

7D.2 The Origin of Systematic Errors in the GCM Simulation of ITCZ Precipitation

Winston C. Chao¹, Max J. Suarez¹, Julio T. Bacmeister²,

Baode Chen³ and Lawrence L. Takacs³

1 NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771

2 Goddard Earth Sciences and Technology Center, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD 21250

3 Science Applications International Corporation, Lanham, MD 20771

1. Introduction *

The latent heat released in the intertropical convergence zone (ITCZ) drives (or, more precisely, interacts with) the Hadley/Walker circulation; thus the realism of the location and intensity of the ITCZ precipitation simulated in a general circulation model (GCM) is a fundamental factor in the performance of a GCM. The ITCZ precipitation in most GCMs has large systematic errors. In some GCMs the ITCZ precipitation in the western and central Pacific in the June-July-August (JJA) season can be so unrealistic as to have a maximum in the southern--the incorrect--hemisphere (e.g., Fig. 22 of Hack et al. 1998, and in an earlier version of the NASA seasonal-to-interannual prediction model (NSIPP) (Bacmeister et al. 2006)).

A related issue is why the ITCZ does not appear in the wrong hemisphere in the eastern Pacific in the JJA season. Most GCMs, after some empirical modifications, may not have such an extreme as maximum ITCZ precipitation in the wrong hemisphere, but they still have the lesser problem of wrong ITCZ intensity. Why the empirical modifications helped in removing the wrong hemisphere problem and how the remaining

problems can be resolved are additional questions. Another problem common among the GCMs is the dip in the ITCZ precipitation in the middle of the northeastern Pacific—i.e., the precipitation tends to concentrate in the coastal region next to Central America.

Correcting these ITCZ systematic errors is an important area of research that has attracted many researchers (e.g., Wu et al. 2003 and Bacmeister et al. 2006). Grasping the origin of these systematic errors would aid in correcting them. The purpose of this paper is to study the origin of these systematic errors in an attempt to contribute to the larger goal of building a theoretical foundation for ITCZ study. The previous theoretical and modeling studies by Chao (2000) and Chao and Chen (2001, 2004) of the ITCZ using an aqua-planet model provide a starting point for this study. Below, we will briefly review these aqua-planet studies and apply the knowledge gained there to the problems at hand. We will also support our findings by GCM experiments using a recent version of the Goddard Earth Observing System GCM (GEOS-5).

2. Brief review of the proposed fundamental mechanisms governing the ITCZ's latitudinal location in aqua-planet settings

* Corresponding Author Address: Dr. Winston C. Chao, Code 613.2, NASA/GSFC, Greenbelt, MD, USA. Email: winston.c.chao@nasa.gov

To proceed with our study, we need to delve into the fundamental physical mechanisms that are responsible for the ITCZ. These mechanisms are most clearly revealed in aqua-planet (AP) GCM simulations. AP GCMs, with zonally-uniform sea surface temperature (SST), provide simplified settings to examine the ITCZ. Under these settings the latitudinal location of the ITCZ is determined by the earth's rotation, interaction among model physics components, and the SST latitudinal profile. A more basic AP model setting is one without variations in SST and solar angle. This case will be reviewed first. The case of SST varying only in the latitudinal direction will be reviewed next.

2.a Aqua-planet model with globally-uniform SST and solar angle

The study of the ITCZ in an AP model with globally- and temporally-uniform SST and solar angle by Chao and Chen (2004) showed that the ITCZ under such settings could be either a single ITCZ over the equator or a double ITCZ at approximately 14N&S depending on the model physics. Sometimes only one component of the double ITCZ appears (this remains a puzzle); still a single ITCZ away from the equator is distinctly different from a single ITCZ over the equator. Whether a single or a double ITCZ appears is determined by the earth's rotation, the interaction between convection and surface fluxes through earth's rotation, and the interaction between convection and radiation. Since convection is central to these interactions, the cumulus parameterization scheme plays a very important role in GCM simulation of ITCZ.

Chao and Chen (2001) performed some experiments in which the relaxed Arakawa-Schubert scheme (RAS, Moorthi and Suarez 1992) was allowed to operate only when the boundary layer relative humidity rose above a certain critical value. By increasing this critical value the behavior of the cumulus scheme could be changed from that of RAS to that of the moist convective adjustment scheme (MCA, Manabe et al. 1965), and the ITCZ could be correspondingly changed from a double ITCZ (with RAS) to a single ITCZ over the equator (with MCA).

Chao and Chen (2004) theorized that under uniform SST and solar angle conditions the ITCZ experiences two opposing types of attraction--both due to the earth's rotation--and that the latitude where these two attractions balance each other is where the ITCZ resides. The first type of attraction is due to inertial stability, which pulls the ITCZ toward the equator (see Section 3 of Chao and Chen (2001) for an explanation). This attraction does not depend on the model physics. The second type of attraction on the ITCZ is due to the latitudinal gradient of the Coriolis parameter-modified surface heat fluxes in association with synoptic convective systems, which pulls the ITCZ toward one of the poles. The degree of modification depends on the cumulus parameterization scheme, among other components of the model physics.

The magnitudes of these two types of attraction on the ITCZ as functions of latitude are depicted schematically in Fig. 15 of Chao and Chen (2004), which is reproduced here as Fig. 1. The magnitude of the first type of attraction—represented as curve A (a positive value means southward attraction)--is equal to $8\Omega \sin\phi \cos\phi$

with Ω being the earth's rotation rate and ϕ the latitude. The magnitude of the second type of attraction—represented as curve B (a positive value means northward attraction)—is depicted for RAS and MCA. Chao and Chen (2004) gave the interpretation that the conditions for MCA to operate are more restrictive than that for RAS, and therefore under MCA the modeled synoptic convective systems are more vigorous, and thus the associated surface wind--and in turn, the surface fluxes--are less affected by the earth's rotation. This is because after an air parcel moves down into the boundary layer, it moves quickly towards the center of the convective systems and spends a very short time in being affected by the Coriolis force to increase its speed. As a result, curve B_{mca} is weaker than B_{ras} . Curve A is derived analytically and curve B is constructed based on both numerical experimental results and theoretical arguments; see Chao and Chen (2004) for details.

For RAS the stable balance between the two types of attraction is at approximately 14N&S and for MCA the stable balance is at the equator. (These locations are called the centers of rotational ITCZ attractors (Chao and Chen 2001)). Therefore, RAS yields a double ITCZ straddling the equator, whereas MCA yields a single ITCZ over the equator. The net attraction on the ITCZ (a positive value means southward attraction) is depicted as curve R in Fig. 2a and Fig. 2b for both RAS and MCA (reproduced from Chao (2000)).

When the condition that the boundary layer relative humidity must be above a certain critical value is added to RAS, the condition for RAS to operate becomes stricter and RAS behaves more like MCA; i.e., in Fig.1, B_{ras} is reduced to

B_{mca} as this critical value increases. As a result a double ITCZ turns into a single ITCZ.

Chao and Chen (2004) pointed out that the failure of earlier theories of the ITCZ was due to the failure of CISK and wave-CISK theories and to not recognizing the existence of curve B in Fig. 1.

2.b *Aqua-planet model with an SST latitudinal profile*

When the SST distribution is changed from globally-uniform to latitudinal-varying (but zonally-uniform) and is given a Gaussian-shape latitudinal dependence, the ITCZ experiences an additional type of attraction towards a latitude offset slightly poleward from the SST peak. This is shown in Fig. 11 of Chao (2000), in an experiment without the earth's rotation. In this experiment with the Coriolis parameter f set to zero as the SST peak is moved poleward--and with the shape of the SST latitudinal Gaussian profile unchanged--the ITCZ offset from the SST peak increases¹. But this offset remains small. This new type of attraction is depicted in Figs. 2a,b as line S. Chao (2000) gave an explanation as to why this attraction could be approximately represented by a linear line. Obviously, the slope of line S (or its

¹ The explanation for the poleward offset of the ITCZ from the SST peak is as follows: When the SST peak is at the equator in this experiment, the equator is the latitude of symmetry and the ITCZ is located there.; but when the SST peak is moved away from the equator, the earth's geometry is no longer symmetric with respect to the SST peak. The poleward side of the SST peak has a higher averaged SST and thus the ITCZ is located slightly poleward of the SST peak. The degree of the asymmetry and thus that of the offset becomes larger as the SST peak is moved farther away from the equator.

closeness to a vertical line) is an indication of the strength of the attraction due to the SST peak.

When both the earth's rotation and a Gaussian SST latitudinal profile exist within an experiment, the balance in Fig. 2 of curve R (a positive value means southward attraction)--representing the rotational forcing (i.e., the difference between curves A and B in Fig. 1)--and line S (a positive value means northward attraction) determines the latitudinal location of the ITCZ for both RAS and MCA. If RAS is used and the SST peak remains at the equator and becomes sharper--i.e., line S becomes more vertical--the two components of the double ITCZ draw closer and eventually merge, See Fig. 13 of Chao (2000) for the result of such an experiment.

If the SST Gaussian latitudinal profile retains its shape but is moved latitudinally, the ITCZ structure can change quite substantially. Fig. 11 of Chao and Chen (2001) shows the results of such an experiment for both MCA and RAS types of convection schemes. When MCA is used and the SST peak is moved northward from the equator, consistent with Fig. 2a, a single ITCZ follows behind the SST peak and then suddenly starts to catch up with the SST peak, but does not quite reach the SST peak, and thereafter the ITCZ appears to be almost stationary despite further northward movement of the SST peak.

When RAS is used, there are two balance latitudes if the SST peak is not too far away from the equator (Fig. 2b). Thus, there is a double ITCZ. As the SST peak moves northward from the equator, both ITCZ components move northward and the southern component of the double ITCZ becomes stronger than the northern component. Finally, the southern ITCZ moves rapidly to merge

with the northern component, and thereafter the merged single ITCZ remains almost stationary despite further northward movement of the SST peak. This phenomenon, shown in Fig. 3.b of Chao and Chen (2001), has not been previously explained. The explanation for this phenomenon is a prerequisite of our answer to the theoretical questions asked in the introduction and will be given in the next section.

2.c Remarks

Our interpretation of the AP experimental results is based on the assumption that the attractions on the ITCZ can be linearly added; however, this assumption does not have to be exactly correct for our interpretation to hold. See the Appendix for a discussion of this additive assumption.

3. The explanations

3.a Explanation for Fig. 3 of Chao and Chen (2001)

The explanation for the ITCZ behavior illustrated in Fig. 3.b of Chao and Chen (2001) is as follows. There is a nearly vertical demarcation line in the zonal mean meridional circulation separating the northern components of the meridional circulation cells from the southern components. One may call the latitude of this demarcation line the "meridional circulation equator (MCE)." When the SST peak is at the equator, the MCE is there too. When the SST peak is moved northward from the equator, the MCE--which lies midway between the two ITCZ

components that are moving northward--should move northward as well. As the MCE moves north of the equator, the global area south of the MCE becomes larger than that north of the MCE. Since the southern component of the double ITCZ is now responsible for heating a larger area, it is expected to become stronger than the northern component of the double ITCZ². Thus, as the SST peak is moved north from the equator, the southern component of the double ITCZ strengthens. As the SST peak is moved further north away from the equator, its attraction no longer balances the two rotational attractors separately. Now, in Fig. 2.b, line S no longer intersects curve R south of the equator--i.e., the attraction due to the SST peak has to deal with the two rotational attractors as a whole. Therefore, the double ITCZ now becomes a single ITCZ--i.e., the southern component of the double ITCZ moves rapidly to merge with the northern one.

3.b *Explanation for how the simulated ITCZ maximum precipitation can be in the wrong hemisphere*

In Fig. 2b (from Chao and Chen 2001), it is obvious that if the slope of line S becomes greater (i.e., if line S becomes more vertical) relative to curve R through a modification of the model physics, the two components of the double ITCZ will merge sooner (i.e., the southern ITCZ will move to merge with the northern ITCZ sooner) as the SST peak is moved north from the equator. On the other hand, if the slope of line S relative to

² Although the ITCZ is not responsible for all the convective heating, it is by far the main contributor. Also, there can be net energy flux across the MCE. But since the Hadley circulation is dominant in the tropics, this flux is negligible.

curve R is weak enough, or the SST peak is not moved sufficiently far from the equator, the merger will not happen. For a seasonal movement of the SST peak that moves only between, for example, 5S and 10N (as the observed SST peak in the Pacific, ignoring the minor peak northeast of Australia; or as the observed zonal mean SST), a weaker slope of line S relative to curve R--by not allowing the merger to occur--yields a seasonal cycle of the ITCZ that has a double ITCZ year-round with a stronger southern component in the JJA season. On the other hand, a greater slope of line S relative to curve R yields this ITCZ structure only in off-JJA seasons and yields a single northern ITCZ in the JJA season, when the SST peak is farthest north of the equator.

In the eastern Pacific in the JJA season, the SST has a much stronger peak in the meridional direction than in the central and western Pacific. Thus, according to our interpretation above, the wrong hemisphere problem does not occur in the eastern Pacific even when it occurs in the western and central Pacific.

3.c *Remarks*

If given a GCM that has maximum ITCZ precipitation in the southern hemisphere in the central and western Pacific in the JJA season, one should be able to correct the problem by increasing the SST peak in the northern hemisphere in the JJA season or by changing the model physics such that line S becomes more vertical relative to curve R in Fig. 2b. Of course, changing the SST is not a real option, but it can verify our idea. The next question is how to change the model physics. We will discuss three possibilities.

As demonstrated in Chao and Chen (2004) curve B in Fig. 1 and therefore curve R in Fig. 2 can be changed by adding a condition to the cumulus parameterization scheme such that the cumulus parameterization scheme is allowed to operate only when the boundary layer relative humidity exceeds a critical value. By increasing this critical value, the convection is harder to occur, but when it does occur, it is more vigorous. This reduces the control of the ITCZ due to the earth's rotation--i.e. it reduces the magnitude of curve R, thus making the slope of line S relative to curve R greater in Fig. 2b.

A second possible change in the model physics is to change the degree of re-evaporation of the cumulus rainfall. With rain re-evaporation intensified--which reduces the net convective heating--the synoptic-scale convective systems are less vigorous and they experience the modifying effect of f more, resulting in a more unstable vertical atmospheric structure as a consequence of the boundary layer air that converges toward the convective system center taking on a more spiral path and higher speed (due to stronger tangential wind in responding to f) and incurring more surface fluxes (see the discussion associated with Fig. 6 of Chao and Chen 2004). This is the same way that a less vigorous convection scheme has higher attraction of the ITCZ due to the earth's rotation in an AP model with uniform SST³. This means a greater curve R in Fig. 2b. Intensifying rain re-evaporation also increases the magnitude of line S in Fig. 2b for a similar reason. Whether curve R or line S increases at a faster rate determines whether rain re-evaporation should be

³ However, the attraction due to the SST peak depends on f , whereas the second rotational attraction depend on f and β .

increased or decreased so as to realize its salutary effect. This will have to be determined by experimentation.

A third possibility of changing the model physics is to modify the cumulus momentum transport (CMT). Intensifying CMT reduces the intensity of the convective systems and should have a similar effect as rain re-evaporation. In the next section, our explanation is put to test. Of course, there can be many other ways of modifying the model physics to change the slope of line S relative to curve R in Fig. 2b; the mechanisms of how they effect their changes remains to be explored.

4. Supporting experiments

The model used for this study is a recent version of the Goddard Modeling and Simulation Office's (GMAO) Earth Observing System GCM (GEOS-5). The model has the finite-volume dynamical core of Lin (2004), the combined boundary layer and turbulence package of Louis (1980) and Lock et al. (2000), the land surface model of Koster and Suarez (1996), the radiation package of Chou and Suarez (1994, 1999), the relaxed Arakawa-Schubert scheme (RAS, Moorthi and Suarez 1992), and the prognostic cloud scheme of Bacmeister et al. (2006). It also has the rain re-evaporation scheme of Bacmeister et al. (2006). The scheme of cumulus transport of momentum follows that used in the UCLA model. This scheme advects momentum using the cumulus mass flux calculated in RAS. The resolution we used was 2.5° (lon), 2° (lat), and 32 levels. This model has the same poor simulation of the JJA Pacific ITCZ if rain re-evaporation is absent, but

not the same healing effect when rain re-evaporation is added, as found in the original NSIPP model.

We created an aqua-planet version of GEOS-5 and used it and the full model for our experiments. We did ten one-year experiments, APE1 through APE10, with the AP model; in each experiment the rain re-evaporation scheme was multiplied by a factor EV and the cumulus momentum transport was multiplied by a factor CF . EV varies from 0 to 2; 0 means rain re-evaporation is not used and 1 means the original rain re-evaporation intensity is used. CF is either 1 or 0--i.e., cumulus momentum transport is either used or not used (see Table 1a).

In all these experiments, the initial condition is the end result of a three-year AP experiment with globally- and temporally-uniform SST (29°C) and solar angle Z ($\cos Z=0.25$), starting from a resting atmosphere plus minute perturbations in surface winds, uniform surface pressure and temperature and moisture fields as functions of height only. This initial condition, given a date of January 1, has a double ITCZ. Also, the SST is a linear combination of 25% of a constant 29°C and 75% of a Gaussian latitudinal profile centered at the equator as specified in Chao (2000, see its Eq. 1). In APE1 through APE10 the SST remains unchanged in the first 4 months and then the SST latitudinal profile, retaining its shape, is moved northward by 15 degrees in 8 months at a constant rate.

Figs. 3a and 3b show the zonally-averaged precipitation rate as a function of latitude and time for APE2 and APE7, respectively. Fig. 3.a shows that as the SST peak is moved poleward from the equator, the ITCZ behaves just like in Fig. 2a—

falling behind the SST peak at first and then catching up with it, but failing to do so completely and then remaining almost stationary in spite of further poleward movement of the SST peak, essentially a repeat of the experiment described in Fig. 2 of Chao (2000). In APE3 through APE5, during the first four months while the SST peak is at the equator, a double ITCZ exists and the two components of the double ITCZ draw closer as the rain re-evaporation rate is increased. The change from a single ITCZ in APE2 to a double ITCZ in APE3 in the first four months of the experiments indicates that curve R in Fig. 2b has a small magnitude so that it intersects line S only at the equator in APE2, whereas it has a larger magnitude so that it intersects line S at three places in APE3. The difference between APE2 and APE3 is due to a change in the intensity of rain re-evaporation.

Table 1b gives 1) the month that the southern component of the double ITCZ crosses the equator, 2) a label “single” for experiments yielding a single ITCZ, or 3) a label “double” for an experiment yielding double ITCZ but its southern component did not cross the equator. In APE3 through APE5, as the SST peak is moved northward, the southern ITCZ intensifies and its crossing into to the northern hemisphere occurs later when the rain re-evaporation rate is increased—results of decreasing of the slope of curve S relative to curve R in Fig. 2b. These experiments lend support to our interpretation of the mechanism behind the ability of rain re-evaporation to influence the ITCZ simulation in GCMs.

Table 1b shows that inclusion of cumulus momentum transport can delay the equator-crossing of the southern component of the double

ITCZ--i.e., decreasing the slope of line S relative to curve R in Fig. 2b for $EV=0.7$ and 1 cases. However, for $EV>1$ the impact of adding cumulus momentum transport is reversed. Thus, like rain re-evaporation, the impact of cumulus momentum transport on the ITCZ location is not uniform. Also, when cumulus momentum transport is included, a further increase of EV above 1 does not delay the merger. This indicates that both curve R and line S in Fig. 2b increase at a rate to balance each other.

We also did four experiments with the full model at 2.5° (lon) by 2° (lat) and 72 levels of resolution (which is more than double the vertical resolution in both the troposphere and stratosphere as used in the AP experiments): FME1 with no rain re-evaporation ($EV=0$); FME2 with rain re-evaporation ($EV=1$); FME3, a repeat of FME1 but with an SST perturbation in the form of a linear function of latitude from zero at the equator to 4°C at 20N , and another linear function back to zero at 40N being added to the observed SST used in FME2 in the JJA season; FME4 a repeat of FME2 with a condition on RAS that the boundary layer relative humidity has to be greater than 95%. In all four experiments, CF is set at 1.

The full model experiments started from Oct 11, 1992 using observed SST. Each ran for more than three years. FME1 shows an ITCZ precipitation peak in the wrong hemisphere in the JJA season and FME2 shows that the bias has been alleviated to some extent, similar to what Bacmeister et al. (2006) found with the NSIPP model, in 1994 but not in 1993. FME3 (Fig. 6) shows that strengthening the northern SST peak and moving it further north in the JJA season can move the ITCZ to the correct hemisphere in JJA.

This is consistent with our AP experiments and it supports our interpretation as presented in the preceding paragraph.

The FME2 results indicate that the degree of impact of rain re-evaporation is not uniform and is highly dependent on other factors, such as the SST. The latter experiments showed that increasing rain re-evaporation help the ITCZ component on the other side of the equator from the SSP peak to prolong its existence. As we mentioned in the preceding section, when the model setting is changed (from AP to full model and with the SST distribution changed and more levels) and when the rain re-evaporation rate is increased the rate of increase in the slope of line S can be larger than the rate of increase of curve R so that adding rain re-evaporation may hasten the merger of the southern ITCZ with the northern one and the maximum ITCZ precipitation peak and the SST peak can be in the same hemisphere in JJA.

The weak JJA precipitation in the northern Indian Ocean in FME1 has persisted in FME2. Thus rain re-evaporation is not a panacea and has to be used in conjunction with other changes in the GCM physics.

FME4 (Fig. 7) indicates that the ITCZ precipitation shows no sign of double ITCZ as a result of curve R in Fig. 2 being reduced and there is only one intersecting point.

5. Summary and remarks

The latitudinal location of the ITCZ is controlled by the balance of two factors: the latitudinal distribution of the SST and the earth's rotation. The strength of each factor is affected by the model physics. Thus, the latitudinal location of

the ITCZ responds to changes in the model physics. Identification of the origin of some of the ITCZ systematic errors and a description of how the treatment of the moist convective process can affect these errors have been the contribution of this paper and the work leading to it. Also, the impacts on the ITCZ systematic errors due to changes in rain re-evaporation and cumulus momentum transport are highly variable. The ITCZ simulation can also be sensitive to other components of the model physics. However, they have not yet been systematically studied yet.

If the SST-peak controlling factor is greater than the rotational controlling factor, the ITCZ precipitation in a zonally non-uniform setting tends to show excessive peaks in the zonal direction, in addition to the meridional direction, generating locally excessive precipitation maximum areas. Many GCMs show a dip in the ITCZ precipitation in the zonal direction in the middle of the eastern Pacific for this reason—that the control by the SST peak in the Pacific coastal region next to Central America is too high. Also, the JJA mean precipitation maximum in the northwestern Pacific is often excessive for the same reason.

How to change the GCM physics so as to improve the ITCZ simulation remains a challenge, despite the progress made herein. Although we have identified a few factors in the model physics that may influence the simulation of the ITCZ and have explained the mechanisms behind their influence, we do not yet have a complete collection of these factors. Among the few important factors that we are familiar with we do not yet know to what degree each of them should be changed. There may be sets of changes to these factors that

can bring similar degree of improvement in the ITCZ simulation. The best choice within these sets of changes may have to be determined by—in addition to the model’s performance in simulating the monthly and seasonal mean structure of the ITCZ—the model’s performance in simulating phenomena related to the ITCZ, such as the Madden-Julian oscillation, mixed Rossby-gravity (Yanai) waves, Kelvin waves, and the ITCZ breakdown-and-zonalization cycle (all related to the oscillations of the convection within the ITCZ). Thus, the physical mechanisms behind these other tropical phenomena should also be studied in order to improve the GCM simulation of the ITCZ precipitation. In other words, possible sources of the random errors in the ITCZ simulation and the mechanisms behind them should also be studied. Thus, much more work still lies ahead.

Although the recent effort in super-parameterization has resulted in improvement in the ITCZ simulation, there is room for further improvement. For example, the too-high precipitation maximum in the northwestern Pacific in JJA is still present in the latest models with super-parameterization (Tao, personal communication).

Our study is based on aqua-planet settings with prescribed SST; we have not studied the roles of land-atmosphere and ocean-atmosphere interactions in determining ITCZ precipitation. Coastal regions of South America and India are often the trouble spots for GCM precipitation simulation. Improving the El Niño simulation, which strongly depends on the ITCZ simulation, remains a challenge as well. These also await our efforts.

References

- Arakawa, A. and W. H. Schubert, 1974: Interaction of a cumulus cloud ensemble with the large-scale Environment, Part I. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **31**, 674–701.
- Bacmeister, J. T., M. J. Suarez, and F. R. Robertson, 2006: Rain re-evaporation, boundary-layer/convection interactions, and Pacific rainfall patterns in an AGCM. *J. Climate*. In press.
- Chao, W. C., 2000: Multiple quasi-equilibria of the ITCZ and the origin of monsoon onset. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **57**, 641-651.
- Chao, W. C., and B. Chen, 2001: Multiple quasi-equilibria of the ITCZ and the origin of monsoon onset. Part II. Rotational ITCZ attractors. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **58**, 2820-2831.
- Chao, W. C. and B. Chen, 2004: Single and double ITCZ in an aqua-planet model with constant SST and solar angle. *Climate Dynamics*, **22**, 447-479.
- Chou, M. D. and M. J. Suarez, 1994: An efficient thermal infrared radiation parameterization for use in general circulation models. NASA Tech. Memo., 104606, 10 84pp.
- Chou, M. D. and M. J. Suarez, 1999: A solar radiation parameterization for atmospheric studies, NASA Technical Memo, 104606, Vol. 11, 40pp.
- Hack, J. J., J T. Kiehl and J. W. Hurrell, 1998: The hydrologic and thermodynamic characteristics of the NCAR CCM3. *J. Clim.*, **11**, 1179-1206.
- Koster, R., and M. Suarez, 1996: Energy and water balance calculations in the Mosaic LSM. *NASA Tech Memo*. 104606, Vol. 9, 60 pp. (available from the library of NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771).
- Lin, S.-J. 2004: A “vertically Lagrangian” finite-volume dynamical core for global models. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **132**, 2293–2307.
- Lock, A. P., A. R. Brown, M. R. Bush, G. M. Martin, and R. N. B. Smith: 2000: A new boundary layer mixing scheme. Part I: Scheme description and single-column model tests. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **128**, 1387-1399.
- Louis, J.-F., 1979: A parametric model of vertical eddy fluxes in the atmosphere. *Boundary Layer Meteor.* **17**, 187-202.
- Manabe, S., J. Smagorinsky and R. F. Strickler, 1965: Simulated climatology of a general circulation model with a hydrological cycle. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **93**, 769-798.
- Moorthi, S., and M. J. Suarez, 1990: Relaxed Arakawa-Schubert: A parameterization of moist convection for general circulation models. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **120**, 978-1002.
- Wu, X., X. Liang, and G. J. Zhang, 2003: Seasonal migration of ITCZ precipitation across the equator: Why can't GCMs simulate it? *GRL*, **30**, No. 15, 1824-1828.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Modeling, Analysis and Prediction program of NASA Science Mission Directorate.

Appendix

Additive assumption in Fig. 2

In Fig. 2 it is assumed that the two types of attractions on the ITCZ due to the earth's rotation and the SST peak can be added. This additive assumption is only approximately correct. Our explanation does not hinge on this assumption being exactly correct. This appendix provides a discussion of this point.

The ITCZ latitudinal location can be expressed as the latitude(s) where $A(\Omega, \text{SST}, \phi) = 0$ and $\partial A / \partial \phi > 0$, where A denotes the net southward attraction on the ITCZ. A is of course a highly nonlinear function of the earth's rotation rate Ω , SST distribution, and latitude ϕ , among other factors. This equation can only be approximately expressed as $A(\Omega, G, \phi) + A(0, \text{SST}, \phi) = 0$, where G is the globally averaged SST—or curve R minus line $S=0$ in Fig. 2.

Our argument in explaining Fig. 3 of Chao and Chen (2001) using Fig. 2 only requires that as the SST peak is moved northward from the equator, the two ITCZ components move northward also. The locations of these ITCZ components do not have to be at the exact locations of the intersecting points between curve R and line S in Fig 2. It is obvious that when the SST peak is moved northward from the equator, both ITCZ components should move northward as well.

Our argument as to why the southern ITCZ component should be stronger once the SST peak moves into the northern hemisphere does not depend on the additive assumption being exactly correct. The multiple solutions presented in Fig. 3 of Chao and Chen demonstrates the nonlinear nature of the dependence of A on SST.

Table 1a

		EV					
		0	0.5	0.75	1.0	1.5	2.0
CF	0	APE1	APE2	APE3	APE4	APE5	
	1		APE6	APE7	APE8	APE9	APE10

Table 1a shows the experiment labels as functions of EV and CF

Table 1b

		EV					
		0	0.5	0.75	1.0	1.5	2.0
CF	0	single	single	June	Aug	double	
	1		single	Aug	Sept	Sept	Sept

Table 1b shows the structure of the ITCZ for different experiments. Single (double) means the ITCZ remained single (double) throughout the experiment. Month means the month that the southern component of the double ITCZ crosses the equator.




Fig. 1 Schematic diagram showing the strength of the two types of attraction acting on the ITCZ, both due to the earth's rotation. Curve A represents the strength of the southward attraction due to inertial stability. Curve B represents the strength of the northward attraction due to latitudinal gradient of f -modified surface fluxes associated with synoptic-scale convective systems. (from Chao and Chen 2004)




Fig. 2a Curve R represents the net southward attraction on the ITCZ due to the earth's rotation--i.e., the difference between the two curves in Fig. 1 when MCA is used--and line S represents the northward attraction on the ITCZ due to the SST peak. Line S1 is line S when the SST peak is close to the equator. (From Chao 2000)




Fig. 2b Curve R represents the strength of the southward net attraction on the ITCZ due to the earth's rotation--i.e., the difference between the two curves in Fig. 1--when RAS is used and line S is the strength of the northward attraction on the ITCZ due to the SST peak when the SST peak is at the equator. (From Chao 2000)

E058 Rainfall d3-d365




Fig. 3a Zonally averaged precipitation (mm/day) for APE2 as a function of latitude and time.

E051 Rainfall d3-d365




Fig. 3.b Zonally averaged precipitation (mm/day) for APE7 as a function of latitude and time.

E062 time mean rainfall JJA 1993




Fig. 4.a June-July-August mean precipitation (mm/day) in 1993 for FME1.

E062 time mean rainfall JJA 1994




Fig. 4.b June-July-August mean precipitation (mm/day) in 1994 for FME1.

E061 time mean rainfall JJA 1993




Fig. 5a June-July-August mean precipitation (mm/day) in 1993 for FME2.

E061 time mean rainfall JJA 1994




Fig. 5b June-July-August mean precipitation (mm/day) in 1994 for FME2.

E070 time mean rainfall JJA 1993




Fig. 6 June-July-August mean precipitation (mm/day) in 1993 for FME3.

E081 time mean rainfall JJA 1993




Fig. 7 June-July-August mean precipitation (mm/day) in 1993 for FME4.