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Abstract

We evaluate the longitudinal variation in meridional shifts of the tropical rainband in response to natural and anthropogenic forcings using a large suite of coupled climate model simulations. We find that the energetic framework of the zonal mean Hadley cell is generally not useful for characterizing shifts of the rainband at regional scales, regardless of the characteristics of the forcing. Forcings with large hemispheric asymmetry such as extratropical volcanic forcing and meltwater forcing give rise to robust zonal mean shifts of the rainband, however the direction and magnitude of the shift varies strongly as a function of longitude. Even the Pacific rainband doesn’t shift uniformly under any forcing considered. Forcings with weak hemispheric asymmetry such as CO and mid-Holocene forcing give rise to zonal mean shifts that are small or absent, but the rainband does shift regionally in coherent ways across models that may have important dynamical consequences.
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Key Points

- All forcings produce robust regional rainbelt shifts that are larger than (and sometime oppose the direction of) the zonal mean shift
- The central and eastern Pacific provide the greatest contribution to the zonal mean shift and are largely decoupled from the western Pacific
- The direction of the regional shifts under CO₂ forcing is robust across models despite no consensus on the direction of the zonal mean shift
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Abstract

We evaluate the longitudinal variation in meridional shifts of the tropical rainbelt in response to natural and anthropogenic forcings using a large suite of coupled climate model simulations. We find that the energetic framework of the zonal mean Hadley cell is generally not useful for characterizing shifts of the rainbelt at regional scales, regardless of the characteristics of the forcing. Forcings with large hemispheric asymmetry such as extratropical volcanic forcing and meltwater forcing give rise to robust zonal mean shifts of the rainbelt, however the direction and magnitude of the shift varies strongly as a function of longitude. Even the Pacific rainband doesn’t shift uniformly under any forcing considered. Forcings with weak hemispheric asymmetry such as CO₂ and mid-Holocene forcing give rise to zonal mean shifts that are small or absent, but the rainbelt does shift regionally in coherent ways across models that may have important dynamical consequences.

Plain Language Summary

A band of heavy precipitation spanning the deep tropics is an essential feature of the climate system that diverse ecosystems and billions of people depend on. It is well known that this rainbelt, when averaged across all longitudes, shifts north and south in response to heating or cooling the atmosphere in one hemisphere more than the other; this framework has been widely applied to past tropical rainfall changes under differing climate states. However, we show using many different climate model experiments that this framework does not apply to regional shifts in the rainbelt. Shifts of the rainbelt vary from place to place and thus data documenting north or south shifts in the rainbelt in one location can’t be used to infer similar shifts at other longitudes.
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Introduction

A large body of literature has emerged over the past two decades demonstrating that there is a latitudinal shift in the distribution of zonally-averaged tropical precipitation in response to hemispheric asymmetry in atmospheric heating that is well constrained by energetic arguments (e.g. 1, 2-5). This relationship arises because both precipitation and atmospheric energy transport in the tropics are largely controlled by the Hadley circulation: precipitation occurs in the ascending branch of the Hadley cell, and the cross-equatorial energy transport is proportional to the strength of the Hadley cell at the equator, which is nearly proportional to the distance of the ascending branch from the equator (6). This energetic framework of the zonal mean Hadley cell provides a useful way to relate changes in the tropical climate to the hemispheric-scale energy budget, and thus shifts in the zonal mean precipitation in idealized and comprehensive model simulations of past, modern, and future climates have been understood in terms of the response to hemispheric asymmetries in atmospheric heating (1-3, 7, 8).

However, while the energetic framework of the zonal mean Hadley cell has been widely used to assess mechanisms of change in the tropical rainbelt on seasonal to orbital timescales, it obscures the inherently regional nature of tropical rainfall. By construction, it averages out the rich zonal variations of tropical rainfall patterns that reflect the distinct processes that govern the large-scale circulation and precipitation in different regions of the tropics. In particular, the dynamics that govern precipitation in monsoon systems are largely distinct from those that govern precipitation in regions of the ocean characterized by strong sea surface temperature gradients and narrow rainbands (i.e. the Intertropical Convergence Zones (ITCZs); e.g. 9, 10). Shifts in tropical precipitation that occur under interhemispheric changes in atmospheric heating thus tend to be zonally-variable and the heat transport changes have been shown to be of limited utility in explaining local rainfall changes (11-14).

Evidence for meridional shifts in tropical rainfall have been found for a variety of past climate states based on proxy records from the tropics and the high latitudes, such as the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM, ~21 kya) when southward shifts of the terrestrial and marine tropical rainbands of up to 7° latitude have been proposed (15, 16), and the North Atlantic iceberg discharge (Heinrich) events of the last glacial period (17-20). A northward shift of the Pacific and Atlantic rainbands of similar magnitude has been proposed during the early-Holocene, when boreal summer insolation was more intense (18-21). During the Little Ice Age (LIA, 1400-1850 CE), a southward shift of the rainbands (by up to 5° latitude) has been inferred from proxy records in and around the tropical Pacific and Atlantic (21-24). Many such paleoclimate studies have invoked the relationship between the zonal mean position of the ITCZ and the cross-equatorial energy flux (and/or interhemispheric temperature gradient) in interpreting meridional shifts of tropical rainfall. However, it is not clear to what degree proxy data documenting regional shifts in rainfall can be extrapolated to infer similar shifts at other longitudes. In many cases, the large regional shifts proposed from paleoclimate records must be regionally localized (as opposed to zonally homogenous) because the cross-equatorial atmospheric heat transport implied from zonal mean ITCZ shifts of that magnitude is physically untenable (25).

In this study, we evaluate the zonal structure of meridional shifts in tropical rainfall in a compilation of climate models under a range of past and future climate forcings. Some forcings are characterized by strong hemispheric asymmetry (e.g. meltwater forcing in the North Atlantic Ocean, extratropical volcanic eruptions, and LGM orography and albedo), while others are characterized by weak hemispheric asymmetry (e.g. quadrupling of CO₂ and mid-Holocene orbital and greenhouse gas forcing). We show that the zonal mean meridional shift of the tropical rainbelt is greater under some forcings than others, but all forcings produce robust regional meridional shifts that are much greater than (and not always in the same direction as) the zonal mean shift.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Model simulations

Details of all the model simulations used in this study are summarized in Table S1. For the response associated with LGM and mid-Holocene forcing, we analyzed model simulations from the Paleoclimate Modeling Intercomparison Project phase 2 (PMIP2)/Coupled modeling Intercomparison project phase 3 (CMIP3) and PMIP3/CMIP5 archives. For the LGM forcing simulations, the forced
Response was calculated by averaging years 31-200 after the spin-up period and comparing to the PI control runs. For the mid-Holocene forcing, the response was calculated by averaging years 100-685 after the spin-up period and comparing to the PI control runs. For the response to CO\textsubscript{2} forcing, we analyzed simulations from the CMIP5 4\times\text{CO2} simulations. The forced response was taken to be the difference between the last 50 years of these simulations and the preindustrial (PI) control simulations.

Response to volcanic forcing is assessed from selected PMIP3 last millennium transient simulations (CCSM4 and GISS Model E ensemble members 122, 125, and 128), CESM Last Millennium Ensemble (LME) volcanic-only simulations, and an ensemble of simulations with Norwegian Earth System Model version 1-M (NorESM) mimicking a high latitude Northern Hemisphere summer eruption (the Laki eruption in Iceland; 26, 27). CCSM4 and CESM LME prescribed sulfate loading (in Tg) from Gao, Robock and Ammann (28) (29) (GRA), while GISS 122, GISS 125, and GISS 128 prescribed volcanic aerosols as functions of AOD and aerosol effective radius with twice the forcing of Crowley, et al. (30) (CEA). Years with large extratropical volcanic events (defined as globally averaged AOD > 0.1 and at least 25% greater in one hemisphere), centered around the peak of the event, were compared to the five years prior to the onset of the event and organized into NH and SH composites. In each of the CMIP5 LM and CESM LME simulations, the NH composite consisted of 20 volcanic events and the SH composite consisted of five volcanic events that met these criteria. In the NorESM simulations, the Laki eruption was simulated by adding 100 Tg of SO\textsubscript{2} and dust (as an analog for ash) into the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere over a 4-month period. 48 ensemble members were averaged into three composites (each composite therefore consisting of 16 NH eruptions) in order to be consistent with the CMIP5 LM and CESM LME composites. The NorESM volcanic forcing runs are compared against their own “No Volcano” control run that was branched from the same initial conditions of a transient historical simulation.

For the North Atlantic meltwater forcing simulations, an ensemble of simulations with the Community Earth System Model version 1.0 (CESM 1.0) were used (31). To simulate the atmospheric response to meltwater-induced terminations of the Atlantic overturning circulation, a set of simulations were branched from the control run with 1 Sv of freshwater forcing imposed across the surface of the northern North Atlantic Ocean (50°-70°N) for 100 years. Four ensemble members were performed with this default configuration of CESM by branching from the end of the control run at 9-year intervals. Because it takes 20 years to shut down the AMOC, the last 80 years of these simulations are averaged to create the forced climatology.

Additionally, because the default CESM fully coupled control run is known to have large biases in the mean state of the tropical Pacific compared to observations (Figs. S1, S2; 32) we also apply the same freshwater forcing to a bias corrected version of the model. The mean state bias corrections include both a modification to the topography of central America and surface heat flux modifications, so-called Q-fluxes (also see 33). We raised the height of the mountains in Central America to 1500 m (from 7-18°N, 120-76°W) to reduce the low-level wind biases in the eastern Pacific associated with the poor resolution of Central American topography. Along with the surface heat flux corrections, reductions of these low-level wind biases reduce the tropical sea surface temperature (SST) biases throughout the tropics. In one configuration of the model with three ensemble members we only raised the topography over Central America with no changes in the surface heat fluxes. In a second configuration of the model with four ensemble members we both raise the topography and prescribe a surface heat flux correction with a cyclostationary seasonal cycle throughout the tropical oceans (30°S-30°N) to further reduce the bias in the climatological seasonal cycle in SST. The mean state bias corrections are described in Atwood (31) and in the Supplemental Material. The tropical surface temperature, precipitation, and wind fields before and after these bias corrections are shown in Figs. S1 and S2. The anomalies due to forcing are calculated to be the difference between the final 80 years of each 100 year-long hosing simulations and 100 years of unforced control runs with the same model configuration. We also included two hosing simulations with PMIP2-era models (MPI and HadCM3) in our analyses.

2.2. Changes in the tropical precipitation centroid

Meridional shifts in tropical rainfall are characterized in terms of the mean annual tropical precipitation centroid, \( P_c \) (the latitude at which the mean annual area-weighted tropical rainfall to the north equals that to the south, within the bounds 20°N to 20°S). \( P_c \) is calculated at each longitude. We
decompose forced changes in \( P_c \) (\( \Delta P_c \); defined as the difference between a forced simulation and a control simulation) in the following way:

\[
\Delta P_c = \Delta P_c^z + \Delta P_c^* ,
\]

where \( \Delta P_c^z \) is the zonal mean change (i.e. \( \Delta P_c \) averaged over all longitudes) and \( \Delta P_c^* \) denotes the deviation from the zonal mean. For each set of forcings, in Fig. 1 we compare the change in the zonal mean precipitation centroid \( \Delta P_c^z \) to the change in the zonal variation of \( \Delta P_c^* \) (i.e. the ‘waviness’ of \( \Delta P_c^* \)), quantifying the latter by the standard deviation of \( \Delta P_c^* \) across longitudes:

\[
\sigma_{Pc} = \left( \frac{1}{N-1}\sum_{j=1}^{N} (\Delta P_c^* - \Delta P_c^z)^2 \right)^{1/2} = \left( \frac{1}{N-1}\sum_{j=1}^{N} (\Delta P_c^* )^2 \right)^{1/2} ,
\]

where \( j = \) all longitudes. To evaluate the robustness of regional shifts in the precipitation centroid across models, changes in \( P_c \) were discretized into zonal bins of width 15° longitude.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. How does the zonal mean shift of the rainbelt compare to the zonal variations?

The zonal mean shift of the tropical rainbelt is robust across models under climate forcings with strong hemispheric asymmetry. The zonal mean rainbelt shifts south under North Atlantic meltwater forcing, Northern Hemisphere (NH) extratropical volcanic eruptions, and in the majority of models (12/13) under LGM boundary conditions (ordinate of Fig. 1a, d, g; Table 1a). These shifts are expected due to the hemispheric asymmetry in atmospheric heating associated with the slowdown of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation and Arctic sea ice growth in the case of North Atlantic meltwater forcing, the scattering of solar radiation in the NH by stratospheric sulfate aerosols in the case of NH volcanic eruptions, and the presence of large, high albedo NH ice sheets in the case of the LGM. Similarly, the zonal mean rainbelt shifts robustly north under Southern Hemisphere (SH) extratropical volcanic eruptions and weakly north in most models (8/10) under mid-Holocene boundary conditions (Fig. 1i). Only under \( \mathrm{CO}_2 \) forcing is there no robust ensemble mean shift of the zonal mean rainbelt (Fig. 1k).

There are strong longitudinal variations in \( \Delta P_c \) under all forcings considered, including those that give rise to large zonal mean shifts of the rainbelt and those that do not. To quantify the zonal mean shift of the rainbelt (\( \Delta P_c^z \)) relative to its zonal variations (\( \sigma_{Pc} \)) in each set of simulations, the amplitude of the zonal mean change in the tropical precipitation centroid (\( \Delta P_c^z \)) is compared to the standard deviation of \( \Delta P_c \) across longitudes (left panels in Fig. 1). In this plane of \( P_c \) changes, the blue shaded sector indicates tropical precipitation changes that are more zonally inhomogeneous than they are zonally homogeneous whereas regions in white represent tropical precipitation changes that are more zonally homogeneous. Under no forcing is the zonal mean shift substantially larger than the zonal variation (1σ) in the shift, as indicated by the changes in \( \Delta P_c^z \) falling near or within the blue shaded sector. Of all the forcings considered, shifts in the mean position of the rainbelt are largest (up to 3.3° latitude) when there is a sufficiently large North Atlantic meltwater forcing to cause a collapse in the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (Fig. 1a).

However, even under this extreme scenario, the zonal variation (1σ) in the shift is as large as the zonal mean shift. Notably, the zonal mean shift and zonal variations are much larger in the CESM simulations without any bias corrections (c.f. simulations 1-4 versus 12-15 in Fig. 1A). A similar relationship between the zonal mean shift and the zonal variations are seen in the rainfall response to extratropical volcanic forcing: although the amplitude of the response is far more muted, the zonal variation in the shift is also of similar magnitude to the zonal mean shift (Fig. 1d).

In contrast to the meltwater and volcanic forcing simulations, under all other forcings considered, the zonal variations in \( \Delta P_c \) are generally much larger than the zonal mean change in \( P_c \). In the LGM simulations, the zonal variations in \( \Delta P_c \) range from 0.7 to 3.2° latitude, with some models demonstrating as much zonal variation in \( \Delta P_c \) as that found in the North Atlantic meltwater simulations (\( 1.4 \leq \sigma_{Pc} \leq 3.3° \))
latitude; Fig. 1a, g). However, the zonal mean shift in the LGM is much smaller than that in response to meltwater forcing (multi-model mean $\Delta P_c = -0.5^\circ$ latitude; c.f. ordinate values in Fig. 1a versus 1g). There is general agreement in the sign of the zonal mean shift in the LGM simulations: in 5/7 of the PMIP2 models and all of the PMIP3 models, the zonal mean ITCZ shifts southward by up to 1.4$^\circ$ latitude. The PMIP3 LGM simulations demonstrate a greater zonal mean shift and less zonal variation on average as compared to their PMIP2 counterparts (Fig. 1g); the differences between these two classes of models is most pronounced in the tropical Pacific, where several PMIP2 models demonstrate a northward shift of tropical precipitation in parts of the region (Fig. 1h).

Under mid-Holocene conditions, zonal variations in $\Delta P_c$ are on average much smaller (multi-model mean $\sigma_{nc} = 0.8^\circ$ latitude) than in the LGM simulations (multi-model mean $\sigma_{nc} = 1.8^\circ$ latitude; Table 1a). While the zonal mean shift is also small under mid-Holocene forcing ($\Delta P_c = 0.3^\circ$ latitude), there is general consistency in the northward direction of the shift (8/10 models). In contrast, under abrupt 4$\times$CO$_2$ forcing, zonal variations in $\Delta P_c$ (multi-model mean $\sigma_{nc} = 1.6^\circ$ latitude) are generally as large as under LGM conditions and far exceed the magnitude of the zonal mean $\Delta P_c$ in every model (i.e. all points are well within the blue sector in Fig. 1K). Additionally, there is no consistency in the direction of the zonal mean shift under CO$_2$ forcing (northward in 9/18 models, southward in 9/18 models). However, the rainbelt does shift regionally in coherent ways across models. The robust aspects of the regional variations in the rainbelt shifts and their contribution to the zonal mean shifts are presented in Section 3.2.

3.2. Where are there robust regional shifts of the rainbelt?

Identifying where robust regional variations of the rainbelt occur in response to a given forcing is important for understanding the globally teleconnected response of the climate system to that forcing, as it is the regional rainfall changes in the tropics that dictate tropical and extratropical teleconnection patterns (through latent heating of the atmosphere) and give rise to regional ocean-atmosphere feedbacks such as the Bjerknes feedback (e.g. 34, 35, 36). To assess the robustness of the regional shifts in the precipitation centroid under each type of forcing, we compare the multi-model mean $\Delta P_c$ in discretized zonal bins to the standard deviation of $\Delta P_c$ around the mean (i.e. $\pm 1\sigma$ across models) in Fig. 2.

Under North Atlantic meltwater forcing, the rainbelt shifts south robustly across models at all longitudes except for the western Pacific and Maritime Continent, although there is substantial longitudinal variation in the magnitude of the shift (Fig. 2a). A large systematic southward shift occurs in the Atlantic and eastern Pacific Oceans (4-6$^\circ$ latitude) and to a lesser degree over the Indian Ocean and Africa (2.5$^\circ$ latitude). Little to no shift of the rainbelt occurs over the western Pacific, while the shift over the Indian Ocean and Africa is most similar to the zonal mean (2.5$^\circ$ latitude). The longitudinal extent and location of the shift varies widely between models, with the largest intermodel variation in $\Delta P_c$ occurring in the central Pacific, where the precipitation centroid is particularly sensitive to changes in the distribution of the northern and southern branches of the Pacific ITCZ. In this region, as well as in the eastern Pacific and Atlantic sectors, the response strongly depends on whether or not the model has been flux-corrected to have a more realistic climatology (Fig. 1b; Fig. S1). In particular, the precipitation response is greater in the Atlantic but smaller in the Pacific in the bias-corrected versions of CESM, as compared to their non-bias-corrected counterparts. The precipitation response increases in the Atlantic when the surface heat flux correction is added (which sharpens the Atlantic rainband; Fig. S1b,c), while the precipitation response decreases in the Pacific when central American topography is raised (as the eastern Pacific low level winds become less responsive to changes in the tropical Atlantic). These bias-corrected versions of the meltwater simulations demonstrate the importance of accurately representing the tropical rainfall climatology to the rainfall responses in these regions.

Under volcanic forcing, the longitudinal structure of the precipitation shift is nearly equal and opposite between the NH and SH eruptions. The amplitude of the zonal mean shift is 0.5-1.0$^\circ$ latitude, similar to the regional shifts over the Atlantic and eastern Indian Oceans and parts of the Maritime Continent (Fig. 2c,d). Larger systematic shifts of 1-2$^\circ$ occur in the central Pacific. The shift is generally weaker over land than ocean regions, with the exception of the western Pacific. As with North Atlantic meltwater forcing, the precipitation centroid over the western Pacific is insensitive to volcanic forcing.

Under LGM boundary conditions, 11/13 models demonstrate a southward shift of tropical precipitation in the zonal mean, though the zonal variations are typically much larger than the small zonal
boundary conditions, the models diverge widely in their regional representation of the rainbelt response (Fig. 1g), consistent with the findings of Roberts, Valdes and Singarayer (13). The models diverge widely in their regional representation of the rainbelt response (Fig. 1h), with the largest intermodel variations appearing in the central and western Pacific (where \( \Delta P_C \) varies from 9º north to 15º south across models; Fig. 1h). However, in most models, rainfall shifts south over South America and the East African/western Indian Ocean sector (Fig. 1h; Fig. 2b). It is these regions, as well as a large southward shift in the central Pacific in some models, that drives the southward zonal mean ITCZ shift in the LGM simulations.

In contrast to the North Atlantic meltwater, volcanic, and LGM simulations, the mid-Holocene and 4xCO₂ simulations are characterized by weak interhemispheric asymmetry in their forcings. Under mid-Holocene conditions, 8/10 models demonstrate a weak northward shift of zonal mean tropical rainfall (Fig. 1i), though the zonal variations are substantially larger than the small zonal mean shift, which is only 0.3º latitude in the multi-model mean (Fig. 1a; Fig. 2f). In most models, this zonal mean shift is driven by northward shifts of rainfall over the central Pacific and eastern Africa, while a weak southward shift (opposing the zonal mean) typically occurs over the tropical Atlantic (Fig. 2f).

CO₂ forcing gives rise to the largest zonal variations of any forcing considered and no robust zonal mean precipitation shift (Fig. 1k). However, there are robust and opposing regional shifts in tropical precipitation (Fig. 2e). The rainfall distribution robustly shifts southward in the eastern Pacific and shifts northward by a similar magnitude over the Indian Ocean and East Africa. We emphasize that the direction of these regional shifts in the rainbelt are robust across models despite the wildly diverging direction of the zonal mean rainbelt shift. As with most other forcings, the precipitation centroid over the western Pacific and Maritime Continent is insensitive to CO₂ forcing, while shifts in the central Pacific are large but vary widely across models (Fig. 1l).

Considering all forcings in aggregate, the largest shifts of the mean annual tropical precipitation centroid tend to occur in the central/eastern Pacific, where this metric is particularly sensitive to changes in the distribution of the northern and southern branches of the Pacific ITCZ. However, models also tend to differ widely in their rainfall response to forcing over this region. Tropical mean state biases appear to be a major culprit of the disparate rainfall responses in this region (as indicated by bias-corrected versions of the meltwater simulations), thus highlighting an important caveat to interpreting rainfall changes in this region from model simulations with poor representation of tropical rainfall climatology.

It is clear from all of the forcings analyzed in this study that \( \Delta P_C \) in the central and eastern Pacific is not simply related to \( \Delta P_C \) in the western Pacific (Fig. 2). As shown in Fig. 1, the Pacific rainband doesn’t shift uniformly across all longitudes under any forcing considered, even within a single model. Under forcings with large hemispheric asymmetry, shifts of the central and eastern Pacific rainband tend to be coordinated with shifts of the Atlantic rainband but are largely decoupled from the western Pacific, where the response of the precipitation centroid is weak under any forcing considered (Fig. 2a-f). When robust shifts of the zonal mean rainbelt occur, the central and eastern Pacific provides the greatest contribution to the zonal mean shift, highlighting the importance of capturing this region when attempting to reconstruct the sign of a change in the zonal mean Hadley circulation from the paleoclimate record.

4. Conclusions

We find that meridional shifts of the tropical rainbelt vary strongly in both magnitude and direction as a function of longitude in response to a variety of natural and anthropogenic forcings. Analysis of a large suite of model simulations demonstrates that the zonal mean framework is generally not useful for characterizing shifts at regional scales regardless of the type of forcing. Forcings with large hemispheric asymmetry (including extratropical volcanic eruptions, meltwater forcing in the North Atlantic Ocean, and the LGM) give rise to robust zonal mean shifts of the rainbelt, however the direction and magnitude of the shift varies strongly as a function of longitude. While under forcings with weak hemispheric asymmetry (including CO₂ quadrupling and mid-Holocene insolation and greenhouse gas forcing), zonal mean shifts are small or absent, but large regional shifts can occur that may have important dynamical consequences.

Robust regional shifts in the tropical rainbelt include a large systematic southward shift (4-6º latitude) in the Atlantic and eastern Pacific Oceans under North Atlantic meltwater forcing. Under extratropical volcanic forcing, the regional structure of the precipitation shift is nearly equal and opposite between the NH and SH eruptions and the shift is generally larger over ocean than land. Under LGM boundary conditions, the models diverge widely in their regional representation of the rainbelt response,
but there is general agreement of a southward shift of zonal mean rainfall driven by changes in the central Pacific, South America, and East Africa/western Indian Ocean. In mid-Holocene simulations, the weak northward shift of zonal mean rainfall is driven by rainfall changes in the central Pacific and eastern Africa. While CO₂ forcing gives rise to large zonal variations and no robust zonal mean shift, tropical rainfall robustly shifts southward over the eastern Pacific, while rainfall shifts northward by a similar magnitude over the Indian Ocean and East Africa. CO₂ forcing highlights the limitations of the zonal mean framework wherein the lack of a robust zonal mean shift across models obscures robust regional shifts of opposing direction (e.g., the eastern Pacific and Indian sectors under CO₂ forcing).

Considering all forcings analyzed in this study, it is notable that the tropical Pacific rainband doesn’t shift uniformly under any forcing. The rainband location over the western Pacific and Maritime Continent is relatively insensitive to most types of forcing, while meridional shifts of the central and eastern Pacific rainband tend to be coordinated with the Atlantic rainband under forcings with large hemispheric asymmetry. When robust shifts of the zonal mean rainband occur, the central and eastern Pacific provide the greatest contribution to the zonal mean shift, highlighting the importance of capturing this region when attempting to constrain the sign of the zonal mean Hadley cell change based on networks of paleoclimate data. These findings demonstrate the zonal complexity inherent in shifts in the tropical rainbelt and caution against the practice of inferring large-scale (i.e., Pacific basin wide and larger) changes in the tropical rainbelt based on data from a limited spatial domain.
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Figures and Tables

Figure 1. The meridional shift in the tropical precipitation centroid (\(\Delta P_c\)) under different climate forcings and boundary conditions. Left panels: Zonal mean shift in the precipitation centroid (\(\Delta P_c\)) versus the standard deviation of \(\Delta P_c\) (\(\sigma_{P_c}\); see Eqns.1-2). The blue triangle indicates the region where the longitudinal variations in \(\Delta P_c\) are as large, or larger than the zonal-mean change in \(\Delta P_c\). Middle and right panels: \(2 \times \Delta P_c\) as a function of longitude, where the meridional displacement is multiplied by a factor of two for visual clarity.
as a function of longitude, where the meridional displacement is multiplied by a factor of two for visual clarity.

Figure 2. Change in tropical precipitation centroid ($\Delta P_c$) as a function of longitude under different climate forcings and boundary conditions. Yellow bars indicate the multi-model mean $\Delta P_c$ (multiplied by a factor of two for visual clarity) averaged over zonal bins of width 15° longitude. The whiskers represent ± 1σ across models. Blue bars indicate the multi-model mean zonally-averaged $\Delta P_c$ ($\left<P_c\right>$), also multiplied by a factor of two for visual clarity.
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Text S1. Description of surface heat flux correction in CESM

In a 13-year simulation with raised topography over Central America, sea surface temperatures (SSTs) were nudged to observed climatology (NOAA ERSST v3b from 1970-2009) within 30° of the equator (linearly decreasing to zero between 25° and 30° latitude), using a Newtonian cooling in the top layer of the ocean model with a restoring time-scale (τ) of 10 days. The monthly climatology of the surface heat flux adjustment was calculated over the last 10 years of this simulation and applied as a constant (seasonally-varying) surface heat flux adjustment to the final 500-yr control simulation. These bias corrections are applied to both the climatological and perturbed simulations and allow a realistic tropical mean state while simultaneously allowing the tropics to respond in the forced experiments. The tropical surface temperature, precipitation, and wind fields before and after these bias corrections are shown in Figs. S1 and S2. See Atwood (2015) for further information and analysis of these simulations.

![Figure S1](image)

**Fig. S1.** Left panels: climatology of tropical precipitation in March-April-May (MAM) in (a) observations (GPCP), (b) CESM with surface heat flux corrections and raised central American topography, and (c) the pre-industrial control of CESM. Right panels: ensemble-mean change in MAM precipitation (colors) due to North Atlantic meltwater forcing where the forcing is applied to (d) the bias-corrected CESM control run, and (e) the pre-industrial CESM control run. The climatological ensemble mean precipitation is shown by the unfilled contours (contours = 4, 8, 12 mm/day).
**Fig. S2.** Observed mean annual climatology of SST and surface winds in ERSST v3b reanalysis (top). SST and surface wind field biases in CESM without (middle) and with (bottom) surface heat flux and central American topography corrections. Note that the magnitude of the reference vector in the top panel is larger by a factor of 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forcing</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Atmos Resolution (lat x lon grid points or spectral, vertical levels)</th>
<th>Ocean Resolution (lat x lon grid points or spectral, vertical levels)</th>
<th>Volcanic forcing details</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miocene (PMP3)</td>
<td>BCC-CESM.1</td>
<td>Beijing Climate Center, China Meteorological Administration, China</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Gao et al. (2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCESS-CM</td>
<td>Center National de Recherches Meteorologiques, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Violette et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFDL-CM3</td>
<td>Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, US</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Held et al. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPSL-CM5A-LR</td>
<td>Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Friedlingstein et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRI-CGCM3</td>
<td>Meteorological Research Institute, Japan</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Yokohata et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFDL-CM2.1</td>
<td>Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, US</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Taylor et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPSL-CM4A-MR</td>
<td>Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Friedlingstein et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRI-CGCM3</td>
<td>Meteorological Research Institute, Japan</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Yokohata et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCESS-CM</td>
<td>Center National de Recherches Meteorologiques, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Violette et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFDL-CM3</td>
<td>Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, US</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Held et al. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPSL-CM5A-LR</td>
<td>Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Friedlingstein et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRI-CGCM3</td>
<td>Meteorological Research Institute, Japan</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Yokohata et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCESS-CM</td>
<td>Center National de Recherches Meteorologiques, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Violette et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFDL-CM3</td>
<td>Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, US</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Held et al. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPSL-CM5A-LR</td>
<td>Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Friedlingstein et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRI-CGCM3</td>
<td>Meteorological Research Institute, Japan</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Yokohata et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCESS-CM</td>
<td>Center National de Recherches Meteorologiques, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Violette et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFDL-CM3</td>
<td>Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, US</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Held et al. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPSL-CM5A-LR</td>
<td>Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Friedlingstein et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRI-CGCM3</td>
<td>Meteorological Research Institute, Japan</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Yokohata et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCESS-CM</td>
<td>Center National de Recherches Meteorologiques, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Violette et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFDL-CM3</td>
<td>Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, US</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Held et al. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPSL-CM5A-LR</td>
<td>Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Friedlingstein et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRI-CGCM3</td>
<td>Meteorological Research Institute, Japan</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Yokohata et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCESS-CM</td>
<td>Center National de Recherches Meteorologiques, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Violette et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFDL-CM3</td>
<td>Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, US</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Held et al. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPSL-CM5A-LR</td>
<td>Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Friedlingstein et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRI-CGCM3</td>
<td>Meteorological Research Institute, Japan</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Yokohata et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCESS-CM</td>
<td>Center National de Recherches Meteorologiques, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Violette et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFDL-CM3</td>
<td>Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, US</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Held et al. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPSL-CM5A-LR</td>
<td>Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, France</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Friedlingstein et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRI-CGCM3</td>
<td>Meteorological Research Institute, Japan</td>
<td>914, 1.26, 232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>232 x 380, 140</td>
<td>Yokohata et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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