Supporting Information for

"Stratospheric response in a first geoengineering simulation meeting multiple surface climate objectives"

Jadwiga H. Richter¹, Simone Tilmes^{1,2}, Anne Glanville^{1,2}, Ben Kravitz³, Douglas G. MacMartin^{4,5}, Michael J. Mills², Isla R. Simpson¹, Francis Vitt², Joseph J. Tribbia¹, Jean-Francois Lamarque¹

¹Climate and Global Dynamics Laboratory, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder CO, USA ²Atmospheric Chemistry, Observations, and Modeling Laboratory, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder CO,

USA

³Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, USA

⁴Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

⁵Department of Computing and Mathematical Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA

Supplementary Figures

Corresponding author: Jadwiga H. Richter, jrichter@ucar.edu



Figure S1. Stratospheric temperature difference between the feedback and RCP8.5 simulations over the same time period averaged over a) 2020 - 2039, b) 2040 - 2059, c) 2060 - 2079, and d) 2080 - 2099. Contours are in intervals of 2 K. Black circles depict the locations of SO₂ injections. Areas not statistically significant at the 95% level based on a two-sided student t-test are stippled.



Figure S2. Stratospheric ozone concentration differences between the feedback simulation and RCP8.5 simulation over the same time period averaged over a) 2020 - 2039, b) 2040 - 2059, c) 2060 - 2079, and d) 2080 - 2099. Contour interval is 0.2 ppmv. Areas not statistically significant at the 95% level based on a two-sided student t-test are stippled.



Figure S3. Same as Figure S2 but for SW heating rate. Contours are in intervals of 2 K. Black circles depict the locations of SO₂ injections. Contours are in intervals of 0.05 K day⁻¹. Areas not statistically significant at the 95% level based on a two-sided student t-test are stippled.



Figure S4. Same as Figure S2 but for annually averaged zonal mean wind. Contour interval is 2 m s^{-1} .