

Regional and global temperature response to anthropogenic SO₂ emissions from China in three climate models

Article

Accepted Version

Kasoar, M., Voulgarakis, A., Lamarque, J.-F., Shindell, D. T., Bellouin, N. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2109-9559>, Collins, W. J. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7419-0850>, Faluvegi, G. and Tsigaridis, K. (2016) Regional and global temperature response to anthropogenic SO₂ emissions from China in three climate models. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions*, 16 (15). pp. 9785-9804. ISSN 1680-7375 doi: 10.5194/acp-2015-1017 Available at <https://reading-pure-test.eprints-hosting.org/65996/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5194/acp-2015-1017>

Publisher: Copernicus Publications

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1 **Regional and global temperature response to**
2 **anthropogenic SO₂ emissions from China in three climate**
3 **models**

4

5 **M. Kasoar¹, A. Voulgarakis¹, J.-F. Lamarque², D. T. Shindell³, N. Bellouin⁴, W. J.**
6 **Collins⁴, G. Faluvegi⁵, and K. Tsigaridis⁵**

7 [1]{Department of Physics, Imperial College London, London, UK }

8 [2]{NCAR Earth System Laboratory, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO,
9 USA }

10 [3]{Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA }

11 [4]{Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading, UK }

12 [5]{Center for Climate Systems Research, Columbia University, and NASA Goddard Institute
13 for Space Studies, New York, NY, USA }

14 Correspondence to: M. Kasoar (m.kasoar12@imperial.ac.uk)

15

16 **Abstract**

17 We use the HadGEM3-GA4, CESM1, and GISS ModelE2 climate models to investigate the
18 global and regional aerosol burden, radiative flux, and surface temperature responses to
19 removing anthropogenic sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions from China. We find that the models
20 differ by up to a factor of six in the simulated change in aerosol optical depth (AOD) and
21 shortwave radiative flux over China that results from reduced sulfate aerosol, leading to a large
22 range of magnitudes in the regional and global temperature responses. Two of the three models
23 simulate a near-ubiquitous hemispheric warming due to the regional SO₂ removal, with
24 similarities in the local and remote pattern of response, but overall with a substantially different
25 magnitude. The third model simulates almost no significant temperature response. We attribute
26 the discrepancies in the response to a combination of substantial differences in the chemical
27 conversion of SO₂ to sulfate, translation of sulfate mass into AOD, cloud radiative interactions,
28 and differences in the radiative forcing efficiency of sulfate aerosol in the models. The model

1 with the strongest response (HadGEM3-GA4) compares best with observations of AOD
2 regionally, however the other two models compare similarly (albeit poorly) and still disagree
3 substantially in their simulated climate response, indicating that total AOD observations are far
4 from sufficient to determine which model response is more plausible. Our results highlight that
5 there remains a large uncertainty in the representation of both aerosol chemistry as well as direct
6 and indirect aerosol radiative effects in current climate models, and reinforces that caution must
7 be applied when interpreting the results of modelling studies of aerosol influences on climate.
8 Model studies that implicate aerosols in climate responses should ideally explore a range of
9 radiative forcing strengths representative of this uncertainty, in addition to thoroughly
10 evaluating the models used against observations.

11

12 **1 Introduction**

13 Short-lived atmospheric pollutants such as aerosols have very inhomogeneous spatial
14 distributions. This means that, unlike long-lived greenhouse gases such as CO₂, the radiative
15 forcing due to aerosols is highly variable, and the resulting climate response may be strongly
16 influenced by the region of emission and the prevailing circulation patterns. There is increasing
17 interest in trying to understand how aerosol forcing from different regions affects the climate,
18 both locally and remotely. For example, Shindell and Faluvegi (2009) and Shindell et al. (2012)
19 looked systematically at the response of temperature and precipitation to single-species forcings
20 imposed in different latitude bands, and showed that the influence of remote forcings on certain
21 regions can often outweigh and even have opposite sign to the influence of local forcings. Teng
22 et al. (2012) investigated the global temperature response to drastically increasing carbonaceous
23 aerosols only over Asia, finding a strong remote effect on US summertime temperatures.

24 One of the most important anthropogenically-sourced aerosol species is sulfate (SO₄) (e.g.
25 Myhre et al., 2013b). Sulfate-containing aerosols are formed following chemical conversion
26 of gaseous sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions from fossil-fuel combustion, as well as natural
27 sources such as volcanic SO₂ and ocean dimethyl sulfide (DMS) emissions (e.g. Andres and
28 Kasgnoc, 1998; Andreae and Crutzen, 1997). Sulfate particles strongly scatter incoming
29 shortwave (SW) radiation, which helps to increase the planetary albedo and cool the surface.
30 They also act as cloud condensation nuclei, leading to additional cloud droplets forming in
31 supersaturated conditions, which increases cloud albedo and again cools the Earth system

1 (Boucher et al., 2013). Historically, cooling from sulfate aerosol, predominantly in the more
2 industrialised northern hemisphere, has been implicated by a range of modelling studies in
3 disrupting climate since the mid-20th century. For instance, Booth et al. (2012), Hwang et al.
4 (2013), and Wilcox et al. (2013) discussed the importance of historical aerosol cooling in
5 modulating large-scale temperature and precipitation patterns, while other studies such as
6 Bollasina et al. (2011), Dong et al. (2014), and Polson et al. (2014) have looked at the impact
7 of historical aerosols on regional climate features such as the monsoon systems or Sahelian
8 rainfall.

9 The few studies that have investigated specific regional aerosol forcings (e.g. Shindell and
10 Faluvegi, 2009; Shindell et al., 2012; Teng et al., 2012) typically used a single climate model
11 at a time to investigate the climate response to idealised, historical, or projected forcings.
12 However models vary considerably in their representation of aerosols and their radiative
13 properties, resulting in a large uncertainty in aerosol radiative forcing (e.g. Myhre et al., 2013b;
14 Shindell et al., 2013a). When investigating the climate response to regional aerosol emissions,
15 such uncertainties are likely to be confounded even further by the variability between models
16 in regional climate and circulation patterns, and variation in the global and regional climate
17 sensitivity (the amount of simulated warming per unit radiative forcing). To best interpret the
18 findings of single-model experiments with regional aerosol forcings, it is therefore critical to
19 understand the range of uncertainty in the climate response that may arise as a result of
20 structural and parametric differences between climate models.

21 We investigate here the range of variability that can arise in the translation of a regional
22 emission perturbation to a climate (temperature) response, between three different state-of-the-
23 art global climate models. We select as a case study the removal of SO₂ anthropogenic
24 emissions from the region of China. Since China is currently the largest anthropogenic source
25 region of sulfur dioxide (Smith et al., 2011) and hence anthropogenic aerosol, this regional
26 perturbation represents a substantial modification to global aerosol levels, with the additional
27 characteristic of being localised over a particular part of the world. This aspect of our
28 experiment is distinct from many previous model intercomparison studies, which have typically
29 compared the climate response in models forced by global historical trends in aerosols (for
30 example, Shindell et al., 2015; Wilcox et al., 2013), or which have only considered the impact
31 of regional emissions on long-range pollution transport and on radiative forcing (for example
32 the HTAP and AeroCom experiments (HTAP, 2010; Yu et al., 2013; Kinne et al., 2006; Schulz

1 et al., 2006; Textor et al., 2006; Myhre et al., 2013)), but have not investigated the range of
2 model climate responses to a regionally localised emission perturbation. The potential
3 importance of remote climate effects due to the strong zonal asymmetry created by such
4 regional emissions has therefore not yet been explored in multi-model studies. Single-model
5 studies such as Teng et al. (2012) suggest though that regionally localised forcings can produce
6 significant climate teleconnections in at least the longitudinal direction.

7 In the following sections we first describe the three models employed, and our experimental
8 setup (Sect. 2). We then present the results of the radiative flux and surface temperature
9 responses to the removal of Chinese SO₂ (Sect. 3), and analyse the possible reasons for
10 differences between the model responses (Sect. 4). Finally, in Sect. 5 we present our
11 conclusions.

12

13 **2 Model descriptions and experimental set-up**

14 The three models we employ are the Hadley Centre Global Environment Model 3 – Global
15 Atmosphere 4.0 (HadGEM3-GA4), the Community Earth System Model 1 (CESM1), and the
16 Goddard Institute for Space Studies ModelE2 (GISS-E2). To allow the climate system to freely
17 respond, the models are all used in a fully coupled atmosphere-ocean configuration. These
18 three models all feature explicit aerosol modelling, and include both direct and indirect radiative
19 effects of aerosols. However the models all vary in the details of the parameterisations used,
20 the dynamical cores, radiation and cloud schemes, model grids and horizontal and vertical
21 resolutions, land surface and ocean components, etc. This lack of common structural features
22 makes these three models well suited to contrast against one another and probe the range of
23 potential model uncertainty, as we do here. The models are briefly described below, and the
24 key references and features are summarised in Table 1.

25

26 **2.1 Model descriptions**

27 **2.1.1 HadGEM3-GA4**

28 For HadGEM3, we use the Global Atmosphere 4.0 version of the model (Walters et al., 2014)
29 in a standard climate configuration with a horizontal resolution of 1.875° longitude x 1.25°
30 latitude in the atmosphere, with 85 vertical levels and the model top at 85km. The atmosphere

1 is coupled to the JULES land surface model (Walters et al., 2014). Here we prescribe fixed
2 vegetation and also globally-uniform observed mass-mixing ratios for CO₂, CH₄, and other
3 long-lived greenhouse gases, taking their year-2000 values from the CMIP5 historical dataset
4 (Meinshausen et al., 2011). A zonally-uniform present-day ozone climatology is also
5 prescribed in the radiation scheme, derived from the SPARC dataset (Cionni et al., 2011). The
6 atmospheric model is coupled to the NEMO dynamical ocean model (Madec, 2008) and CICE
7 sea-ice model (Hunke and Lipscombe, 2008), which are run with a 1° horizontal resolution, and
8 75 vertical depth levels for the ocean.

9 HadGEM3-GA4 can be run with a choice of two aerosol schemes of differing complexity –
10 CLASSIC (Bellouin et al., 2011), and GLOMAP (Mann et al., 2010). Here we use the simpler
11 CLASSIC scheme, which is less computationally expensive, and is also the aerosol scheme that
12 was used for CMIP5 simulations with the predecessor of this model (HadGEM2). CLASSIC
13 is a mass-based scheme, meaning that only aerosol mass (and not particle number) is tracked,
14 and therefore all aerosol species are assumed to be externally mixed. The scheme includes an
15 interactive representation of sulfate in three modes (Aitken, accumulation, and in-cloud), fossil-
16 fuel black carbon, fossil-fuel organic carbon, and biomass-burning aerosol in three modes
17 (fresh, aged, and in-cloud), dust in six size bins, and sea-salt in two modes (jet and film), as
18 well as an offline biogenic aerosol climatology. The scheme can also include a representation
19 of nitrate aerosol, but this option was not used here.

20 The sulfate component of the scheme (Jones et al., 2001) includes tracers for two gas-phase
21 precursors: SO₂ from anthropogenic and natural sources, and DMS from natural sources. These
22 are emitted into the atmosphere and can undergo advection, wet and dry deposition, or oxidation
23 using prescribed 4D oxidant fields (Derwent et al., 2003). In CLASSIC, oxidation of SO₂ to
24 SO₄ aerosol can proceed through three possible reaction pathways: in the gas phase by reaction
25 with OH, or in the aqueous phase by reaction with either H₂O₂ or O₃.

26 The radiative transfer scheme of Edwards and Slingo (1996) is used with six spectral bands in
27 the shortwave, and all aerosol species interact with radiation. The hygroscopic aerosols (sulfate,
28 organic carbon, biomass-burning aerosol, sea-salt) can also interact with clouds via their role
29 as cloud condensation nuclei. Cloud droplet number concentration and effective radius are
30 determined from the mass concentration of these aerosols, which affects the simulated cloud
31 lifetime (2nd indirect effect) and cloud brightness (1st indirect effect) as described in Bellouin et
32 al. (2011) and Jones et al. (2001).

1

2 **2.1.2 CESM1**

3 CESM1 is run in its standard CAM5-Chem configuration (Tilmes et al., 2015) with a horizontal
4 resolution of 2.5° longitude x 1.875° latitude, and 30 vertical levels, with the model top at
5 approximately 40 km. The atmosphere is coupled to the Community Land Atmosphere version
6 4 land surface model (Lawrence et al., 2011). In the present configuration, the vegetation
7 distribution is fixed at its 2005 distribution and the CO₂ concentration is specified. The
8 atmosphere model is coupled to the POP2 ocean and CICE4 sea-ice models, with an equivalent
9 resolution of 1° .

10 In the present CAM5-Chem configuration (Tilmes et al., 2015) we use an online representation
11 of tropospheric and stratospheric chemistry so that no chemical constituents are specified, other
12 than specifying the long-lived greenhouse gases' concentrations in the surface layer. CAM5-
13 Chem uses the MAM3 modal aerosol scheme (Liu et al., 2012), which is the same as used for
14 the CESM1 submission to CMIP5. Both aerosol mass and particle number are prognostic, and
15 the scheme simulates sulfate, black carbon, primary organic matter, secondary organic aerosol,
16 dust, and sea salt aerosol species as an internal mixture in Aitken, accumulation, and coarse
17 modes.

18 The model includes emissions of natural and anthropogenic SO₂ and natural DMS as sulfate
19 precursors, and the gas-phase chemistry is coupled to the MAM3 aerosol scheme so that the
20 rate of formation of sulfate aerosols is dependent on the chemical state of the atmosphere. SO₂
21 can be converted to SO₄ through three oxidation pathways: by OH in the gas phase, or by either
22 H₂O₂ or O₃ in the aqueous phase. In addition, the surface area of the prognostic tropospheric
23 aerosols is used to compute heterogeneous reaction rates that affect gas-phase chemistry.

24 Shortwave radiative transfer is based on the RRTM_SW scheme (Clough et al., 2005) with 14
25 spectral bands, and aerosols interact with climate through both absorption and scattering of
26 radiation. Aerosol-cloud interactions allow for the effect of aerosols on both cloud droplet
27 number and mass concentrations (Tilmes et al, 2015).

28

29 **2.1.3 GISS-E2**

1 GISS-E2 is run in the configuration used for CMIP5 with a horizontal resolution of 2.5°
2 longitude x 2° latitude, and 40 vertical levels, with the model top at 0.1 hPa (80 km). The
3 atmospheric model is coupled to the dynamic Russell ocean model with horizontal resolution
4 of 1° latitude x 1.25° longitude, and 32 vertical levels as described in Schmidt et al. (2014) and
5 Russell et al. (1995).

6 Well-mixed greenhouse gases are prescribed as described in Miller et al. (2014), but methane
7 is only prescribed at the surface and is otherwise interactive with the chemistry. The ozone
8 distribution is prognostic throughout the simulated atmosphere, and the chemical mechanism is
9 described in Shindell et al. (2013b). In general, other atmospheric gas and aerosol constituents
10 are also simulated online and interact with each other (via oxidants in both the gas and aqueous
11 phases, heterogeneous chemistry, aerosol-influenced gas photolysis, and secondary coating of
12 dust) and with climate (via radiative effects of ozone and methane, water vapour change due to
13 chemistry, and aerosol direct and indirect effects) in a manner consistent with the physics of
14 the rest of the GCM as described in Sect. 2 of Schmidt et al. (2014).

15 GISS-E2 has a choice of three aerosol schemes of varying complexity – OMA (Koch et al.,
16 2011; 2006), MATRIX (Bauer et al, 2008), and TOMAS (Lee and Adams, 2012). Following
17 the GISS-E2 CMIP5 configuration, we use here simpler mass-based OMA scheme, which
18 includes sulfate, nitrate, elemental and organic carbon, along with secondary organic aerosols
19 and natural sea-salt and mineral dust. Aerosols are parameterised as an external mixture of dry
20 and dissolved aerosol, with particle size parameterised as a function of relative humidity
21 (Schmidt et al., 2006). The sulfur scheme includes natural emissions of DMS, and natural and
22 anthropogenic emissions of SO_2 . SO_2 from these sources can be oxidised to SO_4 aerosol
23 through two reaction pathways: by OH in the gas phase, or by H_2O_2 in the aqueous phase.

24 Aerosol direct effects are calculated following the Hansen et al. (1983) radiation model, with
25 six spectral bands in the shortwave. Aerosol indirect effects are calculated as described in
26 Menon et al. (2010), such that cloud droplet number concentration and autoconversion rate
27 depend on the local concentration of aerosol.

28

29 **2.2 Experimental setup**

30 For this study we investigate the surface temperature response to an idealised regional emission
31 perturbation, on a centennial timescale. Each model has a control simulation, initialised from

1 a present-day state, which is forced with the same anthropogenic emissions of aerosols and their
2 precursors following the year-2000 ACCMIP emission inventory (Lamarque et al., 2010). The
3 control simulations are run for 200 years with continuous year-2000 conditions. For each
4 model, we then also run a 200-year perturbation simulation from the same initial state, in which
5 SO_2 emissions from energy production, industry, transport, domestic use, and waste, are set to
6 zero over the region of China, defined here to be the rectangular domain $80^\circ\text{-}120^\circ\text{E}$, $20^\circ\text{-}50^\circ\text{N}$.
7 These emission sectors contribute 98.7% of the anthropogenic SO_2 emitted from this region, so
8 this corresponds to a near complete removal of SO_2 emissions from this highly polluting area
9 of the globe. Quantitatively, this perturbation reduces global anthropogenic SO_2 emissions
10 from around 104 Tg yr^{-1} to 86 Tg yr^{-1} , a reduction of around 17 Tg yr^{-1} , or 16.5%.

11 Additionally, shorter atmosphere-only simulations were performed with HadGEM3-GA4
12 (identical in setup except that sea-surface temperatures (SSTs) and sea-ice cover are prescribed
13 to year-2000 values) in order to diagnose the effective radiative forcing, as well as the SO_2
14 oxidation rates and SO_4 wet deposition rates for this model, referred to in Section 3, Section
15 4.1, and Section 4.1.1. In CESM1, the SO_2 burden, surface SO_4 concentration, clear-sky
16 radiative flux, and cloud cover referred to in Sections 4.1.1, 4.2, and 4.3, were all diagnosed
17 from a 30-year extension of the control and perturbation coupled simulations, rather than from
18 the original 200 years.

19

20 **3 Radiative forcing and climate response**

21 We investigate the change in the mean state of the models by taking averages over the last 150
22 years of the 200-year-long simulations (the first 50 years are discarded to allow the response to
23 the perturbation to establish itself), and taking the difference between the perturbation
24 simulation and the control simulation. As well as plotting maps of 2D variables, we also
25 calculate area-weighted means of temperature, short-wave radiative flux, and aerosol optical
26 depth, both globally and for an east China region (E. China) defined as $100^\circ\text{-}120^\circ\text{E}$, $20^\circ\text{-}40^\circ\text{N}$.
27 This region is found to contain the most intense changes in sulfate aerosol in all three models,
28 and is used from here on to quantify the magnitude of local changes over China. The global-
29 and regionally-averaged quantities, with associated uncertainties where available, are tabulated
30 in Table 2, along with the total sulfate burdens over the globe and E. China, and the ratios of
31 AOD to sulfate burden and SW flux to AOD changes.

1 The anticipated immediate consequence of removing SO₂ emissions from China is that there
2 will be a reduction in the amount of sulfate aerosol formed, leading to a positive shortwave
3 (SW) radiative forcing. Figure 1 shows the changes in net downward top-of-atmosphere (TOA)
4 SW radiative flux in each of the three models. For HadGEM3-GA4 and GISS-E2, the plot is
5 stippled in locations where the change exceeds two standard deviations, estimated for
6 HadGEM3-GA4 from the grid-point standard deviations from six 150-year-long year-2000
7 control simulations with perturbed atmospheric initial conditions, and for GISS-E2 from 12
8 non-overlapping 150-year sections of a 1900-year-long pre-industrial control simulation that
9 had reached radiative equilibrium. Such uncertainty analysis has not been performed for
10 CESM1 due to lack of the necessary unforced simulation output for the version of the model
11 used here. For reference, Fig. 1 also shows the outline of the E. China region, which
12 corresponds well to the region of maximum SW flux changes in all three models.

13 Figure 1 reveals that there is a very substantial variation between the models in the intensity of
14 the local radiative flux change over China. GISS-E2 shows a fairly weak increase in net
15 downward SW flux over E. China, with a local increase (from Table 2) of 0.91 W m⁻² and an
16 insignificant global mean change (-0.034 W m⁻²), whereas HadGEM3-GA4 shows a very
17 pronounced change of 5.3 W m⁻² locally over E. China, and a global mean value of 0.28 W m⁻². CESM1 lies in the middle, with a moderate local SW flux change of 4.2 W m⁻², and 0.19 W
18 m⁻² in the global mean. Between GISS-E2 and HadGEM3-GA4, there is a 6-fold increase in
19 the intensity of the local SW radiative flux change over E. China.
20

21 Because these are fully coupled simulations, the change in the TOA SW flux does not provide
22 a measure of the shortwave radiative forcing, since the underlying climate has been allowed to
23 adjust, potentially allowing feedbacks on clouds, and snow and ice cover. A complementary
24 pair of atmosphere-only simulations were performed with HadGEM3-GA4 to diagnose the
25 effective radiative forcing (ERF) – the change in TOA radiative flux when feedbacks due to the
26 slow response of the ocean are prevented (Andrews et al., 2010). The global SW ERF due to
27 removing SO₂ from China in these fixed-SST simulations is 0.18 W m⁻², 35% smaller than the
28 0.28 W m⁻² change in the fully coupled case. However, locally over the E. China region, the
29 fixed-SST SW ERF was found to be 4.2 W m⁻², which is only 21% lower than the 5.3 W m⁻²
30 value in the fully coupled experiment. Moreover, the spatial map of the SW flux anomaly over
31 China is very similar between the two experiments (Supplementary fig. S1). At least in
32 HadGEM3-GA4, over E. China the change in sulfate therefore appears to be the dominant

1 driver of the change in TOA SW flux, and the local change in SW flux over this region is
2 reasonably representative of the local radiative effect of the sulfate perturbation even in the
3 fully-coupled simulations with this model. The same is less true of the global-mean values
4 because of positive feedback from ice melt in the Arctic, and also some small but widespread
5 changes in cloud cover, which globally add up to a sizeable effect in the coupled simulations
6 (not shown).

7 Based on the fully coupled simulations, the substantial differences in the intensity of SW flux
8 changes over China ultimately translate to very pronounced differences in the strength of the
9 resulting climate response. Figure 2 shows the change in surface air temperatures between the
10 perturbation and control simulations for each of the three models, clearly demonstrating that
11 temperature effects extend far beyond the more localised radiative effects. Again stippling
12 indicates that the response exceeds the 2σ level in HadGEM3-GA4 and GISS-E2. The
13 difference between GISS-E2 and HadGEM3-GA4 is particularly striking. Apart from a small
14 warming in parts of eastern China and north-east Europe by around 0.1-0.3 K, there is virtually
15 no coherent temperature response across the rest of the globe in GISS-E2. The global mean
16 temperature change (Table 2) is -0.028 K and is not significant. In contrast HadGEM3-GA4
17 displays significant warming across almost all of the northern hemisphere, with much larger
18 increases in temperature between 0.4-1 K in many regions, not only in China but also in much
19 of the US, northern Eurasia, and the Arctic. The global mean temperature response is +0.12 K.
20 CESM1 sits again in the middle, with clear warming responses between 0.2-0.5 K over much
21 of eastern Europe, Asia, and the western Pacific. Overall the warming response is still less
22 strong and less widespread than in HadGEM3-GA4, with a global mean warming of +0.054 K.
23 The spatial pattern of warming over Europe and Asia in CESM1 bears some qualitative
24 similarity though to the pattern over the same region in HadGEM3-GA4, suggesting that there
25 may be a similar mode of global response to heating over eastern China in these models, at least
26 across the Eurasian continent. The dynamical mechanisms through which local aerosol
27 emissions are translated to remote response are beyond the scope of this manuscript though.
28 Whether GISS-E2 would have displayed the same pattern had the radiative forcing over China
29 been stronger is impossible to tell from these results; given the small magnitude of the SW flux
30 change it seems that most of the spatial pattern in the temperature response in GISS-E2 can be
31 attributed to internal variability – the largest changes in temperature seen in this model are in

1 fact a region of cooling over the north-west Atlantic, which is mostly not significant and appears
2 instead to be the result of particularly large internal variability in this region.

3

4 **4 Exploring drivers of diversity**

5 We investigate the differences between these models that lead to such a large variation in the
6 predicted temperature response. We explore below a number of possible sources of
7 discrepancy.

8

9 **4.1 Differences in simulated aerosol amounts and aerosol optical depths**

10 We address first the possibility that differences in the aerosol schemes themselves, lead directly
11 to very different aerosol loadings between the models, despite the identical change in SO₂
12 emissions applied. Figure 3 shows the change in column-integrated SO₄ in each model as a
13 result of removing SO₂ emissions from China. The models vary in both the distribution and
14 magnitude of SO₄ reductions. In particular, HadGEM3-GA4 has the reduction in SO₄ burden
15 fairly concentrated over China. CESM1 and GISS-E2 simulate changes in SO₄ which extend
16 further downwind from the source region, giving a larger spatial footprint, although CESM1
17 still has large reductions over China as well.

18 For GISS-E2 and HadGEM3-GA4, more detailed chemistry diagnostics were available from a
19 5-year period of a HadGEM3-GA4 atmosphere-only control simulation, and a 5-year period of
20 the GISS-E2 coupled control simulation. For these two models, the difference in spatial extent
21 of the SO₄ field from Chinese SO₂ emissions seems to be due to faster conversion of SO₂ to
22 SO₄ in HadGEM3-GA4, resulting in much more concentrated changes in SO₄ close to the
23 source. The SO₂ lifetime is around 1.8 times shorter in HadGEM3-GA4, associated with around
24 45% higher wet oxidation rates in this model. This difference is due in part to the inclusion of
25 an additional wet oxidation pathway in HadGEM3-GA4: whereas GISS-E2 only includes wet
26 oxidation of SO₂ by H₂O₂ (around 730 kg(S) s⁻¹ globally integrated), HadGEM3-GA4 includes
27 wet oxidation by both H₂O₂ and O₃, each of which contribute similarly in this model (around
28 540 kg(S) s⁻¹ and 520 kg(S) s⁻¹ respectively).

29 Globally integrated, HadGEM3-GA4 and GISS-E2 simulate fairly similar reductions in SO₄
30 burden, at -0.070 Tg and -0.077 Tg respectively (Table 2). This, combined with the more

1 spread-out SO_4 field in GISS-E2, means that locally over eastern China HadGEM3-GA4 has a
2 much more intense reduction in SO_4 burden, with 50% of the global reduction occurring over
3 E. China in HadGEM3-GA4 (-0.035 Tg), compared with only 21% (-0.016 Tg) in GISS-E2.

4 CESM1 includes the same oxidation pathways as HadGEM3-GA4, and in fact has a slightly
5 shorter SO_2 lifetime still, and so the differences between these two models have different
6 origins. CESM1 in fact simulates almost double the global change in SO_4 burden as the other
7 two models, with -0.136 Tg. This means that although the SO_4 reduction spreads further from
8 the source in CESM1 than in HadGEM3-GA4, CESM1 still has a similar reduction to
9 HadGEM3-GA4 locally over E. China as well (-0.039 Tg), which is also evident in Fig. 3.

10 Given that HadGEM3-GA4 and GISS-E2 simulate a similar global reduction in SO_4 , it is
11 surprising that there is such a difference in the magnitude of their climate responses. Also,
12 given that CESM1 simulates a much larger global reduction in SO_4 than the other two models,
13 it is similarly surprising that this model does not have the largest response. A partial
14 explanation may be found by inspecting the change in total aerosol optical depth (AOD), which
15 is a more direct measure of the radiative properties of the aerosol column. Unfortunately, the
16 AOD diagnosed by the models is not completely equivalent: HadGEM3-GA4 diagnosed clear-
17 sky AOD, which is done in this model by calculating the relative humidity in the cloud-free
18 portion of each grid-box, and using this adjusted humidity to calculate the size of the aerosol
19 droplets in the optical depth calculation (Bellouin et al., 2007). However CESM1 uses the
20 unadjusted grid-box relative humidity to calculate the droplet sizes in its optical depth
21 calculation, thereby providing an all-sky AOD calculation (Neale et al., 2012). GISS-E2
22 diagnosed both all-sky and clear-sky AOD, and unless otherwise stated we compare here its
23 clear-sky AOD, as it is more directly comparable with satellite retrievals of AOD (Kahn et al.,
24 2010; Levy et al., 2013). Figure 4 shows these changes in AOD at the 550nm wavelength for
25 the three models.

26 As with the radiative flux change, there is a large range in the magnitude of local AOD
27 reduction, with E. China AOD reductions ranging from 0.047 in GISS-E2 to 0.287 in
28 HadGEM3-GA4, i.e. about six times higher (Table 2). This is comparable to the approximately
29 6-fold range of SW flux change found over this region. Globally averaged, HadGEM3-GA4
30 also has a much larger AOD reduction than GISS-E2; 0.0042 compared with an almost
31 negligible 0.0003 in GISS-E2, despite these two models having a similar change in global SO_4
32 burden. The much lower globally-averaged value in GISS is partly due to a very small but quite

1 zonally-uniform compensating increase in nitrate aerosol (absent in HadGEM3-GA4), which
2 occurs across the northern hemisphere (not shown). However, the global change in sulfate-
3 only optical depth in GISS-E2 is still only half that in HadGEM3-GA4 (not shown), and locally
4 around eastern China we find the increase in nitrate optical depth in GISS-E2 is at least an order
5 of magnitude smaller than the decrease in sulfate optical depth, and so nitrate compensation
6 does not substantially contribute to the discrepancy in local AOD changes. We therefore still
7 find that HadGEM3-GA4 simulates a considerably larger change in sulfate optical depth per
8 unit change in SO_4 burden at both global and local scales. Having the largest change in AOD
9 per unit change in aerosol burden (Table 2) appears to be key to this model simulating the
10 largest climate response.

11 Comparing the clear-sky and all-sky AOD for GISS-E2 (for which we have both diagnostics),
12 we find that the simulated reduction in E. China all-sky AOD (-0.183) is much larger than the
13 reduction in clear-sky AOD (-0.047). We cannot be sure that the same would apply to CESM1,
14 but it suggests that we might expect the all-sky values we have for CESM1 to be larger than the
15 equivalent clear-sky values. Given this, it is all the more surprising to find reductions of all-
16 sky AOD in CESM1 for the E. China region of -0.076 and for the global mean of -0.0013 (Table
17 2), which lie in between the clear-sky values of GISS-E2 and HadGEM3-GA4 even though
18 CESM1 had the largest change in SO_4 burden both locally and globally.

19 The AOD changes per unit burden change are summarised in Table 2, and it is clear that there
20 is a large diversity between the models. The possible contributors to diversity in the AOD per
21 unit burden are extensive, and a full analysis of them is beyond the scope of this paper. Host
22 model effects, such as different cloud climatologies and radiative transfer schemes, are one
23 likely contributor. Stier et al. (2013) suggests that one third of total diversity originates there.
24 Relative humidity, which drives water uptake (hygroscopic growth), is also diverse among
25 models. For example, Pan et al. (2015) find that over India, boundary-layer RH is the main
26 source of diversity. At the more basic level, assumed composition and hygroscopic growth
27 curves also often differ between models – in this case, the aerosol scheme used for HadGEM3-
28 GA4 assumes that all sulfate is in the form of ammonium sulfate, whereas CESM1 and GISS-
29 E2 both assume a mixture of ammonium sulfate and sulfuric acid, and additionally all three
30 models use different sources for their hygroscopic growth parameterisations (Bellouin et al.,
31 2011; Liu et al., 2012; Koch et al., 2011; and references therein).

1 The changes in SW radiative flux and the final climate response seem to correlate with the
2 changes in AOD much better than with the changes in SO₄ burden for HadGEM3-GA4 and
3 GISS-E2, where over China there is a 6-fold difference both in AOD and in SW flux change
4 between these two models. For CESM1, the all-sky AOD change over E. China is about 1.6
5 times larger than the clear-sky change in GISS-E2 (Table 2). If we used instead all-sky AOD
6 from GISS-E2 (not shown in Table 2), we find that the AOD change over E. China is more than
7 2 times smaller in CESM1 than in GISS-E2. However, the change in TOA SW over the same
8 region is about 4.7 times larger in CESM1, and so it seems that unlike the discrepancies between
9 HadGEM3-GA4 and GISS-E2, differences in the AOD response cannot explain the difference
10 in the magnitudes of radiative flux change between CESM1 and GISS-E2 (see Sect. 4.2).

11

12 **4.1.1 Validation of aerosol fields**

13 To get an indication of whether the model-simulated AODs are realistic in the region of interest,
14 we compare the mean AOD from each model's control run with station observations in Asia
15 from the AERONET radiometer network (Holben et al., 2001). Because of the limited number
16 of stations in the region with long data records, we use the observed AOD at 500 nm from all
17 AERONET stations able to provide an annual mean estimate for at least one year, averaged
18 over all years for which an annual mean was available, (generally ranging between 1998 and
19 2014 in different stations), and compare this with the annual mean AODs at 550 nm from the
20 three models, masked to the locations of the AERONET stations (Supplementary fig. S2).
21 Focusing on stations in E. China (eight in total), we find that HadGEM3-GA4 compares best
22 with AERONET in this region with a mean station bias of -22%, whilst both GISS-E2 and
23 CESM1 appear to be biased lower in this part of the world, with mean biases of -56% and -60%
24 respectively.

25 We also calculate the area-weighted mean AOD as observed by the MODIS and MISR satellite
26 instruments. The MODIS (Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer) instrument is
27 flown on both the Terra and Aqua satellites, whilst MISR (Multi-angle Imaging
28 SpectroRadiometer) is flown on Terra. For MODIS we use the collection 6 combined Deep
29 Blue + Dark Target monthly AOD product at 550 nm (Levy et al., 2013) (available from
30 <https://ladsweb.nascom.nasa.gov/>), averaged from both Terra and Aqua satellites, and take a
31 10-year average from 2003-2012 (2003 being the earliest year that data from both satellites is

1 available). For MISR we use the best estimate monthly AOD product (Kahn et al., 2010)
2 version 31 (available from <https://eosweb.larc.nasa.gov/>) at 550 nm over a 15-year averaging
3 period, from 2000-2014 (2000 being the earliest year MISR data is available). For MODIS the
4 area-weighted E. China mean AOD is 0.51, whilst for MISR it is 0.31, so regionally there is a
5 considerable uncertainty in these observations. HadGEM3-GA4 overestimates the AOD
6 compared with both instruments (though only slightly so when compared to MODIS), with a
7 regional average AOD of 0.58, whilst GISS-E2 and CESM1 underestimate it with regionally-
8 averaged AODs of 0.23 for both models. Globally the two instruments are in better agreement,
9 with MODIS giving a global average AOD of 0.17 and MISR giving 0.15. Again HadGEM3-
10 GA4 overestimates global AOD compared with both instruments (0.22) whilst GISS-E2 and
11 CESM1 both underestimate it (0.13 and 0.12). Given that CESM1 diagnosed all-sky AOD,
12 whereas satellite retrievals are only possible for clear-sky conditions, the underestimate for this
13 model is likely greater than these numbers suggest.

14 There is considerable variation in the observations as well as the models. Globally-averaged,
15 GISS-E2 seems to compare best against MODIS and MISR, though tentatively HadGEM3-
16 GA4 seems to have the more accurate AOD over China, comparing best regionally with both
17 AERONET and MODIS, though poorer against MISR. This suggests that the more concentrated
18 sulfate aerosol burden and larger AOD reduction simulated by HadGEM3-GA4 over this region
19 may be more realistic. We note though that since these observations only measure total AOD
20 and cannot differentiate by species, the comparison cannot show for certain that the higher
21 sulfate optical depth specifically is more realistic in HadGEM3-GA4. The AOD reduction over
22 E. China due to removing Chinese SO₂ represents 50% of the climatological total AOD in
23 HadGEM3-GA4 over the region, compared with 34% in CESM1 and only 20% in GISS-E2.
24 Even if the total AOD in HadGEM3-GA4 is more realistic, there is still considerable variation
25 between the models as to what fraction of that total AOD is due to Chinese SO₂ emissions. This
26 is illustrated further for the two extreme cases, HadGEM3-GA4 and GISS-E2, in
27 Supplementary Fig. S3, which shows that the fraction of climatological AOD made up by
28 sulfate is consistently higher across the east Asian region in HadGEM3-GA4 than in GISS-E2.
29 However, the total non-sulfate AOD is fairly similar across the region in these two models
30 (Supplementary Fig. S4), indicating that the stark difference in the fractional contribution of
31 sulfate comes primarily from HadGEM3-GA4 simulating much greater sulfate AOD alone.
32 Given that regionally GISS-E2 appeared to underestimate total AOD, this would then suggest

1 that either the higher sulfate AOD in HadGEM3-GA4 is more realistic, or else both models
2 underestimate the non-sulfate AOD.

3 To try and better constrain whether the sulfate content (rather than total aerosol) is correct, we
4 therefore also compared against the surface sulfate observations conducted in China reported
5 by Zhang et al. (2012) for 2006-2007 (Supplementary fig. S5). However, all three models
6 performed extremely poorly, with HadGEM3-GA4 having a mean bias of -71% (-66% if urban
7 stations are excluded), CESM1 a mean bias of -71% (unchanged if urban stations are excluded),
8 and GISS-E2 a mean bias of -87% (-86% when urban stations are excluded). Although
9 HadGEM3-GA4 and CESM1 are slightly closer to the observed values, the large
10 underestimation despite the relatively good column AOD in HadGEM3-GA4 suggests that at
11 least this model has difficulty representing the vertical profile of sulfate aerosol, and so this
12 comparison with surface measurements may not be particularly useful in constraining the
13 sulfate optical depth or column-integrated burdens. Large underestimations of surface sulfate
14 concentration over East Asia have been reported previously for two other models, MIROC and
15 NICAM, by Goto et al. (2015), suggesting that this is a problem common to many current
16 generation models.

17 It seems plausible that any differences in the processing of sulfate aerosol would apply to all
18 polluted regions, and not just over China. Indeed, the spatial pattern of the climatological
19 sulfate burden over other major emission regions such as the United States shows a similar
20 characteristic to that over China, with HadGEM3-GA4 and CESM1 having higher burdens
21 close to the emission source regions, whilst GISS-E2 has a more diffuse sulfate distribution
22 (Supplementary fig. S6). With this in mind we also validated the models against surface sulfate
23 observations from the Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments (IMPROVE)
24 network in the United States (Malm et al., 1994), a dataset with a far more extensive record
25 than the Zhang et al. (2012) dataset for China. Taking 61 IMPROVE stations which have data
26 for at least six years between 1995 and 2005, we find that over the United States all three models
27 are in fact biased high, with GISS-E2 performing relatively better with a mean bias of +10.1%,
28 but HadGEM3-GA4 somewhat worse with +44.5%, and CESM1 worse still with +86%.
29 However, in the case of HadGEM3-GA4 we find that the larger mean bias comes mainly from
30 an incorrect spatial distribution (Supplementary fig. S7), with a high bias on the West Coast but
31 a pronounced low bias in surface SO_4 on the East Coast. Consequently, this comparison would
32 suggest that HadGEM3-GA4 in fact has too little sulfate around the principal US emission

1 regions on the East Coast, even though over that area HadGEM3-GA4 actually has a larger
2 column-integrated sulfate burden (Supplementary fig. S6) and a larger AOD (not shown) than
3 GISS-E2, as was the case for China. This suggests that HadGEM3-GA4 again fails to capture
4 the vertical profile of sulfate, underestimating surface concentrations over this region despite
5 having a high column-integrated burden.

6 Validation with surface observations therefore seems insufficient to constrain which model
7 performs better with regard to the more climate-relevant column-integrated quantities of sulfate
8 burden and AOD. Returning to Asia, we therefore also tried evaluating the models against
9 column sulphur dioxide observations. We use the gridded, monthly mean Level 3 observations
10 from the Ozone Monitoring Instrument (OMI) (Krotkov et al, 2008) (available from
11 <http://disc.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/Aura>) which is flown on the Aura satellite, averaged over eight
12 years from 2005 - 2012. Over the E. China region the mean OMI SO₂ is 0.153 Dobson Units
13 (DU), and all three models appear to overestimate this substantially, with very similar regional
14 mean SO₂ columns of 0.282 DU for HadGEM3-GA4, 0.272 DU for GISS-E2, and 0.259 DU
15 for CESM1. Spatially, all three models have more diffuse SO₂ fields than the OMI
16 observations, in which by contrast the SO₂ burden seems much more localised around sources
17 (Supplementary Fig. S8). This may be partly due to the coarse resolution of the models
18 compared with the 0.25° satellite product, but also suggests that the lifetimes for SO₂ may be
19 too long in all three models, or transport processes too efficient. The surprisingly similar
20 column SO₂ burdens in all three models suggests that, at least on regional scales, column SO₂
21 may not constrain SO₄ burden that well.

22 An alternative observational measure which to an extent reflects a column-integrated quantity
23 is the deposition rate, and for the two extreme cases of HadGEM3-GA4 and GISS-E2 we
24 therefore also try comparing against observations of sulfate wet deposition. We use the 3-year
25 mean wet deposition data from 2000-2002 described in Vet et al. (2014) and provided by the
26 World Data Centre for Precipitation Chemistry (<http://wdcpc.org>, 2014), taking the 6 stations
27 located in China. We exclude the station in Guizhou province in southern China where
28 HadGEM3-GA4 has a bias of +590% and GISS-E2 a bias of +253%. This station only provided
29 data for one year and was flagged as having a high uncertainty in the Vet et al. (2014) dataset;
30 it is also located in a mountainous region and so it could equally be that the models cannot
31 resolve the specific local conditions. Removing this station from the analysis we find for the
32 remaining 5 stations in China that HadGEM3-GA4 performs well with a mean bias of -3.9%,

1 compared with -64.8% for GISS-E2. This gives an indication that HadGEM3-GA4 has more
2 realistic sulfate deposition directly over China (though the sample size is very small), and
3 supports the earlier findings from the comparison against AERONET and MODIS. If we
4 broaden the analysis to include all stations described as being broadly in Asia – an additional
5 32 stations – then the mean bias for HadGEM3-GA4 is worsened (-41.8%), whilst the bias in
6 GISS-E2 is slightly improved (-54.1%). HadGEM3-GA4 still performs better over the Asian
7 region as a whole, though less dramatically so (Supplementary fig. S9). This overall picture
8 seems consistent with that of the other observational measures looked at here, although it should
9 be noted that wet deposition rates are dependent not just on the column sulfate burden but also
10 on the amount and distribution of precipitation, and so biases in wet deposition could also be
11 due to incorrect precipitation distribution rather than sulfate.

12 Still, overall HadGEM3-GA4 seems to compare slightly better than GISS-E2 and CESM1
13 regionally over E. Asia against observations of total AOD, and better than GISS-E2 regionally
14 against surface sulfate as well as wet deposition observations, although globally and over other
15 regions this model is not necessarily found to compare better in general. This might hint that
16 at least over China, HadGEM3-GA4 has more realistic sulfate optical depth, although none of
17 these comparisons is very conclusive in that respect. Moreover, given that none of these
18 observational measures directly constrains the sulfate radiative forcing, there is also no
19 guarantee that performance with respect to these variables will necessarily translate to a more
20 realistic climate response (see also Section 4.3).

21

22 **4.2 Differences in cloud effects**

23 Sulfate aerosol exerts indirect radiative effects by modifying cloud properties. The strength of
24 these indirect effects is highly uncertain (e.g. Boucher et al., 2013) and differs substantially
25 between the models, having been shown to contribute substantially to inter-model variation in
26 historical aerosol forcing (Wilcox et al., 2015). Differences in the underlying climatologies of
27 the models, particularly with regard to cloud distributions, could also be important. For
28 instance, the radiative effect of sulfate aerosol is modulated by the reflectivity of the underlying
29 surface in the radiation scheme (Chýlek and Coakley, 1974; Chand et al., 2009), which may
30 often be a cloud-top. The low contrast with a highly reflective cloud surface means that sulfate
31 aerosol above a cloud top will have a reduced direct radiative forcing. Blocking of radiation

1 by clouds will also reduce the direct radiative effects of any aerosols within or below them (e.g.
2 Keil and Haywood, 2003). Additionally, aerosol indirect effects can saturate in regions with a
3 high level of background aerosol (e.g. Verheggen et al., 2007; Carslaw et al., 2013), meaning
4 that the potential for indirect radiative forcing can also vary with the location of clouds. On top
5 of diversity in indirect effects, and in the climatological distribution of clouds, different
6 dynamical changes in cloud cover could also alter the all-sky flux.

7 In our case, the good correspondence between higher (clear-sky) AOD change in HadGEM3-
8 GA4 and higher (all-sky) SW flux change in this model might suggest that the cloud effects are
9 not the root cause of the larger radiative response in this model. However, the origin of this
10 good correspondence in fact appears to be somewhat dependent on how clouds modify the
11 radiative effects of sulfate aerosol:

12 For the extreme cases of HadGEM3-GA4 and GISS-E2, comparing the changes in clear-sky
13 TOA SW flux with the all-sky TOA SW flux anomalies (Table 2 and Supplementary Fig. S10)
14 reveals that for clear-sky conditions, there is in fact a much smaller regional discrepancy
15 between these two models: Over the E. Asia region GISS-E2 has a 4.1 Wm^{-2} clear-sky SW flux
16 change, whereas HadGEM3-GA4 has a 5.1 Wm^{-2} flux change. HadGEM3-GA4 still has the
17 larger radiative change, but nowhere near the 6-fold difference that is seen in the all-sky flux
18 (Section 3, and Table 2). This much reduced difference between GISS-E2 and HadGEM3-GA4
19 in the clear-sky compared with the all-sky anomaly is hard to apportion quantitatively though,
20 because compared with the clear-sky change, the all-sky response incorporates all the
21 contributing factors described above: the additional radiative forcing due to aerosol indirect
22 effects, the screening of direct radiative effects due to clouds blocking radiation and providing
23 a high albedo background, and also any dynamical changes in cloud cover.

24 In this case, GISS-E2 is found to simulate a small increase in cloudiness in east China due to
25 dynamical changes when sulfate is removed (Supplementary Fig. S11a). Combined with the
26 screening effect of clouds, this appears to almost completely offset the direct forcing of reduced
27 SO_4 , and results in a far smaller all-sky flux change than clear-sky flux change over E. China
28 (0.9 Wm^{-2} all-sky compared with 4.1 Wm^{-2} clear-sky). HadGEM3-GA4 by contrast has very
29 little difference between all-sky and clear-sky flux changes (5.3 Wm^{-2} and 5.1 Wm^{-2}
30 respectively (Table 2)). The changes in cloud amount over east China are somewhat more
31 mixed (Supplementary Fig. S11c), although area-averaged, the overall cloud change is a small
32 decrease, which should enhance the all-sky flux change. However, spatially as well as in

1 magnitude the HadGEM3-GA4 all-sky flux change is exceptionally similar to the clear-sky flux
2 change, and does not resemble the pattern of cloud changes (comparing Supplementary Figs.
3 S10e,f, and Fig. S11c), which suggests that changes in aerosol radiative effects are larger than
4 the effect of the small cloud cover changes, and still dominate the all-sky flux changes.
5 Therefore, the very similar regional all-sky and clear-sky SW flux changes in HadGEM3-GA4
6 imply that unlike in GISS-E2, aerosol indirect effects in HadGEM3-GA4 probably roughly
7 compensated for the presence of clouds reducing the direct effect, so that the change in all-sky
8 combined direct and indirect forcing is similar to the change in clear-sky direct forcing when
9 sulfate is removed.

10 The picture is different again for CESM1. Comparing the clear-sky and all-sky TOA SW flux
11 changes for this model (Supplementary Figs. S10c,d), we find that regionally, the clear-sky
12 changes are much smaller than the all-sky flux changes – in fact, over China the clear-sky SW
13 flux changes in CESM1 are considerably smaller in magnitude than the clear-sky flux changes
14 in GISS-E2 (comparing Supplementary Figs. S10a,c). Averaged over the E. China region, the
15 clear-sky flux change in CESM1 is only 2.2 Wm^{-2} , compared with the 4.1 Wm^{-2} clear-sky
16 change in GISS-E2 (Table 2). However, whereas in GISS-E2 the all-sky SW flux change (0.9
17 Wm^{-2}) was then more than four times smaller than this clear-sky flux change, in CESM1 the
18 all-sky SW flux change is instead almost two times larger than the clear-sky flux change: 4.2
19 Wm^{-2} regionally averaged.

20 This is partly again due to cloud changes – in this case CESM1 has predominantly reductions
21 in cloud amount over E. China (Supplementary Fig. S11b), which will have the effect of
22 increasing the all-sky radiative flux change relative to the clear-sky changes. However, as with
23 HadGEM3-GA4, these regional cloud reductions in CESM1 do not match up spatially with the
24 maximum changes in all-sky SW flux seen in Fig. 1b and Supplementary Fig. S10d. Instead,
25 the maximum changes in the all-sky SW flux change match closely the clear-sky SW flux
26 changes (Supplementary Fig. S10c), which in turn correspond very well with the reduction in
27 AOD (Fig. 4b). Both all-sky and clear-sky SW flux changes are maximum around where the
28 AOD reduction is maximum, and in this location the all-sky flux change is still substantially
29 greater than the clear-sky change. This implies that in CESM1 a large aerosol indirect effect,
30 and/or effect of clouds increasing aerosol particle size through hygroscopic growth, overall
31 amplifies the radiative effect of aerosols considerably in cloudy conditions, resulting in the
32 much greater regional change in all-sky flux when aerosol is removed.

1 Between these three models, then, the way that clouds modify the radiative balance is a major
2 source of diversity over the E. China region in the response to removing SO₂ emissions from
3 China. In GISS-E2, the inclusion of clouds greatly reduces the radiative effect of a change in
4 sulfate aerosol. In HadGEM3-GA4, the effect of including clouds is small, and does not change
5 the clear-sky forcing substantially. Finally, in CESM1, including clouds considerably amplifies
6 an otherwise weak clear-sky radiative flux change. We note though that clear-sky diagnostics
7 will be influenced by choices within the models of how aerosol water uptake is determined
8 under the artificial assumption of clear-sky conditions. The all-sky SW flux change, which
9 drives the final climate response, is regionally still the most directly comparable quantity,
10 reflecting the total radiative effect of the aerosol change in the different models.

11

12 **4.3 Differences in aerosol forcing efficiency**

13 An additional source of discrepancy between the models lies in differences in the aerosol
14 radiative forcing efficiency – the direct forcing that results from a given aerosol optical depth
15 or burden (e.g. Samset et al, 2013). A previous model intercomparison looking at radiative
16 forcing as part of the AeroCom Phase II study found that, on a global scale, there was a large
17 variation in the radiative forcing due to aerosol-radiation interactions per unit AOD between
18 different participating models (Myhre et al., 2013a). As a result, whether a model simulates
19 AOD changes correctly, for instance, may not particularly constrain the resultant direct forcing
20 even, let alone the indirect forcing or eventual climate response.

21 Globally-averaged, the changes in radiative flux and AOD are too small in our experiments to
22 calculate an accurate ratio, but instead we calculate here a regional radiative efficiency by
23 taking the change in clear-sky SW flux over the 100-120E, 20-40N E. China region, and
24 dividing by the AOD change over the same region (Table 2). This is not directly comparable
25 with previous studies like Myhre et al. (2013a), as we use a regionally-averaged number instead
26 of globally-averaged, and for the numerator we use the change in clear-sky TOA SW flux as
27 the best available measure of aerosol direct radiative effect, rather than the direct radiative
28 forcing diagnosed either from double radiation calls or simulations with fixed meteorology.
29 Consequently, we use this metric here mainly to qualitatively highlight differences between the
30 models.

1 As noted in Sect. 4.1 and 4.2, over the eastern China region HadGEM3-GA4 has a 6-fold larger
2 mean AOD reduction (-0.29) compared with GISS-E2 (-0.047), but only slightly larger clear-
3 sky SW change (5.1 W m^{-2} compared with 4.1 W m^{-2}). As a result, the regional radiative
4 efficiency for HadGEM3-GA4 is much smaller than that of GISS-E2: -17.6 W m^{-2} compared
5 with -87.2 W m^{-2} per unit AOD change (Table 2). If instead of AOD we normalise by the
6 change in sulfate burden integrated over the same region, we find a similar relationship:
7 HadGEM3-GA4 has a smaller regional mean change in clear-sky SW flux per Tg sulfate than
8 GISS-E2: $-145 \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ Tg}^{-1}$ compared with $-256 \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ Tg}^{-1}$. Proportionally though, the
9 discrepancy is not as great when normalising by change in sulfate burden, due to the much
10 larger AOD per unit mass of sulfate simulated in HadGEM3-GA4. Curiously Myhre et al.
11 (2013a) reported results that were qualitatively the inverse of what we show here, finding that
12 the atmospheric component of GISS ModelE has a smaller sulfate radiative forcing than that of
13 HadGEM2 (HadGEM3's predecessor, with a very similar aerosol scheme) when normalised by
14 AOD, although still larger when normalised by column-integrated sulfate burden. The reason
15 for the discrepancy is not clear, though the aforementioned fact that we calculate our numbers
16 for a specific region means that there may be important local factors. The sulfate-specific
17 forcing efficiencies in Myhre et al. (2013) are calculated relative to all-sky direct radiative
18 effect, and so local differences in vertical profiles and cloud screening may therefore change
19 the relationship – however they also evaluated clear-sky forcing normalised by AOD for all
20 aerosol species combined, and again found HadGEM2 to be higher than GISS ModelE.

21 CESM1 seems to sit in the middle of the range, with a regional radiative efficiency of -28.4 W
22 m^{-2} per unit AOD change (Table 2) – though again with the caveat that for CESM1, the AOD
23 is an all-sky quantity, whereas the values given for HadGEM3-GA4 and GISS-E2 (-17.6 W m^{-2}
24 and -87.2 W m^{-2} respectively) were calculated using clear-sky AOD. GISS-E2 provided both
25 clear-sky and all-sky AOD diagnostics, and using instead the all-sky AOD change from GISS-
26 E2 gives a smaller value of -22.4 W m^{-2} per unit AOD, which suggests that when compared
27 like-for-like, CESM1 (with -28.4 W m^{-2}) may in fact have the greater regional radiative
28 efficiency. More directly comparable between all three models is the regional clear-sky flux
29 change normalised by regional change in sulfate burden, which for CESM1 is $-55.4 \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ Tg}^{-1}$. This is considerably lower than either HadGEM3-GA4 or GISS-E2, and indicates that despite
30 having at least average radiative efficiency per unit AOD, the very small translation of sulfate
31 burden to AOD in CESM1 is a dominant factor which prevents this model from simulating a
32 larger SW flux change and climate response than it already does. As noted in the previous

1 Section though, this small clear-sky flux change per unit sulfate change is compensated by a
2 large indirect effect as well as favourable regional cloud changes, meaning that the all-sky flux
3 change per unit AOD is by far the largest in CESM1 (Table 2), and the all-sky flux change per
4 sulfate burden change is then average in CESM1 (not shown, but readily calculated from Table
5 2). Similarly, the exceptional reduction in aerosol radiative effects due to clouds in GISS-E2
6 means that its all-sky flux change per unit AOD is almost exactly the same as that of HadGEM3-
7 GA4 (Table 2), despite the clear-sky regional radiative efficiency being so much larger.

8 The Myhre et al. (2013a) AeroCom intercomparison found that globally, the atmospheric
9 component of CESM1 (CAM5.1) had a much higher sulfate radiative efficiency than the
10 atmosphere-only version of GISS-E2. In their case, they found CAM5.1 to have approximately
11 2.25 times higher all-sky direct radiative forcing per unit AOD than GISS-E2. However, the
12 study also found that, globally, the atmospheric component of HadGEM2 had a slightly larger
13 forcing efficiency than CAM5.1 both for sulfate (all-sky) and all aerosols (clear-sky), unlike
14 the somewhat smaller regional efficiencies found here for HadGEM3-GA4 compared with
15 CESM1. Given that our regional values from GISS-E2 and HadGEM3-GA4 also seem to
16 conflict qualitatively with the global values from the AeroCom study, this would suggest that
17 either the global comparison is not relevant on regional scales, or else the radiative efficiency
18 is very sensitive to changes in model configuration and version..

19

20 **4.4 Differences in climate sensitivity**

21 So far we have discussed mainly factors which influence the translation of a change in aerosol
22 precursor emissions to a radiative heating, and these varied strongly between the models. There
23 is a final step in arriving at the climate response, which is the translation of a given radiative
24 heating into a surface temperature change. The climate sensitivity – the amount of warming
25 simulated per unit radiative forcing – is also well known to vary considerably between models,
26 globally (Flato et al., 2013) and regionally (Voulgarakis and Shindell, 2010), and this will
27 additionally impact the strength of the final response. Climate sensitivity is typically estimated
28 from a 2x or 4x global CO₂ simulation, giving a large response and a large forcing from which
29 to calculate the ratio. For GISS-E2, a climate sensitivity value of 0.6 K (W m⁻²)⁻¹ was found in
30 the IPCC AR5 report from a 4x CO₂ simulation (Flato et al., 2013) using the regression method
31 of Gregory et al. (2004) to estimate radiative forcing. For CESM1, a value of 1.1 K (W m⁻²)⁻¹

1 is obtained from values from a 2x CO₂ simulation (Meehl et al., 2013), noting that in this case
2 the radiative forcing was calculated using the stratospheric adjustment method (Hansen et al.,
3 2005). For HadGEM3-GA4, we use a 100-year 2x CO₂ simulation that was performed
4 separately as part of the Precipitation Driver Response Model Intercomparison Project (Samset
5 et al., 2016), which gives a value of 1.1 K (W m⁻²)⁻¹ based on the Gregory method.

6 While CESM1 and HadGEM3-GA4 both have very similar climate sensitivities, we see that
7 GISS-E2 has a particularly small sensitivity – in fact, the smallest value of all the CMIP5
8 models reported in the AR5 report (Flato et al., 2013). This presumably compounds the fact
9 that GISS-E2 simulates the smallest SW flux change of the three models, ensuring that the
10 resulting surface temperature response is comparatively smaller still. Differences in climate
11 sensitivity do not seem to explain any of the variation in the magnitude of the response between
12 CESM1 and HadGEM3-GA4, at least based on these values. However, it is worth noting that
13 the climate sensitivity values that we report are derived from global CO₂ forcings, whereas in
14 our case we are looking at the translation of a very regional forcing into a global response. It
15 is not trivial that the global-mean temperature response to a regionally localised forcing is a
16 function only of the resulting globally-averaged forcing, and in particular it may be that
17 different models are more or less sensitive to forcings in specific regions. Unfortunately we
18 know of no study that has calculated climate sensitivity to regional forcings in single or multi-
19 model frameworks. Shindell (2012) calculated climate sensitivities to forcings imposed in
20 different latitudinal bands for the GISS-E2 model, finding that there is considerable variation
21 relative to the global climate sensitivity. In that study, estimates of the response to forcings at
22 different latitudes in three other global climate models, based on the GISS-E2 sensitivities, are
23 found to largely agree to within +/- 20% with the full simulations however, suggesting that
24 regional sensitivities (relative to a model's global sensitivity) may not vary that much between
25 models.

26

27 **5 Conclusions**

28 By applying an identical regional perturbation to anthropogenic SO₂ emissions in three different
29 climate models, we observe three markedly different resulting climate responses, ranging from
30 virtually no coherent surface air temperature response in one model (GISS-E2), to pronounced
31 surface warming all across most of the northern hemisphere in another (HadGEM3-GA4). The

1 third model (CESM1) sits in the middle in terms of both magnitude and spatial extent of the
2 temperature response. This huge variation in climate response corresponds to a similarly large
3 variation in the SW radiative flux change following the reduction in sulfate aerosol. All three
4 models show a fairly localised increase in net downwards SW radiation over China as a result
5 of reduced SO₂ emissions from this region, however the magnitude of this radiative heating is
6 substantially greater in HadGEM3-GA4 than in CESM1, which is substantially greater still than
7 in GISS-E2. The response in GISS-E2 is so weak that temperature changes are largely not
8 detectable above the internal variability of the model. The stronger heating in CESM1 and
9 HadGEM3-GA4 produces much more pronounced temperature changes, and even though the
10 radiative heating is localised over China, the temperature responses in these two models are
11 much more spread out, particularly in the zonal direction. This is consistent with the findings
12 of Shindell et al. (2010), who found that the temperature response to inhomogeneous aerosol
13 forcings is more uniform and extends much further from the forcing location in the zonal
14 direction than in the meridional direction.

15 Comparing the models, we find different SO₄ mass changes due to removing SO₂ emissions
16 from China, very different ratios of AOD change per mass of sulfate, and very different
17 radiative flux changes per unit AOD change. These differences are compounded further by
18 very large variations in cloud interactions, as well as variations in climate sensitivity, and
19 feedbacks on other aerosol species such as nitrate, which diversify the response further.

20 Specifically, we find that CESM1 simulates the largest reduction in sulfate burden both globally
21 and locally. HadGEM3-GA4 has the smallest reduction in sulfate burden globally and the
22 second largest reduction regionally, yet it produces by far the largest reduction in AOD both
23 globally and regionally over E. China. Though GISS-E2 and CESM1 both simulate much
24 smaller changes in AOD than HadGEM3-GA4, still the SW flux changes and temperature
25 responses produced are very different between these two models. An inferred larger aerosol-
26 cloud interaction means that CESM1 simulates a particularly large change in all-sky SW flux
27 relative to its fairly small AOD change, so although having a smaller response than HadGEM3-
28 GA4, it is still much closer to it than GISS-E2. In GISS-E2 the clear-sky radiative forcing
29 efficiency of sulfate is very large, but this is almost perfectly compensated for by large
30 reductions in the direct radiative effect of sulfate when clouds are factored in. The absolute
31 AOD change is also much smaller than HadGEM3-GA4 in this model. This then combines
32 with compensating increases in nitrate aerosol globally to reduce the radiative response yet

1 further, and finally a smaller global climate sensitivity than the other two models results in this
2 being translated into a largely negligible temperature response.

3 In addition to differences in the total changes in sulfate and AOD, we find there are also
4 substantial differences in the spatial distribution of the changes, attributed to differences in the
5 rate of chemical conversion of SO_2 to SO_4 which influences how concentrated the aerosol
6 changes are around the emission region. This implies that even if both the AOD per sulfate
7 burden and the forcing per unit AOD were identical among the three models, they would still
8 have different distributions of radiative forcing.

9 There are no direct observations of sulfate radiative forcing, nor of sulfate optical depth or
10 vertically-integrated burden, and so we have tried validating the aerosol component of the
11 models with a range of surface and satellite-based measurements of total aerosol optical depth,
12 surface sulfate concentration, column SO_2 , and sulfate wet deposition. All the models have
13 biases, and no model performs best against all the observational datasets used. Tentatively
14 HadGEM3-GA4 seems to perform best over China against observations of both total AOD and
15 sulfate wet deposition, though over some other parts of the world this model performed slightly
16 poorer, e.g. for global AOD and US surface sulfate concentrations. However, the main
17 conclusion is that comparison against all existing observational measures is unable to
18 satisfactorily constrain which model response is more realistic, given that the ratios of both
19 AOD change per sulfate burden change and SW flux change per AOD (Table 2) are found to
20 vary so substantially between the models. The model with the largest sulfate mass change
21 (CESM1) did not have the largest radiative or climate response, and two models with a similar
22 AOD change (CESM1 and GISS-E2) had markedly different radiative and climate responses.
23 Given the range of discrepancies that we find in all steps along the conversion of SO_2 change
24 to SO_4 change to AOD change to radiative forcing to temperature response, it seems that
25 knowing how accurate a model is with respect to either sulfate concentrations or total AOD is
26 far from sufficient to determine whether the climate response to a regional aerosol perturbation
27 is similarly accurate.

28 There are several possible avenues for future work to isolate the particular processes that lead
29 to this model diversity in more detail; for instance studies imposing the aerosol field from one
30 model into others would remove the diversity introduced by translating emissions into aerosol
31 concentrations, while imposing surface temperatures and meteorology from one model into
32 others could remove the diversity introduced by different background climatologies and climate

1 sensitivities, although this may be difficult practically in complex climate models. A thorough
2 assay of the range of parameter choices and formulae used in the aerosol schemes of various
3 models could also help reveal where assumed aerosol properties diverge. However, without
4 stronger observational constraints on aerosol radiative forcing, it is not clear that this alone
5 could help make models more realistic. In particular, it seems that being able to better constrain
6 not only the column-integrated sulfate burden, but also the AOD per sulfate burden, and the
7 radiative forcing per AOD, would all also be needed. This represents a considerable
8 observational challenge, and until it is possible, the considerable current diversity may be
9 irreducible.

10 We have only looked here at surface temperature, which is a particularly direct measure of the
11 climate response. The response of other, less well-constrained, climate variables such as
12 precipitation might be expected to show even greater variation. Our results show that there
13 remains a very large uncertainty in current climate models in the translation of aerosol precursor
14 emissions into a climate response, and imply that care must be taken not to over-interpret studies
15 of aerosol-climate interaction if the robustness of results across diverse models cannot be
16 demonstrated.

17 On a more optimistic note, we remark that in the two models which showed the more substantial
18 change in SW radiative flux (CESM1 and HadGEM3-GA4), both also show a remarkably
19 strong remote temperature response to a relatively localised northern-midlatitude heat source,
20 with qualitatively similar temperature change patterns that extend across much of the
21 hemisphere, indicating that there may be some agreement on the response to a given regional
22 forcing, if not on the forcing itself.

23

24 **Data availability**

25 Model output data from all simulations described here is available upon request from the
26 corresponding author.

27

28 **Acknowledgements**

29 MK and AV are supported by the Natural Environment Research Council under grant number
30 NE/K500872/1. Also, we wish to thank the European Commission's Marie Curie Actions

1 International Research Staff Exchange Scheme (IRSES) for funding MK's placement at NASA
2 GISS and Columbia University and facilitating interactions on this work with the US
3 colleagues, as part of the Regional Climate-Air Quality Interactions (REQUA) project.
4 Simulations with GISS-E2 used resources provided by the NASA High-End Computing (HEC)
5 Program through the NASA Center for Climate Simulation (NCCS) at Goddard Space Flight
6 Center. Simulations with HadGEM3-GA4 were performed using the MONSooN system, a
7 collaborative facility supplied under the Joint Weather and Climate Research Programme,
8 which is a strategic partnership between the Met Office and the Natural Environment Research
9 Council. We specifically thank Dr. Fiona O'Connor, Dr. Jeremy Walton, and Mr. Mohit Dalvi
10 from the Met Office for their support with using the HadGEM3-GA4 model.

1 **References**

2 Andreae, M. O. and Crutzen, P. J.: Atmospheric Aerosols: Biogeochemical Sources and Role
3 in Atmospheric Chemistry, *Science*, 276, 1052-1058, 1997.

4 Andres, R. J. and Kasgnoc, A. D.: A time-averaged inventory of subaerial volcanic sulfur
5 emissions, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103, D19, 25251-25261, 1998.

6 Andrews, T., Forster, P. M., Boucher, O., Bellouin, N., and Jones, A.: Precipitation, radiative
7 forcing and global temperature change, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 37, L14701,
8 doi:10.1029/2010GL043991, 2010.

9 Bauer, S. E., Bausch, A., Nazarenko, L., Tsigaridis, K., Xu, B., Edwards, R., Bisiaux, M., and
10 McConnell, J.: Historical and future black carbon deposition on the three ice caps: Ice core
11 measurements and model simulations from 1850 to 2100, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 118, 7948–
12 7961, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50612, 2013.

13 Bellouin, N., Boucher, O., Haywood, J., Johnson, C., Jones, A., Rae, J., and Woodward, S.:
14 Improved representation of aerosols for HadGEM2, Technical Note 73, Hadley Centre, Met
15 Office, Exeter, UK, 2007.

16 Bellouin, N., Rae, J., Jones, A., Johnson, C., Haywood, J., and Boucher, O.: Aerosol forcing in
17 the Climate Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP5) simulations by HadGEM2-ES and the
18 role of ammonium nitrate, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, D20206, doi:10.1029/2011JD016074, 2011.

19 Bollasina, A. M., Ming, Y., and Ramaswamy, V.: Anthropogenic Aerosols and the Weakening
20 of the South Asian Summer Monsoon, *Science*, 334, 502-505, 2011.

21 Booth, B., Dunstone, N. J., Halloran, P. R., Andrews, T., and Bellouin, N.: Aerosols implicated
22 as a prime driver of twentieth-century North Atlantic climate variability, *Nature*, 484, 228-232,
23 doi:10.1038/nature10946, 2012.

24 Boucher, O., Randall, D., Artaxo, P., Bretherton, C., Feingold, G., Forster, P., Kerminen, V.-
25 M., Kondo, Y., Liao, H., Lohmann, U., Rasch, P., Satheesh, S. K., Sherwood, S., Stevens, B.,
26 and Zhang, X. Y.: Clouds and Aerosols. In: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis.*
27 Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental
28 Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T. F., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor, M., Allen, S. K.,

1 Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., and Midgley, P. M. (eds.)], Cambridge University
2 Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2013.

3 Carslaw, K. S., Lee, L. A., Reddington, C. L., Pringle, K. J., Rap, A., Forster, P. M., Mann, G.
4 W., Spracklen, D. V., Woodhouse, M. T., Regayre, L. A., and Pierce, J. R.: Large contribution
5 of natural aerosols to uncertainty in indirect forcing, *Nature*, 503, 67-71, 10.1038/nature12674,
6 2013.

7 Chand, D., Wood, R., Anderson, T. L., Satheesh, S. K., and Charlson, R. J.: Satellite derived
8 direct radiative effect of aerosols dependent on cloud cover, *Nature Geosci.*, 2, 181–184, 2009.

9 Chýlek, P. and Coakley, J. A. Jr.: Aerosol and climate, *Science*, 183, 75-77, 1974.

10 Cionni, I., Eyring, V., Lamarque, J. F., Randel, W. J., Stevenson, D. S., Wu, F., Bodeker, G.
11 E., Shepherd, T. G., Shindell, D. T., and Waugh, D. W.: Ozone database in support of CMIP5
12 simulations: results and corresponding radiative forcing, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 11267-
13 11292, doi:10.5194/acp-11-11267-2011, 2011.

14 Clough, S. A., Shephard, M. W., Mlawer, E. J., Delamere, J. S., Iacono, M. J., Cady-Pereira,
15 K., Boukabara, S., and Brown, P. D.: Atmospheric radiative transfer modeling: a summary of
16 the AER codes, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer*, 91, 233–244, 2005.

17 Derwent, R. G., Collins, W. J., Jenkin, M. E., Johnson, C. E., and Stevenson, D. S.: The global
18 distribution of secondary particulate matter in a 3D Lagrangian chemistry transport model, *J.*
19 *Atmos. Chem.*, 44, 57–95, 2003.

20 Dong, B., Sutton, R. T., Highwood, E., and Wilcox, L.: The Impacts of European and Asian
21 Anthropogenic Sulfur Dioxide Emissions on Sahel Rainfall, *J. Climate*, 27, 7000–7017,
22 doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-13-00769.1, 2014.

23 Edwards, J. M. and Slingo, A.: Studies with a flexible new radiation code, I: Choosing a
24 configuration for a large-scale model, *Q. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.*, 122, 689–719, 1996.

25 Flato, G., Marotzke, J., Abiodun, B., Braconnot, P., Chou, S. C., Collins, W., Cox, P., Driouech,
26 F., Emori, S., Eyring, V., Forest, C., Gleckler, P., Guilyardi, E., Jakob, C., Kattsov, V., Reason,
27 C., and Rummukainen, M.: Evaluation of Climate Models. In: *Climate Change 2013: The*
28 *Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the*
29 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T. F., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor,

1 M., Allen, S. K., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., and Midgley, P. M. (eds.)],
2 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2013.

3 Goto, D., Nakajima, T., Dai, T., Takemura, T., Kajino, M., Matsui, H., Takami, A.,
4 Hatakeyama, S., Sugimoto, N., Shimizu, A., and Ohara, T.: An evaluation of simulated
5 particulate sulfate over East Asia through global model intercomparison, *J. Geophys. Res.*
6 *Atmos.*, 120, doi:10.1002/2014JD021693, 2015.

7 Gregory, J. M., Ingram, W. J., Palmer, M. A., Jones, G. S., Stott, P. A., Thorpe, R. B., Lowe, J.
8 A., Johns, T. C., and Williams, K. D.: A new method for diagnosing radiative forcing and
9 climate sensitivity, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31, L03205, doi:10.1029/2003GL018747, 2004.

10 Hansen, J. E., Russell, G. L., Rind, D., Stone, P., Lacis, A., Ruedy, R., and Travis, L.: Efficient
11 three-dimensional models for climatic studies. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 111, 609–662, 1983.

12 Hansen, J., Sato, M., Ruedy, R., Nazarenko, L., Lacis, A., Schmidt, G. A., Russell, G., Aleinov,
13 I., Bauer, M., Bauer, S., Bell, N., Cairns, B., Canuto, V., Chandler, M., Cheng, Y., Del Genio,
14 A., Faluvegi, G., Fleming, E., Friend, A., Hall, T., Jackman, C., Kelley, M., Kiang, N., Koch,
15 D., Lean, J., Lerner, J., Lo, K., Menon, S., Miller, R., Minnis, P., Novakov, T., Oinas, V.,
16 Perlitz, J., Perlitz, J., Rind, D., Romanou, A., Shindell, D., Stone, P., Sun, S., Tausnev,
17 N., Thresher, D., Wielicki, B., Wong, T., Yao, M., and Zhang, S.: Efficacy of climate forcings,
18 *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, D18104, doi:10.1029/2005JD005776, 2005.

19 Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution (HTAP): Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution 2010.
20 Part A: Ozone and Particulate Matter, Air Pollution Studies No. 17, [Dentener, F., Keating, T.,
21 and Akimoto, H. (eds.)], United Nations, New York, 2010.

22 Holben, B. N., Tanré, D., Smirnov, A., Eck, T. F., Slutsker, I., Abuhassan, N., Newcomb, W.
23 W., Schafer, J. S., Chatenet, B., Lavenu, F., Kaufman, Y. J., Vande Castle, J., Setzer, A.,
24 Markham, B., Clark, D., Frouin, R., Halthore, R., Karneli, A., O'Neill, N. T., Pietras, C., Pinker,
25 R. T., Voss, K., and Zibordi, G.: An emerging ground-based aerosol climatology: Aerosol
26 optical depth from AERONET, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106(D11), 12067–12097,
27 doi:10.1029/2001JD900014, 2001.

28 Hunke, E. C. and Lipscombe, W. H.: CICE: the Los Alamos sea ice model documentation and
29 software user's manual, Version 4.0, LA-CC-06-012, Los Alamos National Laboratory, New
30 Mexico, 2008.

1 Hwang, Y.-T., Frierson, D. M. W., and Kang, S. M.: Anthropogenic sulfate aerosol and the
2 southward shift of tropical precipitation in the late 20th century, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40,
3 doi:10.1002/grl.50502, 2013.

4 Jones, A., Roberts, D. L., Woodage, M. J., and Johnson, C. E.: Indirect sulphate aerosol forcing
5 in a climate model with an interactive sulphur cycle, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 20293–20310, 2001.

6 Kahn, R. A., Gaitley, B. J., Garay, M. J., Diner, D. J., Eck, T. F., Smirnov, A., and Holben, B.
7 N.: Multiangle Imaging SpectroRadiometer global aerosol product assessment by comparison
8 with the Aerosol Robotic Network, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, D23209,
9 doi:10.1029/2010JD014601, 2010.

10 Keil, A., and Haywood, J. M.: Solar radiative forcing by biomass burning aerosol particles
11 during SAFARI 2000: A case study based on measured aerosol and cloud properties, *J.*
12 *Geophys. Res.*, 108(D13), 8467, doi:10.1029/2002JD002315, 2003.

13 Kinne, S., Schulz, M., Textor, C., Guibert, S., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S. E., Berntsen, T.,
14 Berglen, T. F., Boucher, O., Chin, M., Collins, W., Dentener, F., Diehl, T., Easter, R.,
15 Feichter, J., Fillmore, D., Ghan, S., Ginoux, P., Gong, S., Grini, A., Hendricks, J., Herzog, M.,
16 Horowitz, L., Isaksen, I., Iversen, T., Kirkevåg, A., Kloster, S., Koch, D., Kristjansson, J. E.,
17 Krol, M., Lauer, A., Lamarque, J. F., Lesins, G., Liu, X., Lohmann, U., Montanaro, V.,
18 Myhre, G., Penner, J., Pitari, G., Reddy, S., Seland, O., Stier, P., Takemura, T., and Tie, X.: An
19 AeroCom initial assessment – optical properties in aerosol component modules of global
20 models, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 1815-1834, doi:10.5194/acp-6-1815-2006, 2006.

21 Koch, D., Schmidt, G. A., and Field, C. V.: Sulfur, sea salt and radionuclide aerosols in GISS
22 ModelE, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111, doi:10.1029/2004JD005550, 2006.

23 Koch, D., Bauer, S., Del Genio, A., Faluvegi, G., McConnell, J. R., Menon, S., Miller, R. L.,
24 Rind, D., Ruedy, R., Schmidt, G. A., and Shindell, D.: Coupled aerosol-chemistry-climate
25 twentieth century transient model investigation: Trends in short-lived species and climate
26 responses, *J. Climate*, 24, 2693–2714, doi:10.1175/2011JCLI3582.1, 2011.

27 Krotkov, N. A., McClure, B., Dickerson, R. R., Carn, S. A., Li, C., Bhartia, P. K., Yang, K.,
28 Krueger, A. J., Li, Z., Levelt, P. F., Chen, H., Wang, P., and Lu, D.: Validation of SO₂ retrievals
29 from the Ozone Monitoring Instrument over NE China, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D16S40,
30 doi:10.1029/2007JD008818, 2008.

1 Lamarque, J.-F., Bond, T. C., Eyring, V., Granier, C., Heil, A., Klimont, Z., Lee, D.,
2 Lioussse, C., Mieville, A., Owen, B., Schultz, M. G., Shindell, D., Smith, S. J., Stehfest, E.,
3 Van Aardenne, J., Cooper, O. R., Kainuma, M., Mahowald, N., McConnell, J. R., Naik, V.,
4 Riahi, K., and van Vuuren, D. P.: Historical (1850–2000) gridded anthropogenic and biomass
5 burning emissions of reactive gases and aerosols: methodology and application, *Atmos. Chem.*
6 *Phys.*, 10, 7017–7039, doi:10.5194/acp-10-7017-2010, 2010.

7 Lawrence, D.M., Oleson, K. W., Flanner, M. G., Thornton, P. E., Swenson, S. C., Lawrence,
8 P. J., Zeng, X., Yang, Z.-L., Levis, S., Sakaguchi, K., Bonan, G. B., and Slater, A.
9 G.: Parameterization improvements and functional and structural advances in version 4 of the
10 Community Land Model, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Sys.*, 3, DOI: 10.1029/2011MS000045, 2011.

11 Lee, Y.-H., and Adams, P. J.: A fast and efficient version of the Two-Moment Aerosol
12 Sectional (TOMAS) global aerosol microphysics model, *Aerosol. Sci. Technol.*, 46, 678–689,
13 doi:10.1080/02786826.2011.643259, 2012.

14 Levy, R. C., Mattoo, S., Munchak, L. A., Remer, L. A., Sayer, A. M., Patadia, F., and Hsu, N.
15 C.: The Collection 6 MODIS aerosol products over land and ocean, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 6,
16 2989–3034, doi:10.5194/amt-6-2989-2013, 2013.

17 Liu, X., Easter, R. C., Ghan, S., Zaveri, R., Rasch, P., Shi, X., Lamarque, J.-F., Gettelman, A.,
18 Morrison, H., Vitt, F., Conley, A., Park, S., Neale, R., Hannay, C., Ekman, A. M. L., Hess, P.,
19 Mahowald, N., Collins, W., Iacono, M. J., Bretherton, C. S., Flanner, M. G., and Mitchell, D.,
20 Toward a Minimal Representation of Aerosol Direct and Indirect Effects: Model Description
21 and Evaluation, *GeoSci. Mod. Dev.*, 5, 709–739, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-709-2012, 2012.

22 Madec, G.: NEMO ocean engine, Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace (IPSL), France, No. 27, ISSN
23 No. 1288–1619, 2008.

24 Malm, W. C., Sisler, J. F., Huffman, D., Eldred, R. A., and Cahill, T. A.: Spatial and seasonal
25 trends in particle concentration and optical extinction in the United States, *J. Geophys. Res.*,
26 99, 1347–1370, 1994.

27 Mann, G. W., Carslaw, K. S., Spracklen, D. V., Ridley, D. A., Manktelow, P. T., Chipperfield,
28 M. P., Pickering, S. J., and Johnson, C. E.: Description and evaluation of GLOMAP-mode: a
29 modal global aerosol microphysics model for the UKCA composition-climate model, *Geosci.*
30 *Model Dev.*, 3, 519–551, doi:10.5194/gmd-3-519-2010, 2010.

1 Meehl, G. A., Washington, W. M., Arblaster, J. M., Hu, A., Teng, H., Kay, J. E., Gettleman, 2 Lawrence, D. M., Sanderson, B. M., and Strand, W. G.: Climate Change Projections in 3 CESM1(CAM5) Compared to CCMS4, *Journal of Climate*, 26, 6287-6308, 2013.

4 Meinshausen, M., Smith, S. J., Calvin, K., Daniel, J. S., Kainuma, M. L. T., Lamarque, J. F., 5 Matsumoto, K., Montzka, S. A., Raper, S. C. B., Riahi, K., Thomson, A., Velders, G. J. M., and 6 van Vuuren, D. P. P.: The RCP greenhouse gas concentrations and their extensions from 1765 7 to 2300, *Climatic Change*, 109, 213-241, 10.1007/s10584-011-0156-z, 2011.

8 Menon, S., Koch, D., Beig, G., Sahu, S., Fasullo, J., and Orlikowski, D.: Black carbon aerosols 9 and the third polar ice cap, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 4559–4571, 2010.

10 Miller, R. L., Schmidt, G. A., Nazarenko, L. S., Tausnev, N., Bauer, S. E., Del Genio, A. D., 11 Kelley, M., Lo, K. K., Ruedy, R., Shindell, D. T., Aleinov, I., Bauer, M., Bleck, R., Canuto, V., 12 Chen, Y.-H., Cheng, Y., Clune, T. L., Faluvegi, G., Hansen, J. E., Healy, R. J., Kiang, N. Y., 13 Koch, D., Lacis, A. A., LeGrande, A. N., Lerner, J., Menon, S., Oinas, V., Pérez García-Pando, 14 Perlitz, J. P., Puma, M. J., Rind, D., Romanou, A., Russell, G. L., Sato, M., Sun, S., 15 Tsigaridis, K., Unger, N., Voulgarakis, A., Yao, M.-S., and Zhang, J.: CMIP5 historical 16 simulations (1850-2012) with GISS ModelE2, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 6, no. 2, 441-477, 17 doi:10.1002/2013MS000266, 2014.

18 Myhre, G., Samset, B. H., Schulz, M., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., Berntsen, T. K., Bian, H., 19 Bellouin, N., Chin, M., Diehl, T., Easter, R. C., Feichter, J., Ghan, S. J., Hauglustaine, D., 20 Iversen, T., Kinne, S., Kirkevåg, A., Lamarque, J.-F., Lin, G., Liu, X., Lund, M. T., Luo, G., 21 Ma, X., van Noije, T., Penner, J. E., Rasch, P. J., Ruiz, A., Seland, Ø., Skeie, R. B., Stier, P., 22 Takemura, T., Tsigaridis, K., Wang, P., Wang, Z., Xu, L., Yu, H., Yu, F., Yoon, J.-H., 23 Zhang, K., Zhang, H., and Zhou, C.: Radiative forcing of the direct aerosol effect from 24 AeroCom Phase II simulations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 1853-1877, doi:10.5194/acp-13- 25 1853-2013, 2013a.

26 Myhre, G., Shindell, D., Breon, F.-M., Collins, W., Fuglestvedt, J., Huang, J., Koch, D., 27 Lamarque, J.-F., Lee, D., Mendoza, B., Nakajima, T., Robock, A., Stephens, G., Takemura, T., 28 and Zhang, H.: Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing. In: *Climate Change 2013: The* 29 *Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the* 30 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T. F., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor,

1 M., Allen, S. K., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., and Midgley, P. M. (eds.)],
2 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2013b.

3 Neale, R. B., Chen, C.-C., Gettleman, A., Lauritzen, P. H., Park, S., Williamson, D. L., Conley,
4 A. J., Garcia, R., Kinnison, D., Lamarque, J.-F., Marsh, D., Mills, M., Smith, A. K., Tilmes, S.,
5 Vitt, F., Morrison, H., Cameron-Smith, P., Collins, W. D., Iacono, M. J., Easter, R. C., Ghan,
6 S. J., Liu, X., Rasch, P. J., and Taylor, M. A.: Description of the NCAR Community
7 Atmosphere Model (CAM 5.0), NCAR Technical Note TN-486+STR, National Center for
8 Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado, USA, 2012.

9 Pan, X., Chin, M., Gautam, R., Bian, H., Kim, D., Colarco, P. R., Diehl, T. L., Takemura, T.,
10 Pozzoli, L., Tsigaridis, K., Bauer, S., and Bellouin, N.: A multi-model evaluation of aerosols
11 over South Asia: common problems and possible causes, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 5903-5928,
12 doi:10.5194/acp-15-5903-2015, 2015.

13 Polson, D., Bollasina, M., Hegerl, G. C., and Wilcox, L. J.: Decreased monsoon precipitation
14 in the Northern Hemisphere due to anthropogenic aerosols, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41,
15 doi:10.1002/2014GL060811, 2014.

16 Reddy, S., Seland, O., Stier, P., Takemura, T., and Tie, X.: An AeroCom initial assessment –
17 optical properties in aerosol component modules of global models, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6,
18 1815-1834, doi:10.5194/acp-6-1815-2006, 2006.

19 Russell, G. L., Miller, J. R., and Rind, D.: A coupled atmosphere-ocean model for transient
20 climate change, *Atmosphere-Ocean*, 33(4), 683–730, 1995.

21 Samset, B. H., Myhre, G., Schulz, M., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., Berntsen, T. K., Bian, H.,
22 Bellouin, N., Diehl, T., Easter, R. C., Ghan, S. J., Iversen, T., Kinne, S., Kirkevåg, A.,
23 Lamarque, J.-F., Lin, G., Liu, X., Penner, J. E., Seland, Ø., Skeie, R. B., Stier, P., Takemura,
24 T., Tsigaridis, K., and Zhang, K.: Black carbon vertical profiles strongly affect its radiative
25 forcing uncertainty, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 2423-2434, doi:10.5194/acp-13-2423-2013,
26 2013.

27 Samset, B. H., Myhre, G., Forster, P. M., Hodnebrog, Ø., Andrews, T., Faluvegi, G., Fläschner,
28 D., Kasoar, M., Kharin, V., Kirkevåg, A., Lamarque, J.-F., Olivié, D., Richardson, T., Shindell,
29 D., Shine, K. P., Takemura, T., and Voulgarakis, A: Fast and slow precipitation responses to

1 individual climate forcers: A PDRMIP multimodel study, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43,
2 doi:10.1002/2016GL068064, 2016.

3 Schmidt, G.A., Kelley, M., Nazarenko, L., Ruedy, R., Russell, G. L., Aleinov, I., Bauer, M.,
4 Bauer, S. E., Bhat, M. K., Bleck, R., Canuto, V., Chen, Y.-H., Cheng, Y., Clune, T. L., Del
5 Genio, A., de Fainchtein, R., Faluvegi, G., Hansen, J. E., Healy, R. J., Kiang, N. Y., Koch, D.,
6 Lacis, A. A., LeGrande, A. N., Lerner, J., Lo, K. K., Matthews, E. E., Menon, S., Miller, R. L.,
7 Oinas, V., Oloso, A. O., Perlitz, J. P., Puma, M. J., Putman, W. M., Rind, D., Romanou, A.,
8 Sato, M., Shindell, D. T., Sun, S., Syed, R. A., Tausnev, N., Tsigaridis, K., Unger, N.,
9 Voulgarakis, A., Yao, M.-S., and Zhang, J.: Configuration and assessment of the GISS
10 ModelE2 contributions to the CMIP5 archive, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 6, no. 1, 141-184,
11 doi:10.1002/2013MS000265, 2014.

12 Schulz, M., Textor, C., Kinne, S., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., Berntsen, T., Berglen, T.,
13 Boucher, O., Dentener, F., Guibert, S., Isaksen, I. S. A., Iversen, T., Koch, D., Kirkevåg, A.,
14 Liu, X., Montanaro, V., Myhre, G., Penner, J. E., Pitari, G., Reddy, S., Seland, Ø., Stier, P., and
15 Takemura, T.: Radiative forcing by aerosols as derived from the AeroCom present-day and pre-
16 industrial simulations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 5225-5246, doi:10.5194/acp-6-5225-2006,
17 2006.

18 Shindell, D. T.: Evaluation of the absolute regional temperature potential, *Atmospheric
19 Chemistry and Physics*, 12, 7955-7960, doi:10.5194/acp-12-7955-2012, 2012.

20 Shindell, D. and Faluvegi, G.: Climate response to regional radiative forcing during the 20th
21 century, *Nat. Geosci.*, 2, 294-300, 2009.

22 Shindell, D., Schulz, M., Ming, Y., Takemura, T., Faluvegi, G., and Ramaswamy, V.: Spatial
23 scales of climate response to inhomogeneous radiative forcing, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, D19110,
24 doi:10.1029/2010JD014108, 2010.

25 Shindell, D. T., Voulgarakis, A., Faluvegi, G., and Milly, G.: Precipitation response to regional
26 radiative forcing, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 6969–6982, 2012.

27 Shindell, D. T., Lamarque, J.-F., Schulz, M., Flanner, M., Jiao, C., Chin, M., Young, P. J.,
28 Lee, Y. H., Rotstayn, L., Mahowald, N., Milly, G., Faluvegi, G., Balkanski, Y., Collins, W. J.,
29 Conley, A. J., Dalsoren, S., Easter, R., Ghan, S., Horowitz, L., Liu, X., Myhre, G.,
30 Nagashima, T., Naik, V., Rumbold, S. T., Skeie, R., Sudo, K., Szopa, S., Takemura, T.,

1 Voulgarakis, A., Yoon, J.-H., and Lo, F.: Radiative forcing in the ACCMIP historical and
2 future climate simulations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 2939-2974, doi:10.5194/acp-13-2939-
3 2013, 2013a.

4 Shindell, D. T., Pechony, O., Voulgarakis, A., Faluvegi, G., Nazarenko, L., Lamarque, J.-F.,
5 Bowman, K., Milly, G., Kovari, B., Ruedy, R., and Schmidt, G.: Interactive ozone and methane
6 chemistry in GISS-E2 historical and future climate simulations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 2653-
7 2689, doi:10.5194/acp-13-2653-2013, 2013b.

8 Shindell, D. T., Faluvegi, G., Rotstayn, L., and Milly, G.: Spatial patterns of radiative forcing
9 and surface temperature response, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 120, doi:10.1002/2014JD022752,
10 2015

11 Smith, S. J., van Aardenne, J., Klimont, Z., Andres, R. J., Volke, A., and Delgado Arias, S.:
12 Anthropogenic sulfur dioxide emissions: 1850–2005, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 1101-1116,
13 doi:10.5194/acp-11-1101-2011, 2011.

14 Stier, P., Schutgens, N. A. J., Bellouin, N., Bian, H., Boucher, O., Chin, M., Ghan, S., Huneeus,
15 N., Kinne, S., Lin, G., Ma, X., Myhre, G., Penner, J. E., Randles, C. A., Samset, B., Schulz, M.,
16 Takemura, T., Yu, F., Yu, H., and Zhou, C.: Host model uncertainties in aerosol radiative
17 forcing estimates: results from the AeroCom Prescribed intercomparison study, *Atmos. Chem.*
18 *Phys.*, 13, 3245-3270, doi:10.5194/acp-13-3245-2013, 2013.

19 Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J., and Meehl, G. A.: An Overview of CMIP5 and the Experiment
20 Design, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 93, 485–498, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1, 2012.

21 Teng, H., Washington, W. M., Branstator, G., Meehl, G. A., and Lamarque, J.-F.: Potential
22 impacts of Asian carbon aerosols on future US warming, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39, L11703,
23 doi:10.1029/2012GL051723, 2012.

24 Textor, C., Schulz, M., Guibert, S., Kinne, S., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., Berntsen, T.,
25 Berglen, T., Boucher, O., Chin, M., Dentener, F., Diehl, T., Easter, R., Feichter, H.,
26 Fillmore, D., Ghan, S., Ginoux, P., Gong, S., Grini, A., Hendricks, J., Horowitz, L., Huang, P.,
27 Isaksen, I., Iversen, I., Kloster, S., Koch, D., Kirkevåg, A., Kristjansson, J. E., Krol, M.,
28 Lauer, A., Lamarque, J. F., Liu, X., Montanaro, V., Myhre, G., Penner, J., Pitari, G., Reddy, S.,
29 Seland, Ø., Stier, P., Takemura, T., and Tie, X.: Analysis and quantification of the diversities

1 of aerosol life cycles within AeroCom, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 1777-1813, doi:10.5194/acp-6-
2 1777-2006, 2006.

3 Tilmes, S., Lamarque, J.-F., Emmons, L. K., Kinnison, D. E., Ma, P.-L., Liu, X., Ghan, S.,
4 Bardeen, C., Arnold, S., Deeter, M., Vitt, F., Ryerson, T., Elkins, J. W., Moore, F., and
5 Spackman, R.: Description and evaluation of tropospheric chemistry and aerosols in the
6 Community Earth System Model (CESM1.2), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 8, 1395-1426,
7 doi:10.5194/gmd-8-1395-2015, 2015.

8 Verheggen, B., Cozic, J., Weingartner, E., Bower, K., Mertes, S., Connolly, P., Gallagher, M.,
9 Flynn, M., Choularton, T., and Baltensperger, U.: Aerosol partitioning between the interstitial
10 and the condensed phase in mixed-phase clouds, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D23202,
11 doi:10.1029/2007JD008714, 2007.

12 Vet, R., Artz, R. S., Carou, S., Shaw, M., Ro, C.-U., Aas, W., Baker, A., Bowersox, V. C.,
13 Dentener, F., Galy-Lacaux, C., Hou, A., Pienaar, J. J., Gillett, R., Forti, M. C., Gromov, S.,
14 Hara, H., Khodzher, T., Mahowald, N. M., Nickovic, S., Rao, P. S. P., and Reid, N. W.: A
15 global assessment of precipitation chemistry and deposition of sulfur, nitrogen, sea salt, base
16 cations, organic acids, acidity and pH, and phosphorus, *Atmospheric Environment*, 93, 3-100,
17 doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.10.060, 2014.

18 Voulgarakis, A., and Shindell, D. T., Constraining the sensitivity of regional climate with the
19 use of historical observations. *J. Climate*, 23, 6068-6073, doi:10.1175/2010JCLI3623.1, 2010.

20 Walters, D. N., Williams, K. D., Boutle, I. A., Bushell, A. C., Edwards, J. M., Field, P. R.,
21 Lock, A. P., Morcrette, C. J., Stratton, R. A., Wilkinson, J. M., Willett, M. R., Bellouin, N.,
22 Bodas-Salcedo, A., Brooks, M. E., Copsey, D., Earnshaw, P. D., Hardiman, S. C.,
23 Harris, C. M., Levine, R. C., MacLachlan, C., Manners, J. C., Martin, G. M., Milton, S. F.,
24 Palmer, M. D., Roberts, M. J., Rodríguez, J. M., Tennant, W. J., and Vidale, P. L.: The Met
25 Office Unified Model Global Atmosphere 4.0 and JULES Global Land 4.0 configurations,
26 *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 7, 361-386, doi:10.5194/gmd-7-361-2014, 2014.

27 Wilcox, L. J., Highwood, E. J., and Dunstone, N. J.: The influence of anthropogenic aerosol on
28 multi-decadal variations of historical global climate *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 8, 024033, 2013.

1 Wilcox, L. J., Highwood, E. J., Booth, B. B. B., and Carslaw, K. S.: Quantifying sources of
2 inter-model diversity in the cloud albedo effect, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42, 1568–1575,
3 doi:10.1002/2015GL063301, 2015.

4 Yu, H., Chin, M., West, J. J., Atherton, C. S., Bellouin, N., Bergmann, D., Bey, I., Bian, H.,
5 Diehl, T., Forberth, G., Hess, P., Schulz, M., Shindell, D., Takemura, T., and Tan, Q.: A
6 multimodel assessment of the influence of regional anthropogenic emission reductions on
7 aerosol direct radiative forcing and the role of intercontinental transport, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 118,
8 700-720, doi:10.1029/2012JD018148, 2013.

9 Zhang, X. Y., Wang, Y. Q., Niu, T., Zhang, X. C., Gong, S. L., Zhang, Y. M., and Sun, J. Y.:
10 Atmospheric aerosol compositions in China: spatial/temporal variability, chemical signature,
11 regional haze distribution and comparisons with global aerosols, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 779-
12 799, doi:10.5194/acp-12-779-2012, 2012.


	HadGEM3-GA4	CESM1	GISS-E2
Primary model reference	Walters et al. (2014)	Tilmes et al. (2015)	Schmidt et al. (2014)
Aerosol scheme references	Bellouin et al. (2011) Jones et al. (2001)	Liu et al. (2012)	Koch et al. (2011) Koch et al. (2006)
Resolution (longitude x latitude)	1.875° x 1.25° 85 vertical levels, model top at 85 km	2.5° x 1.875° 30 vertical levels, model top at 40 km	2.5° x 2° 40 vertical levels, model top at 80km
Aerosol tracers	Sulfate, fossil-fuel black carbon, fossil-fuel organic carbon, biomass-burning, dust, sea salt	Sulfate, black carbon, primary organic matter, secondary organic aerosol, dust, sea salt	Sulfate, nitrate, black carbon, organic carbon, secondary organic aerosol, dust, sea salt
Indirect effects included	Yes (1 st and 2 nd)	Yes (1 st and 2 nd)	Yes (1 st and 2 nd)
SO₂ oxidation reactions included	OH (gas phase) H ₂ O ₂ , O ₃ (aqueous phase)	OH (gas phase) H ₂ O ₂ , O ₃ (aqueous phase)	OH (gas phase) H ₂ O ₂ (aqueous phase)
Chemistry	Offline (prescribed 4D oxidant fields)	Online	Online
Shortwave radiation	Edwards and Slingo (1996) 6 spectral bands	Clough et al. (2005) 14 spectral bands	Hansen et al. (1983) 6 spectral bands

1

2 Table 1: Key references and features of the three models and their aerosol schemes used in
3 this study

		HadGEM3-GA4			GISS-E2			CESM1		
		Con	Ch0	Ch0-Con	Con	Ch0	Ch0-Con	Con	Ch0	Ch0-Con
	Total SO_2 (Tg)	0.637	0.592	-0.045 ± 0.001	1.151	1.075	-0.076	0.553	0.503	-0.050
	Total SO_4 (Tg)	1.569	1.499	-0.070 ± 0.004	1.091	1.014	-0.077	1.459	1.323	-0.136
	Mean AOD	0.217	0.213	-0.0042 ± 0.0004	0.131	0.131	-0.0003	0.123	0.122	-0.0013
	Clear-sky TOA SW flux (W m⁻²)	286.0	286.2	0.184 ± 0.06	289.0	289.1	0.052	288.7	288.8	0.076
	All-sky TOA SW flux (W m⁻²)	242.3	242.6	0.279 ± 0.10	241.0	241.0	-0.034 ± 0.06	236.7	236.9	0.186
Global	Mean temperature (K)	288.6	288.7	0.115 ± 0.05	289.0	289.0	-0.028 ± 0.04	288.0	288.1	0.054
<hr/>										
	$\Delta \text{AOD}/\Delta \text{SO}_4$ (Tg⁻¹)			0.0603			0.0042			0.0094
	$\Delta \text{Clear-sky SW}/\Delta \text{AOD}$ (W m⁻²)			-43.8			-173			-58.5
	$\Delta \text{All-sky SW}/\Delta \text{AOD}$ (W m⁻²)			-66.4			106			-145
<hr/>										
	Total SO_2 (Tg)	0.035	0.006	-0.029 ± 0.0002	0.033	0.005	-0.028	0.030	0.001	-0.028
	Total SO_4 (Tg)	0.050	0.015	-0.035 ± 0.0003	0.043	0.027	-0.016	0.054	0.015	-0.039
	Mean AOD	0.576	0.289	-0.287 ± 0.002	0.232	0.185	-0.047	0.227	0.151	-0.076
	Clear-sky TOA SW flux (W m⁻²)	296.3	301.4	5.06 ± 0.08	294.3	298.4	4.10	305.35	307.51	2.16
	All-sky TOA SW flux (W m⁻²)	228.8	234.2	5.34 ± 0.3	233.32	234.22	0.90 ± 0.3	224.16	228.36	4.20
E. China (100°E-120°E, 20°N-40°N)	Mean temperature (K)	287.6	287.9	0.382 ± 0.07	288.965	289.014	0.049 ± 0.07	289.110	289.404	0.294
<hr/>										
	$\Delta \text{AOD}/\Delta \text{SO}_4$ (Tg⁻¹)			8.23			2.94			1.96
	$\Delta \text{Clear-sky SW}/\Delta \text{AOD}$ (W m⁻²)			-17.6			-87.2			-28.4
	$\Delta \text{All-sky SW}/\Delta \text{AOD}$ (W m⁻²)			-18.6			-19.3			-55.0


1 Table 2: Area-integrated SO₂ and SO₄ burdens, area-weighted annual means of AOD, net down
2 clear-sky and all-sky TOA SW flux, and surface temperature, and ratios of the changes in AOD
3 to change in SO₄ burden, and SW flux to change in AOD, for the globe and the E. China region
4 100°E - 120°E, 20°N - 40°N. Values are shown for each model for the control simulation
5 (Con), the simulation with no SO₂ emissions from China (Ch0), and the difference (Ch0 – Con).
6 AOD is diagnosed for clear-sky conditions in HadGEM3-GA4 and GISS-E2, and for all-sky
7 conditions in CESM1. For models and variables where data was available, error ranges are
8 quoted for the Ch0-Con values and indicate ± 2 standard deviations, evaluated in HadGEM3-
9 GA4 from an ensemble of six 150-year control runs with perturbed initial conditions, and in
10 GISS-E2 from twelve 150-year segments of a long pre-industrial control run. Values quoted
11 without error ranges indicate that uncertainty was not evaluated.



1

2 Figure 1: Change in net downward TOA SW flux due to removal of anthropogenic SO_2
3 emissions over China for a) GISS-E2, b) CESM1, and c) HadGEM3-GA4. Differences are


1 calculated as the 150-year annual mean of the perturbation simulation minus the 150-year
2 annual mean of the control simulation. Plots focus on the Asian region as changes outside this
3 domain were found to be minimal. Stippling for GISS-E2 and HadGEM3-GA4 indicates that
4 the change in that grid-box exceeded two standard deviations. Significance was not evaluated
5 for CESM1 as multiple 150-year control runs were not available to assess internal variability
6 for this model. The grey box denotes the E. China (100°E - 120°E, 20°N - 40°N) region which
7 is used in Table 2 and throughout the discussion.



1


2 Figure 2: Global changes in surface air temperature due to removing anthropogenic SO_2
3 emissions from China for a) GISS-E2, b) CESM1, and c) HadGEM3. Differences are for 150-

- 1 year annual means of perturbation simulation minus control simulation. Stippling for GISS-E2
- 2 and HadGEM3-GA4 indicates changes exceeded two standard deviations for that grid box.



1

2 Figure 3: Global changes in column-integrated SO_4 burden due to removing anthropogenic SO_2
3 emissions from China, for a) GISS-E2, b) CESM1, and c) HadGEM3-GA4. Differences are
4 calculated as perturbation simulation minus control simulation, averaged over 150 years.



1

2 Figure 4: Change in AOD at 550nm due to removing SO₂ emissions from China for a) GISS-
 3 E2, b) CESM1, and c) HadGEM3-GA4. For HadGEM3-GA4 and GISS-E2, AOD is calculated
 4 for clear-sky conditions, whereas for CESM1 AOD is calculated for all-sky conditions, which

1 will generally result in higher values within each simulation. Differences are calculated as
2 perturbation run minus control run, averaged over 150 years. The plot region focuses on Asia
3 as changes outside of this domain were minimal.