Wind-driven evolution of the North Pacific subpolar gyre over the last deglaciation
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Key points

- Planktic foraminiferal $\delta^{18}$O data indicate that the North Pacific subpolar gyre expanded southward by $\sim$3$^\circ$ during the Last Glacial Maximum
- Climate models show that changes in gyre extent/strength are driven by the response of the westerlies to ice sheet albedo and topography
- Proxy data and model simulations indicate that the gyre boundary and winds began to migrate northward at $\sim$17-16 ka, during Heinrich Stadial 1

Abstract
North Pacific atmospheric and oceanic circulations are key missing pieces in our understanding of the reorganisation of the global climate system since the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM). Here, using a basin-wide compilation of planktic foraminiferal $\delta^{18}$O, we show that the North Pacific subpolar gyre extended $\sim$3° further south during the LGM, consistent with sea surface temperature and productivity proxy data. Analysis of an ensemble of climate models indicates that the expansion of the subpolar gyre was associated with a substantial gyre strengthening. These gyre circulation changes were driven by a southward shift in the mid-latitude westerlies and increased wind-stress from the polar easterlies. Using single-forcing model runs, we show these atmospheric circulation changes are a non-linear response to the combined topographic and albedo effects of the Laurentide Ice Sheet. Our reconstruction suggests the gyre boundary (and thus westerly winds) began to migrate northward at $\sim$17-16 ka, during Heinrich Stadial 1.

Plain language summary

Despite the North Pacific’s importance in the global climate system, changes in the circulation of this region since the last ice age are poorly understood. Today, the North Pacific Ocean has very different properties north and south of $\sim$40°N: to the south, the warm surface waters form a circulation cell that moves clockwise (the subtropical gyre); to the north, the cold surface waters form a circulation cell that moves anti-clockwise (the subpolar gyre). This difference in surface ocean circulation north and south of $\sim$40°N is determined by the wind patterns. Here, using a compilation of oxygen isotopes measured in the carbonate shells of fossil plankton from sediment cores across the basin, which tracks changes in the spatial pattern of temperature, we reconstruct how the position of the boundary between the gyres changed since the last
ice age. Our results show that the boundary between the gyres was shifted southward by ~3° during the last ice age; this indicates that the westerly winds were also shifted southward at this time. Using numerical simulations of the climate, we find that this ice age shift in the westerly winds is primarily due to the presence of a large ice sheet over North America.

1. Introduction

Despite the North Pacific’s importance in the global climate system, the reorganisation of surface ocean and atmosphere in this region during the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM, ~20 ka) and the last deglaciation (~10-20 ka, ‘the deglaciation’ from here on) remain poorly constrained. Changes in atmospheric and surface ocean circulation within the North Pacific are potentially important drivers of observed changes in the overturning circulation and biogeochemistry of the North Pacific during the LGM and deglaciation, suggested to play a role in regulating atmospheric CO₂ (Keigwin, 1998; Okazaki et al., 2010; Rae et al., 2014; Gray et al., 2018). The overturning and gyre circulations are also important influences on poleward ocean heat transport. Large changes in the hydroclimate of western North America during the LGM and the deglaciation (e.g. Oviatt et al., 1999; Nelson et al., 2005; Lyle et al., 2012; McGee et al., 2012; Kirby et al., 2013; Ibarra et al., 2014) have been suggested to result from the reorganisation of North Pacific atmospheric circulation (e.g. Oster et al., 2015; Wong et al., 2016; Lora et al., 2017; Lora, 2018), with early modelling work suggesting a southward displacement of the westerly jet with the presence of the Laurentide Ice Sheet (Manabe & Broccoli, 1985; Bartlein et al., 1998). However, evidence for this atmospheric reorganisation has not yet been identified in marine records.
Driven by the opposite signs of the climatological wind stress curl ($\nabla \times \tau$), the subtropical and subpolar gyres of the North Pacific Ocean have vastly different physical and chemical properties (Boyer et al., 2013; Key et al., 2015). The boundary between the gyres (defined as the point between the gyres at which the barotropic streamfunction $[\Psi_{\text{barotropic}}] = 0$) is determined by Sverdrup balance and occurs where $\nabla \times \tau$ integrated from the eastern boundary of the basin is zero (Sverdrup, 1947; Deser et al., 1999).

Today, the gyre boundary (which broadly determines the position of the subarctic front) is nearly zonal and lies at ~40 °N, approximately following the local $\nabla \times \tau = 0$ line. South of ~40°N, anticyclonic wind stress curl in the subtropical gyre (STG) results in Ekman pumping (downwelling), allowing warm, nutrient-poor, surface waters to accumulate. North of ~40°N, cyclonic wind stress curl in the subpolar gyre (SPG) results in Ekman suction (upwelling), bringing cold, nutrient-rich, waters from the oceans interior into the surface. Surface ocean chlorophyll concentrations are order of magnitude higher in the SPG compared to the STG. The gyre circulation also dominates ocean heat transport in the Pacific (Forget and Ferreira, 2019). The relative extent and the strength of the gyres therefore exerts a large influence over basin-wide ecology, biogeochemistry, and climate.

Coupled climate models predict a ~60% increase in wind stress curl within the subpolar North Pacific under glacial forcings compared to pre-industrial forcings (Gray et al., 2018). By Sverdrup balance (Sverdrup, 1947), this should result in a large and predictable response in gyre circulation. Despite some early work suggesting the subarctic front may have shifted southward during glacial times (Thompson and Shackleton, 1980; Sawada and Handa, 1998), little is known about gyre circulation over
the deglaciation. Here, we use meridional profiles of planktic foraminiferal $\delta^{18}$O to reconstruct the position of the gyre boundary over the deglaciation. Given the relatively simple dynamical link between gyre circulation and wind stress, our gyre boundary reconstruction also helps constrain the deglacial reorganisation of the atmospheric circulation. We use an ensemble of climate models forced by a range of boundary conditions to further explore the causes and implications of our gyre boundary reconstruction for the atmospheric and near-surface ocean circulations within the North Pacific.

2. Methods

2.1 $\delta^{18}$O as a tracer of gyre circulation

The large (~20 °C) sea surface temperature (SST) difference between the gyres (Boyer et al., 2013) allows us to use meridional profiles of $\delta^{18}$O in planktic foraminiferal calcite ($\delta^{18}$O$_{\text{calcite}}$) to trace the gyre boundary (supporting information). This temperature difference between the gyres drives a calcite-water fractionation ($\delta^{18}$O$_{\text{calcite-water}}$) that is ~6 ‰ greater in the SPG than the STG (Figure 1d). Therefore, although the $\delta^{18}$O of seawater ($\delta^{18}$O$_{\text{water}}$) is ~1 ‰ lighter in the SPG compared to the STG due to its lower salinity (~1.5 PSU; Figure 1c), $\delta^{18}$O$_{\text{calcite}}$ is ~5 ‰ higher in the SPG than the STG (Figure 1e). The two gyres are thus clearly delineated in the $\delta^{18}$O of planktic foraminiferal calcite predicted using modern temperature and $\delta^{18}$O$_{\text{water}}$ (Figure 1e), with the steepest meridional gradient in $\delta^{18}$O$_{\text{calcite}}$ at the gyre boundary (Figure 1f). While there are likely to be local changes in $\delta^{18}$O$_{\text{water}}$ across the basin over the deglaciation, a salinity difference of ~15 PSU would be required to equal the temperature signal between the gyres. As no mechanism exists to drive such a salinity/$\delta^{18}$O$_{\text{water}}$ difference, temperature will always dominate the meridional $\delta^{18}$O$_{\text{calcite}}$
gradient (Figure 1f). We can therefore use meridional profiles of $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ to track the position of the gyre boundary.

We compiled previously published planktic foraminiferal $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ records spanning the last deglaciation from the North Pacific Ocean (Figure 1; supporting information). The gyre boundary is clearly defined by the steepest meridional gradient ($\Delta \delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}/\Delta \text{Latitude}$) in the Holocene planktic foraminiferal $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ data (Figure 2; supporting information). The difference in meridional temperature gradient between the east and west of the basin is also evident in the Holocene $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ data (Figure 2b).

To reconstruct position the of gyre boundary over the deglaciation, we first model the $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ data as a function of latitude, using a general additive model (GAM) in the mgcv package in R (Wood, 2011; Wood et al., 2016) at 500 yr timesteps from 18.5 to 10.5 ka (supporting information; Figures S2-4). The smoothing term was calculated using generalised cross validation (GCV), and corroborated using Reduced Maximum Likelihood (REML), with both methods resulting in near-identical smoothing terms and model fits. We then calculate the change in gyre boundary position over the deglaciation as the latitudinal shift ($x^\circ$) that minimises the Euclidian distance ($L^2$) between the Holocene (taken as 10.5±0.5 ka) $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$(Lat) GAM fit and the GAM fit at each time step, computed within a 5° latitudinal band around the maximum meridional $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ gradient in the Holocene data (supporting information; Figure S5). The width of this latitudinal band has a negligible effect on our results (Figure S6).
We account for the effect of whole ocean changes in sea level ($\delta^{18}O_{water}$) and SST on $\delta^{18}O_{calcite}$ by subtracting the 1‰ whole ocean change in $\delta^{18}O_{water}$ (Schrag et al., 2002) and the $\sim$2°C global-mean change in SST from the PMIP3 climate model ensemble (see below), scaling the subtracted anomalies through time in proportion to the sea level curve of Lambeck et al. (2014). This scaling is most robust for $\delta^{18}O_{water}$ due to its direct correlation with global terrestrial ice volume, however the correction for global SST has very little effect and is not therefore a significant source of error. We opt to make this global-mean SST correction in order to minimise differences in $\delta^{18}O_{calcite}$ at different time steps relating to whole-ocean SST changes (i.e. from radiative forcing), rather than local SST anomalies. The calculated changes in gyre boundary position ($\Delta$Lat) are given in table S2; the reported uncertainty in $\Delta$Lat is derived by quadratically propagating the uncertainty in the $\delta^{18}O_{calcite}$(Lat) GAM fits, and is typically ±0.9° (1σ).

2.2 General circulation models

We analysed an ensemble of general circulation models forced with pre-industrial and glacial boundary conditions from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 5 (CMIP5, Taylor et al. 2012) and the Paleoclimate Model Intercomparison Project phase 3 (PMIP3, Braconnot et al. 2012). We include all four models for which both wind stress and barotropic stream function are available (supporting information). We also analyse results from a single model (HadCM3) where LGM greenhouse gases, ice sheet topography ('green mountains'), and ice sheet albedo ('white plains') forcing were changed individually (Roberts and Valdes, 2017), as well as a series of HadCM3 runs where all forcings and boundary conditions are changed progressively over the deglaciation in 500 yr ‘snapshots’ (as used by Morris
et al., 2018), broadly following the PMIP4 protocol (Figure S8; see Ivanovic et al.,
2016 and supporting information).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 LGM planktic foraminiferal δ^18O, SST, and productivity

While sites that today are located well within either the modern SPG or STG
display an LGM difference in δ^18O_{calcite} of ~1-1.5 ‰, sites located within the transition
zone between the gyres display a much greater change of up to ~3 ‰ (Figure 1). This
anomalously large glacial increase in δ^18O_{calcite} is observed in transition zone sites in
the east and west of the basin. The Holocene δ^18O_{calcite} of sites located in today’s
transition zone typically falls about half-way between the δ^18O_{calcite} of the SPG and
STG. In contrast, during the LGM the δ^18O_{calcite} of these same sites is almost identical
to the δ^18O_{calcite} of sites located well within the SPG. This pattern is indicative of a
southward shift in the boundary between the SPG and STG, such that sites that are
located within the transition zone today were located in (or felt a much greater influence
of) the SPG during the LGM.

Analysing all data from across the basin together indicates the gyre boundary
was positioned 3.1±0.9° (1σ) further south during the LGM compared with its position
in the Holocene (Figure 2a). Analysing the data from east and west of 180° separately
results in a smaller change in the west of 2.0±0.9°, and a greater change in the east of
6.0±1.1° (Figure 2b). To assess if the larger change in the east of the basin may be an
artefact of changes in coastal upwelling, a process which could also influence the local
SST (and thus δ^18O_{calcite}) anomaly, we compare the PMIP3 ensemble mean SST near
the eastern boundary of the basin to the zonal mean, and zonal mean east of 180° (Figure
This analysis demonstrates no anomalous cooling at the eastern margin of the basin relative to the zonal average and zonal average east of 180° in the models, suggesting that coastal upwelling is unlikely to have a significant effect on our reconstruction. It is more difficult to track the position of the gyre boundary in the east because of the gentler slope of the meridional temperature gradient and fewer number of sites. However, Sverdrup balance implies that the gyre boundary in the west of the basin should respond to the integrated wind stress curl across the entire basin. Therefore, the observation of a southward shift in the basin-wide gyre boundary observed in the west holds regardless of how we interpret changes in the east of the basin.

Compiling all available Mg/Ca and $^{37}$SST data (supporting information) reveals a very similar pattern of temperature changes to the foraminiferal δ$^{18}$O data (Figure 2c). At the LGM, the SPG shows a slight warming or no change and the STG shows a slight cooling, while transition zone sites on both the east and west of the basin show an anomalously large cooling, supporting the southward extension of cold subpolar waters during glacial times.

Analysing the North Pacific %Opal compilation of Kohfeld and Chase (2011) over the last deglaciation reveals that, while the SPG and STG show a decrease in %Opal during the LGM, sites in the transition zone show a ~25% increase in %Opal on both sides of the basin (Figure 2d). This pattern is consistent with nutrient-rich subpolar waters moving further south during the LGM and increasing local productivity. The southward extension of the SPG provides a solution to the long-standing question of why, while productivity decreased throughout the SPG during LGM, it increased in the modern day location of the transition zone between the gyres.
Leading to an anti-phased pattern of productivity between the SPG and transition zone over glacial-interglacial cycles (Figure S10).

3.2 LGM General Circulation Model Simulations

Every model within the PMIP3 ensemble analysed exhibits a southward shift of the gyre boundary under glacial forcings relative to pre-industrial, with an ensemble mean change of 2.7° in the zonal-mean position of $\Psi_{\text{barotropic}} = 0$ (Figures 3 and 4), in excellent agreement with our reconstruction. Consistent with the proxy data, most models show a greater shift in the east of the basin, with a model mean southward shift of 3.4°, and a smaller change in the west of 2.3° (Fig. 4c). In the models this southward shift in the southern boundary of the SPG is caused by an overall expansion of the gyre; there is no change in the location of the northern edge of the gyre, which remains at the northern boundary of the basin. In addition to the expansion of the gyre, the models show a substantial increase in gyre strength, with an ensemble mean $\Psi_{\text{barotropic}}$ increase of 8.2 Sv (maximum north of 40°). The expansion and strengthening of the subpolar gyre circulation appear tightly coupled across all models and forcings (Figure 4). This coupling of the expansion and strengthening of the gyre arises as both processes are driven by changes in wind stress curl, rather than through a mechanistic link based on gyre dynamics.

The PMIP3 ensemble demonstrates a 2.8° southward shift in the latitude of maximum westerly wind stress in the east of the basin, but little change in the west of the basin (Figure 3); this southward shift the westerly winds is in keeping with early modelling work which demonstrated a southward displacement of the westerly jet during the LGM (e.g. Manabe & Broccoli, 1985; Bartlein et al., 1998). A southward
shift in the position of the easterlies – such that they blow over the northern boundary of the North Pacific during the LGM, rather than over the Bering Straits and Sea as they do today (Gray et al., 2018) – drives a large increase in the zonal wind stress over the subpolar gyre (50% increase in the west of the basin and 100% increase in the east of the basin). The combined effect of the increase in easterly wind stress and the southward shift and increase in westerly wind stress is a large increase in wind stress curl across the subpolar gyre (Gray et al., 2018), with a southward expansion in positive wind stress curl in the east of the basin. This southward expansion in positive wind stress curl in the east drives the southward expansion of the subpolar gyre across the entire basin because the circulation is, to a good approximation, in Sverdrup balance and therefore reflects the zonal integral of $\nabla \times \tau$ from the eastern boundary of the basin (Sverdrup, 1947; Hautala et al., 1994; Deser et al., 1999; Wunsch, 2011).

To investigate which forcing(s) ultimately drive the wind stress and gyre circulation changes during the LGM, we analysed HadCM3 model runs with individual LGM forcings from greenhouse gases, ice sheet albedo, ice sheet topography, and combined ice sheet albedo and topography (Figure 4). Substantial changes in the position of $\nabla \times \tau = 0$ and $\Psi_{\text{barotropic}} = 0$ are only seen with the combined effects of ice sheet topography and albedo; ice sheet topography or ice sheet albedo alone have very little effect, as do greenhouse gases. This result illustrates a large non-linearity in the response of atmospheric circulations to ice sheet forcing; this is the result of the distinct and differing seasonality in the response of the atmosphere over the Pacific to ice sheet forcing, with albedo having the greatest effect in summer and topography having the greatest effect in winter (Roberts et al., 2019). Note that a further shift in the gyre boundary is seen with the addition of greenhouse gas forcing (Figure 4), again
exceeding that expected from the sum of the individual responses and suggesting a further non-linear response to the combined ice sheet and greenhouse gas forcings (e.g. Broccoli and Manabe, 1987).

The expansion of the subpolar gyre, and associated cold waters, drives a large cooling in the mid-latitudes south of the modern-day gyre boundary. The contraction and expansion of the gyre therefore act to amplify temperature changes in the mid-latitudes over glacial-interglacial cycles. The strengthening of the SPG would increase poleward heat transport and may play a role in driving the relative warmth of the SPG during the LGM (Figure 2). A modern analogue is the Pacific Decadal Oscillation ‘warm’ phase, which results from a strengthening of the subpolar gyre in response to a deepening of the Aleutian Low due to stochastic fluctuations (Wills et al., 2019). The gyre strengthening thus acts to dampen temperature changes in the high-latitudes over glacial-interglacial cycles.

The glacial increase in wind stress curl seen within the model ensemble would drive a large increase in Ekman suction within the subpolar gyre (Gray et al., 2018). Given the close association of the wind stress curl changes driving the expansion and strengthening of the subpolar gyre, we suggest that the proxy evidence for a ~3° southward shift in the gyre boundary is also indirect evidence for a glacial increase in Ekman suction within the subpolar gyre. The impact of this increased Ekman suction on surface ocean nutrients and CO₂ over deglaciation is discussed in detail in Gray et al., 2018. Increased Ekman suction would also increase the salinity of the SPG with increased upwelling of salty subsurface waters (e.g. Warren, 1983). Furthermore, both the strengthening of the gyre circulation (via increased eddy transport from the salty
STG gyre and the reduced residence time of water in the SPG; Emile-Geay et al., 2003) and the reorganisation of the atmosphere (lower precipitation in the SPG due to the southward shift in the jet stream and atmospheric river events e.g. Laine et al. 2009; Lora et al., 2017) would increase the salinity of the SPG. The reorganisation of the atmosphere and gyre circulation in response to ice sheet forcing may therefore play an important role in pre-conditioning basin for the enhanced overturning circulation observed within the North Pacific during glacial periods (e.g. Keigwin, 1998; Matsumoto et al., 2002; Knudson and Ravelo, 2015; Max et al., 2017), and points towards a weakening of the North Pacific halocline, rather than a strengthening, under glacial climates (c.f. Haug et al., 1999).

3.3 Deglaciation

Considering all of the δ¹⁸O data from east and west of 180° together, our reconstruction shows the gyre boundary begins to migrate northward beginning at ~17-16 ka, during Heinrich Stadial 1 (HS1) (Fig. 5d). The boundary then appears relatively constant during the Bølling-Allerød (14.8-12.9 ka; B/A) with a second major shift north at ~12 ka, during the latter part of the Younger Dryas. There is reasonable agreement between the timing of the gyre migration in the data and the deglacial model runs, which show the majority of the change occurring between ~16.5-12 ka (Fig. 5e); however, the model shows a steady change, rather than the two-step change in the data. We speculate this is due to the lack of routed freshwater into the North Atlantic within these model runs, via its effects on hemispheric temperature asymmetry through heat transport. The timing also agrees with evidence of lake level changes in western North America (Fig. 5c; see below) and other Pacific-wide changes in atmospheric circulation during the deglaciation (Russell et al., 2014; McGee et al., 2014; Jones et al., 2018).
However, assessing the $\delta^{18}O$ data from the east and west of the basin separately reveals a large difference in timing; the majority of the change occurs earlier in the deglaciation in the east of the basin (~16.5-14 ka) whereas the majority of the change occurs later in the deglaciation in the west of the basin (~12.5 – 10.5 ka). This east-west difference in timing can be seen in the raw $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ data (Figure 1) and is too large to be explained by age model uncertainty. Contrary to the data, HadCM3 shows no difference in the timing of the northward shift of the gyre boundary between the east and west, although the weakening of the westerlies does occur substantially later in the west of the basin (compared to the east) within the model (Fig. 5g).

The northward migration of the gyre boundary in the east of the basin beginning at ~16.5 ka indicates the westerly winds in the east of the basin began to shift northward at this time, concomitant with the recession of the Laurentide Ice Sheet (Lambeck et al., 2014). Such a change in atmospheric circulation within the east of the basin at this time is in good agreement with records of hydroclimate in southwestern North America (Figure 5c; Bartlein et al., 1998; Lyle et al., 2012; Ibarra et al., 2014; McGee et al., 2015; Oviatt, 2015; Lora et al., 2016; Shuman & Serravezza, 2017; Bhattacharya et al., 2018; McGee et al., 2018), and suggests a clear role for dynamics in driving the observed changes in hydroclimate. However, given Sverdrup balance, changes in wind stress curl within the east of the basin should propagate across the basin and drive changes in the position of the gyre boundary in the west, and, as noted above, only a small change is seen in the west of the basin at this time.
One possible dynamical explanation for the observed difference in the timing between the east and west of the basin is that the jet stream became less zonal (i.e. more tilted) during this period, and as such, the northward shift in the westerlies in the east did not result in a substantial change to the integrated wind stress curl across the basin, resulting in a less zonal (i.e. more tilted) gyre. A more tilted jet stream does not seem unreasonable given the large changes in the size of the North American ice sheets beginning at this time (e.g. Lambeck et al., 2014), and is in good agreement with terrestrial proxy records and paleoclimatic simulations of this time period (Wong et al., 2016; Lora et al., 2016). Increased heat transport from a more tilted gyre could help explain the anomalous warmth of the SPG during the Bølling-Allerød (e.g. Gray et al., 2018), and may help drive wider northern-hemisphere warming at this time. We note that the tilt of the gyre in the modern North Atlantic is poorly simulated by climate models (Zappa et al., 2013), and thus it may also be poorly simulated in the North Pacific. We also note the other models (besides HadCM3) better simulate the larger gyre boundary shift in the east relative to the west under glacial forcing (Fig. 4c), and thus may better simulate gyre tilt.

6. Conclusions

Using a basin wide compilation of planktic foraminiferal δ¹⁸O data we show that the boundary between the North Pacific subpolar and subtropical gyres shifted southward by ~3° during the Last Glacial Maximum, consistent with sea surface temperature and productivity proxy data. This expansion of the North Pacific subpolar gyre is evident within all PMIP3 climate models forced with glacial boundary conditions. The models suggest that this expansion is associated with a substantial strengthening of the subpolar gyre. The strengthening of the subpolar gyre is driven by
an increase in wind stress curl within the subpolar gyre resulting from a southward shift
and strengthening of the mid-latitude westerlies in the east of the basin, and a southward
shift in the polar easterlies across the basin. The expansion of the gyre is driven by a
southward expansion of the area of positive wind stress curl within the east of the basin,
due to the southward shift in the westerlies. Using model runs with individual forcings,
we demonstrate that the changes in wind stress curl and associated expansion and
strengthening of the subpolar gyre are a response to the combined effects of ice sheet
albedo, ice sheet topography, and CO$_2$. Changes are small in climate model simulations
where albedo and topography are forced separately, compared to their combined
effects, illustrating the highly non-linear nature of the response of atmospheric
circulation to ice sheet forcing (e.g. Löfverström et al., 2014; Roberts et al., 2019).

The southward expansion of the subpolar gyre would have brought nutrient-rich
waters further south, explaining why productivity increased in the transition zone
between the gyres while decreasing throughout the subpolar gyre during LGM. The
expansion and contraction of the subpolar gyre acts as a mechanism to amplify
temperature changes in the mid-latitudes over glacial-interglacial cycles. On the
contrary, the strengthening of the subpolar gyre would increase poleward heat transport,
warming the north of the basin and dampening temperature changes in the high-
latitudes over glacial-interglacial cycles. The strengthening of the gyre circulation, in
conjunction with increased Ekman suction (Gray et al., 2018), and reduced
precipitation (Lora et al., 2017), would also make the subpolar gyre saltier, weakening
the halocline under glacial climates (c.f. Haug et al., 1999).
Our gyre-boundary reconstruction offers a constraint on the position of the mid-latitude westerly winds over the last deglaciation and suggests the westerly winds began to shift northward at ~17-16 ka, during Heinrich Stadial 1, as the Laurentide Ice Sheet receded. This reorganisation of atmospheric circulation likely drove the large changes in hydroclimate within southwestern North America (e.g. Lora et al., 2016), and may be related to other changes in atmospheric circulation seen at this time across the whole Pacific, deep into the tropics and the Southern Hemisphere (e.g. D’Agostino et al., 2017; Jones et al., 2018).
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Figure 1. Planktic foraminiferal $\delta^{18}O$ versus age with core site latitude represented by colour. Data are divided east (b) and west (a) of 180°. HS1, B/A and YD are Heinrich Stadial 1 (14.8-17.5 ka), Bølling-Allerød (12.9-14.8 ka) and the Younger Dryas (11.8-12.9 ka), respectively. (c) gridded $\delta^{18}O_{\text{water}}$ from LeGrande and Schmidt (2006) (d) calcite-water fractionation calculated using WOA13 mean annual temperature (Boyer et al., 2013) and the temperature-fractionation relationship of Kim and O’Neil (1997) (e) predicted $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ using (c) and (d) (note the colour scale is the same for all three panels) (f) slope of the zonal-mean meridional gradient in $\delta^{18}O_{\text{water}}$, $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite-water}}$ and $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$. The steepest part of the meridional $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ gradient lies at the gyre boundary, and is a result of the large temperature difference between the gyres.
Figure 2 (a) Holocene (open symbols, dashed line) and LGM (filled symbols, solid line) foraminiferal δ¹⁸O data versus latitude – symbols reflect species of planktic foraminifera (see panel b). Foraminiferal δ¹⁸O values have been corrected for whole ocean changes in δ¹⁸O water due to changes in terrestrial ice volume and the mean ocean change in SST from the PMIP3 ensemble (δ¹⁸Owc; see Methods). The data are fit with a general additive model (see Methods), with the standard error (68% and 95%) of the fit shown (b) as in (a), however with data separated east and west of 180°. (c) Compiled LGM-Holocene SST differences versus latitude, based on Mg/Ca and U⁰³⁷: Open symbols/dashed line is LGM proxy SST minus modern climatological SST. Filled symbols/solid line is LGM proxy SST minus Holocene proxy SST (d) Compiled %Opal from Kohfeld and Chase (2011) data, shown as a ratio of LGM/Holocene versus latitude, with a value of greater than 1 indicating a glacial increase. In (c) and (d) the data are fit with a general additive model, with the standard error of fit (68%) shown.
Figure 3 PMIP3 ensemble mean of (a) LGM-PI zonal windstress (\( u_t \)), with the PI climatology indicated by contours (contour interval of 0.04 N m\(^{-2} \); dashed is negative and solid is positive), (b) zonal average and averages east and west of 180° of zonal windstress in LGM and PI, (c) LGM-PI barotropic streamfunction (\( \Psi_{\text{barotropic}} \)), with the PI climatology indicated by contours (contour interval of 10 Sv; dashed is negative and solid is positive), (d) zonal average and averages east and west of 180° of the barotropic streamfunction in LGM and PI, (e) LGM-PI SST anomaly from global mean, with the PI climatology indicated by the contours (f) zonal average and averages east and west of 180° of the SST anomaly from global mean in the LGM and PI.
Figure 4 (a) LGM-PI change in latitude of zonal-mean $\Psi_{\text{barotropic}} = 0$ versus change in longitudinally weighted mean $\nabla \times \tau_{\text{curt}}$ across the southern boundary of the subpolar gyre (38-50 °N) (b) LGM-PI change in latitude of zonal mean $\Psi_{\text{barotropic}} = 0$ versus change in $\Psi_{\text{barotropic}}$ within the subpolar gyre (maximum north of 40°) (c) LGM-PI change in latitude of zonal mean $\Psi_{\text{barotropic}} = 0$ east and west of 180°. Green Mountains = LGM ice sheet topography with PI albedo, White Mountains = LGM ice sheet albedo with PI topography, White Mountains = LGM ice sheet topography and albedo.
Figure 5 (a) Sealevel curve of Lambeck et al. (2014) and sealevel equivalent of global and North American ice sheet volume in the ICE6Ge ice sheet reconstruction (b) Atmospheric $pCO_2$ record of Marcott et al. (2014) and $pCO_2$ forcing used in model (c) North-westward progression of lake high stands in southwestern North America (McGee et al., 2018) (d) reconstructed change in gyre boundary position with 1σ uncertainty (east and west is east and west of 180°) (e) modelled change in gyre boundary
position (f) modelled change in subpolar gyre strength (maximum north of 40°) (g) modelled change in westerly position (determined as latitude of maximum zonal windstress, \( \tau_u \)) (h) modelled change in westerly strength (determined as maximum \( \tau_u \)) (i) modelled change in wind stress strength exerted by the easterlies (determined as mean \( \tau_u \) between 50-60 °N). For model results solid lines denote a change in position, and the dashed lines denote a change in strength. See Figure S8 for meridional profiles of (g), (h), and (i).
**supporting information**

**Using planktic foraminiferal \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{calcite} to trace the gyre boundary**

Our ability to use the planktic foraminiferal \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{calcite} to trace the gyre boundary comes from the dominance of the temperature signal over that of \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{water} in driving the meridional pattern of \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{calcite} across the basin; the temperature signal is \(-5\) times greater than the \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{water} (\(-\text{salinity}\)) signal (Figure 1). As the spatial temperature pattern across the basin is primarily governed by the gyre circulation, with the steepest meridional temperature gradient (and thus meridional \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{calcite} gradient) at the gyre boundary, we can use the meridional profiles of temperature (-\(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{calcite}) to track the movement of the gyre boundary. Coupled climate models demonstrate a very tight coupling between the LGM-PI change in latitude of gyre boundary (defined where barotropic stream function = 0) and LGM-PI change in the latitude of maximum latitudinal gradient in sea surface temperature (SST) (Figure S1). As no mechanism exists to drive changes in \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{water} of the same magnitude as the changes in \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{calcite}-water fractionation from the large temperature difference between the gyres (Figure 1d), the temperature signal will always dominate over the \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{water} signal in determining the spatial pattern of \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{calcite} (Figure 1e) across the basin and the maximum meridional \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{calcite} gradient (Figure 1f); thus, while there are likely to be local changes in \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{water} across the basin, the steepest part of the meridional \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{calcite} gradient will always be determined by temperature, allowing us to use meridional profiles of \(\delta^{18}\)O\textsubscript{calcite} to track the position of the gyre boundary through time.
Figure S1 Modelled zonal mean LGM-pre-industrial (PI) change in latitude of gyre boundary (defined where barotropic stream function = 0) versus LGM-PI change in latitude of maximum meridional gradient in sea surface temperature (SST) within a 5° moving window; the close relationship demonstrates past changes in the position of the maximum gradient in SST/Lat (and thus ~δ¹⁸Ocalcite/Lat) can be used to trace changes in the position of the gyre boundary.

We model the δ¹⁸Ocalcite data as a function of latitude, using a general additive model (GAM) (Wood, 2011; Wood et al., 2016) in the mgcv package in R (R core Team) at 500 yr timesteps from 18.5 to 10.5 ka (the time interval for which we have sufficient spatial and temporal resolution in our dataset; Figure 1),

\[ δ¹⁸O_{calcite} = \beta + f(Lat) + \varepsilon \]

where f(Lat) is the sum of the underlying basis functions (Wood, 2011; Wood et al., 2016). The smoothing term (λ) was determined using generalised cross validation (GCV). We tested the models fitted using GCV by fitting models with an identical form, however using Reduced Maximum Likelihood (REML), which can sometimes be a preferable method to GCV (Reis and Ogden, 2009; Wood et al., 2016), to determine the smoothing term; both GCV and REML result in identical smoothing terms, very similar degrees of freedom (4.06 with GCV versus 4.19 with REML), and indistinguishable model fits.
Figure S2 GAM fits to $\delta^{18}O_{calcite}$ data as a function of latitude at 500 year timesteps from 18.5 to 10.5 ka (colours); the GAM fit to Holocene $\delta^{18}O_{calcite}$ data (10.5 ka) is shown in grey. The portion of the curve within the latitudinal band used to calculate the shift in gyre position is shown by the solid line; at each timestep we calculate the latitudinal shift that minimises the Euclidian distance between the solid part of the coloured curve and the solid part of the grey curve. Data are the combined east-west dataset (marked ALL on Figure 4).
Figure S3 As figure SX, however data are from west of 180°.
Figure S4 As figure SX, however data are from east of 180°.
We calculate the change in gyre boundary position over deglaciation as the latitudinal shift (\(\Delta \theta\)) that minimises the Euclidian distance (L^2) between the Holocene (taken as 10.5±0.5 ka) \(\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}\)-latitude GAM fit and the GAM fit to each time step, within a latitudinal band spanning the gyre boundary; this latitudinal band is centred around the maximum gradient in \(\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}\) versus latitude in the Holocene data within a 5° moving window (36.1 °N). In the combined dataset from the east and west, and the data from the west only, we calculate the latitudinal shift using a 5° latitudinal band (i.e. 33.6 to 38.6 °N), and we note the size of this latitudinal band has only a negligible effect on our results (Fig. SX); as the gyre boundary (and thus meridional temperature and \(\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}\) gradient) is more diffuse in the east, we use a slightly larger window of 10° (i.e. 31.1 to 41.1 °N).

**Figure S5** method used to calculate the shift in gyre boundary position (a) at each time step (here LGM, 18.5 ka) we calculate the gyre boundary shift as the latitudinal shift (\(\Delta \theta\), in 0.1 ° increments from 0 to 10 degrees) that minimises the Euclidian distance (b) within a specified latitudinal band (grey box in (a)) between the GAM fit to the timestep and the Holocene in data is calculated. The coloured lines in (a) show the LGM GAM fit shifted north in 0.5° increments, and the coloured dots in (b) show the Euclidian distance at each increment, with the colour indicating the degree to which the curve has been shifted.
Figure S6 (a) calculated change in the position of the gyre boundary using different sizes of latitudinal band (between 1° and 9°) in which the Euclidian distance is calculated; the size of latitudinal band (the grey box in figure SXa above) has very little effect on the results.

We note that the steepest part of the Holocene curve (~36.1 °N) using the combined dataset from the east and west, is further south than the zonal mean position of the gyre boundary today (~40 °N). This is due to the westward bias within the dataset (i.e. there are many more sites in the west relative to the east within the dataset), and the gyre boundary is located slightly further south in the west relative to the zonal mean; the maximum meridional gradient in mean annual SST is found at ~36 °N along the western margin of the basin (Boyer et al., 2013), in good agreement with our reconstruction.

We also note that if we use a totally different method to calculate the change in position of the gyre boundary, simply calculating the change in latitude in the steepest part of the meridional $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ gradient (within a 5° moving window), we arrive at a very similar estimate of a ~2.6° southward shift between the Holocene and LGM. This method is more prone to anomalous values at the latitudinal extremes, hence we opt for the method of calculating the latitudinal shift that minimises the Euclidian distance.
between timesteps within a defined latitudinal band described above; however, the agreement between the two methods is reassuring.

*Planktic foraminiferal \( \delta^{18}O \) compilation*

We compiled all available planktic foraminiferal calcite \( \delta^{18}O \) from cores across the North Pacific. All data were kept on the original age models, except in the case when data were only available on uncalibrated \(^{14}C\) age models, in which case the \(^{14}C\) data were recalibrated using IntCal13 (Reimer et al., 2013) using an average of the modern reservoir age at each site and a regional glacial increase of +400 years with large uncertainties (±500 years). All \( \delta^{18}O \) calcite data along with the core, location, water depth, species, sediment depth, age, and original data reference are given in Table S1. We only include cores spanning the interval between 10.5 to 18.5 ka with an average resolution of >1 point per ka. We exclude core EW0408-26/66JC from the compilation (Praetorious and Mix, 2014); this core is located in close proximity to the terminus of a glacier and comparing the \( \delta^{18}O \) calcite data of this core to other cores within the subpolar gyre demonstrates planktic foraminiferal \( \delta^{18}O \) calcite data from this core primarily reflect local meltwater changes, rather than wider oceanographic conditions in the subpolar gyre (Figure S3). The compiled dataset will be available on Pangea.
Figure S7 Foraminiferal $\delta^{18}$O$_{\text{calcite}}$ from the subpolar gyre over deglaciation. A GAM fit with to all the data (excluding core EW0408-26/66JC) is shown by the purple line, with standard error of the fit shaded. Data from core EW0408-26/66JC (Praetorius and Mix, 2014) is shown in green.

Seasonality of planktic foraminifera

Our approach assumes that any change in seasonal bias relating to the habitat preference of foraminifera are small relative to the change in temperature due to the movement of the gyre boundary. The validity of this approach is supported by sites where $\delta^{18}$O$_{\text{calcite}}$ has been measured on more than one species of foraminifera, such as core ODP Site 893 (Figure 1 and Figure 2). At this site, foraminiferal species with habitat temperature preferences that are known to be different ($G. bulloides$ and $N. pachyderma$, e.g. Taylor et al., 2018) show very similar changes down core, with a Holocene-LGM change that is identical (within error); this suggests any changes relating to changes seasonal bias are likely to be insignificant in our reconstruction.
We compiled Mg/Ca and $^{187}\text{U}$ sea surface temperature (SST) data from across the North Pacific (Mg/Ca: Reitdorf et al., 2013; Gebhardt et al., 2008; Rodriguez Sanz et al., 2013; Taylor et al., 2015; Sagawa et al., 2006; Sagawa et al., 2008; Pak et al., 2012; Kubota et al., 2010; Gray et al., 2018. $^{187}\text{U}$: Minoshima et al., 2007; Seki, 2004; Harada et al., 2004; Harada, 2006; Harada et al., 2008; Inagaki et al., 2009; Herbert et al., 2001; Sawada et al., 1998; Yamamoto et al., 2004; Isono et al., 2009). All age models are as given in the original publication. All Mg/Ca and $^{187}\text{U}$ data were recalibrated (see below) and the temperature change during the LGM is given as a difference to both proxy temperature in the Holocene, and to mean annual climatological temperature from the WOA13 (Boyer et al., 2013).

While the direct temperature sensitivity of Mg/Ca in planktic foraminifera is ~6% per °C (Gray et al., 2018b; Gray and Evans, 2019), due to the effect of temperature on pH through the disassociation constant of water ($K_w$), the ‘apparent’ Mg/Ca temperature sensitivity is higher (Gray et al., 2018b). Thus, we calculate the change in temperature from the change in Mg/Ca at each site using a temperature sensitivity of 8.8%, derived from laboratory cultures (Kisakürek et al., 2008), which encompasses both the direct temperature effect and the temperature-pH effect, with a Mg/Ca-pH sensitivity of ~ -8% per 0.1 pH unit (Lea et al., 1999; Russell et al., 2004; Evans et al., 2016; Gray et al., 2018b; Gray and Evans, 2019). Mg/Ca is also influenced by salinity, with a sensitivity of ~4% per PSU (Hönisch et al, 2013; Gray et al., 2018b; Gray and Evans, 2019). We make no attempt to account for the effects of salinity (due to sea level) or pH downcore (due to lower atmospheric CO$_2$). The combined effect of the whole-ocean increase in salinity (due to sea level), and the increase in surface ocean pH (due to lower atmospheric CO$_2$) means changes in temperature derived from changes in Mg/Ca are
likely to be cold-biased by ~1.5 °C during the LGM (Gray and Evans, 2019). For $U^{K'37}$, the change in temperature at each site was calculated using the calibration of Prahl et al., 1988; the temperature range in this study is too low to be substantially effected by the non-linearity of $U^{K'37}$ (e.g. Tierney and Tingley, 2018).

**General Circulation Models**

We assess differences in North Pacific barotropic stream function, wind stress curl, zonal wind stress, and SST between LGM and pre-industrial conditions as represented by five coupled climate models (CCSM4, CNRM-CM5, MPI-ESM-P and MRI-CGCM3). All models are part of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 5 (CMIP5, Taylor et al., 2012). We only used models where both wind stress and barotropic stream function data are available. Orbital parameters, atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations, coastlines and ice topography for the LGM simulations are standardized as part of the Paleoclimate Model Intercomparison Project phase 3 (PMIP3) (Braconnot et al., 2012, Taylor et al., 2012). Ensemble means are computed by first linearly interpolating to a common grid.

Using a single model (HadCM3) we look at runs where the model greenhouse gas, ice sheet albedo, ice sheet topography are changed individually (‘Green Mountains, White Plains’) as described in Roberts and Valdes (2017). The ‘Green Mountains, White Plains’ runs use the ICE5G ice sheet reconstruction (Peltier et al., 2004), whereas the deglacial ‘snapshot’ runs (below) use the ICE6G ice sheet reconstruction (Peltier et al., 2015).
We also explore changes through time over the deglaciation using a series of HadCM3 equilibrium-type simulations where all forcings and model boundary conditions are changed at 500-year intervals broadly adhering to the PMIP4 last deglaciation protocol (Ivanovic et al., 2016). These simulations use the ICE6GC ice sheet reconstruction and 'melt-uniform' scenario for ice sheet meltwater; i.e. freshwater from the melting ice sheets is NOT routed to the ocean via coastal outlets. Instead, water is conserved by forcing the global mean ocean salinity to be consistent with the change in global ice sheet volume with respect to present. Note, these deglacial simulations are not transient, but are equilibrium-type experiments that begin from the end of the 1750-year long simulations run by Singarayer et al. (2011). At each 500-year interval (21.0 ka, 20.5 ka, 20.0 ka…0.5 ka, 0.0 ka), all boundary conditions and forcings are updated according to the more recent literature (presented by Ivanovic et al., 2016) and held constant for the full 500-year duration of the run. The climate means and standard deviations used here are calculated from the last 50 years of each simulation (i.e. year 451-500, inclusive).

More information on these runs can be found in the supplement to Morris et al. (2018), noting that we use the raw model output and not the downscaled and bias-corrected data used in the previous publication.

**Figure S8** Deglacial evolution of zonal mean (a) SST anomaly (relative to global mean) (b) barotropic stream function (c) zonal wind stress in the HadCM3 simulations.
To test if there is an influence of coastal upwelling on the data in the east (i.e. a signal of some other control on latitudinal temperature anomaly [and thus latitudinal $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ anomaly] besides change in gyre position) we compare the ensemble mean SST along the eastern boundary of the basin (taken as the first oceanic grid point west of land during the LGM) to the zonal mean, and zonal mean east of the dateline (Fig. S9). The models show no indication of a strong influence of coastal upwelling, which would manifest as an anomalous cooling relative to the zonal mean. This analysis suggests coastal upwelling is unlikely to be having a significant effect on our results, although the simulated coastal upwelling may be poorly represented due to the resolution of the models. A further argument against a strong influence of upwelling on the data in the East Pacific is that sites that are $\sim$15° apart from each other latitudinally, such that they are in different upwelling regimes today and are likely to have undergone very different changes in upwelling since the LGM, display very similar patterns of change in $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ over deglaciation, with no differences in timing (Fig. 1).

**Figure S9** (a) LGM and PI SST anomaly (from global mean), and (b) LGM-PI SST anomaly in different longitudinal bins; zonal mean (grey), zonal mean east of the dateline (180°, blue), along the eastern boundary of the basin (green), and 5° seaward from the eastern boundary of the basin (orange). Note, the gyre boundary s located slightly further north along the eastern margin relative to the zonal mean and zonal mean east of the dateline.
Figure S10 Opal Mass Accumulation Rate data from core KH99-03 in the SPG (Narita et al., 2002) and core NCG108 in the transition zone (Maeda et al., 2002). Dashed lines show mean value for each marine isotope stage (MIS). Grey shading shows MIS 1, 3 and 5. Transition zone and subpolar waters show an anti-phased relationship in Opal MAR over the last glacial cycle.

**HS1 Freshwater test**

The release of large amounts of freshwater into the eastern subpolar North Pacific has been suggested over deglaciation, at ~17.5 ka (Maier et al. 2018). The release of freshwater into the eastern subpolar North Pacific is evident in an increase in the δ¹⁸O(calcite) difference between the mixed-layer dwelling species G. bulloides and the slightly deeper-dwelling species N. pachyderma in core MD02-2489 (54.39°N, -148.92°E) at this time; during this interval G. bulloides becomes ~0.6 ‰ more depleted than N. pachyderma. To test if this release of freshwater may be influencing our gyre boundary reconstruction we re-run the gyre-boundary analysis, however removing the G. bulloides data from core MD02-2489; the results are identical to the gyre boundary reconstruction including the G. bulloides data demonstrating that the effect of freshwater release has very little effect on our gyre boundary reconstruction. This is because the change in δ¹⁸O(calcite) from the freshwater release (~0.6 ‰, equivalent to ~2
PSU freshening) is very small compared to the large change in $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ resulting from the temperature difference between the gyres (6 ‰). Localised freshwater inputs, while having a large effect locally, do very little to change the pattern of $\delta^{18}O_{\text{calcite}}$ at the basin scale.
Table S1 Compiled planktic foraminiferal $\delta^{18}$O<sub>calcite</sub> records. The compiled will be made available on Pangea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Lat (°N)</th>
<th>Lon (°E)</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD02-2489</td>
<td>54.39</td>
<td>-148.921</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Gebhardt et al 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD02-2489</td>
<td>54.39</td>
<td>-148.921</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Gebhardt et al 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR87A-10</td>
<td>54.363</td>
<td>-148.4667</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Zahn et al 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR87A-02</td>
<td>54.29</td>
<td>-149.605</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Zahn et al 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR87A-02</td>
<td>54.29</td>
<td>-149.605</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Zahn et al 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD02-2496</td>
<td>48.967</td>
<td>-127.033</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Taylor et al 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD02-2496</td>
<td>48.967</td>
<td>-127.033</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Taylor et al 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP1017</td>
<td>34.32</td>
<td>-121.6</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Pak et al 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP893</td>
<td>34.2875</td>
<td>-120.0367</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Hendy et al 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP893</td>
<td>34.2875</td>
<td>-120.0367</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Hendy et al 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD02-2503</td>
<td>34.28</td>
<td>-120.04</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Hill et al 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHF-28181</td>
<td>33.011667</td>
<td>-119.06</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Mortyn et al 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD05-2505</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-112</td>
<td>G. ruber</td>
<td>Rodríguez-Sanz et al 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO201-2-101</td>
<td>58.883</td>
<td>170.683</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Reitdorf et al 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO201-2-85</td>
<td>57.505</td>
<td>170.413167</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Reitdorf et al 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO201-2-77</td>
<td>56.33</td>
<td>170.69883</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Reitdorf et al 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO201-2-12</td>
<td>53.992667</td>
<td>162.375833</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Reitdorf et al 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD01-2416</td>
<td>51.268</td>
<td>167.725</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Gebhardt et al 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD01-2416</td>
<td>51.268</td>
<td>167.725</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Gebhardt et al 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINO-GGC37</td>
<td>50.28</td>
<td>167.7</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Keigwin 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV29-114-3</td>
<td>49.375667</td>
<td>152.877933</td>
<td>N. pachyderma</td>
<td>Reitdorf et al 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT90-9_21</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>144.3167</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Oba and Murayama 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH02-1030</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Sagawa and Ikehara 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH84-14</td>
<td>41.44</td>
<td>142.33</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Labeyrie 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH84-04</td>
<td>36.46</td>
<td>142.13</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Labeyrie 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD01-2420</td>
<td>36.067</td>
<td>141.817</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Sagawa et al 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD01-2421</td>
<td>36.01667</td>
<td>141.7833</td>
<td>G. bulloides</td>
<td>Oba and Murayama 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY07_04_01</td>
<td>31.6391667</td>
<td>128.944</td>
<td>G. ruber</td>
<td>Kubota et al 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>126.98</td>
<td>G. ruber</td>
<td>Sun et al 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP184-1145</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>117.63</td>
<td>G. ruber</td>
<td>Oppo and Sun 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2: Reconstructed change in gyre boundary latitude. Uncertainty is 1σ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age</th>
<th>DLat</th>
<th>DLat_error</th>
<th>DLat_west</th>
<th>DLat_west_error</th>
<th>Dlat_east</th>
<th>DLat_east_error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional References


