UNDERSTANDING THE STRATOSPHERIC **RESPONSE TO ARCTIC AMPLIFICATION** 2 School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham, UK

I. MOTIVATION



The Arctic is dramatically changing with rising emissions, warming almost four times as fast as the global average

Some studies propose that associated sea ice loss affects the stratospheric polar vortex by modulating upward propagating planetary waves

Others suggest that this could perturb the winter jet stream and affect surface weather, with higher chance of blocking

- In comprehensive model studies, such as PAMIP and CMIP, there are diverging stratospheric responses to future Arctic sea ice loss and climate change, respectively
- There is large intermodel spread in the depth (and strength) of the heat response to Arctic amplification - both between similar models, and when comparing atmosphere-only to fully coupled simulations
- •Here, we investigate the extent to which such differences modulate the response of the stratospheric polar vortex to polar heating

2. METHODS

We use the idealised modelling framework lsca to: • understand the fundamental mechanisms behind modelled responses; • unravel the impact of model differences;

• help reduce biases in the complex, state-of-the-art models

I) a stratosphere

using Newtonian relaxation to an equilibrium temperature profile¹ representative of northern hemisphere winter and run for $\sim 40y$:

 $T_{eq}^{strat}(\phi, p) = [1 - W(\phi)]T_{US}(\phi) - W(\phi)T_{US}(p_T) \left(\frac{p}{n_T}\right)^{-r_T/g}$

- 2) semi-realistic atmospheric variability through careful model parameter selection and by introducing a wave-generating zonally asymmetric midlatitude heating²
- 3) Arctic amplification-representative heating using a zonally symmetric pole-centred heating³ that conserves total energy input for a given heating strength

I Polvani & Kushner, 2002, Geophys. Res. Lett.















^{*}rm811@exeter.ac.uk / rgnmudhar@gmail.com

flux (arrows) and divergence (filled contours) is for all wave numbers.

Regan Mudhar^{1*}, Ruth Geen², Neil T. Lewis¹, James A. Screen¹, William J. M. Seviour¹, Stephen I. Thomson¹

I Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Exeter, UK



- QBO phase