

Dear reviewer, dear Editor Kirsten Elger,

30 September 2020

Thank you for your time and efforts to provide us with this constructive and clear review of our manuscript version from May 7, 2020. Our reply to each of your comments is provided below (in *italics*).

The new version of the dataset, version 3, is available at <https://doi.org/10.11582/2020.00052>. We updated the figures in the manuscript accordingly. As the only difference with dataset version 2 is the re-referencing of humidity and temperature, only Figure 1 and 7 (anomaly and multi-model mean spread for humidity and temperature) and the tas and huss variables in Fig. A1 are slightly different. Note as well that we included the river runoff anomalies in a new Table 4, and a description thereof in the section on precipitation (Sect. 3.4).

Yours sincerely,

Anne Morée and Jörg Schwinger

General comments

Text: The manuscript is well structured, and the text is generally easy to read, though some concepts and methods are introduced without proper explanation (see Specific comments). Therefore, it would be helpful if some clarifications were added. I have also given suggestions to smaller changes of the text that I find would improve the reading experience.

Thank you for providing constructive input to improve the text - see our reply below for details on how we addressed your concerns.

Figures: When showing anomaly figures, it is always easier for the reader to understand the fields resulting from these anomalies if the original fields (in this case, PMIP3 piControl) are also shown. I therefore suggest adding figures of the piControl fields for each of the variables to the supplementary material. I have also suggested to add model spread of the sea-ice anomaly to supplementary material, as model spread in other variables is assumed to be based on the spread in modelled sea-ice.

Thank you for this suggestion. We decided to add the piControl multi-model annual mean fields for all eight variables by adding a new appendix figure A2 (as an appendix for easier reference than a separate supplementary material file). The new Fig. A2 is introduced in Sect. 2 directly after introducing Fig. A1.

We visualize the model spread of the sea ice cover anomaly in a new figure A3 (based on variable 'sic' in CMIP/PMIP, % fraction of grid cell covered by sea ice) and refer to this new figure where appropriate in Sect. 3 (see more details in our reply below).

Data availability: To simplify for the user, it would be great to add a download link which allows download of the entire dataset at once. I found it difficult to know if I had downloaded all files in the containers and sub-containers. Once downloaded, the dataset appears to be easy to handle and well documented, though I have not yet had the opportunity to apply it to simulations.

Download of all data with one click would indeed be a good improvement. We inquired with the NIRD Research Data Archive whether this is a possibility. They suggested including a zipped archive of all files as an additional file, which we have done and named 'Moree2020v3.tar.gz'.

Specific comments

Abstract

Page 1, line 11: "ocean-sea-ice" – Though 'ocean-sea-ice' is adequate in the sense that the model does not simulate land-ice, it does not read well. I would suggest changing to 'ocean and sea-ice'. The term ocean-sea-ice-atmosphere model is used later in the paper (P 2, L 8), and by clearly stating ocean and sea-ice here, the second contraction of these words becomes clearer.

Thank you for this suggestion, we changed the manuscript accordingly.

Page 1, lines 12-14: "The data presented here are derived from fully coupled paleoclimate simulations [...]" – The previous two sentences (lines 8-12) seem to be about justifying the use of ocean-ice only models. Here, you very suddenly switch to talking about data from fully coupled simulations, which got me confused. Consider making this transition smoother by first introducing the problem addressed by your dataset (now on lines 21-22) rather than the dataset itself.

Thank you for noting this. We restructured the abstract by moving back and rephrasing the sentence that introduced the problem addressed by our dataset (lines 21-22) such that it is placed before lines 12-14 - where we state that we base our dataset on fully coupled models.

Page 1, line 19: "pre-industrial times" – The anomaly fields presented in this paper are based on PMIP3-simulations and are thus LGM-PI anomalies. However, it is also stated that the fields are optimized for use with the CORE forcing fields, which are not explicitly pre-industrial, but which have rather been evaluated against contemporary data. This should be clarified in the text (see also page 2, lines 32-33)

We replaced the word 'times' with 'simulations' and explained the definition of the piControl simulation in Sect. 2. To clarify that the CORE is not strictly a pre-industrial forcing, we added a sentence in Sect. 2: 'We note that the CORE forcing is based on modern era (1948-2009) reanalysis and observations, and thus is not a pre-industrial forcing. However, the anthropogenic climate signal contained in these data is relatively small, particularly in comparison to the uncertainties of the LGM-PI anomalies (see below).'

Introduction

Page 1, lines 26-28: "[...] the LGM is extensively studied in modelling frameworks (Menviel et al., 2017; Brady et al., 2012; Otto-Bliesner et al., 2007)." – For a topic that has been studied as extensively as the LGM in modelling frameworks, only citing three studies seems too little. I would suggest adding a few more relevant references and adding an e.g. before the given references.

There are indeed many other studies we could have cited here, and an 'e.g.' is therefore in place. We added 'e.g.' and included several more (ocean) modelling studies in our citation.

Page 2, lines 3-5: "Complex fully coupled models can typically not be run into full equilibrium (which requires hundreds to thousands of years of integration) due to computational costs (Eyring et al., 2016). Therefore, the PMIP3 models exhibit model drift (especially in the deep ocean, e.g.

Marzocchi and Jansen, 2017).” – It would be valuable for the reader if you explained/exemplified, in one sentence, why equilibrium states are desirable and/or what kind of problems you get when analyzing a model that drifts.

We added the sentence ‘Since significant differences between a (drifting) non-equilibrated state and the equilibrium model state can impede comparison of model results with proxy data, a well equilibrated model with minimal drift is desirable.’

Page 2, lines 8-9: “We refer to a forced ocean model as a model of the ocean-sea-iceatmosphere system in which the atmosphere is represented by prescribed 2-D forcing fields.” – It would be helpful to add a few references to widely used examples of such models, or papers that make intercomparisons.

We followed this suggestion by adding the sentence ‘Such model set-ups have been extensively used in model intercomparison studies such as the Coordinated Ocean-ice Reference Experiments (COREs; Griffies et al., 2009), and more recently in the CMIP6 Ocean Model Intercomparison Project (OMIP; Griffies et al. 2016).

Page 2, lines 22-27: starting with “The description of the procedure [...]” – I find it a little odd to present Section 3 before you present Section 2. In my opinion, it disturbs the fluidity in reading the text, and it is not clear to me why you have chosen to do so.

We agree with the reviewer that the text has a better flow when Sect. 2 is introduced before Sect. 3, and we moved the sentence that introduces Sect. 2 forward in order to do so.

2 General description of the dataset

Page 2, line 29: “pre-industrial state” – What is the definition of pre-industrial in PMIP3?

The piControl experiments which represent ‘the pre-industrial state’ are the same as in CMIP5 and represent the year 1850. We clarified this in the text.

Page 2, lines 32-33: “and are optimized for use in combination with Coordinated Oceanice Reference Experiments (CORE) forcing fields (Griffies et al., 2009).” – It should be clarified that these fields are in fact not strictly pre-industrial but rather corresponding to contemporary forcing. This was pointed out in a previous version of the manuscript, but unfortunately, that information has been removed.

We clarified this by adding the sentence ‘We note that the CORE forcing is based on modern era (1948-2009) reanalysis and observations, and thus is not a pre-industrial forcing. However, the anthropogenic climate signal contained in these data is relatively small, particularly in comparison to the uncertainties of the anomaly fields (see below).’

Page 2, lines 33-34: “The use of an anomaly forcing implies the assumption that no changes in temporal or spatial variability occurred between the lgm and piControl states beyond changes in the mean.” – What are the implications of this assumption? It does not seem to be discussed anywhere in the paper.

We have removed this sentence, since this problem is already discussed in Section 4 (limitations of our dataset), and since we feel that this sentence is a bit out of context in Section 2. In Section

4, we have added a brief discussion of the implications: ‘We can currently not quantify the implications of this assumption, but future phases of PMIP (providing simulation output with higher temporal resolution) might alleviate this problem.’

Page 3, lines 2-3: “A discussion on the limitations of our dataset is provided in Sect. 4.” – Why not mention this in the introduction, where the rest of the structure of the paper is presented? It seems unnecessary that the reader needs to search for this information.

We agree with the reviewer that Sect. 4 could be introduced earlier in the paper, and added the sentence ‘Limitations of the dataset are discussed in Sect. 4.’ to the structure description at the end of Sect. 1.

Page 3, lines 13-14: “[...] proxy-based reconstructions are available for some of the variables (e.g., temperature)” – ‘some of’ feels unnecessarily vague. You only have seven variables. You could say specifically for which variables proxy-based reconstructions are (currently) available and include relevant references.

We are not aware of a purely proxy-based reconstruction with global coverage for any of the variables, which would be required for the creation of a proxy-based model forcing. Nevertheless, in this sentence we mean to refer to the availability of some regional/local information for some of the variables. Combination of such proxy data with output from (PMIP) model runs can create global coverage for air-temperatures (e.g., Annan and Hargreaves, 2015). Similarly, the development of new methods to reconstruct humidity (e.g., Alexandre et al., 2018) or precipitation (e.g., Mendes et al., 2019) shows promise for these variables as well, although the proxy data are only available over the continents. Large-scale proxy-based information about wind speed and direction (e.g., Markewich et al., 2015) is mostly qualitative. Information on incoming (‘downwelling’) radiation can be reconstructed based on the Milankovitch parameters for the top of the atmosphere, but no proxy exists which could quantitatively reconstruct the near-surface radiation which would be affected by cloud cover, humidity, etc. Last, sea surface salinity is (like precipitation) only locally reconstructed based on proxies and highly uncertain (Rohling, 2000). In summary, the variables we present in our dataset are generally only reconstructed using proxies over land and in qualitative form, and are not available with global coverage without involving model data. We will summarize the above by replacing this sentence with a more elaborate paragraph covering the above.

Page 3, line 23: “[...] which have been extensively used in the ocean modelling community (e.g. Griffies et al., 2009; Schwinger et al., 2016).” – If they have been extensively used, it would be advisable to add a few more references here.

We wish to highlight here that they are common because they are a standard in model intercomparison studies. We added a few more references and specifically refer to the fact that CMIP6 OMIP experiments rely on CORE format forcing and include the relevant CMIP references.

Page 3, lines 30-31: “This choice ensures that the anomaly forcing data can be used with any pre-industrial land-sea mask.” – Is this true in any forced-model resolution? (I think here of models with lower-than-average horizontal resolution.)

We indeed expect this to be true for any pre-industrial land mask, as we extended the WOA coastline 1.5 degrees inland. However, the statement may be too strong (for very low resolution models) and we rephrased this sentence and added 'likely' to it.

3 The variables

Page 4, line 4: “[...] a 6-hour time resolution” – There is no description in the text of why some variables are time interpolated to 6-hour time resolution and some to a daily time resolution. It would be helpful for the reader if this was outlined in Section 2.

We chose to time-interpolate the variables to their respective time resolution in the CORE Normal Year Forcing format (CORE-NYF; Large and Yeager, 2004). This sentence is now added to Sect. 2.

Page 4, line 8: “without any strong spatial pattern” – Here, I disagree with the authors. I do see a clear spatial pattern, with more spread in the Northern Hemisphere and particularly in the western boundary current regions/close to the major Northern ice sheets. I would therefore like to know what the authors base this statement on.

We agree that this statement was not accurate. We changed the text as follows: ‘The model spread of the anomaly shows a disagreement between the PMIP3 models generally in the order of $1-2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ kg kg}^{-1}$, but is larger (up $4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ kg kg}^{-1}$) in the northern hemisphere western boundary current regions and close to the Arctic ice edge.’

Page 5, lines 18-20: “The inter-model spread ($\sim 1-3 \text{ m s}^{-1}$) has little structure except for the $\sim 4-5 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ disagreement in the Southern Ocean south of $\sim 40^\circ\text{S}$, and the $\sim 3-5 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ disagreement in the North Atlantic (Fig. 6).” – These disagreement zones are indeed quite pronounced. It gets me wondering what the likely explanation for the disagreements in each of these two zones is. Later, in the Discussion (page 8, lines 2-3), you state that these explanations are beyond the scope of this study, though in this section you do provide explanations for some of the other variables. I would argue that if these explanations have been provided in other PMIP3-studies, it would not be a major effort for the authors to include them. For the North Atlantic, this is not evident, but for the Southern Ocean, is it possible that the explanation is found in the differences in the jet position relative to the sea-ice edge, as described by Sime et al., 2016? (Sime, L. C., Hodgson, D., Bracegirdle, T. J., Allen, C., Perren, B., Roberts, S., de Boer, A. M., 2016: Sea ice led to poleward-shifted winds at the Last Glacial Maximum: the influence of state dependency on CMIP5 and PMIP3 models, *Clim. Past*, 12, 22412253, doi: /10.5194/cp-12-2241-2016)

Thank you for pointing us to this interesting result. We included a brief discussion of the Southern Ocean westerly wind disagreement as follows: ‘In the Southern Ocean the band of large disagreement in westerly wind speeds reflects the large uncertainty in the simulated position of the southern hemisphere jet stream, both in the pre-industrial and the LGM. This disagreement is reinforced by the fact that shifts in the jet position between pre-industrial and LGM also depend on the simulated expansion of sea-ice (Sime et al. 2016; Fig. A3).’

Page 6, lines 24-26: “Regarding the dynamical inconsistencies, it is important to note that the CORE forcing itself is a mixture of reanalysis and 25 observational data products and as such not dynamically consistent.” – This sentence is phrased in a way that makes me feel like the CORE

forcing has been previously discussed in the paragraph, which is not the case. Consider rephrasing or adding a sentence 'Our dataset has been adapted to be an extension of the CORE forcing.' (or similar) before this sentence.

We added 'for which our dataset is optimized' in parentheses after the mention of CORE forcing.

Page 8, lines 2-3: "The attribution of the model spread to specific processes is beyond the scope of this article [...]" – Yet the authors do attempt to provide these explanations for several variables. For a user of the dataset, I think it would be useful to know where the model spread originates from, and while reading the article, I found it somewhat frustrating that some of these explanations were missing (see my comment for page 5, lines 18-20). I feel that, in those cases where that information is available from other PMIP3 research, it is something that the authors could provide without additional analysis. For those variables that explanations for the model spread are given, there are generally no motivations for these explanations, for example in the form of a cited paper or a confirming supplementary figure (see e.g. page 4, lines 14-15; and page 5, lines 25-26, which could both be confirmed with a figure of model spread in sea-ice cover). Based on the fact that some explanations are indeed already given, I would advise to rephrase this sentence to 'The complete attribution of the model spread [...]', whether or not any further explanations can be added.

We added the word 'complete' as suggested as well as including the new model spread figure for ice cover, Fig. A3. We refer to this new figure in Sect 3.2, 3.5 and 3.6.

Page 8, line 5: "Finally, there is no other way [...]" – I would suggest expressing this a bit more cautiously, by changing to Finally, there is currently no other way [...]

Corrected as suggested by adding 'currently'.

Technical corrections

Page 3, line 9: "yearly" – annual

Corrected as suggested

Page 3, line 19: "The SSS fields is [...]" – The SSS fields are [...]

Corrected as suggested

Page 3, line 35: "under the assumption of an unchanged spatial and temporal variability" – remove an

Corrected as suggested

Page 4, lines 6 and 8: "2-3 kg kg⁻¹" and "1-2 kg kg⁻¹" – According to the colourbar in Fig. 1, the magnitude of the specific humidity anomaly and spread is 10-3 kg kg⁻¹ .

Corrected as suggested

Page 4, line 23: "symmetrically" – symmetrical, i.e. a symmetrical spatial pattern, though it is not entirely clear what symmetrically refers back to here. Consider either changing to symmetrical or rephrasing the sentence.

Corrected to symmetrical

Page 5, line 24: The temperature anomalies of 10K and ~2.5K are presumably supposed to be negative.

Corrected as suggested by adding negative signs

References

Alexandre, A., Landais, A., Vallet-Coulomb, C., Piel, C., Devidal, S., Pauchet, S., Sonzogni, C., Couapel, M., Pasturel, M., Cornuault, P., Xin, J., Mazur, J. C., Prié, F., Bentaleb, I., Webb, E., Chalié, F., and Roy, J.: *The triple oxygen isotope composition of phytoliths as a proxy of continental atmospheric humidity: insights from climate chamber and climate transect calibrations*, *Biogeosciences*, 15, 3223-3241, 10.5194/bg-15-3223-2018, 2018.

Annan, J. D. and Hargreaves, J. C.: *A new global reconstruction of temperature changes at the Last Glacial Maximum*, *Clim. Past*, 9, 367–376, <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-9-367-2013>, 2013.

Markewich, H. W., Litwin, R. J., Wysocki, D. A., and Pavich, M. J.: *Synthesis on Quaternary aeolian research in the unglaciated eastern United States*, *Aeolian Research*, 17, 139-191, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeolia.2015.01.011>, 2015.

Mendes, V. R., Sawakuchi, A. O., Chiessi, C. M., Giannini, P. C. F., Rehfeld, K., and Mulitza, S.: *Thermoluminescence and Optically Stimulated Luminescence Measured in Marine Sediments Indicate Precipitation Changes Over Northeastern Brazil*, *Paleoceanography and Paleoclimatology*, 34, 1476-1486, 10.1029/2019PA003691, 2019.

Rohling, E. J.: *Paleosalinity: confidence limits and future applications*, *Marine Geology*, 163, 1-11, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227\(99\)00097-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227(99)00097-3), 2000.

A Last Glacial Maximum forcing dataset for ocean modelling

Anne L. Morée¹, Jörg Schwinger²

¹Geophysical Institute, University of Bergen and Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research, Bergen, 5007, Norway

²NORCE Climate, Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research, 5007 Bergen, Norway

5 *Correspondence to:* Anne L. Morée (anne.moree@uib.no)

Abstract. Model simulations of the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM, ~21 000 years before present) can aid the interpretation of proxy records, help to gain an improved mechanistic understanding of the LGM climate system, and are valuable for the evaluation of model performance in a different climate state. Ocean-ice only model configurations forced by prescribed atmospheric data (referred to as “forced ocean models”) drastically reduce the computational cost of paleoclimate modelling as compared to fully coupled model frameworks. While feedbacks between the atmosphere and ocean and sea-ice compartments of the Earth system are not present in such model configurations, many scientific questions can be addressed with models of this type. Our ~~These forcing dataset~~ supports provide a means to simulation of the LGM in a forced ocean model set-up computationally efficient way, while still taking advantage of the complexity of fully coupled model set-ups. The data presented here are derived from fully coupled paleoclimate simulations of the Palaeoclimate Modelling Intercomparison Project phase 3 (PMIP3). The data are publicly accessible at the NIRD Research Data Archive at https://doi.org/10.11582/2020.00052_10.11582/2019.00019 (Morée and Schwinger, 2020^{19a}). They consist of 2-D anomaly forcing fields suitable for use in ocean models that employ a bulk forcing approach and are optimized for use with CORE forcing fields. The data include specific humidity, downwelling longwave and shortwave radiation, precipitation, wind (v and u components), temperature, and sea surface salinity (SSS). All fields are provided as climatological mean anomalies between LGM and pre-industrial ~~times~~ simulations. These anomaly data can therefore be added to any pre-industrial ocean forcing data set in order to obtain forcing fields representative of LGM conditions as simulated by PMIP3 models. ~~These forcing data provide a means to simulate the LGM in a computationally efficient way, while still taking advantage of the complexity of fully coupled model set-ups.~~ Furthermore, the dataset can be easily updated to reflect results from upcoming and future paleo model intercomparison activities.

1 Introduction

The LGM (~21 kya) is of interest to the climate research community because of the relative abundance of proxy data, and because it is the most recent profoundly different climatic state of our planet. For these reasons, the LGM is extensively studied in modelling frameworks (e.g., Menviel et al., 2017; Brady et al., 2012; Otto-Bliesner et al., 2007; Bouttes et al., 2011; Buchanan et al., 2016; Lynch-Stieglitz et al., 2016; Kageyama et al., 2017). Model simulations of the past ocean cannot only provide a method to gain a mechanistic understanding of marine proxy records, they can also inform us about model performance in a different climatic state of the Earth system (Braconnot et al., 2012). Typical state-of-the-art tools to simulate the (past) Earth system are climate or Earth

system models as, for example, used in the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 5 (CMIP5; Taylor et al., 2011). Besides simulating our present climate, these CMIP5 models are also used to simulate past climate states (such as the LGM) in the Palaeoclimate Modelling Intercomparison Project 3 (PMIP3). However, the computational costs and run-time of such fully coupled model frameworks are a major obstacle for their application to palaeoclimate modelling. Palaeoclimate modelling optimally requires long (thousands to ten thousands of years) simulations in order to provide the necessary time for relevant processes to emerge (e.g. CaCO₃ compensation) (Braconnot et al., 2007). Complex fully coupled models can typically not be run into full equilibrium (which requires hundreds to thousands of years of integration) due to computational costs (Eyring et al., 2016). Therefore, the PMIP3 models exhibit model drift (especially in the deep ocean, e.g. Marzocchi and Jansen, 2017). Since significant differences between a (drifting) non-equilibrated state and the equilibrium model state can impede comparison of model results with proxy data, a well equilibrated model with minimal drift is desirable. The 3rd phase of the PMIP project (Braconnot et al., 2012) limits global mean sea-surface temperature drift to under 0.05 K per century and requires the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation to be stable (Kageyama et al., 2018). We refer to a “forced ocean model” as a model of the ocean-sea-ice-atmosphere system in which the atmosphere is represented by prescribed 2-D forcing fields. Such model set-ups have been extensively used in model intercomparison studies such as the Coordinated Ocean-ice Reference Experiments (COREs; Griffies et al., 2009), and more recently in the CMIP6 Ocean Model Intercomparison Project (OMIP; Griffies et al. 2016). ~~A forced ocean model~~ can be used whenever ocean-atmosphere feedbacks are of minor importance and has the advantage of reducing the computational costs – making longer or more model runs feasible. The use of PMIP output in forced ocean modelling is acommon practice (e.g., Muglia and Schmittner, 2015; Khatiwala et al., 2019). Until now however, there is no standardized dataset available that can be used to easily derive a Last Glacial Maximum model forcing. Therefore, ~~We~~ we present 2-D (surface) anomaly fields of CMIP5/PMIP3 experiments ‘lgm’ (representing the Last Glacial Maximum state of the Earth system) minus ‘piControl’ (representing the pre-industrial state) calculated from monthly climatological PMIP3 output. The PMIP3 output is the result of global boundary conditions and forcings (such as insolation and ice sheet cover) applied in the fully coupled PMIP3 models (Braconnot et al., 2012). Our dataset (Morée and Schwinger, ~~2019a~~2020) is a unique compilation of existing data, processed and reformatted such that it can be readily applied in a forced ocean model framework that uses a bulk forcing approach similar to Large and Yeager (2004). Since this approach has been popularized through coordinated model intercomparison activities (Griffies et al., 2009), a majority of forced ocean models today uses this approach. The 2-D anomaly fields presented here can be added to the pre-industrial forcing of a forced ocean model in order to obtain an atmospheric forcing representative of the LGM. The data are climatological mean anomalies, and as such suitable for equilibrium LGM ‘time-slice’ modelling of the ocean. In Sect. 2, a general description of the dataset and data sources is provided alongside an overview of the variables (Table 1). The description of the procedure followed to make this dataset (Sect. 3) should support any extension of the dataset with additional (PMIP-derived) variables if needed. The PMIP4 guidelines (Kageyama et al., 2017) can support users in designing a specific model set-up, for example regarding the land-sea mask, trace gas concentrations, river runoff or other conditions and forcing one would want to apply to a model. ~~In Sect. 2, a general description of the dataset and data sources is provided alongside an overview of the variables (Table 1).~~ Limitations of the dataset are discussed in Sect. 4.

2 General description of the dataset

The data presented in this article are 2-D anomaly fields of the LGM versus pre-industrial state based on PMIP3 (Braconnot et al., 2012). We note that the PMIP3/CMIP5 pre-industrial state, which is the result of ‘piControl’ experiments, represents the year 1850 and is therefore strictly speaking already influenced by anthropogenic forcing (e.g., Eyring et al., 2016). These Our anomaly fields can be used as atmospheric LGM forcing fields for ocean-only model set-ups when added to pre-industrial forcing fields (as done by e.g. Muglia and Schmittner, 2015; Khatiwala et al., 2019), and are optimized for use in combination with ~~Coordinated Ocean-ice Reference Experiments (CORE)~~ forcing fields (Griffies et al., 2009). We note that the CORE forcing is based on modern era (1948-2009) reanalysis and observations, and thus is not a pre-industrial forcing. However, the anthropogenic climate signal contained in these data is relatively small, particularly in comparison to the uncertainties of the LGM-PI anomalies (see below). The use of an anomaly forcing implies the assumption that no changes in temporal or spatial variability occurred between the lgm and piControl states beyond changes in the mean. The basis of the anomaly data is monthly climatological PMIP3 output. Any variables presented on sub-monthly time resolution are therefore time-interpolated. We chose to time-interpolate the variables to their respective time resolution in the CORE Normal Year Forcing format (CORE-NYF; Large and Yeager, 2004). The anomalies are calculated as the mean of the difference between monthly climatologies of the ‘lgm’ and ‘piControl’ PMIP3 model runs. In cases where modelling groups provided more than one ensemble member, we included only the first member in our calculations. The data is the mean anomaly of five PMIP3 models (CNRM-CM5, IPSL-CM5A-LR, GISS-E2-R, MIROC-ESM and MRI-CGCM3: Table 2), as only these models provide output for all variables. A discussion on the limitations of our dataset is provided in Sect. 4.

The variables are i) near-surface specific humidity, ii) downwelling longwave radiation, iii) downwelling shortwave radiation, iv) precipitation, v) wind (v and u components), vi) near surface temperature, and vii) sea surface salinity (SSS) (Table 1). The SSS anomaly field can be used to adjust SSS restoring in LGM simulations. All variables (Sect. 3.1-7) of the monthly climatological PMIP3 output have been regridded (Table 3, #1), averaged (Table 3, #2), and differenced (Table 3, #3) to calculate the anomaly fields. Additional procedures for each variable are provided in the respective part of Sect. 3, together with a figure of each variable’s yearly annual mean anomaly and model spread. Alongside the lgm-piControl anomaly for each variable, the model spread across all five models is made available. The individual model anomalies for each of the variables are presented in Fig. A1. In order to give the reader the opportunity to compare the anomaly data with typical pre-industrial values for each of the variables, we provide the multi-model annual mean for the piControl experiment in Fig. A2.

The inter-model disagreement is described for each variable in Sect. 3, and could for example be used to guide adjustments of the amplitude of the forcing anomaly for model tuning purposes. Additionally, proxy-based reconstructions are available for some of the variables ~~(e.g., temperature)~~, which can constrain potential adjustments to the forcing anomaly fields. We note however that for none of our variables a purely proxy-based global reconstruction exists – underlining the value of model-based reconstructions. A combination of model and proxy data makes it feasible to create global coverage for air temperatures (e.g., Annan and Hargreaves, 2013), but we are not aware of similar efforts for any of our other variables. Regional proxy-based reconstructions, although mostly quantitative and only over the continents, exist for humidity (e.g., Alexandre et al., 2018), precipitation (e.g., Mendes et al., 2019) as well as wind direction and strength (e.g., Markewich et al., 2015). Regarding ocean proxies, salinity reconstructions are highly uncertain (Rohling, 2000), but could also provide

~~some constraint to the model data.~~ We leave ~~the decision~~ to the individual modelling groups ~~whether to make such adjustment~~ ~~adjusts to~~ their forcing fields for their specific application.

All operations were performed with NetCDF toolkits CDO version 1.9.3 (Schulzweida, 2019) or NCO version 4.6.9. The main functions used are documented in Table 3, and referred to in the text at the first occurrence. The atmospheric anomaly data are on a Gaussian grid, with 192×94 (lon×lat) grid-points. The SSS fields ~~are~~ on a regular 360×180 (lon×lat) grid. Regridding any of the files to a different model grid should be straightforward (e.g., Table 3, #1), as it was ensured that all files contain the information needed for re-gridding. The variables, grid and time resolution are chosen to be compatible with the CORE forcing fields (Large and Yeager, 2004), which have been extensively used in the ocean modelling community ~~as they are the standard in ocean model comparisons~~ (e.g. Griffies et al., 2009, 2016; Schwinger et al., 2016). We anticipate that the variables selected here should be useful in different model set-ups as well. We intend to provide a data set that is flexible with respect to the use of different land-ocean masks in different models. Therefore, we account for changes in sea-level (i.e. a larger land area in the LGM), which can affect variables in coastline areas, by applying the following masking procedure: i) masking the multi-model mean anomaly with the maximum lgm land mask across all models, then ii) extrapolating the variable over land using a distance-weighted average (Table 3, #4), and iii) finally masking the data with a present-day land mask (based on the World Ocean Atlas 2013 1° resolution land mask), but with the ocean extended in a 1.5 degrees radius over land. ~~This choice ensures that~~ ~~Therefore, the our~~ anomaly forcing dataset can ~~likely~~ be used with any pre-industrial land-sea mask. Through following this procedure, the grid points affected by land-sea mask changes are thus filled with the extrapolated model mean anomaly from the LGM coastal ocean. In the case of NorESM-OC (Schwinger et al., 2016), the atmospheric anomaly fields were added to its ~~CORE-NYF-normal-year forcing~~ fields (Large and Yeager, 2004) to obtain an LGM normal-year forcing, under the assumption of ~~an~~ unchanged spatial and temporal variability for the respective variable. Note that the addition of the anomaly fields to the user's own model forcing could lead to physically unrealistic/not-meaningful results for some variables (such as negative precipitation or radiation). This must be corrected for by capping off sub-zero values (Table 3, #5) after addition of the anomaly.

3 The variables

3.1 Specific humidity anomaly

The mean anomaly of near-surface specific humidity over the five models was time interpolated (Table 3, #6) to a 6-hour time resolution from the monthly climatological PMIP3 output. The annual mean lgm-piControl anomaly field (Fig. 1) shows a global decrease in specific humidity, as expected from decreased air temperatures (Sect. 3.6). The anomaly is most pronounced around the equator, where we see a decrease of $2-3 \times 10^{-3}$ kg kg⁻¹, while the anomaly is near-zero towards both poles. The model spread of the anomaly shows a disagreement between the PMIP3 models generally in the order of $1-2 \times 10^{-3}$ kg kg⁻¹, ~~but is larger (up 4×10^{-3} kg kg⁻¹) in the northern hemisphere western boundary current regions and close to the Arctic ice edge~~ ~~without any strong spatial pattern~~ (Fig. 1).

3.2 Downwelling longwave radiation anomaly

The anomaly for surface downwelling longwave radiation is time-interpolated (Table 3, #6) to a daily time resolution. The annual mean anomaly field (Fig. 2) shows globally decreased downwelling longwave radiation in the 'lgm' experiment as compared to the 'piControl' experiment, in the order of 10-30 W m⁻² over most of the ocean due to a generally cooler atmosphere (Sect. 3.6). The largest anomalies lie close to the northern ice sheets, with up to -90 W m⁻² lower radiation in the 'lgm' experiment than in the 'piControl' experiment. Ice is likely also the main contributor to the high (60-90 W m⁻²) inter-model spread in North Atlantic and Southern Oceans (Fig. A3). The remainder of the ocean exhibits a better agreement, with inter-model spreads generally below 20 W m⁻² (Fig. 2).

3.3 Downwelling shortwave radiation anomaly

The surface downwelling shortwave radiation anomaly field is time-interpolated (Table 3, #6) to daily fields as done for downwelling longwave radiation. The annual mean anomaly is especially pronounced around the Laurentide and Scandinavian ice sheets, where strong positive anomalies of over ~30 W m⁻² exist (Fig. 3). Globally, the annual mean downwelling shortwave radiation anomaly generally falls in a range of -15 to +15 W m⁻² over the ocean. The anomaly field shows negative anomalies as well positive ones in an alternating spatial pattern approximately symmetrically around the equator in the Pacific basin. The inter-model spread is largest in the North Atlantic region and along the equator (Fig. 3). Due to the large model disagreement of up to 50 W m⁻² for this variable (Fig. 3), the inter-model spread and mean anomaly are of similar magnitude although a consistent pattern is present in the anomaly field.

3.4 Precipitation anomaly and river runoff

The anomaly precipitation presented here is the lgm-piControl ~~precipitation~~ anomaly at the air-sea interface and includes both the liquid and solid phases from all types of clouds (both large-scale and convective), ~~and excludes evaporation~~. The units were converted to mm day⁻¹ to comply with the CORE forcing format (causing a deviation from the CF-1.6 convention). The resulting annual mean anomaly generally falls in the range of -2 to 2 mm day⁻¹, and is most pronounced along the equator (Fig. 4). The models show a mean increase in precipitation directly south of the equator in the Pacific basin, as well as in the Pacific subtropics off the western North-American coast. The North Atlantic also receives a mean positive precipitation anomaly, offsetting part of the positive salinity anomaly there, which is potentially relevant for the simulation of deep-water formation in this region (Sect. 3.7). Negative mean precipitation anomalies are most pronounced directly north of the equator and north of ~40° N in the Pacific basin as well as in the Atlantic Arctic. The inter-model spread is up to ~5 mm day⁻¹ around the equator, likely due to the model disagreement about the sign and location of changes in the inter-tropical convergence zone (Fig. 4). Related to precipitation fluxes, river runoff fluxes also changed between the lgm and piControl model experiments. As land-sea masks and river routing- are very model specific we cannot provide a gridded river runoff anomaly. Instead, we provide mean absolute and relative large-scale river runoff changes integrated over ocean basins (North/South Atlantic, North/South Pacific, Indian Ocean, Table 4). These anomalies can be used by modelling groups to scale pre-industrial river runoff. Note that evaporation simulated by a forced ocean model will generally not equal the sum of the prescribed precipitation and river runoff. For long integrations it is therefore

[necessary to adjust one \(or both\) of these forcings to close the freshwater balance and avoid salinity drift. We assume that modelling groups employing our anomaly forcing will have such a mechanism suitable for their model in place.](#)

3.5 Wind anomalies, u and v components

5 Both for the u and v component of the wind speed, the lgm-piControl anomaly is time-interpolated to 6-hourly fields. The annual mean meridional wind velocity (v, southerly winds) anomaly shows a pronounced increase ($\sim 3\text{-}5\text{ m s}^{-1}$) in southerly winds around the NW edge of the Laurentide ice sheet as well as over the NW edge of the Scandinavian ice sheet (Fig. 5). Alongside that, a pronounced decrease ($\sim 3\text{-}5\text{ m s}^{-1}$) in southerly winds is simulated along the eastern North American coast and the Canadian archipelago. The open ocean anomalies are generally
10 small (at most $\pm 1\text{ m s}^{-1}$). The inter-model spread has no pronounced pattern but is sizable, with $\sim 1\text{-}5\text{ m s}^{-1}$ disagreement between the PMIP3 models. The mean zonal wind velocity (u, westerly winds) anomaly shows alternating negative and positive anomaly bands with an approximate $\pm 2\text{ m s}^{-1}$ range (Fig. 6). This pattern is stronger in the Northern Hemisphere north of $\sim 45^\circ\text{ N}$. The inter-model spread ($\sim 1\text{-}3\text{ m s}^{-1}$) has little structure except for the $\sim 4\text{-}5\text{ m s}^{-1}$ disagreement in the Southern Ocean south of $\sim 40^\circ\text{ S}$, and the $\sim 3\text{-}5\text{ m s}^{-1}$ disagreement in
15 the North Atlantic (Fig. 6). [In the Southern Ocean the band of large disagreement in westerly wind speeds reflects the large uncertainty in the simulated position of the southern hemisphere jet stream, both in the pre-industrial and the LGM. This disagreement is reinforced by the fact that shifts in the jet position between pre-industrial and LGM also depend on the simulated expansion of sea-ice \(Sime et al. 2016; Fig. A3\).](#)

3.6 Temperature anomaly

20 The near-surface atmospheric temperature is time-interpolated to calculate the 6-hourly mean anomaly for temperature. The annual mean anomaly is most pronounced in the North Atlantic, where open ocean anomalies exceed -10 K . Elsewhere, the annual mean temperature anomaly is $\sim -2.5\text{ K}$. There is a clear pattern in the model spread: The models show a large spread ($>10\text{ K}$) north of $\sim 45^\circ\text{ N}$, as well as south of $\sim 540^\circ\text{ S}$ ($5\text{-}10\text{ K}$), likely due to the disagreement about ice cover ([Fig. A3](#)). At lower latitudes, the model spread is generally smaller ($0\text{-}3\text{ K}$)
25 (Fig. 7).

3.7 Sea surface salinity anomaly

Global mean salinity is initialized in PMIP3 models with a 1 psu higher salinity to account for the concentrating effect of the decrease in sea level (Kageyama et al., 2017). Sea surface salinity however, shows a more variable annual mean lgm-piControl change due to changes in the global hydrological cycle (Fig. 8). The sea surface salinity
30 anomaly is presented on a regular 1×1 grid for ease of use. The resulting annual mean SSS anomaly (Fig. 8) shows an increase in sea surface salinity ($\sim 1\text{ psu}$) over the Southern Ocean south of $\sim 55^\circ\text{ S}$, as well as in the Arctic ($>3\text{ psu}$) and the Northern Indian Ocean ($\sim 1\text{ psu}$). A $\sim 2\text{ psu}$ anomaly is simulated in the Canadian Archipelago, the Labrador Sea and across the North Atlantic between what is now Canada and Europe (Fig. 8). Freshening is simulated close to some continents, and is especially pronounced around Scandinavia (about -3 psu). Simulated
35 ocean circulation can be very sensitive to fresh water forcing and thus SSS, especially in the North Atlantic (e.g. Rahmstorf, 1996; Spence et al., 2008). Application of SSS restoring using the SSS anomaly field should therefore

be done with caution and attention to its effects on the meridional overturning circulation. Tuning of the salinity anomaly in important deep-water formation regions of up to about ± 1 psu, such as done by for example Winguth et al. (1999), may be required to obtain a satisfactory circulation field in reasonable agreement with proxy data. Such adjustments fall well within the PMIP3 model spread (Fig. 8), and show the current limitations of fully coupled PMIP3 models to simulate the LGM hydrological cycle consistent with proxy records of ocean circulation.

4 Limitations of the dataset

The anomaly fields presented here are a model-based ‘best-estimate’ of the LGM anomaly relative to the pre-industrial state. There are some important limitations to these data related to the temporal resolution, the use of model means, and the fact that we rely on modelling results only.

Proxy data with global coverage are unavailable for most of the variables needed to force stand-alone ocean models. We do not attempt to constrain the anomaly fields using the spatially limited information from available proxy data. Consequently, where PMIP3 models are in disagreement with proxy data, our dataset will be so, too. The limitations (or uncertainty) of the PMIP3 simulations can be seen through the large inter-model spread, which is provided with the anomaly data. This does not preclude the possibility that PMIP3 models collectively (i.e. such that the model spread is small) disagree with available proxy data. Nevertheless, PMIP3 is the state of the art for modelling of past climates at present (Braconnot et al., 2012; Braconnot and Kageyama, 2015).

By adding multi model mean anomalies to forcing fields, dynamical inconsistencies (e.g. between wind and temperature fields) will be created. This means that the resulting forcing fields do not strictly obey the equations of state/motion. A forcing data set would typically be dynamically consistent if the forcing would be the outcome of an atmospheric model or an advanced reanalysis. The advantage of using model mean fields is that large anomalies of individual models will be smoothed out where models disagree. We believe that currently a main challenge for paleo modelling activities is to achieve long enough integration times. Therefore, using a single forcing (as opposed to using multiple forcings from individual models) seems to be preferable. Regarding the dynamical inconsistencies, it is important to note that the CORE forcing itself (for which our dataset is optimized) is a mixture of reanalysis and observational data products and as such not dynamically consistent.

PMIP3 model output is publicly available only as monthly mean fields, which also results in some limitations for the anomaly forcing data set. First, although we interpolate the monthly mean anomaly fields to higher (e.g. 6-hourly) temporal resolution, we implicitly assume that any sub-monthly variability (e.g. the diurnal cycle) is preserved from the preindustrial climate state to the LGM state. We can currently not quantify the implications of this assumption, but future phases of PMIP (providing simulation output with higher temporal resolution) might alleviate this problem. Second, we are not able to accurately re-reference near-surface temperature and humidity to a different reference height. The CORE bulk forcing method of Large and Yeager (2004) ~~actually~~ requires near-surface specific humidity and temperature at the same height as the wind forcing (at 10 meters). Humidity and temperature are, however, provided at 2 meters height in PMIP3 (as in most atmospheric data products). A procedure to re-reference humidity and temperature from 2 to 10 meters (e.g. Large and Yeager 2004) requires input data in higher (sub-daily) time resolution in order to resolve different boundary layer stability regimes. However, for an anomaly forcing, the re-referencing only has an effect if it leads to different temperature/humidity

increments under the PI and the LGM state. For the open ocean this is barely the case and taking a climatological anomaly of 2-meter-quantities and apply it at 10 meters height is unproblematic. Over sea ice, however, there could be a larger effect of the re-referencing (due to a significantly different atmospheric stability in the LGM state), especially regarding the temperature. Our analysis indicates that this is probably the case over the central Arctic Ocean (not shown). For all other regions, we estimate that the error made in applying the re-referencing approach on monthly climatological data resolved data, does not justify its application. In general, the error made by omitting the re-referencing is much smaller than the uncertainties of the anomalies (i.e. the model spread), particularly at high latitudes.

Regarding the robustness of the dataset, we observe that the inclusion of additional model data only leads to minor changes in the anomalies. An example of this is given by comparing version 1 (Morée and Schwinger, 2019b) and the current version 32 (Morée and Schwinger, 2019a,2020) of this dataset, as the latter also includes the GISS-E2-R model for the calculation of the anomalies. Indeed, individual model anomalies (Fig. A1) show broad agreement, although the magnitude of the anomaly is less agreed on (as discussed in more detail for the individual variables in Sect. 3).

Despite the limitations described here, we believe that using the mean PMIP3 anomaly of coupled models as forcing is currently the best available option for use in stand-alone ocean models. For this purpose, our dataset provides lgm-piControl anomalies in standardized format for the most common variables used in ocean forcing.

5 Data availability

The data are publicly accessible at the NIRD Research Data Archive at <https://doi.org/10.11582/2020.00052> (Morée and Schwinger, 2019a,2020). The .md5 files contain an md5 checksum, which can be used to check whether changes have been made to the respective NetCDF files.

6 Summary and Conclusions

The output of the fully coupled PMIP3 simulations of CNRM-CM5, IPSL-CM5A-LR, MIROC-ESM, MRI-CGCM3 and GISS-E2-R is converted to anomaly datasets intended for use in forced ocean modelling of the LGM.

All anomalies are calculated as the difference between the ‘lgm’ and ‘piControl’ PMIP3 experiments. In addition, all data are formatted in a way that further conversions (of for example units or the grid) can be applied in a straightforward way. The variables are provided in NetCDF format in separate files, and distributed by the NIRD Research Data Archive (Morée and Schwinger, 2019a,2020). A climatological LGM forcing data set can be created for any forced ocean model by addition of the presented 2-D anomaly fields to the model’s pre-industrial forcing.

This approach enables the scientific community to simulate the LGM ocean state in a forced ocean model set-up. We expect that if additional forcing is needed for a specific model, the same approach as described above can be followed. This process is simplified by providing all main CDO and NCO commands used in creating the dataset (Table 3). All data represent a climatological year, i.e. one annual cycle per variable. The application of the data is thus suitable for ‘time-slice’ equilibrium simulations of the LGM, and optimised for use with the CORE forcing format (Large and Yeager, 2004).

The uncertainty of our anomaly forcing (approximated by the model spread of the PMIP3 models) is generally of similar magnitude as the multi-model annual mean. The complete attribution of the model spread to specific processes is beyond the scope of this article, but our results show that there is considerable uncertainty involved in the magnitude of the anomaly for all variables presented here. Nevertheless, all mean anomalies show a distinct spatial pattern that we expect to be indicative of the LGM-PI changes. Finally, there is currently no other way to reconstruct most of these variables than model simulations with state-of-the-art Earth system models such as those applied in the PMIP3 experiments. For modelling purposes, the inter-model disagreement of PMIP3 provides the user with leeway to adjust the amplitude of the forcing (guided by the size of the model spread, which is therefore provided alongside the variables in the dataset). Such adjustments can improve model-proxy data agreements, such as described for salinity in Sect. 3.7.

Appendix A.




Figure A1: Annual mean individual model anomalies for each of the variables (see Table 1) and models in the dataset. Units as in the remainder of this manuscript.




Figure A2: Annual mean for each of the variables (see Table 1) for the piControl CMIP5/PMIP3 experiment.




Figure A3: Annual mean model spread of sea ice fraction.

Author contributions. AM prepared, visualized and analysed the data and wrote the original draft of the manuscript. AM and JS together conceptualized the method and revised the manuscript. JS provided supervision throughout the study.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

5 **Acknowledgements.** We acknowledge the World Climate Research Programme’s Working Group on Coupled Modelling, which is responsible for CMIP, and we thank the climate modelling groups (Table 2) for producing and making available their model output. For CMIP the U.S. Department of Energy’s Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison provides coordinating support and led development of software infrastructure in partnership with the Global Organization for Earth System Science Portals. This is a contribution to the Bjerknes
10 Centre for Climate Research (Bergen, Norway). Storage resources were provided by UNINETT Sigma2 - the National Infrastructure for High Performance Computing and Data Storage in Norway (project number ns2980k). Anne L. Morée is grateful for PhD funding through the Faculty for Mathematics and Natural Sciences of the University of Bergen. Jörg Schwinger acknowledges funding through the Research Council of Norway (project INES, 270061). This study is a contribution to the project “Coordinated Research in Earth Systems and Climate:
15 Experiments, kNOWLEDge, Dissemination and Outreach” (CRESCENDO; EU Horizon2020 Programme grant no. 641816) which is funded by the European Commission.

References

- 20 [Alexandre, A., Landais, A., Vallet-Coulomb, C., Piel, C., Devidal, S., Pauchet, S., Sonzogni, C., Couapel, M., Pasturel, M., Cornuault, P., Xin, J., Mazur, J. C., Prié, F., Bentaleb, I., Webb, E., Chalié, F., and Roy, J.: The triple oxygen isotope composition of phytoliths as a proxy of continental atmospheric humidity: insights from climate chamber and climate transect calibrations. *Biogeosciences*, 15, 3223-3241, 10.5194/bg-15-3223-2018, 2018.](#)
[Annan, J. D., and Hargreaves, J. C.: A new global reconstruction of temperature changes at the Last Glacial Maximum, *Clim. Past*, 9, 367-376, 10.5194/cp-9-367-2013, 2013.](#)
25 [Bouttes, N., Paillard, D., Roche, D. M., Brovkin, V., and Bopp, L.: Last Glacial Maximum CO₂ and δ13C successfully reconciled, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38, 10.1029/2010GL044499, 2011.](#)
Braconnot, P., Otto-Bliesner, B., Harrison, S., Joussaume, S., Peterchmitt, J. Y., Abe-Ouchi, A., Crucifix, M., Driesschaert, E., Fichefet, T., Hewitt, C. D., Kageyama, M., Kitoh, A., Laîné, A., Loutre, M. F., Marti, O., Merkel, U., Ramstein, G., Valdes, P., Weber, S. L., Yu, Y., and Zhao, Y.: Results of PMIP2 coupled simulations of the Mid-Holocene and Last Glacial Maximum; Part 1: experiments and large-scale features, *Clim. Past*, 3, 261-277,
30 10.5194/cp-3-261-2007, 2007.
Braconnot, P., Harrison, S., Kageyama, M., Bartlein, P., Masson-Delmotte, V., Abe-Ouchi, A., Otto-Bliesner, B., and Zhao, Y.: Evaluation of climate models using palaeoclimatic data, *Nature Climate Change*, 2, 417-424, doi: 10.1038/nclimate1456, 2012.

- Braconnot, P., and Kageyama, M.: Shortwave forcing and feedbacks in Last Glacial Maximum and Mid-Holocene PMIP3 simulations, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 373, 20140424, 10.1098/rsta.2014.0424, 2015.
- 5 Brady, E. C., Otto-Bliesner, B. L., Kay, J. E., and Rosenbloom, N.: Sensitivity to Glacial Forcing in the CCSM4, *Journal of Climate*, 26, 1901-1925, 10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00416.1, 2012.
- Caubel, A., Denvil, S., Foujols, M. A., Marti, O., Dufresne, J.-L., Bopp, L., Cadule, P., Ethé, C., Idelkadi, A., Mancip, M., Masson, S., Mignot, J., Ionela, M., Balkanski, Y., Bekki, S., Bony, S., Braconnot, P., Brockman, P., Codron, F., Cozic, A., Cugnet, D., Fairhead, L., Fichet, T., Flavoni, S., Guez, L., Guilyardi, E., Hourdin, F., Ghattas, J., Kageyama, M., Khodri, M., Labetoulle, S., Lefebvre, M.-P., Levy, C., Li, L., Lott, F., Madec, G., Marchand, M., Meurdesoif, Y., Rio, C., Schulz, M., Swingedouw, D., Szopa, S., Viovy, N., and Vuichard, N.: IPSL-CM5A-LR model output prepared for CMIP5 piControl experiment, served by ESGF, WDCC at DKRZ, doi:10.1594/WDCC/CMIP5.IPILpc, 2016.
- 10 [Buchanan, P. J., Matear, R. J., Lenton, A., Phipps, S. J., Chase, Z., and Etheridge, D. M.: The simulated climate of the Last Glacial Maximum and insights into the global marine carbon cycle, *Clim. Past*, 12, 2271-2295, 10.5194/cp-12-2271-2016, 2016.](#)
- 15 Dufresne, J. L., Foujols, M. A., Denvil, S., Caubel, A., Marti, O., Aumont, O., Balkanski, Y., Bekki, S., Bellenger, H., Benshila, R., Bony, S., Bopp, L., Braconnot, P., Brockmann, P., Cadule, P., Cheruy, F., Codron, F., Cozic, A., Cugnet, D., de Noblet, N., Duvel, J. P., Ethé, C., Fairhead, L., Fichet, T., Flavoni, S., Friedlingstein, P., Grandpeix, J. Y., Guez, L., Guilyardi, E., Hauglustaine, D., Hourdin, F., Idelkadi, A., Ghattas, J., Joussaume, S., Kageyama, M., Krinner, G., Labetoulle, S., Lahellec, A., Lefebvre, M. P., Lefevre, F., Levy, C., Li, Z. X., Lloyd, J., Lott, F., Madec, G., Mancip, M., Marchand, M., Masson, S., Meurdesoif, Y., Mignot, J., Musat, I., Parouty, S., Polcher, J., Rio, C., Schulz, M., Swingedouw, D., Szopa, S., Talandier, C., Terray, P., Viovy, N., and Vuichard, N.: Climate change projections using the IPSL-CM5 Earth System Model: from CMIP3 to CMIP5, *Clim Dyn*, 40, 2123-2165, 10.1007/s00382-012-1636-1, 2013.
- 20 Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R. J., and Taylor, K. E.: Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 9, 1937-1958, 10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016, 2016.
- Griffies, S. M., Biastoch, A., Böning, C., Bryan, F., Danabasoglu, G., Chassignet, E. P., England, M. H., Gerdes, R., Haak, H., Hallberg, R. W., Hazeleger, W., Jungclaus, J., Large, W. G., Madec, G., Pirani, A., Samuels, B. L., Scheinert, M., Gupta, A. S., Severijns, C. A., Simmons, H. L., Treguier, A. M., Winton, M., Yeager, S., and Yin, J.: Coordinated Ocean-ice Reference Experiments (COREs), *Ocean Modelling*, 26, 1-46, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2008.08.007>, 2009.
- 30 [Griffies, S. M., Danabasoglu, G., Durack, P. J., Adcroft, A. J., Balaji, V., Böning, C. W., Chassignet, E. P., Curchitser, E., Deshayes, J., Drange, H., Fox-Kemper, B., Gleckler, P. J., Gregory, J. M., Haak, H., Hallberg, R. W., Heimbach, P., Hewitt, H. T., Holland, D. M., Ilyina, T., Jungclaus, J. H., Komuro, Y., Krasting, J. P., Large, W. G., Marsland, S. J., Masina, S., McDougall, T. J., Nurser, A. J. G., Orr, J. C., Pirani, A., Qiao, F., Stouffer, R. J., Taylor, K. E., Treguier, A. M., Tsujino, H., Uotila, P., Valdivieso, M., Wang, Q., Winton, M., and Yeager, S. G.: OMIP contribution to CMIP6: experimental and diagnostic protocol for the physical component of the Ocean Model Intercomparison Project, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 9, 3231-3296, 10.5194/gmd-9-3231-2016, 2016.](#)
- 35 JAMSTEC, AORI, and NIES: MIROC-ESM model output prepared for CMIP5 piControl, served by ESGF, doi:10.1594/WDCC/CMIP5.MIMEpc 2015a.
- JAMSTEC, AORI, and NIES: MIROC-ESM model output prepared for CMIP5 lgm, served by ESGF, doi:10.1594/WDCC/CMIP5.MIMElg, 2015b.
- 40 Kageyama, M., Denvil, S., Foujols, M. A., Caubel, A., Marti, O., Dufresne, J.-L., Bopp, L., Cadule, P., Ethé, C., Idelkadi, A., Mancip, M., Masson, S., Mignot, J., Ionela, M., Balkanski, Y., Bekki, S., Bony, S., Braconnot, P., Brockman, P., Codron, F., Cozic, A., Cugnet, D., Fairhead, L., Fichet, T., Flavoni, S., Guez, L., Guilyardi, E., Hourdin, F., Ghattas, J., Khodri, M., Labetoulle, S., Lefebvre, M.-P., Levy, C., Li, L., Lott, F., Madec, G., Marchand, M., Meurdesoif, Y., Rio, C., Schulz, M., Swingedouw, D., Szopa, S., Viovy, N., and Vuichard, N.: IPSL-CM5A-LR model output prepared for CMIP5 lgm experiment, served by ESGF, WDCC at DKRZ doi:10.1594/WDCC/CMIP5.IPILlg, 2016.
- 45 Kageyama, M., Albani, S., Braconnot, P., Harrison, S. P., Hopcroft, P. O., Ivanovic, R. F., Lambert, F., Marti, O., Peltier, W. R., Peterschmitt, J. Y., Roche, D. M., Tarasov, L., Zhang, X., Brady, E. C., Haywood, A. M., LeGrande, A. N., Lunt, D. J., Mahowald, N. M., Mikolajewicz, U., Nisancioglu, K. H., Otto-Bliesner, B. L., Renssen, H., Tomas, R. A., Zhang, Q., Abe-Ouchi, A., Bartlein, P. J., Cao, J., Li, Q., Lohmann, G., Ohgaito, R., Shi, X., Volodin, E., Yoshida, K., Zhang, X., and Zheng, W.: The PMIP4 contribution to CMIP6 – Part 4: Scientific objectives and experimental design of the PMIP4-CMIP6 Last Glacial Maximum experiments and PMIP4 sensitivity experiments, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 10, 4035-4055, 10.5194/gmd-10-4035-2017, 2017.
- 50 Kageyama, M., Braconnot, P., Harrison, S. P., Haywood, A. M., Jungclaus, J. H., Otto-Bliesner, B. L., Peterschmitt, J. Y., Abe-Ouchi, A., Albani, S., Bartlein, P. J., Brierley, C., Crucifix, M., Dolan, A., Fernandez-Donado, L., Fischer, H., Hopcroft, P. O., Ivanovic, R. F., Lambert, F., Lunt, D. J., Mahowald, N. M., Peltier, W.
- 60

- R., Phipps, S. J., Roche, D. M., Schmidt, G. A., Tarasov, L., Valdes, P. J., Zhang, Q., and Zhou, T.: The PMIP4 contribution to CMIP6 – Part 1: Overview and over-arching analysis plan, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 11, 1033-1057, 10.5194/gmd-11-1033-2018, 2018.
- 5 Khatiwala, S., Schmittner, A., and Muglia, J.: Air-sea disequilibrium enhances ocean carbon storage during glacial periods, *Science Advances*, 5, eaaw4981, 10.1126/sciadv.aaw4981, 2019.
- Large, W. G., and Yeager, S. G.: Diurnal to decadal global forcing for ocean and sea-ice models: the data sets and flux climatologies, Tech. Note NCAR/TN-460+STR. National Center of Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado, USA, <http://opensky.ucar.edu/islandora/object/technotes:434>, 2004.
- 10 [Lynch-Stieglitz, J., Ito, T., and Michel, E.: Antarctic density stratification and the strength of the circumpolar current during the Last Glacial Maximum, *Paleoceanography*, 31, 539-552, 10.1002/2015PA002915, 2016.](#)
- [Markewich, H. W., Litwin, R. J., Wysocki, D. A., and Pavich, M. J.: Synthesis on Quaternary aeolian research in the unglaciated eastern United States, *Aeolian Research*, 17, 139-191, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeolia.2015.01.011>, 2015.](#)
- 15 Marzocchi, A., and Jansen, M. F.: Connecting Antarctic sea ice to deep-ocean circulation in modern and glacial climate simulations, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44, 6286-6295, 10.1002/2017GL073936, 2017.
- [Mendes, V. R., Sawakuchi, A. O., Chiessi, C. M., Giannini, P. C. F., Rehfeld, K., and Mulitza, S.: Thermoluminescence and Optically Stimulated Luminescence Measured in Marine Sediments Indicate Precipitation Changes Over Northeastern Brazil, *Paleoceanography and Paleoclimatology*, 34, 1476-1486, 10.1029/2019PA003691, 2019.](#)
- 20 Menviel, L., Yu, J., Joos, F., Mouchet, A., Meissner, K. J., and England, M. H.: Poorly ventilated deep ocean at the Last Glacial Maximum inferred from carbon isotopes: A data-model comparison study, *Paleoceanography*, 32, 2-17, 10.1002/2016pa003024, 2017.
- Morée, A., Schwinger, J.: PMIP3-based Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) pre-industrial (PI) anomaly fields for addition to PI ocean model forcing, version 32, Norstore, <https://doi.org/10.11582/2020.00052,-20202019a>.
- 25 Morée, A., Schwinger, J.: Last Glacial Maximum minus pre-industrial anomaly fields for use in forced ocean modelling, based on PMIP3, Norstore, <https://doi.org/10.11582/2019.00011>, 2019b.
- Muglia, J., and Schmittner, A.: Glacial Atlantic overturning increased by wind stress in climate models, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42, 9862-9868, doi:10.1002/2015gl064583, 2015.
- 30 NASA-GISS: GISS-E2-R model output prepared for CMIP5 pre-industrial control, served by ESGF WDCC at DKRZ, doi:10.1594/WDCC/CMIP5.GIGRpc, 2014a.
- NASA-GISS: GISS-E2-R model output prepared for CMIP5 last glacial maximum, served by ESGF WDCC at DKRZ, doi:10.1594/WDCC/CMIP5.GIGRIg, 2014b.
- Otto-Bliesner, B. L., Hewitt, C. D., Marchitto, T. M., Brady, E., Abe-Ouchi, A., Crucifix, M., Murakami, S., and Weber, S. L.: Last Glacial Maximum ocean thermohaline circulation: PMIP2 model intercomparisons and data constraints, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, 10.1029/2007GL029475, 2007.
- 35 Rahmstorf, S.: On the freshwater forcing and transport of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation, *Clim Dyn*, 12, 799-811, 10.1007/s003820050144, 1996.
- [Rohling, E. J.: Paleosalinity: confidence limits and future applications, *Marine Geology*, 163, 1-11, \[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227\\(99\\)00097-3\]\(https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227\(99\)00097-3\), 2000.](#)
- 40 Schmidt, G. A., Kelley, M., Nazarenko, L., Ruedy, R., Russell, G. L., Aleinov, I., Bauer, M., Bauer, S. E., Bhat, M. K., Bleck, R., Canuto, V., Chen, Y.-H., Cheng, Y., Clune, T. L., Del Genio, A., de Fainchtein, R., Faluvegi, G., Hansen, J. E., Healy, R. J., Kiang, N. Y., Koch, D., Lacis, A. A., LeGrande, A. N., Lerner, J., Lo, K. K., Matthews, E. E., Menon, S., Miller, R. L., Oinas, V., Oloso, A. O., Perlwitz, J. P., Puma, M. J., Putman, W. M., Rind, D., Romanou, A., Sato, M., Shindell, D. T., Sun, S., Syed, R. A., Tausnev, N., Tsigaridis, K., Unger, N.,
- 45 Voulgarakis, A., Yao, M.-S., and Zhang, J.: Configuration and assessment of the GISS ModelE2 contributions to the CMIP5 archive, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 6, 141-184, 10.1002/2013MS000265, 2014.
- Schulzweida, U.: CDO User Guide (Version 1.9.6), Max Planck Institute for Meteorology, Bundesstraße 53, 20146 Hamburg, Germany, <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2558193>, 215 pp., 2019.
- 50 Schwinger, J., Goris, N., Tjiputra, J. F., Kriest, I., Bentsen, M., Bethke, I., Ilicak, M., Assmann, K. M., and Heinze, C.: Evaluation of NorESM-OC (versions 1 and 1.2), the ocean carbon-cycle stand-alone configuration of the Norwegian Earth System Model (NorESM1), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 9, 2589-2622, 10.5194/gmd-9-2589-2016, 2016.
- Sénési, S., Richon, J., Franchistéguy, L., Tyteca, S., Moine, M.-P., Voltaire, A., Sanchez-Gomez, E., Salas y Mélia, D., Decharme, B., Cassou, C., Valcke, S., Beau, I., Alias, A., Chevallier, M., Déqué, M., Deshayes, J.,
- 55 Douville, H., Madec, G., Maisonnave, E., Planton, S., Saint-Martin, D., Szopa, S., Alkama, R., Belamari, S., Braun, A., Coquart, L., and Chauvin, F.: CNRM-CM5 model output prepared for CMIP5 piControl, served by ESGF/WDCC at DKRZ, doi:10.1594/WDCC/CMIP5.CEC5pc, 2014a.
- Sénési, S., Richon, J., Franchistéguy, L., Tyteca, S., Moine, M.-P., Voltaire, A., Sanchez-Gomez, E., Salas y Mélia, D., Decharme, B., Cassou, C., Valcke, S., Beau, I., Alias, A., Chevallier, M., Déqué, M., Deshayes, J.,
- 60 Douville, H., Madec, G., Maisonnave, E., Planton, S., Saint-Martin, D., Szopa, S., Alkama, R., Belamari, S.,

- Braun, A., Coquart, L., and Chauvin, F.: CNRM-CM5 model output prepared for CMIP5 lgm, served by ESGF,WDCC at DKRZ, doi:10.1594/WDCC/CMIP5.CEC5lg, 2014b.
- Sime, L. C., Hodgson, D., Bracegirdle, T. J., Allen, C., Perren, B., Roberts, S., and de Boer, A. M.: Sea ice led to poleward-shifted winds at the Last Glacial Maximum: the influence of state dependency on CMIP5 and PMIP3 models, *Clim. Past*, 12, 2241-2253, 10.5194/cp-12-2241-2016, 2016.
- 5 Spence, J. P., Eby, M., and Weaver, A. J.: The Sensitivity of the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation to Freshwater Forcing at Eddy-Permitting Resolutions, *Journal of Climate*, 21, 2697-2710, 10.1175/2007JCLI2103.1, 2008.
- 10 Sueyoshi, T., Ohgaito, R., Yamamoto, A., Chikamoto, M. O., Hajima, T., Okajima, H., Yoshimori, M., Abe, M., O'Ishi, R., Saito, F., Watanabe, S., Kawamiya, M., and Abe-Ouchi, A.: Set-up of the PMIP3 paleoclimate experiments conducted using an Earth system model, MIROC-ESM, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 6, 819-836, 10.5194/gmd-6-819-2013, 2013.
- Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J., and Meehl, G. A.: An Overview of CMIP5 and the Experiment Design, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93, 485-498, 10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1, 2011.
- 15 Voltaire, A., Sanchez-Gomez, E., Salas y Méliá, D., Decharme, B., Cassou, C., Sénési, S., Valcke, S., Beau, I., Alias, A., Chevallier, M., Déqué, M., Deshayes, J., Douville, H., Fernandez, E., Madec, G., Maisonnave, E., Moine, M. P., Planton, S., Saint-Martin, D., Szopa, S., Tyteca, S., Alkama, R., Belamari, S., Braun, A., Coquart, L., and Chauvin, F.: The CNRM-CM5.1 global climate model: description and basic evaluation, *Clim Dyn*, 40, 2091-2121, 10.1007/s00382-011-1259-y, 2013.
- 20 Winguth, A. M. E., Archer, D., Duplessy, J. C., Maier-Reimer, E., and Mikolajewicz, U.: Sensitivity of paleonutrient tracer distributions and deep-sea circulation to glacial boundary conditions, *Paleoceanography*, 14, 304-323, 10.1029/1999PA900002, 1999.
- Yukimoto, S., Adachi, Y., Hosaka, M., Sakami, T., Yoshimura, H., Hirabara, M., Tanaka, T. Y., Shindo, E., Tsujino, H., Deushi, M., Mizuta, R., Yabu, S., Obata, A., Nakano, H., Koshiro, T., Ose, T., and Kitoh, A.: A New
- 25 Global Climate Model of the Meteorological Research Institute: MRI-CGCM3;Model Description and Basic Performance, *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 90A, 23-64, 10.2151/jmsj.2012-A02, 2012.
- Yukimoto, S., Adachi, Y., Hosaka, M., Sakami, T., Yoshimura, H., Hirabara, M., Tanaka, T., Shindo, E., Tsujino, H., Deushi, M., Mizuta, R., Yabu, S., Obata, A., Nakano, H., Koshiro, T., Ose, T., and Kitoh, A.: MRI-CGCM3 model output prepared for CMIP5 piControl, served by ESGF,WDCC at DKRZ,
- 30 doi:10.1594/WDCC/CMIP5.MRMCpc, 2015a.
- Yukimoto, S., Adachi, Y., Hosaka, M., Sakami, T., Yoshimura, H., Hirabara, M., Tanaka, T., Shindo, E., Tsujino, H., Deushi, M., Mizuta, R., Yabu, S., Obata, A., Nakano, H., Koshiro, T., Ose, T., and Kitoh, A.: MRI-CGCM3 model output prepared for CMIP5 lgm, served by ESGF,WDCC at DKRZ, doi:10.1594/WDCC/CMIP5.MRMC1g, 2015b.

Variable description	Units	Resolution (lon×lat), time	Variable name
Specific humidity	kg kg ⁻¹	192×94, 1460	huss
Downwelling longwave radiation	W m ⁻²	192×94, 365	rlds
Downwelling shortwave radiation	W m ⁻²	192×94, 365	rsds
Precipitation	mm day ⁻¹	192×94, 12	pr
Wind (u and v components)	m s ⁻¹	192×94, 1460	uas and vas
Temperature	K	192×94, 1460	tas
Sea surface salinity	psu	360×180, 12	sos

Table 1: Summary of the data showing variable description, units, format (lon×lat, time), and NetCDF variable name(s). Formats follow CORE conventions (Large and Yeager, 2004). The wind component variables are provided in separate files (Morée and Schwinger, [2019a](#)[2020](#)). In each NetCDF file (i.e., for each variable) the model spread is provided alongside the anomaly field named ‘variablename_spread’.

Model name	Modelling group	Reference	Source data reference
CNRM-CM5	CNRM-CERFACS (France)	Voldoire et al. (2013)	piControl: Sénési et al. (2014a) lgm: Sénési et al. (2014b)
IPSL-CM5A-LR	IPSL (Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, France)	Dufresne et al. (2013)	piControl: Caubel et al. (2016) lgm: Kageyama et al. (2016)
MIROC-ESM	MIROC (JAMSTEC and NIES, Japan)	Sueyoshi et al. (2013)	piControl: JAMSTEC et al. (2015a) lgm: JAMSTEC et al. (2015b)
MRI-CGCM3	MRI (Meteorological Research Institute, Japan)	Yukimoto et al. (2012)	piControl: Yukimoto et al. (2015a) lgm: Yukimoto et al. (2015b)
GISS-E2-R	NASA/GISS (Goddard Institute for Space Studies, USA)	Schmidt et al. (2014)	piControl: NASA-GISS (2014a) lgm: NASA-GISS (2014b)

Table 2: PMIP3 models used in this study

#	CDO or NCO command
1	cdo remapbil,t62grid
2	cdo ensmean
3	cdo sub
4	cdo setmisstodis
5	ncap2
6	cdo inttime

Table 3: Package commands applied in this study. Detailed information on these commands can be found in the respective NCO and CDO documentation online. All operations were performed with either CDO version 1.9.3 (Schulzweida, 2019) or NCO version 4.6.9. The complete list of commands is available in the NetCDF files under global attribute 'history'.

	<u>Global</u>	<u>Arctic</u>	<u>N-Atlantic</u>	<u>S-Atlantic</u>	<u>N-Pacific</u>	<u>S-Pacific</u>	<u>Indian</u>
<u>PI</u>	<u>1.20 /</u>	<u>0.12 /</u>	<u>0.38 /</u>	<u>0.14 /</u>	<u>0.29 /</u>	<u>0.15 /</u>	<u>0.12 /</u>
<u>10⁹ kg s⁻¹</u>	<u>1.41 /</u>	<u>0.16 /</u>	<u>0.49 /</u>	<u>0.17 /</u>	<u>0.33 /</u>	<u>0.21 /</u>	<u>0.16 /</u>
<u>(mean/max/min)</u>	<u>1.07</u>	<u>0.07</u>	<u>0.32</u>	<u>0.13</u>	<u>0.25</u>	<u>0.09</u>	<u>0.08</u>
<u>LGM</u>	<u>1.23 /</u>	<u>0.04 /</u>	<u>0.38 /</u>	<u>0.15 /</u>	<u>0.31 /</u>	<u>0.18 /</u>	<u>0.17 /</u>
<u>10⁹ kg s⁻¹</u>	<u>1.41 /</u>	<u>0.08 /</u>	<u>0.48 /</u>	<u>0.17 /</u>	<u>0.38 /</u>	<u>0.23 /</u>	<u>0.25 /</u>
<u>(mean/max/min)</u>	<u>0.93</u>	<u>0.004</u>	<u>0.20</u>	<u>0.12</u>	<u>0.24</u>	<u>0.14</u>	<u>0.12</u>
<u>Relative change</u>	<u>1.8 /</u>	<u>-70.4 /</u>	<u>-0.7 /</u>	<u>4.4 /</u>	<u>6.9 /</u>	<u>29.6 /</u>	<u>43.4 /</u>
<u>%</u>	<u>16.3 /</u>	<u>-45.2 /</u>	<u>20.5 /</u>	<u>37.7 /</u>	<u>20.6 /</u>	<u>59.8 /</u>	<u>94.5 /</u>
<u>(mean/max/min)</u>	<u>-13.2</u>	<u>-93.9</u>	<u>-35.7</u>	<u>-14.2</u>	<u>-10.2</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>2.6</u>

Table 4: River runoff simulated by the PMIP3 models. Note that only four of the models (CNRM-CM5, IPSL-CM5A-LR, MIROC-ESM, and MRI-CGCM3) provide the necessary output. Arctic is defined as the region north of 65°N, and the eastern boundaries of the Southern Ocean sectors of the Pacific, Atlantic, and Indian are at 70°W, 20°E, and 148°E, respectively.

5





Figure 1: Annual mean **10-meter height** specific humidity Igm-piControl anomaly (left) and model spread (right) in kg kg^{-1} .



5 Figure 2: Annual mean downwelling longwave radiation Igm-piControl anomaly (left) and model spread (right) in W m^{-2} .




Figure 3: Annual mean downwelling shortwave radiation Igm-piControl anomaly (left) and model spread (right) in W m^{-2} .




Figure 4: Annual mean precipitation lgm-piControl anomaly (left) and model spread (right) in mm day^{-1} .




Figure 5: Annual mean meridional wind velocity lgm-piControl anomaly (left) and model spread (right) in m s^{-1} .




Figure 6: Annual mean zonal wind velocity lgm-piControl anomaly (left) and model spread (right) in m s^{-1} .

5




Figure 7: Annual mean **10-meter height** temperature Igm-piControl anomaly (left) and model spread (right) in K.




Figure 8: Annual mean sea surface salinity Igm-piControl anomaly (left) and model spread (right) in psu.