

## ***Interactive comment on “Climatic effects of 1950–2050 changes in US anthropogenic aerosols – Part 2: Climate response” by E. M. Leibensperger et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 16 September 2011

“Climatic effects of 1950–2050 changes in US anthropogenic aerosols – Part 2: Climate response” by Leibensperger et al presents the results of a study examining the response to US aerosols in a climate model. The study is generally well written and informative, and the results are interesting and well-worth presenting to the community. In general I feel the authors have done an excellent job describing the motivation, experimental setup, and the results. The figures are also clear and informative, and overall I commend the authors on a very good discussion paper. I have only three main issues I would like to see addressed in revision before I would consider this paper acceptable for publication in ACP.

C9016

The first issue is that I would like to see more attention given to the statistical significance of some of the trends. In particular, on P24143, I11-16, the authors should discuss the statistical significance of the results in Table 1 when drawing their conclusions. It looks like none of the differences between simulations are statistically significant in any time periods, and differences between either simulation and the observations are also not significant. The insignificance of the Table 1 results suggests that this may simply be too short a trend to get reliable climate information. While more ensemble members could have reduced the uncertainty in the model runs, the 1960-1979 and 1980-2010 periods in the observational record do not have statistically different trends.

The second issue is that there are two issues in particular where I do not feel that the authors have fully put their results into context with the literature. These concern the relationship of the location of forcing with the pattern of temperature response in this study vs prior work, and the relationship of the BC results from the GEOS-Chem model used here in comparison with other published studies (see my detailed comments on these two issues below).

The final issue is that the ‘Conclusions’ section starts with 6 paragraphs summarizing what we’ve just read, with only two short paragraphs at the end discussing the implications. A broader discussion of the implications and relationship to other works (as in issue 2) would make for a much more valuable conclusion, and I’d suggest that a very short summary followed by a substantially enhanced discussion could provide a good way to address the issues raised above.

Specific context issues:

P. 24131, I. 6-18: This paragraph discusses prior modeling of the climate impact of regionally inhomogeneous aerosol forcing. It present a somewhat black and white picture, with several studies cited initially that show ‘a strong regional climate sensitivity to aerosols’ and then another group of studies that show ‘patterns similar to (but opposite in sign) to greenhouse gas forcing’. The implication is that the climate response

C9017

to aerosols is either entirely local or is just the same as for homogeneous greenhouse gas forcing. The latter is not an accurate description, as the four recent studies cited there (Shindell et al., 2007, 2008; Levy et al., 2008; Kloster et al., 2009) all show climate responses that are quite distinct from those seen in response to greenhouse gases. Figure 7 of Shindell et al (2008), for example, compares the climate responses to short- and long-lived species forcings in the GISS, NCAR and GFDL models, and in all three there are distinct differences. The Northern and Southern Hemispheres, for example, behave rather differently in these cases, and the Arctic response in some models is strong compared with elsewhere for both long- and short-lived forcings, and in others it is not. Similarly, Figure 3 in Kloster et al (2009) shows a much weaker Southern Hemisphere response to aerosol forcing than to greenhouse gases while the Northern Hemisphere response is fairly similar. An overall conclusion from a visual inspection of these climate response patterns suggests a more nuanced effect, with the response often being largest in areas where forcing is large, but not necessarily being highly localized to the forcing location. One need not rely solely on visual inspection, however, as there is another study that the authors have missed that attempts to quantify this link. Shindell et al (2010) examined exactly this question using the results of four GCMs and quantified length scales of influence. They found that inhomogeneous aerosol forcing does indeed tend to cause a strong impact locally in those GCMs, but the impacts is not confined to those areas and extends quite far in the zonal direction while not extending nearly as far in the meridional (consistent with transport timescales in the atmosphere). The surface temperature response presented in the authors' Figure 3 is in fact consistent with the general pattern of the other GCMs, showing a response to US emissions that is greatest for the Eastern US but which extends broadly around the Northern Hemisphere mid-latitudes while having little impact on the tropics or the Southern Hemisphere. Hence the response in this model relative to other GCMs should be put into context with the prior work showing that the spatial structure is not black or white (purely local or insensitive to the spatial structure), but somewhere in between. It may be that the response in this model is a bit more localized

C9018

than the others – the authors could calculate the same metric as in the Shindell et al (2010) paper to see – but the broad relationship appears similar to me. Currently, this topic is raised in the introduction, but the authors do not return to it when they present their forcing and temperature results nor in their conclusion. In my opinion, it would be useful to revise the introduction to better reflect the other GCM results, and to discuss how the current results fit into context with those in the conclusion.

P24146, I 16-19: The authors concluded that BC has minimal effect on temperatures for the US. Their result needs to be put into context as well, as there is ample literature on the uncertainties in modeling BC. The authors use the Chen et al (JGR, 2010) representation of aerosol indirect effects. They conclude that 'BC sources in the US are too small for their climatic impact to be significant'. The model they use was shown in Chen et al (GRL, 2010) to give a net warming for reductions in BC. In that sense, it's no surprise that mitigation of BC does not give cooling in this study, regardless of their size. However, there are multiple other studies that give very different results from Chen et al (e.g. Bauer et al., 2010; Koch and Del Genio, 2010 and the many papers reviewed therein; Jacobson, 2010). A useful discussion would be to put the current results into context with these other studies.

#### References

D. Koch, A. Del Genio, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 10, 7685 (2010).

S. E. Bauer, S. Menon, D. Koch, T. C. Bond, K. Tsigaridis, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 10, 7439 (2010).

Jacobson, M. Z. (2010), Short-term effects of controlling fossil-fuel soot, biofuel soot and gases, and methane on climate, Arctic ice, and air pollution health, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, D14209, doi:10.1029/2009JD013795.

Shindell, D., M. Schulz, Y. Ming, T. Takemura, G. Faluvegi, and V. Ramaswamy (2010), Spatial scales of climate response to inhomogeneous radiative forcing, *J. Geophys.*

C9019

Res., 115, D19110, doi:10.1029/2010JD014108.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 24127, 2011.

C9020