

# ATS 781 Proposal

## A potential emergent constraint on climate sensitivity

Luke Davis

Wice  
extension of  
your work!!

Coupled climate model estimates of equilibrium climate sensitivity (ECS) are subject to persistent, considerable uncertainty (e.g., [Zelinka et al. 2020](#)). So-called *emergent constraints*, defined as statistically significant relationships between model ECS and the unforced model climate, are critical for reducing this uncertainty. Recently, [Davis et al. \(in review\)](#) used the dynamical core model to identify links between ECS and the circulation – including possible “candidates” for emergent constraints.

In the dynamical core model, all sources of diabatic heating  $Q$  are replaced with the linear damping term  $Q \equiv -(T - T^e)/\tau$ , where  $T^e$  is the *equilibrium temperature* and  $\tau$  is the *thermal damping timescale*. Since heating is explicitly linearized about temperature,  $\tau^{-1}$  is analogous to the *climate feedback parameter* – in other words, the climate feedbacks are explicitly prescribed, and thus ECS is known *a priori* ([Davis et al. in review](#)). By systematically varying  $\tau^{-1}$ , [Davis et al. \(in review\)](#) identify two unique relationships between ECS and the unforced extratropical circulation of the dynamical core model:

1. ECS and *isentropic slope* (defined as the meridional slope of constant potential temperature surfaces – units m / km).
2. ECS and *thermal diffusivity* (defined as the ratio of the meridional eddy heat transport to the meridional temperature gradient – units  $\text{m}^2/\text{s}$ ).

ind. response to forcing  
like jet position?

→ might change quite a bit under forcing, you

forced response first (with the base state) and then constrain ECS/temp?

If these relationships hold in more complex general circulation models (GCMs), then they might be used to construct *emergent constraints* on climate sensitivity. Compared to existing candidates, the above candidates have a number of advantages. First, their physical basis is rooted in well-established theories of baroclinic dynamics ([Schneider 2004](#), [Zurita-Gotor 2008](#)). Second, they are independent of dynamical core equilibrium temperature ([Davis et al. in review](#)), suggesting resistance to inter-model biases in absolute temperature and radiative-convective equilibria. Third, while previous constraints largely focused on the tropical climate [Bretherton and Caldwell](#) (e.g., [2020](#)), recent work has highlighted extratropical cloud feedbacks as a critical source of uncertainty in ECS estimates [Zelinka et al.](#) (e.g., [2020](#)) – and constraints derived from the extratropical climate are more likely to pick up on this uncertainty. *in the SH*

I propose testing the above constraint “candidates” using phases 5 and 6 of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP5 and CMIP6). I will first compile climatologies of the CMIP “pre-industrial control” simulations, computing hemisphere-wide metrics of isentropic slope and thermal diffusivity. I will then compare these metrics against estimates of the ECS obtained by regressing the atmospheric energy imbalance against 1) surface temperature and 2) column-average temperature on both a global and per-hemisphere basis ([Gregory et al. 2004](#)). If robust statistical relationships are identified, I will compute the same metrics from “observational” data using the ERA-5 and MERRA-2 reanalysis products ([Gelaro et al. 2017](#), [Hersbach et al. 2020](#)) and use these metrics to establish restricted error bounds on ECS for the CMIP5 and CMIP6 ensembles.

*hypothesis: works best for SH midlats in CMIP6*

This work has the potential to reduce uncertainty in model-derived estimates of equilibrium climate sensitivity. It would also test the utility of the dynamical core framework for instructing us on real-world relationships between the circulation and climate sensitivity.

## References

- Mark D. Zelinka, Timothy A. Myers, Daniel T. McCoy, Stephen Po-Chedley, Peter M. Caldwell, Paulo Ceppi, Stephen A. Klein, and Karl E. Taylor. Causes of Higher Climate Sensitivity in CMIP6 Models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(1):e2019GL085782, 2020. ISSN 1944-8007. doi: 10.1029/2019GL085782.
- Luke L. B. Davis, David W. J. Thompson, and Thomas Birner. On the relationships between climate sensitivity and the large-scale extratropical circulation. *Journal of Climate*, in review.
- Tapio Schneider. The Tropopause and the Thermal Stratification in the Extratropics of a Dry Atmosphere. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 61(12):1317–1340, June 2004. ISSN 0022-4928. doi: 10.1175/1520-0469(2004)061<1317:TTATTS>2.0.CO;2.
- Pablo Zurita-Gotor. The Sensitivity of the Isentropic Slope in a Primitive Equation Dry Model. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 65(1):43–65, January 2008. ISSN 0022-4928. doi: 10.1175/2007JAS2284.1.
- Christopher S. Bretherton and Peter M. Caldwell. Combining Emergent Constraints for Climate Sensitivity. *Journal of Climate*, 33(17):7413–7430, September 2020. ISSN 0894-8755. doi: 10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0911.1.
- J. M. Gregory, W. J. Ingram, M. A. Palmer, G. S. Jones, P. A. Stott, R. B. Thorpe, J. A. Lowe, T. C. Johns, and K. D. Williams. A new method for diagnosing radiative forcing and climate sensitivity. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31(3), February 2004. ISSN 1944-8007. doi: 10.1029/2003GL018747.
- Ronald Gelaro, Will McCarty, Max J. Suárez, Ricardo Todling, Andrea Molod, Lawrence Takacs, Cynthia A. Randles, Anton Darmenov, Michael G. Bosilovich, Rolf Reichle, Krzysztof Wargan, Lawrence Coy, Richard Cullather, Clara Draper, Santha Akella, Virginie Buchar, Austin Conaty, Arlindo M. da Silva, Wei Gu, Gi-Kong Kim, Randal Koster, Robert Lucchesi, Dagmar Merkova, Jon Eric Nielsen, Gary Partyka, Steven Pawson, William Putman, Michele Rienecker, Siegfried D. Schubert, Meta Sienkiewicz, and Bin Zhao. The Modern-Era Retrospective Analysis for Research and Applications, Version 2 (MERRA-2). *Journal of Climate*, 30(14):5419–5454, July 2017. ISSN 0894-8755. doi: 10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0758.1.
- Hans Hersbach, Bill Bell, Paul Berrisford, Shoji Hirahara, András Horányi, Joaquín Muñoz-Sabater, Julien Nicolas, Carole Peubey, Raluca Radu, Dinand Schepers, Adrian Simmons, Cornel Soci, Saleh Abdalla, Xavier Abellan, Gianpaolo Balsamo, Peter Bechtold, Gionata Biavati, Jean Bidlot, Massimo Bonavita, Giovanna De Chiara, Per Dahlgren, Dick Dee, Michail Diamantakis, Rossana Dragani, Johannes Flemming, Richard Forbes, Manuel Fuentes, Alan Geer, Leo Haimberger, Sean Healy, Robin J. Hogan, Elías Hólm, Marta Janisková, Sarah Keeley, Patrick Laloyaux, Philippe Lopez, Cristina Lupu, Gabor Radnoti, Patricia de Rosnay, Iryna Rozum, Freja Vamborg, Sebastien Villaume, and Jean-Noël Thépaut. The ERA5 global reanalysis. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 146(730):1999–2049, 2020. ISSN 1477-870X. doi: 10.1002/qj.3803.