



# Investigating the role of stratospheric ozone as a driver of inter-model spread in CO<sub>2</sub> effective radiative forcing

Rachael E. Byrom<sup>1</sup>, Gunnar Myhre<sup>1</sup>, Øivind Hodnebrog<sup>1</sup>, Dirk Olivié<sup>2</sup>, and Michael Schulz<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CICERO Center for International Climate Research, 0318 Oslo, Norway <sup>2</sup>Norwegian Meteorological Institute, 0313 Oslo, Norway

Correspondence: Rachael E. Byrom (rachael.byrom@cicero.oslo.no)

Received: 15 January 2024 – Discussion started: 26 January 2024 Revised: 2 February 2025 – Accepted: 11 February 2025 – Published: 11 June 2025

**Abstract.** Addressing the cause of inter-model spread in carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) radiative forcing is essential for reducing uncertainty in estimates of climate sensitivity. Recent studies have demonstrated that a large proportion of this spread arises from variance in model base-state climatology, particularly the specification of stratospheric temperature, which itself plays a dominant role in determining the magnitude of CO<sub>2</sub> forcing. Here, we investigate stratospheric ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) as a cause of inter-model differences in stratospheric temperature, and hence its role as a contributing factor to spread in CO<sub>2</sub> radiative forcing. We use the Norwegian Earth System Model 2 (NorESM2) to analyse the impact of systematic increases and decreases in stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> on the magnitude of  $4xCO_2$  effective radiative forcing (ERF) and its components. Firstly, we demonstrate that the accurate estimation of instantaneous radiative forcing (IRF) requires the use of host-model radiative transfer calculations. Secondly, we show that a 50 % increase or decrease in the stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> concentration leads to significant differences in the base-state stratospheric temperature, ranging from +6 to -9 K, respectively. These experiments impact IRF primarily due to the influence of the base-state stratospheric temperature on the emission of outgoing longwave radiation, with the spectral overlap of CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> playing a subsidiary role. However, the impact on IRF does not result in a correspondingly large spread in CO<sub>2</sub> ERF. We conclude that inter-model differences in stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> concentration are, therefore, not predominantly responsible for inter-model spread in CO<sub>2</sub> ERF.

# 1 Introduction

Effective radiative forcing (ERF) quantifies the top-ofatmosphere (TOA) perturbation to the Earth's energy balance imposed by a forcing mechanism, such as  $CO_2$ , aerosols or solar irradiance. It includes the instantaneous radiative forcing (IRF; i.e. the initial radiative response to the perturbation) and the subsequent radiative effect of adjustments in tropospheric and stratospheric temperature, water vapour, surface albedo and clouds, which each cause an impact on TOA radiative fluxes (Myhre et al., 2013; Boucher et al., 2013; Sherwood et al., 2015; Forster et al., 2021).

ERF can be expressed simply (e.g. Chung and Soden, 2015a; Smith et al., 2018) as follows:

 $\text{ERF} = \text{IRF} + A_{T_{\text{Strat}}} + A_{T_{\text{Trop}}} + A_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} + A_{\alpha} + A_{\text{c}} + \epsilon, \quad (1)$ 

where ERF is the net (shortwave plus longwave) change in downward TOA flux (W m<sup>-2</sup>); IRF is the direct net change in downward TOA flux (W m<sup>-2</sup>);  $A_x$  is the radiative adjustment from stratospheric temperature ( $T_{\text{Strat}}$ ), tropospheric temperature ( $T_{\text{Trop}}$ ), water vapour (H<sub>2</sub>O), surface albedo ( $\alpha$ ) and clouds (c); and  $\epsilon$  represents a non-linear residual term that is typically small (around 10 % of the ERF; Shell et al., 2008).

ERF is used extensively to compare the relative strength of different forcing agents. Historically, quantifying the climate impact of a given agent commonly relied solely on diagnosing its IRF or stratospheric-temperature-adjusted radiative forcing (SARF; e.g. Ramaswamy et al., 2019). However, given that additional so-called "adjustments" develop from the initial radiative perturbation and impact the TOA imbalance, it is also necessary to include them in the radiative forcing framework. Consequently, this has been shown to improve the utility of the radiative forcing metric in predicting global-mean surface temperature change ( $\Delta T_s$ ), ultimately due to a more realistic separation of forcing from surfacetemperature-driven feedbacks (e.g. Sherwood et al., 2015; Marvel et al., 2016; Richardson et al., 2019). Adjustments, therefore, form an important component of climate change assessment and necessitate the use of climate model integrations to simulate the radiative response of tropospheric and land surface changes to the TOA energy imbalance, in addition to the traditional diagnostic of IRF or SARF, which can be calculated using offline radiative transfer codes or simplified expressions (e.g. Hansen et al., 1988; Myhre et al., 1998; Etminan et al., 2016; Meinshausen et al., 2020). This makes ERF considerably more computationally expensive to estimate and introduces more model-diversity-driven uncertainty. The use of different methods to calculate ERF further complicates inter-model comparison, with some studies opting to diagnose the forcing from fixed sea surface temperature (SST) and sea ice simulations (Hansen et al., 2005) or, alternatively, by regressing TOA irradiance against global surface temperature change (Gregory et al., 2004; see Forster et al., 2016).

For CO<sub>2</sub>, inter-model spread in ERF remains an ongoing issue. Smith et al. (2020a) report a 4xCO<sub>2</sub> ERF range of 7.3-8.9 W m<sup>-2</sup> for 17 CMIP6 (Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6; Eyring et al., 2016) models contributing to the Radiative Forcing Model Intercomparison Project (RFMIP; Pincus et al., 2016), which aims to achieve accurate characterisation of ERF through consistent diagnosis with the fixed-SST method (Forster et al., 2016). Whilst this spread has been reduced compared to earlier analysis of 13 CMIP5 models (Kamae and Watanabe, 2012; see Smith et al., 2020a, their Fig. 5), identifying and remedying the exact nature of CO<sub>2</sub> ERF diversity is an active area of research (e.g. Soden et al., 2018; Pincus et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2020a). Several studies have shown that model differences in the magnitude of IRF contribute significantly (e.g. Zhang and Huang, 2014; Chung and Soden, 2015b; Andrews et al., 2015), arising either from radiative transfer parameterisation error (e.g. Collins et al., 2006; Pincus et al., 2015) and/or differences in model base-state climatology (Pincus et al., 2020; Jeevanjee et al., 2021). Recently, He et al. (2023) more specifically attributed this base-state dependence to stratospheric temperature. They reported a significant correlation between 4xCO<sub>2</sub> IRF and 10 hPa air temperature in CMIP5 and CMIP6 models, demonstrating that biases in stratospheric temperature play a leading role in causing inter-model CO2 IRF spread. Given that IRF accounts for around 60% of CO<sub>2</sub> ERF and that stratospheric cooling is its dominant adjustment (Myhre et al., 2013; Smith et al., 2018), examining potential causes of model differences in stratospheric temperature presents a clear opportunity to further current understanding.

One such cause could relate to stratospheric  $O_3$  – a key constituent in modulating stratospheric temperature. De-

pending on the treatment of stratospheric chemistry, models adopt a range of methods to generate O<sub>3</sub> fields using either an interactive chemistry scheme, a simplified online scheme or a prescribed pre-simulated dataset. Consequently, the resulting spatial structure and regional distribution of concentrations can differ substantially. Keeble et al. (2021) evaluated long-term O<sub>3</sub> trends in 22 CMIP6 models and found poor agreement in the simulation of pre-industrial total column ozone (TCO), with a variation from 275 to 340 DU between  $60^{\circ}$  N and  $60^{\circ}$  S. Further, a ~ 20 DU range has been observed between 10 of the models that prescribe stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> according to the CMIP6 O<sub>3</sub> dataset (Checa-Garcia, 2018), highlighting that even the model-specific implementation of common input can lead to significant differences in TCO.

Here, we perform idealised experiments (Sect. 2) to investigate the role of stratospheric  $O_3$  as a driver of inter-model diversity in stratospheric temperature, and hence its role as a driver of spread in CO<sub>2</sub> ERF. First, we examine 4xCO<sub>2</sub> ERF and compare our results to previous estimates, with a particular focus on the diagnosis of IRF and  $T_{\text{Strat}}$  (Sect. 3). We then investigate the impact of stratospheric  $O_3$  specification on each component of 4xCO<sub>2</sub> ERF (Sect. 4).

#### 2 Models, experiments and methods

We use atmosphere-only simulations from the "mediumresolution" version of NorESM2 (NorESM2-MM; Seland et al., 2020) to calculate ERF following an abrupt quadrupling of CO<sub>2</sub> relative to pre-industrial (1850) conditions (see Text S1 in the Supplement for further details on the model configuration). This model is used to perform a baseline (control) integration and a perturbed  $(4xCO_2)$  integration using prescribed SST and sea ice extent climatologies; hence, we use the fixed-SST method to diagnose forcing as recommended by RFMIP (Pincus et al., 2016), whereby ERF is calculated as the difference in TOA net radiative flux between the perturbed and control simulations. Integrations are run for 30 years, with years 6 to 30 used for analysis in Sect. 3. This simulation length was chosen to allow for better comparison of our results against the 30-year NorESM2-MM 4xCO<sub>2</sub> ERF experiments of Smith et al. (2020a).

We perform two further  $4xCO_2$  ERF experiments in which stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> is increased by 50 % (Strat O<sub>3</sub>x1.5) and decreased by 50 % (Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5) relative to its pre-industrial concentration. Considering the substantial range in preindustrial TCO noted by Keeble et al. (2021, their Fig. A3), we choose such a large, idealised increase and decrease in an attempt to cover a broader range of stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> than shown by CMIP6 models; thus, any effect on  $4xCO_2$  ERF would likely be amplified in comparison.

Note that, in each ERF experiment, the  $O_3$  increase (and decrease) is applied to both the control and  $4xCO_2$  simulation so that the new  $O_3$  field acts exclusively to alter the base-state atmosphere and does not act as a forcing itself. As

in the "standard"  $4xCO_2$  ERF experiment described above, stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> fields are prescribed using zonally averaged 5 d fields derived from the Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model version 6 from the Community Earth System Model version 2 (CESM2-WACCM6; Gettelman et al., 2019) (Fig. S1 in the Supplement). A linearly varying tropopause (from 100 hPa at the Equator to 300 hPa at the poles) is used to delineate the stratosphere and troposphere (Soden et al., 2008; Smith et al., 2018). O<sub>3</sub> concentrations above this boundary are multiplied by 1.5 and 0.5 to increase and decrease levels by 50 %, respectively. These simulations are run for 15 years to reduce computational expense, with years 6 to 15 of each integration used for analysis (Sect. 4). Table S1 in the Supplement summarises all experiments.

IRF is calculated using the Parallel Offline Radiative Transfer (PORT; Conley et al., 2013) code. This code isolates the radiative transfer scheme employed by NorESM2-MM (i.e. RRTMG; Iacono et al., 2008) to provide stand-alone offline radiation diagnostics. It is used here to perform two sets of radiative transfer calculations for each experiment listed in Table S1: a baseline (control) simulation and a perturbed ( $4xCO_2$ ) simulation, which are both run using a year's worth of climatology from the corresponding ERF control integration (i.e. the first 12 months of its output). Simulations are then run for 12 months to diagnose the annual-mean IRF as the difference in TOA net radiative flux between the perturbed and control run.

Corresponding radiative adjustments are quantified using radiative kernels (Soden et al., 2008). Summarising the more detailed description given by Smith et al. (2018), these characterise the change in TOA radiative flux  $\Delta R$  (either shortwave or longwave) following a unit change in a state variable ( $\Delta x$ ), e.g. temperature, surface albedo or water vapour. They are constructed by running a climate model's offline radiative transfer code twice, once with a baseline climatology and again with a unit change in x to calculate  $\Delta R$ . The radiative kernel ( $K_x$ ) is given by the following:

$$K_x = \frac{\partial R}{\partial x}.$$
 (2)

The corresponding adjustment  $(A_x)$  is then quantified as follows:

$$A_x = K_x(x_p - x_c), \tag{3}$$

where  $x_p - x_c$  represents the difference in *x* between the perturbed and control atmosphere-only climate model integrations, respectively. Here,  $A_x$  is calculated using output from NorESM2-MM with radiative kernels derived from three models: the Community Earth System Model 1–Community Atmosphere Model 5 (CESM-CAM5; Pendergrass et al., 2018), the Hadley Centre Global Environment Model 3-GA7.1 (HadGEM3-GA7.1; Smith et al., 2020b) and the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF)-Oslo model (Myhre et al., 2018). We use kernels

to calculate all adjustments given in Eq. (1) except for  $A_c$ , which cannot be directly calculated from a kernel because the radiative effects of clouds are too non-linear (Soden et al., 2008). To estimate  $A_c$ , we calculate the difference between all-sky and clear-sky TOA ERF (i.e. the change in cloud radiative effect;  $\Delta CRE$ ) and then modify this to correct for cloud masking of the clear-sky 4xCO<sub>2</sub> IRF and adjustment response (see Soden et al., 2008, and Smith et al., 2018, 2020a). This differs from alternate approaches used to calculate  $A_{\rm c}$  such as the approximate partial radiative perturbation (APRP) method, which estimates shortwave cloud responses from climate model diagnostics (Zelinka et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2018), and the offline partial radiative perturbation (PRP) method, in which cloud radiative effects are estimated using an offline radiative transfer code and model cloud fields (e.g. Smith et al., 2020a). Additionally, we also use kernels to calculate the adjustment due to surface temperature change  $(A_{T_S})$  following Smith et al. (2018), as land surface temperatures are allowed to respond to the forcing in our simulations given the difficulty in prescribing fixed surface temperatures (Forster et al., 2016). Several studies have also followed this approach, whereby the calculation of ERF includes the radiative response of land surface warming or cooling (e.g. Hansen et al., 2005; Forster et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2018, 2020a). Generally, methods that correct for this produce a slightly larger ERF following a CO<sub>2</sub> perturbation (Smith et al., 2020a; Andrews et al., 2021). Subtracting  $A_{T_{S}}$  from the ERF could provide a land-surfacewarming-corrected forcing (following Smith et al., 2020a), although we do not calculate this here. Instead, we report the magnitude of  $A_{T_s}$  to inspect any change in its value with each O3 experiment. Further, we use the same tropopause definition as above to delineate  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  and  $A_{T_{\text{Trop}}}$ .

# 3 The importance of directly calculating IRF and the dependence of $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$ on radiative kernel design

Figure 1a (purple bars) shows the resulting NorESM2-MM ERF, IRF and adjustments. For comparison, corresponding data from the NorESM2-MM  $4xCO_2$  ERF experiment of Smith et al. (2020a) are also shown (green bars). As expected, the magnitude of ERF is almost equal in each experiment, at  $8.40 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  (purple bar) and  $8.38 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  (green bar). The difference of  $0.02 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  is likely attributable to differences in the time period used to average model output or to the use of alternate initial conditions and computing machine architecture given that all other aspects of simulation design were implemented identically (see Sect. 2 and Sect. 2 of Smith et al., 2020a).



Figure 1. (a) NorESM2-MM 4xCO<sub>2</sub> ERF, IRF, adjustments and the residual term  $\epsilon$  (purple bars), with IRF calculated using PORT and adjustments diagnosed using the CESM-CAM5 kernels. Green bars show corresponding data from Smith et al. (2020a), whereby the ERF for the same perturbation has been calculated from 30year simulations of NorESM2-MM with non-cloud adjustments calculated using the HadGEM3-GA7.1 radiative kernels and shortwave and longwave cloud adjustments calculated using the APRP and PRP method, respectively, with IRF estimated as the residual of ERF minus total adjustments; hence, there is no specific  $\epsilon$  term, as this is aliased into the IRF. (b) Comparison of NorESM2-MM  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  when calculated using different radiative kernels. Filled circles represent  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  calculated following the methodology outlined in Sect. 2, whereby NorESM2-MM output is interpolated onto the given radiative kernel pressure levels but not extrapolated to kernel pressure levels outside of the NorESM2-MM uppermost and lowermost pressures. Crosses represent the magnitude of  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$ if such extrapolation is performed using the ECMWF-Oslo (blue cross) and HadGEM3-GA7.1 (yellow cross) kernels along with the value given by Smith et al. (2020a) (green cross, which uses the HadGEM3-GA7.1 kernel).

Figure 1a further shows that the magnitude of IRF varies notably, demonstrating a dependence on the diagnostic method of choice. When calculated directly using PORT, the IRF is  $0.54 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  larger than when estimated as the

difference between ERF and the sum of adjustments (as in Smith et al., 2020a), comparing  $5.30 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  (purple bar) and  $4.76 \,\mathrm{W}\,\mathrm{m}^{-2}$  (green bar). This demonstrates the necessity of using a model's own radiative transfer code to calculate IRF and highlights the possibility for error in studies that derive this forcing as a residual. Directly calculating the IRF also permits the calculation of  $\epsilon$  (see Eq. 1) to analyse the magnitude of non-linearities that are not accounted for by the kernel-derived adjustments. Our  $\epsilon$  value (calculated as ERF–IRF– $\Sigma A_x$ ) is 3 % (0.27 W m<sup>-2</sup>) of the ERF  $(8.40 \text{ Wm}^{-2})$  and is, therefore, well within the 10% guideline given by Shell et al. (2008). However, when spectrally split, the shortwave  $\epsilon$  is 33 % (-0.47 W m<sup>-2</sup>) of the shortwave ERF  $(1.42 \text{ Wm}^{-2})$  and works to partially counteract a longwave  $\epsilon$  of 0.74 W m<sup>-2</sup> (which itself is 11 % of the longwave ERF of  $6.98 \text{ W} \text{ m}^{-2}$ ). This finding also extends to our analysis of the clear-sky 4xCO<sub>2</sub> forcing and adjustments (not shown). These much larger residuals can possibly be explained by the collapse of linear behaviour for a large perturbation like 4xCO<sub>2</sub> (see Jonko et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2020b). We further note the close agreement in  $A_c$ , which occurs despite the use of different methods to calculate it. In Smith et al. (2020a), shortwave and longwave  $A_{\rm c}$ are estimated separately using the APRP approach and offline monthly mean PRP calculations, respectively. In our approach,  $A_c$  is calculated using the adjusted CRE method (see Sect. 2).

The stratospheric temperature adjustment is strong and positive, as anticipated due to the process of stratospheric cooling following an increase in CO<sub>2</sub> concentration (e.g. Myhre et al., 2013; Smith et al., 2018; Forster et al., 2021). However, there is a clear difference when comparing the value reported here  $(1.94 \text{ Wm}^{-2}, \text{ purple bar})$ against Smith et al. (2020a;  $2.84 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ , green bar). Because  $A_{T_{\text{Trop}}}$  is similar between both experiments (-1.23 vs.  $-1.32 \,\mathrm{W}\,\mathrm{m}^{-2}$ ), it can be deduced that the difference in the magnitude of  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  is not predominantly driven by the choice of the tropopause definition (in Smith et al., 2020a, this is based on the World Meteorological Organization definition of a lapse-rate tropopause). Instead, the difference in  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  stems from the use of different radiative kernels (i.e. CESM-CAM5 vs. HadGEM3-GA7.1) and the method of applying model output in the  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  calculation. For our derivation of  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$ , we interpolate NorESM2-MM output to the 30 CESM-CAM5 kernel pressure levels, where 3.64 hPa is the highest level. Even though this is a "low-top" kernel, it matches the highest level of NorESM2-MM output, meaning that the use of this kernel in the  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  calculation captures all of the stratospheric cooling occurring in NorESM2-MM following a 4xCO<sub>2</sub> perturbation. Alternatively, Smith et al. (2020a) used the HadGEM3-GA7.1 radiative kernel, which itself has been interpolated from a native vertical resolution of 85 pressure levels (up to around 0.005 hPa) to the standard 19 CMIP6 pressure levels, with an upper bound of 1 hPa.

Smith et al. (2020a) derived  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  using model output that has been interpolated and extrapolated to the 19 CMIP6 pressure levels. This, therefore, extends stratospheric temperatures in NorESM2-MM above the model's highest level of 3.64 hPa to 1 hPa. Whilst this method better accounts for outgoing radiation emitted to space from the upper stratosphere for each unit change in temperature, it does not represent the actual adjustment modelled by NorESM2-MM.

Figure 1b (filled circles) further demonstrates this issue by comparing the magnitude of  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  calculated by applying our NorESM2-MM output to two additional kernels: ECMWF-Oslo and HadGEM3-GA7.1. The ECMWF-Oslo kernel has 60 pressure levels, with a high resolution in the stratosphere extending to 0.1 hPa, whereas the HadGEM3-GA7.1 kernel (as described above) utilises the standard CMIP6 19 pressure levels. When we interpolate (but do not extrapolate) NorESM2-MM output onto these pressure levels, the use of both ECMWF-Oslo and HadGEM3-GA7.1 results in an adjustment similar to that given by CESM-CAM5, at  $2.05 \,\mathrm{W}\,\mathrm{m}^{-2}$  (blue and yellow filled circles). However, when NorESM2-MM output is both interpolated and extrapolated to the upper stratospheric levels of the ECMWF-Oslo and HadGEM3-GA7.1 kernels, the adjustment is notably stronger (and in closer agreement with Smith et al., 2020a) at around  $2.80 \,\mathrm{Wm^{-2}}$  (blue and yellow crosses). The importance of the vertical resolution of the stratosphere has been stated previously in studies quantifying the magnitude of  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  to a CO<sub>2</sub> forcing. Notably, Smith et al. (2018) demonstrated that disagreement in  $2xCO_2 A_{T_{Strat}}$ is dependent on whether a given kernel has a high stratospheric resolution (e.g. ECMWF-Oslo) and if the model output is also highly resolved in the stratosphere. Smith et al. (2020b) further reported that kernels based on a high-top atmospheric model with a large number of native pressure levels have a pronounced increase in the magnitude and rate of emitted radiation at 5 hPa and 1 hPa. Here, the difference between the "extrapolated" (blue and yellow crosses) and "not-extrapolated" (blue and yellow circles)  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  values in Fig. 1b infers that around  $0.75 \,\mathrm{W m^{-2}}$  of "additional" stratospheric temperature adjustment occurs between the model top and the upper pressure limit of the ECMWF-Oslo and HadGEM3-GA7.1 kernels (0.1 and 1 hPa, respectively). This, therefore, supports previous studies that highlight the significance of vertical stratospheric resolution on  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$ , and it further demonstrates that the choice and method of applying a radiative kernel can substantially impact results. Opting to use a radiative kernel that has been constructed from the same atmospheric model as the CO<sub>2</sub> forcing simulations in question will more accurately represent the magnitude of  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  simulated within that given model. This also ensures that the calculation of  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  is based entirely on one underlying radiative transfer code, which eliminates any uncertainty in the magnitude of  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  that could occur if the kernel and model output were derived from two different parameterisations. If a radiative kernel is not available for a given model or a kernel needs to be applied across multiple models to evaluate inter-model spread, it could be more suitable to not extrapolate data outside of each model's native vertical bounds. However, the best use of kernels is likely quite case-specific.

#### 4 Stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> experiments

#### 4.1 Impact on stratospheric temperature

O<sub>3</sub> plays an important role in driving the thermal structure of the stratosphere due to its strong absorption of ultraviolet radiation and its absorption and emission of thermal infrared (TIR) radiation. Figure 2a shows the effect of a 50 % increase in stratospheric  $O_3$  concentration on the zonal-mean atmospheric temperature in the control integration of NorESM2-MM. A strong increase in stratospheric temperature is evident, consistent with enhanced absorption of solar radiation and, hence, enhanced solar heating rates. The peak increase in temperature occurs in the lower stratosphere centred across the equatorial region, co-located with high insolation. Here, the maximum  $\Delta T$  reaches 5.8 K. Similarly, decreasing stratospheric O3 concentration by 50 % results in reduced absorption of solar radiation, reduced solar heating rates and a strong cooling of the stratosphere (Fig. 2b). As above, the peak temperature decrease occurs in the lower stratosphere across the Equator, with a maximum  $\Delta T$  of -9 K. The impact of reduced stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> also propagates into the troposphere (primarily between 70 and 90° N/S), due to more downward solar irradiance reaching the lower levels of the atmosphere where enhanced absorption and heating can take place. Considering the high correlation between the 4xCO<sub>2</sub> IRF and 10 hPa air temperature reported by He et al. (2023), we note that at this level in particular  $\Delta T$  largely increases by  $\geq 3 \text{ K}$  in the "Strat  $O_3 x 1.5$ " case (Fig. 2c) and largely decreases by  $\ge 4 \text{ K}$  in the "Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5" case (Fig. 2b).

# 4.2 Impact on 4xCO<sub>2</sub> ERF and components

Figure 3 compares ERF, IRF and the individual adjustments for the standard  $4xCO_2$ , Strat  $O_3x1.5$  and Strat  $O_3x0.5$  experiments. As shown, increasing stratospheric  $O_3$  by 50 % has a negligible impact on the magnitude of  $4xCO_2$  ERF in NorESM2-MM, resulting in a near-identical forcing (of  $8.47 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ ) compared to the standard case (dark-orange bar). Similarly, the effect of decreasing stratospheric  $O_3$  by 50 % has a marginal effect on  $4xCO_2$  ERF, increasing the forcing by just  $0.23 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  relative to the standard case. Evidently, increasing or decreasing the  $O_3$  concentration to modify stratospheric temperature (Fig. 2) does not result in a marked impact on ERF. In all three cases, NorESM2-MM simulates a considerably larger ERF than the 17 CMIP6 multi-model mean of 7.98 Wm<sup>-2</sup> reported by Smith et al. (2020a).



**Figure 2.** Zonal-mean difference in atmospheric temperature between the control integration of "Strat  $O_3 x 1.5$ " and the control integration of the "standard"  $4xCO_2$  ERF simulation (**a**) and between the control integration of "Strat  $O_3 x 0.5$ " and the control integration of the standard  $4xCO_2$  ERF simulation (**b**). Note that, for display purposes, model output on hybrid-sigma levels has been interpolated onto global-mean NorESM2-MM pressure levels.



**Figure 3.** Comparison of NorESM2-MM "standard"  $4xCO_2$  ERF, IRF, adjustments and the residual term against the ERF, IRF, adjustments and the residual term diagnosed from the "Strat  $O_3x1.5$ " and "Strat  $O_3x0.5$ " experiments. All adjustments are derived using the CESM-CAM5 kernels, and all components are calculated from the average of years 6–15 of NorESM2-MM output; hence, the values for the standard  $4xCO_2$  case shown here differ slightly from those shown in Fig. 1. Error bars show the standard error of the mean of each component; note that we do not compute an error estimate for  $\epsilon$ .

Analysis of  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  further demonstrates that these experiments do not cause a significant effect on the magnitude of the temperature adjustment throughout the stratosphere, producing just a 3 % decrease and 4 % increase in this component for Strat O<sub>3</sub>x1.5 and Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5, respectively. This corroborates experiments from He et al. (2023; see their Fig. S6) that compare the size of the stratospheric temperature adjustment after a quadrupling of CO<sub>2</sub> from two dif-

ferent base states; the multi-model ensemble-mean difference in their adjustment is just  $-0.03 \,\mathrm{Wm^{-2}}$  (although the model range is considerably larger at around  $0.5 \,\mathrm{Wm^{-2}}$ ). As described by Shine and Myhre (2020), the magnitude of stratospheric temperature adjustment is driven by the balance between enhanced stratospheric emittance at the TOA and enhanced stratospheric absorptance of upwelling irradiance from the troposphere, which lead to a cooling and warming of the stratosphere, respectively. Following an increase in CO<sub>2</sub>, enhanced TOA emission is greater than enhanced stratospheric absorptance because upwelling irradiance largely emanates from the cold upper troposphere with a low effective emitting temperature (e.g. Ramaswamy et al., 2001). Subsequently, the stratosphere cools, leading to a decrease in longwave emission to space, which, in turn, strengthens the TOA forcing. Given that the magnitude of  $A_{T_{\text{Strat}}}$  shows little variation in Fig. 3, we can infer that the net effect of increased emissivity vs. increased absorptance is similar across each experiment, ultimately leading to a cooler stratosphere and a stronger TOA radiative imbalance in all cases. Whilst increased or decreased stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> affects the degree of spectral overlap with CO<sub>2</sub> (discussed further below) and the vertical profile of stratospheric absorption and emission, it is apparent that the base state of the stratosphere is not a significant factor in determining the magnitude of our 4xCO<sub>2</sub> temperature adjustments.

Evidently, the largest impact occurs on the IRF, which increases by 8 % and decreases by 6 % when stratospheric  $O_3$  is reduced and enhanced, respectively, relative to the standard experiment. The IRF across all three experiments ranges from 4.98 to  $5.74 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ , resulting in a spread of around  $0.8 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ . This is smaller than the spread of  $2 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  (ranging from around 5 to  $7 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ ) reported by He et al. (2023) for offline "double-call" experiments of  $4xCO_2$  IRF

calculated with a single radiative transfer code and base states from the Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP) for 12 CMIP5 and CMIP6 models (hence, their spread is due only to differences in base state). However, we find closer agreement between our IRF sensitivity to 10 hPa base-state temperature and He et al. (2023), who found a near  $-0.1 \,\mathrm{Wm^{-2} \, K^{-1}}$  relation between the spread in offline double-call experiments and air temperature at this level (Fig. 1c in He et al., 2023). From Fig. 2, it can be inferred that this matches very well with the  $\sim \geq 7 \,\mathrm{K}$  difference in StratO<sub>3</sub>x1.5 and StratO<sub>3</sub>x0.5 10 hPa base-state temperature and the corresponding  $0.8 \,\mathrm{Wm^{-2}}$  spread in IRF.

The effect on IRF can be explained principally by the impact of the O<sub>3</sub> concentration changes on base-state stratospheric temperature and secondarily by the spectral overlap of CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>3</sub>.<sup>1</sup> In the Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5 case for example, the reduced O<sub>3</sub> concentration induces a colder basestate stratosphere, which reduces the emission of outgoing TIR irradiance at the TOA and makes the radiative impact of a 4xCO<sub>2</sub> perturbation more potent. The reverse is true in the Strat O<sub>3</sub>x1.5 case. In relation to spectral overlap, O<sub>3</sub> itself possesses two fundamental absorption bands in the TIR at around 9.6 and 14.27 µm, with a relatively strong band formed by overtone and combination transitions centred at 4.75  $\mu$ m. As stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> concentrations increase, TIR absorption at these wavelengths also increases to an extent that depends on the level of band saturation and the abundance of other gases absorbing at these wavelengths. The opposite occurs if stratospheric O3 concentrations decrease. For CO<sub>2</sub>, the main TIR bands lie in the window regions of the  $H_2O$  spectrum, with absorption centred at 4.3 and 15  $\mu$ m (the latter of which is highly significant due to its proximity to the peak of blackbody distribution for the Earth's effective emitting temperature). Weaker bands also occur near 10 µm. Regions of spectral overlap between O<sub>3</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> therefore arise at several wavelengths: at  $15 \,\mu\text{m}$ , the strength of CO<sub>2</sub> absorption largely masks the radiative effect of  $O_3$  at 14.27 µm, and absorption by both gases at 4.75 and 4.3 µm has little impact given their location further away from the peak of Earth's blackbody distribution. However, a decreased stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> concentration leads to weakened absorption at 9.6 µm that allows for enhanced absorption by CO<sub>2</sub> at 10 µm. Likewise, increasing the stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> concentration results in strengthened 9.6 µm absorption that mutes CO<sub>2</sub>. Combining the effect of base-state stratospheric temperature and spectral overlap, a 4xCO<sub>2</sub> perturbation therefore results in an enhancement of IRF in the Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5 case relative to the standard experiment. Correspondingly, an increase in stratospheric  $O_3$  has an opposite (albeit evidently weaker) effect.

As successive adjustments to the  $4xCO_2$  perturbation either strengthen or weaken IRF, the radiative impact of both O<sub>3</sub> experiments is either enhanced or reduced according to the sign and magnitude of each  $A_x$  term in Fig. 3 (see also Table S2 in the Supplement). Although somewhat minorly,  $A_{T_{Strat}}$ ,  $A_{T_S}$ ,  $A_{\alpha}$  and  $A_{H_2O}$  (as well as  $A_{T_{Trop}}$  for Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5) work to strengthen the difference of each experiment relative to the standard case (i.e. enhancing the TOA radiative impact for Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5 and decreasing the TOA radiative impact for Strat O<sub>3</sub>x1.5). Conversely,  $A_c$  and  $A_{T_{Trop}}$  (the latter only for Strat O<sub>3</sub>x1.5) exhibit the opposite effect, whereby the TOA radiative impact for Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5 is reduced relative to the standard case and enhanced for Strat O<sub>3</sub>x1.5.

A closer inspection of  $A_c$  (Fig. S2a in the Supplement) reveals that a significant part of this offsetting behaviour stems from  $\triangle$ CRE. This is more positive for Strat O<sub>3</sub>x1.5 (compared to the standard) and negative for Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5, implying that the presence of clouds reduces the 4xCO<sub>2</sub> ERF in the latter. Interestingly, this phenomenon occurs due to a decidedly stronger clear-sky shortwave ERF (Table S3 in the Supplement), which reduces the difference between allsky and clear-sky forcing (Fig. S2b), thereby resulting in a net negative  $\triangle CRE$  when combined with the longwave  $\Delta CRE$  (Fig. S2c and a). In general, in all cases, the 4xCO<sub>2</sub> perturbation induces a similar zonal-mean decrease in lowcloud fraction and increase in high-cloud fraction (Fig. S3a in the Supplement). However, relative to the standard base state, both O<sub>3</sub> experiments clearly have the greatest impact on cloud fraction in the upper troposphere at almost all latitudes, whereby coverage decreases in Strat O<sub>3</sub>x1.5 and increases in Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5 (Fig. S3b). As expected for high clouds, this change appears to have the strongest influence on thermal fluxes, resulting in a weaker and stronger masking of the longwave IRF for Strat O<sub>3</sub>x1.5 and Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5, respectively (Table S3). However, for the net IRF and adjustment terms (Fig. S2a), the effect of cloud masking shows little variation between each experiment and, therefore, plays a less significant role in driving the differences observed in  $A_c$ .

Finally, we note that the residual term,  $\epsilon$ , also exhibits offsetting behaviour and works to counterbalance the initial radiative impact of each O<sub>3</sub> experiment the most (Fig. 3, Table S2), implying that non-linearity in Eq. (1) is largely responsible for dampening the differences with regard to the IRF. Overall, in each experiment, the summation of IRF,  $A_x$  and  $\epsilon$  results in strikingly similar ERF values for the standard and Strat O<sub>3</sub>x1.5 cases and a slightly larger ERF for Strat O<sub>3</sub>x0.5.

In discussion of the potential climate implications of their findings, He et al. (2023) suggested that  $O_3$  depletion since the 1970s could have led to a strengthening of the TOA  $CO_2$  IRF due to the cooling of the lower stratosphere associated with  $O_3$  loss. They theorised that the combined effect of  $O_3$  depletion and  $CO_2$  increase should produce a larger  $CO_2$  ERF and a greater surface warming than model experiments that impose these perturbations separately. They calcu-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Tests performed by the GENLN2 line by line (Myhre et al., 2006) show that a decrease in temperature of 2 K across the whole stratosphere leads to a  $0.16 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  increase in  $4xCO_2$  IRF, whilst a 50 % reduction in stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> leads to a  $0.07 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  increase in  $4xCO_2$  IRF.

lated the indirect surface warming effect of  $O_3$  loss by differencing surface temperature anomalies between two such sets of experiments (historical forcing between 1985 and 2014 vs. the sum of all historical forcings between 1985 and 2014 imposed independently) and inferred that the sign and spatial distribution of the non-linear warming contribution of  $O_3$  loss to  $CO_2$  IRF is consistent with the base-state dependence of IRF. As shown above, we demonstrate that a highly idealised reduction in stratospheric  $O_3$  does lead to an enhancement of  $4xCO_2$  IRF. However, we find that this does not significantly affect the magnitude of ERF.

# 5 Conclusions

Here, we demonstrate that accurate calculation of IRF requires the use of host-model radiative transfer calculations, which can be computed either offline or online using doublecall simulations. As noted elsewhere (e.g. Chung and Soden, 2015b), we encourage modelling centres to make this diagnostic available with their simulations. Inferring IRF indirectly as the residual of ERF and the sum of adjustments can result in the erroneous estimation of its magnitude, which introduces further uncertainty into the exact nature of the inter-model spread in CO2 ERF. We further show that increasing or decreasing stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> by 50 % results in a strong warming or cooling of the stratosphere, with the peak change in temperature in each experiment reaching around 6 or -9 K, respectively. Despite the sizeable effect on stratospheric temperature, these highly idealised changes in  $O_3$ concentration do not result in a correspondingly large spread in the magnitude of stratospheric temperature adjustment or 4xCO<sub>2</sub> ERF. Instead, these experiments demonstrate a dominant impact on the magnitude of IRF, primarily due to the impact on base-state stratospheric temperature with an ancillary effect from the spectral overlap of CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>3</sub>. Given that such large changes in stratospheric O<sub>3</sub> do not yield a significant impact on 4xCO<sub>2</sub> ERF, our results suggests that inter-model differences in stratospheric O3 concentration are not predominantly responsible for the inter-model spread in CO<sub>2</sub> forcing.

**Code availability.** NorESM2 (tag release-noresm2.0.6) can be downloaded from https://github.com/NorESMhub/NorESM (see Seland et al., 2020).

**Data availability.** The CESM-CAM5 radiative kernels are freely available at https://doi.org/10.5065/D6F47MT6 (Pendergrass, 2017). The ECMWF-Oslo kernels are freely available at https://github.com/ciceroOslo/Radiative-kernels.git (Myhre et al., 2018). The HadGEM3-GA7.1 kernels are freely available at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3594673 (Smith et al., 2019). **Supplement.** The supplement related to this article is available online at https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-25-5683-2025-supplement.

Author contributions. GM had the initial idea for the work. GM and REB designed the study. REB performed the simulations with supporting calculations performed by GM and ØH. DO provided expertise on model performance. REB created the figures and wrote the paper with regular input from GM. GM, DO, ØH and MS reviewed the paper and contributed to the writing.

**Competing interests.** At least one of the (co-)authors is a member of the editorial board of *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*. The peer-review process was guided by an independent editor, and the authors also have no other competing interests to declare.

**Disclaimer.** Publisher's note: Copernicus Publications remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims made in the text, published maps, institutional affiliations, or any other geographical representation in this paper. While Copernicus Publications makes every effort to include appropriate place names, the final responsibility lies with the authors.

Acknowledgements. We thank Christopher J. Smith for his input on technical aspects of this paper and for his review and comments. We also thank Marit Sandstad for her technical advice on model simulations.

**Financial support.** This research has been supported by the EU Horizon 2020 (grant no. 820829).

**Review statement.** This paper was edited by Paulo Ceppi and reviewed by three anonymous referees.

# References

- Andrews, T., Gregory, J. M., and Webb, M. J.: The Dependence of Radiative Forcing and Feedback on Evolving Patterns of Surface Temperature Change in Climate Models, J. Climate, 28, 1630– 1648, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00545.1, 2015.
- Andrews, T., Smith, C. J., Myhre, G., Forster, P. M., Chadwick, R., and Ackerley, D.: Effective Radiative Forcing in a GCM With Fixed Surface Temperatures, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 126, e2020JD033880, https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JD033880, 2021.
- Boucher, O., Randall, D., Artaxo, C., Bretherton, G., Feingold, G., Forster, P., Kerminen, V.-M., Kondo, Y., Liao, H., Lohmann, U., Rasch, P., Satheesh, S. K., Sherwood, S., Stevens, B., and Zhang, X. Y.: Clouds and aerosols, in: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Stocker, T. F., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor, M., Allen, S. K., Boschung,

J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., and Midgley, P. M., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, 571–657, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.016, 2013.

- Checa-Garcia, R.: CMIP6 Ozone forcing dataset: supporting information, Zenodo, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1135127, 2018.
- Chung, E.-S. and Soden, B. J.: An Assessment of Direct Radiative Forcing, Radiative Adjustments, and Radiative Feedbacks in Coupled Ocean–Atmosphere Models, J. Climate, 28, 4152– 4170, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00436.1, 2015a.
- Chung, E.-S. and Soden, B. J.: An assessment of methods for computing radiative forcing in climate models, Environ. Res. Lett., 10, 074004, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/10/7/074004, 2015b.
- Collins, W. D., Ramaswamy, V., Schwarzkopf, M. D., Sun, Y., Portmann, R. W., Fu, Q., Casanova, S. E. B., Dufresne, J.-L., Fillmore, D. W., Forster, P. M. D., Galin, V. Y., Gohar, L. K., Ingram, W. J., Kratz, D. P., Lefebvre, M.-P., Li, J., Marquet, P., Oinas, V., Tsushima, Y., Uchiyama, T., and Zhong, W. Y.: Radiative forcing by well-mixed greenhouse gases: Estimates from climate models in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 111, https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JD006713, 2006.
- Conley, A. J., Lamarque, J.-F., Vitt, F., Collins, W. D., and Kiehl, J.: PORT, a CESM tool for the diagnosis of radiative forcing, Geosci. Model Dev., 6, 469–476, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-6-469-2013, 2013.
- Etminan, M., Myhre, G., Highwood, E. J., and Shine, K. P.: Radiative forcing of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide: A significant revision of the methane radiative forcing, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43, 12614–12623, https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL071930, 2016.
- Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R. J., and Taylor, K. E.: Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization, Geosci. Model Dev., 9, 1937–1958, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016, 2016.
- Forster, P., Storelvmo, T., Armour, K., Collins, W., Dufresne, J.-L., Frame, D., Lunt, D. J., Mauritsen, T., Palmer, M. D., Watanabe, M., Wild, M., and Zhang, H.: The Earth's Energy Budget, Climate Feedbacks and Climate Sensitivity, in: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B.: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.009, 923–1054, 2021.
- Forster, P. M., Richardson, T., Maycock, A. C., Smith, C. J., Samset, B. H., Myhre, G., Andrews, T., Pincus, R., and Schulz, M.: Recommendations for diagnosing effective radiative forcing from climate models for CMIP6, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 121, 12,460-412,475, https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD025320, 2016.
- Gettelman, A., Mills, M. J., Kinnison, D. E., Garcia, R. R., Smith, A. K., Marsh, D. R., Tilmes, S., Vitt, F., Bardeen, C. G., McInerny, J., Liu, H.-L., Solomon, S. C., Polvani, L. M., Emmons, L. K., Lamarque, J.-F., Richter, J. H., Glanville, A. S., Bacmeister, J. T., Phillips, A. S., Neale, R. B., Simp-

son, I. R., DuVivier, A. K., Hodzic, A., and Randel, W. J.: The Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model Version 6 (WACCM6), J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 124, 12380–12403, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD030943, 2019.

- Gregory, J. M., Ingram, W. J., Palmer, M. A., Jones, G. S., Stott, P. A., Thorpe, R. B., Lowe, J. A., Johns, T. C., and Williams, K. D.: A new method for diagnosing radiative forcing and climate sensitivity, Geophys. Res. Lett., 31, L03205, https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL018747, 2004.
- Hansen, J., Fung, I., Lacis, A., Rind, D., Lebedeff, S., Ruedy, R., Russell, G., and Stone, P.: Global climate changes as forecast by Goddard Institute for Space Studies threedimensional model, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 93, 9341–9364, https://doi.org/10.1029/JD093iD08p09341, 1988.
- Hansen, J., Sato, M., Ruedy, R., Nazarenko, L., Lacis, A., Schmidt, G. A., Russell, G., Aleinov, I., Bauer, M., Bauer, S., Bell, N., Cairns, B., Canuto, V., Chandler, M., Cheng, Y., Del Genio, A., Faluvegi, G., Fleming, E., Friend, A., Hall, T., Jackman, C., Kelley, M., Kiang, N., Koch, D., Lean, J., Lerner, J., Lo, K., Menon, S., Miller, R., Minnis, P., Novakov, T., Oinas, V., Perlwitz, J., Perlwitz, J., Rind, D., Romanou, A., Shindell, D., Stone, P., Sun, S., Tausnev, N., Thresher, D., Wielicki, B., Wong, T., Yao, M., and Zhang, S.: Efficacy of climate forcings, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 110, D18104, https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JD005776, 2005.
- He, H., Kramer, R. J., Soden, B. J., and Jeevanjee, N.: State dependence of CO<sub>2</sub> forcing and its implications for climate sensitivity, Science, 382, 1051–1056, https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abq6872, 2023.
- Iacono, M. J., Delamere, J. S., Mlawer, E. J., Shephard, M. W., Clough, S. A., and Collins, W. D.: Radiative forcing by long-lived greenhouse gases: Calculations with the AER radiative transfer models, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 113, D13103, https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD009944, 2008.
- Jeevanjee, N., Seeley, J. T., Paynter, D., and Fueglistaler, S.: An Analytical Model for Spatially Varying Clear-Sky CO<sub>2</sub> Forcing, J. Climate, 34, 9463–9480, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0756.1, 2021.
- Jonko, A. K., Shell, K. M., Sanderson, B. M., and Danabasoglu, G.: Climate Feedbacks in CCSM3 under Changing CO<sub>2</sub> Forcing. Part I: Adapting the Linear Radiative Kernel Technique to Feedback Calculations for a Broad Range of Forcings, J. Climate, 25, 5260–5272, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00524.1, 2012.
- Kamae, Y. and Watanabe, M.: On the robustness of tropospheric adjustment in CMIP5 models, Geophys. Res. Lett., 39, L23808, https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL054275, 2012.
- Keeble, J., Hassler, B., Banerjee, A., Checa-Garcia, R., Chiodo, G., Davis, S., Eyring, V., Griffiths, P. T., Morgenstern, O., Nowack, P., Zeng, G., Zhang, J., Bodeker, G., Burrows, S., Cameron-Smith, P., Cugnet, D., Danek, C., Deushi, M., Horowitz, L. W., Kubin, A., Li, L., Lohmann, G., Michou, M., Mills, M. J., Nabat, P., Olivié, D., Park, S., Seland, Ø., Stoll, J., Wieners, K.-H., and Wu, T.: Evaluating stratospheric ozone and water vapour changes in CMIP6 models from 1850 to 2100, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 21, 5015–5061, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-5015-2021, 2021.
- Marvel, K., Schmidt, G. A., Miller, R. L., and Nazarenko, L. S.: Implications for climate sensitivity from the response to individual forcings, Nat. Clim. Change, 6, 386–389, https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2888, 2016.

- Meinshausen, M., Nicholls, Z. R. J., Lewis, J., Gidden, M. J., Vogel, E., Freund, M., Beyerle, U., Gessner, C., Nauels, A., Bauer, N., Canadell, J. G., Daniel, J. S., John, A., Krummel, P. B., Luderer, G., Meinshausen, N., Montzka, S. A., Rayner, P. J., Reimann, S., Smith, S. J., van den Berg, M., Velders, G. J. M., Vollmer, M. K., and Wang, R. H. J.: The shared socioeconomic pathway (SSP) greenhouse gas concentrations and their extensions to 2500, Geosci. Model Dev., 13, 3571–3605, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-3571-2020, 2020.
- Myhre, G., Highwood, E. J., Shine, K. P., and Stordal, F.: New estimates of radiative forcing due to well mixed greenhouse gases, Geophys. Res. Lett., 25, 2715–2718, https://doi.org/10.1029/98GL01908, 1998.
- Myhre, G., Stordal, F., Gausemel, I., Nielsen, C. J., and Mahieu, E.: Line-by-line calculations of thermal infrared radiation representative for global condition: CFC-12 as an example, J. Quant. Spectrosc. Ra., 97, 317–331, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2005.04.015, 2006.
- Myhre, G., Shindell, D., Bréon, F.-M., Collins, W., Fuglestvedt, J., Huang, J., Koch, D., Lamarque, J.-F., Lee, D., Mendoza, B., Nakajima, T., Robock, A., Stephens, G., Takemura, T., and Zhang, H.: Anthropogenic and natural radiative forcing, in: Climate change 2013: The physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Stocker, T. F., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor, M., Allen, S. K., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., and Midgley, P. M., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 659–740, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.018, 2013.
- Myhre, G., Kramer, R. J., Smith, C. J., Hodnebrog, Ø., Forster, P., Soden, B. J., Samset, B. H., Stjern, C. W., Andrews, T., Boucher, O., Faluvegi, G., Fläschner, D., Kasoar, M., Kirkevåg, A., Lamarque, J.-F., Olivié, D., Richardson, T., Shindell, D., Stier, P., Takemura, T., Voulgarakis, A., and Watson-Parris, D.: Quantifying the Importance of Rapid Adjustments for Global Precipitation Changes, Geophys. Res. Lett., 45, 11399–11405, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL079474, 2018 (data available at: https://github.com/ciceroOslo/Radiative-kernels.git, last access: 21 June 2023).
- Pendergrass, A. G.: CAM5 Radiative Kernels, Zenodo [data set], https://doi.org/10.5065/D6F47MT6, 2017.
- Pendergrass, A. G., Conley, A., and Vitt, F. M.: Surface and top-ofatmosphere radiative feedback kernels for CESM-CAM5, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 10, 317–324, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-10-317-2018, 2018.
- Pincus, R., Mlawer, E. J., Oreopoulos, L., Ackerman, A. S., Baek, S., Brath, M., Buehler, S. A., Cady-Pereira, K. E., Cole, J. N. S., Dufresne, J.-L., Kelley, M., Li, J., Manners, J., Paynter, D. J., Roehrig, R., Sekiguchi, M., and Schwarzkopf, D. M.: Radiative flux and forcing parameterization error in aerosol-free clear skies, Geophys. Res. Lett., 42, 5485–5492, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064291, 2015.
- Pincus, R., Forster, P. M., and Stevens, B.: The Radiative Forcing Model Intercomparison Project (RFMIP): experimental protocol for CMIP6, Geosci. Model Dev., 9, 3447–3460, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3447-2016, 2016.
- Pincus, R., Buehler, S. A., Brath, M., Crevoisier, C., Jamil, O., Franklin Evans, K., Manners, J., Menzel, R. L., Mlawer,

E. J., Paynter, D., Pernak, R. L., and Tellier, Y.: Benchmark Calculations of Radiative Forcing by Greenhouse Gases, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 125, e2020JD033483, https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JD033483, 2020.

- Ramaswamy, V., Chanin, M.-L., Angell, J., Barnett, J., Gaffen, D., Gelman, M., Keckhut, P., Koshelkov, Y., Labitzke, K., Lin, J.-J. R., O'Neill, A., Nash, J., Randel, W., Rood, R., Shine, K., Shiotani, M., and Swinbank, R.: Stratospheric temperature trends: Observations and model simulations, Rev. Geophys., 39, 71–122, https://doi.org/10.1029/1999RG000065, 2001.
- Ramaswamy, V., Collins, W., Haywood, J., Lean, J., Mahowald, N., Myhre, G., Naik, V., Shine, K. P., Soden, B., Stenchikov, G., and Storelvmo, T.: Radiative Forcing of Climate: The Historical Evolution of the Radiative Forcing Concept, the Forcing Agents and their Quantification, and Applications, Meteor. Mon., 59, 14.1–14.101, https://doi.org/10.1175/AMSMONOGRAPHS-D-19-0001.1, 2019.
- Richardson, T. B., Forster, P. M., Smith, C. J., Maycock, A. C., Wood, T., Andrews, T., Boucher, O., Faluvegi, G., Fläschner, D., Hodnebrog, Ø., Kasoar, M., Kirkevåg, A., Lamarque, J.-F., Mülmenstädt, J., Myhre, G., Olivié, D., Portmann, R. W., Samset, B. H., Shawki, D., Shindell, D., Stier, P., Takemura, T., Voulgarakis, A., and Watson-Parris, D.: Efficacy of Climate Forcings in PDRMIP Models, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 124, 12824–12844, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD030581, 2019.
- Seland, Ø., Bentsen, M., Olivié, D., Toniazzo, T., Gjermundsen, A., Graff, L. S., Debernard, J. B., Gupta, A. K., He, Y.-C., Kirkevåg, A., Schwinger, J., Tjiputra, J., Aas, K. S., Bethke, I., Fan, Y., Griesfeller, J., Grini, A., Guo, C., Ilicak, M., Karset, I. H. H., Landgren, O., Liakka, J., Moseid, K. O., Nummelin, A., Spensberger, C., Tang, H., Zhang, Z., Heinze, C., Iversen, T., and Schulz, M.: Overview of the Norwegian Earth System Model (NorESM2) and key climate response of CMIP6 DECK, historical, and scenario simulations, Geosci. Model Dev., 13, 6165– 6200, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-6165-2020, 2020 (code available at: https://github.com/NorESMhub/NorESM, last access: 16 June 2022).
- Shell, K. M., Kiehl, J. T., and Shields, C. A.: Using the Radiative Kernel Technique to Calculate Climate Feedbacks in NCAR's Community Atmospheric Model, J. Climate, 21, 2269–2282, https://doi.org/10.1175/2007JCLI2044.1, 2008.
- Sherwood, S. C., Bony, S., Boucher, O., Bretherton, C., Forster, P. M., Gregory, J. M., and Stevens, B.: Adjustments in the Forcing-Feedback Framework for Understanding Climate Change, B. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 96, 217–228, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00167.1, 2015.
- Shine, K. P. and Myhre, G.: The spectral nature of stratospheric temperature adjustment and its application to halocarbon radiative forcing, J. Adv. Model. Earth Sy., 12, e2019MS001951, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001951, 2020.
- Smith, C.: HadGEM3-GA7.1 radiative kernels, Zenodo [data set], https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3594673, 2019.
- Smith, C. J., Kramer, R. J., Myhre, G., Forster, P. M., Soden, B. J., Andrews, T., Boucher, O., Faluvegi, G., Fläschner, D., Hodnebrog, Ø., Kasoar, M., Kharin, V., Kirkevåg, A., Lamarque, J.-F., Mülmenstädt, J., Olivié, D., Richardson, T., Samset, B. H., Shindell, D., Stier, P., Takemura, T., Voulgarakis, A., and Watson-Parris, D.: Understanding Rapid Adjustments to Di-

verse Forcing Agents, Geophys. Res. Lett., 45, 12023–12031, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL079826, 2018.

- Smith, C. J., Kramer, R. J., Myhre, G., Alterskjær, K., Collins, W., Sima, A., Boucher, O., Dufresne, J.-L., Nabat, P., Michou, M., Yukimoto, S., Cole, J., Paynter, D., Shiogama, H., O'Connor, F. M., Robertson, E., Wiltshire, A., Andrews, T., Hannay, C., Miller, R., Nazarenko, L., Kirkevåg, A., Olivié, D., Fiedler, S., Lewinschal, A., Mackallah, C., Dix, M., Pincus, R., and Forster, P. M.: Effective radiative forcing and adjustments in CMIP6 models, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 20, 9591–9618, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-9591-2020, 2020a.
- Smith, C. J., Kramer, R. J., and Sima, A.: The HadGEM3-GA7.1 radiative kernel: the importance of a well-resolved stratosphere, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 12, 2157–2168, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-2157-2020, 2020b.

- Soden, B. J., Held, I. M., Colman, R., Shell, K. M., Kiehl, J. T., and Shields, C. A.: Quantifying Climate Feedbacks Using Radiative Kernels, J. Climate, 21, 3504–3520, https://doi.org/10.1175/2007JCLI2110.1, 2008.
- Soden, B. J., Collins, W. D., and Feldman, D. R.: Reducing uncertainties in climate models, Science, 361, 326–327, https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau1864, 2018.
- Zelinka, M. D., Andrews, T., Forster, P. M., and Taylor, K. E.: Quantifying components of aerosol-cloud-radiation interactions in climate models, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 119, 7599–7615, https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD021710, 2014.
- Zhang, M. and Huang, Y.: Radiative Forcing of Quadrupling CO<sub>2</sub>, J. Climate, 27, 2496–2508, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-13-00535.1, 2014.