

1 Modeling the influences of aerosols on Pre-monsoon circulation and rainfall over Southeast  
2 Asia

3 D. Lee<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Y. C. Sud<sup>2</sup>, L. Oreopoulos<sup>2</sup>, K.-M. Kim<sup>2</sup>, W. K. Lau<sup>2</sup>, and I.-S. Kang<sup>3</sup>

4

5 1. GESTAR, Morgan State University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

6 2. Earth Sciences Division, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, USA

7 3. School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea

8 Correspondence to: D. Lee (Dongmin.Lee@nasa.gov)

9

1 Abstract

2 We conduct several sets of simulations with a version of NASA's Goddard Earth Observing  
3 System, version 5, (GEOS-5) Atmospheric Global Climate Model (AGCM) equipped with a  
4 two-moment cloud microphysical scheme to understand the role of biomass burning aerosol  
5 (BBA) emissions in Southeast Asia (SEA) in the pre-monsoon period: February - May. Our  
6 experiments are designed so that both direct and indirect aerosol effects can be evaluated. For  
7 climatologically prescribed monthly sea surface temperatures, we conduct sets of model  
8 integrations with and without biomass burning emissions in the area of peak burning activity,  
9 and with direct aerosol radiative effects either active or inactive. Taking appropriate differences  
10 between AGCM experiment sets, we find that BBA affects liquid clouds in statistically  
11 significantly ways, increasing cloud droplet number concentrations, decreasing droplet effective  
12 radii (i.e., a classic aerosol indirect effect), and locally suppressing precipitation due to a  
13 deceleration of the autoconversion process, with the latter effect apparently also leading to cloud  
14 condensate increases. Geographical re-arrangements of precipitation patterns, with precipitation  
15 increases downwind of aerosol sources are also seen, most likely because of advection of weakly  
16 precipitating cloud fields. Somewhat unexpectedly, the change in cloud radiative effect (cloud  
17 forcing) at surface is in the direction of lesser cooling because of decreases in cloud fraction.  
18 Overall, however, because of direct radiative effect contributions, aerosols exert a net negative  
19 forcing at both the top of the atmosphere and, perhaps most importantly, the surface, where  
20 decreased evaporation triggers feedbacks that further reduce precipitation. Invoking the  
21 approximation that direct and indirect aerosol effects are additive, we estimate that the overall  
22 precipitation reduction is about 40% due to the direct effects of absorbing aerosols which  
23 stabilize the atmosphere and reduce surface latent heat fluxes via cooler land surface  
24 temperatures. Further refinements of our two-moment cloud microphysics scheme are needed for  
25 a more complete examination of the role of aerosol-convection interactions in the seasonal  
26 development of the SEA monsoon.

27

## 1 Introduction

2 Use of fossil fuels for ever-growing energy demands, particularly in developing countries, has  
3 led to increased concentrations of aerosol-laden combustion by-products, especially in the  
4 planetary boundary layer (PBL) (Roelofs, 2013). Moorthy et al. (2013) estimate that aerosols  
5 over India have been increasing at the rate of 2-4% per year over the last three decades resulting  
6 in doubled aerosol optical depth (AOD) in India's lower atmosphere. Similar changes are  
7 expected over other regions such as Southeast Asia (SEA). Biomass burning (BB) is an age-old  
8 method of disposing agricultural trash (Taylor, 2010) and in SEA, it occurs primarily during the  
9 spring season (i.e., February-March-April, FMA; Gautam et al., 2013). Over SEA, the  
10 combustion by-products released into the atmosphere contain large quantities of biogenic  
11 aerosol/carbon particles whose quantitative estimates are being tabulated with extensive  
12 measurements (Wiedinmyer et al., 2011).

13 Biomass burning aerosol (BBA) can affect the atmospheric circulation in several ways. BBA  
14 absorbs and reflects solar radiation, thereby reducing the solar radiation reaching the surface,  
15 reducing surface sensible and latent heat fluxes (Ramanathan et al., 2005). Chung and  
16 Ramanathan (2006) showed the so-called "Atmospheric Brown Cloud" decreases the surface  
17 solar radiation flux which reduces surface evaporation while also weakening latitudinal sea  
18 surface temperature (SST) gradients and stabilizing the troposphere causing monsoon rainfall  
19 decreases. On the other hand, absorption of solar radiation at the aerosol level warms the local  
20 atmosphere, inducing elevated heating that can invigorate air mass convergence near the surface  
21 and with the addition of sensible and latent heat, can make the PBL unstable enough to promote  
22 moist convection (Lau et al., 2006; Lau and Kim, 2006; Lau and Kim, 2013). The net outcome of  
23 the resulting complex feedback interactions may either increase or decrease local rainfall (Meehl  
24 et al., 2008). Furthermore, many particles from BB emission are active cloud condensation  
25 nuclei (CCN) (Petters et al., 2009). Hence more BB emission leads to more CCN and ice nuclei  
26 (IN) and thereby more cloud particles. If we assume that the net condensate production is solely  
27 governed by cloud-scale dynamics, i.e., more CCN would imply larger number but smaller cloud  
28 droplet and thereby an increase in cloud albedo (Twomey, 1977). Smaller cloud particles would  
29 also hamper the autoconversion of cloud water into precipitation, so the presence of BB sources  
30 is expected to reduce precipitation production rate and increase cloud lifetime (Albrecht, 1989).

1 However, this process is only applicable to warm rain. Observations show that cold and mixed  
2 cloud regimes have complicated responses as summarized in Tao et al. (2012, Table 1). Li et al.  
3 (2011) show that cloud-top height and thickness increase with aerosol concentration in mixed-  
4 phase clouds and rain increases with aerosol concentration in deep clouds, but declines in clouds  
5 that have low liquid-water content with extensive observational analysis in Atmospheric  
6 Radiation Measurement (ARM) site at Southern Great Plains.

7 Satellite data reveal that during FMA, the SEA region exhibits the highest aerosol concentrations,  
8 an order of magnitude greater than that in the summer monsoon May-June-July-August (MJJA)  
9 season because of more BBA sources during dry FMA (Ichoku et al., 2008; Lin et al., 2009) and  
10 less wet scavenging of aerosols compared to rainy MJJA. Accordingly, aerosol optical depth and  
11 aerosol-activated cloud particle numbers are expected to be much larger in FMA than MJJA.  
12 This is the main reason for focusing this investigation of BBA direct and indirect effects on FMA  
13 and the transition month of May. Our working hypothesis is that, high aerosol number  
14 concentration in FMA has strong influence on the radiative forcing, circulation, and precipitation  
15 of the local and surrounding region. Important factors would be aerosol – cloud - radiation  
16 interactions. The cloud cover over SEA is generally composed of stratiform, low-altitude clouds  
17 associated with frontal systems that originate in China (Hsu et al. 2003). Major type of  
18 precipitation would be warm rainfall in the focused season.

19 Direct and indirect effects of aerosols are intrinsically interactive, and therefore their combined  
20 effects can be very different from their linear sum. Even though the fundamental physics of  
21 aerosol direct and indirect effects is reasonably well understood, uncertainty of aerosol data  
22 under cloudy conditions and complexities in coupling the aerosol-cloud-radiation interactions  
23 prohibit a better understanding of the impact of these processes. For example, a positive  
24 relationship between AOD and total cloud cover (TCC) was shown in satellite data (Kaufman et  
25 al., 2005; Kaufman and Koren, 2006), but the dominant contribution to the AOD-TCC  
26 relationship have been attributed to aerosol swelling in humid air rather than the direct effects of  
27 aerosols on the cloud fields (Quass et al., 2010).

28 Aerosol-cloud interaction effects on South Asia to East Asia circulation and monsoons has been  
29 the subject of investigations with regional models (Wu et al., 2013; Lim et al., 2014) as well as  
30 global climate models (Bollasina et al., 2011; Ganguly et al., 2013; Guo et al., 2013). Our current

1 cloud physics scheme, Microphysics of clouds with Relaxed Arakawa-Schubert moist  
2 convection upgraded with prognostic Aerosol Cloud interactions (McRAS-AC; Sud et al., 2013),  
3 has indirect effect simulation capabilities, and has been implemented in the GEOS-5 AGCM  
4 (Rienecker et al., 2008). It provides an opportunity to perform simulation studies to  
5 systematically assess the influence of BBA on rainfall and circulation in SEA. Clearly,  
6 constrained model simulations are one plausible way to better distinguish between the roles of  
7 direct and indirect effects and their interactive influences that depend on circulation, cloud types,  
8 and aerosol-dependent cloud microphysics. While in principle these effects can be properly  
9 simulated only with a coupled ocean-atmosphere model, as a first step we use an AGCM with  
10 prescribed monthly SSTs and with aerosol emission anomalies prescribed from the Quick Fire  
11 Emissions Dataset (QFED) dataset (See Section 2.1). This way we can isolate the influence of  
12 BBA over land by comparative assessments of circulation and rainfall changes in neighboring  
13 regions.

14 In this endeavor, we perform a comprehensive model simulation study with the physically  
15 interactive aerosol-cloud-radiation treatment of McRAS-AC as implemented in the GEOS-5  
16 AGCM, in order to better understand the spatiotemporal modulation of the SEA pre-monsoon  
17 season by BBA. Section 2 describes the dataset, model and experimental design; results and a  
18 summary are presented in sections 3 and 4, respectively.

## 19 2. Data, model and experimental design

### 20 2.1 Datasets for aerosol effect analysis

21 BB is a major source of primary emissions of carbonaceous aerosols over the SEA region. QFED  
22 (Darmenov and da Silva, 2013) was developed to meet the needs of the NASA Goddard Earth  
23 Observing System Model (GEOS) with regard to atmospheric constituent modeling and data  
24 assimilation of BB events. QFED is based on global gridded fire radiative power, derived from  
25 the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) Level 2 fire product. QFED is  
26 used not only as a BB inventory for the global Goddard Chemistry Aerosol Radiation and  
27 Transport (GOCART, Chin et al., 2002, Colarco et al., 2010) model in the GEOS-5 system, but  
28 also as an index indicating high BB days for our composite analysis. Version 2.2 used in this  
29 study covers the period from January 2003 to December 2010. The QFED Level-3 products are

1 available at  $0.3125 \times 0.25$  degree horizontal resolution, but are degraded to  $2.5 \times 2.0$  degree for use  
2 in the present model simulation. The  $1^\circ$  MODIS Aqua level 3 daily product (MYD03\_D3) is  
3 used for aerosol optical depth (Chu et al., 2002) and liquid cloud effective radius (Platnick et al.,  
4 2003). The data cover the period from July 2002 to present. For precipitation, 1-degree daily  
5 Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP-1DD; Huffman et al. 2001) data are used  
6 covering the period October 1996 to present.

## 7 2.2 GEOS-5 AGCM with double moment microphysics and updated radiation

8 The numerical model used for this study is the GEOS-5 AGCM, version Fortuna 2.5 documented  
9 by Molod et al. (2012). In the current application, McRAS-AC replaces the cloud scheme of the  
10 baseline model. McRAS-AC synthesizes the initial version of McRAS (described in Sud and  
11 Walker, 1999, 2003) with subsequently developed aerosol-cloud interaction microphysics  
12 described in Sud and Lee (2007). The latest modification to McRAS-AC includes the addition of  
13 Barahona and Nenes (2009a, b) ice nucleation for mixed phase and ice phase clouds, as well as  
14 Fountoukis and Nenes (2005) liquid droplet formation. The precipitation parameterization  
15 remains as before, namely Sud and Lee (2007) for the liquid phase and Sundqvist (1988) for the  
16 mixed and ice phases. In-cloud evaporation, precipitation and self-collection of cloud water are  
17 parameterized according to Sud and Lee (2007) employing a reformulated version of the Seifert  
18 and Beheng (2001, 2006) parameterization to handle the much thicker cloud-layers encountered  
19 in a coarse resolution GCM. These algorithms work seamlessly across widely varying vertical  
20 model-layer thicknesses. Any change in the cloud water substance mass by  
21 condensation/deposition and/or collection by precipitation works interactively through an  
22 implicit backward numerical integration that approximates the solution of the basic nonlinear  
23 coupled differential equations for the cloud source and sink terms of the mass balance tendency  
24 equation. Despite using the observationally-based Sundqvist (1988) equations for the mixed  
25 phase and ice phase precipitation tendencies, the implementation of Barahona and Nenes (2009a,  
26 b) ice nucleation and Bergeron-Findeisen cloud water-to-ice mass transfer (Rotstayn et al., 2000)  
27 allows a reasonable separation of cloud liquid and ice mass fractions with their accompanying  
28 liquid and ice particle number concentrations. Homogenous freezing of in-cloud liquid droplets  
29 surviving below  $-38^\circ\text{C}$  is enforced by assuming instantaneous freezing. Aerosol – cloud  
30 interactions are implemented into both stratiform (large-scale) clouds, and convective towers

1 topped by detraining convective anvils that transform into large-scale clouds at a prescribed  
2 time-scale of an hour. Sud et al. (2013) provides a much more comprehensive discussion of  
3 McRAS-AC (including treatment of the different cloud types) and its comparative performance  
4 against the cloud scheme of the baseline model. That study also includes sensitivity studies with  
5 an interactive aerosol module and modified aerosol size distribution. The model used in the  
6 current study contains all the upgrades outlined above. The CFMIP Observation Simulator  
7 Package (COSIP, <http://cfmip.metoffice.com/COSIP.html>) is also employed on-line in our  
8 experiments. Because of the significant differences between the way clouds are observed and  
9 represented in models, a “satellite simulator” facilitates proper comparison and validations of the  
10 key simulated cloud and radiation fields against observations (Klein et al., 2013). The GOCART  
11 module provides prognostic aerosols fields consisting of five aerosol species with fifteen modes.  
12 There are five modes of dust and sea salt sorted in different particle size bins; there are two  
13 modes of organic and black carbon to sort hydrophilic and hydrophobic particles; and one mode  
14 of sulfate particles. All aerosol modes are assumed to be ‘externally’ mixed. The GOCART  
15 module runs interactively and provides prognostic aerosol fields within the AGCM.

16 Accurate radiation calculations are also very important for properly simulating aerosol  
17 direct/indirect effect. Our means of calculating realistic cloud radiative effect (CRE) is the  
18 advanced RRTMG radiative transfer package (Clough et al. 2005) equipped with a subcolumn  
19 generator in the GEOS-5 AGCM. RRTMG can be run in Monte Carlo Independent Column  
20 Approximation (McICA) mode (Pincus et al. 2003) that operates on subcolumns with either clear  
21 or completely overcast cloud layers produced by a cloud generator. Whether the cloud  
22 condensate in a particular layer is different from subcolumn to subcolumn depends on the  
23 specific assumptions about horizontal cloud heterogeneity as determined by distributions of  
24 condensate specified within the cloud generator. A prior implementation of McRAS-AC (Sud et  
25 al. 2013) used cloud water path scaling to account for the radiative effects of subgrid scale cloud  
26 water inhomogeneity. More detailed discussions about RRTMG in the GEOS-5 AGCM can be  
27 found in Oreopoulos et al. (2012).

## 28 2.3 Experimental design

29 In order to investigate BBA effects on SEA climate, several observation-inspired experiments  
30 with and without BB emission over SEA are designed. Fig. 1a shows the climatological amount

1 of carbonaceous aerosol emission from BB during FMA averaged over 8 years from 2003 to  
2 2010, and Fig. 1b depicts the time series of the boxed area. The QFED dataset described earlier  
3 was used for this figure. Massive BB emissions occur during FMA in the eastern regions of  
4 Cambodia, Myanmar, Laos, and northern Thailand with peaks in March. Fig. 1b shows large  
5 temporal variations of BB emissions. It could be high in one month and also could become near  
6 zero in another month.

7 To isolate the potential BBA effects, the AGCM experiments were performed with  
8 climatological SSTs, to eliminate large-scale forcing (e.g. El Nino events) influences due to SST  
9 variability. Moreover, to separate the signal from model own internal variability, multi-member  
10 ensemble simulations were performed. Each simulation-set consists of a ten-member ensemble  
11 covering the early January to late August period; each runs starts with different initial conditions  
12 taken from the model runs used in Sud et al. (2013). To estimate the signal of aerosol effects on  
13 climate variability, we conducted experiments with ‘Zero’ BB emission over the green dash box  
14 region (Fig. 1a) and compared them to experiments with ‘High’ BB emission in 2007. BB  
15 emissions outside of the boxed area and all other sources of aerosol were set to climatological  
16 means for both ‘High’ and ‘Zero’ emission experiments. Such an “aerosol on” and “aerosol off”  
17 design is often used in aerosol – climate sensitivity studies (e.g., Lau et al., 2006; Wu et al., 2013)  
18 to better depict the aerosol signal, but this methodology has the drawback of making comparison  
19 of simulations with observations difficult. Initial simulation sets using year-to-year emission  
20 dataset did not yield statistically significant differences on circulation, while some sensitivity to  
21 enhanced emissions could be discerned in increased AODs, brightened liquid clouds and  
22 decreased rainfall. Clearly, by design, the differences between ‘High’ and ‘Zero’ emission  
23 experiments yield the effect of BBA, black carbon, organic carbon, and sulfate originating from  
24 the boxed area and in order to isolate statistically significant signals a Student’s t-test is  
25 employed. We considered the differences exceeding 95% confidence level in a difference field as  
26 statistically significant.

27 The differences between ‘HighBoth’ and ‘ZeroBoth’ simulations are a measure of the total BB  
28 effect. Here, ‘Both’ means that the model’s experimental setup includes both aerosol direct and  
29 indirect effects. The indirect only simulations are denoted by ‘HighInd’ and ‘ZeroInd’  
30 experiments. In these simulations, we neglect the aerosol direct effect by turning off aerosol



1 radiative interactions globally, thereby allowing only the indirect effects of aerosols to operate on  
2 clouds and influence their radiative effects. ‘HighInd’ minus ‘ZeroInd’ differences therefore  
3 measure the strength of the BBA indirect effect. Finally, while not additive due to nonlinearities,  
4 comparing ‘Both’ and ‘Ind’ runs gives insight into the relative contributions of direct and  
5 indirect effects to the total aerosol effect.

### 6 3. Results

#### 7 3.1 Comparison between model simulations and satellite observations

8 Some insight on the effects of BB in SEA can be obtained by comparing high and  
9 climatological BB conditions in observations. We have constructed composites of MODIS Aqua  
10 Level 3 daily products (MYD03\_D8) for 36 days of highest BB emission index within the 2003  
11 to 2010 period. The BB emission index is defined as area average for dashed box area in Fig 1a.  
12 Smoothed time series of the index is shown in Fig. 1b. Fig. 2 shows comparisons between the  
13 high emission days and the 8-year climatology of MODIS-Aqua AOD (Fig. 2a) and liquid cloud  
14 effective radius ( $R_{eff}$ , Fig. 2b). When BB is high in FMA over inland areas of SEA compared to  
15 normal days, anomalously high AOD appears over the northern part of SEA up to the coast of  
16 southern China. According to Lau and Kim (2013), low-level wind in the area carries BBA from  
17 the source region to southern China, resulting in the high BB AOD anomaly of Fig. 2a.  
18 According to the rightmost panel of Fig. 2b, the corresponding negative anomaly of  $R_{eff}$   
19 coincides with the region where a positive AOD anomaly exists. This is a classic manifestation  
20 of aerosol indirect effect whereby increased BBA reduces the size of cloud droplets by  
21 increasing CCN number concentration. Indeed if the negative anomaly of  $R_{eff}$  is related to aerosol,  
22 then the imprints of other aerosol indirect effects may also exist in other meteorological fields,  
23 such as the precipitation. Fig. 2c compares composited daily GPCP precipitation for the  
24 enhanced BB days and the climatology. The difference plot reveals a negative precipitation  
25 anomaly over the aerosol source and its adjacent areas while in the vicinity of the east coast of  
26 China increased rainfall is observed. This can be interpreted in a Lagrangian framework, by the  
27 cloud holding more cloud water due to reduced autoconversion efficiency, but as the cloud  
28 advects downwind (i.e., towards the northeast direction) and eventually releasing cloud water as  
29 precipitation far away from the source region. Higher BB emission days are selected from every  
30 year and compared with climatology, to remove interannual variability and SST forcing and

1 isolate the BBA effects. However, since large-scale SST forcings, such as El Nino, can trigger  
2 simultaneously a reduction in precipitation and an increase in aerosols (Tosca et al., 2010) it is  
3 necessary to study shifts in the precipitation pattern from AGCM simulations.

4 In order to evaluate the sensitivity of the AGCM to BBA variations, model output is compared to  
5 the satellite data analysis. Fig. 3 shows the overall BBA simulated sensitivity of the model as the  
6 difference between “HighBoth” and “ZeroBoth” experiments. Anomalies in  $R_{eff}$  are obtained  
7 using COSP’s MODIS simulator in the GEOS-5 AGCM for fair comparison with observations.  
8 For the ten-member ensemble mean, simulated AOD increases downwind (i.e., towards the  
9 northeast direction) of the BB source and correspondingly  $R_{eff}$  decreases. Not only are McRAS-  
10 AC AGCM simulations capable of simulating the response of cloud droplets to AOD, but the  
11 model’s overall response exhibits reasonable spatial coherence with the composite maps of  
12 observations data (Fig. 2), particularly on the downwind side of the BB source. Wind vectors at  
13 800 hPa are plotted on Fig. 3a to explain an advection of BBA. For precipitation, the  
14 observations show a dipole-like anomaly pattern, namely overall decrease near source area and at  
15 eastern locations, and increase further east near the coast (Fig. 2c, Diff). In the model, on the  
16 other hand, the average BB signal on FMA precipitation materializes as a reduction in the  
17 precipitation of large areas south and east of the source region. Since SSTs were prescribed  
18 climatologically, less meaningful responses over the ocean is expected. Potential BBA effects on  
19 SEA pre-monsoon are investigated further in the following sections by taking appropriate  
20 differences of GEOS-5 experimental sets described earlier.

### 21 3.2 BB effects on cloud microphysics and precipitation simulation

22 One of the mechanisms that changes the nature and amount of precipitation is cloud  
23 microphysical processes as influenced by aerosols, widely known as the aerosol second indirect  
24 effect (Albrecht, 1989). This mechanism acts on the autoconversion rate that modulates the  
25 intensity of liquid precipitation. Our area of focus where precipitation decreases in MODIS  
26 analysis and model simulations is likely affected by BBA that are transported to Southern China  
27 where a persistent cloud band exists. In the model simulation the horizontal and vertical location  
28 of aerosol and the cloud band(s) are in close proximity as seen in Fig. 4 showing the vertical  
29 cross section of BBA mixing ratio (shading) and cloud liquid water content (contour) for March  
30 obtained from the ‘HighBoth’ experiment in the vicinity of decreased precipitation shown in Fig.

1 3c (105E to 120E). BBA are lifted aloft by topography (oriented in a north-south direction), and  
2 act as an additional source of CCN in pre-existing clouds which are mostly low-level (warm) and  
3 therefore of liquid phase at this particular location and time of the year.

4 In the model, BB produces sulfate and carbonaceous aerosols that can be activated as cloud  
5 droplets. Sulfate aerosols are highly soluble, while the carbonaceous aerosols have both  
6 hydrophobic and hydrophilic modes. Hydrophilic organic and black carbon aerosols have  
7 prescribed fractions of soluble mass (0.25 and 0.1) so they also act as CCNs. Thus BBAs present  
8 at the level of developing liquid clouds also activate along with the background aerosols. Under  
9 conditions of massive BB, the CCN number concentration increases greatly, yielding increased  
10 cloud drop number concentration and reduced cloud droplet sizes for constant cloud water. The  
11 underlying physics leading to the reduction in  $R_{eff}$  is well captured by the model (Fig. 3b).  
12 Smaller droplets reduce the efficiency of autoconversion from cloud liquid water to rain,  
13 resulting in less precipitation. The double moment microphysics in McRAS-AC reduces  
14 autoconversion rate process via the parameterization,

$$15 \quad \left(\frac{\partial L_c}{\partial t}\right)_{auto} = -KL_c^4 N_c^{-2}, \quad (1)$$

16 where  $L_c$  is the cloud liquid water content ( $\text{kg m}^{-3}$ ),  $N_c$  is the cloud drop number concentration  
17 ( $\text{m}^{-3}$ ), and  $K$  is an accumulated constant for autoconversion (See Equation A.2 in Sud and Lee,  
18 2007, with units of  $\text{kg}^{-3}\text{m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$ ). From (1) as  $N_c$  increases under assumption of constant  $L_c$ , the  
19 autoconversion rate decreases. The occurrence of this second aerosol indirect effect is shown by  
20 the model experiments. Monthly mean difference fields between ‘HighBoth’ and ‘ZeroBoth’  
21 experiments from March to May are shown in Fig. 5 for AOD,  $N_c$ , cloud liquid water path  
22 (LWP), precipitation and total cloud fraction.  $N_c$  has been vertically averaged from 900 to 750  
23 hPa. Red (blue) color indicates positive (negative) anomaly with increasing BBA. Green  
24 contours delineate the areas where the change by BBA is significant at the 95% significance  
25 level, based on Student’s t-test. Aerosols clearly increase due to BB emission with an annual  
26 peak in March, and so does the AOD anomaly. Since February is dry season for the area, the  
27 analysis focuses on March, April, and May with the latter month delineating the onset of the East  
28 Asian monsoon. With BB occurring mainly in early spring, aerosol concentrations in May should  
29 not be affected much, so any signal in the meteorological fields for that month is potentially due

1 to circulation and land surface changes induced by BB emission in the preceding months. In the  
2 model we can decompose AOD anomaly by species. The difference of AOD between ‘HighBoth’  
3 and ‘ZeroBoth’ experiments over the boxed area in Fig. 1, for the month of March is 0.6, 0.487  
4 coming from organic carbon, 0.063 from sulfate, and 0.05 from black carbon. There is some  
5 amount of ‘background’ sulfate in ‘ZeroBoth’ (AOD=0.129), but organic and black carbon  
6 aerosols are mostly from BB emission so their AODs in ‘ZeroBoth’ are quite small, 0.031 and  
7 0.013, respectively. Dust and sea salt aerosol presence are very small over the region with AODs  
8 less than 0.01.

9 As stated earlier, as the BBA loadings increase, grid mean  $N_c$ , the product of in-cloud  $N_c$  and  
10 cloud fraction also increases. Overall, both  $N_c$  and LWP increase in the high BB experiments,  
11 due to delayed precipitation particularly in March and April. Still, some regions exhibit negative  
12 grid mean  $N_c$  and LWP anomalies, possibly because of reduced cloud fraction (Fig. 5e) due to  
13 reduced grid-scale relative humidity (RH) that determines cloud amount for stratiform clouds.  
14 The reduced RH is the outcome of larger stability of the lower atmosphere which suppress rising  
15 motion.

16 While enhanced BB emission increases AOD, CCN,  $N_c$ , and even  $L_c$ , the relationship is not  
17 linear. Increased  $L_c$  eventually creates a tendency for higher autoconversion and precipitation  
18 rates which opposes the tendency of the increased  $N_c$  (eq. 1). If we do not account for complex  
19 feedbacks, precipitation near the BB emission source can be expected to decrease if the increased  
20  $N_c$  effect is stronger than the enhanced  $L_c$  effect, as shown in Fig. 5d for March and April. While  
21 the satellite data analysis suggests alternating negative-positive precipitation anomalies along the  
22 wind flow, a weak positive anomaly surrounds the simulated strong negative anomaly over the  
23 South China Sea and northern China in April (Fig. 5d). This may be explained by two possible  
24 mechanisms. Liquid cloud water gets transported downstream instead of precipitating out locally  
25 because of suppressed autoconversion, while reduced local precipitation creates favorable  
26 circulation conditions for precipitation downwind. Meanwhile, a statistically significant anomaly  
27 of precipitation is found in May, suggesting that large BB emission in March and April can have  
28 a delayed effect even in regions far away from the source. Microphysical processes may  
29 therefore not be the only mechanism that reduces precipitation. The impact of BBA on May  
30 precipitation could be a combination of direct, indirect effects, and feedback processes initiated

1 by aerosols in March-April. Further analysis of circulation changes is needed to distinguish  
2 whether this anomaly can be attributed to cloud microphysics or some other mechanism, a topic  
3 that we will address in §3.4.

### 4 3.3. BB effects on the radiation budget

5 BBA can change the radiation balance by both their direct and indirect effects. The direct effect  
6 of BBA consists of scattering (sulfate aerosols) and absorption (black carbon aerosols) of  
7 incoming solar radiation which cause surface cooling and atmospheric heating. As discussed in  
8 section 3.2, the indirect effect of BBA comes from altering cloud optical properties like  $R_{eff}$  and  
9 cloud amount which modify the net (=shortwave + longwave) radiation budget at the top of the  
10 atmosphere (TOA), atmosphere (ATM), and surface (SFC). Fig. 6 illustrates the magnitude of  
11 the net radiation change at TOA, ATM, and SFC due to both direct and indirect aerosol effects,  
12 primarily due to changes in shortwave (SW) radiation. Each map shows the monthly mean  
13 difference between ‘HighBoth’ and ‘ZeroBoth’ experiments from March to May with red (blue)  
14 indicating heating (cooling) anomalies by aerosol, and green contours delineating the areas of  
15 statistically significant change. The overall net radiative effect of BBA is TOA/SFC cooling, and  
16 ATM heating near the source region, but its interpretation requires further scrutiny because  
17 contributions to net radiation change also come from circulation changes and associated  
18 feedbacks. The ATM heating in March and April provides a clearer signal of direct effects since  
19 the radiative heating comes almost exclusively from aerosol absorption, while TOA and SFC  
20 cooling comes from both direct and indirect aerosol effects. In May there is little aerosol direct  
21 effect, but a significant anomaly signal exists at the TOA and SFC due to feedbacks from  
22 circulation changes. When examining TOA and SFC radiation fields in May, the dipole pattern  
23 seen near the east coast of China and Korea is due to cloud fraction change (Fig. 5e) consistent  
24 with the precipitation change shown in Fig. 5d, and discussed further in the following section.

25 Table 2 shows the differences between ‘HighBoth’ and ‘ZeroBoth’ experiments of the net  
26 downward (down minus up) fluxes in March when BBA peaks, regionally averaged across the  
27 emission control region. Aerosol radiative effects are much larger in the SW than the longwave  
28 (LW), so most of the net radiation change comes from SW effects. The corresponding clear sky  
29 fluxes demonstrate that BBA increases SW reflectance, but also absorptance, because large  
30 fractions of BBA are composed by carbonaceous aerosols which are efficient absorbers of SW

1 radiation. Differences between all-sky and clear sky radiative flux represent the CRE change by  
2 BBA which is, somewhat surprisingly, positive at SFC (weaker SW and net CRE for the  
3 “HighBoth” experiment). Despite LWP increases (Fig. 5c) and  $R_{eff}$  decreases (Fig. 3b) in  
4 conditions of high BB, yielding an average optical thickness increase of 46% for the cloudy part  
5 of the table 2 region, decreased total cloud fraction (Fig. 5e) due to feedbacks overrides  
6 increased cloud brightness. So, the total indirect effect, namely  $R_{eff}$  decreases (classic “Twomey  
7 effect”) and LWP increases and any resulting cloud feedbacks, seem to counteract the direct  
8 aerosol effect in these GEOS-5 experiments.

### 9 3.4. Temperature, moisture, and circulation changes

10 In this section we discuss meteorological consequences of the BBA radiative effects which we  
11 have shown to lead to surface cooling and atmospheric heating. The surface temperature  
12 anomaly due to BBA is plotted in Fig. 7 and can be seen to be very significant near the source  
13 region in March and April. Weak negative anomalies also appear in May, but are mostly  
14 insignificant statistically. The vertical profile of temperature change (black line) by BB  
15 regionally averaged from 100E to 120E and from 18N to 30N (cf. red box in Fig. 7) is plotted in  
16 Fig. 8. This profile is obtained as the difference between the ‘HighBoth’ and ‘ZeroBoth’  
17 experiments in March and April when the decrease of precipitation is significant, and reveals the  
18 presence of a cooling signal from the surface all the way up to the 250 hPa level. In order to  
19 better understand what causes the temperature change, the model’s major heating/cooling rate  
20 contributions are shown in Fig. 8. The orange line shows the SW heating rate (K/day) anomaly,  
21 the red line the LW heating rate anomaly, and the blue line the anomaly of the heating rate due to  
22 the model’s moist physics, namely large-scale condensation and convective processes. As  
23 expected, SW radiation heats the atmosphere near the height of the aerosol layer (Fig. 4). The  
24 reason the temperature profile does not cross over to the positive side is other contributors to  
25 temperature change, namely LW and moist physics both of which cool the low and middle  
26 troposphere. The increase in LW cooling is a consequence of increased cloud liquid water  
27 between 800 hPa to 600 hPa due to aerosol-induced changes in cloud microphysical processes.  
28 Although the magnitude of LW cooling is only about a quarter of the SW heating, it has an  
29 impact since LW cooling occurs at the time and location of SW heating because of liquid water  
30 and BBA collocation.

1 The major factor contributing to the negative temperature anomaly is the reduced moist heating,  
2 the most significant change of all the heating rate components of the model's physics. A negative  
3 moist physics heating rate anomaly translates to subdued cloud formation by large-scale  
4 condensation and even moist convection. In the area of interest March precipitation mostly  
5 comes from large-scale condensation, while in April there is some contribution from moist  
6 convection. The reduced convective precipitation in April, accounting for about 40% of the total  
7 precipitation reduction, can be explained by changes in the vertical temperature gradient. BBA  
8 direct radiative effects make the surface cooler and the 700 hPa level warmer, decreasing thus  
9 low level atmospheric instability as seen in the vertical temperature profile anomaly; even  
10 though the overall temperature change is negative (cooling), a bump of temperature anomaly  
11 forms near 700 hPa that suppresses the onset of moist convection.

12 Another important reason behind moist physics suppression which can explain both large-scale  
13 condensation and moist convection is change in atmospheric moisture content. Zonally- averaged  
14 moisture and meridional circulation anomalies due to BBA within 100–120E for March, April,  
15 and 110–140° E for May are plotted in Fig. 9. The blue shading, indicating dry anomaly, spreads  
16 over the 20-30° N latitude zone where the BBA sources are located. A few factors play a role in  
17 making this region drier. One is reduced surface evaporation (Fig. 10) in the region of negative  
18 surface temperature anomaly. The other is circulation changes, specifically the substantial  
19 downward and southward flow anomalies induced by BBA. While the downward anomaly could  
20 be the result of reduced moist activity, the accompanying southward anomaly may actually be  
21 *the cause* of reduced moisture transport from low latitudes. The column-integrated moisture  
22 convergence anomaly (not shown) in the region where precipitation decreases is negative with  
23 some degree of statistical significance, albeit less than surface evaporation (Fig. 10). Another  
24 possible cause for overall drying is the decreased precipitation itself, implying positive feedback.  
25 Because of BBA indirect effect, reduced autoconversion leaves behind more in-cloud water  
26 which advects downwind instead of being converted into local precipitation, resulting in reduced  
27 supply of moisture to the levels underneath and creating a feedback loop where weaker latent  
28 heat flux at the surface causes further decreases in precipitation.

29 Several mechanisms can potentially reduce precipitation in the downwind side of an active BB  
30 region. Cloud microphysics can delay the precipitation process by slowing down autoconversion,

1 and then radiation can help make the area stable and dry, all conditions unfavorable for vigorous  
2 moist processes. Moreover, dry anomalies can be the result of cloud microphysics as well as in  
3 lack of rain and its evaporation. Likewise, a number of other variables may be changing in the  
4 same direction due to direct BBA effects on radiation and the indirect effects on cloud  
5 microphysics. Both effects cause SW dimming at the surface, low level drying, and decreased  
6 precipitation. Separating microphysical from radiative effects is thus a worthwhile objective  
7 which we pursue in the following section.

### 8 3.5 Quantitative breakdowns of direct and indirect effects

9 In the previous sections, all the results explaining aerosol effects were based on ‘HighBoth’ and  
10 ‘ZeroBoth’ experiments, the first including BBA from a high emission year and the latter  
11 neglecting entirely BBA emissions from the area of strongest fire activity. The GEOS-5 AGCM  
12 accounted for both direct effects in its radiative transfer routines and indirect effects in its cloud  
13 microphysics routines. Differences between the two experiments capture both aerosol direct and  
14 indirect effects (as well as feedbacks), or in other words combined effects (CE). In two other  
15 experimental sets, the ‘HighInd’ and ‘ZeroInd’ experiments, direct effects of aerosol on radiation  
16 are ignored (globally), leaving only the indirect effect (IE) of BBA to be diagnosed as the  
17 difference between the two ‘Ind’ experiments. Our diagnostic approach to separate the direct and  
18 indirect aerosol effects of a rather complex regional climatic response consists of comparing key  
19 variables from ‘CE’ and ‘IE’ differences, both including feedback from circulation changes.

20 Table 3 shows the radiative fluxes in the same way as Table 2, but for ‘IE’ and ‘CE minus IE’.  
21 Evidently, CE of TOA and SFC SW fluxes and atmospheric column SW absorption are much  
22 larger than the corresponding IE of aerosols on SW. This implies a much stronger contribution of  
23 the direct effect (DE) of BBA in CE and makes sense because BBAs have large AOD over the  
24 high emission regions. Moreover, BBA effects on radiation in the CE runs are quite similar for  
25 clear-sky and all-sky conditions as pointed out earlier in section 3.3. This provides further  
26 support for the notion that the IE due to BBA is an order of magnitude smaller on the SW and net  
27 radiation compared to the corresponding DE of aerosols as a component of CE. Net radiation  
28 change by IE turns out small because it depends on both cloud fraction (which depends on cloud  
29 production, cloud dissipation, and cloud advective tendencies) and cloud optical thickness  
30 (which depends on CCN and cloud water removal by precipitation). In ‘ZeroInd’, the (BBA-



1 independent) cloud fraction increases while the cloud optical thickness decreases compared to  
2 ‘HighInd’ simulations.

3 One of the interesting features of the BBA signal is decreased precipitation over the downwind  
4 side of the source. The separation of ‘CE’ and ‘IE’ impacts on precipitation would be interesting  
5 to study for this area. To minimize feedback contributions, we focus on variables that are  
6 primarily forced directly during the March and April timeframe and near the source region, in  
7 particular 100E to 120E and 18N to 30N. Table 4 provides the spatiotemporal averages of these  
8 CE and IE breakdowns. While the CE precipitation reduction in HighBoth minus ZeroBoth BBA  
9 is 1.08 mm/day, the corresponding IE precipitation reduction is 0.77 mm/day only. For a linear  
10 system, one would attribute the 0.31 mm/day reduction corresponding to the CE minus IE  
11 difference, to the direct aerosol effect, but we are well aware that linearity is not necessarily a  
12 good assumption, so we view the differences as representing add-on direct effects that also  
13 contain effects of interactive circulation changes. Even though the IE averages do not show  
14 much change in the simulated surface temperature and evaporation of the boxed region, IE does  
15 have a prominent role in decreasing surface precipitation, which is caused not only by  
16 autoconversion reduction, but also by low-level drying due to SW dimming in cloudy areas. In  
17 other words, the suppressed autoconversion that follows CCN and  $N_c$  increases due to the  
18 presence of additional BBA in the IE simulations decreases precipitation, which creates a dry  
19 anomaly in atmosphere beneath the precipitating cloud due to reduced evaporation of rain. In  
20 comparison, the DE as a part of CE has a more straightforward effect on the moisture supply that  
21 can be traced to atmospheric stabilization and reduced surface temperature due to surface cooling.  
22 So while both CE and IE tend to reduce precipitation, the mechanisms can differ overall despite  
23 sharing the common processes of slower autoconversion and low level drying.

#### 24 4. Summary and Discussion

25 An aerosol impact study including both the direct and indirect effects focusing on the  
26 Southeast Asia pre-monsoon season is conducted based on simulations using the GEOS-5  
27 AGCM with double moment cloud microphysics called McRAS-AC, interactive GOCART  
28 aerosol model, advanced radiative transfer package RRTMG applying the Monte Carlo  
29 Independent Column Approximation, and CFMIP Observation Simulator Package (COSP).  
30 Analysis of GEOS-5 integrations with and without BB emission allows us to separate the

1 responses of clouds and precipitation to aerosol from those due to changes in meteorological  
2 fields. Our analysis indicates that plausible reasons for the reduced precipitation are (a) vertical  
3 stabilization by atmospheric heating aloft accompanied by surface cooling due to the shortwave  
4 scattering and absorption by the BBA; (b) less efficient autoconversion despite liquid water  
5 increases due to increased cloud droplet number concentration; and (c) suppressed moist  
6 processes due to atmospheric drying. With properly designed experiments we managed to  
7 separate the impacts of direct and indirect effects. While vertical stabilization is traced to direct  
8 aerosol-radiation interaction which causes rapid cloud adjustments (commonly referred to as the  
9 “semi-direct effect”) because of depressed dynamical forcing, and the reduced autoconversion  
10 rate is primarily a consequence of aerosol-cloud interaction (the indirect effect), the drying of the  
11 lower and middle troposphere is caused by both.

12 An interesting, and somewhat unexpected, consequence of enhanced BBAs is the May  
13 precipitation anomaly near the Korean peninsula shown in Fig. 5d. Since BB is not a major  
14 factor in May aerosol loadings, the precipitation anomaly could be due to circulation and land  
15 surface changes triggered by BB in the preceding month. In March and April, the surface  
16 temperature over Southeast Asia drops significantly due to the combined direct and indirect solar  
17 dimming effect of BBA and this reduces the meridional temperature gradient. Fig. 9 shows that  
18 the overall circulation anomaly heads south in March and April. The May circulation anomaly  
19 exhibits downward motion at 30° N and a little upward motion south of 30° N. According to  
20 Kim et al. (2007) an upper level jet stream change can induce secondary circulation changes near  
21 the entrance of the jet core in East Asia. In their analysis, an initial surface cooling by the direct  
22 effect of sulfate aerosol results in a reduced north-south thermal gradient. Fig. 11a shows a  
23 similar weakened meridional temperature gradient change due to surface cooling found in March  
24 and April. This reduced gradient weakens the zonal wind shear through the thermal wind  
25 relationship, and slows down the westerly jet stream (Fig. 11b). The deceleration causes  
26 ageostrophic meridional winds and, in this case, anomalous sinking motion at 30° N (see Fig. 9,  
27 May), conditions that are less favorable for precipitation. Although Kim et al. (2007) account  
28 only for direct forcing of aerosol, the circulation anomalies induced by the BBA emissions of  
29 this study are similar, because indirect effects did not affect much the surface forcing in CE  
30 simulations.

1 While this study provided some confirmation that our BB sensitivity in the model looks similar  
2 to that from MODIS analysis, the ‘Zero’ BB assumption is admittedly extreme. So the year-to-  
3 year change of meteorological fields by BBA could be weaker than suggested by the results  
4 shown here. But given the plausibility of how the model’s mechanisms operate, there is good  
5 possibility that real conditions would be consistent with the overall tendencies of the model. Still,  
6 there is much room for further development of the GEOS-5 model towards more realism. For  
7 example, phenomena such as aerosol-induced convective invigoration (Rosenfeld et al., 2008)  
8 cannot be properly reproduced in our model because heat release due to freezing does not affect  
9 the convective mass flux. This process could be better represented in a bulk mass flux convection  
10 scheme (e.g., Kim and Kang 2012), but it remains to be seen whether its inclusion in such a  
11 scheme would ultimately affect overall convective activity in a substantial way. Evidently,  
12 further refinements and cloud model validations are needed for a better understanding of the role  
13 of aerosol-convection interactions in the seasonal development of the summer monsoon. Our  
14 method of separating direct and indirect aerosol effects may be imperfect, but no better  
15 alternative currently exists given present modeling limitations. Regardless, we believe that this  
16 study provides a foundation on which to develop better methodologies to properly distinguish  
17 direct and indirect effect sensitivity to aerosols in large-scale models.

## 18 Acknowledgements

19 Funding from NASA's Modeling Analysis and Prediction (MAP) program managed by David  
20 Considine, and from the Interdisciplinary Research in Earth Science (IDS) program (Water and  
21 Energy Cycle Impacts of Biomass Burning subelement) managed by Hal Maring is gratefully  
22 acknowledged. I.-S. Kang was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF)  
23 grant funded by the Korean government (MEST) (NRF-2012M1A2A2671775) and the BK21  
24 program.

1 References

- 2 Albrecht, B.: Aerosols, Cloud Microphysics, and Fractional Cloudiness, *Science*, 245, 1227-  
3 1230, doi:10.1126/science.245.4923.1227, 1989.
- 4 Barahona, D., and Nenes, A.: Parameterizing the competition between homogeneous and  
5 heterogeneous freezing in cirrus cloud formation - monodisperse ice nuclei, *Atmospheric*  
6 *Chemistry and Physics*, 9, 369-381, 2009a.
- 7 Barahona, D., and Nenes, A.: Parameterizing the competition between homogeneous and  
8 heterogeneous freezing in ice cloud formation - polydisperse ice nuclei, *Atmospheric Chemistry*  
9 *and Physics*, 9, 5933-5948, 2009b.
- 10 Bollasina, M., Ming, Y., and Ramaswamy, V.: Anthropogenic Aerosols and the Weakening of  
11 the South Asian Summer Monsoon, *Science*, 334, 502-505, doi:10.1126/science.1204994, 2011.
- 12 Chin, M., Ginoux, P., Kinne, S., Torres, O., Holben, B., Duncan, B., Martin, R., Logan, J.,  
13 Higurashi, A., and Nakajima, T.: Tropospheric aerosol optical thickness from the GOCART  
14 model and comparisons with satellite and Sun photometer measurements, *Journal of the*  
15 *Atmospheric Sciences*, 59, 461-483, doi:10.1175/1520-  
16 0469(2002)059<0461:TAOTFT>2.0.CO;2, 2002.
- 17 Chu, D., Kaufman, Y., Ichoku, C., Remer, L., Tanre, D., and Holben, B.: Validation of MODIS  
18 aerosol optical depth retrieval over land, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29,  
19 doi:10.1029/2001GL013205, 2002.
- 20 Chung, C., and Ramanathan, V.: Weakening of North Indian SST gradients and the monsoon  
21 rainfall in India and the Sahel, *Journal of Climate*, 19, 2036-2045, doi:10.1175/JCLI3820.1, 2006.
- 22 Clough, S., Shephard, M., Mlawer, E., Delamere, J., Iacono, M., Cady-Pereira, K., Boukabara, S.,  
23 and Brown, P.: Atmospheric radiative transfer modeling: a summary of the AER codes, *Journal*  
24 *of Quantitative Spectroscopy & Radiative Transfer*, 91, 233-244, doi:10.1016/j.jqsrt.2004.05.058,  
25 2005.
- 26 Colarco, P., da Silva, A., Chin, M., and Diehl, T.: Online simulations of global aerosol  
27 distributions in the NASA GEOS-4 model and comparisons to satellite and ground-based aerosol

1 optical depth, Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres, 115, doi:10.1029/2009JD012820,  
2 2010.

3 Darmenov, A., and A. da Silva: The Quick Fire Emissions Dataset (QFED) - Documentation of  
4 versions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4., NASA Technical Report Series on Global Modeling and Data  
5 Assimilation. NASA TM-2013-104606, Vol. 32, 183 pp., 2013.

6 Fountoukis, C., and Nenes, A.: Continued development of a cloud droplet formation  
7 parameterization for global climate models, Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres, 110,  
8 doi:10.1029/2004JD005591|10.1029/2004JD005591, 2005

9 Ganguly, D., Rasch, P., Wang, H., and Yoon, J.: Climate response of the South Asian monsoon  
10 system to anthropogenic aerosols, Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres, 117,  
11 doi:10.1029/2012JD017508, 2012.

12 Gautam, R., Hsu, N., Eck, T., Holben, B., Janjai, S., Jantarach, T., Tsay, S., and Lau, W.:  
13 Characterization of aerosols over the Indochina peninsula from satellite-surface observations  
14 during biomass burning pre-monsoon season, Atmospheric Environment, 78, 51-59,  
15 doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.05.038, 2013.

16 Guo, L., Highwood, E., Shaffrey, L., and Turner, A.: The effect of regional changes in  
17 anthropogenic aerosols on rainfall of the East Asian Summer Monsoon, Atmospheric Chemistry  
18 and Physics, 13, 1521-1534, doi:10.5194/acp-13-1521-2013, 2013. Huffman, G., Adler, R.,  
19 Morrissey, M., Bolvin, D., Curtis, S., Joyce, R., McGavock, B., and Susskind, J.: Global  
20 precipitation at one-degree daily resolution from multisatellite observations, Journal of  
21 Hydrometeorology, 2, 36-50, doi:10.1175/1525-7541(2001)002<0036:GPAODD>2.0.CO;2,  
22 2001.

23 Ichoku, C., Giglio, L., Wooster, M., and Remer, L.: Global characterization of biomass-burning  
24 patterns using satellite measurements of fire radiative energy, Remote Sensing of Environment,  
25 112, 2950-2962, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2008.02.009, 2008.

26 Kaufman, Y., and Koren, I.: Smoke and pollution aerosol effect on cloud cover, Science, 313,  
27 655-658, doi:10.1126/science.1126232, 2006.

1 Kaufman, Y., Koren, I., Remer, L., Rosenfeld, D., and Rudich, Y.: The effect of smoke, dust,  
2 and pollution aerosol on shallow cloud development over the Atlantic Ocean, Proceedings of the  
3 National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 102, 11207-11212,  
4 doi:10.1073/pnas.0505191102, 2005.

5 Kim, D., and Kang, I.-S.: A bulk mass flux convection scheme for climate model: description  
6 and moisture sensitivity, *Climate Dynamics*, 38, 411-429, doi:10.1007/s00382-010-0972-2, 2012.

7 Kim, M.-K., Lau, K.-M., Kim, K.-M., and Lee, W.: A GCM study of effects of radiative forcing  
8 of sulfate aerosol on large scale circulation and rainfall in East Asia during boreal spring,  
9 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, doi:10.1029/2007GL031683, 2007.

10 Klein, S., Zhang, Y., Zelinka, M., Pincus, R., Boyle, J., and Gleckler, P.: Are climate model  
11 simulations of clouds improving? An evaluation using the ISCCP simulator, *Journal of*  
12 *Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 118, 1329-1342, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50141, 2013.

13 Lau, K.-M., and Kim, K.-M.: Observational relationships between aerosol and Asian monsoon  
14 rainfall, and circulation, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 33,  
15 doi:10.1029/2006GL027546|10.1029/2006GL027546, 2006.

16 Lau, K.-M., and Kim, K.-M.: Impact of aerosols on the Asian monsoon - an interim assessment,  
17 in: *Climate Change: Multidecadal and Beyond*, edited by: Chang, C.-P., Ghil, M., Latif, M., and  
18 Wallace, M., in press, Springer Praxis, Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.

19 Lau, K.-M., Kim, M.-K., and Kim, K.-M.: Asian summer monsoon anomalies induced by aerosol  
20 direct forcing: the role of the Tibetan Plateau, *Climate Dynamics*, 26, 855-864,  
21 doi:10.1007/s00382-006-0114-z|10.1007/s00382-006-0114-z, 2006.

22 Li, Z., Niu, F., Fan, J., Liu, Y., Rosenfeld, D., and Ding, Y.: Long-term impacts of aerosols on  
23 the vertical development of clouds and precipitation, *Nature Geoscience*, 4, 888-894,  
24 doi:10.1038/NGEO1313, 2011.

25 Lin, C., Hsu, H., Lee, Y., Kuo, C., Sheng, Y., and Chu, D.: A new transport mechanism of  
26 biomass burning from Indochina as identified by modeling studies, *Atmospheric Chemistry and*  
27 *Physics*, 9, 7901-7911, 2009.

1 Lim, K.-S. S., Fan, J., Leung, L. R., Ma, P.-L., Singh, B., Zhao, C., Zhang, Y., Zhang, G., and  
2 Song, X.: Investigation of aerosol indirect effects using a cumulus microphysics  
3 parameterization in a regional climate model, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*,  
4 119, 906–926, doi:10.1002/2013JD020958, 2014.

5 Meehl, G., Arblaster, J., and Collins, W.: Effects of black carbon aerosols on the Indian monsoon,  
6 *Journal of Climate*, 21, 2869-2882, doi:10.1175/2007JCLI1777.1, 2008.

7 Molod, A., Takacs, L., Suarez, M. J., Bacmeister, J., Song, I.-S., and Eichmann, A.: GEOS-5  
8 Atmospheric General Circulation Model: mean climate development from MERRA to Fortuna,  
9 Tech. Memo., NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, MD, pp 115, 2012.

10 Moorthy, K., Babu, S., Manoj, M., and Satheesh, S.: Buildup of aerosols over the Indian Region,  
11 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40, 1011-1014, doi:10.1002/grl.50165, 2013.

12 Oreopoulos, L., Lee, D., Sud, Y., and Suarez, M.: Radiative impacts of cloud heterogeneity and  
13 overlap in an atmospheric General Circulation Model, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 12,  
14 9097-9111, doi:10.5194/acp-12-9097-2012, 2012.

15 Petrenko, M., Kahn, R., Chin, M., Soja, A., Kucsera, T., and Harshvardhan: The use of satellite-  
16 measured aerosol optical depth to constrain biomass burning emissions source strength in the  
17 global model GOCART, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 117,  
18 doi:10.1029/2012JD017870, 2012.

19 Petters, M., Carrico, C., Kreidenweis, S., Prenni, A., DeMott, P., Collett, J., and Moosmuller, H.:  
20 Cloud condensation nucleation activity of biomass burning aerosol, *Journal of Geophysical*  
21 *Research-Atmospheres*, 114, doi:10.1029/2009JD012353, 2009.

22 Pincus, R., Barker, H., and Morcrette, J.: A fast, flexible, approximate technique for computing  
23 radiative transfer in inhomogeneous cloud fields, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*,  
24 108, doi:10.1029/2002JD003322|10.1029/2002JD003322, 2003.

25 Platnick, S., King, M., Ackerman, S., Menzel, W., Baum, B., Riedi, J., and Frey, R.: The MODIS  
26 cloud products: Algorithms and examples from Terra, *Ieee Transactions on Geoscience and*  
27 *Remote Sensing*, 41, 459-473, doi:10.1109/TGRS.2002.808301, 2003.

1 Quaas, J., Stevens, B., Stier, P., and Lohmann, U.: Interpreting the cloud cover - aerosol optical  
2 depth relationship found in satellite data using a general circulation model, *Atmospheric*  
3 *Chemistry and Physics*, 10, 6129-6135, doi:10.5194/acp-10-6129-2010, 2010.

4 Ramanathan, V., Chung, C., Kim, D., Bettge, T., Buja, L., Kiehl, J., Washington, W., Fu, Q.,  
5 Sikka, D., and Wild, M.: Atmospheric brown clouds: Impacts on South Asian climate and  
6 hydrological cycle, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*  
7 *America*, 102, 5326-5333, doi:10.1073/pnas.0500656102|10.1073/pnas.0500656102, 2005.

8 Rienecker M. M., Suarez, M. J., Todling R., Bacmeister J., Takacs L., Liu H.-C., Gu W.,  
9 Sienkiewicz M., Koster, R. D., Gelaro, R., Stajner, I., and Nielsen, J. E.: The GEOS-5 Data  
10 Assimilation System Documentation of Versions 1 5.0.1, 5.1.0, and 5.2.0. NASA/TM-2008-2  
11 104606, Vol. 27, 118 pp., 2008.

12 Roelofs, G.: A steady-state analysis of the temperature responses of water vapor and aerosol  
13 lifetimes, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13, 8245-8254, doi:10.5194/acp-13-8245-2013,  
14 2013.

15 Rosenfeld, D., Lohmann, U., Raga, G., O'Dowd, C., Kulmala, M., Fuzzi, S., Reissell, A., and  
16 Andreae, M.: Flood or drought: How do aerosols affect precipitation?, *Science*, 321, 1309-1313,  
17 doi:10.1126/science.1160606, 2008.

18 Rotstayn, L., Ryan, B., and Katzfey, J.: A scheme for calculation of the liquid fraction in mixed-  
19 phase stratiform clouds in large-scale models, *Monthly Weather Review*, 128, 1070-1088,  
20 doi:10.1175/1520-0493(2000)128<1070:ASFCOT>2.0.CO;2, 2000.

21 Seifert, A., and Beheng, K.: A double-moment parameterization for simulating autoconversion,  
22 accretion and selfcollection, *Atmospheric Research*, 59, 265-281, doi:10.1016/S0169-  
23 8095(01)00126-0, 2001.

24 Seifert, A., and Beheng, K.: A two-moment cloud microphysics parameterization for mixed-  
25 phase clouds. Part 1: Model description, *Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics*, 92, 45-66,  
26 doi:10.1007/s00703-005-0112-4|10.1007/s00703-005-0112-4, 2006.



1 Sud, Y. C., and Lee, D.: Parameterization of aerosol indirect effect to complement McRAS cloud  
2 scheme and its evaluation with the 3-year ARM-SGP analyzed data for single column models,  
3 Atmospheric Research, 86, 105-125, doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2007.03.007, 2007.

4 Sud, Y. C., Lee, D., Oreopoulos, L., Barahona, D., Nenes, A., and Suarez, M.: Performance of  
5 McRAS-AC in the GEOS-5 AGCM: aerosol-cloud-microphysics, precipitation, cloud radiative  
6 effects, and circulation, Geoscientific Model Development, 6, 57-79, doi:10.5194/gmd-6-57-  
7 2013, 2013.

8 Sud, Y. C., and Walker, G.: Microphysics of Clouds with the Relaxed Arakawa-Schubert  
9 Scheme (McRAS). Part I: Design and evaluation with GATE Phase III data, Journal of the  
10 Atmospheric Sciences, 56, 3196-3220, 1999.

11 Sud, Y. C., and Walker, G.: New upgrades to the microphysics and thermodynamics of clouds in  
12 McRAS: SCM and GCM evaluation of simulation biases in GEOS GCM, Proceedings of the  
13 Indian National Science Academy, Part-A, Physical Sciences (5) 69, 543-565, 2003.

14 Sundqvist, H.: Parameterization of condensation and associated clouds in models for weather  
15 prediction and general circulation simulation, Physically based modeling and simulation of  
16 climate and climatic change, ed. M. E. Schlesinger, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, the  
17 Netherlands, pp. 433-461, 1988.

18 Tao, W., Chen, J., Li, Z., Wang, C., and Zhang, C.: IMPACT OF AEROSOLS ON  
19 CONVECTIVE CLOUDS AND PRECIPITATION, Reviews of Geophysics, 50,  
20 doi:10.1029/2011RG000369, 2012.

21 Taylor, D.: Biomass burning, humans and climate change in Southeast Asia, Biodiversity and  
22 Conservation, 19, 1025-1042, doi:10.1007/s10531-009-9756-6, 2010.

23 Tosca, M., Randerson, J., Zender, C., Flanner, M., and Rasch, P.: Do biomass burning aerosols  
24 intensify drought in equatorial Asia during El Nino?, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 10,  
25 3515-3528, 2010.

26 Twomey, S.: The influence of pollution on the shortwave albedo of clouds, J. Atmos. Sci., 34,  
27 1149-1152, 1977.

- 1 Wiedinmyer, C., Akagi, S., Yokelson, R., Emmons, L., Al-Saadi, J., Orlando, J., and Soja, A.:  
2 The Fire IN ventory from NCAR (FINN): a high resolution global model to estimate the  
3 emissions from open burning, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 4, 625-641, doi:10.5194/gmd-  
4 4-625-2011, 2011.
- 5 Wu, L., Su, H., and Jiang, J.: Regional simulation of aerosol impacts on precipitation during the  
6 East Asian summer monsoon, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 118, 6454-6467,  
7 doi:10.1002/jgrd.50527, 2013.

1 Table 1. Experimental designs for our GEOS-5 AGCM simulations. 'Zero' stands for zero BB  
2 emission over the green dash box region of Fig. 1a, 'High' for high (year 2007, Fig. 1b) emission.  
3 Symbols under aerosol direct effect and indirect effect indicate experiments with (O) and without  
4 (X) the effect.

	BB	Direct effect	Indirect effect
HighBoth	High	O	O
ZeroBoth	Zero	O	O
HighInd	High	X	O
ZeroInd	Zero	X	O

5

6

1 Table 2. Radiative flux change ( $W/m^2$ ) by BBA: Numbers indicate the difference between  
 2 HighBoth and ZeroBoth experiments on March and April, regional averaged from 90E to 110E  
 3 and from 12N to 30N only including land grid (emission control region). All fluxes are net  
 4 downward, which means upward fluxes are subtracted from downward fluxes.

	TOA	ATM	SFC
SW, all sky	-9.5	15.1	-24.6
SW, clear sky	-9.0	17.1	-26.1
LW, all sky	0.3	-2.5	2.8
LW, clear sky	1.2	-1.0	2.2

5

6

- 1 Table 3. Radiative flux change ( $W/m^2$ ) by indirect effect of BBA, and the differences from Table
- 2 2. 'IE' indicates the difference between HighInd and ZeroInd experiments, 'CE' indicates the
- 3 difference between HighBoth and ZeroBoth experiments while others are the same as Table 2.

	TOA		ATM		SFC	
	IE	CE – IE	IE	CE-IE	IE	CE-IE
SW, all sky	0.5	-10	0.0	15.1	0.5	-25.1
SW, clear sky	-0.3	-8.7	-0.3	17.4	0.0	-26.1
LW, all sky	-2.1	2.4	0.8	-3.3	-1.3	4.1
LW, clear sky	-0.4	1.6	0.7	-1.7	-1.1	3.3

4

1

2 Table 4. Analysis of combined effects (CE, Direct+Indirect) and only indirect effect (IE).

3 \*Regional average from 100E to 120E and 18N to 30N, on March and April, and \*\*975 hPa to

4 500 hPa vertical.

Aerosol Effect	Combined effect	Indirect effect
Precipitation* (mm/day)	-1.08	-0.77
Surface temperature* (K)	-0.59	0.09
Surface evaporation* (mm/day)	-0.25	0.07
Moisture** (g/kg)	-0.38	-0.23
Moist heating rate** (K/day)	-0.29	-0.16
Temperature** (K)	-0.24	-0.07

5

6

7

1 Figure Captions

2 Fig. 1. QFED BB emission data (OC data is used for this figure, unit of  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^2/\text{s}$ ). a) February-  
3 March-April mean and b) averaged time series for dashed box area. Time series are smoothed by  
4 a seven-day moving average. Orange line represents data for year 2007 for high BB simulation  
5 experiments. Other years are plotted in gray.

6 Fig. 2. Composite analysis and differences (Diff) in a) aerosol optical depth and b) liquid cloud  
7 effective radius ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) from MODIS-Aqua retrievals, and c) GPCP precipitation (mm/day). High  
8 emission (left), climatology (middle) and differences: high minus climatology (right) panels  
9 respectively. Here 36 high emission days and 8-years climatology data are used.

10 Fig. 3. Same variables as in Fig. 2 but for HighBoth minus ZeroBoth differences of AGCM  
11 simulations. Panels show a) aerosol optical depth, b) liquid cloud effective radius ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) and  
12 precipitation rate (mm/day) during the FMA time period. Vectors on a) are wind vectors at 800  
13 hPa from 'HighBoth', only plotted where AOD increases.

14 Fig. 4. Vertical cross section of simulated mixing ratio of BBA (shading,  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ) and cloud liquid  
15 water (contour, mg/kg) in March in HighBoth simulations; zonal averaging is performed for 105  
16 to 120E.

17 Fig. 5. HighBoth minus ZeroBoth representing BBA effects on a) aerosol optical depth, b) grid  
18 mean cloud drop number concentration, c) liquid water path (LWP), d) precipitation and e) total  
19 cloud fraction (%) from COSP. Green contour mark regions of >95% significant in a student's t-  
20 test.

21 Fig. 6. Same layout as in Fig. 5, but for net radiative fluxes at a) top of the atmosphere, b)  
22 column atmosphere, and c) surface.

23 Fig. 7. Same layout as in Fig. 5, but for surface temperature (K). Red dashed domain is for area  
24 average fields in Fig. 8 and Table 4.

25 Fig. 8. Vertical profile of temperature (K) and heating rate (K/day) differences between  
26 HighBoth and ZeroBoth simulations for March and April when decrease of precipitation is  
27 significant, averaging region  $100^\circ\text{E}$  to  $120^\circ\text{E}$  and  $18^\circ\text{N}$  to  $30^\circ\text{N}$  and is marked in Fig. 7. Black,

1 orange, red and blue lines represent temperature, SW heating rate, LW heating rate, and the  
2 heating rate due to the model's moist physics.


3 Fig. 9. Zonally-averaged profiles of moisture (shading) and meridional circulation anomalies  
4 (vectors, horizontal component is for meridional wind anomaly, vertical component is for  
5 pressure velocity) from HighBoth minus ZeroBoth experiments over the longitude sector 100–  
6 120° E for March, April and sector 110–140° E for May. Units of pressure velocity, meridional  
7 wind, and water vapor mixing ratio are  $10^{-2}$  Pa/s, m/s, and g/kg respectively.

8 Fig. 10. Similar to Fig. 5, but for surface evaporation (mm/day).


9 Fig. 11. Zonal mean temperature (K) and wind (m/s) differences between HighBoth and Zero  
10 Both BBA for 110–140E in May. Green contour identifies regions with >95% significant  
11 differences according to the Student's t-test. Black contour on b) is zonal mean wind in  
12 'HighBoth' run.



1 Fig. 1. QFED BB emission data (OC data is used for this figure, unit of  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^2/\text{s}$ ). a) February-  
2 March-April mean and b) averaged time series for dashed box area. Time series are smoothed by  
3 a seven-day moving average. Orange line represents data for year 2007 for high BB simulation  
4 experiments. Other years are plotted in gray.




1 Fig. 2. Composite analysis and differences (Diff) in a) aerosol optical depth and b) liquid cloud  
 2 effective radius ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) from MODIS-Aqua retrievals, and c) GPCP precipitation (mm/day). High  
 3 emission (left), climatology (middle) and differences: high minus climatology (right) panels  
 4 respectively. Here 36 high emission days and 8-years climatology data are used.



5

6


1 Fig. 3. Same variables as in Fig. 2 but for HighBoth minus ZeroBoth differences of AGCM  
2 simulations. Panels show a) aerosol optical depth, b) liquid cloud effective radius ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) and  
3 precipitation rate (mm/day) during the FMA time period. Vectors on a) are wind vectors at 800  
4 hPa from 'HighBoth', only plotted where AOD increases.



5

6

- 1 Fig. 4. Vertical cross section of simulated mixing ratio of BBA (shading,  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ) and cloud liquid
- 2 water (contour,  $\text{mg}/\text{kg}$ ) in March in HighBoth simulations; zonal averaging is performed for 105
- 3 to 120E.




4

5




1 Fig. 5. HighBoth minus ZeroBoth representing BBA effects on a) aerosol optical depth, b) grid  
 2 mean cloud drop number concentration, c) liquid water path (LWP), d) precipitation and e) total  
 3 cloud fraction (%) from COSP. Green contour mark regions of >95% significant in a student's t-  
 4 test.



5


- 1 Fig. 6. Same layout as in Fig. 5, but for net radiative fluxes at a) top of the atmosphere, b)
- 2 column atmosphere, and c) surface.



3

4

- 1 Fig. 7. Same layout as in Fig. 5, but for surface temperature (K). Red dashed domain is for area
- 2 average fields in Fig. 8 and Table 4.




3

4

5

1 Fig. 8. Vertical profile of temperature (K) and heating rate (K/day) differences between  
2 HighBoth and ZeroBoth simulations for March and April when decrease of precipitation is  
3 significant, averaging region 100° E to 120° E and 18° N to 30° N and is marked in Fig. 7. Black,  
4 orange, red and blue lines represent temperature, SW heating rate, LW heating rate, and the  
5 heating rate due to the model's moist physics.




6

7




1 Fig. 9. Zonally-averaged profiles of moisture (shading) and meridional circulation anomalies  
2 (vectors, horizontal component is for meridional wind anomaly, vertical component is for  
3 pressure velocity) from HighBoth minus ZeroBoth experiments over the longitude sector 100–  
4 120° E for March, April and sector 110–140° E for May. Units of pressure velocity, meridional  
5 wind, and water vapor mixing ratio are  $10^{-2}$  Pa/s, m/s, and g/kg respectively.



6

7


1 Fig. 10. Similar to Fig. 5, but for surface evaporation (mm/day).



2

3

1 Fig. 11. Zonal mean temperature (K) and wind (m/s) differences between HighBoth and Zero  
2 Both BBA for 110–140E in May. Green contour identifies regions with >95% significant  
3 differences according to the Student's t-test. Black contour on b) is zonal mean wind in  
4 'HighBoth' run.



5  
6  
7  
8  
9