

Description and basic evaluation of simulated mean state, internal variability, and climate sensitivity  
in MIROC6

Hiroaki Tatebe<sup>1</sup>, Tomoo Ogura<sup>2</sup>, Tomoko Nitta<sup>3</sup>, Yoshiki Komuro<sup>1</sup>, Koji Ogochi<sup>1</sup>, Toshihiko  
Takemura<sup>4</sup>, Kengo Sudo<sup>5</sup>, Miho Sekiguchi<sup>6</sup>, Manabu Abe<sup>1</sup>, Fuyuki Saito<sup>1</sup>, Minoru Chikira<sup>3</sup>, Shingo  
Watanabe<sup>1</sup>, Masato Mori<sup>7</sup>, Nagio Hirota<sup>2</sup>, Yoshio Kawatani<sup>1</sup>, Takashi Mochizuki<sup>1</sup>, Kei Yoshimura<sup>3</sup>,  
Kumiko Takata<sup>2</sup>, Ryouta O'ishi<sup>3</sup>, Dai Yamazaki<sup>8</sup>, Tatsuo Suzuki<sup>1</sup>, Masao Kurogi<sup>1</sup>, Takahito Kataoka<sup>1</sup>,  
Masahiro Watanabe<sup>3</sup>, and Masahide Kimoto<sup>3</sup>

1: Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology, Yokohama, Japan

2: National Institute for Environmental Studies, Tsukuba, Japan

3: Atmosphere and Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Japan

4: Research Institute for Applied Mechanics, Kyushu University, Kasuga, Japan

5: Graduate School of Environmental Studies, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan

6: Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology, Tokyo, Japan

7: Research Center for Advanced Science and Technology, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

8: Institute of Industrial Sciences, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

Corresponding author: Hiroaki Tatebe ([E-mail: tatebe@jamstec.go.jp](mailto:tatebe@jamstec.go.jp))

[Research Center for Environmental Modeling and Application](#), ~~Project team for advanced climate~~  
~~modeling~~, Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology

3173-25 Showa-machi, Kanazawa-ku, Yokohama, Kanagawa 236-0001, Japan



## Abstract

The sixth version of the Model for Interdisciplinary Research on Climate (MIROC), called MIROC6, was cooperatively developed by a Japanese modeling community. In the present manuscript, simulated mean climate, internal climate variability, and climate sensitivity in MIROC6 are evaluated and briefly summarized in comparison with the previous version of our climate model (MIROC5) and observations. The results show that overall reproducibility of mean climate and internal climate variability in MIROC6 is better than that in MIROC5. The tropical climate systems (e.g., summertime precipitation in the western Pacific and the eastward propagating Madden-Julian Oscillation) and the mid-latitude atmospheric circulations (e.g., the westerlies, the polar night jet, and troposphere-stratosphere interactions) are significantly improved in MIROC6. These improvements can be attributed to the newly implemented parameterization for shallow convective processes and to the inclusion of the ~~directly-resolved~~ stratosphere. While there are significant differences in climates and variabilities between the two models, the effective climate sensitivity of 2.5 K remains the same because the differences in radiative forcing and climate feedback tend to offset each other. With an aim towards contributing to the sixth phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project, designated simulations tackling a wide range of climate science issues, as well as seasonal-to-decadal climate predictions and future climate projections, are currently ongoing using MIROC6.

## 1 Introduction

As the global warming due to increasing emissions of the anthropogenic greenhouse gases progresses, ~~it is anticipated, or has been already observed that~~ global and regional patterns of ~~climate~~ ~~mean-atmospheric temperature, circulations,~~ and precipitation as well as temperature are projected to be will drastically changed until the end of the twentieth-first century (e.g., Neelin et al., 2006; Zhang et al., 2007; Bengtsson et al., 2009; Andrews et al., 2010; Scaife et al., 2012) and that occurrence frequency of extreme weather events such as heatwaves, droughts will be increased, and extratropical cyclones will be stronger than in the present ~~increase~~ (e.g., Mizuta et al., 2012; Sillmann et al., 2013; Zappa et al., 2013). Corresponding to the atmospheric changes under the global warming, the sea levels will rise due to the thermal expansion of sea water and ice-sheet melting in the polar continental regions (e.g., Church and White, 2011; Bamber and Aspinall, 2013). Additionally, ocean acidification due to absorption of atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and changes in carbon-nitrogen cycles are expected to lead to the loss of Earth biodiversity (e.g., Riebesell et al., 2009; Rockström, et al. 2009; Taucher and Oeschlies, 2011; Watanabe et al., 2017). Societal demands for information on the global and regional climate changes have increased significantly worldwide in order to meet information requirements for political decision making related to mitigation and adaptation to the global warming.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has continuously published the assessment reports (ARs) in which a comprehensive view of past, present, and future climate changes on various timescales, including the centennial global warming, are synthesized ~~(IPCC 2007; 2013).~~ Together with observations, climate models have been contributing to the IPCC-ARs through a broad range of numerical simulations, especially, future climate projections after the twenty-first century. However, there are many uncertainties in future climate projections and the range of uncertainties has not been narrowed by an update of the IPCC reports. The uncertainties are arising from imperfections



of climate models in representing micro- to global-scale physical and dynamical processes in sub-systems of the Earth's climate and their interactions. To reduce the uncertainties and errors in climate projections and predictions, utilizing observations, extracting essences of physical processes in the real climate, and investigating the response of the climate system to various external forcings based on a set of climate model simulations ~~sophisticating physical parameterizations of climate models, which represent unresolved sub-grid scale phenomena,~~ are necessary. In particular, a state-of-the-art climate model which can represent various processes in the Earth's climate system is a powerful tool for deeper understanding the Earth's climate system.

One of Japanese climate models, which is called MIROC (Model for Interdisciplinary Research on Climate), has been cooperatively developed at the Center for Climate System Research (CCSR; the precursor of a part of the Atmosphere and Ocean Research Institute), the University of Tokyo, the Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology (JAMSTEC), and the National Institute for Environmental Studies (NIES). Utilizing MIROC, our Japanese climate modelling group has been tackling a wide range of climate science issues and seasonal-to-decadal climate predictions and future climate projections. At the same time, by providing simulation data, we have been participating to the third and fifth phases of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Projects (CMIP3 and CMIP5; Meehl et al. 2007; Taylor et al. 2011) which have been contributing to the IPCC-ARs by synthesizing multi-model ensemble datasets.

In the years up to the IPCC fifth assessment report (IPCC-AR5; IPCC 2013), we have developed four versions of MIROC, three of which (MIROC3m, MIROC3h, and MIROC4h) have almost the same dynamical and physical packages, but different resolutions. MIROC3m (K-1 model developers, 2004) is composed of a medium-resolution model consisting of T42L20 atmosphere and 1.4°L43 ocean ~~components~~. Resolutions of MIROC3h (K-1 model developers, 2004) are higher than MIROC3m and are T106L56 for the atmosphere and eddy-permitting for the ocean ( $1/4^\circ \times 1/6^\circ$ ). Only

the horizontal resolution of the atmosphere of MIROC3h is changed to T213 in MIROC4h (Sakamoto et al., 2012). MIROC5 is ~~a medium-resolution model~~ composed ~~nsisting~~ of T85L40 atmosphere and 1.4°L50 ocean ~~components~~, but with considerably updated physical and dynamical packages (Watanabe et al., 2010). These models have been used to study various scientific issues such as the detection of natural influences on climate changes (e.g., Nozawa et al., 2005; Mori et al., 2014; Watanabe et al., 2014), uncertainty quantification of climate sensitivity (e.g., Shiogama et al., 2012; Kamae et al., 2016), future projections of regional sea-level rises (e.g., Suzuki et al., 2005; Suzuki and Ishii, 2011), and mechanism studies on tropical decadal variability (e.g., Tatebe et al., 2013; Mochizuki et al., 2016).

During the last decade, our efforts have been preferentially devoted to providing science-oriented risk information on climate changes that is beneficial to international, domestic, and municipal communities. For example, so-called event attribution (EA) studies with large ensemble simulations initiated from slightly different conditions have been conducted in order to statistically evaluate influences of the global warming on the occurrence frequencies of observed individual extremes (e.g., Imada et al., 2013; Watanabe et al., 2013; Shiogama et al., 2014). Seasonal-to-decadal climate predictions are also of significant concerns. By initializing prognostic variables in our climate models using observation-based data (Tatebe et al., 2012), significant prediction skills in several specific phenomena, such as the El Niño/Southern Oscillation (ENSO) and the Arctic sea-ice extent on seasonal timescales, the Pacific Decadal Oscillations (PDO; Mantua et al., 1997), the Atlantic Multi-decadal Oscillations (AMO; Schlesinger and Ramankutty, 2004), and the tropical trans-basin interactions between the Pacific and the Atlantic on decadal timescales, are detected (e.g., Mochizuki et al., 2010; Chikamoto et al. 2015; Imada et al., 2015; Ono et al., 2018).

However, while the applicability of MIROC has been extended to a wide range of climate science issues, almost all of the above-mentioned approaches were based on our medium-resolution

versions of MIROC (MIROC3m and MIROC5), and it is well known that higher-resolution models are capable of better representing the model mean climate and internal climate variability, such as regional extremes, orographic winds, and oceanic western boundary currents/eddies than lower-resolution models (e.g., Shaffrey et al., 2009; Roberts et al., 2009; Sakamoto et al., 2012). Nevertheless, ~~even in high-resolution models,~~ there remain persistent biases associated with, for example, cloud-aerosol-radiative feedback and turbulent vertical mixing of the air in the planetary boundary layer (e.g., Bony and Dufresne, 2005; Bodas-Salcedo et al., 2012; Williams et al., 2013), which are tightly linked with dominant uncertainties in climate projections. Therefore, improvement of physical parameterizations for sub-grid scale processes is essential for better representing observed climatic-mean states and internal climate variability ~~and may result in reducing uncertainty range of climate projections.~~ As well as physical parameterizations, enhanced vertical resolution in both of atmosphere and ocean components, along with a highly accurate tracer advection scheme, have been suggested to have impacts on reproducibility of model-climate and internal climate variations (e.g., Tatebe and Hasumi, 2010; Ineson and Scaife, 2009; Scaife et al., 2012).

Recently, we have developed the sixth version of MIROC, called MIROC6. This newly developed climate model has updated physical parameterizations in all sub-modules. In order to suppress an increase of computational cost, the horizontal resolutions of MIROC6 are not significantly higher than those of MIROC5. The reason is that a larger number of ensemble members are required to realize significant seasonal predictions of, for example, the wintertime Eurasian climate (Murphy et al., 1990; Scaife et al., 2014) ~~because the signal-to-noise ratio is smaller in the mid-latitude atmosphere than in the tropics.~~ Indeed, climate predictions by the older versions of MIROC having at most 10 ensemble members are skillful only in the tropical climate ~~and~~ the mid-latitude ocean ~~not in the mid-latitude atmosphere.~~ ~~In addition, when evaluating the contributions of internal variations, which will be done in preparation for use in the global stocktake, namely, a five-yearly review of each~~

~~countries' provisions to climate changes, established by the Paris Agreement in 2015, I~~ large ensemble predictions ~~are~~ may also ~~be~~ required in decadal-scale predictions in order to evaluate the human influences on the near-term climate changes.— The model top ~~of the atmosphere (TOA)~~ in MIROC6 is placed at the 0.004 hPa pressure level which is higher than that of MIROC5 (3 hPa), and the stratospheric vertical resolution has been enhanced in comparison to MIROC5 in order to represent the stratospheric circulations. Overall, the reproducibility of the mean climate and internal variability of MIROC6 is better than those of MIROC5, but the model's computational cost is about 3.6 times as large as that of MIROC5. Considering that the computational costs of large ensemble predictions based on climate high-resolution models with horizontal resolutions of, for example, 50 km atmosphere and eddy-resolving ocean ~~ing~~ are still huge on recent computer systems, the use of relatively low ~~medium-~~ resolution models such as MIROC6 with further elaborated parameterizations can still be actively useful in science-oriented climate studies and climate predictions produced for societal needs.

The rest of the present paper is organized as follows. We describe the model configuration, tuning and spin-up procedures in Section 2, while simulated mean-state, internal variability, and climate sensitivity are evaluated in Section 3. Simulation performance of MIROC6 and remaining issues are briefly summarized and discussed in Section 4. Currently, MIROC6 is being used for various simulations designed by the sixth phase of the CMIP (CMIP6; Eyring et al., 2016), which aims to strengthen the scientific basis of the IPCC-AR6. ~~In addition, I~~ large ensemble simulations and climate predictions using MIROC6 are also on-going ~~will be conducted~~ for science-oriented studies in our modeling group, and for societal benefits. In addition, the latest earth system model version of MIROC with the global carbon cycle, whose physical core will be MIROC6, has been developed for the CMIP6 towards further wide range issues of climate and societal applications (Hajima et al., in preparation).

## 2 Model configurations and spinup procedures

MIROC6 is composed of three sub-models: atmosphere, land, and sea ice-ocean. The atmospheric model is based on the CCSR-NIES atmospheric general circulation model (AGCM; Numaguti et al., 1997). The land surface model is based on Minimal Advanced Treatments of Surface Interaction and Runoff (MATSIRO; Takata et al. 2003), which includes a river routing model of Oki and Sud (2003) based on a kinematic wave flow equation (Ngo-Duc et al., 2007) and a lake module where one-dimensional thermal diffusion and mass conservation are considered. The sea ice-ocean model is based on the CCSR Ocean Component model (COCO; Hasumi, 2006). A coupler system calculates heat and freshwater fluxes between the sub-models in order to ensure that all fluxes are conserved within machine precision and then exchanges the fluxes among the sub-models (Suzuki et al., 2009). No flux adjustments are used in MIROC6. In the remaining part of this section, we will provide details of MIROC6 configurations, focusing on updates from MIROC5. Readers may also refer to Table A+ in Appendix where the updates are briefly summarized.

### 2.1 Atmospheric component

MIROC6 employs a spectral dynamical core in its AGCM component as in MIROC5. The horizontal resolution is a T85 spectral truncation that is an approximately  $1.4^\circ$  grid interval for both latitude and longitude. The vertical grid coordinate is a hybrid  $\sigma$ - $p$  coordinate (Arakawa and Konor, 1996). The model top<sup>TOA</sup> is placed at 0.004 hPa, and there are 81 vertical levels (Fig. 1a). The vertical grid arrangement in MIROC6 is considerably enhanced in comparison to that in MIROC5 (40 levels; 3 hPa) in order that the stratospheric circulations can be represented. A sponge layer that damps wave motions is set at the model top level by increasing Rayleigh friction to prevent extra wave reflection near the model top<sup>TOA</sup>. The atmospheric component of MIROC6 has standard physical parameterizations for cumulus convections, radiation transfer, cloud microphysics, turbulence, and

gravity wave drag. It also has an aerosol module. These are basically the same as those used in MIROC5, but several updates have been made, as will be detailed below. The parameterizations for cloud micro-physics and planetary boundary layer processes in MIROC6 are the same as in MIROC5. The standard timestep for MIROC6 is 6 minutes which is shorter than that of MIROC5 (12 minutes) because stratospheric winds whose speed sometimes exceeds  $150 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  must be resolved in time integration. The timestep for radiative transfer models is set separately and is 3 hours in both of MIROC6 and MIROC5.

A cumulus parameterization proposed by Chikira and Sugiyama (2010), which uses an entrainment formulation of Gregory (2001), is adopted in MIROC6 as in MIROC5. This parameterization deals with multiple cloud types including shallow cumulus and deep convective clouds. MIROC5, however, tends to overestimate the low-level cloud amounts over the low-latitude oceans and has a dry bias in the free troposphere. These biases appear to be the result of insufficient vertical mixing of the humid air in the planetary boundary layer and the dry air in the free troposphere ~~is insufficient~~. To alleviate these biases, an additional parameterization for shallow cumulus convection based on Park and Bretherton (2009) is implemented in MIROC6. Shallow convections associated with the atmospheric instability are calculated by the Chikira and Sugiyama (2010) scheme, and those associated with turbulence in the planetary boundary layer are represented by the Park and Bretherton (2009) scheme. The shallow convective parameterization is a mass flux scheme based on a buoyancy-sorting, entrainment-detrainment single plume model that calculates the vertical transport of liquid water, potential temperature, total water mixing ratio, and horizontal winds in the lower troposphere. The cloud-base mass flux is controlled by turbulent kinetic energy within the sub-cloud layer and convective inhibition. The cloud-base height for shallow cumulus is set between the lifting condensation level and the boundary layer top, which is diagnosed based on the vertical profile of relative humidity. When implementing the parameterization in MIROC6, the following conditions for

triggering the shallow convection are specified: 1) The estimated inversion strength (Wood and Bretherton, 2006) is smaller than a tuning parameter, and 2) the convection depth diagnosed by a separate cumulus convection scheme (Chikira and Sugiyama, 2010) is smaller than a tuning parameter.

The Spectral Radiation-Transport Model for Aerosol Species (SPRINTARS; Takemura et al., 2000, 2005, 2009) is used as an aerosol module for MIROC6 to predict the mass mixing ratios of the main tropospheric aerosols which are black carbon, organic matter, sulfate, soil dust, and sea salt, and the precursor gases of sulfate (sulfur dioxide, SO<sub>2</sub>, and dimethylsulfide). By coupling the radiation and cloud-precipitation schemes in MIROC, SPRINTARS calculates not only the aerosol transport processes of emission, advection, diffusion, sulfur chemistry, wet deposition, dry deposition, and gravitational settling, but also the aerosol-radiation and aerosol-cloud interactions. There are two primary updates in SPRINTARS of MIROC6 that were not included in MIROC5. One is the treatment of precursor gases of organic matters as prognostic variables. In the previous version, the conversion rates from the precursor gases (e.g., terpene and isoprene) to organic matters are prescribed (Takemura et al., 2000), while an explicit simplified scheme for secondary organic matters was introduced from a global chemical climate model (Sudo et al., 2002). The other is a treatment of oceanic primary and secondary organic matters. Emissions of primary organic matters are calculated with wind at a 10-m height, the particle diameter of sea salt aerosols, and chlorophyll-*a* concentration at the ocean surface (Gantt et al., 2011). The oceanic isoprene and monoterpene, which are precursor gases of organic matters, are emitted depending on the photosynthetically active radiation, diffuse attenuation coefficient at 490 nm, and the ocean surface chlorophyll-*a* concentration (Gantt et al., 2009).

The radiative transfer in MIROC6 is calculated by an updated version of the *k*-distribution scheme used in MIROC5 (Sekiguchi and Nakajima 2008). The single scattering parameters have been calculated and tabulated in advance, and liquid, ice, and five aerosol species can be treated in this updated version. Given the significant effect of crystal habit on a particle's optical characteristics

(Baran, 2012), the assumption of ice particles habit has been updated from our previous simple assumption of sphere used in MIROC5 to a hexagonal solid column (Yang et al., 2013) in MIROC6. The upper limits of the mode radius of cloud particles have been extended from 32  $\mu\text{m}$  to 0.2 mm for liquids and from 80  $\mu\text{m}$  to 0.5 mm for ice. Therefore, the scheme can now handle the large-sized water particles (e.g., drizzle and rain) that have been shown to have a significant radiative impacts (Waliser et al., 2011). ~~This extended capability is expected to be effective in our future model versions, especially in situations where mass mixing ratios of the large-sized particles are predicted or diagnosed in the cloud microphysics scheme.~~

Following Hines (1997) and Watanabe et al. (2011), a non-orographic gravity wave parameterization is newly implemented into MIROC6 in order to ~~to~~ represent realistic large-scale circulations and thermal structures in the stratosphere and mesosphere. Following Watanabe (2008), a present-day climatological source of non-orographic gravity waves, which is estimated using results of a gravity wave-resolving version of MIROC-AGCM (Watanabe et al., 2008), is launched at the 70 hPa level in the extratropics, while an isotropic source of non-orographic gravity waves is launched at the 650 hPa level in the tropics. Together with this parameterization, an orographic gravity wave parameterization of McFarlane (1987) is also adopted as in MIROC5. In both the orographic and non-orographic gravity wave parametrizations, wave source parameters at launch levels are tuned so that the realistic seasonal progress of the middle atmosphere circulations, frequency of sudden stratospheric warmings, and period and amplitude of the equatorial quasi-biennial oscillations (QBOs) can be represented.

## 2.2 Land surface component

The land surface model is also basically the same as in MIROC5. Energy and water exchanges between land and atmosphere are calculated, considering the physical and physiological



effects of vegetation with a single layer canopy, and the thermal and hydrological effects of snow and soil respectively with a three-layers snow and a six-layers soil down to a 14-m depth. Sub-grid fractions of land use and snow cover have also been considered. The timestep for the land surface model integration is 1 hour in MIROC6 which is the same as in MIROC5. In addition to the standard package in MIROC5, a few other physical parameterizations are implemented as described below.

A physically-based parameterization of sub-grid snow distribution (SSNOWD; Liston, 2004; Nitta et al., 2014) replaces the simple functional approach of snow water equivalent in calculating sub-grid snow fractions in MIROC5 in order to improve seasonal cycle of snow cover. In SSNOWD, the snow cover fraction is formulated for accumulation and ablation seasons separately. For the ablation season, the snow cover fraction decreases based on the sub-grid distribution of the snow water equivalent. A lognormal distribution function is assumed and the coefficient of variation category is diagnosed from the standard deviation of the sub-grid topography, coldness index, and vegetation type that is a proxy of surface winds. While the cold degree month was adopted for coldness in the original SSNOWD, we decided instead to introduce the annually averaged temperature over the latest 30 years using the time-relaxation method of Krinner et al. (2005), in which the timescale parameter is set to 16 years. The temperature threshold for a category diagnosis is set to 0°C and 10°C. In addition, a scheme representing a snow-fed wetland that takes into consideration sub-grid terrain complexity (Nitta et al., 2017) is incorporated. The river routing model and lake module are the same as those used in MIROC5, but the river network map is updated to keep the consistency to the new land-sea mask (Yamazaki et al., 2009).

### **2.3 Ocean and sea-ice component**

The ocean component of MIROC6 is basically the same as that used in MIROC5, but several updates are implemented as described below. The warped bipolar horizontal coordinate system

in MIROC5 has been replaced by the tripolar coordinate system proposed by Murray (1996). Two singular points in the bipolar region to the north of about 63°N are placed at (63°N, 60°E) in Canada and (63°N, 120°W) in Siberia (Fig. 2). In the spherical coordinate portion to the south of 63°N, the longitudinal grid spacing is 1° and the meridional grid spacing varies from about 0.5° near the equator to 1° in the mid-latitudes. In the central Arctic Ocean where the bipole coordinate system is applied, the grid spacings are about 60 km in zonal and 33 km in meridional, respectively. By introducing the horizontal tripolar coordinate system, it is expected that theoretical westward propagation of the oceanic baroclinic Rossby can be represented with less numerical dispersions because of agreement of the coordinate system and the geographical coordinate system and that the horizontal resolutions in the Arctic Ocean where the Rossby radius of deformation is relatively small are higher than in the case where the bipolar warped coordinate system in MIROC5 is adopted. There are 62 vertical levels in a hybrid  $\sigma$ -z coordinate system. The horizontal grid spacing in MIROC5 is nominally 1.4°, except for the equatorial region and there are 49 vertical levels. The resolutions in MIROC6 are higher than in MIROC5. In particular, 31 (23) of the 62 (49) vertical layers in MIROC6 (MIROC5) are within the upper 500 m depth (Fig. 1b). The increased vertical layers in MIROC6 have been adopted in order to better represent the equatorial thermocline and observed complex hydrography in the Arctic Ocean. An increase in computational costs of the ocean component due to higher resolutions in MIROC6 is suppressed by implementing a time-staggered scheme for the tracer and baroclinic momentum equations (Griffies et al., 2005). Owing to the time-staggered scheme, the timestep for the ocean and sea-ice components of MIROC6 is 20 minutes which is longer than that in MIROC5 (15 minutes).

The tracer advection scheme (Prather, 1986), the surface mixed layer parameterization (Noh and Kim, 1999), and the parameterization for eddy isopycnal diffusion (Gent et al., 1995) used in MIROC6 are the same as those used in MIROC5. Also as in MIROC5, the bottom boundary layer parameterization of Nakano and Suganohara (2002) is introduced south (north) of 54°S (49°N) for

representing the down-sloping flow of dense waters. The constant parameters used in the above-mentioned parameterizations are determined in the same manner as that of MIROC5, except for the Arctic region. An empirical profile of background vertical diffusivity, which is proposed in Tsujino et al. (2000), is modified above the 50 m depth to the north of 65°N. It is  $1.0 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$  in the uppermost 29 m and gradually increases to  $1.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$  at the 50 m depth. Additionally, the turbulent mixing process in the surface mixed layer is changed so that there is no surface wave breaking and no resultant near-surface mixing in regions covered by sea ice. The combination of the weak background vertical diffusivity and suppression of turbulent mixing under the sea-ice contributes to better representations of the surface stratification in the Arctic Ocean with little impact on the rest of the global oceans (Komuro, 2014).

The sea-ice component in MIROC6 is almost the same as in MIROC5. A brief description, along with some major parameters, is given here. Readers may refer to Komuro et al. (2012) and Komuro and Suzuki (2013) for further details. A subgrid-scale sea-ice thickness distribution is incorporated by following Bitz et al. (2001). There are five ice categories (plus one additional category for open water), and the lower bounds of the ice thickness for these categories are set to 0.3, 0.6, 1, 2.5, and 5 m. The momentum equation for sea-ice dynamics is solved using elastic-viscous-plastic rheology (Hunke and Dukowicz, 1997). The strength of the ice per unit thickness and concentration is set at  $2.0 \times 10^4 \text{ N m}^{-2}$ , and the ice–ocean drag coefficient is set to 0.02. The surface albedo for bare ice surface is 0.85 (0.65) for the visible (infrared) radiation. The surface albedo in snow-covered areas is 0.95 (0.80) when the surface temperature is lower than -5°C for the visible (infrared) radiation, and it is 0.85 (0.65) when the temperature is 0°C. Note that the albedo changes linearly between -5°C and 0°C. These parameter values listed here are the same as those listed in MIROC5.

## **2.4 Boundary conditions**

A set of external forcing data recommended by the CMIP6 protocol are used. The historical solar irradiance spectra, greenhouse gas concentrations, anthropogenic aerosol emissions, and biomass burning emissions are given by Matthes et al. (2017), Meinshausen et al. (2017), Hoesly et al. (2018), and van Marle et al. (2017), respectively. The concentrations of greenhouse gases averaged globally and annually are given to MIROC6. Radiative forcing of stratospheric aerosols due to volcanic eruptions are computed by vertically integrating extinction coefficients for each radiation band, which are provided by Thomason et al. (2016), in the model layers above the tropopause~~are taken into account as extinction coefficients for each radiation band~~. Three-dimensional atmospheric concentrations of historical ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) are produced by the Chemistry-Climate Model Initiative (Hegglin et al., in preparation; the data are available at <http://blogs.reading.ac.uk/ccmi/forcing-databases-in-support-of-cmip6/>). Three dimensional concentrations of the OH radical, hydrogen peroxide (H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>) and Nitrate (NO<sub>3</sub>) are precalculated by a chemical atmospheric model of Sudo et al. (2002). As precursors of secondary organic aerosol, emission data of terpenes and isoprene provided by the Global Emissions Inventory Activity (Guenther et al., 1995) are normally used, although simulated emissions from the land ecosystem model of Ito and Inatmoni (2012) are also used alternatively.

For specifying the soil types and area fractions of natural vegetation and crop-land on grids of the land-surface component, the harmonized land-use dataset (Hurtt et al., in prep.), Center for Sustainability and the Global Environment global potential vegetation dataset (Ramankutty and Foley, 1999), and the dataset provided by the International Satellite Land Surface Climatology Project Initiative I (Sellers et al., 1996) are used. ~~These is~~ datasets are also used in prescribing background reflectance at the land surface. Leaf-area index data are prepared based on the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer Leaf-area index products of Myneni et al. (2002).

The forcing dataset used for the preindustrial control simulation is basically composed of

the data for the year 1850, which are included in the above-mentioned historical dataset. The stratospheric aerosols and solar irradiance in the preindustrial simulation are given as monthly climatology averaged in 1850 – 2014 and in 1850 – 1873, respectively. The total solar irradiance is about  $1361 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ , and the global-mean concentrations of  $\text{CO}_2$ , methane ( $\text{CH}_4$ ), and nitrous oxide ( $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ ) are 284.32 ppm, 808.25 ppb, and 273.02 ppb, respectively.

## 2.5 Spin-up and tuning procedures

Firstly, the stand-alone ocean component of MIROC6, which includes the sea-ice processes, is integrated from the initial motionless state with the observed temperature and salinity distribution of the Polar Science Center hydrographic climatology (Steele et al., 2001). Ocean model coastline geometry and bottom bathymetry are specified based on horizontal interpolation of the land and sea-floor dataset of ETOPO5 (National Geophysical Data Center, 1993). The ocean component is spun-up for 1000 years by the monthly climatological surface fluxes of Röske (2006). An acceleration method of Bryan (1984) is used in the spin-up stage in order to obtain a thermally and dynamically quasi-steady state. After the spin-up, additional integration for 200 years is performed without the acceleration method. By analyzing the last 50-yr-long data from the stand-alone ocean component, the monthly climatology of typical variables (e.g., zonal-mean temperature and salinity in several basins, volume transports across major straits and archipelagos, meridional overturning circulations, and sea-ice distributions) are compared with observations. Once the configuration of the ocean component is frozen, the land-sea distribution and land-sea area ratios on the ~~model grids of the~~ atmospheric and land surface model grids are ~~and land surface components are~~ determined according the coastline geometry of the ocean component, after which the atmospheric and the land surface components are coupled with the ocean component. Surface topography in the atmospheric and land surface component are also made using the ETOPO5 dataset. Note that horizontal grid arrangement of the

land surface model is exactly same as the atmospheric component. The coupling interval among the sub-models is 1 hour. An initial condition of the ocean component in MIROC6 is given by the stand-alone ocean experiment, and those of the atmosphere and land are taken from an arbitrary year of the pre-industrial control run of MIROC5.

After coupling the sub-models, climate model tuning is done under the pre-industrial boundary conditions. Conventionally, the climate models of our modeling community are retuned in coupled modes after stand-alone sub-model tuning. This is because reproducibility of climatic-mean state and internal climate variations is not necessarily guaranteed in climate models with the same parameters determined in stand-alone sub-model tuning, which is particularly the case in the tropical climate. In our tuning procedures described below, many of the 10-yr-long climate model runs are conducted with different parameter values. There are numerous parameters associated with physical parameterizations, whose upper/lower bounds are constrained by empirical or physical reasoning. The main parameters used in our tuning procedures are chosen referring to a perturbed parameter ensemble set made by Shiogama et al. (2012) in which parameter sensitivity to cloud-radiative processes is examined.~~stated in the next paragraph and are chosen primarily referring to Shiogama et al. (2012), in which the uncertainty of the climate sensitivity in MIROC5 is extensively measured using a perturbed parameter ensemble set.~~ The impact of parameter tuning on the present climate is also discussed by Ogura et al (2017), focusing on the top-of-the-atmosphere (TOA) radiation and clouds. Any objective and optimal methods for parameter tuning are not used in our modeling group and the tuning procedures are like those in other climate modeling groups as summarized in Hourdin et al. (2017).

In the first model tuning step, climatology, seasonal progression, and internal climate variability in the tropical coupled system are tuned in order that departures from observations or reanalysis datasets are reduced. Here, it should be noted that representation of the tropical system in MIROC6 is sensitive to the parameters for ~~cumulus~~-convection~~s~~ and planetary boundary layer

processes. Specifically, parameters of reference height for cumulus precipitation, efficiency of the cumulus entrainment of surrounding environment and maximum cumulus updraft velocity at the cumulus base are used to tune strength of the equatorial trade wind, climatological position and intensity of the Inter-Tropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) and South Pacific Convergence Zone (SPCZ), and interannual variability of El-Niño/Southern Oscillation (ENSO). In particular, the parameter for the cumulus entrainment is known as a controlling factor of ENSO in MIROC5 (Watanabe et al., 2011). Summertime precipitation in the western tropical Pacific and characteristic of tropical intraseasonal oscillations are tuned by using the parameter for shallow convection describing the partitioning of turbulent kinetic energy between horizontal and vertical motions at the sub-cloud layer inversion. Next, the wintertime mid-latitude westerly jets and the stationary waves in the troposphere are tuned using the parameters of the orographic gravity wave drag and the hyper diffusion of momentum. The parameters of the hyper diffusion and the non-orographic gravity wave drag are also used when tuning stratospheric circulations of the polar vortex and QBO. Finally, the radiation budget at the TOA is tuned, primarily using the parameters for the auto-conversion process so that excess downward radiation can be minimized and maintained closer to  $0.0 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ . The surface albedos for bare sea-ice and snow-covered sea-ice are set to higher values than in observations (see Section 2.3) in order to avoid underestimating of the summertime sea-ice extent in the Arctic Ocean due to excess downward shortwave radiation in this region. In addition, parameter tuning for the total radiative forcing associated with aerosol-radiation and aerosol-cloud interactions~~cooling effects due to interactions between anthropogenic aerosol emissions and cloud-radiative processes~~ is ~~are~~ done. In order that the total radiative forcing ~~cooling effects~~ can be closer to the estimate of  $-0.9 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  (IPCC, 2013; negative value indicates cooling) with an uncertainty range of  $-1.9$  to  $-0.1 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ , parameters of cloud microphysics and the aerosol transport module, such as timescale for cloud droplet nucleation, in-cloud properties of aerosol removal by precipitation, and minimum threshold of number concentration

of cloud droplets, are perturbed. To determine a suitable parameter set, several pairs of a present-day run under the anthropogenic aerosol emissions at the year 2000 and a pre-industrial run are conducted. A pair of the present and preindustrial runs has exactly the same parameters, and differences of tropospheric radiations between two runs are considered as anthropogenic radiative forcing ~~cooling~~ effects. Note that MIROC6 in a coupled mode is used in this tuning procedure, and thus the sea surface temperature (SST) is not fixed. The estimated radiative forcing here is not strictly the same as the effective radiative forcing estimated in IPCC (2013). However, by the present tuning procedure, the global-mean surface air temperature (SAT) change after the mid-19th century is well reproduced in the historical runs by MIROC6 (details are discussed in Section 4). As above-mentioned, reproducibility of the global-mean SAT is not a tuning goal but is a typical metric which reflects results of the parameter tunings for individual processes of convections, dynamics, and radiative forcing.

After fixing the model parameters, the climate model is spun-up for 2000 years. During the first several hundred years, waters contained in the land surface are drained to the ocean via river runoff, which leads to a temporal weakening of the meridional overturning circulations in the ocean and a rising of the global-mean sea level. After the global hydrological cycle reaches to an equilibrium state, the strengths of the meridional overturning circulations recover and keep quasi steady state. The above-mentioned processes spend about 1000 years, after which an additional 1000-yr-long integration is performed in order to obtain a thermally and dynamically quasi-steady ocean state.

Figure 3 shows the time series of the global-mean quantities after the spin-up. The labeled year in Fig. 3 indicates the elapsed year after the spin-up duration of 2000 years. Linear trend of the global-mean SAT is  $9.5 \times 10^{-3}$  K/100 yr and ~~The global-mean surface air temperature (SAT) and the radiation budget at the TOA show no significant drifts, thereby indicating that they are in a quasi-steady state. Linear trends of the global-mean SAT and the radiation budget are  $9.5 \times 10^{-3}$  K/100yr and  $2.1 \times 10^{-3}$  Wm<sup>-2</sup>/100yr, respectively. The trend of the SAT is much smaller than the observed value of~~



about 0.62 K/100 \_yr in the twentieth century, indicating that there is no significant drift and the global-mean SAT is in a quasi-steady state. While the global-mean ~~sea surface temperature~~ (SST) is in a quasi-steady state (linear trend of  $7.0 \times 10^{-3}$  K/100 yr), the global-mean ocean temperature shows a larger trend of  $6.8 \times 10^{-3}$  K/100 \_yr in the first 500 years than that of  $1.3 \times 10^{-3}$  K/100 \_yr in the later period. In the later sections, the 200-yr-long data between the 500-th and 699-th years are analyzed.

The ~~larger~~ trend of the global-mean ocean temperature in the later period suggests slight but continuous warming of the deep ocean. The radiation budget at the TOA is  $1.1 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  downward on average (linear trend of  $9.5 \times 10^{-3}$  K/100 yr) and the net heat input at the sea surface is  $0.32 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ . The deep ocean warming is explained by the net heat input.~~global-mean-ocean-temperature-suggests that the deep ocean continues to warm slightly.~~ Note that there is about  $0.78 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  inconsistency between the TOA radiation budget and the ocean heat uptake. This heat energy inconsistency is due to that internal energy associated with precipitation, water vapor and river runoff is not taken account in the atmospheric and land surface component in MIROC6 and that these waters with no temperature information implicitly set their temperature to the SST when they flow or fall into the ocean. Perpetual melting of the prescribed Antarctic ice-sheet with invariant ice thickness, which is occurred due to the warm SAT bias in the Antarctic region (details will be discussed in Section 3.1.3), is also a cause of the heat energy inconsistency.

~~In the later sections, the 200-yr-long data between the 500-th and 699-th years are analyzed.~~

### 3 Results of pre-industrial simulation

Representations of climatic-mean field and internal climate variability in MIROC6 are evaluated in comparison with MIROC5 and observations. The 200-yr-long data of the preindustrial control simulation by MIROC5 are used. The observations and reanalysis datasets used in the

comparison are listed in Table 1.

Here, the model climatology in the pre-industrial simulations is compared with observations in the recent decades. Because observations are obtained concurrently with the progress of the global-warming due to increasing anthropogenic radiative forcing, the model climate under the pre-industrial conditions may not be adequate for use when making comparisons with recent observations. However, the root-mean-squared (RMS) errors of typical variables (e.g., the global-mean SAT) in the climate models with respect to observations are much larger than the RMS differences between the model climatology in the pre-industrial simulation and those in the last 30-yr-long period in the historical simulations. Therefore, the era differences where climatology is defined are not significant concern in comparisons among the climate models and observations.

### 3.1 Climatology

#### 3.1.1 Atmosphere and Land-surface

First, model systematic biases in radiations at the TOA are evaluated because they reflect model deficiencies in cloud-radiative processes that contribute to a large degree of uncertainty in climate modelling. Figure 4 shows annual-mean biases in radiative fluxes at the TOA in MIROC6 and MIROC5 with respect to the recent Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) estimate (Loeb et al., 2009; the data are available at <https://ceres.larc.nasa.gov/>). At the top-right of each panel, a global-mean (GM) value and a root-mean-squared error (RMSE) with respect to observations are written. In the present manuscript, RMSE is computed without model and observed global-mean quantities unless otherwise noted.

~~Because the modeled and observed global-mean values are not considered when calculating the RMSE, the RMSE reflects model errors in spatial distribution.~~

~~Persistent overestimates~~ of net shortwave radiative flux and the in the sum of net shortwave

and net longwave fluxes ~~net and outgoing shortwave radiative fluxes (hereafter, NET and OSR, respectively)~~ over low-latitude oceans in MIROC5 are significantly reduced in MIROC6. Hereafter, net shortwave, longwave, and the sum of them are denoted as OSR, OLR and NET, respectively, for simplicity. As described in Ogura et al. (2017), since parameter tuning cannot eliminate the above-mentioned excess upward radiations, it is suggested that implementing a shallow convective parameterization is required in order to reduce the biases. Figure 5 shows annual-mean moistening rates associated with deep and shallow convections at the 850 hPa pressure level in MIROC6, ~~which has a shallow convective parameterization based on Park and Bretherton (2009).~~ Moistening due to shallow convections occurs mainly over the low-latitude oceans, especially the eastern subtropical Pacific and the western Atlantic and Indian oceans. These active regions of shallow convections occur separately from regions with active deep convections in the western tropical Pacific and the ~~ITCZ~~ ~~Tropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ)~~. The clear separation of the two convection types is consistent with satellite-based observations (Williams and Tselioudis, 2007). Owing to the shallow convective process that mixes the humid air in the planetary boundary layer with the dry air in the free troposphere, low-level cloud cover over the low-latitude oceans is better represented in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Figure 6 shows annual-mean biases in cloud covers with respect to the International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project (ISCCP; Rosso et al., 1996; Zhang et al., 2004; the data are available at <https://isccp.giss.nasa.gov/>). Overestimate of low-level cloud cover over the low-latitude oceans in MIROC5 (Fig. 6b) is apparently reduced in MIROC6 (Fig. 6a), which results in the smaller biases in NET and OSR biases (Fig. 4). RMS error in low-level cloud cover in MIROC6 is 9% lower than that in MIROC5.

OSR in the mid-latitudes are also better represented in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Zonally distributed downward OSR bias in MIROC5 is reduced or becomes a relatively small upward bias in MIROC6 (Figs. 4cd). This difference in the OSR bias is commonly found in both hemispheres. Cloud

covers at middle and high levels are larger in MIROC6 over the subarctic North Pacific, North Atlantic, and the Southern Ocean (Figs. 6c-f), while low-level cloud cover over the same regions is smaller in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 over the same regions (Figs. 6ab). The smaller low-level cloud cover in MIROC6 is inconsistent with the larger upward OSR bias in MIROC6. The wintertime mid-latitude westerlies are stronger and are located more poleward in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Correspondingly, activity of sub-weekly disturbances in the mid-latitudes is strengthened in MIROC6 (details are described later). These differences in the mid-latitude atmospheric circulations between MIROC6 and MIROC5 lead to an enhanced poleward moist air transport from the subtropics to the subarctic region, which could result in an increase in the mid- and high-level cloud covers in MIROC6, as reported in previous modeling studies (e.g., Bodas-Salcedo et al., 2012; Williams et al., 2013). Consequently, the downward OSR bias in the mid-latitudes is smaller in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. In polar regions, both biases in OSR and NET remain the same as in MIROC5.

Systematic bias in the outgoing longwave radiative flux (hereafter, OLR) is worse in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 because MIROC6 tends to underestimate OLR over almost the entire global domain, except for Antarctica (Figs. 4ef). The global-mean of the high-level cloud cover in MIROC6 is larger than in MIROC5 by 0.04 (Figs. 6ef), which is consistent with the smaller OLR in MIROC6. The increased moisture transport due to the strengthening of the westerlies and sub-weekly disturbances can partly explain the increase in the mid-latitude high-level clouds in MIROC6, but high-level cloud cover is also larger in the low-latitudes. Hirota et al. (2018) reported that moistening of the free troposphere due to shallow convections creates favorable conditions for atmospheric instabilities that leads to the resultant activation of deep convections in the low-latitudes. Such processes may contribute to the inferior representation of OLR in MIROC6.

Next, we will discuss on the global budget of the radiative fluxes and the RMS errors between models and observations. Note that only deviations from the global means are considered

when calculating RMS errors. As written on the upper right of panels in Fig. 4ab, the global-mean (RMS errors) NETs are  $-1.11$  ( $12.7$ )  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in MIROC6 and  $-0.98$  ( $15.9$ )  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in MIROC5, respectively, and these values are consistent with the observed value of  $-0.81$   $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  (CERES; Loeb et al, 2009). However, the observed value is estimated in the present-day condition. Ideally, the model value in the preindustrial condition should be  $0$   $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  and is in the marginally acceptable range. If NET is divided into OSR and OLR, so-called error compensation becomes apparent. The global means of OSR (OLR) are  $-231.3$  ( $230.2$ )  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in MIROC6 and  $-237.6$  ( $236.6$ )  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in MIROC5, respectively (Figs. 4c-f). The observed global-means of OSR and OLR are  $-240.5$   $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  and  $239.7$   $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ . Biases in the global-mean OSR (OLR) with respect to observations are  $9.2$  ( $-9.5$ )  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in MIROC6 and  $2.9$  ( $-3.1$ )  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in MIROC5, respectively. Thus, the global-mean OSR and OLR in MIROC6 are worse than those in MIROC5. Further division of OSR and OLR into cloud-radiative forcing and clear-sky shortwave (longwave) radiative components shows that shortwave cloud-radiative forcing is dominant on the biases in radiative fluxes. The biases in the global-mean shortwave (longwave) cloud-radiative forcing with respect to observations are  $12.0$  ( $6.7$ )  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in MIROC6 and  $-4.0$  ( $-0.2$ )  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in MIROC5, respectively.

The global radiation budget in MIROC6 is inferior to that in MIROC5, while reproducibility of climatic means of typical model variables, other than radiative fluxes, and internal variations are better simulated in MIROC6 (details are shown later). As described in Section 2.5, the intensive tuning by perturbing model parameters is done focusing on reproducibility of climatic means, internal variations, and radiative forcing due to anthropogenic aerosols. During this procedure, the global radiation budget is traded-off. On the other hand, RMS errors in NET, OSR, and OLR are  $12.7$ ,  $16.2$ , and  $6.3$   $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in MIROC6 and  $15.9$ ,  $18.9$ , and  $6.8$   $\text{Wm}^{-2}$  in MIROC5, respectively, thereby indicating that the errors in MIROC6 have been reduced by 7% to 20 %. This is also the case for shortwave and longwave cloud radiative forcings, where the corresponding errors have been reduced

by 17% and 13 %, respectively. Taken together, these results show that the spatial patterns of the radiative fluxes are better simulated in MIROC6 than in MIROC5.

The improvement in spatial radiation patterns, especially in low-latitude OSR, is explained primarily by the implementation of shallow convective processes, which results in a moister free troposphere in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Figures 7ab show zonal-mean biases in annual-mean specific humidity with respect to the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecast interim reanalysis (ERA-I; Dee et al., 2011; the data are available at <https://www.ecmwf.int/en/forecasts/datasets/archive-datasets/reanalysis-datasets/era-interim>). Dry bias in 30°S–30°N, which occurs persistently in MIROC5, are largely reduced in MIROC6 owing to vertical mixing at the interface of the planetary boundary layer and the free troposphere. On the other hand, moist bias below the 600 hPa pressure level in the mid-latitudes is somewhat worse in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Shallow convections also contribute to the improvement of precipitations in the low latitudes. Figure 8 shows global maps for climatological precipitation in boreal winter (December–February) and summer (June–August). The second version of the Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP; the data are available at <https://precip.gsfc.nasa.gov/>) Monthly Precipitation Analysis (Adler et al., 2003) is used for the observations. While MIROC5 suffers from underestimate of summertime precipitation over the western tropical Pacific, the underestimate is largely reduced in MIROC6 (Figs. 8df). The increase of precipitations is associated with deep convections because the moister free troposphere in MIROC6 is more favorable for the occurrence of deep convections (Hirota et al., 2018). On the other hand, model representation of the precipitation in MIROC6 is not necessarily alleviated other than the western tropical Pacific. For example, the overestimate of wintertime precipitation over the Indian Ocean and the mid-latitude North Pacific is worse in MIROC6 than in MIROC5.

Zonal-mean biases in annual-mean air temperature and zonal wind velocity are also better

represented in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 (Figs. 7c-f). The ~~remarkable~~ upper stratospheric warm bias in 50°S–50°N in MIROC5 is significantly reduced in MIROC6. The ~~model top of TOA in~~ MIROC6 is located at the 0.004 hPa pressure level and there are 42 vertical layers above the 50 hPa pressure level, while the ~~model top TOA~~ of MIROC5 is placed at the 3 hPa pressure level. As a result, there are significant differences in stratospheric circulations between the models. As shown in the annual-mean mass stream function ~~calculated using zonal-mean meridional winds with log<sub>10</sub> vertical scale~~ (Fig. 9), an upward wind continuing from the low-latitude troposphere to the stratosphere is stronger in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. It is considered that an increased upward advection of the temperature minimum around the tropopause in 30°S–30°N may lead to reduction of warm temperature bias in the stratosphere which is significant in MIROC5. ~~from the tropopause to the stratopause is apparent in low latitudes of MIROC6. This upward wind transports the cold air in the temperature minimum around the tropopause in 30°S–30°N, which reduces the warm bias in the stratosphere.~~

Correspondingly, the stratospheric westerly bias in low latitudes of MIROC5 is also considerably alleviated in MIROC6. Note that the atmospheric O<sub>3</sub> concentration data used in MIROC5 is different from those in MIROC6, and the concentration in the stratosphere is higher than the data used in MIROC6. About 25% of the above-mentioned reduction in the stratospheric warm biases is explained by the smaller absorption of ~~short~~longwave radiation by O<sub>3</sub>. Note that the zonal-mean temperature bias in Fig. 7c is smaller when the climatological-mean temperature from 1980 to 2009 in a historical simulation are evaluated against observations because of the known stratospheric cooling with increased greenhouse gases and reduced O<sub>3</sub> concentrations.

The zonal-means of the air temperature and zonal wind in MIROC6 are also better simulated in the mid- and high latitudes. A pair of easterly and westerly biases in MIROC5, which is in the troposphere of the Northern Hemisphere, is associated with a weaker mid-latitude westerly jet and its southward shift with respect to observations. The pair of the biases is reduced in MIROC6,

thereby suggesting that a strengthening and northward shift of the westerly jet occurs in MIROC6. Indeed, as shown in the upper panels of Fig. 10, the meridional contrast of high and low biases in the 500 hPa pressure level (Z500) along the wintertime westerly jet is weaker in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. The latitudes with the maximal meridional gradient of Z500 are located further northward in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, especially over the North Atlantic. Correspondingly, wintertime storm track activity (STA), which is defined as an 8-day-high-pass-filtered eddy meridional temperature flux at the 850 hPa pressure level, is stronger over the North Pacific and Atlantic in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 (see upper panels of Fig. 11) and is accompanied by an associated increase in precipitation, especially in the North Pacific (Figs. 8ce). In the stratosphere above the 10 hPa pressure level, the polar night jet is reasonably captured in MIROC6, although the westerly is somewhat overestimated in 30°N–60°N. Also, in the Southern Hemisphere, representation of the tropospheric westerly and the polar night jets are better in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, and the easterly bias centered at 60°S in the troposphere is clearly reduced in MIROC6. Although causality is unclear, the warm air temperature bias above the tropopause to the south of 60°S is smaller in MIROC6 than in MIROC5.

The enhanced wintertime STA in MIROC6 leads to a strengthening of the Ferrel circulation in the Northern Hemisphere and a broadening of its meridional width. As shown in Fig. 9, the northern edge of the Ferrel cell is located further northward in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Because the Ferrel cell is a thermally indirect circulation driven primarily by eddy temperature and momentum fluxes, the stronger STA in MIROC6 possibly causes the Ferrel cell differences between the two models. Associated with the northward extension of the Ferrel cell, the upward wind between the Ferrel cell and the polar cell centered at 65°N is stronger in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 and the meridional width of the polar cell is smaller. Also, in the Southern Hemisphere, the upward wind around 60°S at the southern edge of the Ferrel cell is stronger in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Correspondingly, high sea level pressure (SLP) biases in polar region in MIROC5 are significantly reduced in MIROC6 (figures



are omitted) and RMS errors with respect to observations (ERA-I) are decreased by 30 %. Meanwhile, in the stratosphere, anti-clockwise (clockwise) circulations to the north (south) of 50°N (S) are stronger and extends further upward in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. These circulations seem to continue from the troposphere into the stratosphere, thereby implying that more active troposphere-stratosphere interactions associated with wave-coupling exist in MIROC6. Further details will be described later, focusing on the occurrence of the sudden stratospheric warmings.

Parameterizations of SSNOWD (Liston, 2004; Nitta et al., 2014) and a wetland due to snow-melting water have been newly implemented into MIROC6 (Nitta et al., 2017). In comparison of MIROC6 with MIROC5, it can be seen that the former parameterization brings about significant ~~remarkable~~ improvement in the Northern Hemisphere snow cover fractions from the early to the late winter (Fig. 12). Compared with observations of the Northern Hemisphere EASE-Grid 2.0 (Brodzik and Armstrong, 2013; the data are available at <https://nsidc.org/data/ease/>), the distribution of the snow cover fractions is more realistic in MIROC6 than MIROC5, especially where and when the snow water equivalent is relatively small (e.g., mid- and high latitudes in November, over Siberia in February). Note that no clear improvement is found in May. This is because the newly implemented SSNOWD represents hysteresis in the snow water equivalent-snow cover fraction relationship in both the accumulation and ablation seasons. MIROC6 underestimates the snow cover fraction in the partially snow-covered regions and overestimates it on the Tibetan plateau and in some parts of China. We note that meteorological (e.g., precipitation or temperature) phenomena might affect these biases, but further investigation will be necessary to identify their causes. Nevertheless, in spite of those discrepancies, it can be said that the seasonal changes of the snow cover fraction are better simulated in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 (Fig. 12j).

### 3.1.2 Ocean

Next, we evaluate the climatological fields of the ocean hydrographic structure, meridional overturning circulations (MOCs), and sea-ice distribution. The zonal-mean potential temperature and salinity are displayed in Figs. 13 and 14, respectively. Both MIROC6 and MIROC5 capture the general features of the observed climatological hydrography (ProjD; Ishii et al., 2003). ~~However, in the deep and bottom layers to the south of 60°S, into which cold and dense water forms due to intense surface cooling around Antarctica sinks,~~ the potential temperatures in the deep and bottom layers to the south of 60°S in the two models are warmer than observations because of ~~in the two models are warmer than observations~~ insufficient formation and sinking of cold and dense water due to intense surface cooling around Antarctica (Figs. 13a-c and 14a-c). Such warm temperature bias associated with deep water formation is also found in northern high latitudes of the Atlantic sector (Figs. 13a-c). ~~-(Figs. 13a-e and 14a-e), as are the potential temperatures in northern high latitudes of the Atlantic sector (Figs. 13a-e).~~ By horizontal advection of the warm temperature biases associated with the Pacific and Atlantic MOCs, the model temperatures in deep layers apart other from ~~than~~ polar regions are also warmer than in observations. The warm potential temperature bias in ~~In general,~~ the deep layer is worse in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 in both of the Atlantic and Pacific sectors and the warm bias influences the subsurface and the intermediate layers above the 3000 m depth, which might be attributed to the excess ocean heat uptake and longer integration time in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 (the spinup duration of MIROC6 is 2000 years and that of MIROC5 is about 1000 years, respectively). Also the low salinity bias below the 2000 m depth is worse in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, especially in the Pacific sector (Figs. 14ef). This worsening can be explained the excess supply of the freshwater in the Southern Ocean and weaker northward intrusion of the less saline water in MIROC6. ~~water distribution in MIROC6 remains the same as in MIROC5.~~

~~Meanwhile, the northward intrusion of Antarctic Intermediate Water in the Southern Hemisphere around the 1000-m depth is better simulated in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, especially in~~

~~the Pacific sector (Figs. 13a-e).~~ In the Arctic Ocean, the halocline above the upper 500 m depth is sharper and more realistic in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 and the high salinity bias below the 500 m depth in MIROC5 is alleviated in MIROC6 (Figs. 13ef) because, as described in Section 2.3, there are many more vertical levels in the surface and subsurface layers of MIROC6. In addition, vertical diffusivity in the Arctic Ocean is set to smaller values in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, and the turbulent kinetic energy input induced by surface wave breaking, as a function of the sea-ice concentration in each grid cell, is reduced in MIROC6, as shown in Komuro (2014). ~~These differences in the ocean model configuration are considered likely to contribute to the improved oceanic structures in the surface and intermediate layers.~~ In the North Pacific, the southward intrusion of North Pacific Intermediate Water (NPIW) around the 1000 m depth retreats northward in MIROC6. Strong tide-induced vertical mixing of sea water is observed along the Kuril Islands (e.g., Katsumata et al., 2004). The locally enhanced tide-induced mixing is known to reinforce the southward intrusion of the Oyashio and associated water mass transport from the subarctic to subtropical North Pacific, and to feed the salinity minimum of NPIW (Nakamura et al., 2004; Tatebe and Yasuda, 2004). Hence, ~~in situations where enhanced tidal mixing is considered,~~ NPIW reproducibility is better in MIROC5 where enhanced tidal mixing is considered than in MIROC6. Because we encountered significant uncertainty in implementing the tidal mixing, ~~and~~ we decided to quit implementing it in developing phase of MIROC6, at the expense of NPIW reproducibility.

The annual-mean potential temperature and zonal currents along the equator in MIROC6 are better simulated in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 (Fig. 15). Relatively cold water below the equatorial thermocline is upwelled ~~rises~~ in MIROC6, especially in the eastern tropical Pacific, which leads to a strengthening of the vertical temperature gradient across the thermocline. The eastward speed of the Equatorial Undercurrent in MIROC6 is over  $80 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$ , and is closer to the products of Simple Ocean Data Assimilation (SODA; Carton and Giese, 2008; the data are available at

[http://www.atmos.umd.edu/~lchen/SODA3.3\\_Description.html](http://www.atmos.umd.edu/~lchen/SODA3.3_Description.html)) than in MIROC5. These improvements are mainly attributed to the higher vertical resolution of MIROC6 in the surface and subsurface layers. However, the thermocline depths in the western tropical Pacific are still larger in the models than in observations and are attributed. ~~This is due~~ to the stronger trade winds in the models. When both of MIROC6 and MIROC5 are executed as stand-alone AGCMs with the prescribed SST obtained from observations, the overestimate of the equatorial trade winds also appears due to overestimate of the upward winds over the maritime continent associated with deep cumulus convection and the resultant strengthening of the Walker circulation over the equatorial Pacific. ~~which is a deficiency that also appears in stand-alone AGCM experiments. Hence, b~~ Better parameterizing deep cumulus convection ~~representation of cloud physics~~ in the models ~~could~~ may be required for better representation of the equatorial trade winds and thus oceanic states. ~~in the future.~~

Figure 16 displays annual-mean [YK1]Atlantic and Pacific MOCs. In the Atlantic, two deep circulation cells associated with North Atlantic Deep Water (NADW; upper cell) and Antarctic Bottom Water (AABW, lower cell) are found in both of the models. NADW transport across 26.5°N is 17.2 (17.6) Sv ( $1 \text{ Sv} = 10^6 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) in MIROC6 (MIROC5). These values are consistent with the observational estimate of 17.2 Sv (McCarthy et al., 2015). RMS amplitudes of NADW transport are about 0.9 Sv in MIROC6 and 1.1 Sv in MIROC5 on longer-than-interannual timescales, respectively. These are smaller than the observed amplitude of 1.6 Sv in 2005–2014. Because observations include the weakening trend of the Atlantic MOC due to the global warming, they can be larger than the model variability under the preindustrial conditions. In the Pacific Ocean, both the models have the deep circulation associated with Circumpolar Deep Water (CDW), but the northward transport of CDW across 10°S is 8.6 Sv in MIROC6, which is slightly larger than 7.5 Sv of MIROC5. Although these models values are somewhat smaller than observations, they are within the uncertainty range of observations (Talley et al., 2003; Kawabe and Fujio, 2010).

Northern Hemisphere sea-ice concentrations are shown in Fig. 17. Here, it can be seen that both the March and September sea-ice distributions in MIROC6 resemble ~~to~~ the satellite-based observation (SSM/I; Cavarieli et al., 1991; the data are available at <https://nsidc.org/>). In general, the spatial patterns of the models resemble the observations. Sea-ice areas in March (September) are 12.4 (6.1), 13.0 (6.9), and 14.9 (5.7) Million km<sup>2</sup> in MIROC6, MIROC5, and observations, respectively. The model estimates are smaller (larger) in March (September) than in observations. The underestimate in March is still found in MIROC6 and is attributed to the underestimate of sea-ice area in the Sea of Okhotsk and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, even though the sea-ice area in the former region is better simulated in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Meanwhile, the eastward retreat of the sea-ice in the Barents Sea is better represented in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. The overestimates in September in the models are due to that the model climatology is defined under the pre-industrial conditions while observations are taken in present-day conditions of 1980–2009, where a rapid decreasing trend of summertime sea-ice area (including a few events of drastic decreases) is on-going (e.g., Comiso et al., 2008). Note that the model September sea-ice area in 1980–2009 of historical simulations is smaller than the observations and the sea-ice area does not show year-to-year drastic sea-ice decrease with comparable amplitude with observations. The underestimate of the mean September sea-ice area in MIROC6 might be attributed to slightly rapid warming of the Arctic climate in MIROC6 than in observations. On the other hand, the modeled sea-ice areas in the Southern Ocean are unrealistically smaller than in observations. Southern Hemisphere sea-ice areas in March (September) are 0.1 (3.4), 0.2 (5.2), and 5.0 (18.4) Million km<sup>2</sup> in MIROC6, MIROC5, and observations, respectively. Since there are no ~~significant~~~~remarkable~~ differences between the two models, the spatial maps for the sea-ice area in the southern hemisphere are omitted.

Figure 18 shows the global maps of annual-mean sea level height relative to the geoid. The absolute dynamic height data provided by Archiving, Validation, and Interpretation of Satellite

Oceanographic (AVISO; Rio et al. 2014) data are used as observed sea level height (the data are available at <https://www.aviso.altimetry.fr/en/home.html>). ~~Although~~ Overall oceanic gyre structures in the two models are consistent with observations. Although representation of the gyres in MIROC6 remain generally the same as in MIROC5, there are a few improvements in the North Pacific and the North Atlantic. The mid-latitude westerly in MIROC6 is stronger and is shifted further northward than in MIROC5 (Fig. 10), which results in the strengthening of the subtropical gyres, northward shifts of the western boundary currents, and their extensions. In particular, the current speed of the Gulf Stream and the North Atlantic Current are faster in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, and the contours emanating from the North Atlantic reach the Barents Sea in MIROC6. A corresponding increase in warm water transport from the North Atlantic to the Barents Sea leads to sea-ice melting and an eastward retreat of the wintertime sea-ice there in MIROC6 (Figs. 17a-c). An remarkable improvement in MIROC6 is also found in the Subtropical Countercurrent (STCC) in the North Pacific along 20°N. As reported in Kubokawa and Inui (1999), the low potential vorticity water associated with a wintertime mixed layer deepening in the western boundary current region is transported southward in the subsurface layer and it pushes up isopycnal surfaces around 25°N. Thus, the eastward-flowing STCC is induced around 25°N. Although both of the models show the wintertime mixed layer deepening, the ocean stratification along 160°E is weaker in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 (not shown). This suggests that the isopycnal advection of low potential vorticity water in MIROC6 is more realistic than in MIROC5.

### 3.1.3 Discussions on model climatological biases

We have evaluated the simulated climatology in MIROC6 in comparison with MIROC5 and observations. The model climatology in MIROC6 shows certain improvements in simulating radiations, atmospheric and oceanic circulations, and the snow cover fractions in the Northern

Hemisphere. ~~land surface variables.~~ In Fig. 19, we display the model biases in annual-mean SAT and SST (Fig. 19) because these are typical variables that reflect errors in individual processes in the climate system. The global-mean of SAT (SST) is 15.2 (18.1) °C in MIROC6, 14.6 (18.0) °C in MIROC5, and 14.4 (18.1) °C in observations. The modeled global-mean SATs and SSTs are generally consistent with observations. However, since the observed (model) value is estimated in the present-day (preindustrial) condition, the model global-mean SATs and SSTs are overestimated. Here, it should be noted that while the spatial patterns of the SAT and SST biases in MIROC6 resemble those in MIROC5, there are several improvements. For example, cold SAT bias in MIROC5 extending from the Barents Sea to Eurasia is significantly smaller in MIROC6, possibly owing to the increase in warm water transport by the North Atlantic Current and the resultant eastward retreat of the sea ice in the Barents Sea (Figs. 17 and 18). Warm SAT and SST biases along the west coast of the North America are smaller in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. The reason is that an ~~thereby suggesting that the strengthening of the mid-latitude westerly jet (Fig. 10) and the associated strengthening of the Aleutian low~~ increase of southeastward Ekman transport in the eastern subarctic North Pacific due to the strengthening of the mid-latitude westerly jet (Fig. 10) and the Aleutian low tend to cancel out the relatively warm water supply from the subtropics to the subarctic region by the surface geostrophic current. ~~lead to increase in southward transport of relatively cold water in the subarctic region.~~ Although it is not clear from Fig. 19, the SAT and SST in the subtropical North Pacific around 20°N are warmer by 2 K in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Also in the Atlantic, the SAT in the western tropics is warmer in MIROC6. These warmer surface temperatures in MIROC6 indicates a reduction of the cold SAT and SST biases that can be alleviated by an increase in the downward OSR in MIROC6 due to the implementation of a shallow convective parameterization (Fig. 4), and by an increase in eastward transport of the warm pool temperature associated with the stronger STCC in MIROC6 (Fig. 18).

On the other hand, the warm SAT and SST biases in the Southern Ocean and the warm SAT bias in Middle East and the Mediterranean are worse in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Consequently, the RMS error in SAT is larger in MIROC6 (2.4 K) than in MIROC5 (2.2 K). The former is due essentially to the underestimate of mid-level cloud covers, excess downward OSR, and the resultant underestimate of the sea ice in the Southern Ocean. Such bias commonly occurs in many of climate models and is normally attributed to errors in cloud radiative processes (e.g., Bodas-Salcedo et al., 2012; Williams et al., 2013). In addition, poor representations of mixed layer depths and open ocean deep convections due to the lack of mesoscale processes in the Antarctic Circumpolar Current are causes of the warm bias (Olbers et al., 2004; Downes and Hogg, 2013). The latter warm bias, seen in Middle East around the Mediterranean, can be explained by a tendency to underestimate the radiative forcing cooling effects of aerosol-radiation interactions due to underestimate of dust emissions from the Sahara Desert in MIROC6 (not shown).

### 3.2 Internal climate variations

#### 3.2.1 Madden-Julian oscillation and East Asian Monsoon

In this section, we will evaluate the reproducibility of internal climate variations in MIROC6 in comparison with MIROC5 and observations, beginning with an examination of the equatorial waves in the atmosphere. Zonal wavenumber–frequency power spectra normalized by background spectra for the symmetric and antisymmetric components of OLR are calculated following Wheeler and Kiladis (1999) and are shown in Fig. 20. The daily-mean OLR data derived from the Advanced Very High-Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) satellites (Liebmann and Smith, 1996; the data are available at [https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/data/gridded/data.interp\\_OLR.html](https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/data/gridded/data.interp_OLR.html)) are used for observational references. The signals corresponding to the Madden-Julian oscillation (MJO), equatorial Kelvin (EK),



~~and equatorial~~ Rossby ~~waves~~ (ER), eastward inertia-gravity (n=1 EIG), and westward inertia-gravity (WIG) waves in the symmetric component and mixed Rossby-gravity (MRG) and eastward inertia-gravity (n=0 EIG) waves in the antisymmetric component stand out from the background spectra in observations. MIROC5 qualitatively reproduces these spectral maxima of the symmetric MJO, EK, and ER qualitatively, while the amplitudes of the MJO and the EK are underestimated. These underestimates are partially mitigated in MIROC6. The power summed over the eastward wavenumber 1–3 and periods of 30–60 days corresponding to the MJO are 20% larger in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Furthermore, some additional analyses indicate that many aspects of the MJO, including its eastward propagation over the western tropical Pacific, are improved in MIROC6. Those improvements are primarily associated with the implementation of the shallow convective scheme that moistens the lower troposphere. The results of these additional analyses, along with ~~and~~ some sensitivity experiments, are described in a separate paper (Hirota et al., 2018). The EIG and WIG in the symmetric component and the MRG and the EIG in the antisymmetric component are missing in both MIROC6 and MIROC5.

Figure 21 shows the June–August (JJA) climatology of precipitation and circulations in the East Asia. As shown in observations (ERA-I; Fig. 21a), the East Asian summer monsoon (EASM) is characterized by the monsoon low over the warmer Eurasian continent and the subtropical high over the colder Pacific Ocean (e.g., Ninomiya and Akiyama, 1992). The southwesterly between these pressure systems transports moist air to the mid-latitudes forming a rainband called *Baiu* in Japanese. The general circulation pattern of the EASM and the rainband are well simulated in both MIROC6 and MIROC5. It should be noted that one of major deficiencies in MIROC5, the underestimate of the precipitation around the Philippines, has been largely alleviated in MIROC6. This improvement is, again, associated with the moistening of the lower troposphere by shallow convective processes. Interannual EASM variabilities are examined using an empirical orthogonal function (EOF) analysis

of vorticity at the 850 hPa pressure level over [100°E–150°E, 0°N–60°N] following Kosaka and Nakamura (2010). The regressions of precipitation and 850hPa vorticity with respect to the time series of the first mode (EOF1) are shown in the lower panels of Fig. 21. In observations, precipitation and vorticity anomalies show a tripolar pattern with centers located around the Philippines, Japan, and the Sea of Okhotsk (Hirota and Takahashi, 2012). The anomalies around the Philippines and Japan correspond to the so-called Pacific-Japan pattern (Nitta et al., 1987). ~~In MIROC6,~~ The southwest-northeast orientation of the wave-like anomalies is better simulated in MIROC6 than in MIROC5.

Figure 22 shows the wintertime (December–February) climatology of circulations and the STA in the East Asia. The East Asian winter monsoon (EAWM) is characterized by northwesterly between the Siberian high and the Aleutian low in observations (ERA-I; e.g. Zhang et al., 1997). The monsoon northwesterly advects cold air to East Asia, enhancing the meridional temperature gradients and strengthening the subtropical jet around Japan. The jet’s strength influences synoptic wave activities in the storm track. MIROC5 captures the circulation pattern, but significantly underestimates the STA. The STA in MIROC6 is better simulated than in MIROC5, but it is still smaller than in observations. Interannual variability of the EAWM is also better represented in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. The dominant variability of the monsoon northwesterly is extracted as the EOF1 of the meridional wind at the 850 hPa pressure level over the region [30°N–60°N, 120°E–150°E]. In observations, the regressions with respect to the time series of the EOF1 show stronger northwesterly accompanied with suppressed STA, which is consistent with previous studies (Fig. 22d; e.g., Nakamura, 1992). This relationship between the circulations and the STA can be found in MIROC6 but not in MIROC5 (Figs. 22e, f). The explained variance of the EOF1 is 46.0% in observations, 37.1% in MIROC5, and 47.1% in MIROC6, suggesting that the amplitude of this variability in MIROC6 is consistent with ~~has become closer to~~ observations.

### 3.2.2 Stratospheric circulations

A few of the major changes in the model setting from MIROC5 to MIROC6 are higher vertical resolution and higher model top altitude in MIROC6, namely, representation of the stratospheric circulations. Here, we examine representation of the Quasi-Biennial Oscillations (QBOs) in MIROC6. Figure 23 shows the time-height cross-sections of the monthly mean, zonal-mean zonal wind over the equator for observations (ERA-I) and MIROC6. In this figure, an obvious QBO with mean period of approximately 22 months can be seen in MIROC6. The mean period is slightly shorter than that of ~28 months in observations, and the simulated QBO period varies slightly from cycle to cycle. The maximum speed of the easterly at the 20 hPa pressure level is approximately  $-25 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  in MIROC6 and that of the westerly is  $15 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ . On the other hand, the observed maximum wind speeds are  $-35 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  for the easterly and  $20 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  westerly, respectively. The simulated QBO has somewhat weaker amplitude in MIROC6 than observations, but the same east-west phase asymmetry. The QBO in the MIROC6 shifts upward compared with that in observations, and the simulated amplitude is larger above the 5 hPa pressure level and smaller in the lower stratosphere. The simulated downward propagation of the westerly shear zones of zonal wind ( $\partial \bar{u} / \partial z > 0$ , where  $z$  is the altitude) is faster than the downward propagation of easterly shear zones ( $\partial \bar{u} / \partial z < 0$ ), which agrees with observations. The QBOs in MIROC6 are qualitatively similar to that represented in the MIROC-ESM, which is an Earth system model with a similar vertical resolution that participated in the CMIP5 (Watanabe et al., 2011). Note that nothing resembling a realistic QBO was simulated in the previous low-top version MIROC5, which only has a few vertical layers in the stratosphere.

Recently, Yoo and Son (2016) found that the observed MJO amplitude in the boreal winter is stronger than normal during the QBO easterly phase at the 50 hPa pressure level. They also showed that the QBO exerted greater influence on the MJO than did ENSO. Marshall et al. (2016) pointed out the improvement in forecast skill during the easterly phase of the QBO and indicated that the QBO

could be a potential source of the MJO predictability. MIROC6 successfully simulates both the MJO and QBO in a way ~~that~~ consistent with observations, as mentioned above, but correlations between the QBO and MJO are ~~insignificant~~~~not clear~~. One possible reason is smaller amplitude of the simulated QBO in the lowermost stratosphere. The QBO contribution to tropical temperature variation at the 100 hPa pressure level is  $\sim 0.1$  K in the MIROC6, which is much smaller than the observed value of  $\sim 0.5$  K (Randel et al., 2000). The simulated QBO has little effects on static stability and vertical wind shear in the tropical upper troposphere.

MIROC6 can also simulate Sudden Stratospheric Warming (SSW), which is a typical intra-seasonal variability ~~of in~~ the mid-latitude stratosphere in the Northern Hemisphere. ~~Figure 24 shows~~ ~~the~~ standard deviation of monthly and zonal-mean zonal wind (colors) superimposed on monthly climatology of zonal-mean zonal wind (black contours) in February ~~are shown in Fig. 24 (a)-(c).~~ There are two maxima of the standard deviations over the equatorial stratosphere and the mid-to-high latitude upper stratosphere in the Northern Hemisphere in observations (Fig. 24a), which correspond to QBO and polar vortex variability. This feature is well captured in MIROC6 (Fig. 24b), while there are too small variations in MIROC5 where the stratosphere cannot be well resolved (Fig. 24c). Here, ~~a prominent variation is observed over the equatorial stratosphere and the extratropical upper stratosphere. These two maxima, which correspond to QBO and polar vortex variability, respectively, are well captured in MIROC6. Although MIROC6 still has biases for magnitude and structure, no variation with a realistic magnitude appears when the stratosphere is not well resolved (Fig. 24c).~~ The better representation ~~improvement in the simulation~~ of the polar vortex variability in MIROC6 is closely ~~related~~ associated with ~~to~~ that of the SSW. As shown in the bottom ~~lower~~ panels of Fig. 24, abrupt and short-lived warming events associated with SSW are detected in MIROC6, which are reproduced comparably to observations in terms of magnitude, but are not detected in MIROC5. This is consistent with previous modeling studies that reported the importance of the ~~a~~ well-resolved

stratosphere for better simulation of stratospheric variability (e.g., Cagnazzo and Manzini, 2009; Charlton-Perez et al., 2013; Osprey et al., 2013). ~~In December–January, however, On the other hand,~~ MIROC6 ~~still tends to~~ underestimates the frequency of SSW events ~~in December and January,~~ which is a common bias ~~found in common with~~ other high-top climate models (e.g., Inatsu et al., 2007; Charlton-Perez et al., 2013; Osprey et al., 2013). It is conjectured that the less frequent SSW in December–January could be attributed to less frequent stationary wave breakings due to overestimate of climatological zonal wind speed of the polar night jet in MIROC6 (Figs. 24d and e). ~~It is conjectured that less frequent stationary wave breaking due to overestimate of climatological wind speeds associated with the polar night jet (Fig. 7e) have the effect to reducing the SSW frequency in December and January.~~

The inclusion of a well-resolved stratosphere in MIROC6 is also considered to be important for improvement in representation of stratosphere-troposphere coupling. In order to evaluate this, we examine the time-development of the Northern Annular Modes (NAM) associated with strongly weakened polar vortex events in the stratosphere. The NAM indices are defined by the first EOF mode of the zonal-mean year-round daily geopotential height anomalies over the Northern Hemisphere and are computed separately at each pressure level (Baldwin and Thompson, 2009). The height anomalies are first filtered by a 10-day low-pass filter to remove transient eddies. Figure 25 shows the composite of time development of the NAM index for weak polar vortex events. The events are determined by the dates on which the 10 hPa NAM index exceeded -3.0 standard deviations (Baldwin and Dunkerton, 2001). Note that the NAM index is multiplied by the square root of the eigenvalue in each level before the composite, that is, the composite having the geopotential height dimension. The weak polar vortex signal in the stratosphere propagates downward to the surface and persists approximately 60 days in the lower stratosphere and upper troposphere. These observational features are well represented in MIROC6 (Figs. 25ab). Although MIROC5 has also captured

downward propagating signals, its magnitude is approximately half in the stratosphere, and its persistency is weak in the lower stratosphere and upper troposphere. Therefore, these results strongly indicate that the inclusion of a well-resolved stratosphere in a model is important for representing not only stratospheric variability, but also stratosphere-troposphere coupling.

### 3.2.3 El Niño/Southern Oscillation and Indian Ocean Dipole mode

Among the various internal climate variabilities on interannual timescales, ENSO is of great importance because it can influence climate not only in tropics but also mid- and high latitudes of both hemispheres through atmospheric teleconnections associated with wave propagations (e.g., Hoskins and Karoly, 1981; Alexander et al., 2002). Here, we describe representation of ENSO and related teleconnection pattern. Figure 26 shows anomalies of SST, precipitation, the 500 hPa pressure height, and the equatorial ocean temperature regressed onto the NINO3 index which is defined as the area average of the SST in [5°S–5°N, 150°W–90°W]. ProjD and ERA-I in 1980–2009 are used as observations. Although the maximum of the SST anomalies in the tropical Pacific is shifted more westward than in observations, the ENSO-related SST anomalies simulated in both of MIROC6 and MIROC5 are globally consistent with observations (Figs. 26a-c). Simulated positive precipitation anomalies in MIROC6 still overextend to the western Pacific (Figs. 26d-f). Meanwhile, dry anomalies over the maritime continent, the eastern equatorial Indian Ocean, and ~~the SPCZ~~  
~~South-Pacific Convergence Zone (SPCZ)~~ are better simulated in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. ENSO teleconnection patterns in Z500 (Figs. 26g-i) are also realistically simulated as seen in, for example, the Pacific-North American pattern (Wallace and Gutzler, 1981). Equatorial subsurface ocean temperature anomalies in MIROC6 are more confined within the thermocline than in MIROC5 (Figs. 26j-l), and the signals in MIROC6 are closer to observations. However, the subsurface signals in MIROC6 reside deeper than in observations. ~~However, the existence depths of the subsurface signals are larger in MIROC6 than in~~

978 ~~observations~~. This is due to the difference in the climatological structure of the equatorial thermocline,  
979 which is attributed to the overestimate of the trade winds over the equatorial Pacific, as mentioned in  
980 Section 3.1.2.

981 As well as ENSO, the Indian Ocean Dipole (IOD) mode is recognized as a prominent  
982 interannual variability (Saji et al., 1999; Webster et al., 1999). Figure 27 shows anomalies of SST, 10  
983 m wind, and precipitation regressed onto the autumn (September–November) dipole mode index  
984 (DMI) which is defined as the zonal difference of the anomalous SST averaged over  $[10^{\circ}\text{S}–10^{\circ}\text{N},$   
985  $50^{\circ}\text{E}–70^{\circ}\text{E}]$  and that averaged in  $[10^{\circ}\text{S}–10^{\circ}\text{N}, 90^{\circ}\text{E}–110^{\circ}\text{E}]$ . ProjD and ERA-I in 1980–2009 are used  
986 as observations. The observed positive IOD phase is characterized by a basin-wide zonal mode with  
987 positive (negative) SST anomalies in the western (eastern) Indian Ocean, and precipitation is increased  
988 (decreased) over the positive (negative) SST anomalies (Figs. 27ad). The dipole SST pattern is better  
989 simulated in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 where the eastern SST anomalies are located more southward  
990 than in observations (Figs. 27a-c). Correspondingly, a meridional dipole pattern in the precipitation of  
991 MIROC5 is alleviated, and MIROC6 shows a zonal dipole precipitation pattern, as in observations  
992 (Figs. 27d-f). Seasonal IOD phase locking to boreal autumn, which is assessed based on RMS  
993 amplitude of the DMI, is also better simulated in MIROC6 than in MIROC5 (not shown). Seasonal  
994 shoaling of the eastern equatorial thermocline in the Indian Ocean is realistically simulated in  
995 MIROC6 during boreal summer to autumn. The shallower thermocline leads the stronger thermocline  
996 feedback which is evaluated based on the SST anomalies regressed onto the  $20^{\circ}\text{C}$  isotherm depth  
997 anomalies averaged over the eastern part of the IOD region. As displayed in the top of the upper panels  
998 of Fig. 27, the thermocline feedback in MIROC6 is comparable to observations. This larger  
999 thermocline feedback in MIROC6 possibly leads to the above-mentioned improvements in the IOD  
1000 pattern. Note that the simulated surface wind anomalies are more realistic in MIROC6 than in  
1001 MIROC5, although the magnitude of SST anomalies is overestimated in MIROC6. The overestimate

of the SST anomalies may have arisen from an excessive response of the equatorial and coastal Ekman up- and down-welling to the wind changes, which are favorable in coarse-resolution ocean models.

### 3.2.4 Decadal-scale variations in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans

On longer-than-interannual timescales, the PDO (Mantua et al., 1997) or the Interdecadal Pacific Oscillations (IPO; Power et al., 1999) is known to be a dominant climate mode that is detected in the SST and the SLP over the North Pacific. To examine simulated PDO patterns, monthly SST and wintertime (December–February) SLP anomalies are regressed onto the PDO index defined as the 1st EOF mode of the North Pacific SST to the north of 20°N and are shown in Fig. 28. In order to detect the decadal-scale variation, the COBE-SST2/SLP2 data (Hirahara et al., 2014) from 1900 to 2013 are used as observations. Negative SST anomalies in the western and central North Pacific and positive SST anomalies in the eastern North Pacific are found in observations. These signals are also represented in both of MIROC6 and MIROC5. The regression of SLP anomalies corresponding to the deepening of the Aleutian low are well simulated in the models over the subarctic North Pacific, and it can be seen that the amplitudes of the SLP anomalies are larger in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, which is closer to the observation ~~and better represented in MIROC6 than in MIROC5~~. In the tropical Pacific, positive SST anomalies, which are among the more important driving processes of the PDO (e.g. Alexander et al., 2002), are seen in both the models and the observations. In MIROC5, the 5-yr running means of the wintertime (November–March) North Pacific Index (NPI), defined as the SLP averaged over [30°N–65°N, 160°E–140°W], are ~~excessively~~ less sensitive to the NINO3 index (correlation coefficient  $r = -0.37$ ) than to the NINO4 index ( $r = -0.64$ ). Note that the NINO4 index is defined as the area average of the SST in [5°S–5°N, 160°E–150°W]. The distorted response of the extratropical atmosphere to the tropical SST variations works to unsuitably modify the extratropical ocean and plays a major role in limiting the decadal predictability of the PDO index in MIROC5 (Mochizuki et al.,



2014). In contrast, those in MIROC6 are well correlated with the NINO3 index ( $r = -0.61$ ) in addition to the NINO4 index ( $r = -0.62$ ). Overestimate of the tropical signals of MIROC5 in the western tropical Pacific are also alleviated in MIROC6. The above-mentioned PDO improvement and the linkage between the tropics and the mid-latitude North Pacific imply a potential for improved skills in initialized decadal climate predictions.

In the Atlantic Ocean, there is another decadal-scale variability, which is called the AMO (Schlesinger and Ramankutty, 2004). Figure 29 shows anomalies of SST and SLP regressed onto the AMO index, which is defined as the area average of the SST anomalies in the North Atlantic [ $0^{\circ}$ – $60^{\circ}$ N,  $0^{\circ}$ – $80^{\circ}$ W] with the global-mean SST anomalies subtracted (Trenberth and Shea, 2006). As in the PDO, the centennial-long data of the COBE-SST2/SLP2 data in 1900–2013 are used as observations. The observed AMO spatial pattern in its positive phase is characterized by positive SST anomalies in the off-equator and the subarctic North Atlantic, and by negative or weakly-positive SST anomalies in the western subtropical North Atlantic (Fig. 29a). Corresponding to negative (positive) SLP anomalies over the subtropical (subarctic) North Atlantic, the mid-latitude westerly jet is weaker in a positive AMO phase than in normal years. These spatial patterns in the SST and SLP are simulated in both of MIROC6 and MIROC5. It is especially noteworthy that the positive SST anomalies in low latitudes have larger amplitudes in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, and they extend to the South Atlantic as in observations (Figs. 29bc). On the other hand, the positive SST anomalies in the subarctic region are underestimated in MIROC6, which may be due to the smaller RMS amplitudes of NADW transport in MIROC6 (see Section 3.1).

### 3.3 Climate sensitivity

Following the regression method by Gregory et al. (2004) and Gregory and Webb (2008), we conducted abrupt CO<sub>2</sub> quadrupling experiments with MIROC6 and MIROC5 in order to evaluate

effective climate sensitivity (ECS), radiative forcing, and climate feedback. The CO<sub>2</sub> quadrupling experiments were initiated from the pre-industrial control runs. Data from the first 1250 years after the CO<sub>2</sub> increase were used for the analysis.

ECS, 2 × CO<sub>2</sub> radiative forcing, and climate feedback for MIROC6 are estimated to be 2.56 K, 3.87 Wm<sup>-2</sup>, and -1.54 Wm<sup>-2</sup>K<sup>-1</sup>, respectively (Fig. 30a and Table 2). The ECS, radiative forcing, and climate feedback in MIROC6 are lower, higher, and negatively larger than those of the CMIP5 multi-model ensemble means, although these estimates for MIROC6 are within the ensemble spread of the multi-models (Andrews et al., 2012). The ECS of MIROC6 is almost the same as MIROC5 because the decrease in radiative forcing is counterbalanced by the positive increase in climate feedback, although the change in climate feedback is small and not statistically significant. The decrease in radiative forcing of MIROC6 relative to MIROC5 is evident in the longwave and shortwave cloud components (LCRE and SCRE in Fig. 30b and Table 3). On the other hand, the clear-sky shortwave component (SWclr) increases in MIROC6 relative to MIROC5, which partially cancels the differences between the two models. The positive increase in climate feedback is pronounced in the SCRE, which is partially offset by the decrease in the clear sky longwave (LWclr) and SWclr (Fig. 30c and Table 3).

We now focus on the SCRE of the radiative forcing and climate feedback, which show the largest differences between the two models, and compare the geographical distribution (Fig. 31). The distribution is calculated by regressing the changes in SCRE caused by the CO<sub>2</sub> increase at each latitude-longitude grid box against the change in the global-mean SAT. There is a large difference in the geographical distribution between MIROC6 and MIROC5, with the former showing more pronounced zonal contrast in the tropical Pacific than the latter. The changes in the global mean from MIROC5 to MIROC6 (Figs. 30bc) are correlated with the changes in the western tropical Pacific, showing more negative radiative forcing and more positive climate feedback, which are

partially offset by the changes in the central tropical Pacific with opposite signs. Interestingly, the radiative forcing and climate feedback tend to show similar geographical patterns with opposite signs in each model.

#### 4. Summary and discussions

The sixth version of a climate model, MIROC6, was developed by a Japanese climate modeling community, aiming at contributing to the CMIP6 through deeper understanding of a wide range of climate science issues and seasonal-to-decadal climate predictions and future climate projections. The model configurations and basic performances in the pre-industrial control simulation have been described and evaluated in the present manuscript. Major changes from MIROC5, which was our official model for the CMIP5, to MIROC6 are mainly done in the atmospheric component. These include implementation of a parameterization of shallow convective processes, the higher model top and TOA, vertical resolution in the stratosphere. The ocean and land-surface components have been also updated in terms of the horizontal grid coordinate system and higher vertical resolution in the former, and parameterizations for sub-grid scale snow distribution and wet lands due to snow-melting water in the latter. Overall, the model climatology and internal climate variability of MIROC6, which are assessed in comparison with observations, are better simulated than in MIROC5.

Overestimate of low-level cloud amounts in low latitudes, which can be partly attributed to insufficient representation of shallow convective processes, are significantly alleviated in MIROC6. The free atmosphere becomes wetter and the precipitation over the western tropical Pacific becomes larger in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, primarily due to vertical mixing of the humid air in the planetary boundary layer with the dry air in the free troposphere. Shallow convections also contribute to better propagation characteristics of intra-seasonal variability associated with MJO in MIROC6, as well as East Asian summer monsoon variability on interannual timescales. In addition, QBO, which is absent

in MIROC5, appears in MIROC6 because of its better stratospheric resolution and non-orographic gravity wave drag parameterization.

Climatic mean and internal climate variability in the mid-latitudes are also remarkably improved in MIROC6. Together with enhanced activity of sub-weekly disturbances, the tropospheric westerly jets in MIROC6 are shifted more poleward and are stronger than in MIROC5, especially in the Northern Hemisphere. Overestimates in zonal wind speed of the polar night jet are reduced in MIROC6. These advanced representations lead to tighter interactions between the troposphere and the stratosphere in MIROC6. SSW events in the form of polar vortex destructions induced by upward momentum transfer from the troposphere to the stratosphere (e.g., Matsuno, 1971), are well captured in MIROC6. On interannual timescales, the improvement of the westerly jet results in better representations of the spatial wind pattern of the wintertime East Asian monsoon. Associated with changes in the large-scale atmospheric circulations, the western boundary currents in the oceans, the Kuroshio-Oyashio current system, the Gulf Stream, and their extensions are better simulated in MIROC6. The increase in warm water transport from the subtropical North Atlantic to the Barents Sea seems to melt the sea ice in the Barents Sea, and to alleviate the overestimate of the wintertime sea-ice area that is seen in that region in MIROC5. Another remarkable improvement in MIROC6 is found in the climatological snow cover fractions in the early winter over the Northern Hemisphere continents. In the Southern Hemisphere, however, the underestimate of mid-level clouds and the corresponding warm SAT bias, the underestimate of sea-ice area, and the overestimate of incoming shortwave radiation in the Southern Ocean, all of which are attributed to errors in cloud radiative and planetary boundary layer processes (e.g., Bodas-Salcedo et al., 2012; Williams et al., 2013), remains the same as in MIROC5.

Qualitatively, the linkage representations between the tropics and the mid-latitudes associated with ENSO in MIROC6 are mostly the same as in MIROC5, qualitatively. Meanwhile,

oceanic subsurface signals, which partly control ENSO characteristics, are more confined along the equatorial thermocline in MIROC6, which is consistent with observations. Regarding the PDO, tropical influence on the mid-latitudes is more dominant in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, suggesting improvements in decadal-scale atmospheric teleconnections in MIROC6.

The above descriptions are mainly on the Pacific internal climate variabilities. Regarding the Indian Ocean, the zonal dipole structures in the SST and precipitation associated with the interannual variability, known as the IOD, are better simulated in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, which has a bias of a false meridional precipitation pattern. In the Atlantic, the multi-decadal variability, known as the AMO, is represented in both of the models roughly consistent with observations, but their reproducibility shows both drawbacks and advantage. Signals associated with AMO in the subarctic (tropical) region are underestimated (~~overestimated~~) in MIROC6 (MIROC5).

As a metric for climate change induced by atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> increase, ~~one of important metrics for quantifying uncertainty in future climate projections~~, ECS is also estimated. Although the model configurations and performances are different between the models, the ECS is almost the same (2.5 K). However, looking at geographical distributions of radiative forcing and climate feedback, the amplitudes of shortwave cloud components are much larger in MIROC6 than in MIROC5. Since the larger negative (positive) radiative forcing and positive (negative) climate feedback in the western (central) tropical Pacific cancel each other, global-mean quantities in MIROC6 almost remain the same as in MIROC5. As a topic of future study, estimating radiative forcing and climate feedback with Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project-type experiments in order to check robustness of the present study would be desirable. Elucidating the impact of different geographical patterns of radiative forcing and climate feedback on the projected future climates would also be useful.

After conducting the pre-industrial control simulation and evaluating the model reproducibility of the mean climate and the internal climate variability, ensemble historical simulations

that were initiated from the pre-industrial simulations were executed using the historical forcing data recommended by the CMIP6 protocol. Figure 32 shows a time series of the global-mean SAT anomalies with respect to the 1961–1990 mean. There are 30 (5) ensemble members in the MIROC6 (MIROC5) historical simulations. Note that the MIROC5 historical simulations are executed using the forcing datasets of the CMIP5 protocol. As shown in Fig. 32, the simulated SAT variations in both of MIROC6 and MIROC5 follow observations (HadCRUTv4.4.0; Morice et al., 2012; the data are available at <https://crudata.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/temperature/>) on a centennial timescale. The temperature rises from the nineteenth century to the early twenty-first century are about 0.72 K in MIROC6, 0.85 K in MIROC5, and 0.82 K in observations, respectively. Focusing on the period from the 1940s to the 1960s, the SAT variations seem to be better simulated in MIROC6 than in MIROC5, which can be due to both of an update of the forcing datasets and the larger ensemble number in MIROC6. On the other hand, the warming trend during the first half of the twentieth century in the models is about half as large as in observations. Whether it can be attributed to internal climate variability (e.g., Thompson et al., 2014; Kosaka and Xie, 2016) or to an externally forced mode (e.g., Meehl et al., 2003; Nozawa et al., 2005) is still being debated. Interestingly, the so-called recent hiatus of the global warming (Easterling and Wehner, 2009) in the first decade of the twenty-first century is not reasonably simulated in both of MIROC6 and MIROC5. captured in MIROC6. The observed hiatus is considered to occur in association with a negative IPO phase as internal climate variations (e.g., Meehl et al., 2011; Watanabe et al., 2014). As external drivers of the hiatus, the increase in stratospheric water vapor and the weakening of solar activity are given as possible candidates, for example (e.g., Solomon et al., 2010; Kaufmann et al., 2011). Failure of simulating the hiatus in the models could be attributed to uncertainties in the historical forcing datasets or cancellation of internal climate variations of the IPO by ensemble-mean manipulation of the individual historical simulations. ~~while the simulated spatial pattern of the SAT trends in the first decade of the twenty-~~

~~first century does not have a negative IPO pattern (not shown). Considering that the ensemble mean of the individual simulations reflects only externally forced variations and that signals of internal climate variations have been roughly removed, the simulated hiatus in MIROC6 could be spurious and the SAT trend difference between MIROC6 and MIROC5 could be attributed to the difference in the forcing datasets.~~

As summarized above, the overall reproducibility of the mean climate and the internal variability in the latest version of our climate model, MIROC6, has progressed, as well as the historical warming trend of the climate system. During the first trial of the preindustrial simulation conducted just after the model configuration was frozen, however, the model reproducibility was not as good as seen in MIROC5. As described in Section 2.5, we intensively tuned the model by perturbing parameters associated with, especially, cumulus and shallow convections, and planetary boundary processes. In addition, before starting the historical simulations, we estimated and tuned the radiative forcing ~~cooling effects~~ due to aerosol-radiation and aerosol-cloud interactions by changing the parameters of cloud microphysics in order to ensure that the estimated radiative forcing ~~cooling~~ would be closer to the best-estimate of the IPCC-AR5 (IPCC, 2013). Without this parameter tuning, the simulated warming trend after the 1960s was 70% as large as seen in observations. This dependence of radiative forcing and reproducibility of the warming trend on cloud microphysics has also been reported in other climate models (Golaz et al., 2013). A recent comparison of cloud microphysical statistics between climate models and satellite-based observations has pointed out that "tuned" model parameters that were adjusted for adequate radiative forcing ~~cooling~~ and realistic SAT changes do not necessarily ensure cloud properties and rain/snow formations will be consistent with observations and implies the presence of error compensations in climate models (e.g., Suzuki et al., 2013; Michibata et al., 2016). Error compensations are found also in both of global and regional aspects. As described in Section 3.1, the global TOA radiation imbalance in MIROC6 is about  $-1.1 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ , which is in the

acceptable range of ~~consistent with  $-0.8 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  in~~ observations. However, when the TOA imbalance is examined in parts, cloud radiative components in the model contain non-negligible biases with respect to satellite-based observations. Regarding error compensations in the oceanic processes, for example, ~~Pacific Ocean,~~ the modeled northward transport of CDW, which ~~is about  $8.6 \text{ Sv}$  and is~~ within the uncertainty range of observations, is. ~~Although this transport is realistic, it is~~ maintained by spurious open ocean convections in the Southern Ocean, ~~which occur apart from the coastal region of Antarctica~~ and reach the sea floor, which often ~~that are artifacts~~ appear in coarse-resolution ocean models where oceanic mesoscale eddies and coastal bottom water formation cannot be represented (e.g., Olbers et al., 2004; Downes and Hogg, 2013).

There remain several key foci of ongoing model development efforts. These include process-oriented refinements of cloud microphysics and convective systems based on constraints from satellite data and feedbacks from cloud-resolving atmospheric models (e.g., Satoh et al., 2014), higher resolutions for representations of regional extremes, oceanic eddies and river floods, and parameterization of tide-induced micro-scale mixing of sea water. Improvement of computational efficiency, especially on massive parallel computing systems, is among the urgent issues for long-term and large ensemble simulations. ~~In terms of model architecture, giving each sub-module in a climate model greater independence for effective model development may be required.~~ These improvements can contribute to deeper understanding of the Earth's climate, reducing uncertainties in climate projections and predictions, and more precise evaluations of human influences on carbon-nitrogen cycles when applied to Earth system models.

*Code and data availability.* ~~Please contact the corresponding author if readers may want to validate the model configurations of MIROC6 and MIROC5 and to conduct replication experiments. The source codes and required input data will be provided by the modeling community where the author~~



*belongs. The model output from the CMIP6/CMIP5 pre-industrial control and historical simulations used in the present manuscript are distributed through the Earth System Grid Federation and are freely accessible. Details on ESGF are given on the CMIP Panel website (<https://www.wcrp-climate.org/wgcm-cmip>).*

~~*Source code of MIROC6 and MIROC5 associated with this study is available to those who conduct collaborative research with the model users under license from copyright holders. For further information on how to obtain the code, please contact the corresponding author. The data from the model simulations and observations used in the analyses are available from the corresponding author upon request.*~~

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

## **Acknowledgements**

This research is supported by the “Integrated Research Program for Advancing Climate Models (TOUGOU Program)” from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan. Model simulations were performed on the Earth Simulator at JAMSTEC and NEC SX-ACE at NIES. The authors are much indebted to Dr. Teruyuki Nishimura and Mr. Hiroaki Kanai for their long-term support in areas related to model developments and server administration. The authors also wish to express thanks to our anonymous reviewers for their suggestions and careful reading of the manuscript.

## **References**

Adcroft, A., Hill, C., and Marshall, J.: Representation of topography by shaved cells in a height

coordinate ocean model, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 125, 2293–2315, 1997.

Adler, R. F., Huffman, G. J., Chang, A., Ferraro, R., Xie, P., Janowiak, J., Rudolf, B., Schneider, U., Curtis, S., Bolvin, D., Gruber, A., Susskind, J., and Arkin, P.: The Version 2 Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) Monthly Precipitation Analysis (1979–Present), *J. Hydrometeor.*, 4, 1147–1167, 2003.

Alexander, M. A., Bladé, I., Newman, M., Lanzante, J. R., Lau, N.-C., and Scott, J. D.: The atmospheric bridge: The influence of ENSO teleconnections on air–sea interaction over the global oceans, *J. Clim.*, 15, 2205–2231, 2002.

Andrews, T., Foster, P., Boucher, O., Bellouin, N., and Jones, A.: Precipitation, radiative forcing and global temperature change. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 37, doi:10.1029/2010GL043991, 2010.

Andrews, T., Gregory, J. M., Webb, M. J., and Taylor, K. E.: Forcing, feedbacks and climate sensitivity in CMIP5 coupled atmosphere-ocean climate models, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39, L09712, doi:10.1029/2012GL051607, 2012.

Arakawa, A. and Konor, C. S.: Vertical differencing of the primitive equations based on the Charney-Phillips grid in hybrid  $\sigma$ -p vertical coordinates, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 124, 511–528, 1996.

Baldwin, M. P. and Dunkerton, T. J.: Stratospheric harbingers of anomalous weather regimes, *Science*, 294, 581–584, 2001.

Baldwin, M. P. and Thompson, D. W. J.: A critical comparison of stratosphere-troposphere coupling indices, *Quart. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.*, 135, 1661–1672, 2009.

Bamber, J. L. and Aspinall, W. P.: An expert judgement assessment of future sea level rise from the ice sheets, *Nature Clim. Change*, 3, 424–427, 2013.

Baran, A. J.: From the single-scattering properties of ice crystals to climate prediction: A way forward, *Atmospheric Res.*, 112, 45–69, 2012.

Bengtsson, L., Hodges, K. I., and Keenlyside, N.: Will extratropical storms intensify in a warmer

1266 climate? *J. Clim.*, 22, 2276-2301, 2009.

1267 Bitz, C., Holland, M., Weaver, A., and Eby, M.: Simulating the ice-thickness distribution in a coupled  
1268 climate model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 2441–2463, 2001.

1269 Bryan, K.: Accelerating the convergence to equilibrium of ocean-climate models, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*,  
1270 14, 666-673.

1271 Brodzik, M. and Armstrong, R.: Northern Hemisphere EASE-Grid 2.0 Weekly Snow Cover and Sea  
1272 Ice Extent. Version 4, Boulder, Colorado USA: NASA DAAC at the National Snow and Ice Data  
1273 Center, 2013.

1274 Cagnazzo, C. and Manzini, E.: Impact of the stratosphere on the winter tropospheric teleconnections  
1275 between ENSO and the North Atlantic and European region, *J. Clim.*, 22, 1223-1238, 2009.

1276 Carton, J. A. and Giese, B. S.: A reanalysis of ocean climate using simple ocean data assimilation,  
1277 *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 136, 2999–3017, 2008.

1278 Cavarieli, D. J., Corawford, J. P., Drinkwater M. R., Eppler, D. T., Farmer, L. D., Jentz, R. R., and  
1279 Wackerman, C. C.: Aircraft active and passive microwave validation of sea ice concentrations from  
1280 the DMSP SSM/I, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 96, 21989-22088, 1991.

1281 Charlton-Perez, A. J., and co-authors: On the lack of stratospheric dynamical variability in low-top  
1282 versions of the CMIP5 models, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 118, 2494-2505, 2013.

1283 Chikamoto, Y., Timmermann, A., Luo, J.-J., Mochizuki, T., Kimoto, M., Watanabe, M., Ishii, M., Xie,  
1284 S.-P., and Jin, F.-F.: Skillful multi-year predictions of tropical trans-basin climate variability, *Nature*.  
1285 *commun.*, 6, doi:10.1038/ncomms7869, 2015.

1286 Chikira, M. and Sugiyama, M.: A cumulus parameterization with state-dependent entrainment rate.  
1287 Part I: Description and sensitivity to temperature and humidity profiles, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 67, 2171-2193,  
1288 2010.

1289 Church, J. A. and White, N. J.: Sea-level rise from the late 19th to the early 21st century, *Surv.*

1290 Geophys., 32, 585–602, 2011.

1291 Comiso, J. C., Parkinson, C. L., Gersten, R., and Stock, L.: Accelerated decline in the Arctic sea ice  
 1292 cover, Geophys. Res. Lett., 35, doi:10.1029/2007GL031972, 2008.

1293 Dee, D.. and co-authors: The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data  
 1294 assimilation system. Quart J Roy Met. Soc., 137, 535–597, 2011.

1295 Downes, S. M. and Hogg, A. M.: Southern Ocean circulation and eddy compensation in CMIP5  
 1296 models, J. Clim., 26, 7198-7220, 2013.

1297 Easterling, D. R. and Wehner, M. F.: Is the climate warming or cooling? Geophys. Res. Lett., 36,  
 1298 doi:10.1029/2009GL037810, 2009.

1299 Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R. J., and Taylor, K. E.:  
 1300 Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and  
 1301 organization, Geosci. Model. Dev., 9, 1937-1958, 2016.

1302 Gantt, B., Meskhidze, N., and Kamykowski, D.: A new physically-based quantification of marine  
 1303 isoprene and primary organic aerosol emissions, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 4915-4927, doi:10.5194/acp-  
 1304 9-4915-2009, 2009.

1305 Gantt, B., Meskhidze, N., Facchini, M. C., Rinaldi, M., Ceburnis, D., and O’Dowd, C. D.: Wind speed  
 1306 dependent size-resolved parameterization for the organic mass fraction of sea spray aerosol, Atmos.  
 1307 Chem. Phys., 11, 8777-8790, doi:10.5194/acp-11-8777-2011, 2011.

1308 Gent, P.R., Willebrand, J., McDougall, T.J., and McWilliams, J.C: Parameterizing eddy-induced tracer  
 1309 transports in ocean circulation models, J. Phys. Oceanogr., 25, 463-474, 1995.

1310 Golaz, J. C., Horowitz, L. W., and Levy II, H.: Cloud tuning in a coupled climate model: Impact on  
 1311 20th century warming, Geophys. Res. Lett., 40, 2246-2251, 2013.

1312 Gregory, D.: Estimation of entrainment rate in simple models of convective clouds, Quart. J. Roy.  
 1313 Meteor. Soc., 127, 53–72, 2001.

1314 Gregory, J. M., Ingram, W. J., Palmer, M. A., Jones, G. S., Stott, P. A., Thorpe, R. B., Lowe, J. A.,  
 1315 Johns, T. C., and Williams, K. D.: A new method for diagnosing radiative forcing and climate  
 1316 sensitivity, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31, L03205, doi:10.1029/2003GL018747, 2004.  
 1317 Gregory, J. and Webb, M.: Tropospheric adjustment induces a cloud component in CO<sub>2</sub> forcing, *J.*  
 1318 *Clim.*, 21, 58-71, 2008.  
 1319 Griffies, S. M., Gnanadesikan, A., Dixon, K. W., Dunne, J. P., Gerdes, R., Harrison, M. J., Rosati, A.,  
 1320 Russell, J. L., Samuels, B. L., Spelman, M. J., Winton, M., and Zhang, R.: Formulation of an ocean  
 1321 model for global climate simulations, *Ocean Sci.*, 1, 45-79, 2005.  
 1322 Guenther, A., Hewitt, N., Erickson, D., Fall, R., Geron, C., Graedel, T., Harley, P., Klinger, L., Lerdau,  
 1323 M., McKay, W., Pierce, T., Scholes, B., Steinbrecher, R., Tallamraju, R., Taylor, J., and Zim-merman,  
 1324 P.: A global model of natural volatile organic compound emissions, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100, 8873–8892,  
 1325 1995.  
 1326 [Hajima, T., and co-authors: Model description of a new Earth system model “MIROC-ES2L” and the](#)  
 1327 [sensitivity analysis of the biogeochemical feedbacks, in preparation.](#)  
 1328 Hasumi, H.: CCSR Ocean Component Model (COCO) version 4.0, Center for Climate System  
 1329 Research Rep., 25, 103 pp., 2006. [Available online at [http://www.ccsr.u-](http://www.ccsr.u-tokyo.ac.jp/hasumi/COCO/coco4.pdf)  
 1330 [tokyo.ac.jp/hasumi/COCO/coco4.pdf](http://www.ccsr.u-tokyo.ac.jp/hasumi/COCO/coco4.pdf).]  
 1331 Hegglin, M. I., and co-authors: Historical and future ozone database (1850-2100) in support of CMIP6,  
 1332 in prep.  
 1333 Hines, C. O.: Doppler-spread parameterization of gravity wave momentum deposition in the middle  
 1334 atmosphere, Part 2: Broad and quasi monochromatic spectra, and implementation, *J. Atmos. Solar Terr.*  
 1335 *Phys.*, 59, 387–400, 1997.  
 1336 Hirahara, S., Ishii, M., and Fukuda, Y.: Centennial-scale sea surface temperature analysis and its  
 1337 uncertainty, *J. Clim.*, 27, 57-75, 2014.

1338 Hirota, N., Ogura, T., Tatebe, H., Shiogama, H., Kimoto, M., and Watanabe, M.: Roles of shallow  
1339 convective moistening in the eastward propagation of the MJO in MIROC6, *J. Clim.*, 31, 3033-3034,  
1340 2018.

1341 Hirota, N. and Takahashi, M.: A tripolar pattern as an internal mode of the East Asian summer  
1342 monsoon, *Clim. Dyn.*, 39, 2219–2238, doi:10.1007/s00382-012-1416-y, 2012.

1343 Hoesly, R.M., and co-authors: Historical (1750-2014) anthropogenic emissions of reactive gases and  
1344 aerosols from the Community Emission Data System (CEDS), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 11, 369-408,  
1345 doi:10.5194/gmd-11-369-2018, 2018.

1346 Hourdin, F., Maurisen, T., Getteleman, A., Golaz, J.-C., Balaji, V., Duan, Q., Folini, D., Klocke, D.,  
1347 Qian, Y., Rauser, F., Rio, C., Tomassini, L., Watanabe, M., and Williamson, D.: The art and science of  
1348 climate model tuning, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 98, 589-602, 2017.

1349 Hoskins, B. J. and Karoly, D. J.: The steady linear response of a spherical atmosphere to thermal and  
1350 orographic forcing, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 38, 1179-1196, 1981.

1351 Hunke, E. and Dukowicz, J.: An elastic–viscous–plastic model for sea ice dynamics, *J. Phys.*  
1352 *Oceanogr.*, 27, 1849–1867, 1997.

1353 Hurtt, G., and co-authors: Harmonization of global land-use change and management for the period  
1354 850-2100, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, in preparation.

1355 Inatsu, M., Kimoto, M. and Sumi, A.: Stratospheric sudden warming with projected global warming  
1356 and related tropospheric wave activity, *SOLA*, 3, 105-108, 2007.

1357 Ineson, S. and Scaife, A. A.: The role of the stratosphere in the European climate response to El Niño,  
1358 *Nature Geosci.*, 2, 32-36, 2009.

1359 ~~IPCC: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the~~  
1360 ~~Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by Solomon, S.,~~  
1361 ~~Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K. B., Tignor, M. and Miller, H. L., Cambridge~~

~~University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 996 pp.~~

IPCC: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by Stocker, T.F. et al., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1535 pp, 2013.

Ishii, M., Kimoto, M., and Kachi, M.: Historical ocean subsurface temperature analysis with error estimate, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 131, 51-73, 2003.

Imada, Y., Watanabe, M., Mori, M., Kimoto, M., Shiogama, H., and Ishii, M.: Contribution of atmospheric circulation change to the 2012 heavy rainfall in southwestern Japan, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 95, S52-S54, 2013.

Imada, Y., Tatebe, H., Ishii, M., Chikamoto, Y., Mori, M., Arai, M., Watanabe, M., and Kimoto, M.: Predictability of two types of El-Niño assessed using an extended seasonal prediction system by MIROC, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 143, 4597-4617, 2015.

Ito, A. and Inatomi, M.: Use of a process-based model for assessing the methane budgets of global terrestrial ecosystems and evaluation of uncertainty, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 759-773, 2012.

K-1 model developers: K-1 coupled GCM (MIROC) description, K-1 Tech. Rep., 1, edited by H. Hasumi, H., and Emori, S., 34 pp., Center for Climate System Research, the Univ. of Tokyo, Tokyo, 2004.

Kamae, Y., Shiogama, H., Watanabe, M., Ogura, T., Yokohata, T., and Kimoto, M.: Lower tropospheric mixing as a constraint on cloud feedback in a multiparameter multiphysics ensemble, *J. Clim.*, 29, 6259-6275, 2016.

Katsumate, K., Ohshima, K. I., Kono, T., Itoh, M., Yasuda, I., Volkov, Y., and Wakatsuchi, M.: Water exchange and tidal current through the Bussol's Strait revealed by direct current measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, doi:10.1019/2003JC001864, 2004.

[Kaufmann, R. K., Kauppi, H., Mann, M. L., and Stock, J. H.: Reconciling anthropogenic climate change with observed temperature 1998–2008, \*Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA\*, 108, 11790–11793, 2011.](#)

Kawabe, M. and Fujio, S.: Pacific Ocean circulation based on observation, *J. Oceanogr.*, 66, 389–403, doi:10.1007/s10872-010-0034-8, 2010.

Krinner, G., Viovy, N., de Noblet-Ducoudre, N., Ogee, J., Polcher, J., Friedlingstein, P., Ciais, P., Sitch, S., and Prentice, I. C.: A dynamic global vegetation model for studies of the coupled atmosphere-biosphere system, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 19, GB1015, doi:10.1029/2003GB002199, 2005.

Komuro, Y., Suzuki, T., Sakamoto, T. T., Hasumi, H., Ishii, M., Watanabe, M., Nozawa, T., Yokohata, T., Nishimura, T., Ogochi, K., Emori, S., and Kimoto, M.: Sea-ice in twentieth-century simulations by new MIROC coupled models: a comparison between models with high resolution and with ice thickness distribution, *J. Meteor. Soc. Japan*, 90A, 213–232, 2012.

Komuro, Y. and Suzuki, T.: Impact of subgrid-scale ice thickness distribution on heat flux on and through sea ice, *Ocean Modell.*, 71, 13–25, 2013.

Komuro, Y.: The Impact of Surface Mixing on the Arctic River Water Distribution and Stratification in a Global Ice–Ocean Model, *J. Clim.*, 27, 4359–4370, 2014.

Kosaka, Y. and Nakamura, H.: Mechanisms of meridional teleconnection observed between a summer monsoon system and a subtropical anticyclone. Part I: The Pacific-Japan pattern, *J. Clim.*, 23, 5085–5108, 2010.

Kosaka, Y. and Xie, S.-P.: The tropical Pacific as a key pacemaker of the variable rates of global warming, *Nature Geosci.*, 9, 669–673, 2016.

Kubokawa, A., and Inui, T.: Subtropical Countercurrent in an idealized Ocean OGCM, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, 29, 1303–1313, 1999.

Liebmann, B.: Description of a complete (interpolated) outgoing longwave radiation dataset, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 77, 1275–1277, 1996.



1410 Liston, G.E.: Representing subgrid snow cover heterogeneities in regional and global models, *J. Clim.*,  
 1411 17, 1381-1397, 2014.

1412 Loeb, N. G., Wielicki, B. A., Doelling, D. R., Smith, G.L., Keyes, D.F., Kato, S., Manalo-Smith, N.,  
 1413 and Wong, T.: Toward optimal closure of the earth's top-of-atmosphere radiation budget, *J. Clim.*, 22,  
 1414 748–766, 2009.

1415 Mantua, N. J., Hare, S. R., Zhang, Y., Wallace, J. M., and Francis, R. C: A Pacific interdecadal climate  
 1416 oscillation with impacts on salmon production, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 78, 1069-1079, 1997.

1417 Meehl, G. A., Covey, C., Delworth, T., Latif, M., McAvaney, B., Mitchell, J. F. B., Stouffer, R. J., and  
 1418 Taylor, K. E.: The WCRP CMIP3 multi-model dataset: a new era in climate change research. *Bull.*  
 1419 *Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 88, 1383-1394, 2007.

1420 Myneni, R. B., and co-authors: Global products of vegetation leaf area and fraction absorbed PAR  
 1421 from year one of MODIS data, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 83, 214–231, 2002.

1422 Mori, M., Watanabe, M., Shiogama, H., Inoue, J., and Kimoto, M.: Robust Arctic sea-ice influence on  
 1423 the frequent Eurasian cold winters in past decades, *Nature Geosci.*, 7, 869-873, 2014.

1424 Marshall, A. G., Hendon, H. H., Son, S. W., and Lim, Y.: Impact of the quasi-biennial oscillation on  
 1425 predictability of the Madden–Julian oscillation, *Clim. Dyn.*, doi:10.1007/s00382-016-3392-0, 2016.

1426 McCarthy, G. D., Smeed, D. A., Johns, W. E., Frajka-Williams, E., Moat, B. I., Rayner, D., Baringer,  
 1427 M. O., Meinen, C. S., Collins, J., and Bryden, H. L.: Measuring the Atlantic Meridional Overturning  
 1428 Circulation at 26°N, *Prog. Oceanogr.*, 130, 91-111, doi: 10.1016/j.pocean.2014.10.006, 2015.

1429 Matsuno, T.: A dynamical mode of the stratospheric sudden warming, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 28, 1479-1494,  
 1430 1971.

1431 Matthes, K., and co-authors: Solar forcing for CMIP6 (v3.2), *Geosc. Model Dev.*, 10, 2247-2302,  
 1432 doi:10.5194/gmd-10-2247-2017, 2017.

1433 Meehl, G. A., Washington, W. M., Wigley, T. M. L., Arblaster, J. M., and Dai, A.: Solar and greenhouse

1434 gas forcing and climate response in the twentieth century, *J. Clim.*, 16, 426-444, 2003.  
 1435 Meehl, G. A., Arblaster, J. M., Fasullo, J. T., Hu, A., and Trenberth, K. E.: Model-based evidence of  
 1436 deep-ocean heat uptake during surface temperature hiatus periods, *Nature Clim. Change*, 1, 360-364,  
 1437 2011.  
 1438 Meinshausen, M., and co-authors: Historical greenhouse gas concentrations for climate modelling  
 1439 (CMIP6), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 10, 2057-2116, doi:10.5194/gmd-10-2057-2017, 2017.  
 1440 Michibata, T., Suzuki, K., Sato, Y., and Takemura, T.: The sources of discrepancies in aerosol-cloud-  
 1441 precipitation interactions between GCM and A-Train retrievals, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 15413-  
 1442 15424, 2016.  
 1443 Mizuta, R.: Intensification of extratropical cyclones associated with the polar jet change in the CMIP5  
 1444 global warming projections, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39, doi:10.1029/2012GL053032, 2012.  
 1445 Mochizuki, M., and co-authors: Pacific decadal oscillation hindcasts relevant to near-term climate  
 1446 prediction, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 107, 1833-1837, 2010.  
 1447 Mochizuki, T., Kimoto, M., Chikamoto, Y., Mori, M., Watanabe, M., and Ishii, M.: Error sensitivity  
 1448 to initial climate states in Pacific decadal hindcasts, *SOLA*, 10, 39-44, 2014.  
 1449 Mochizuki, T., Kimoto, M., Watanabe, M., Chikamoto, Y., and Ishii, M.: Interbasin effects of the  
 1450 Indian Ocean on Pacific decadal climate change, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43, 7168-7175, 2016.  
 1451 Morice, C. P., Kennedy, J. J., Rayner, N. A., and Jones, P. D.: Quantifying uncertainties in global and  
 1452 regional temperature change using an ensemble of observational estimates: The HadCRUT4 dataset,  
 1453 *J. Geophys. Res.*, doi:10.1029/2011JD017187, 2012.  
 1454 Murphy, J. M.: Assessment of the practical utility of extended range ensemble forecasts, *Q. J. R.*  
 1455 *Meteorol. Soc.*, 116, 89-125, 1990.  
 1456 Murray, R. J.: Explicit generation of orthogonal grids for ocean models, *J. Comput. Phys.*, 126, 251-  
 1457 273, 1996.

1458 Nakamura, H.: Midwinter suppression of baroclinic wave activity in the Pacific, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 49,  
1459 1629–1642, 1992.

1460 Nakamura, T., Toyoda, T., Ishikawa, Y., and Awaji, T.: Tidal mixing in the Kuril Straits and its impact  
1461 on ventilation in the North Pacific Ocean, *J. Oceanogr.*, 60, 411–423, 2004.

1462 Nakano, H., and Sugimoto, N.: Effects of bottom boundary layer parameterization on reproducing  
1463 deep and bottom waters in a world ocean model, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, 32, 1209–1227, 2002.

1464 [National Geophysical Data Center, 1993: 5-minute Gridded Global Relief Data \(ETOPO5\), National](#)  
1465 [Geophysical Data Center, NOAA, doi:10.7289/V5D798BF.](#)

1466 Neeling, J. D., Munnich, M., Su, H., Meyerson, J. E., and Holloway, C. E.: Tropical drying trends in  
1467 global warming models and observations, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 103, 6110–6115, 2006.

1468 Ngo-Duc, T., Oki, T., and Kanae, S.: A variable streamflow velocity method for global river routing  
1469 model: model description and preliminary results, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 4, 4389–4414,  
1470 doi:10.5194/hessd-4-4389-2007, 2007.

1471 Ninomiya, K., and Akiyama, T.: Multi-scale features of Baiu, the summer monsoon over Japan and  
1472 East Asia, *J. Meteor. Res. Japan*, 70, 467–495, 1992.

1473 Nitta, T., Yoshimura, K., and Abe-Ouchi, A.: Impact of arctic wetlands on the climate system: Model  
1474 sensitivity simulations with the MIROC5 AGCM and a snow-fed wetland scheme, *J. Hydrometeor.*,  
1475 18, 2923–2936, 2017.

1476 Nitta, T., Yoshimura, K., Takata, K., Oishi, R., Sueyoshi, T., Kanae, S., Oki, T., Abe-Ouchi, A., and  
1477 Liston, G. E.: Representing variability in subgrid snow cover and snow depth in a global land model,  
1478 *J. Clim.*, 27, 3318–3330, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-13-003, 2014.

1479 Nozawa, T., Nagashima, T., Shiogama, H., and Crooks, S.A.: Detecting natural influence on surface  
1480 air temperature change in the early twentieth century, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32,  
1481 doi:10.1029/2005GL023540, 2005.

1482 Numaguti, A., Takahashi, M., Nakajima, T., and Sumi, A.: Description of CCSR/NIES atmospheric  
 1483 general circulation model. National Institute for Environmental Studies, Center for Global  
 1484 Environmental Research Supercomputer Monograph Rep., 3, 1-48, 1997.

1485 Olbers, D., Borowski, D., Volker, C., and Wolff, J.-O.: The dynamical balance, transport and  
 1486 circulation of the Antarctic Circumpolar Current. *Antarctic Sci.*, 14, 439-470, 2004.

1487 Oki, T. and Sud, Y.C.: Design of Total Runoff Integrating Pathways (TRIP) - A global river channel  
 1488 network, *Earth Interact.*, 2, 1-37, 1998.

1489 Ono, J., Tatebe, H., Komuro, Y., Nodzu, M. I., and Ishii, M.: Mechanisms influencing seasonal to  
 1490 inter-annual prediction skill of sea ice extent in the Arctic Ocean in MIROC, *The Cryosphere*, 12, 675-  
 1491 683, 2018.

1492 Osprey, S. M., Gray, L. J., Hardiman, S. C., Butchart, N., and Hinton, T. J.: Stratospheric variability  
 1493 in twentieth-century CMIP5 simulations of the Met Office climate model: High top versus low top, *J.*  
 1494 *Clim.*, 26, 1595-1606, 2013.

1495 Park, S. and Bretherton, C. S.: The University of Washington shallow convection and moist turbulence  
 1496 schemes and their impact on climate simulations with the Community Atmosphere Model, *J. Clim.*,  
 1497 22, 3449-3469, 2009.

1498 Power, S., Casey, T., Folland, C., Colman, A., and Mehta, V.: Interdecadal modulation of the impact  
 1499 of ENSO on Australia, *Clim. Dyn.*, 15, 319-324, 1999.

1500 Prather, M. J.: Numerical advection by conservation of second-order moments, *J. Geophys. Res.* 91,  
 1501 6671–6681, 1986.

1502 Ramankutty, N. and Foley, J.A.: Estimating historical changes in global land cover: croplands from  
 1503 1700 to 1992, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 13, 997-1027, 1999.

1504 [Rio, M.-H., Mullet, S., and Picot, N.: Beyond GOCE for the ocean circulation estimate: Synergetic](#)  
 1505 [use of altimetry, gravimetry, and in-situ data provides new insight into geostrophic and Ekman currents,](#)

1506 [Geophys. Res. Lett., 41, 8192-8925, doi:10.1002/2014GL061773.](#)

1507 Rockström, J., and co-authors: A safe operating space for humanity, *Nature*, 461, 472-475, 2009.

1508 Riebesell, U., Körtzinger, A., and Oschlies, A.: Sensitivities of marine carbon fluxes to ocean change,

1509 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 106, 20602–20609, 2009.

1510 Roberts, M. J., Clayton, A., Demory, M.-E., Donners, J., Vidale, P. L., Norton, W., Shaffrey, L.,

1511 Stevens, D. P., Stevens, I., Wood, R. A., and Slingo, J.: Impact of resolution on the tropical Pacific

1512 circulation in a matrix of coupled models. *J. Clim.*, 22, 2541–2556, 2009.

1513 Röske, F.: A global heat and freshwater forcing dataset for ocean models, *Ocean Modell.*, 11, 235-297,

1514 2006.

1515 Rossow, W. B., Walker, A. W., Beuschel, D., and Roiter, M.: International Satellite Cloud Climatology

1516 Project (ISCCP) documentation of new cloud datasets, World Climate Research Programme (ICSU

1517 and WMO), WMO/TD 737, 115pp, 1996.

1518 Scaife, A. A., and co-authors: Climate change projections and stratosphere-troposphere interaction,

1519 *Clim. Dyn.*, 38, 2089-2097, 2012.

1520 Scaife, A. A., and co-authors: Skillful long-range predictions of European and North American winters,

1521 *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 2514-2519, 2014.

1522 Saji, N. H., Goswami, B. N., Vinayachandran, P. N., and Yamagata, T.: A dipole mode in the tropical

1523 Indian Ocean, *Nature*, 401, 360–363, 1999.

1524 Sakamoto, T., and co-authors: MIROC4h - A new high-resolution atmosphere-ocean coupled general

1525 circulation model, *J. Meteor. Soc. Jpn.*, 90A, 325-359, 2012.

1526 Satoh, M., and co-authors: The non-hydrostatic icosahedral atmospheric model: description and

1527 development, *Prog. Earth Planet Sci.*, 1:18, doi:10.1186/s40645-017-014-0018-1, 2014.

1528 Schlesinger, M. E. and Ramankutty, N.: An oscillation in the global climate system of period 65-70

1529 years, *Nature*, 376, 723 – 726, 1994.

1530 Sekiguchi, M. and Nakajima, T.: A k-distribution-based radiation code and its computational  
 1531 optimization for an atmospheric general circulation model, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer*,  
 1532 doi:10.1016/j.jqsrt.2008.07.13, 2008.

1533 Sellers, P.J., and co-authors: The ISLSCP Initiative I global datasets: surface boundary conditions and  
 1534 atmospheric forcings for land-atmosphere studies, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 1987-2005, 1997.

1535 Shaffrey, L., and co-authors: U.K. HiGEM: The new U.K. high resolution global environment model  
 1536 - Model description and basic evaluation, *J. Clim.*, 22, 1861–1896, 2009.

1537 [Shiogama, H., Watanabe, M., Yoshimori, M., Yokohata, T., Ogura, T., Annan, J.D., Hargreaves, J.C.,](#)  
 1538 [Abe, M., Kamae, Y., O'ishi, R., Nobui, R., Emori, S., Nozawa, T., Abe-Ouchi, A., and Kimoto, M.:](#)  
 1539 [Perturbed physics ensemble using the MIROC5 coupled atmosphere-ocean GCM without flux](#)  
 1540 [corrections: experimental design and results, \*Clim. Dyn.\*, 39, 3041-3056, 2012.](#)

1541 ~~[Shiogama, H., Watanabe, M., Yoshimori, M., Yokohata, T., Ogura, T., Annan, J.D., Hargreaves, J.C.,](#)~~  
 1542 ~~[Abe, M., Kamae, Y., O'ishi, R., Nobui, R., Emori, S., Nozawa, T., Abe-Ouchi, A., and Kimoto, M.:](#)~~  
 1543 ~~[Perturbed physics ensemble using the MIROC5 coupled atmosphere-ocean GCM without flux](#)~~  
 1544 ~~[corrections: experimental design and results, \*Clim. Dyn.\*, 39, 3041-3056, 2012.](#)~~

1545 Shiogama, H., Watanabe, M., Imada, Y., Mori, M., Kamae, Y., Ishii, M., and Kimoto, M.: Attribution  
 1546 of the June-July 2013 heat wave in the southwestern United States, *SOLA*, 10, 122-126, 2014.

1547 Sillmann, J., Kharin, V. V., Zwiers, F. W., Zhang, X., and Bronaugh, D.: Climate extremes indices in  
 1548 the CMIP5 multimodel ensemble: Part 2. Future climate projections, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 118, 2473-  
 1549 2493, 2013.

1550 [Solomon, S., Rosenlot, K. H., Portmann, R. W., Daniel, J. S., Davis, S. M., Sanford, T. J., and Plattner,](#)  
 1551 [G.-K.: Contributions of stratospheric water vapor to decadal changes in the rate of global warming,](#)  
 1552 [Science, 327, 1219-1223.](#)

1553 Steele, M., Morley, R., and Ermold, W.: PHC: A global ocean hydrography with a high-quality Arctic

1554 Ocean, J. Clim., 14, 2079-2087, 2001.  
 1555 Stott, P. A., Stone, D. A. and Allen, M. R.: Human contribution to the European heatwave of 2003,  
 1556 Nature, 432, 610-614, 2004.  
 1557 Sudo, K., Takahashi, M., Kurokawa, J., and Akimoto, H.: CHASER: A global chemical model of the  
 1558 troposphere 1. Model description, J. Geophys. Res., 107, 4339, doi:10.1029/2001JD001113, 2002.  
 1559 Suzuki, K., Golaz, J.-C., and Stephens, G. L., 2013: Evaluating cloud tuning in a climate model with  
 1560 satellite observations, Geophys. Res. Lett., 40, 4464-4468, 2013.  
 1561 Suzuki, T., Saito, F., Nishimura, T., and Ogochi, K.: Heat and freshwater exchanges between sub-  
 1562 models of MIROC version 4, JAMSTEC Rep. Res. Dev., 9, 2009 (in Japanese).  
 1563 Suzuki, T., Hasumi, H., Sakamoto, T. T., Nishimura, T., Abe-Ouchi, A., Segawa, T., Okada, N., Oka,  
 1564 A., and Emori, S.: Projection of future sea level and its variability in a high-resolution climate model:  
 1565 ocean processes and Greenland and Antarctic ice-melt contributions, Geophys. Res. Lett., 32,  
 1566 doi:10.1029/2005GL023677, 2005.  
 1567 Suzuki, T. and Ishii, M.: Regional distribution of sea level changes resulting from enhanced  
 1568 greenhouse warming in the Model for Interdisciplinary Research on Climate version 3.2, Geophys.  
 1569 Res. Lett., 38, doi:10.1029/2010GL045693, 2011.  
 1570 Takata, K., Emori, S., and Watanabe, T.: Development of the Minimal Advanced Treatments of  
 1571 Surface Interaction and RunOff (MATSIRO), Global and Planetary Change, 38, 209-222, 2003.  
 1572 Takemura, T., Okamoto, H., Maruyama, Y., Numaguti, A., Higurashi, A., and Nakajima, T.: Global  
 1573 three-dimensional simulation of aerosol optical thickness distribution of various origins, J. Geophys.  
 1574 Res., 105, 17853-17873, 2000.  
 1575 Takemura, T., Nakajima, T., Dubovik, O., Holben, B. N., and Kinne, S.: Single-scattering albedo and  
 1576 radiative forcing of various aerosol species with a global three-dimensional model, J. Clim., 15, 333-  
 1577 352, 2002.

1578 Takemura, T., Nozawa, T., Emori, S., Nakajima, T. Y., and Nakajima, T.: Simulation of climate  
 1579 response to aerosol direct and indirect effects with aerosol transport-radiation model, *J. Geophys. Res.*,  
 1580 110, D02202, doi:10.1029/2004JD005029, 2005.

1581 Takemura, T., Egashira, M., Matsuzawa, K., Ichijo, H., O'ishi, R., and Abe-Ouchi, A.: A simulation of  
 1582 the global distribution and radiative forcing of soil dust aerosols at the Last Glacial Maximum, *Atmos.*  
 1583 *Chem. Phys.*, 9, 3061-3073, doi:10.5194/acp-9-3061-2009, 2009.

1584 Talley, L. D., Reid, J. L., and Robbins, P. E.: Date-based meridional overturning streamfuctions for  
 1585 the global ocean, *J. Clim.*, 16, 3213-3226, 2003.

1586 Tatebe, H. and Yasuda, I: Oyashio southward intrusion and cross-gyre transport related to diapycnal  
 1587 upwelling in the Okhotsk Sea, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, 34, 2327-2341, 2004.

1588 Tatebe, H. and Hasumi, H.: Formation mechanism of the Pacific equatorial thermocline revealed by a  
 1589 general circulation model with a high accuracy tracer advection scheme, *Ocean Modell.*, 35, 245-252,  
 1590 2010.

1591 Tatebe, H., and co-authors: The initialization of the MIROC climate models with hydrographic data  
 1592 assimilation for decadal prediction, *J. Meteor. Soc. Jpn.*, 90A, 275-294, 2012.

1593 Tatebe, H., Imada, Y., Mori, M., Kimoto, M., and Hasumi, H.: Control of decadal and bidecadal  
 1594 climate variability in the tropical Pacific by the off-equatorial South Pacific Ocean, *J. Clim.*, 26, 6524-  
 1595 6534, 2013.

1596 Taucher, J. and Oschlies, A.: Can we predict the direction of marine primary production change under  
 1597 global warming? *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, doi:10.1029/2010GL045934, 2011.

1598 Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J., and Meehl, G. A.: A summary of the CMIP5 experiment design.  
 1599 [https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/?cmip5/docs/Taylor\\_CMIP5\\_22Jan11\\_marked.pdf](https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/?cmip5/docs/Taylor_CMIP5_22Jan11_marked.pdf), 2011.

1600 Thompson, D. M., Cole, J. E., Shen, G. T., Tudhope, A. W., and Meehl, G. A.: Early twentieth-century  
 1601 warming linked to tropical Pacific wind strength. *Nature Geosci.*, 8, doi:10.1038/ngeo2321, 2014.



1602 Thomason, L., Vernier, J.-P., Bourassa, A., Arfeuille, F., Bingen, C., Peter, T., and Luo, B.:  
 1603 Stratospheric Aerosol Data Set (SADS Version 2) Prospectus, to be submitted to Geosci. Model Dev.  
 1604 Discuss., 2016.  
 1605 Trenberth, K. E., and Shea, D. J.: Atlantic hurricanes and natural variability in 2005, Geophys. Res.  
 1606 Lett., 33, L12704, doi:10.1029/2006GL026894, 2006.  
 1607 van Marle, M.J.E., and co-authors: Historic global biomass burning emissions for CMIP6 (BB4CMIP)  
 1608 based on merging satellite observations with proxies and fire models (1750-2015), Geosci. Model Dev.,  
 1609 10, 3329-3357, doi:10.5194/gmd-10-3329-2017, 2017.  
 1610 Waliser, D. E., Li, J.-L. F., L'Ecuyer, T. S., and Chen, W.-T.: The impact of precipitating ice and snow  
 1611 on the radiation balance in global climate models, Geophys. Res. Lett., 38, L06802,  
 1612 doi:10.1029/2010GL046478, 2011.  
 1613 Wallace, J. M. and Gutzler, D. S.: Teleconnections in the geopotential height field during the northern  
 1614 hemisphere winter, Mon. Wea. Rev., 109, 784-812, 1981.  
 1615 Watanabe, M., Suzuki, T., O'ishi, R., Komuro, Y., Watanabe, S., Emori, S., Takemura, T., Chikira, M.,  
 1616 Ogura, T., Sekiguchi, M., Takata, K., Yamazaki, D., Yokohata, T., Nozawa, T., Hasumi, H., Tatebe, H.,  
 1617 and ~~M.~~Kimoto, M.: Improved climate simulation by MIROC5: Mean states, variability, and climate  
 1618 sensitivity, J. Clim., 23, 6312-6335, DOI: 10.1175/2010JCLI3679.1, 2010.  
 1619 Watanabe, M., Chikira, M., Imada, Y., and Kimoto, M.: Convective control of ENSO, J. Climate, 24,  
 1620 543-562, 2011.  
 1621 Watanabe, M., Shiogama, H., Tatebe, H., Hayashi, M., Ishii, M., and Kimoto, M.: Contribution of  
 1622 natural decadal variability to global warming acceleration and hiatus, Nature Clim. Change, 4, 893-  
 1623 897, 2014.  
 1624 Watanabe, M., Shiogama, H., Imada, Y., Mori, M., Ishii, M., and Kimoto, M.: Event attribution of the  
 1625 August 2010 Russian heat wave, SOLA, 9, 65-68, 2013.

[Watanabe, S.: Constraints on a non-orographic gravity wave drag parameterization using a gravity wave resolving general circulation model, SOLA\(Scientific Online Letters on the Atmosphere\), 4, 61–64, doi:10.2151/sola.2008-016, 2008.](#)

[Watanabe, S., Kawatani, Y., Tomikawa, Y., Miyazaki, K., Takahashi, M., and Sato, K.: General aspects of a T213L256 middle atmosphere general circulation model, J. Geophys. Res., 113, D12110, doi:10.1029/2008JD010026, 2008.](#)

Watanabe, S., Hajima, T., Sudo, K., Nagashima, T., Takemura, T., Okajima, H., Nozawa, T., Kawase, H., Abe, M., Yokohata, T., Ise, T., Sato, H., Kato, E., Takata, K., Emori, S., and Kawamiya, M.: MIROC-ESM 2010: model description and basic results of CMIP5-20c3m experiments, Geosci. Model Dev., 4, 845-872, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-845-2011, 2011.

Watanabe, M., and Kawamiya, M.: Remote effects of mixed layer development on ocean acidification in the subsurface layers of the North Pacific, J. Oceanogr., 73, 771-784, 2017.

Wood, R. and Bretherton, C. S.: On the relationship between stratiform low cloud cover and lower-tropospheric stability, J. Clim., 19, 6425-6432, 2006.

Webster, P. J., Moore, A. M., Loschnigg, J. P., and Leben, R. R.: Coupled ocean-atmosphere dynamics in the Indian Ocean during 1997-98, Nature, 401, 35-360, 1999.


Wheeler, M. and Kiladis, G. N.: Convectively coupled equatorial waves: Analysis of clouds and temperature in the wavenumberfrequency domain, J. Atmos. Sci., 56, 374-399, 1999.

Yamazaki, D., Oki, T., and Kanae, S.: Deriving a global river network map and its sub-grid topographic characteristics from a fine-resolution flow direction map, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 13, 2241–2251, 2009.

Yang, P., Lei, B., Baum, B.A., Liou, K-N., Kattawar, G.W., Mischenko, M. I., and Cole, B.: Spectrally consistent scattering, absorption, and polarization properties of atmospheric ice crystals at

1650 wavelengths from 0.2 to 100  $\mu\text{m}$ , *J. Atm. Sci.*, 70, 330-347, 2013.  
 1651 Yoo, C. and Son, S. W.: Modulation of the boreal wintertime Madden Julian oscillation by the  
 1652 stratospheric quasi-biennial oscillation, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43, 1392-1398, 2016.  
 1653 Zappa, G., Shaffrey, L. C., Hodges, K. I., Sansom, P. G., and Stephenson, D. B.: A multi-model  
 1654 assessment of future projections of North Atlantic and European extratropical cyclones in the CMIP5  
 1655 climate models, *J. Clim.*, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00573.1, 2013.  
 1656 Zhang, X. B., and co-authors: Detection of human influence on twentieth-century precipitation trends,  
 1657 *Nature*, 448, 461-464, 2007.  
 1658 Zhang, Y., Sperber, K. R., and Boyle, J. S.: Climatology and interannual variation of the East Asian  
 1659 winter monsoon: Results from the 1979-95 NCEP/NCAR reanalysis, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 125, 2605-2619,  
 1660 1997.  
 1661 Zhang, Y., Rossow, W. B., Lacis, A. A., Oinas, V., and Mishchenko, M. I.: Calculation of radiative  
 1662 fluxes from the surface to top of atmosphere based on ISCCP and other global data sets: Refinements  
 1663 of the radiative transfer model and the input data, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, doi:10.1029/2003JD004457,  
 1664 2004.  
 1665  
 1666


1667



1668

1669 Fig. 1. Vertical half levels for the atmospheric (left panel) and the oceanic (right panel) components of  
 1670 MIROC6 and MIROC5.

1671




1672

1673 Fig. 2. Horizontal grid coordinate system and model bathymetry of the ocean component of MIROC6.

1674

1675

1676




1677

1678 Fig. 3. (a) Time series of the global-mean SAT (solid) and the TOA radiation budget (dashed; upward  
1679 positive). (b) Same as (a), but for the global-mean SST (solid) and the ocean temperature through the  
1680 full water column (dashed).

1681

1682



1683

1684 Fig. 4. Annual-mean TOA radiative fluxes in MIROC6 (left panels) and MIROC5 (right panels).

1685 Upward is defined as positive. The net, shortwave and longwave radiative fluxes, and the sum of

1686 the two fluxes are denoted as OSR, OLR, and NET, respectively. outgoing shortwave, and outgoing

1687 longwave radiations are aligned from the top to the bottom. Colors indicate errors with respect to

1688 observations (CERES) and contours denote values in each model. Note that a different color scale is

1689 used for the longwave radiations. The global-mean values and root-mean-squared errors are indicated

1690 by GM and RMSE, respectively. In the present manuscript, RMSE is computed without model and

1691 observed global-mean quantities unless otherwise noted.


1692 Note that a different color scale is used for the longwave radiations.

1693





1695



1696

1697 Fig. 5. Annual-mean moistening rate associated with (a) deep convections and (b) shallow convections

1698 in MIROC6 at the 850 hPa pressure level.

1699






Fig. 6. Same as Fig. 4, but for cloud covers in MIROC6 (left panels) and MIROC5 (right panels).

Low-, middle-, and high-level cloud covers are aligned from the top to the bottom. The tops for low-, middle-, and high-level clouds are defined to exist below the 680 hPa, between the 680 hPa and 440 hPa, and above the 440 hPa pressure levels, respectively. The unit is non-dimensional. ISCCP climatology is used as observations.




Fig. 7. Annual and zonal-mean specific humidity (top panels), temperature (middle), and zonal wind (bottom) in MIROC6 (left) and MIROC5 (right). Colors indicate errors with respect to observations (ERA-I) and contours denote values in each model.







Fig. 8. Precipitation in boreal winter (December–February; left panels) and summer (June–August; right panels) in observations (top; GPCP), MIROC6 (middle), and MIROC5 (bottom). Areas with precipitation smaller than  $3 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$  are not colored.

1717

1718



1719

1720 Fig. 9. Annual-mean mass stream functions in (a) MIROC6 and (b) MIROC5. Contour interval is 0.3


1721  $(0.025) \times 10^{10} \text{ kg s}^{-1}$  below (above) the 100 hPa pressure level. Negative values are denoted by dashed

1722 contours, and the horizontal dashed lines indicate the 100 hPa pressure level.

1723


1724

1725



1726 Fig. 10. Same as Fig. 4, but for the wintertime 500 hPa pressure level in MIROC6 (left panels) and  
 1727 MIROC5 (right panels). Maps for boreal (austral) winter are shown in the upper (lower) panels. ERA-  
 1728 I is used as observations.

1729



1730 Fig. 11. Wintertime storm track activity (STA) in observations (left), MIROC6 (center), and MIROC5  
 1731 (right). STA is defined as 8-day-highpass-filtered eddy meridional temperature flux at the 850 hPa  
 1732 pressure level. Maps for boreal (austral) winter are shown in the upper (lower) panels. ERA-I is used  
 1733 as observations.

1734

1735






Fig. 12. Snow cover fractions for observations (top panels), MIROC6 (middle), and MIROC5 (bottom). Maps in November, February, and May are aligned from the left to the right. The unit is non-dimensional. Areas where snow cover fractions are less than 0.01 are masked. Ave and corr. in the panels indicate spatial averages and correlation coefficients between observations and models over the land surface in the Northern Hemisphere, respectively. Time series in the bottom-left panel shows temporal rate of change of the monthly spatial averages. Snow-cover dataset of the Northern Hemisphere EASE-Grid 2.0 is used as observations.



1748



1749




1750

1751 Fig. 13. Annual-mean potential temperature (upper panels; unit is  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) and salinity (lower; psu) in the  
 1752 Atlantic sector ~~for from~~ observations (left), MIROC6 (middle), and MIROC5 (right). Colors indicate  
 1753 errors with respect to observations (ProjD) and contours denote model values in the middle and right  
 1754 panels.


1755 ProjD is used as observations.

1756

1757



1758




1759

1760 Fig. 14. Same as Fig. 13, but for the Pacific sector.

1761

1762





1764

1765


1766

1767

1768

Fig. 15. Annual-mean climatology of potential temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ; colors) and zonal current speed ( $\text{cm s}^{-1}$ ; contours) along the equator ( $1^{\circ}\text{S}$ – $1^{\circ}\text{N}$ ) in (a) observations (ProjD and SODA), (b) MIROC6, and (c) MIROC5.

1769



1770


1771 Fig. 16. Annual-mean meridional overturning circulations in the Atlantic (upper panels) and the Indo-

1772 Pacific sectors (lower) in MIROC6 (left) and MIROC5 (right). The unit is Sv ( $\equiv 10^6 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ).

1773

1774

1775



1776


1777 Fig. 17. Northern Hemisphere sea-ice concentrations in March (upper panels) and September (lower  
1778 panels) for observations (left), MIROC6 (middle), and MIROC5 (right). The unit is non-dimensional.

1779 Satellite-based sea-ice concentration data of the SSM/I are used as observations.

1780

1781

1782



1783





Fig. 18. Annual-mean sea level height relative to the geoid in (a) observations, (b) MIROC6, and (c) MIROC5. Contour interval is 20 cm. Negative values are denoted by dashed lines. Note that loading due to sea-ice and accumulated snow on sea-ice are removed from the model sea level height and that the global-mean value is is also eliminated.



1790




1791

1792 Fig. 19. Same as Fig. 4, but for annual-mean SAT (upper panels) and SST (lower panels). ERA-I for  
 1793 the SAT and the ProjD for the SST are used as observations.

1794

1795



1797

1798

1799

1800

1801


1802

Fig. 20. Zonal wavenumber–frequency power spectra of the (a–c) symmetric and (d–f) antisymmetric component of OLR divided by background power in (a,d) observations (NOAA OLR), (b,e) MIROC6, and (c,f) MIROC5. Dispersion curves of equatorial waves for the three equivalent depths of 12, 25, and 50 m are indicated by black lines. Signals corresponding to the westward and eastward inertia-

1803 gravity (WIG and EIG) waves, the equatorial Rossby (ER) waves, equatorial Kelvin waves, the mix-  
1804 ed Rossby-gravity waves (MRG), and Madden-Julian oscillation (MJO) are labeled in (a). The unit of  
1805 the vertical axes is cycle per day (cpd).  
1806



1807



1808

1809 Fig. 21. (a-c) Summertime (JJA) climatology of precipitation (colorshading, mm day<sup>-1</sup>) and the 850  
 1810 hPa horizontal wind (vector; m s<sup>-1</sup>) for (a) observations (ERA-I), (b) MIROC6, and (c) MIROC5. (d-  
 1811 f) Anomalies of summertime precipitation (shading; mm day<sup>-1</sup>) and the 850 hPa vorticity (contour;  
 1812 10<sup>-6</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) regressed to the time series of EOF1 of the 850 hPa vorticity over [100°E–150°E, 0°N–60°N]  
 1813 for (d) observations, (e) MIROC6, and (f) MIROC5.





Fig. 22. (a-c) Wintertime (DJF) climatology of STA (color shading;  $\text{K m s}^{-1}$ ), the 300 hPa zonal wind (contour;  $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ), and the 300 hPa horizontal wind (vector;  $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ) for (a) observations (ERA-I), (b) MIROC6, and (c) MIROC5. (d-f) As in (a-c), but for anomalies regressed onto the time series of the EOF1 of the 850 hPa meridional wind over [120°E–150°E, 30°N–60°N].

1821




1822

1823 Fig. 23. Time-height cross section of the monthly mean, zonal mean zonal wind over the equator for  
1824 (a) observations (ERA-I) and (b) MIROC6. The contour intervals are  $5 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ . Dashed lines correspond  
1825 to the altitude of the 70 hPa pressure level. The red and blue colors correspond to westerlies and  
1826 easterlies, respectively.

1827

1828









Fig. 24. (a)-(e) Standard deviation of monthly and zonal-mean zonal wind (colors; unit is  $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ) superimposed on monthly climatology of zonal-mean zonal wind (black contours; unit is  $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ) in (a-c) February and (d-f) January for observations (ERA-I in 1979-2014; left panels), MIROC6 (middle) and MIROC5 (right) during 60-year period. In panels (g-i), the daily-mean temperatures at the 10 hPa pressure level on the North Pole are plotted. for (a) observations (ERA-I) in 1979-2014, (b) MIROC6, and (c) MIROC5 during 60-year period. Unit is  $\text{m s}^{-1}$ . (d-f) Daily variation of temperature at the 10 hPa pressure level on the North Pole for (d) observations (ERA-I), (e) MIROC6, and (f) MIROC5. Daily mean data during 36-year period are included in each panel (1979-2014 for observations).

1841

1842




1843

1844 Fig. 25. Composites of time development of the zonal-mean NAM index for stratospheric weak polar  
 1845 vortex events in (a) observations (ERA-I), (b) MIROC6, and (c) MIROC5. The indices having  
 1846 dimension of geopotential height (m), and red colors denote negative values. Interval of colors  
 1847 (contours) is 50 (400) m. The number of events included in the composite are indicated above each  
 1848 panel.

1849

1850




1851

1852 Figure 26. Anomalies of SST (K), precipitation ( $\text{mm day}^{-1}$ ), the 500 hPa pressure height (m), and the  
 1853 equatorial ocean temperature averaged in  $5^{\circ}\text{S}$ – $5^{\circ}\text{N}$  (K) which are regressed onto the Niño3 index.  
 1854 Monthly anomalies with respect to monthly climatology are used here. From the left to the right, the  
 1855 anomalies in observations (ProjD and ERA-I), MIROC6, and MIROC5 are aligned. In the bottom  
 1856 panels, contours denote annual-mean climatological temperature with the  $20^{\circ}\text{C}$  isotherms thickened  
 1857 and the contour interval is  $2^{\circ}\text{C}$ .

1858


1859



1860

1861 Figure 27. Same as Fig. 26, but for anomalies of SST (colors), 10 m wind vectors (upper panels) and  
1862 precipitation (lower panels) regressed onto the autumn DMI. The values of the regression slope  
1863 between anomalies of the 20°C isotherm depth and the SST over the eastern IOD region, which  
1864 indicates the thermocline feedback, are displayed on the top of the upper panels.

1865




1866

1867 Figure 28. Same as Fig. 26, but for anomalies of monthly SST and wintertime SLP regressed onto the  
1868 PDO index (see the text). COBE-SST2/SLP2 data in 1900–2013 are used as observations.

1869



1870




1871

1872 Figure 29. Same as Fig. 26, but for anomalies of SST (colors) and SLP (contours; 0.2 hPa) regressed

1873 onto the AMO index (see the text). Negative values are denoted by dashed contours.

1874



1875

1876

1877 Fig. 30. (a) Global mean net radiative imbalance at the TOA plotted against the global mean SAT

1878 increase. Data from the first 15020 years after the abrupt CO<sub>2</sub> quadrupling are used. (b) 2 × CO<sub>2</sub>

1879 radiative forcing estimated by regressing four components of TOA radiation against the global-mean

1880 SAT, following Gregory and Webb (2008). (c) Same as (b) but for climate feedback. In Figs. 30bc,


1881 LWclr (SWclr) and LCRE (SCRE) denote a clear-sky longwave (shortwave) component and a  
1882 longwave (shortwave) cloud component, respectively. The arrows in (b) and (c) indicate that the results  
1883 of MIROC6 are different from MIROC5 at the 5% level.  
1884 

---


1885

1886

1887



1888



1889

1890

Figure 31. Shortwave cloud component of (a, c)  $2 \times \text{CO}_2$  radiative forcing (left panels) and (b, d)


1891

climate feedback (right panels) in MIROC6 (upper panels) and MIROC5 (lower panels).

1892

1893

1894



1895 Figure 32. Time series of the global-mean SAT anomalies for observations (black), MIROC6 (red),  
1896 and MIROC5 (blue). A 5-yr running-mean filter is applied to the anomalies with respect to the 1961–  
1897 1990 mean. Colors indicate spreads of ensemble experiments for each model (1 standard deviation).

1898

1899

1900

Dataset	Used data period (year)	Reference
CERES (edition 2.8)	2001–2013	Loeb et al. (2009)
ISCCP	Climatology	Zhang et al. (2004)
ERA-Interim	1980–2009	Dee et al. (2011)
GPCPv2	1980–2009	Adler et al. (2003)
EASE-Grid 2.0	1980–2009	Brodzik and Armstrong (2013)
ProjD	1980–2009	Ishii et al. (2013)
SODA	1980–2009	Carton and Giese (2008)
SSM/I	1980–2009	Cavarieli et al. (1991)
NOAA OLR	1974–2013	Liebmann and Smith (1996)
COBE-SST2/SLP2	1900–2013	Hirahara et al. (2014)
HadCRUT	1850–2015	Morice et al. (2012)

1901 Table 1. Summary of observation and reanalysis datasets used as the references in the present  
1902 manuscript.

1903

1904

Model	ECS [K]	Radiative forcing [W/m <sup>2</sup> ]	Climate feedback [W/m <sup>2</sup> /K]
MIROC6	2.56	3.7281*	-1.4453
MIROC5	2.67	4.1033	-1.5063

1905 Table 2. Effective climate sensitivity (ECS), radiative forcing of CO<sub>2</sub> doubling, and climate feedback  
1906 for MIROC6 and MIROC5. The result of MIROC6 with ‘\*’ is different from MIROC5 at the 5% level.

1907

1908

1909  
1910

Model	Radiative forcing [W/m <sup>2</sup> ]				Climate feedback [W/m <sup>2</sup> /K]			
	LWclr	SWclr	LCRE	SCRE	LWclr	SWclr	LCRE	SCRE
MIROC6	4.2433	-0.036*	-1.2+1*	0.7663*	-	0.758*	-0.4+05	-
					21.9401*			0.2415*
MIROC5	4.2328	-0.1325	-	1.403	-1.876	0.883	-0.4504	-0.493
			01.0484					

1911 Table 3. Radiative forcing of CO<sub>2</sub> doubling and climate feedback for MIROC6 and MIROC5,  
1912 evaluated with different components of TOA radiation as longwave clear sky (LWclr), shortwave clear  
1913 sky (SWclr), longwave cloud radiative effect (LCRE), and shortwave cloud radiative effect (SCRE).  
1914 The results of MIROC6 with ‘\*’ are different from MIROC5 at the 5% level.  
1915

MIROC5 (Watanabe et al., 2010)		MIROC6 (this issue)
Atmosphere	Core	Same as MIROC5
	Resolution	T85 (150 km), 81 levels up to 0.004 hPa
	Cumulus	Same as MIROC5
	Shallow conv.	A mass flux-based single plume model based on Park and Bretherton (2009)
	Aerosol	Same as MIROC5, but with prognostic precursor gases of organic matters and diagnostic oceanic primary and secondary organic matters.
	Radiation	Same as MIROC5, but with a hexagonal solid column as ice particle habit and extended mode radius of cloud particles.
	Gravity waves	Same as MIROC5, but with a non-orographic gravity wave parameterization (Hines, 1997)
		Same as MIROC5, but with parameterizations for subgrid snow distribution (Linston et al. 2004; Nitta et al., 2014) and a snow-fed wetland (Nitta et al., 2017)
Land	Core	Same as MIROC5
Ocean/sea-ice	Resolution	Same as MIROC5
	Core	Same as MIROC5
	Resolution	Nominal 1° (tripolar grid system), 63 levels down to 6300 m
	Turbulence	Same as MIROC5, but modified turbulent kinetic energy input and smaller background vertical diffusivity under sea-ice (Komuro 2014)

Table A. Summary of the updated configurations from MIROC5 to MIROC6