

Balloon-borne observations of acoustic-gravity waves from the 2022 Hunga Tonga eruption in the stratosphere

Aurélien Podglajen¹, Alexis Le Pichon², Raphael F. Garcia³, Solène Gerier⁴, Christophe Millet⁵, Kristopher M. Bedka⁶, Konstantin V. Khlopenkov⁷, Sergey M. Khaykin⁸, and Albert Hertzog⁹

¹Laboratoire de météorologie dynamique, Ecole Polytechnique

²CEA, DAM, DIF

³Institut Supérieur de l'Aéronautique et de l'Espace, ISAE-SUPAERO

⁴ISAE-SUPAERO

⁵CEA

⁶NASA Langley Research Center

⁷Science Systems and Applications

⁸CNRS-LATMOS

⁹Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique

November 30, 2022

Abstract

The 15 January 2022 explosion of the Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai (HT-HH) volcano generated an extreme, quasi-instantaneous perturbation of the atmosphere. As part of its adjustment following the eruption, a rich spectrum of waves radiated away from HT-HH and achieved worldwide propagation. Among numerous platforms monitoring the event, two long-duration stratospheric balloons flying over the tropical Pacific provided unique observations of Lamb and infrasonic wave arrivals, detecting three revolutions of the Lamb wave and five of infrasound waves. Combined with ground measurements from the infrasound network of the International Monitoring System, such observations bring precious insights into the eruption process (chronology and altitude of energy release), and highlight previously unobserved long-range propagation of infrasound modes triggered by the eruption and their dispersion patterns. A comparison between ground- and balloon-based measurements emphasizes generally larger signal-to-noise ratios onboard the balloons and further demonstrates their potential for infrasound studies.

1 **Balloon-borne observations of acoustic-gravity waves**
2 **from the 2022 Hunga Tonga eruption in the**
3 **stratosphere**

4 **Aurélien Podglajen¹, Alexis Le Pichon², Raphaël F. Garcia³, Solène Gérier³,**
5 **Christophe Millet², Kristopher Bedka⁴, Konstantin Khlopenkov⁵, Sergey**
6 **Khaykin⁶, Albert Hertzog⁷**

7 ¹Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique (LMD/IPSL), École polytechnique, Institut polytechnique de
8 Paris, Sorbonne Université, École normale supérieure, PSL Research University, CNRS, Paris, France

9 ²CEA, DAM, DIF, 91297 ArpaJon, France

10 ³Institut Supérieur de l'Aéronautique et de l'Espace (ISAE-SUPAERO), Université de Toulouse, 10 Ave
11 E. Belin 31400 Toulouse, France

12 ⁴NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, USA

13 ⁵Science Systems and Applications, Inc., Hampton, Virginia, USA

14 ⁶Laboratoire Atmosphères, Observations Spatiales (LATMOS), UVSQ, Sorbonne Université, CNRS,

15 IPSL, Guyancourt, France

16 ⁷Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique (LMD/IPSL), Sorbonne Université, École polytechnique,
17 Institut polytechnique de Paris, École normale supérieure, PSL Research University, CNRS, Paris, France

18 **Key Points:**

- 19 • Unique stratospheric in situ observations of the multiple revolutions of the Lamb
20 and infrasound waves triggered by the Hunga-Tonga eruption
21 • Insight into eruption scenario and profile of energy release from infrasound in broad
22 agreement with stereoscopic plume top height retrieval
23 • Test bed for the monitoring of infrasound generated by large explosive sources us-
24 ing stratospheric balloons observations

Corresponding author: Aurélien Podglajen, aurelien.podglajen@lmd.ipsl.fr

Abstract

The 15 January 2022 explosion of the Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai (HT-HH) volcano generated an extreme, quasi-instantaneous perturbation of the atmosphere. As part of its adjustment following the eruption, a rich spectrum of waves radiated away from HT-HH and achieved worldwide propagation. Among numerous platforms monitoring the event, two long-duration stratospheric balloons flying over the tropical Pacific provided unique observations of Lamb and infrasonic wave arrivals, detecting three revolutions of the Lamb wave and five of infrasound waves. Combined with ground measurements from the infrasound network of the International Monitoring System, such observations bring precious insights into the eruption process (chronology and altitude of energy release), and highlight previously unobserved long-range propagation of infrasound modes triggered by the eruption and their dispersion patterns. A comparison between ground- and balloon-based measurements emphasizes generally larger signal-to-noise ratios onboard the balloons and further demonstrates their potential for infrasound studies.

Plain Language Summary

The eruption of the Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai volcano on January 15 2022 was one of the most powerful blast of the last century. This fast and strong perturbation of the atmosphere triggered atmospheric waves which were followed around the world multiple times. Here, we use records of sound waves emitted by the eruption from two balloons flying at about 20 km altitude over the Pacific combined with ground stations around the volcano to help characterize the event, its scenario and its energy. Due to weak relative wind and turbulence, the sounds on the balloon are generally clearer than on the ground, demonstrating the potential of high-altitude measurements for extreme events.

1 Introduction

After a phase of mild activity started in mid-December 2021, the 2022 eruption of the Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai (HT-HH) volcano climaxed with an intense explosion on January 15th around 04:16 UTC (Poli & Shapiro, 2022). Over the next hour, the volcanic plume penetrated deep into the atmosphere, reaching the stratopause and beyond (up to 58 km), whereas the umbrella cloud spread at approximately 35 km to form a 600 km diameter disk. The altitude of volcanic overshoots, the height and extent of the umbrella cloud set a new record for volcanic eruptions over the satellite era (Carr et al., 2022), overtaking Mount Pinatubo and its 35 km. The plume generated a large perturbation of the stratospheric aerosol layer and stratospheric composition, with substantial local and global radiative impacts (Sellitto et al., 2022).

Besides triggering globally detected surface seismic waves (Poli & Shapiro, 2022) and a tsunami in the Pacific (Yuen et al., 2022; Matoza et al., 2022), the HT-HH eruption also excited atmospheric acoustic-gravity waves by injecting matter, energy and momentum deep into the atmosphere at an extremely fast rate compared to the time scale of atmospheric adjustment. A wide spectrum of waves was thus observed radiating away from the point source volcano (Matoza et al., 2022) including the edge Lamb wave (Matoza et al., 2022; Wright et al., 2022), infrasound (Matoza et al., 2022; Vergoz et al., 2022) and internal gravity waves (Watanabe et al., 2022; Wright et al., 2022; Ern et al., n.d.). The Lamb wave is a striking feature of this event. Its amplitude (> 11 hPa peak-to-peak near Tonga) and propagation pattern are in particular reminiscent of the wave trains observed following the historical 1883 Krakatoa eruption (Matoza et al., 2022).

Most observations of HT-HH waves were obtained by remote-sensing instruments or surface barometers, whereas the source extended to stratospheric altitudes at least. In this paper, we present unique measurements of acoustic-gravity wave trains directly from within the stratosphere gathered onboard two long-duration balloons flying over

74 the Pacific. While the instruments also recorded signals from the smaller January 13 HT-
 75 HH explosion, we focus here on analyzing Lamb and infrasound waves triggered by the
 76 main eruption on January 15. We describe the first and multiple-revolution arrivals in
 77 balloon data and ancillary satellite and ground-based observations. Then, we discuss how
 78 the waves may provide additional information on the eruptive process and the value of
 79 stratospheric infrasound observations for this and similar events.

80 2 Materials and Methods

81 2.1 Strateole-2 balloon data

82 In the frame of the Strateole-2 project (Haase et al., 2018), 17 superpressure bal-
 83 loons (SPBs) were launched from Seychelles by the French space agency (CNES) in October-
 84 December 2021. Strateole-2 SPBs are constant-volume balloons drifting following the
 85 prevailing wind and designed for flights of several months at a chosen density level be-
 86 tween 18.5 and 21 km in the tropical upper troposphere-lower stratosphere. On January
 87 15 2022, two SPBs remained over the tropical Pacific at about 18.5 km (TTL4) and 20.5 km
 88 above sea level (STR1, see Figure 1 a), b)). Various instruments are carried on-board
 89 the balloons; of interest for our study, all Strateole-2 payloads include the TSEN tem-
 90 perature and pressure sensors (Hertzog et al., 2007) and a GPS. Position and temper-
 91 ature are measured every 30 s, pressure every 1 s. The pressure sensor (Paroscientific
 92 Inc. Series 6000) has a sensor noise as low as 1 mPa/Hz below 1 Hz.

93 SPBs undergo vertical oscillations forced by atmospheric motions and modulated
 94 by the balloon's response. In order to correct for the associated pressure fluctuations,
 95 we derive the Eulerian pressure perturbation p_e by removing a background hydrostatic
 96 pressure gradient:

$$p_e = p \exp\left(\frac{g}{R_d T} \zeta'\right) - \bar{p} \quad (1)$$

97 where p and T are the raw pressure and temperature, \bar{p} time-averaged pressure, ζ' geopo-
 98 tential height anomalies, $g = 9.81 \text{ m s}^{-2}$ and $R_d = 287 \text{ J/K/kg}$ the ideal gas constant
 99 for dry air. Without a high-frequency inertial measurement unit (IMU) onboard, we use
 100 solely GPS position interpolated at 1 s to compute ζ' and p_e . Performing this operation,
 101 care must be taken to properly account for any delay between pressure and position mea-
 102 surements, since a slight phase shift results in an imperfect canceling of the balloon neu-
 103 tral oscillations around 220 s (Massman, 1978; Vincent & Hertzog, 2014). Unless stated
 104 otherwise, pressure observations presented here correspond to p_e , but can be considered
 105 as p for frequencies above ~ 0.02 Hz. Quality of the pressure data is sufficient to detect
 106 the energy peak of the oceanic microbarom around 0.2 Hz (Bowman & Lees, 2018). The
 107 horizontal wind components are estimated by finite-differentiating the GPS position time
 108 series, assuming that the balloons behave as perfect tracers of the flow.

109 2.2 Ancillary datasets

110 2.2.1 IMS microbarometer data

111 Infrasound stations from the International Monitoring system (IMS) of the Com-
 112 prehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBO) are arrays of microbarom-
 113 eters sensitive to acoustic pressure variations with a flat frequency response between 0.02
 114 and 4 Hz. Here, we use data from 5 stations located either in the vicinity of the balloons
 115 or at distances of 2,000-4,000 km from HT-HH: IS22 (22.2°S 166.8°E, $d = 1850$ km from
 116 HT-HH), IS21 (8.9°S 140.2°W, $d = 3990$ km), IS24 (17.8°S 149.3°W, $d = 2755$ km),
 117 IS36 (44.0°S 176.5°W, $d = 2699$ km) and IS57 (33.6°N 116.5°W, $d = 8645$ km). Fre-
 118 quencies lower than 0.01 Hz (periods longer than 2 minutes) are recovered by deconvolv-
 119 ing the high-pass instrumental filter, although the quality of the low-frequency pressure

120 signal may still be affected (Matoza et al., 2022). A thorough investigation of HT-HH
 121 Lamb and infrasound waves in IMS data is presented in Vergoz et al. (2022).

122 **2.2.2 Geostationary satellite data**

123 Level 1B infrared brightness temperature (BT) from the geostationary satellites
 124 GOES-17 (Eastern Pacific sector) and Himawari-8 (Western Pacific sector) at ~ 2 -km spa-
 125 tial resolution and 10-minute time resolution are also presented. In order to contextu-
 126 alize balloon-borne observations of the waves, we use the upper-tropospheric water va-
 127 por channel (band 8, $6.2 \mu\text{m}$) with increased sensitivity to upper-tropospheric proper-
 128 ties, although the waves can be observed in any infrared channel (Wright et al., 2022;
 129 Amores et al., 2022; Watanabe et al., 2022). Second-order time differentiation and a 31-
 130 pixel boxcart median filter are applied to the data in order to highlight wave-induced
 131 fluctuations and reduce the noise associated with weather systems.

132 We also employ stereoscopic cloud top height retrievals to infer the chronology of
 133 the eruption. These data are derived at NASA Langley using the parallax between almost-
 134 synchronized $10.3 \mu\text{m}$ -band images obtained from different viewing angles by the two
 135 satellites. For the HT-HH plume, the spatial resolution of the product is about 6 km and
 136 its vertical accuracy typically lies between 0.2-0.4 km. Further description of the retrieval
 137 method can be found in Supplementary material S1.

138 **3 Results**

139 **3.1 First wave arrivals**

140 **3.1.1 The Lamb wave**

141 The Lamb wave (Lamb, 1910; Taylor, 1929; Pierce & Posey, 1971; Salby, 1980) is
 142 the fastest mode excited by the eruption with a relatively constant propagation speed
 143 $c_{g\text{Lamb}} \simeq 317 \text{ m/s} \pm 5\%$ typically (Bretherton, 1969; Pierce & Posey, 1971). After the
 144 eruption, the Lamb wave left a prominent signature in surface pressure observations around
 145 the world and in the BT of geostationary-satellite infrared channels (Amores et al., 2022;
 146 Wright et al., 2022; Watanabe et al., 2022). Figure 1 shows selected BT maps from GOES-
 147 17 on January 15. Phase lines are clearly identified at $\sim 06:20$ UTC as concentric rings
 148 featuring a large positive temperature anomaly (0.3 K) in between two smaller negative
 149 anomalies. The distance travelled by the wave front is consistent with an emission around
 150 $04:16$ UTC and the nominal propagation speed of 317 m/s (Amores et al., 2022).

151 The initial overpass of the Lamb wave occurs around 06:20 UTC (pressure max-
 152 imum) for STR1 (Fig. 2 c)) and coincides with BT maximum. To further investigate the
 153 consistency of the waveform during early propagation, Figure 1 b) depicts pressure time
 154 series around the Lamb wave arrival time at various sensors. To compensate for geomet-
 155 ric spreading, sonic impedance variations and the vertical structure of the mode, pres-
 156 sure amplitudes A in Fig. 2 c) are adjusted as follows (e.g., Pierce & Posey, 1971):

$$157 \quad A_0 = A \sqrt{2\pi a \sin(d/a) \frac{\rho_r c_r}{\rho c} f\left(\frac{\bar{p}}{\bar{p}_r}\right)} \quad (2)$$

158 where a is the Earth radius, d the horizontal distance from HT-HH, ρ the density, c the
 159 wave phase celerity, and $f\left(\frac{\bar{p}}{\bar{p}_r}\right) = \left(\frac{\bar{p}}{\bar{p}_r}\right)^{\frac{\gamma-2}{\gamma}}$ for Lamb waves in an isothermal atmosphere,
 160 with $\gamma = \frac{C_p}{C_v} \simeq \frac{7}{5}$ the specific capacity ratio. $\rho_r = 1.2 \text{ kg/m}^3$, $p_r = 1,000 \text{ hPa}$ and
 161 $c_r = 317 \text{ m/s}$ are the reference density, pressure and celerity, respectively. Equation 2
 162 neglects attenuation through leakage, absorption, dispersion and lateral ray focusing. In
 163 Fig. 1 (c), we apply this correction to signals collected at various altitude and distance
 164 from the volcano, highlighting its validity for short to medium-range propagation. Be-
 sides pressure and temperature, the Lamb wave also has a signature in horizontal wind




Figure 1. (a) Upper stratospheric (40-60 km average) horizontal wind direction (vectors) and speed (colors) from the European Center for Medium-range Weather Forecast (ECMWF) on January 15 2022, with ground stations and balloon trajectories (black) and (colored lines) orthodroms from HT-HH to sensor locations. (b) Lamb pressure waveforms filtered between 100 and 5,000 s. Series are aligned with respect to the time of the pressure maximum (the propagation speed c in the legend includes a ~ 10 minutes delay between explosion and wave emission); pressure is adjusted to the density and pressure of STR1 using Eq. 2 for quantitative comparison. The vertical line corresponds to the time of panel (c). (c), (d), (e), (f) Selected BT images from GOES-17 band 8 (6.2 μm) showing the Lamb wave passing over STR1 (c) and the first journey and return of the Lamb wave (d, e, f). Colored dots indicate the location of the balloons and ground stations. Black circles are expected phase fronts launched from Tonga at 04:16 and propagating at 317 m/s (Lamb, solid line) or 245 m/s (dashed line).

165 aligned with the wave vector and in phase with pressure fluctuations, which reaches a
 166 few m/s in the lower stratosphere; although it does not stand out of the variability oth-
 167 erwise present, it is detected by both balloons (not shown).

168 Figure 2 depicts pressure spectrograms during the first overpass of the waves. The
 169 Lamb wave appears as a low-frequency pulse extending up to ~ 3 mHz. Since it is non-
 170 dispersive in the linear approximation and has limited sensitivity to refraction (Posey
 171 & Pierce, 1971), its waveform is frozen and it shows isotropic propagation during its first
 172 revolution, as evidenced by the circular wave fronts radiating away from the volcano in
 173 all directions (Fig. 1 c)) and by the similarity between the early waveforms (Fig. 1 b)).
 174 Fluctuations in the tail of the first maximum, particularly pronounced at IS22, are anisotropic
 175 (Fig. 1 a)) and due to slower modes, likely gravity waves.

176 **3.1.2 Gravity waves**

177 Slower gravity wave trains were observed emanating from HT-HH in geostation-
 178 ary and low-orbit temperature sounders (Watanabe et al., 2022; Wright et al., 2022). Those
 179 waves leave no outstanding signature in the balloon time series (raw pressure, p_e , kinetic
 180 or potential energy), in contrast with surface pressure and brightness temperature (Fig. 1
 181 b), c)). This behavior is actually consistent with theoretical expectations for the "Pekeris
 182 mode", which predict a maximum amplitude at 4 scale heights (Salby, 1980) but a min-
 183 imum at the balloons' float level (2-3 scale heights). Furthermore, while nadir-looking
 184 instruments emphasize large vertical-wavelength gravity waves, balloons have a differ-
 185 ent observational filter and also respond to shallower waves, e.g. from tropospheric con-
 186 vection, which contribute to mask the HT-HH gravity waves (see also Ern et al., n.d.).

187 **3.1.3 Infrasound**

188 Balloon-borne and surface sensors recorded at least three distinct infrasound
 189 wave packets (WPs, Fig. 2) above 10 mHz, separated by periods of reduced acoustic vari-
 190 ability. On STR1, their approximate arrival times are: $t_{WP_1} \simeq 06:35$ UTC with a dou-
 191 ble peak (WP_{1a} and $WP_{1b} \simeq 06:49$ UTC), $t_{WP_2} \simeq 07:18$ and $t_{WP_3} \simeq 10:38$. Whereas
 192 the sub-WPs are too close in time for a definite statement, the delay between WP_1 and
 193 WP_2 is incompatible with differential propagation from a unique event with group ve-
 194 locities of, e.g., thermospheric and stratospheric ducts, suggesting that they are excited
 195 by distinct bursts at the source. Such hypothesis is furthermore consistent with the con-
 196 stant time separation between WPs at different distances from HT-HH. Back-propagating
 197 the packets to the source with $c_g \simeq 275$ m/s suggests pulses of emission around 04:19,
 198 05:03 and 08:32. The link between this chronology and observed plume variability will
 199 be investigated later on.

200 Spectra at the arrival of WP_1 show a significant enhancement over the whole acous-
 201 tic range compared to the period immediately prior to it (Fig. 2 a, b). The pressure vari-
 202 ance peaks around 20-30 mHz, especially for balloon sensors. The large spread in the
 203 magnitude of the infrasound signal for the first wave packets observed among the sen-
 204 sors exceeds mere geometric spreading and altitude variations treated by Eq. 2, as well
 205 as the effect of dispersion. This emphasizes anisotropic infrasound propagation in par-
 206 ticular due to the variability of along-path stratospheric winds (Fig. 1 (a)). The effect
 207 of dispersion becomes apparent at TTL4 (d=7600 km) with longer wavepackets and a
 208 duplication of WP_3 .

209 Besides distinct WPs, balloon observations show a slow variance decrease in the
 210 acoustic range (above 0.01 Hz) and a return to pre-eruption levels after about a day. This
 211 tail of acoustic signal is analogous to the Coda observed in seismic waves (e.g. Aki, 1997)
 212 and results from wave scattering by small-scale inhomogeneities (Chunchuzov et al., 2011),
 213 e.g. related to pre-existing gravity waves.




Figure 2. Compensated power spectral density (PSD multiplied by frequency) during the overpass of WP₁ (solid line) and background of the 3 hours before the eruption (dashed line) for (a) the ground stations and (b) the balloons. c), d), e), f) Selected spectrograms of the pressure signals corresponding to the first wave arrivals. The vertical lines indicate arrival times from estimated source timings (see text) and waves traveling at $c_g = 275$ m/s. Blue and green line are arrival times for the first event assuming travel speed $c_g = 300$ m/s and $c_g = 240$ m/s, respectively.

214

3.2 Multiple revolutions of acoustic waves

215

3.2.1 Lamb wave

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

The HT-HH Lamb wave traveled several times around the Earth, and was detected 7 times in ground pressure measurements (Matoza et al., 2022), in agreement with its slow dissipation (Lindzen & Blake, 1972; Salby, 1980) and with observations after the 1883 Krakatoa eruption (Symons, 1888). Figure 3 shows the wavelet spectrograms of the balloon time series along with those of stations IS22 and IS57. In the low-frequency range (<3 mHz), the Lamb wave remains as a non-dispersive pulse progressively attenuated and reflected (90° phase shift) following its first transit through the antipodes (not shown).

223

224

225

226

227

228

An interesting feature of the Lamb wave at STR1 is the observation of three overpasses (instead of two) for antipodal and second transits, due to refraction by the jets and refraction-reflection by orography. This results in the emergence of straight perpendicular wavefronts (Fig. 1 (e), (f)) compared with circular wavefronts (Fig. 1 (c)). At the edge of two wavefronts, STR1 samples one more overpass than the unique expected on the second antipodal transit.

229

3.2.2 Infrasound

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

Figure 3 also emphasizes exceptional multiple passages of infrasound wavepackets. At ground stations, infrasound detections beyond the first circumnavigation are only possible under low wind conditions (Vergoz et al., 2022). Indeed, even though infrasound sensors are equipped with wind-noise reduction systems, recordings remain sensitive to atmospheric turbulences which affect the detection capability (Marty, 2019) and cause the diurnal variations of wind noise visible in Fig. 3 a), c). A clearer picture emerges from balloon observations (Fig. 3 (b), (d)), which exclusively exhibit infrasound signals above 20 mHz. In the following, we adopt the convention for multiple wave passages of Matoza et al. (2022); Vergoz et al. (2022): A1 for the direct short orthodrome arrival, A2 for the first antipodal arrival, A3 for A1 + one revolution etc.

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

Distinct acoustic dispersion patterns appear in long-range arrivals, some of them highlighted in Fig. 3 e)-h). Dispersion mixes A2 and A3 arrivals at STR1 (Fig. 3 e). Nevertheless, one can clearly distinguish a faster A2 wavetrain with limited dispersion ("compact mode") and typical round-the-world transit speed of 280-290 m/s, followed by a second A2 wavetrain ("dispersive mode") typically slower (275 m/s) with significant dispersion and featuring two dispersion lines around 20 mHz and 70 mHz and mixing with A3. This double dispersion line pattern is also seen for the direct arrival at station IS32 15,750 km from the source, in Kenya (Vergoz et al., 2022). The "compact mode" seems to retain the imprint of the source (i.e., distinct WP_1 and WP_2) and is visible at least up to passage A4 at STR1 (Fig. 3 f)). The upper dispersive mode appears for passage A2 at STR1 and both A2 and A4 at TTL4. The lower dispersive line is long-lived and appears at least at A2-4 at TTL4 and A2-10 at STR1, as well as at IS22. From the spectrograms (Fig. 3 a)), we estimate $\frac{\partial c_g}{\partial \omega} \simeq 500 - 600$ m for the low-frequency dispersive mode. The change in travel speed with frequency results in the flattening of the WPs in frequency-time space over successive circumnavigations (Fig. 3 a)-d)).

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

The nature of this zoo of modes remains uncertain and will be the focus of future work. Their typical celerity resembles stratosphere-ducted infrasound with wind bringing substantial contributions in one or the other direction. Wind likely plays a role in the favored "antipodal" propagation found at TTL4 (absence of the "dispersive modes" in A3 arrivals) and the North-western American station IS56 (not shown). Such asymmetry arises due to the variable efficiency of wind ducting encountered in different propagation directions. Although balloon observations provide no information on the azimuth of the incident waves, an exceptional backazimuth drift as a consequence of refraction by the polar vortex was noted by Vergoz et al. (2022). The role of wind in supporting

264 specific long-lived modes and influencing propagation directions will warrant further in-
 265 vestigations.

266 4 Discussion

267 4.1 Infrasound emission and chronology of the eruption

268 Distinct early infrasound WPs (Fig. 2) were attributed to consecutive trigger events
 269 at the source. In Fig. 4, time series of 0.05 Hz variance are compared with cloud top height
 270 (CTH) data. A satisfactory correspondence can be obtained using reduced time $t_r =$
 271 $t - \frac{d}{c}$ with $c = 275$ m/s, although we did not attempt to precisely align cloud top alti-
 272 tude and variance maxima or use expected azimuth-dependent celerities (Matoza et al.,
 273 2022).

274 Accounting for a time delay between wave emission and the plumes reaching their
 275 ceiling, a clear correspondence is found between (i) WP₁ and the first plume reaching
 276 the mesosphere (04:37) with its subsequent bursts (in particular for WP_{1b} at STR1), and
 277 (ii) WP₃ and a much later plume at 38 km altitude (08:47) piercing the umbrella cloud
 278 (~ 35 km ASL at that time). Attribution of WP₂ is less obvious: a few overshoots reach
 279 the upper stratosphere during the hour following the first injection, in contrast with 30 min-
 280 utes of relative quietness between the end of WP₁ and WP₂ ($t_{\text{WP}_1} + 50$ minutes). Nev-
 281 ertheless, CTH data highlights a 55 km cloud top at 05:27 (+50 minutes) surpassing smaller
 282 overshoots of the last 20 to 30 minutes. This scenario of intermittent emission broadly
 283 agrees with the chronology inferred from a ionospheric wave-train analysis by Astafyeva
 284 et al. (2022), who diagnose two explosions within 10 minutes of 4:20 UTC, followed by
 285 ± 20 minutes rest and two later explosions around 04:50. It is also broadly consistent
 286 with pressure records from Tonga at $d = 64$ km (Wright et al., 2022), although this data
 287 rather suggests four major explosions separated by 34, 41 and 175 minutes. Interpret-
 288 ing surface pressure records near the volcano is complicated by the entanglement between
 289 waves propagating at different speeds.

290 4.2 Azimuth and altitude-dependent infrasound signals: an insight on 291 the vertical distribution of sources?

292 Anisotropic propagation of the infrasound is related to the stratospheric wind fields
 293 near HT-HH (Fig. 1 (a)), which imply large variations in the associated effective sound
 294 speed profiles (Fig. 4 (d)). Strong tailwinds support the propagation of stratospheric modes
 295 to IS22 (and IS36), while strong head- and crosswinds hamper it towards STR1, IS21
 296 and IS24.

297 To quantify infrasound ducting and amplitude decrease along propagation paths
 298 for various source heights and source-to-receiver directions, transmission losses (T_L) be-
 299 tween HT-HH and the sensors are calculated using the open-source range-dependent Parabolic
 300 Equation solver (NCPA PAPE, Waxler et al., 2021) with effective sound speeds profiles
 301 obtained from merging ECMWF data with climatologies above 60 km and up to 140 km
 302 (MSISE00 and HWM14, Picone et al., 2002; Drob et al., 2015), including range-dependent
 303 gravity-wave perturbations (Gardner et al., 1993). T_L are estimated in dB for a source
 304 frequency of 0.05 Hz (near the peak amplitude of WP1, Fig. 2), i.e.:

$$T_L(x, z) = 20 \log_{10} \left(\frac{|P|^2(x, z)}{|P|^2(x = 1 \text{ km}, z = z_{\text{source}})} \right) \quad (3)$$

305 where $|P|$ is the modulus of pressure amplitude, x the horizontal range from the source,
 306 z and z_{source} the observation and specified source altitudes. The resulting T_L profiles
 307 at receiver locations for different point source altitudes are depicted in Fig. 4 ((e)-(h)).
 308 A deep duct down to the surface is seen at IS22 and IS36, while the stratospheric duct
 309 prevails at other locations. Differences in T_L between IS22 and other ground and upper-




Figure 3. Spectrograms of the pressure signals corresponding to the successive circumglobal revolutions of the Lamb and infrasound wave packets for balloons a) STR1 and c) TTL4 and ground stations b) IS22 and d) IS57. Expected arrival times are shown for the 317 m/s Lamb wave (orange) and 290 (blue), 275 (red) and 260 (light green) m/s infrasound group velocities (solid lines for "direct", dashed for antipodal). TTL4 time series stop on January 18 due to its burst. e), f), g), h) Zoom on the (a, g) first antipodal arrival and (e, h) second direct and (f, i) antipodal arrivals at the balloons. Direct and antipodal arrival superpose partly at STR1.




Figure 4. (a) Hovmöller diagram of HT-HH stereoscopic plume top altitude and (red line) time series of maximum plume height in the area (23°S - 17°S , 177°W - 174°W). (b) Amplitude time series near 0.05 Hz (4.8 - $5.4 \cdot 10^{-2}$ Hz) for ground stations (solid) and balloons (dashed) corrected with Eq. 2 and (c) observed variance. (d) Average effective sound speed profile along the great-circle paths in Fig. 1 (a) $c_{eff} = \sqrt{\gamma R_d T} + \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{e}_k$, with \mathbf{u}_h the horizontal wind and \mathbf{e}_k the position-dependent unit vector aligned with the orthodrom and pointing away from HT-HH. (e), (f), (g), (h) Vertical profiles of infrasound T_L at sensor position, for a source at (e) the ground, (f) 10 km altitude, (g) 20 km, (h) 30 km and (i) 40 km altitude. Star markers indicate the variance observed during WP₁ and dots during WP₃, normalized by the value at IS22.

310 air sensors are reduced when the altitude of the source is increased (Fig. 4 (e) vs (i)).
 311 While a quantitative Bayesian inversion is beyond the scope of the present letter, con-
 312 fronting the simulations to observed signals suggests that only a high-altitude (20-30 km)
 313 source can reconcile measurements from the different sensors. This is compatible with
 314 the observed plume altitude. The larger spread in magnitude at different stations for WP₃
 315 than for WP₁ also further hints at an excitation at lower altitude for WP₃, consistent
 316 with lower top altitude in CTH retrievals. As a caveat, we should mention here that the
 317 quantitative interpretation of balloon signals might be hampered by unanticipated ar-
 318 tifacts, e.g. related to motions of the balloon-gondola system (Garcia et al., n.d.).

319 In any case, assuming the Lamb wave and infrasound are excited by spatially con-
 320 nected processes (lightnings), a vertical distribution of energy release bears implications,
 321 e.g. for estimating the yield of the eruption. Indeed, theoretical and empirical formu-
 322 las for explosion yields often assume a source primarily located at the ground (e.g., Pierce
 323 & Posey, 1971). If we relax this assumption, Equation (62) of Pierce and Posey (1971)
 324 becomes:

$$E = 15\Delta p(c_0 \tau)^{\frac{3}{2}} H \bar{p} \left(\frac{\bar{p}_g}{\bar{p}_s} \right)^{\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma}} \left(\frac{\bar{p}_{obs}}{\bar{p}_s} \right)^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} \quad (4)$$

325 where H is the scale height, \bar{p}_g the ground pressure, \bar{p}_s the background pressure at the
 326 altitude of the point source and \bar{p}_{obs} the pressure at the observations. Estimated yields
 327 are reduced by a factor of 2 (resp. 4) for a point source near 100 hPa or 16 km (resp.
 328 10 hPa or 30 km). When evaluating their formula against nuclear blasts, Posey and Pierce
 329 (1971) questioned its applicability for extreme yield nuclear explosions. We speculate that
 330 nonlinearities in the plume evolution and high-altitude energy transfer to the environ-
 331 ment, as well as mass and momentum sources, contribute to this discrepancy. While a
 332 detailed assessment of this effect and realistic yield estimates are beyond the scope of
 333 the present study, a significant contribution of high-altitude energy release, consistent
 334 with infrasound and geostationary observations, modify yield estimates for this event.

335 4.3 Advantages and potential limitations of balloon measurements

336 Our study evidences an infrasound signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) improved by a fac-
 337 tor of at least 10 at lower stratospheric altitudes compared to the ground (Fig. 2 a, b
 338 and 4). Reasons include 1) the location of the sensor within the stratospheric waveguide
 339 and 2) reduced noise in the absence of wind relative to the sensor (Bowman & Lees, 2015;
 340 Bowman & Krishnamoorthy, 2021; Krishnamoorthy et al., 2020). For a source located
 341 at the surface, infrasound signals are larger on the ground in conditions favorable for deep
 342 propagation (IS22). However, upper-air reception appears advantageous in unfavorable
 343 propagation conditions (IS21, IS24, Fig. 4 (e)). In general, the strong anisotropy observed
 344 for ground receivers is mitigated at stratospheric levels. This advantage of upper-air ob-
 345 servations is reinforced for sources around the duct (10 to 20 km ASL; Fig. 4 g)).

346 Regarding the noise, winds exceeding a few m/s typically result in a noise level 3
 347 orders of magnitude larger (variance) than on-board the balloons prior to the eruption
 348 (Fig. 4). Turbulence-induced noise is a well-known challenge of ground-based infrasound
 349 monitoring (Marty, 2019). Under low surface wind (e.g. IS57) (Vergoz et al., 2022), the
 350 noise is significantly reduced and likely results in better SNR than onboard the balloon.

351 Despite its advantages, the balloon platform might suffer from specific biases, which
 352 could be only partially corrected by the current implementation of Eq. 1. In particular,
 353 Figure 2 showed a prominent enhancement of the stratospheric signal at 0.05 Hz absent
 354 in ground measurements. Recently, Garcia et al. (n.d.) identified a mismatch between
 355 balloon observations and pressure variations expected from infrasound generated by seis-
 356 mic waves after an earthquake. Those authors proposed that the observed discrepancies
 357 are induced by movements of the balloon/gondola system. Although preliminary inves-
 358 tigation suggest that well-measured multi-revolution dispersive patterns are similar be-

359 tween balloon and ground measurements, detailed modeling of balloon response to in-
 360 cident acoustic waves is needed (Bowman et al., 2022).

361 5 Conclusions

362 A quasi-instantaneous forcing of the atmosphere occurred on January 15 2022 when
 363 Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai violently erupted. Adjustment to this cataclysmic pertur-
 364 bation triggered a wide spectrum of atmospheric waves unprecedented in modern obser-
 365 vational records. Located 2,000 and 7,800 km away from the volcano, two long-duration
 366 stratospheric balloons measured a clear signature of the surface-guided Lamb wave, which
 367 produced the largest pressure perturbation ever observed at that altitude for periods be-
 368 tween 10 and 60 minutes. Lamb wave fronts could be measured for at least 3 revolutions
 369 in the air. The eruption also excited pure acoustic waves. Supported by plume top height
 370 data, the first arrival of infrasound wave packets at frequencies of 0.05 Hz suggest a multiple-
 371 explosion eruption scenario. Later infrasound arrivals associated with multiple revolu-
 372 tions could be followed until the end of the flights, 9 days after the eruption, correspond-
 373 ing to wavepackets circumnavigating the globe 5 times.

374 Together with infrasound earthquake detection (Brissaud et al., 2021; Garcia et al.,
 375 n.d.) and entering bolide airburst in the atmosphere (Bowman et al., 2019), this excep-
 376 tional ultra long-range detection of acoustic waves from the HT-HH eruption demonstrates
 377 the potential of long-duration stratospheric balloons for quakes and explosion monitor-
 378 ing. A shortcoming of the 2021 Strateole-2 infrasound payload is the lack of azimuth and
 379 incidence angle measurements. Recently, different teams tried to cover this gap with in-
 380 ertial measurement units (IMUs) (Garcia et al., 2020; Bowman et al., 2022) or anten-
 381 nas of pressure sensors (Krishnamoorthy et al., 2019; Garcia et al., 2020). While Strateole-
 382 2 balloons unfortunately did not include such measurements at sufficient resolution, we
 383 advocate for including them in the future to provide additional constrain on wave and
 384 source properties. The response of SPBs to high-frequency atmospheric excitations is
 385 prone to significant uncertainties (Podglajen et al., 2016) which will be addressed in the
 386 2024 Strateole-2 campaign by the mean of dedicated instruments. In parallel, theoret-
 387 ical investigations of the balloon response are required to infer atmospheric wave prop-
 388 erties from this invaluable platform.

389 6 Open Research

390 Strateole-2 data is available at [https://data.ipsl.fr/catalog/strateole2/eng/
 391 catalog.search#/search?from=1&to=30](https://data.ipsl.fr/catalog/strateole2/eng/catalog.search#/search?from=1&to=30). Access to IMS data can be made available
 392 upon request through the virtual Data Exploitation Center at [https://www.ctbto.org/
 393 specials/vdec](https://www.ctbto.org/specials/vdec) (last accessed on 2022-05-11). ECMWF data can be found at [https://
 394 cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/reanalysis-era5-pressure-levels
 395 ?tab=form](https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/reanalysis-era5-pressure-levels?tab=form) (last accessed on 2022-05-11).

396 Acknowledgments

397 The authors thank Alain Hauchecorne and François Lott for discussions. The sponsor-
 398 ship of CNES, CNRS-INSU and NSF to Strateole-2 long-duration stratospheric balloon
 399 activities is gratefully acknowledged.

400 References

- 401 Aki, K. (1997). Seismic Coda Waves: A Stochastic Process in Earth’s Lithosphere.
 402 In S. A. Molchanov & W. A. Woyczynski (Eds.), *Stochastic Models in Geosys-
 403 tems* (pp. 1–24). New York, NY: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4613-8500-4.1
 404 Amores, A., Monserrat, S., Marcos, M., Argüeso, D., Villalonga, J., Jordà, G., &

- 405 Gomis, D. (2022). Numerical Simulation of Atmospheric Lamb Waves Gen-
 406 erated by the 2022 Hunga-Tonga Volcanic Eruption. *Geophysical Research*
 407 *Letters*, *49*(6), e2022GL098240. doi: 10.1029/2022GL098240
- 408 Astafyeva, E., Maletckii, B., Mikesell, T. D., Munaibari, E., Ravanelli, M., Coisson,
 409 P., ... Rolland, L. (2022, April). *The 15 January 2022 Hunga Tonga eruption*
 410 *history as inferred from ionospheric observations* (Preprint). Geophysics. doi:
 411 10.1002/essoar.10511226.1
- 412 Bowman, D. C., & Krishnamoorthy, S. (2021). Infrasound From a Buried Chemical
 413 Explosion Recorded on a Balloon in the Lower Stratosphere. *Geophysical Re-*
 414 *search Letters*, *48*(21), e2021GL094861. doi: 10.1029/2021GL094861
- 415 Bowman, D. C., Krishnamoorthy, S., & Brown, P. (2019, December). Underground
 416 explosion and bolide airburst detection using balloon-borne infrasound sensors.
 417 *AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts, 2019*, A21S-2812.
- 418 Bowman, D. C., & Lees, J. M. (2015). Infrasound in the middle stratosphere mea-
 419 sured with a free-flying acoustic array. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *42*(22),
 420 10,010–10,017. doi: 10.1002/2015GL066570
- 421 Bowman, D. C., & Lees, J. M. (2018). Upper Atmosphere Heating From Ocean-
 422 Generated Acoustic Wave Energy. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *45*(10), 5144–
 423 5150. doi: 10.1029/2018GL077737
- 424 Bowman, D. C., Rouse, J. W., Krishnamoorthy, S., & Silber, E. A. (2022, May).
 425 Infrasound direction of arrival determination using a balloon-borne aeroseis-
 426 mometer. *JASA Express Letters*, *2*(5), 054001. doi: 10.1121/10.0010378
- 427 Bretherton, F. P. (1969). Lamb waves in a nearly isothermal atmosphere. *Quarterly*
 428 *Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, *95*(406), 754–757. doi: 10.1002/qj
 429 .49709540608
- 430 Brissaud, Q., Krishnamoorthy, S., Jackson, J. M., Bowman, D. C., Komjathy, A.,
 431 Cutts, J. A., ... Walsh, G. J. (2021). The First Detection of an Earthquake
 432 From a Balloon Using Its Acoustic Signature. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
 433 *48*(12), e2021GL093013. doi: 10.1029/2021GL093013
- 434 Carr, J. L., Horvath, A., Wu, D. L., & Friberg, M. D. (2022, February). *Stereo*
 435 *Plume Height and Motion Retrievals for the Record-Setting Hunga Tonga-*
 436 *Hunga Ha’apai Eruption of 15 January 2022* (Preprint). Atmospheric Sciences.
 437 doi: 10.1002/essoar.10510365.1
- 438 Chunchuzov, I. P., Kulichkov, S. N., Popov, O. E., Waxler, R., & Assink, J. (2011,
 439 October). Infrasound scattering from atmospheric anisotropic inhomoge-
 440 neities. *Izvestiya, Atmospheric and Oceanic Physics*, *47*(5), 540–557. doi:
 441 10.1134/S0001433811050045
- 442 Drob, D. P., Emmert, J. T., Meriwether, J. W., Makela, J. J., Doornbos, E., Conde,
 443 M., ... Klenzing, J. H. (2015). An update to the Horizontal Wind Model
 444 (HWM): The quiet time thermosphere. *Earth and Space Science*, *2*(7), 301–
 445 319. doi: 10.1002/2014EA000089
- 446 Ern, M., Hoffmann, L., Rhode, S., & Preusse, P. (n.d.). The Mesoscale Gravity
 447 Wave Response to the 2022 Tonga Volcanic Eruption: AIRS and MLS Satellite
 448 Observations and Source Backtracing. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *n/a*(*n/a*),
 449 e2022GL098626. doi: 10.1029/2022GL098626
- 450 Garcia, R. F., Klotz, A., Hertzog, A., Roland, M., G erier, S., Kassarian, E., ... Mi-
 451 moun, D. (n.d.). Infrasound from large earthquakes recorded on a network of
 452 balloons in the stratosphere.
- 453 Garcia, R. F., Martire, L., Chaigneau, Y., Cadu, A., Mimoun, D., Portus, M. B.,
 454 ... Martin, R. (2020, December). An active source seismo-acoustic experi-
 455 ment using tethered balloons to validate instrument concepts and modelling
 456 tools for atmospheric seismology. *Geophysical Journal International*, *225*(1),
 457 186–199. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggaa589> doi:
 458 10.1093/gji/ggaa589
- 459 Gardner, C. S., Hostetler, C. A., & Franke, S. J. (1993). Gravity wave models for

- 460 the horizontal wave number spectra of atmospheric velocity and density fluc-
 461 tuations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 98(D1), 1035–1049.
 462 doi: 10.1029/92JD02051
- 463 Haase, J., Alexander, M. J., Hertzog, A., Kalnajs, L., Deshler, T., Davis, S., ...
 464 Venel, S. (2018). Around the World in 84 Days. *EOS*. doi: 10.1029/
 465 2018eo091907
- 466 Hertzog, A., Cocquerez, P., Guilbon, R., Valdivia, J.-N., Venel, S., Basdevant, C.,
 467 ... Schmitt, É. (2007, December). Stratéole/Vorcore—Long-duration, Super-
 468 pressure Balloons to Study the Antarctic Lower Stratosphere during the 2005
 469 Winter. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 24(12), 2048–2061.
 470 doi: 10.1175/2007JTECHA948.1
- 471 Krishnamoorthy, S., Bowman, D. C., Komjathy, A., Pauken, M. T., & Cutts, J. A.
 472 (2020, October). Origin and mitigation of wind noise on balloon-borne infra-
 473 sound microbarometers. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*,
 474 148(4), 2361–2370. doi: 10.1121/10.0002356
- 475 Krishnamoorthy, S., Lai, V. H., Komjathy, A., Pauken, M. T., Cutts, J. A., Gar-
 476 cia, R. F., ... Cadu, A. (2019). Aerial Seismology Using Balloon-Based
 477 Barometers. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 1–11.
 478 Retrieved from <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8809415/> doi:
 479 10.1109/TGRS.2019.2931831
- 480 Lamb, H. (1910). On atmospheric oscillations. *Proc. R. SOC. Lond.*, A84, 551–572.
- 481 Lindzen, R. S., & Blake, D. (1972). Lamb waves in the presence of realistic distribu-
 482 tions of temperature and dissipation. *Journal of Geophysical Research (1896-*
 483 *1977)*, 77(12), 2166–2176. doi: 10.1029/JC077i012p02166
- 484 Marty, J. (2019). The IMS infrasound network: Current status and technological de-
 485 velopments. In A. Le Pichon, E. Blanc, & A. Hauchecorne (Eds.), *Infrasound*
 486 *monitoring for atmospheric studies: Challenges in middle atmosphere dynam-*
 487 *ics and societal benefits* (pp. 3–62). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
 488 doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-75140-5_1
- 489 Massman, W. J. (1978, September). On the Nature of Vertical Oscillations of Con-
 490 stant Volume Balloons. *Journal of Applied Meteorology*, 17(9), 1351–1356. doi:
 491 10.1175/1520-0450(1978)017<1351:OTNOVO>2.0.CO;2
- 492 Matoza, R. S., Fee, D., Assink, J. D., Iezzi, A. M., Green, D. N., Kim, K., ... Wil-
 493 son, D. C. (2022). Atmospheric waves and global seismoacoustic observations
 494 of the january 2022 hunga eruption, tonga. *Science*, 0(0), eeeeeeeeeee. Re-
 495 trieved from <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.abo7063>
 496 doi: 10.1126/science.abo7063
- 497 Picone, J. M., Hedin, A. E., Drob, D. P., & Aikin, A. C. (2002). NRLMSISE-00
 498 empirical model of the atmosphere: Statistical comparisons and scientific is-
 499 sues. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 107(A12), SIA 15-1-SIA
 500 15-16. doi: 10.1029/2002JA009430
- 501 Pierce, A. D., & Posey, J. W. (1971, December). Theory of the Excitation
 502 and Propagation of Lamb’s Atmospheric Edge Mode from Nuclear Ex-
 503 plosions. *Geophysical Journal International*, 26(1-4), 341–368. doi:
 504 10.1111/j.1365-246X.1971.tb03406.x
- 505 Podglajen, A., Hertzog, A., Plougonven, R., & Legras, B. (2016). Lagrangian
 506 temperature and vertical velocity fluctuations due to gravity waves in the
 507 lower stratosphere. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(7), 3543–3553. doi:
 508 10.1002/2016GL068148
- 509 Poli, P., & Shapiro, N. M. (2022, February). *Rapid characterization of large volcanic*
 510 *eruptions: Measuring the impulse of the Hunga Tonga explosion from*
 511 *teleseismic waves* (Preprint). Geophysics. doi: 10.1002/essoar.10510358.1
- 512 Posey, J. W., & Pierce, A. D. (1971, July). Estimation of Nuclear Explosion Ener-
 513 gies from Microbarograph Records. *Nature*, 232(5308), 253–253. doi: 10.1038/
 514 232253a0

- 515 Salby, M. L. (1980, October). The Influence of Realistic Dissipation on Planetary
 516 Normal Structures. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 37(10), 2186–2199.
 517 doi: 10.1175/1520-0469(1980)037<2186:TIORDO>2.0.CO;2
- 518 Sellitto, P., Podglajen, A., Belhadji, R., Boichu, M., Carboni, E., Cuesta, J., ...
 519 Legras, B. (2022). *The unexpected radiative impact of the Hunga Tonga eruption*
 520 *of January 15th, 2022*. doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-1562573/v1
- 521 Symons, G. J. (1888). *The eruption of krakatoa, and subsequent phenomena: Report*
 522 *of the krakatoa committee of the royal society*. Wiley Online Library.
- 523 Taylor, G. I. (1929, December). Waves and tides in the atmosphere. *Proceedings of*
 524 *the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical*
 525 *and Physical Character*, 126(800), 169–183. doi: 10.1098/rspa.1929.0213
- 526 Vergoz, J., Hupe, P., Listowski, C., Le Pichon, A., & Garcés, M. e. a. (2022). A
 527 global analysis of infrasound and acoustic-gravity waves produced by the jan-
 528 uary 2022 volcanic eruption of hunga, tonga. *Earth and Planetary Science*
 529 *Letters, in press*.
- 530 Vincent, R. A., & Hertzog, A. (2014, April). The response of superpressure balloons
 531 to gravity wave motions. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 7(4), 1043–
 532 1055. doi: 10.5194/amt-7-1043-2014
- 533 Watanabe, S., Hamilton, K., Sakazaki, T., & Nakano, M. (2022, March). *First*
 534 *Detection of the Pekeris Internal Global Atmospheric Resonance: Evidence*
 535 *from the 2022 Tonga Eruption and from Global Reanalysis Data* (Preprint).
 536 Atmospheric Sciences. doi: 10.1002/essoar.10510971.1
- 537 Waxler, R., Hetzer, C., Assink, J., & Velea, D. (2021, September). *Chetzer-*
 538 *nca/ncpaprop-release: NCPAprop v2.1.0*. Zenodo. doi: 10.5281/zenodo
 539 .5562713
- 540 Wright, C., Hindley, N., Alexander, M. J., Barlow, M., Hoffmann, L., Mitchell, C.,
 541 ... Yue, J. (2022, March). *Tonga eruption triggered waves propagating glob-*
 542 *ally from surface to edge of space* (Preprint). Atmospheric Sciences. doi:
 543 10.1002/essoar.10510674.1
- 544 Yuen, D. A., Scruggs, M. A., Spera, F. J., Zheng, Y., Hu, H., McNutt, S. R., ...
 545 Tanioka, Y. (2022, March). Under the Surface: Pressure-Induced Planetary-
 546 Scale Waves, Volcanic Lightning, and Gaseous Clouds Caused by the Sub-
 547 marine Eruption of Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai Volcano Provide an Excel-
 548 lent Research Opportunity. *Earthquake Research Advances*, 100134. doi:
 549 10.1016/j.eqrea.2022.100134