables. Table 1 summarises the simulations, encompassing four SO₂ injection magnitudes
173 and up to four seasons: 15 February, 15 May, 15 August, and 15 November. The mag-
174 nitudes vary over three orders of magnitude: 26 Tg(SO₂), 400 Tg(SO₂), 1629 Tg(SO₂),
175 and 3000 Tg(SO₂).

176 The smallest eruption case, C2W↓, is similar in magnitude as compared to events
177 like Mt. Pinatubo (~ 10–20 Tg(SO₂); Timmreck et al., 2018) and Mt. Tambora (~ 56.2 Tg(SO₂);
178 Zanchettin et al., 2016). The intermediate case, C2W–, resembles the magnitude of the
179 Samalas eruption in 1257 (~ 144–170 Tg(SO₂); Vidal et al., 2016), while the second largest
180 and largest eruption cases, C2W↑ and C2W↑↑, is in the likely range of the Young Toba
181 Tuff (YTT) eruption occurring about 72 000 yr ago (100–10 000 Tg(SO₂); Jones et al.,
182 2005). All eruptions were situated at the equator (0°N, 1°E) with SO₂ injected between
183 18 km and 20 km altitude. Collectively, the four tropical eruption cases C2W↓, C2W–,
184 C2W↑, and C2W↑↑ are referred to as C2WTrop. An additional high-latitude eruption
185 ensemble, labelled C2WN↑, of the same injected SO₂ magnitude as C2W↑ was simulated
186 at 56°N, 287.7°E with a six-month separation (15 February and 15 August).

187 3 Results

188 3.1 Analysis of the time series

189 Figure 1 presents time series of global mean AOD, RF, and surface air tempera-
190 ture. The black lines represent the medians across the ensembles, while shading indicates
191 the 5th to 95th percentiles. The four distinct forcing magnitudes (C2W↓, C2W–, C2W↑,
192 and C2W↑↑) outlined in table 1 have been used. The time series in Fig. 1 are normalised

193 by setting the peak value to unity, defined based on the peak of a fit from a Savitzky-
 194 Golay filter of 3rd order and a one-year window length (Savitzky & Golay, 1964).

195 A notable feature across the subfigures of Fig. 1 is the peak occurrence of the C2W↓
 196 case compared to the larger eruption cases. The peak of C2W↓ arrives earlier for both
 197 AOD (Fig. 1a) and temperature (Fig. 1c), while the RF time series in Fig. 1b are all in-
 198 distinguishable. Cases C2W−, C2W↑, and C2W↑↑ are indistinguishable in their tem-
 199 perature development, and while C2W↓ peaks at an earlier time, it decays similarly to
 200 the other cases. Interestingly, the same development between C2W− and C2W↑ is not
 201 found in the AOD time series. C2W↓ peaks at an earlier time, but also spends more time
 202 around the peak and as such decays at a later time post-eruption. Likewise, C2W− has
 203 a faster rise and slower decay compared to C2W↑, but where both peak at a similar time.
 204 C2W↑ and C2W↑↑ have similar AOD developments, but where C2W↑↑ show a slightly
 205 faster decay from the peak.

206 The timescale of the perturbation of AOD and RF is shorter than that of the tem-
 207 perature. While the AOD and RF time series return to their equilibrium state within
 208 roughly three years, the temperature time series remain heavily perturbed three years
 209 post-eruption. Even when running the simulations for 20 years post-eruption, the tem-
 210 perature time series are still decaying.

211 3.2 RF dependency on AOD

212 We next focus on the development of the AOD and RF time series relative to each
 213 other. Similar comparisons were conducted in Gregory et al. (2016, their Fig. 4) and Marshall
 214 et al. (2020, their Fig. 1), with RF plotted against AOD. Figure 2 displays annual mean
 215 values from the five simulation cases in table 1; the small eruption case (C2W↓) as blue
 216 downward-pointing triangles, the intermediate eruption case (C2W−) as orange thick
 217 diamonds, the large tropical eruption case (C2W↑) as green upward-pointing triangles,
 218 the extra large eruption case (C2W↑↑) as small pink upward-pointing carets, and the large
 219 northern hemisphere eruption case (C2WN↑) as brown upward-pointing three-branched
 220 twigs. Also shown are the data from Gregory et al. (2016, Fig. 4, black crosses from HadCM3
 221 sstPiHistVol) as grey crosses labelled G16 (described in Appendix B, section B3). Ad-
 222 ditionally, the estimated peak values from the Mt. Pinatubo and Mt. Tambora eruptions
 223 are plotted as a black star and plus, while the peak from the Jones et al. (2005) simu-
 224 lation is shown as a pink square labelled J05. Finally, red circles represent the peak val-
 225 ues obtained from the C2W eruption cases. The straight lines are the same as shown by
 226 Gregory et al. (2016). The full data range is shown in Fig. 2a while Fig. 2b highlights
 227 a narrow range, focusing on the C2W↓ case.

228 The annual mean data from the Pinatubo-like C2W↓ case in Fig. 2b have RF val-
 229 ues as a function of AOD that follow almost the same constant slope as the G16 data.
 230 However, in Fig. 2a we observe that the stronger eruptions lead to dissimilar responses
 231 in AOD and RF, where C2W− seems to follow close to a -10 slope and C2W↑ is closer
 232 to a -5 slope. The peak values (red circles) suggest a non-linear dependence, while within
 233 each eruption strength (same colour) the annual mean values fall relatively close to a straight
 234 line.

235 To investigate the time dependence of the ratio between RF and AOD, we present
 236 seasonal means of this ratio in Fig. 3. The plot shows the eruption cases given in table 1,
 237 as well as the tropical eruptions from Marshall and Smith (2020) (6 of 82 eruptions), la-
 238 belled M20 and described in Appendix B, section B2. The C2W↑ case is similar to C2W↑↑
 239 as indicated in table 2, but is not shown in the plot to better highlight C2WN↑. In Fig. 3a,
 240 lines are linear regression fits to the seasonal means across all ensemble members, sum-
 241 marised in table 2. Shaded regions are the standard deviation around the seasonal means.
 242 A similar shading is plotted in Fig. 3b, but where the regression fits have been omitted
 243 for clarity. As the AOD and RF time series start from zero, the ratio from the first sea-




Figure 1. AOD (a), RF (b) and temperature response (c) time series to the four tropical volcanic eruption cases, C2W \downarrow , C2W $-$, C2W \uparrow , and C2W $\uparrow\uparrow$. The time series have been normalised to have peak values at unity, where C is the normalisation constant. Black lines indicate the median across the ensembles, while shading marks the 5th and 95th percentiles.




Figure 2. RF as a function of AOD, yearly means. Data from the five simulations listed in table 1 (C2W↓, C2W-, C2W↑, C2WN↑, and C2W↑↑) are shown along with the data from the HadCM3 sstPiHistVol simulation by Gregory et al. (2016) (grey crosses, G16). Also shown are the estimated peak values of the Mt. Pinatubo (black star) and Mt. Tambora (black plus) eruptions. The peak values from the C2W simulations are shown as red circles. Additionally in (a) the simulated super-volcano of Jones et al. (2005) (pink square) is shown. All peak values (as opposed to annual means) have an asterisk (*) in their label. The grey lines are the same regression fits as in Gregory et al. (2016, Fig. 4), where the solid line is the fit to G16. (b): Zooming in on the smallest AOD values.

Table 2. Slope and standard deviation for the data in Fig. 3^a

| Figure | Ensemble name | Pre-peak | Post-peak |
|--------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 3a | C2WN \uparrow | 0.45 ± 1.15 | 1.51 ± 1.45 |
| | C2W $\uparrow\uparrow$ | 3.38 ± 0.97 | -2.74 ± 0.77 |
| | C2W \uparrow | 3.85 ± 0.52 | -3.29 ± 0.60 |
| | C2W $-$ | 4.36 ± 0.82 | -3.37 ± 0.59 |
| | C2W \downarrow | 3.64 ± 2.41 | -1.41 ± 3.25 |
| | M20 | 6.34 ± 1.77 | -0.36 ± 1.33 |
| 3b | C2WN \uparrow | 0.08 ± 0.20 | 0.27 ± 0.26 |
| | C2W $\uparrow\uparrow$ | 0.86 ± 0.25 | -0.70 ± 0.19 |
| | C2W \uparrow | 0.75 ± 0.10 | -0.64 ± 0.12 |
| | C2W $-$ | 0.43 ± 0.08 | -0.34 ± 0.06 |
| | C2W \downarrow | 0.18 ± 0.12 | -0.07 ± 0.16 |
| | M20 | 0.33 ± 0.07 | -0.02 ± 0.08 |

^aThe regression fits in the top half of the table are for Fig. 3a, while the bottom half is for Fig. 3b. The columns “pre-peak” and “post-peak” refer to the two periods as shown in Fig. 3. The ensembles are the same as those given in table 1, in addition to the 6 tropical eruptions from the 82 member ensemble in Marshall et al. (2020).

son is not included. Likewise, after three years both time series are almost fully equilibrated (Fig. 1a,b). The data is further divided into two periods; a pre-peak period where the peak of both the AOD and the RF is included (consisting of the first post-eruption year), and a post-peak period for the decaying part (consisting of the second and third post-eruption years).

Although the ratio changes across the eruption magnitudes, we find that all the tropical cases follow a positive slope during the pre-peak period, as seen in Fig. 3a and described in table 2. The northern latitude case in C2WN \uparrow shows a much flatter slope compared to C2WTrop and M20. The distinction between the slopes from the tropical and non-tropical cases is perhaps more clear in Fig. 3b and corresponding rows in table 2. Again, C2WN \uparrow shows an almost flat slope compared to the tropical cases. During the post-peak period, more noise is introduced, but a weak tendency of negative slopes is found among the tropical cases, as well as in the C2WN \uparrow case up to the last season where the noise is also the largest.

Marshall et al. (2020, their Fig. 1c,d) present results that demonstrate a time-dependent relationship in the conversion between AOD and RF. They obtain an RF to AOD ratio with a negative slope when comparing the first post-eruption year to the second and third. As such, Marshall et al. (2020) find that, on average, the aerosol forcing efficiency increases during the first two to three post-eruption years. This phenomenon is explained by Marshall et al. (2020) as the aerosols initially being spatially confined to the hemisphere where the eruption occurred. Subsequently, during the second and third years, they spread globally, resulting in a higher global-mean albedo per AOD and consequently a stronger RF per AOD ratio with time. However, as noted above, a decrease in aerosol forcing efficiency is found when analysing the M20 data with seasonal resolution during the pre-peak period (first year post-eruption) while constraining the ensemble to only include eruptions within -10 to 10°N . The post-peak period shows an increasing aerosol forcing efficiency, and during the full first three post-eruption years (pre-peak and post-peak), both the tropical subset and the full M20 data yield an increasing efficiency, as expected. Likewise, the first three post-eruption years of the C2W $-$, C2W $\uparrow\uparrow$, and C2WN \uparrow cases show a weak negative slope and thus an increasing efficiency, while C2W \downarrow shows an elevated post-peak ratio as seen in Fig. 3b.




Figure 3. (a): The ratio of RF to AOD, with time-after-eruption on the horizontal axis. Straight lines indicate linear regression fits and are described in table 2, while shaded regions are the standard deviation across the ensembles for each season. Regression fits and shadings are made for the pre-peak and post-peak periods. (b): Same as in (a), but where the underlying AOD and RF time series have been scaled to have peak values at unity. Shown are data from table 1 along with tropical eruptions from M20.

275 We also note that while the aerosol forcing efficiency is decreasing for tropical M20
 276 data in the pre-peak period, the full dataset shows increasing efficiency. This is in line
 277 with what we find from C2W $N\uparrow$, which is the only eruption case that does not show a
 278 clear aerosol forcing efficiency decrease during the pre-peak period.

279 3.3 Parameter scan

280 In Fig. 4, we compare the peak values of all investigated CESM2 output param-
 281 eters against each other as well as to injected SO_2 . For our tropical cases (C2WTrop),
 282 we observe in Fig. 4a an almost linear yet notably weakening relationship between AOD
 283 peak values and injected SO_2 . The latitude also plays a role in the magnitude of the AOD
 284 perturbation, evident from C2W $N\uparrow$. This weak yet notable latitude dependence aligns
 285 with findings by Marshall et al. (2019), indicating that 72 % of the AOD variance can
 286 be attributed to injected SO_2 , while latitude accounts for only 16 % of the variance. Peak
 287 values from their data (82 simulations) plotted as red thin diamonds display a similar
 288 pattern, with AOD exhibiting close to linear dependence on injected SO_2 , but with lat-
 289 itude introducing a spread in AOD. Peak values from Mt. Pinatubo (P) and Mt. Tamb-
 290 ora (T) are shown for reference, along with peak values from Jones et al. (2005) labelled
 291 J05 and Timmreck et al. (2010) labelled T10. The J05 is a simulation of a super-volcano

based on a 100 times scaling of the AOD from Mt. Pinatubo, while T10 is a simulation of the YTT eruption based on SO₂ injections.

In Fig. 4b, RF plotted against injected SO₂ (with the absolute value of RF on the y -axis) indicates a substantial damping effect on RF as injected SO₂ increases for the C2W data, in agreement with results from Otto-Bliesner et al. (2016), labelled OB16. The OB16 data come from a 2500 year long simulation using historic volcanoes as the only external forcing. The analysis details of OB16 can be found in Appendix B, section B1. Despite the model complexity difference, Otto-Bliesner et al. (2016)'s simulations using Community Earth System Model version 1 (CESM1) with a low-top atmosphere (CAM5) produce RFs comparable to our findings.

Niemeier and Timmreck (2015) conducted simulations of continuous sulphur injections up to 200 Tg(SO₂)yr⁻¹ in the ECHAM5's middle atmosphere version (Giorgetta et al., 2006) with aerosol microphysics from HAM (Stier et al., 2005). They observed an RF dependence on SO₂ injection rate following an inverse exponential, which converges to -65 Wm^{-2} , depicted in Fig. 4b as the stippled pink line labelled N15 and given as;

$$\Delta R_{\text{TOA}} = -65 \text{ Wm}^{-2} e^{-\left(\frac{2246 \text{ Tg(S)yr}^{-1}}{x}\right)^{0.23}}. \quad (1)$$

Both our simulations and OB16 exhibit a notably faster increase than this exponential relationship. The results by N15, on which Eq. 1 is based, are all averages over at least three years of steady sulphur burdens, substantially longer than the time it takes for RF to reach peak values after an eruption. Combined with their lack of a full chemistry model (Niemeier & Timmreck, 2015), a direct comparison between Eq. 1 to peak RF values (occurring about one year post-eruption) may not reflect the same chemical and physical processes. In Eq. 1, x represents S, while the axis shows values of SO₂, thus halving of the SO₂ values on the axis gives the appropriate shape of Eq. 1 as a function of S.

With these caveats in mind, we observe that T10's results closely align with the function described in Eq. 1. Starting with an initial input of 850 Tg(S) (equivalent to 1700 Tg(SO₂), representing the YTT eruption), their estimated AOD led to a peak RF of -18 Wm^{-2} , depicted as a pink filled circle in Fig. 4b. The results from T10 came from a simulation using the MPI-ESM climate model, driven by AOD data from the HAM aerosol model. This alignment likely stems from the utilization of the same aerosol microphysical model in both Timmreck et al. (2010) and Niemeier and Timmreck (2015), as well as the application of similar climate models, MPI-ESM and ECHAM5, respectively. The relationship between climate model families and their implications are further described in Appendix C. Notably, the peak values from M20 fit well within an upper boundary defined by C2WTrop and OB16, and a lower boundary defined by Eq. 1. Eruptions closer to the equator within M20 align with data points near the upper boundary, whereas eruptions at more extreme latitudes tend to yield weaker peak RF values, closer to the lower boundary. Importantly, none of the eruption simulations shown in Fig. 4b exceeded the upper threshold of -65 Wm^{-2} as suggested in Eq. 1.

Figure 4c illustrates the response of temperature against injected SO₂. The increase in temperature response with injected SO₂ decreases for higher injected SO₂, showing a similar relationship between C2WTrop, C2WN \uparrow , and OB16. Notably, T10 and J05 exhibit respectively much weaker and much stronger temperature responses to injected SO₂ than C2WTrop. T10 has a maximum temperature anomaly of only -3.5 K for their 1700 Tg(SO₂) eruption, while J05 records a substantially larger maximum temperature anomaly of -10.7 K . Since the M20 experiment was conducted with prescribed sea-surface temperatures (Marshall et al., 2020), preventing the temperature from being fully perturbed, we do not focus on the M20 data in the temperature plots but include them for completeness.

In Fig. 4d, we revisit the relationship between RF and AOD, focusing on peak values rather than annual and seasonal averages. As previously discussed, the RF to AOD




Figure 4. (a) AOD, (b) RF, and (c) temperature anomaly as a function of injected SO₂. (d) RF and (e) temperature anomaly as a function of AOD. (f) Temperature anomaly as a function of RF. Blue diamonds labelled C2WTrop represent tropical cases (C2W↓, C2W−, C2W↑, C2W↑↑), the brown three-branched twig signifies the C2WN↑ case, and green downward triangles denote OB16 data from Otto-Bliesner et al. (2016). The red thin diamonds labelled M20 display the Marshall and Smith (2020) data. Black star and plus indicate Mt. Pinatubo and Mt. Tambora estimates based on observations. The pink square labelled J05 refers to the one-hundred times Mt. Pinatubo super-volcano from Jones et al. (2005), and the pink disk labelled T10 represents the YTT super-volcano from Timmreck et al. (2010). The pink dashed line labelled N15 is from Niemeier and Timmreck (2015), indicating the function in Eq. 1.




Figure 5. Diagram describing the functional relationships of the parameters shown in Fig. 4.

341 ratio displays weaker slopes than previous studies, with the C2W peak values not con-
 342 firming to a linear trend. The relationship between RF and AOD suggests potential sub-
 343 stantial dependencies on the model and its input parameters, such as latitude, but most
 344 notably to an inherent non-linear RF dependence on AOD. Both the G16 data in Fig. 2
 345 and the J05 data originate from the same climate model. Similarly to what we find from
 346 the C2W data, the ratio is much stronger for small eruptions in the industrial era (G16)
 347 compared to the super-volcano eruption (J05).

348 In Fig. 4e, we again find that the response of the C2WTrop data decreases with
 349 injected SO_2 , this time in temperature anomaly. Additionally, both the C2WN \uparrow and the
 350 J05 cases align well with C2WTrop, with the T10 case following a similar dependence.

351 Finally, in Fig. 4f, we compare the temperature and RF responses. Both C2WTrop
 352 and OB16 show a near-linear relationship between temperature and RF. The C2WTrop
 353 data indicate a steeper slope, implying stronger temperature perturbations as compared
 354 to OB16. However, potential biases exist in the values from the analysis of OB16, as out-
 355 lined in Appendix B, section B1. This, along with considerable noise, results in the anal-
 356 ysis of OB16 temperature anomalies being less reliable. As in Fig. 4e, the C2WN \uparrow case
 357 along with both the T10 and J05 cases closely follow the temperature to RF dependence
 358 of C2WTrop.

359 The almost linear relationship between AOD and injected SO_2 for the C2WTrop
 360 data in Fig. 4a suggests a comparable trend for RF versus injected SO_2 in Fig. 4b, as
 361 seen for RF versus AOD in Fig. 4d. For the same reason, we expect Fig. 4e to show a
 362 similar pattern for C2WTrop as observed in Fig. 4c.

363 This relationship, along with the functional relationships between all other param-
 364 eters shown in Fig. 4, are illustrated in Fig. 5. There, we show that from assuming a lin-
 365 ear dependency of AOD on injected SO_2 ($ax+b$), and of temperature on RF ($cx+d$),
 366 we must have that f , g , h , and k all have the same functional form, where $f : \text{SO}_2 \rightarrow$
 367 RF, $g : \text{AOD} \rightarrow \text{T}$, $h : \text{SO}_2 \rightarrow \text{T}$, and $k : \text{AOD} \rightarrow \text{RF}$. From this, we deduce
 368 that $f(x) = k(ax + b)$ and $h(x) = f(cx + d) = g(ax + b)$, and finally that $h(x) =$
 369 $k(acx + ad + b)$, concluding that f , g , h , and k have the same functional form.

370 3.4 Climate sensitivity estimate

371 As previously mentioned, the J05 experiment is similar to C2W \uparrow concerning RF
 372 values, yet differ in both AOD and temperature. At the same time J05 is similar to C2W $\uparrow\uparrow$
 373 in AOD and RF. To investigate this discrepancy, we here conduct a comparison between
 374 the J05 climate feedback parameter α (where $s = 1/\alpha$ is the climate sensitivity param-

Table 3. Estimated climate resistance and TCRP^a

| Simulation type | ρ [Wm ⁻² K ⁻¹] | $1/\rho$ |
|------------------|--|----------|
| C2W \uparrow | 2.21(5) | 0.45(1) |
| C2W $-$ | 2.51(6) | 0.40(1) |
| C2W \downarrow | 2.9(6) | 0.36(7) |
| Total | 2.5(4) | 0.41(5) |

^aEstimates are based on ensembles with four members and $\tau = 20$ yr using Eq. 3.

375 eter) with our climate resistance, denoted as ρ , and the transient climate response pa-
 376 rameter (TCRP) $1/\rho$ (where $TCS = F_{2\times CO_2} \times TCRP$ is the transient climate sensi-
 377 tivity and $F_{2\times CO_2}$ is the forcing due to a doubling of pre-industrial CO₂ concentration).
 378 As the forcing of volcanic eruptions typically lasts for about a year, a duration too short
 379 for $F = \rho T$ to remain valid, an alternative approach using a time-integral form intro-
 380 duced by Merlis et al. (2014) is applied:

$$\int_0^\tau F dt = \rho \int_0^\tau T dt \quad (2)$$

$$\rho = \frac{\int_0^\tau F dt}{\int_0^\tau T dt}. \quad (3)$$

381 If the upper bound of the integral, τ , is sufficiently large, so that the upper ocean
 382 heat content is the same at $t = 0$ and $t = \tau$ (Merlis et al. (2014) used $\tau = 15$ yr), this
 383 approach agrees with $F = \rho T$ for long-term forcing (Gregory et al., 2016). Addition-
 384 ally, we note that the climate resistance and the climate feedback parameter are asso-
 385 ciated with the ocean heat uptake efficiency (κ) through $\rho = \alpha + \kappa$ (Gregory et al.,
 386 2016).

387 The climate feedback parameter estimated by Jones et al. (2005) is $\alpha \simeq 4$ Wm⁻²K⁻¹,
 388 exceeding twice the value obtained by Gregory et al. (2016) in their simulations of Mt.
 389 Pinatubo using the same HadCM3 climate model. We determine the climate resistance
 390 using the integral-form computation outlined in Eq. 3 and adopting $\tau = 20$ yr. The es-
 391 timated climate resistance from the three tropical simulation cases (with four in each en-
 392 semble) converges to $\rho = 2.5(4)$ Wm⁻²K⁻¹, and TCRP values of $1/\rho = 0.41(5)$ KW⁻¹m²,
 393 as reported in table 3, and is therefore assumed to be a good estimate of α .

394 Importantly, our estimate agrees well with G16, while the J05 estimate of $\alpha \simeq 4$ Wm⁻²K⁻¹
 395 is still notably higher. Since the temperature perturbation obtained by J05 was larger
 396 than in any of our CESM2 cases, it indicates that the forcing used by J05 must be stronger.
 397 The peak value of the J05 RF is similar to the C2W \uparrow case, and as such, the overall stronger
 398 forcing must originate from the development of the forcing time series rather than the
 399 peak value.

400 4 Discussion

401 Figures 2, 3, and 4d demonstrate that as the AOD exceeds approximately 1.0, the
 402 linear RF dependence of approximately -20 Wm⁻²AOD⁻¹ no longer holds. The sub-
 403 linear increase in RF with injected SO₂ in Fig. 4b for large eruptions is consistent with
 404 previous results from simulations using similar climate models of smaller historic erup-
 405 tions (G16) and of super-volcanoes (J05). Such a change in ratio has been attributed to
 406 larger eruptions, injecting more SO₂, leading to larger aerosols, and hence less effective
 407 radiation scattering, thereby reducing the RF for the same injected SO₂ (English et al.,
 408 2013; Timmreck et al., 2010, 2018).

409 The non-linear relationship between peak RF and AOD values is a strong signa-
 410 ture in both Figs. 2 and 3. Across eruptions of the same strength, the ratio stays rela-
 411 tively constant, leading to a close to $-10 \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$ slope for C2W- and a $-5 \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$
 412 slope for C2W \uparrow and C2W $\uparrow\uparrow$. Still, a non-linear development in the RF to AOD ratio is
 413 found across all tropical eruptions. Similar to the results of Marshall et al. (2020), we
 414 find in C2W-, C2W \uparrow , and C2W $\uparrow\uparrow$ that the post-peak period (second and third post-
 415 eruption years) has a stronger aerosol forcing efficiency compared to the pre-peak pe-
 416 riod (first post-eruption year). The post-peak period of C2W \downarrow is elevated as compared
 417 to the pre-peak period, resulting in a decreasing aerosol forcing efficiency from the first
 418 to the second and third post-eruption years, in contrast to the other tropical eruptions.

419 Focusing on the pre-peak period, we find tropical eruptions to differ from eruptions
 420 at high latitudes. During the pre-peak period, all tropical eruptions show a decreasing
 421 aerosol forcing efficiency, while no significant change in the RF to AOD ratio is found
 422 from the C2WN \uparrow case. The full M20 dataset indicates an increasing aerosol forcing ef-
 423 ficiency also during the pre-peak period, contrasting the decreasing efficiency found from
 424 their tropical eruptions and supporting the latitudinal dependence we find with C2WN \uparrow .
 425 While we find a linear relationship to be a useful approximation of RF dependence on
 426 AOD for eruptions similar to or smaller than Mt. Pinatubo, additional factors must be
 427 considered for larger eruptions. These factors, such as OH scarcity and aerosol growth,
 428 influence reflectance and their gravitational pull, substantially impacting both AOD and
 429 RF evolution, is highlighted by Timmreck et al. (2010). The large difference in ratio found
 430 when comparing eruption magnitudes suggests that injected SO_2 is crucial when esti-
 431 mating the time-average of the RF to AOD ratio. However, latitude and, in particular,
 432 aerosol dispersion are more influential in determining the post-eruption evolution of the
 433 ratio, particularly during the pre-peak period.

434 We find that the suggested upper threshold from Eq. 1 is not violated by any erup-
 435 tion simulation, and most notably that the temperature peak value follow the RF trend
 436 in reaching a limiting value. The C2WTrop cases follow a close to linear temperature
 437 dependency on RF, with the J05, T10, and C2WN \uparrow aligning close to the same slope. The
 438 linear relationship between temperature and RF is the strongest dependence found be-
 439 tween the parameters in Fig. 4, and a strong signature across both eruption magnitudes
 440 and latitudes, but also across highly different climate models. Thus, from a maximum
 441 RF of -65 Wm^{-2} , we expect temperature anomalies to reach at most $\sim -12 \text{ K}$.

442 The biggest spread in the data shown in Fig. 4 is found when relating injected SO_2
 443 to any of the three output parameters. As the amount of injected SO_2 increases, both
 444 AOD, RF, and temperature across models have a big spread. The AOD to injected SO_2
 445 relationship is consistent within similar models, even when comparing simulations of vol-
 446 canic eruptions (Timmreck et al., 2010) and continuous injection of SO_2 (Niemeier & Timm-
 447 reck, 2015), but has a wide spread at high values of injected SO_2 across model families
 448 (Figs. 4a,b,c). Comparatively, the RF (Fig. 4d) and temperature (Fig. 4e) as a function
 449 of AOD, as well as temperature as a function of RF (Fig. 4f), demonstrate a smaller spread
 450 across models. Marshall et al. (2019, 2020, 2021) use a code with seven log-normal modes
 451 to simulate aerosol mass and number concentrations, along with an atmosphere-only con-
 452 figuration of the UM-UKCA with prescribed sea-surface temperatures and sea-ice ex-
 453 tent (Marshall et al., 2019). This approach is in contrast with CESM2, operating as an
 454 Earth System Model, but with a simpler aerosol chemistry model in the MAM3. The
 455 family of models to which M20 is based is different from that of C2W and OB16, and
 456 also different from the T10 and N15, as described in Appendix C. Based on Fig. 4, we
 457 find the model family to be pivotal in determining the estimated AOD and RF magni-
 458 tudes from injected SO_2 , whereas the various models generally demonstrate more con-
 459 sistency in representing RF from AOD.

460 Timmreck et al. (2010) highlights that for sufficiently large eruptions, OH radicals
 461 are too scarce, which limits SO_2 oxidation. The AOD peak in the YTT simulation of T10

occurs six months after Mt. Pinatubo’s peak. This aligns with our results, as illustrated in Fig. 1a, where C2W↓ shows an earlier AOD peak compared to C2W−, C2W↑, and C2W↑↑. While the peak RF value of T10 occurs 7–8 months post-eruption, similar to C2W, the J05 peak anomaly occurs one year post-eruption. Additionally, as Jones et al. (2005) obtains a climate feedback parameter larger than both what Gregory et al. (2016) found for the same climate model and larger than the climate resistance obtained here from C2W, we conclude that such a simple approach of scaling the AOD of smaller eruptions to represent larger eruptions is insufficient. Moreover, having a small ensemble of large eruptions to represent smaller eruptions is also insufficient when simulating from injected SO₂, as both AOD and temperature evolution are found to develop differently.

5 Summary and conclusions

We consider five medium to super-volcano sized eruption ensembles and compare them to previously reported results. We find the commonly adopted RF dependence on AOD of $\sim -20 \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$ to be representative for Mt. Pinatubo-sized eruptions. Larger eruptions, with one to two orders of magnitude larger injections of SO₂, are found to have an RF dependence on AOD closer to $\sim -10 \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$ and $\sim -5 \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ AOD}^{-1}$. A shallower slope for larger eruptions is also consistent with peak values from previous studies of super-volcanoes.

The time-after-eruption dependence of the ratio between RF and AOD is found to weaken with time, resulting in a decreasing aerosol forcing efficiency in the pre-peak period. The effect is found across all eruption sizes, but only the tropical cases show a clear trend. The high-latitude case displays an almost constant efficiency with time. These results agree with a reanalysis of the tropical data in Marshall and Smith (2020). Thus, these findings provide strong supporting evidence that latitude is generally significant in determining the aerosol forcing efficiency, particularly as a function of time-after-eruption. These findings emphasise the complexity of volcanic impacts on climate, demonstrating significant differences in climatic response depending on eruption magnitude and latitude.

We find that the AOD peak arrives later for larger eruptions than for smaller ones, and also that larger eruptions produce a sharper peak in the AOD time series. The RF time series are similar across all eruption sizes, and while the smallest eruption experiences a faster temperature decay, the larger eruptions produce time series indistinguishable in development for both RF and temperature. Thus, a simple scaling of the AOD or temperature time series from a smaller eruption is insufficient in representing that of larger volcanic eruptions.

Considering injected SO₂ and the peak values of AOD and RF, a large spread is found across model families in Fig. 4. Improving the consistency between model families in how the chemistry and physics of SO₂ and H₂SO₄ are represented is an important step in enhancing the accuracy of simulated volcanic eruptions’ influence on climate by models. More simulations of larger volcanic eruptions with injected SO₂ greater than 200 Tg(SO₂) would provide useful information for a more precise determination of the RF to AOD ratio in the non-linear regime. This would also serve as a useful test to check if a comparison between SO₂ injection events and continuous SO₂ injection is reasonable. Introducing a spread in latitude similar to the Marshall and Smith (2020) dataset would allow for better comparison between eruptions across all latitudes and the suggested lower limit following Eq. 1, describing a situation of aerosol saturation.

Appendix A Simulation set up and output

Input files used in the simulations were created by modifying the file available at <http://svn.code.sf.net/p/codescripts/code/trunk/ncl/emission/createVolcEruptV3>

511 .ncl, using a Python package available on GitHub at [https://github.com/engeir/](https://github.com/engeir/volcano-cooking)
 512 volcano-cooking or through the Python Package Index (PyPI). The package is avail-
 513 able both as a library and a Command Line Interface (CLI), and is used to create vol-
 514 canic eruptions with a specified amount of SO₂ that is injected over six hours at a given
 515 latitude, longitude, and altitude. All volcanic SO₂ files are created from a shell script
 516 by setting the eruption details in a JSON file that is read by the volcano-cooking CLI
 517 at a fixed version, ensuring a reproducible experiment setup.

518 We are using the coupled model version BWma1850 component setup to run the CESM2,
 519 and an accompanying fixed sea-surface temperature version, fSST1850, to obtain esti-
 520 mates of the RF. The applied fSST1850 is not from a standardised component setup but
 521 is instead explicitly specified as 1850_CAM60%WCCM_CLM50%BGC-CROP_CICE%PRES_DOCN%
 522 DOM_MOSART_CISM2%NOEVOLVE_SWAV_TEST. The component setup BWma1850 and fSST1850
 523 differ in that the latter uses a prescribed sea-ice (CICE -> CICE%PRES), a prescribed data
 524 ocean (POP2%ECO%DEP -> DOCN%DOM) and a stub wave component instead of the full Wave
 525 Watch version 3 (WW3 -> SWAV).

526 The important input data used in the model simulations are injected SO₂ in units
 527 of teragrams (Tg(SO₂)), used to simulate volcanic eruptions. RF is calculated as the com-
 528 bined (short wave and long wave) all-sky TOA energy imbalance, where the CESM2 pro-
 529 vide the output variables “net solar flux at the top of the model” (FSNT) and “net long-
 530 wave flux at the top of the model” (FLNT). Thus, $RF_* = FSNT - FLNT$, and taking
 531 the difference between volcanic forcing simulations and a control simulation gives the fi-
 532 nal estimate of RF ($RF = RF_{VOLC} - RF_{CONTROL}$) (Marshall et al., 2020). The RF
 533 calculation is based on fSST1850, hence this outline specifically describes how to calcu-
 534 late ERF as opposed to IRF, which instead is the difference between the ERF and the
 535 sum of all rapid atmospheric adjustments (Marshall et al., 2020; C. J. Smith et al., 2018).
 536 The AOD is obtained from the output variable “stratospheric aerosol optical depth 550
 537 nm day nigh” (AODVISstdn), while global temperature is saved by CESM2 to the vari-
 538 able “reference height temperature” (TREFHT). The analysis of this work is performed
 539 using these four variables.

540 During analysis, one outlier was found in the ensemble representing C2W↓, specif-
 541 ically in the temperature time series. This ensemble member was the February 15, 1850,
 542 eruption, which was changed in favor of a February 15, 1851, eruption in the C2W↓, C2W−,
 543 and C2W↑ ensembles. For completeness, the February 15, 1850, eruption is still included
 544 in the online archive.

545 Appendix B External data

546 B1 Otto-Bliesner data analysis

547 Data from Otto-Bliesner et al. (2016) are the original input data of injected SO₂
 548 as used in their model simulations, along with RF and temperature output data. The
 549 injected SO₂ can be found at [https://www.cesm.ucar.edu/working-groups/paleo/](https://www.cesm.ucar.edu/working-groups/paleo/simulations/ccsm4-1m)
 550 [simulations/ccsm4-1m](https://www.cesm.ucar.edu/working-groups/paleo/simulations/ccsm4-1m). Only the peak values of the SO₂ dataset were used in the anal-
 551 ysis. Output variables are available at www2.cesm.ucar.edu/models/experiments/LME.

552 Since the OB16 dataset contains a five-member ensemble, the final RF and tem-
 553 perature time series used were ensemble means. A single control simulation time series
 554 is used to remove seasonal dependence from the temperature, where the control simu-
 555 lation is averaged into a climatology mean. Further, a drift in the temperature is removed
 556 by subtracting a linear regression fit. RF has seasonality removed in the Fourier domain.

557 The time of an eruption is found based on a best attempt at aligning the SO₂ time
 558 series with both the RF time series and the temperature time series. The RF and tem-
 559 perature peak values are taken as the value of the time series at the time of an eruption

560 according to the SO₂ time series. Missing the true peak means the found peaks will be
 561 biased towards lower values. However, instances where eruptions occur close in time will
 562 contribute a bias to higher values. These biases contribute to a greater uncertainty re-
 563 lated to OB16 in Figs. 4b,c,f.

564 **B2 Marshall data analysis**

565 Data used to compute the M20 values were from Marshall and Smith (2020), avail-
 566 able at <https://doi.org/10.5285/232164e8b1444978a41f2acf8bbbfe91>. As each file
 567 includes a single eruption, peak values of AOD, RF, and temperature were found by ap-
 568 plying a Savitzky-Golay filter of third order and one-year window length, and choosing
 569 the maximum value (Savitzky & Golay, 1964).

570 **B3 Gregory data analysis**

571 Data used to compute G16 values were kindly provided by Jonathan Gregory (per-
 572 sonal communication). The full 160-year-long time series were further analysed by com-
 573 puting annual means.

574 **Appendix C Model families**

575 The model used here was the CESM2 with the WACCM6 atmosphere in the MA
 576 configuration. The MA configuration uses the MAM3 (Gettelman et al., 2019), a sim-
 577 plified and computationally efficient default setting within the CAM5 (Liu et al., 2016),
 578 as described in Liu et al. (2012). The MAM3 was developed from MAM7, consisting of
 579 the seven modes Aitken, accumulation, primary carbon, fine dust, fine sea salt, coarse
 580 dust, and coarse sea salt. Instantaneous internal mixing of primary carbonaceous aerosols
 581 with secondary aerosols and instantaneous ageing of primary carbonaceous particles are
 582 assumed by emitting primary carbon in the accumulation mode (Liu et al., 2016). As
 583 dust absorbs water efficiently and is expected to be removed by wet deposition similarly
 584 to sea salt, fine dust is merged with fine sea salt into the accumulation mode and coarse
 585 dust is merged with coarse sea salt into a coarse mode. The coarse mode will quickly re-
 586 vert to its background state below the tropopause (Liu et al., 2012). Consequently, MAM3
 587 features the three modes Aitken, accumulation, and coarse (Liu et al., 2016).

588 The CESM2 is an ancestor of CESM1 used by OB16. They belong to a different
 589 model family than both the HadCM3 (J05 and G16) and the UM-UKCA (M20), which
 590 is an extended version of HadGEM3 (Dhomse et al., 2014), and an ancestor of HadCM3.
 591 A third model family is represented through ECHAM5 (N15) and MPI-ESM (T10), where
 592 the latter is related to the former via the ECHAM6. A summary of the model code ge-
 593 nealogy is in table C1, based on the model code genealogy map created by Kuma et al.
 594 (2023).

595 **Acronyms**

596 **AODVISstdn** “stratospheric aerosol optical depth 550 nm day night”
 597 **AOD** stratospheric aerosol optical depth
 598 **CAM5** Community Atmosphere Model Version 5
 599 **CESM1** Community Earth System Model Version 1
 600 **CESM2** Community Earth System Model Version 2
 601 **ECS** equilibrium climate sensitivity
 602 **ERF** effective radiative forcing
 603 **FLNT** “net longwave flux at the top of the model”
 604 **FSNT** “net solar flux at the top of the model”

Table C1. Model code family relations^a

| Family relation | Model name | Data name |
|---|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| CESM1 → CESM1-CAM5 → CESM2 | CESM1 CESM2 | OB16 <i>This contribution</i> |
| HadCM3 → HadGEM1 → HadGEM2 → HadGEM3 → UM-UKCA | HadCM3 UM-UKCA | J05, G16 M20 |
| ECHAM5 → ECHAM6 → MPI-ESM | ECHAM5 MPI-ESM | N15 T10 |

^aOverview of various model codes grouped into families according to the model code genealogy map by Kuma et al. (2023), with each table entry also indicating the specific model code used in the referenced papers of this study.

605 **IRF** instantaneous radiative forcing
606 **MAM3** three mode version of the Modal Aerosol Module
607 **MA** middle atmosphere
608 **POP2** Parallel Ocean Program Version 2
609 **RF** effective radiative forcing
610 **TCRP** transient climate response parameter
611 **TOA** top-of-the-atmosphere
612 **TREFHT** “reference height temperature”
613 **WACCM6** Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model Version 6
614 **YTT** Young Toba Tuff

615 Open Research Section

616 The direct output data of CESM2 are too large to be easily archived and trans-
617 ferred. Instead, data generated directly from output fields of CESM2 are made available
618 in a NIRD Research Data Archive (Enger, 2024b), and were generated using scripts avail-
619 able at <https://github.com/engeir/cesm-data-aggregator>. Analysis scripts are avail-
620 able at GitHub ([https://github.com/engeir/code-to-radiative-forcing-by-super-
621 -volcano-eruptions](https://github.com/engeir/code-to-radiative-forcing-by-super-volcano-eruptions)) and is published to Zenodo (Enger, 2024a). Source code used to
622 generate CESM2 input files are available at [https://github.com/engeir/cesm2-volcano-
623 -setup](https://github.com/engeir/cesm2-volcano-setup).

624 Acknowledgments

625 The simulations were performed on resources provided by Sigma2 — the National
626 Infrastructure for High Performance Computing and Data Storage in Norway.

627 This work was supported by the Tromsø Research Foundation under Grant Num-
628 ber 19_SG_AT.

629 Thanks to both Maria Rugenstein and Martin Rypdal for valuable discussions. We
630 would also like to thank the authors of Gregory et al. (2016), Otto-Bliesner et al. (2016),
631 and Marshall and Smith (2020) for making their data available.

632 References

633 Andersson, S. M., Martinsson, B. G., Vernier, J.-P., Friberg, J., Brenninkmeijer,
634 C. A. M., Hermann, M., ... Zahn, A. (2015). Significant radiative impact
635 of volcanic aerosol in the lowermost stratosphere. *Nature Communications*,

- 636 6, 7692-. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8692> doi:
637 10.1038/ncomms8692
- 638 Bender, F. A. M., Ekman, A. M. L., & Rodhe, H. (2010, October). Response
639 to the eruption of Mount Pinatubo in relation to climate sensitivity in
640 the CMIP3 models. *Climate Dynamics*, *35*(5), 875–886. Retrieved
641 from <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00382-010-0777-3> doi:
642 10.1007/s00382-010-0777-3
- 643 Boer, G. J., Stowasser, M., & Hamilton, K. (2007, February). Inferring climate
644 sensitivity from volcanic events. *Climate Dynamics*, *28*(5), 481–502. Re-
645 trieved from <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00382-006-0193-x> doi:
646 10.1007/s00382-006-0193-x
- 647 Danabasoglu, G., Lamarque, J.-F., Bacmeister, J., Bailey, D. A., DuVivier, A. K.,
648 Edwards, J., ... Strand, W. G. (2020). The community earth system model
649 version 2 (CESM2). *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, *12*(2),
650 e2019MS001916. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019MS001916)
651 [.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019MS001916](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019MS001916) (e2019MS001916 2019MS001916) doi:
652 10.1029/2019MS001916
- 653 Dhomse, S. S., Emmerson, K. M., Mann, G. W., Bellouin, N., Carslaw, K. S., Chip-
654 perfield, M. P., ... Thomason, L. W. (2014). Aerosol microphysics simu-
655 lations of the mt. pinatubo eruption with the um-ukca composition-climate
656 model. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *14*(20), 11221–11246. Re-
657 trieved from <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/14/11221/2014/>
658 doi: 10.5194/acp-14-11221-2014
- 659 Douglass, D. H., Knox, R. S., Pearson, B. D., & Jr., A. C. (2006). Thermocline flux
660 exchange during the pinatubo event. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *33*(19),
661 L19711. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2006GL026355)
662 [abs/10.1029/2006GL026355](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2006GL026355) doi: 10.1029/2006GL026355
- 663 Enger, E. R. (2024a, February). *Accompanying code to 'Radiative forcing by super-*
664 *volcano eruptions'* [Software]. Zenodo. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10722164)
665 [.5281/zenodo.10722164](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10722164) doi: 10.5281/zenodo.10722164
- 666 Enger, E. R. (2024b). *CESM2(WACCM6) single super-volcano simulations*
667 [Dataset]. Norstore. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.11582/2024.00025>
668 doi: 10.11582/2024.00025
- 669 English, J. M., Toon, O. B., & Mills, M. J. (2013). Microphysical simula-
670 tions of large volcanic eruptions: Pinatubo and toba. *Journal of Geo-*
671 *physical Research: Atmospheres*, *118*(4), 1880–1895. Retrieved from
672 <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jgrd.50196>
673 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50196>
- 674 Gettelman, A., Mills, M. J., Kinnison, D. E., Garcia, R. R., Smith, A. K., Marsh,
675 D. R., ... Randel, W. J. (2019). The whole atmosphere community climate
676 model version 6 (WACCM6). *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*,
677 *124*(23), 12380–12403. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JD030943)
678 [.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JD030943](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JD030943) doi: 10.1029/2019JD030943
- 679 Giorgetta, M. A., Manzini, E., Roeckner, E., Esch, M., & Bengtsson, L. (2006).
680 Climatology and forcing of the quasi-biennial oscillation in the maecham5
681 model. *Journal of Climate*, *19*(16), 3882 - 3901. Retrieved from [https://](https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/19/16/jcli3830.1.xml)
682 journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/19/16/jcli3830.1.xml doi:
683 10.1175/JCLI3830.1
- 684 Gregory, J. M., Andrews, T., Good, P., Mauritsen, T., & Forster, P. M. (2016, De-
685 cember 01). Small global-mean cooling due to volcanic radiative forcing. *Cli-*
686 *mate Dynamics*, *47*, 3979–3991. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3055-1)
687 [s00382-016-3055-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3055-1) doi: 10.1007/s00382-016-3055-1
- 688 Hansen, J., Sato, M., Ruedy, R., Nazarenko, L., Lacis, A., Schmidt, G. A., ...
689 Zhang, S. (2005). Efficacy of climate forcings. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
690 *Atmospheres*, *110*(D18). Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary>

- 691 .wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2005JD005776 doi: 10.1029/2005JD005776
 692 Jones, G. S., Gregory, J. M., Stott, P. A., Tett, S. F. B., & Thorpe, R. B. (2005,
 693 December 01). An AOGCM simulation of the climate response to a volcanic
 694 super-eruption. *Climate Dynamics*, 25(7), 725–738. Retrieved from [https://](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-005-0066-8)
 695 doi.org/10.1007/s00382-005-0066-8 doi: 10.1007/s00382-005-0066-8
- 696 Kuma, P., Bender, F. A.-M., & Jönsson, A. R. (2023). Climate model code ge-
 697 nealogy and its relation to climate feedbacks and sensitivity. *Journal of*
 698 *Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 15(7), e2022MS003588. Retrieved
 699 from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2022MS003588)
 700 [2022MS003588](https://doi.org/10.1029/2022MS003588) (e2022MS003588 2022MS003588) doi: [https://doi.org/10.1029/](https://doi.org/10.1029/2022MS003588)
 701 [2022MS003588](https://doi.org/10.1029/2022MS003588)
- 702 Liu, X., Easter, R. C., Ghan, S. J., Zaveri, R., Rasch, P., Shi, X., . . . Mitchell,
 703 D. (2012). Toward a minimal representation of aerosols in climate mod-
 704 els: description and evaluation in the community atmosphere model CAM5.
 705 *Geoscientific Model Development*, 5(3), 709–739. Retrieved from [https://](https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/5/709/2012/)
 706 gmd.copernicus.org/articles/5/709/2012/ doi: 10.5194/gmd-5-709-2012
- 707 Liu, X., Ma, P.-L., Wang, H., Tilmes, S., Singh, B., Easter, R. C., . . . Rasch,
 708 P. J. (2016). Description and evaluation of a new four-mode version of
 709 the modal aerosol module (MAM4) within version 5.3 of the community
 710 atmosphere model. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9(2), 505–522. Re-
 711 trieved from <https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/9/505/2016/> doi:
 712 [10.5194/gmd-9-505-2016](https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-505-2016)
- 713 Marshall, L. R., Johnson, J. S., Mann, G. W., Lee, L., Dhomse, S. S., Regayre,
 714 L., . . . Schmidt, A. (2019). Exploring how eruption source parameters af-
 715 fect volcanic radiative forcing using statistical emulation. *Journal of Geo-*
 716 *physical Research: Atmospheres*, 124(2), 964–985. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018JD028675)
 717 agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018JD028675 doi:
 718 [10.1029/2018JD028675](https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JD028675)
- 719 Marshall, L. R., Maters, E. C., Schmidt, A., Timmreck, C., Robock, A., & Toohey,
 720 M. (2022, May 04). Volcanic effects on climate: recent advances and future
 721 avenues. *Bulletin of Volcanology*, 84(5), 54. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00445-022-01559-3)
 722 [10.1007/s00445-022-01559-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00445-022-01559-3) doi: 10.1007/s00445-022-01559-3
- 723 Marshall, L. R., Schmidt, A., Johnson, J. S., Mann, G. W., Lee, L. A., Rigby, R.,
 724 & Carslaw, K. S. (2021). Unknown eruption source parameters cause large
 725 uncertainty in historical volcanic radiative forcing reconstructions. *Journal*
 726 *of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 126(13), e2020JD033578. Retrieved
 727 from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2020JD033578)
 728 [2020JD033578](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JD033578) (e2020JD033578 2020JD033578) doi: 10.1029/2020JD033578
- 729 Marshall, L. R., & Smith, C. J. (2020, September 25). Vol-Clim: UM-
 730 UKCA interactive stratospheric aerosol model summary data for per-
 731 turbed parameter ensemble of volcanic eruptions [dataset]. *Centre*
 732 *for Environmental Data Analysis*. Retrieved from [https://dx.doi](https://dx.doi.org/10.5285/232164e8b1444978a41f2acf8bbbfe91)
 733 [.org/10.5285/232164e8b1444978a41f2acf8bbbfe91](https://doi.org/10.5285/232164e8b1444978a41f2acf8bbbfe91) doi: 10.5285/
 734 [232164e8b1444978a41f2acf8bbbfe91](https://doi.org/10.5285/232164e8b1444978a41f2acf8bbbfe91)
- 735 Marshall, L. R., Smith, C. J., Forster, P. M., Aubry, T. J., Andrews, T., &
 736 Schmidt, A. (2020). Large variations in volcanic aerosol forcing effi-
 737 ciency due to eruption source parameters and rapid adjustments. *Geophys-*
 738 *ical Research Letters*, 47(19), e2020GL090241. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2020GL090241)
 739 agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2020GL090241
 740 (e2020GL090241 2020GL090241) doi: 10.1029/2020GL090241
- 741 Marvel, K., Schmidt, G. A., Miller, R. L., & Nazarenko, L. S. (2016, April 01).
 742 Implications for climate sensitivity from the response to individual forcings.
 743 *Nature Climate Change*, 6(4), 386–389. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2888)
 744 [10.1038/nclimate2888](https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2888) doi: 10.1038/nclimate2888
- 745 Merlis, T. M., Held, I. M., Stenchikov, G. L., Zeng, F., & Horowitz, L. W. (2014).

- 746 Constraining transient climate sensitivity using coupled climate model sim-
 747 ulations of volcanic eruptions. *Journal of Climate*, 27(20), 7781–7795. Re-
 748 trieved from [https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/27/20/](https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/27/20/jcli-d-14-00214.1.xml)
 749 [jcli-d-14-00214.1.xml](https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/27/20/jcli-d-14-00214.1.xml) doi: 10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00214.1
- 750 Mills, M. J., Richter, J. H., Tilmes, S., Kravitz, B., MacMartin, D. G., Glanville,
 751 A. A., ... Kinnison, D. E. (2017). Radiative and chemical response to interac-
 752 tive stratospheric sulfate aerosols in fully coupled CESM1(WACCM). *Journal*
 753 *of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122(23), 13,061–13,078. Retrieved
 754 from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JD027006)
 755 [2017JD027006](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JD027006) doi: 10.1002/2017JD027006
- 756 Myhre, G., Shindell, D., Bréon, F.-M., Collins, W., Fuglestedt, J., Huang, J.,
 757 ... Zhang, H. (2013). Anthropogenic and natural radiative forcing. In
 758 T. F. Stocker et al. (Eds.), *Climate change 2013: The physical science basis.*
 759 *contribution of working group i to the fifth assessment report of the intergov-*
 760 *ernmental panel on climate change* (pp. 659–740). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge
 761 University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107415324.018
- 762 Niemeier, U., & Timmreck, C. (2015, August). What is the limit of climate
 763 engineering by stratospheric injection of SO₂ ? *Atmospheric Chem-*
 764 *istry and Physics*, 15(16), 9129–9141. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-9129-2015)
 765 [10.5194/acp-15-9129-2015](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-9129-2015) doi: 10.5194/acp-15-9129-2015
- 766 Ollila, A. (2016, 02). Climate sensitivity parameter in the test of the mount
 767 pinatubo eruption. *Physical Science International Journal*, 9, 1–14. doi:
 768 10.9734/PSIJ/2016/23242
- 769 Otto-Bliesner, B. L., Brady, E. C., Fasullo, J., Jahn, A., Landrum, L., Stevenson,
 770 S., ... Strand, G. (2016). Climate variability and change since 850 CE: An
 771 ensemble approach with the community earth system model. *Bulletin of the*
 772 *American Meteorological Society*, 97(5), 735–754. Retrieved from [https://](https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/bams/97/5/bams-d-14-00233.1.xml)
 773 journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/bams/97/5/bams-d-14-00233.1.xml
 774 doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-14-00233.1
- 775 Pauling, A. G., Bitz, C. M., & Armour, K. C. (2023). The climate response to
 776 the Mt. Pinatubo eruption does not constrain climate sensitivity. *Geophys-*
 777 *ical Research Letters*, 50(7), e2023GL102946. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2023GL102946)
 778 agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2023GL102946
 779 (e2023GL102946 2023GL102946) doi: 10.1029/2023GL102946
- 780 Pitari, G., Genova, G. D., Mancini, E., Visionsi, D., Gandolfi, I., & Cionni, I. (2016).
 781 Stratospheric aerosols from major volcanic eruptions: A composition-climate
 782 model study of the aerosol cloud dispersal and e-folding time. *Atmosphere*,
 783 7(6). Retrieved from <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4433/7/6/75> doi:
 784 10.3390/atmos7060075
- 785 Richardson, T. B., Forster, P. M., Smith, C. J., Maycock, A. C., Wood, T., An-
 786 drews, T., ... Watson-Parris, D. (2019). Efficacy of climate forcings in
 787 PDRMIP models. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 124(23),
 788 12824–12844. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JD030581)
 789 [doi/abs/10.1029/2019JD030581](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JD030581) doi: 10.1029/2019JD030581
- 790 Robock, A. (2000). Volcanic eruptions and climate. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 38(2),
 791 191–219. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/1998RG000054)
 792 [abs/10.1029/1998RG000054](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/1998RG000054) doi: 10.1029/1998RG000054
- 793 Salvi, P., Ceppi, P., & Gregory, J. M. (2022). Interpreting differences in
 794 radiative feedbacks from aerosols versus greenhouse gases. *Geophys-*
 795 *ical Research Letters*, 49(8), e2022GL097766. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2022GL097766)
 796 agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2022GL097766
 797 (e2022GL097766 2022GL097766) doi: 10.1029/2022GL097766
- 798 Savitzky, A., & Golay, M. J. E. (1964). Smoothing and differentiation of data
 799 by simplified least squares procedures. *Analytical Chemistry*, 36(8), 1627-
 800 1639. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1021/ac60214a047> doi:

- 801 10.1021/ac60214a047
- 802 Sigl, M., Toohey, M., McConnell, J. R., Cole-Dai, J., & Severi, M. (2022). Volcanic
803 stratospheric sulfur injections and aerosol optical depth during the holocene
804 (past 11 500 years) from a bipolar ice-core array. *Earth System Science Data*,
805 *14*(7), 3167–3196. Retrieved from [https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/](https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/14/3167/2022/)
806 [14/3167/2022/](https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/14/3167/2022/) doi: 10.5194/essd-14-3167-2022
- 807 Smith, C. J., Kramer, R. J., Myhre, G., Forster, P. M., Soden, B. J., Andrews,
808 T., ... Watson-Parris, D. (2018). Understanding rapid adjustments to di-
809 verse forcing agents. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *45*(21), 12,023–12,031.
810 Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018GL079826)
811 [10.1029/2018GL079826](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018GL079826) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL079826>
- 812 Smith, R., Jones, P., Briegleb, B., Bryan, F., Danabasoglu, G., Dennis, J., ... Yea-
813 ger, S. (2010, 03 23). The parallel ocean program (POP) reference manual.
814 *LAUR-10-01853*. Retrieved from [https://www.cesm.ucar.edu/models/](https://www.cesm.ucar.edu/models/cesm1.0/pop2/doc/sci/POPRefManual.pdf)
815 [cesm1.0/pop2/doc/sci/POPRefManual.pdf](https://www.cesm.ucar.edu/models/cesm1.0/pop2/doc/sci/POPRefManual.pdf)
- 816 Solomon, S., Daniel, J. S., Neely, R. R., Vernier, J.-P., Dutton, E. G., & Thomason,
817 L. W. (2011). The persistently variable “background” stratospheric aerosol
818 layer and global climate change. *Science*, *333*(6044), 866–870. Retrieved
819 from <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1206027> doi:
820 [10.1126/science.1206027](https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1206027)
- 821 Stier, P., Feichter, J., Kinne, S., Kloster, S., Vignati, E., Wilson, J., ... Petzold, A.
822 (2005). The aerosol-climate model echem5-ham. *Atmospheric Chemistry and*
823 *Physics*, *5*(4), 1125–1156. Retrieved from [https://acp.copernicus.org/](https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/5/1125/2005/)
824 [articles/5/1125/2005/](https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/5/1125/2005/) doi: 10.5194/acp-5-1125-2005
- 825 Timmreck, C., Graf, H.-F., Lorenz, S. J., Niemeier, U., Zanchettin, D., Matei, D., ...
826 Crowley, T. J. (2010). Aerosol size confines climate response to volcanic super-
827 eruptions. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *37*(24). Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2010GL045464)
828 agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2010GL045464 doi:
829 [10.1029/2010GL045464](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2010GL045464)
- 830 Timmreck, C., Mann, G. W., Aquila, V., Hommel, R., Lee, L. A., Schmidt, A.,
831 ... Weisenstein, D. (2018). The interactive stratospheric aerosol model
832 intercomparison project (ISA- MIP): motivation and experimental de-
833 sign. *Geoscientific Model Development*, *11*(7), 2581–2608. Retrieved
834 from <https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/11/2581/2018/> doi:
835 [10.5194/gmd-11-2581-2018](https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/11/2581/2018/)
- 836 Toohey, M., Krüger, K., Niemeier, U., & Timmreck, C. (2011). The influence of
837 eruption season on the global aerosol evolution and radiative impact of tropical
838 volcanic eruptions. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *11*(23), 12351–12367.
839 Retrieved from <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/11/12351/2011/>
840 [doi: 10.5194/acp-11-12351-2011](https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/11/12351/2011/)
- 841 Toohey, M., Krüger, K., Schmidt, H., Timmreck, C., Sigl, M., Stoffel, M., & Wil-
842 son, R. (2019, February 01). Disproportionately strong climate forcing from
843 extratropical explosive volcanic eruptions. *Nature Geoscience*, *12*(2), 100–
844 107. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-018-0286-2> doi:
845 [10.1038/s41561-018-0286-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-018-0286-2)
- 846 Vidal, C. M., Métrich, N., Komorowski, J.-C., Pratomo, I., Michel, A., Kartadinata,
847 N., ... Lavigne, F. (2016, October). The 1257 samalas eruption (lombok, in-
848 donesia): the single greatest stratospheric gas release of the common era. *Sci-*
849 *entific Reports*, *6*(1). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/srep34868>
850 [doi: 10.1038/srep34868](http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/srep34868)
- 851 Wigley, T. M. L., Ammann, C. M., Santer, B. D., & Raper, S. C. B. (2005). Ef-
852 fect of climate sensitivity on the response to volcanic forcing. *Journal of Geo-*
853 *physical Research: Atmospheres*, *110*(D9). Retrieved from [https://agupubs](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2004JD005557)
854 [.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2004JD005557](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2004JD005557) doi: 10.1029/
855 [2004JD005557](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2004JD005557)

- 856 Zanchettin, D., Khodri, M., Timmreck, C., Toohey, M., Schmidt, A., Gerber, E. P.,
857 ... Tummon, F. (2016). The model intercomparison project on the climatic
858 response to volcanic forcing (volMIP): experimental design and forcing input
859 data for CMIP6. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9(8), 2701–2719. Re-
860 trieved from <https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/9/2701/2016/> doi:
861 10.5194/gmd-9-2701-2016
- 862 Zanchettin, D., Timmreck, C., Toohey, M., Jungclaus, J. H., Bittner, M., Lorenz,
863 S. J., & Rubino, A. (2019). Clarifying the relative role of forcing uncer-
864 tainties and initial-condition unknowns in spreading the climate response to
865 volcanic eruptions. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 46(3), 1602–1611. Retrieved
866 from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018GL081018)
867 2018GL081018 doi: 10.1029/2018GL081018

Figure 1.






Figure 2.





Figure 3.





Figure 4.

