

Dear Editor,

Thank you for considering our submission and for arranging the careful reviews. Our revised manuscript is enclosed; please find below our responses (in blue) to each of the comments made by the reviewers.

## **Reviewer #1**

This paper presents a discussion of numerical diffusion in solving tracer transport problems with some theoretical analysis and numerical calculations. It is argued that vertical resolution is, in current models, often more of a problem than horizontal resolution in avoiding excessive diffusion and plume dilution. Increasing vertical resolution should be given higher priority than horizontal resolution when trying to optimise the results achievable with a given computational resource.

General comments:

The topic is of importance, the paper is well written and well argued, and the simulation results appear credible and useful. However there are a number of aspects where there are alternative perspectives and it would be useful if the paper could reflect some of these. I have described these ‘perspective issues’ below. The authors may or may not agree with these issues. This is fine, but, either way, there would be benefit in discussing the issues and/or in providing further arguments for their own view point which might convince readers with a different view point. I also have some specific comments which are not to do with perspective. In terms of clarity and presentation, the paper is excellent and I have suggested very few technical corrections.

Comments on perspective:

Suppose we have a specified velocity field and we are trying to compute the tracer field. Over time the tracer plume will be stretched into thin filaments. Imagine that one has a high resolution simulation which resolves all the features in the tracer at a given time. The best low resolution description could (arguably) then be obtained by averaging the high resolution field to the lower resolution. This low resolution description will not preserve the peak volume mixing ratio. Hence one could argue that seeking to maximise VMR or minimise numerical diffusion is not really the right thing to do; one should seek the right amount of diffusion for the resolution used. Page 12, lines 11-16 go some way to acknowledge this situation but it could be reflected better in other parts of the paper. E.g. page 13, line 10 ‘the best possible simulation would preserve the entropy’. In practice maximising VMR or minimising diffusion or entropy gain are likely to be OK because it’s hard to have too little diffusion without numerical schemes which generate unsatisfactory solutions (loss of monotonicity, negative concentrations), but a little more discussion would be useful (and also see next comment).

We agree that there could exist an “representation error”, which is solely because the low-resolution grid cannot represent the peak VMR due to spatial averaging. We have examined this type of error in Fig. C1 (see below). The tracer field regridded from C384 to C48 is significantly less diffusive than the tracer field produced directly by a C48 simulation. Thus, the C48 grid is actually able to represent relatively sharp tracer gradient. The C48 simulation fails to preserve the sharp gradient because the numerical error in solving the advection equation is too large, not because the C48 grid itself is unable to resolve such gradient.




Fig C1. Column-averaged VMR at Day 8 of the simulation. The highest resolution result (C384L160, top panel) is regridded to lower horizontal resolution (C48, middle panel). The regridded result is still significantly less diffusive than a C48L160 simulation (bottom panel).

In real flows (with molecular diffusion, no matter how small) the filamentation will cascade down to very small scales and eventually be smoothed out by diffusion. Hence, although it's correct to say advection preserves VMR, this doesn't apply to real flows without qualification and hence the relevance of the statement could benefit from some discussion (see page 4, lines 9-11 and page 11, lines 20-22). Also if one allows resolution of small scales in the tracer but doesn't add in smaller scales in the driving flow field, this is like the viscous-convective  $k-1$  spectral range in turbulent flows when the molecular diffusivity is much less than the viscosity (see e.g. Monin and Yaglom, *Statistical Fluid Mechanics*, vol 2, p436, where the tracer is temperature). This can lead to less diffusion than would occur if the smaller velocity scales were present and to rougher tracer fields. ( $k-1$  decays slower with increasing wave number than the standard  $k-5/3$  inertial sub-range). So perhaps this is a situation where one could have too little diffusion (see page 15, lines 30-32) and too much small scale structure in the tracer field.

Thank you for bringing up this issue. We have added a paragraph to the introduction explaining that a model with no advection error would indeed underestimate diffusion. We cite D'Isidoro et al., (2010) who compared the magnitudes of numerical and actual (subgrid) turbulent diffusion, They find that numerical diffusion dominates on the scales of interest here, and indeed this is seen in the inability of the models to preserve plumes.

Mathematically it's nice to think of having a well defined tracer problem (an advection or advection-diffusion problem with a specified flow field) which one tries to solve more and more accurately as computing power increases. This seems to be the authors perspective in places. However it's probably more useful to change the problem by resolving more of the driving flow field.

We can actually better resolve the tracer field without resolving more of the driving flow field (Methven and Hoskins, 1999). Even if the driving flow field is very smooth and can be resolved by a very low-resolution grid, the tracer field can have large gradients and thus needs higher resolution. An extreme example is 1-D advection under constant wind – the wind field can be resolved by a single grid cell, but resolving the tracer field would require many cells.

The comment immediately above reflects this to some extent, but one can also resolve qualitatively different features such as convective updrafts and, eventually, boundary layer turbulence. Here the physics is different, vertical velocities may be larger, and a more isotropic grid may be appropriate. This is relevant to the various discussions of  $\Delta x/\Delta z$ ; for example on page 8, A and B may be similar in size at high resolution.

Our focus is on the free troposphere under stable conditions, hence convective updrafts and boundary layer turbulence are not relevant. This is now clarified in the abstract and in section 4.1, where we also recognize that the plume may originate from a convective updraft, and may dissipate in the boundary layer, but we do not aim to simulate these processes.

On page 11, line 6, ‘offsets the gains’ seems to imply that the authors think the increased resolution of small scale eddies is a backwards step (presumably judged by the narrow target of minimising diffusion). However the simulation may well be better overall, and the material can’t diffuse far because these new eddies are small, so the large scale distribution of the tracer shouldn’t be affected much.

We have rephrased “offsets the gains”.

Other specific comments:

Page 1, line 18: I’m not sure ‘dissipate’ is the right word. ‘Disperse’ might be better. The former suggests loss of mass rather than spreading out and dilution. Of course mass loss is not impossible if mass conservation isn’t satisfied but I’m not sure that interpretation is intended here. See also page 12, line 32, page 13, line 20, page 14, line 28 and figure 4 caption (‘plume decay’).

We have replaced “dissipation” and “decay” by “dilution”. “Dispersion” would not be accurate because it refers to a phase error in the numerical solution.

I have a similar comment with ‘Preserve the plume’ (page 10, line 17) and ‘subsides’ (page 11, line 15). The material is preserved but it’s dispersed and diluted, and presumably the authors don’t mean subside in the sense of moving down towards the ground. (I guess they might actually mean subside as the plume does spread downwards. It’s slightly curious that nothing mixes up to higher heights within the troposphere. But this is likely to reflect this case only rather than generic behaviour.)

Changed to “preserve the plume’s coherent structure”. For “subside” we do mean moving down.

Page 3, lines 13-18: I think ‘(native)’ means the resolution of the driving flow. If so then it would be good to say what was done at lower resolutions – hopefully the driving flow was smoothed rather than applying one grid point value over a larger area where it may be unrepresentative.

The wind field was regrided from  $0.25^\circ \times 0.3125^\circ$  to lower resolutions using conservative regriding. This is now clarified.

Also I’m not sure what a ‘2-D horizontal plume’ is in this context. Does this mean concentration is independent of height and depends only on x and y?

The simulation was performed in a 2D grid. (main text rephrased)

Eqns 19-21: While this is indicative, it’s based on the idea of a coherent smoothly varying plume. In reality, once the plume is broken up into filaments with a lot of small scale structure, the second order derivatives will be dominated by the small scales, not the large scales which are characterised by L and H.

This is now recognized in the text following equation (21).

Page 8: This argument would not work if one was considering 3-D isotropic turbulence. Here one would expect  $k = 2$  (or at least the power of  $\Delta x$  would be twice the power of  $\Delta z$  – both would have a CFL related increase), but it doesn't make sense to make  $\Delta z$  smaller (or bigger) than  $\Delta x$ . Why does the argument go wrong for this case? One explanation for this is that perhaps one should replace (23) with  $D = \max(A\Delta x, B\Delta z)$ , consistent with page 8 lines 29-30, or replace it with  $D = A\Delta x + A\Delta y + B\Delta z$ , treating  $x, y, z$  on an equal footing. I think the authors either need to use one of these more balanced forms of  $D$  (with minor changes in the conclusions) or provide more justification for their choice.

The case for isotropic turbulence is now mentioned at the end of Section 4 and in the conclusion section.

Page 10, line 27 to page 11, line 3: It might be better to initially leave the description of  $\lambda$  in words and not introduce  $\partial u/\partial x$  (see fig 2 caption too) only to redefine it in (28). More importantly, stretching is not in general aligned with the local flow. One can add a uniform flow (Galilean transformation) in any direction without altering the stretching properties of the flow. The values are only used qualitatively however, so it's probably OK to use this as an indication of stretching.

Corrected.

Technical corrections:

Page 9, line 27: Should 'initialize' be 'run' or 'calculate'?

Corrected.

Page 11, line 8: 'Large scale vertical wind speeds' might be better. The values are too small for convective updrafts or boundary layer turbulence.

Corrected.

Fig 7 caption: 'straight lines' should be 'solid lines'.

Corrected.

## Reviewer #2

The aim of this paper is to determine the horizontal and vertical resolution required for accurate free tropospheric plume transport. This topic is of interest and the analysis in this paper is presented clearly and precisely. The quality of the writing is excellent and there are therefore few specific comments. I recommend the paper for publication in ACPD with minor corrections.

### General Comments

1. The paper deals specifically with free tropospheric tracer transport and situations in which the vertical velocities are small (order  $1 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$ ). Do the results hold for different situations in which vertical velocities are larger? For example, in a convective boundary layer,  $A$  and  $B$  (eq 24) may be similar so  $B/A$  is much smaller than 500.

We now specifically discuss the difference with the convective boundary layer in the conclusion section (page 16, ~line 21).

2. In the abstract the authors claim that ‘the local surface pollution influence from the subsiding plume on intercontinental scales is also considerably increased’, but on p12 say that this result is just implied, as the fv3 dynamical core does not include boundary layer physics. Can the authors justify the term ‘considerably’ increased as they have no quantitative estimate of this potential increase?

We have removed “considerably”

3. Throughout the paper the authors refer to typical horizontal plume scales of 1000km. Given that in the real atmosphere plumes sizes cover a whole spectrum how sensitive are the results to the initial plume size? The authors present sensitivity results for plumes of different initial vertical thicknesses but not different initial horizontal spreads.

We also conducted sensitivity simulations with different horizontal extents and found that this did not affect the results. This is now stated in section 4.3.

On a similar topic of variable resolution, I was surprised that there was no discussion of in the introduction.

Adaptive mesh refinement is now mentioned at the end of the conclusion section (page 17, ~line 10).

Specific Comments

1. Page 2 line 6: the authors use ‘thick plumes of Asian ozone pollution’, do they refer to optical or geometric thickness here?

We have deleted ‘thick’

2. Page 4 line 14: This sentence is a little difficult to follow. What is ‘positive’?

Text has been clarified.

3. Page 5 line 21: CFL acronym should be defined.

Now defined.

4. Page 6 line 5: ‘This explains why’, what is ‘this’? Are the authors referring to equation 14?

Changed to “Eq. (14)”.

5. Page 7 line 14 and elsewhere: The authors often refer to ‘reviewed above’, ‘will be discussed’, ‘described below’ etc. Please can the specific section numbers be used in these places?

All corrected.

6. Page 13 line 4: ‘S’ is not defined.

Corrected

7. Page 14 line 6: Why is the z underlined here?

Typo, corrected

8. Page 30 figure B1: A difference plot might help to highlight deviations from the initial conditions due to numerical error more clearly.

Added.

### Reviewer #3

This paper discusses the importance of vertical resolution relative to the horizontal resolution. The authors claim that there exists an optimal grid resolution ratio of 1000 between horizontal and vertical resolution.

The statement that the often used approach of increasing the horizontal resolution alone is insufficient for an optimal solution has been made before, also by the same authors. Also, as the authors themselves point out, optimal grid resolution ratios not too dissimilar to what is stated in the manuscript have been suggested before. This study is extension to previous work in that it aims to theoretically derive an optimal grid resolution ratio and to support the findings by performing idealised simulations with the GFDL-FV3 global dynamical core. Though not ground breaking the manuscript could be published after revisions as outlined below.

The paper makes very bold statements that are not widely valid and applicable since the findings are much more model, case and resolution dependent. This needs to be acknowledged and discussed more widely.

In response to the reviewer's concerns we have revised the manuscript in many places to provide a more even-handed assessment of the findings. Please refer to various comments below regarding the convection-resolving regime, the physical diffusion, etc.

For increasingly higher spatial resolutions that approach convection permitting or even convection resolving scales, an aspect ratio of 1000 wouldn't make much sense since the resolved dynamical features become more isotropic compared to a model where most of the vertical motions is on the subgrid scale.

Good point. We have added a paragraph to that effect at the end of Section 4.3 (page 15, ~line 30).

For a plume with an aspect ratio of 1000 (and flow ratios in the same order) as used here it is not surprising that a grid with the same aspect ratio provides an optimal solution.

There is no reason why  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{\text{opt}}$  would scale as  $L/H$  – see equation (21), it doesn't. We would rather not comment on this coincidence to avoid confusing the reader.

A validation with a real event would be limited by an incomplete knowledge of the atmospheric state. Only with a perfect knowledge of the atmospheric flow that drives the tracer transport the presented argument holds.

We can still diagnose the accuracy of the numerical scheme even without a perfect knowledge of the atmospheric flow. For pure advection, the VMR and entropy must be conserved, even if under highly

divergent flow (Rastigejev et al., 2010). Indeed, there is physical diffusion in the real atmosphere, thus the VMR and entropy cannot be preserved indefinitely. However, D'Isidoro et al., (2010) found that numerical diffusion dominates on the scales of global models. We added more discussions on this in Introduction (page 3, line 25~30).

Advection is not the only time step limiting process. Gravity waves, for example, pose a much stronger constrain. Since in global models the vertical resolution is higher than the vertical resolution (even if smaller than an aspect ratio of 1000) the numerical treatment is usually not the same for the vertical and the horizontal. GFDL-FV3 is an extreme example since it is not even Eulerian in the vertical. Although this is mentioned in section 3 this should already be mentioned at the beginning of section 2 since GFDL-FV3 is already discussed in section 1. Even then GFDL-FV3 doesn't fit the description of an Eulerian chemical transport model for which the theoretical analysis is performed in section 2. GFDL-FV3 is a full dynamical core with tracer transport so that the analysis in section 2 only applies to this model if aspects of predicting the flow are ignored. However, a more accurate prediction of the flow with increasing horizontal and/or vertical resolution is key for the interpretation of results in section 4. Appendix B is important but it shows similar numerical diffusion properties only for the transport, not for the dynamical core as a whole if I understand correctly.

We added more discussions on vertically Lagrangian vs. Eulerian at the end of Appendix B.

Lauritzen et al., (2010) compared dynamics simulations in Eulerian models and a vertically Lagrangian model (CAM-FV, which uses the same vertical scheme as FV3) and got highly consistent results. Thus we expect FV3 also has a similar dynamics property as common Eulerian models.

Volume mixing ratio is usually defined as tracer mass per unit volume and is thus not preserved in a non-divergent flow as stated. However, mass mixing ratio (the tracer mass per total mass) is. According to the figure labels, the authors define volume mixing ratio as tracer volume per total volume. This is only equivalent to mass mixing ratio for gaseous tracers, not for particulate tracers, like aerosols. To my knowledge, GFDL-FV3 solves for the tracer mass per unit dry air.

Volume mixing ratio is actually the same thing as molar mixing ratio for gases (moles ~ volume). It is preserved in divergent flow. To avoid confusion and extend generality to aerosols we changed the terminology to simply refer to 'mixing ratio' and define it in the intro as mass of chemical per mass of air.

I would have expected that section 4 confirms the optimal grid resolution ratio of 1000 but it does not. Since section 4 only focuses on error metrics for the tracer transport without including computer time, unsurprisingly, the case with the highest horizontal and vertical resolution produces the best results. At the highest resolution the aspect ratio is below 1000 ( $dx/dz=25\text{km}/80\text{m}=312.5$ ) so that simulations with higher vertical resolution would be needed to be able to prove the point of section 2. Only for C48 do the performed simulations significantly exceed an aspect ratio of 1000. Simulations with higher vertical resolution at higher horizontal resolution are needed to prove a relationship based on equation (25).

We diagnose the optimal  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  under computational constraints using the contour plots in Fig. 1 and 7, and the two plots are consistent. It is impossible to define the optimal  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  without considering computational constraint. According to Eq. (12), increasing resolution (no matter in  $\Delta x$  or  $\Delta z$ ) will always lead to smaller numerical diffusion (although the benefit can be marginal if the other dimension is limiting). Thus, the highest resolution simulation (C384L160 here) will always have the best preservation of the plume, but its aspect ratio (312.5 here) is not necessarily the optimal ratio. Consider an extreme case:  $(\Delta x, \Delta z) = (0.1 \text{ km}, 1 \text{ km})$  will produce smaller numerical diffusion than  $(\Delta x, \Delta z) = (10 \text{ km}, 1 \text{ km})$ . However,  $(\Delta x, \Delta z) = (0.1 \text{ km}, 1 \text{ km})$ , or  $\Delta x/\Delta z=0.1$ , is considered as a bad configuration because the horizontal resolution is unnecessarily high and the error is limited by vertical resolution. In other words,

$(\Delta x, \Delta z) = (0.1 \text{ km}, 1 \text{ km})$  is bad because it wastes too many computational resources on the horizontal resolution.

The initial conditions chosen for the test case are discontinuous at the plume edges. No matter what the spatial resolution, the grid will never resolve the transition between inside and outside plume. Thus, this test case cannot converge. It should still be possible to test the relationship for an optimal grid ratio as derived in section 2 but it would have been better to consider a test case that can numerically converge.

Traditional error convergence test can only be done in analytical flows, such as solid body rotation or idealized deformational flow, where the true analytical solution is known (Kent et al., 2014). In this work we focus on realistic/turbulent flows to address the issue raised by Rastigejev et al., (2010), and the analytical solution to our problem is unknown.

Instead, we choose the preservation of VMR and entropy as the diagnostics of simulation accuracy. With the entropy diagnostic, one might define the convergence of numerical error as the exactly preservation of entropy (Figure 5 in Lauritzen and Thuburn, 2012). However, in our highly challenging test with strongly stretched flow, the entropy still increases by a factor of 20 even at the highest resolution (C384L160). Thus, it is impossible to achieve error convergence, even if the plume is smooth at edges.

## Reference

- D'Isidoro, M., Maurizi, A. and Tampieri, F.: Effects of resolution on the relative importance of numerical and physical horizontal diffusion in atmospheric composition modelling, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10(13), 6213, doi:10.5194/acp-10-6213-2010, 2010.
- Kent, J., Ullrich, P. A. and Jablonowski, C.: Dynamical core model intercomparison project: Tracer transport test cases, *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 140(681), 1279–1293, doi:10.1002/qj.2208, 2014.
- Lauritzen, P. H. and Thuburn, J.: Evaluating advection/transport schemes using interrelated tracers, scatter plots and numerical mixing diagnostics, *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 138(665), 906–918, doi:10.1002/qj.986, 2012.
- Lauritzen, P. H., Jablonowski, C., Taylor, M. A. and Nair, R. D.: Rotated Versions of the Jablonowski Steady-State and Baroclinic Wave Test Cases: A Dynamical Core Intercomparison, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 2(4), n/a-n/a, doi:10.3894/james.2010.2.15, 2010.
- Methven, J. and Hoskins, B.: The advection of high-resolution tracers by low resolution winds, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 56(18), 3262–3285, 1999.
- Rastigejev, Y., Park, R., Brenner, M. P. and Jacob, D. J.: Resolving intercontinental pollution plumes in global models of atmospheric transport, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 115(2), doi:10.1029/2009JD012568, 2010.

Thank you again for considering this work for *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*. We would like to also thank the reviewers for their time and their comments. The changes we have made in response to their concerns are highlighted in an attached copy of the manuscript. Additions are highlighted in blue, and deletions in red.

Sincerely,  
Jiawei Zhuang

# The importance of vertical resolution in the free troposphere for modeling intercontinental plumes

Jiawei Zhuang<sup>1</sup>, Daniel J. Jacob<sup>1</sup>, Sebastian D. Eastham<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

<sup>2</sup>Laboratory for Aviation and the Environment Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

*Correspondence to:* Jiawei Zhuang (jiaweizhuang@g.harvard.edu)

**Abstract.** Chemical plumes in the free troposphere can preserve their identity for more than a week as they are transported on intercontinental scales, experiencing strong wind shear in a vertically stable environment. Current global models cannot reproduce this transport. The plumes ~~disperse~~dilute far too rapidly due to numerical diffusion in sheared flow. We demonstrate how model accuracy for simulating these plumes can be limited by either horizontal resolution ( $\Delta x$ ) or vertical resolution ( $\Delta z$ ).  
5 Balancing horizontal and vertical numerical diffusion, and weighing ~~by~~ computational cost, implies an optimal grid resolution ratio  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt} \sim 1000$  for ~~plume transport~~simulating the plumes. This is considerably higher than current global models ( $\Delta x/\Delta z \sim 20$ ) and explains the rapid plume ~~dissipation-dilution~~ in these models as ~~limited~~ caused by insufficient vertical resolution. Plume simulations with the GFDL-FV3 global dynamical core over a range of horizontal and vertical grid resolutions confirm this limiting behavior. Our highest-resolution simulation ( $\Delta x \approx 25$  km,  $\Delta z \approx 80$  m) preserves the maximum ~~volume~~-mixing  
10 ratio in the plume to within 35% after 8 days in strongly sheared flow, a drastic improvement over current models. The local surface pollution influence from the subsiding plume on intercontinental scales is also ~~considerably~~-increased. Adding free tropospheric vertical levels in global models is computationally inexpensive and would also improve the simulation of water vapor.

## 1 Introduction

15 Global transport of pollution mainly takes place in the free troposphere where winds are strong and pollutant lifetimes are long. The free troposphere extends from the top of the planetary boundary layer (PBL, typically 2 km altitude) up to the tropopause. It is a ~~moderately~~-prevailingly stable environment with strong wind shear. Much of pollution transport in the free troposphere takes place as plumes, typically  $\sim 1$  km thick in the vertical, that fan out horizontally over a  $\sim 1000$  km scale and may preserve their coherent structure for up to 1-2 weeks (Crawford et al., 2004; Heald et al., 2003; Liang et al., 2007; Newell  
20 et al., 1999; Stoller et al., 1999; Thouret et al., 2000). Global Eulerian models ~~disperse~~dilute these plumes too rapidly, ~~due to~~ because of numerical diffusion introduced by the advection schemes. Although the high-order advection schemes used in ~~these~~ models are highly accurate under uniform flows, the accuracy breaks down in realistic sheared/stretched flows where plumes filament and the ability to resolve cross-plume gradients is rapidly compromised (Rastigejev et al., 2010). Eastham and Jacob

(2017) found that increasing the horizontal resolution of models to address this problem is only of marginal benefit and suggested that the main limitation is vertical resolution. Here we use GFDL-FV3, a global 3-D dynamical core that explicitly solves atmospheric dynamic equations, to understand the horizontal and vertical resolution requirements for models to simulate global-scale plume transport.

5

Preserving [the structure of](#) chemical plumes during global-scale transport is important for representing non-linear chemical and aerosol processes (Wild and Prather, 2006) and for quantifying intercontinental influences on surface air (Lin et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2014). For example, models are unable to capture the ~~thick~~-plumes of Asian ozone pollution frequently observed at 2-5 km altitude over California (Hudman et al., 2004; Nowak et al., 2004). Air quality agencies in California have claimed  
10 that they cannot meet the current surface ozone standard because of this Asian pollution influence (Neuman et al., 2012). Models find Asian pollution influence in surface air over California to be only a few ppb (Goldstein et al., 2004; Zhang et al., 2008), but since they cannot resolve the structure of Asian pollution plumes crossing the Pacific they have little credibility.

General Circulation Models (GCMs) used for global simulations of atmospheric dynamics including meteorological data  
15 assimilation have increased their resolutions 1000-fold over the past 50 years, buoyed by the growth of computing power (Balaji, 2015). Increasing horizontal resolution has been privileged, and attention to vertical resolution has mainly focused on the PBL. For example, assimilated meteorological data produced operationally by the NASA Goddard Earth Observing System (GEOS) started in the 1990s with  $2^{\circ} \times 2.5^{\circ}$  horizontal resolution and 20 vertical levels (GEOS-1; Schubert et al. 1993). Today the operational GEOS forward processing (GEOS-FP) product uses a cubed-sphere C720 horizontal resolution ( $\approx 0.125^{\circ}$ ) and  
20 72 vertical levels (Lucchesi, 2017). This represents a 20-fold increase in horizontal resolution but only a 4-fold increase in vertical resolution. In the free troposphere at 2-10 km altitude the vertical resolution has increased by only a factor of 2 from GEOS-1 (8 levels) to GEOS-FP (15 levels). In NOAA's Next Generation Global Prediction System (NGGPS) program, several state-of-science dynamical cores are tested at horizontal resolutions of 12 km and 3 km, but only with 128 vertical layers -- not trying to improve on the current generation of models (Michalakes et al., 2015). ECMWF's Integrated Forecasting  
25 System (IFS) increased its horizontal resolution from 16 km to 9 km in 2016 but its vertical resolution remains at 137 levels (Haiden et al., 2016). On the Sunway TaihuLight supercomputer, a dynamical core is tested at an unprecedentedly high global horizontal resolution of 488 m but with only 128 vertical layers (Yang et al., 2016).

There are important reasons why horizontal resolution is a priority in GCMs, as reviewed by Haarsma et al. (2016). Increasing  
30 horizontal resolution improves the simulation of large-scale features such as the El Niño–Southern Oscillation (ENSO), as well as small-scale features such as tropical cyclones. It has been argued that increasing vertical resolution should follow ~~suit-~~  
~~based on the ability to resolve fronts and gravity waves~~. Pecnick and Keyser (1989) recommend an optimal relationship between horizontal and vertical grid spacing [to resolve fronts](#):

$$\left(\frac{\Delta x}{\Delta z}\right)_{opt} = \frac{1}{s}, \quad (1)$$

where  $s$  is the frontal slope, and  $\Delta x$  and  $\Delta z$  are the horizontal and vertical grid spacings respectively.  $s$  typically ranges from 0.005 to 0.02 for synoptic-scale fronts, so the optimal  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  would be in the range 50-200. Lindzen and Fox-Rabinovitz (1989) recommend [for resolving gravity waves](#)

$$5 \left(\frac{\Delta x}{\Delta z}\right)_{opt} = \frac{N}{f}, \quad (2)$$

where  $N$  is the Brunt–Väisälä frequency and  $f$  is the Coriolis parameter.  $N/f \sim 100$  is Prandtl's ratio, measuring the ratio between the horizontal and vertical scales of geostrophic flows (Dritschel and McKiver, 2015). Based on both Eq. (1) and Eq. (2),  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  in GCMs is recommended to be of the order of 100 (Chapter 3.2.1 of Warner, 2010). The current generation of GCMs with  $\Delta x \sim 10$  km and  $\Delta z \sim 0.5$  km (thus  $\Delta x/\Delta z \sim 20$ ) in the free troposphere is beginning to fall outside that range.

10

Preserving chemical plume [gradients in the free troposphere](#) may have its own [resolution](#) requirements ~~of  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  related to typical plume sizes and numerical diffusion~~. In idealized tests by Kent et al. (2012), where plumes were advected by a solid-body rotation flow coupled with vertical oscillation, doubling the vertical resolution brought down the numerical diffusion error by more than half. Numerical diffusion [of plumes](#) is considerably more severe in realistic sheared/stretched atmospheric flows (Rastigejev et al., 2010). Eastham and Jacob (2017) used GEOS-FP meteorological data [with  \$0.25^\circ \times 0.3125^\circ\$  horizontal resolution and 72 vertical levels](#) to drive the off-line GEOS-Chem Chemical Transport Model (CTM) with horizontal resolutions ranging from  $0.25^\circ \times 0.3125^\circ$  (~~native~~) to  $4^\circ \times 5^\circ$ , all with ~~the native 72-level~~ [72 vertical resolution levels of GEOS-FP and using conservative regridding of the native meteorological fields for the coarser simulations](#). They found that increasing the horizontal resolution is effective in preserving ~~2-D (horizontal)~~ [plumes in 2-D simulations \(horizontal-only, no vertical dimension\) simulations](#), but fails with 3-D plumes because the coarse vertical resolution of the native GEOS-FP data ~~is the limiting factor~~ [incurs large vertical numerical diffusion](#). They could not increase the vertical resolution in the GEOS-FP environment and thus could not explore the issue further.

15

20

25

30

[Solution of the advection equation in models should conserve the mixing ratio for the transported species \(mass of species per unit mass of air\), but should also account for the filamentation of plumes down to the millimeter Kolmogorov scale where molecular diffusion takes over to complete the dissipation process. An Eulerian model computing advection with no error would underestimate the actual diffusion process if it did not account for subgrid filamentation, which is often parameterized by adding a turbulent diffusion term to the advection equation.](#) D'Isidoro et al., (2010) [examined the relative importance of numerical and actual \(physical\) turbulent horizontal diffusion in air quality models and found that numerical diffusion dominates for grid cell sizes larger than  \$\sim 1\$  km. Numerical diffusion is also expected to dominate in the vertical because the prevailing stable conditions in the free troposphere suppress vertical turbulence. Thus the transport of intercontinental plumes](#)

[in global models incurs numerical diffusion far in excess of physical turbulent diffusion. This is manifest in the failure of the models to preserve the plumes.](#)

Increasing free tropospheric vertical resolution in GCMs would ~~seem to be an important consideration~~ [also have meteorological implications](#) for ~~resolving~~ the transport of water vapor, similar to chemical plumes (Pope et al., 2001; Tompkins and Emanuel, 2000). Water vapor in the free troposphere is layered in the same way as other chemical species (Newell et al., 1999; Thouret et al., 2000). An early intercomparison of GCMs found that the radiative effect of water vapor is relatively insensitive to model vertical resolution (Ingram, 2002), which might explain the lack of attention to this issue. However, all GCMs in that intercomparison had coarse resolution that would make them inadequate for addressing the problem properly.

Here we use the GFDL-FV3 dynamical core as a computationally flexible framework to explore the horizontal and vertical resolution requirements for free tropospheric plume transport. The dynamical core solves the atmospheric dynamics equations with no complications from physical parameterizations [such as boundary layer mixing or deep convection](#). In a full GCM, one would need to account for the vertical resolution dependence of physical parameterization schemes (Kent et al., 2012; Lane et al., 2000). In a dry dynamical core, we are free to choose any horizontal and vertical resolutions to solve the dynamics equations. A realistic sheared/stretched atmospheric flow can be simulated in a dry dynamical core by triggering baroclinic instability (Jablonowski and Williamson 2006).

## 2 Theoretical analysis

### 2.1 Numerical diffusion and its relation to grid resolution

Numerical diffusion [for a given species](#) in a Eulerian chemical transport model is caused by [the error when](#) numerically solving the 3-D advection equation:

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial C}{\partial y} + w \frac{\partial C}{\partial z} = 0, \quad (3)$$

where  $C$  is the ~~species volume~~ mixing ratio [\[kg of species per kg of air\]](#) (VMR) and  $(u, v, w)$  are the horizontal and vertical wind components. [Exact solution of the advection equation translates the mixing ratio downwind while conserving its magnitude, even in divergent flow \(Chapter 7.2 of Brasseur and Jacob, 2017\). However, the discretization of the model grid requires a numerical solution.](#) Numerical schemes in models typically use high-order approximations to the upstream derivatives, ~~and often use the flux form of the advection equation (based on number density) to facilitate mass conservation.~~ ~~A~~ [But a](#) first-order scheme allows here a simple analysis, and is relevant to our problem because higher-order schemes degrade to first order as a plume gets stretched to be resolved by only a few grid cells (Huynh, 1997; Rastigejev et al., 2010). ~~The VMR form allows us to focus on numerical diffusion, since the true solution of the advection equation translates VMR downwind while conserving its magnitude even in divergent flow (Chapter 7.2 of Brasseur and Jacob, 2017).~~

Using a 3-D first-order upwind scheme with no cross terms, applied to a grid cell  $(i, j, k)$  with time level  $n$  and wind vector components  $(u, v, w)$  ~~all positive~~, Eq. (3) is approximated by:

$$\frac{C(n+1,i,j,k)-C(n,i,j,k)}{\Delta t} + u \frac{C(n,i,j,k)-C(n,i-1,j,k)}{\Delta x} + v \frac{C(n,i,j,k)-C(n,i,j-1,k)}{\Delta y} + w \frac{C(n,i,j,k)-C(n,i,j,k-1)}{\Delta z} = 0. \quad (4)$$

- 5 [Here we have assumed that the wind components are positive so that the first-order approximation of the upwind derivatives is given by backward finite difference. Let us ~~Apply~~ apply](#) the Taylor expansion to each term in Eq. (4), for example

$$C(n, i - 1, j, k) = C(n, i, j, k) - \Delta x \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} + \frac{\Delta x^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + o(\Delta x^2). \quad (5)$$

which yields for that term

$$10 \quad u \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} - u \frac{C(n,i,j,k)-C(n,i-1,j,k)}{\Delta x} = u \frac{\Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + o(\Delta x). \quad (6)$$

The right-hand side of Eq. (6) is the truncation error between the  $u(\partial C/\partial x)$  term in the true equation Eq. (3) and its numerical approximation in Eq. (4). Adding up the error for each term in Eq. (3), we obtain the total truncation error  $\varepsilon$ :

$$\varepsilon = -\frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial t^2} + \frac{u\Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + \frac{v\Delta y}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial y^2} + \frac{w\Delta z}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} + o(\Delta t + \Delta x + \Delta y + \Delta z). \quad (7)$$

- 15 In typical truncation error analysis, terms like  $\Delta x$  are important ~~because their order indicates~~ [as indicators of](#) the order of accuracy of the scheme, while terms like  $\partial^2 C/\partial x^2$  are just coefficients. The scheme here is first-order because the error decreases linearly with  $\Delta x$ . The Modified Equation Approach (Chapter 3.3.2 of Durran, 2010; Warming and Hyett, 1974) provides a different view. We can modify the advection equation (Eq. 3) to add the error terms from Eq. (7) on the right-hand side:

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial C}{\partial y} + w \frac{\partial C}{\partial z} = -\frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial t^2} + \frac{u\Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + \frac{v\Delta y}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial y^2} + \frac{w\Delta z}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2}. \quad (8)$$

20

Using the same scheme (Eq. 4) to solve this modified equation, the error becomes second-order, i.e. decreases quadratically ( $\Delta x^2$ ):

$$\varepsilon' = o(\Delta t + \Delta x + \Delta y + \Delta z). \quad (9)$$

- 25 Thus, we can say that, instead of representing the original advection equation (Eq. 3), the numerical scheme (Eq. 4) better represents the advection-diffusion equation (Eq. 8) with the diffusion term

$$D = -\frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial t^2} + \frac{u\Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + \frac{v\Delta y}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial y^2} + \frac{w\Delta z}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2}. \quad (10)$$

This view is different from Eq. (7) in that terms like  $\partial^2 C / \partial x^2$  can now be interpreted as explicit diffusion in the differential equation while terms like  $\Delta x$  become just coefficients. The magnitude of the diffusion term decreases as the resolution increases, i.e., as the grid spacing  $\Delta x$  decreases, bringing the numerical scheme closer to the original equation (Eq. 3).

The time derivative  $(\Delta t/2)\partial^2 C / \partial t^2$  in Eq. (10) is not a standard diffusion term and does not have a clear physical meaning, but we can show following Odman (1997) that in the 1-D upwind scheme it is approximated by the spatial derivative (see Appendix A for proof):

$$10 \quad \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial t^2} \approx \alpha \frac{u\Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2}, \quad (11)$$

where  $\alpha = u\Delta t / \Delta x$  is the [Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy number \(CFL\)](#). [Eulerian advection schemes require  \$|\alpha| \leq 1\$  for stability](#) ~~Courant number with value between 0 and 1~~ (CFL condition). This means, as long as the CFL condition is satisfied, that the time discretization error will not be larger than the spatial discretization error and will not limit the overall accuracy. We omit it in what follows and only consider

$$15 \quad D \approx \frac{u\Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + \frac{v\Delta y}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial y^2} + \frac{w\Delta z}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2}. \quad (12)$$

If the horizontal grid spacings ( $\Delta x$ ,  $\Delta y$ ) decrease while the vertical grid spacing ( $\Delta z$ ) remains the same, we will eventually reach a point where

$$\left| \frac{u\Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} \right| + \left| \frac{v\Delta y}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial y^2} \right| \ll \left| \frac{w\Delta z}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} \right|, \quad (13)$$

20 which implies

$$D \approx \frac{w\Delta z}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2}, \quad (14)$$

Under this condition, the numerical diffusion is independent of the horizontal resolution and only depends on the vertical resolution. [This Eq. \(14\)](#) explains why Eastham and Jacob (2017) found that increasing the horizontal resolution beyond  $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$  in their model did not lead to further [reduction-improvement](#) in plume [dissipation-preservation](#). Similarly, if the vertical resolution increases, the numerical diffusion will eventually be determined by the horizontal resolution.

## 2.2 Balancing horizontal and vertical numerical diffusion

To avoid being limited by one dimension, the horizontal and vertical diffusion [terms](#) in Eq. (12) should have similar magnitude:

$$\left| \frac{u\Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} \right| + \left| \frac{v\Delta y}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial y^2} \right| \approx \left| \frac{w\Delta z}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} \right|. \quad (15)$$

- 5 [There is general isotropy in the horizontal dimensions.](#) ~~The horizontal grid spacings ( $\Delta x$ ,  $\Delta y$ ), wind velocities ( $u$ ,  $v$ ), and plume sharpness ( $\partial^2 C/\partial x^2$ ,  $\partial^2 C/\partial y^2$ ) are all similar in atmospheric applications,~~ thus we have

$$\left| \frac{u\Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} \right| \approx \left| \frac{v\Delta y}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial y^2} \right|. \quad (16)$$

The optimal grid spacing can then be obtained by equating horizontal and vertical diffusion:

$$10 \quad 2 \left| \frac{u\Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} \right| = \left| \frac{w\Delta z}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} \right|. \quad (17)$$

Rearranging, we obtain an expression for the optimal ratio between horizontal and vertical grid resolution to balance the effect of numerical diffusion:

$$\left( \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta z} \right)_{opt} = \frac{|w \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2}|}{2|u \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2}|}. \quad (18)$$

15

Let  $L$  and  $H$  be the horizontal and vertical extents of the plume and  $\Delta C$  be the change in ~~VMR-~~[mixing ratio](#) from the center of the plume to the background. We have

$$\left| \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} \right| \approx \frac{\Delta C}{L^2}, \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} \right| \approx \frac{\Delta C}{H^2}. \quad (19)$$

- 20 The above approximation can be obtained by either scale analysis (Chapter 2.4 of Holton, 2004) or a finite-difference approximation at the center of the plume ( $x = x_0$ ):

$$\frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} \Big|_{x=x_0} \approx \frac{C|_{x=x_0+L} + C|_{x=x_0-L} - 2C|_{x=x_0}}{L^2} = -\frac{2\Delta C}{L^2}. \quad (20)$$

Replacing into Eq. (18), we get

$$25 \quad \left( \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta z} \right)_{opt} = \frac{w}{2u} \left( \frac{L}{H} \right)^2. \quad (21)$$

Eq. (21) means that the optimal ratio of horizontal and vertical grid resolutions depends on the wind velocity and the plume aspect ratio. To get an intuition for this, consider two extreme cases: (1) if  $w = 0$ , i.e. the 3D advection problem degrades to 2D, there will be no vertical diffusion and thus no requirement on the vertical resolution ( $\Delta z_{opt} \rightarrow \infty$ ); (2) if  $H \rightarrow 0$ , i.e. the plume is infinitely thin, we will need infinitely small vertical grids to resolve it ( $\Delta z_{opt} \rightarrow 0$ ). In the real atmosphere with typical [large-scale](#) wind speeds  $u = 10 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ,  $w = 1 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$  and typical plume sizes  $L = 1000 \text{ km}$ ,  $H = 1 \text{ km}$ , we get  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt} = 500$ , ~~higher-larger~~ than the dynamical criteria reviewed [above in the Introduction \(Eq. 1 and Eq. 2\)](#). Although this numerical value is little more than an order-of-magnitude estimate, considering the uncertainty in the individual terms, it suggests that numerical diffusion of chemical plumes may place greater restriction on model vertical resolution than atmospheric dynamics. [The estimated plume aspect ratio  \$L/H = 1000\$  applies to the bulk of the plume, but might not be appropriate for small filaments.](#) Later in this paper ([Section 4.3](#)) we will use numerical simulations to derive  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt}$  and compare to the result of this [simple](#) theoretical analysis.

### 2.3 Applying computational cost considerations

In practice, the trade-off between horizontal resolution ( $\Delta x$ ) and vertical resolution ( $\Delta z$ ) must be considered in the context of a given allocation of computational resources. Increasing horizontal resolution by a factor  $m$  increases the number of grid cells by  $m^2$ , since the increase is applied to both the  $x$  and  $y$  dimensions. In addition, the time step must generally be decreased by a factor  $m$  to satisfy the CFL condition, so that the computation cost scales as  $m^3$ . Increasing vertical resolution does not generally affect the CFL condition because vertical winds are weak relative to  $\Delta z$ . A fixed amount of computation can thus be expressed by  $\Delta z \Delta x^2 = P$  (where  $P$  is a constant), ignoring the CFL condition, or by  $\Delta z \Delta x^3 = P$ , accounting for the CFL condition.

Here we consider the general problem of minimizing the numerical diffusion for a given allocation of computational resources and with a trade-off parameter  $k$  where  $k = 1$  represents equal costs for decreasing  $\Delta x$  and  $\Delta z$ ,  $k = 2$  represents a quadratic cost of decreasing  $\Delta x$  (because of corresponding decrease in  $\Delta y$ ), and  $k = 3$  represents a cubic cost of decreasing  $\Delta x$  (factoring in the CFL condition):

$$\Delta x^k \Delta z = P. \tag{22}$$

From Eq. (12) and (16), the magnitude of the numerical diffusion term can be written as

$$D = A\Delta x + B\Delta z. \tag{23}$$

where  $A$  and  $B$  are coefficients:

$$A = \left| u \frac{\partial^2 c}{\partial x^2} \right|, B = \left| \frac{w}{2} \frac{\partial^2 c}{\partial z^2} \right|. \quad (24)$$

In Section 2.2 and following Eq. (21) we estimated  $B/A \approx 500$  for typical atmospheric conditions.

5 For a given amount of computing  $P$ , the optimal  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  ratio is the one that minimizes the numerical diffusion term  $D$ . This minimum is readily found graphically, as illustrated in Fig. 1. In this Figure, the filled contours are isolines of  $D$  as given by Eq. (23) with  $B/A = 500$ . The solid lines are the computational trade-offs  $\Delta z \Delta x^2 = P$  and  $\Delta z \Delta x^3 = P$ . For a given value of  $P$ , the numerical diffusion is minimized when the contour lines of  $D(\Delta x, \Delta z)$  and  $P(\Delta x, \Delta z)$  are parallel, i.e., when their gradients have the same direction:

$$10 \quad \nabla P(\Delta x, \Delta z) \propto \nabla D(\Delta x, \Delta z). \quad (25)$$

From Eq. (22),  $\nabla P(\Delta x, \Delta z) = (k \Delta x^{k-1} \Delta z, \Delta x^k) = \Delta x^{k-1} (k \Delta z, \Delta x)$ . From Eq. (23),  $\nabla D(\Delta x, \Delta z) = (A, B)$ . Thus Eq. (25) becomes

$$(k \Delta z, \Delta x) \propto (A, B), \quad (26)$$

15 which yields

$$\left( \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta z} \right)_{opt} = \frac{kB}{A}. \quad (27)$$

In Section 2.2 we implicitly assumed that the computational costs of adjusting  $\Delta x$  or  $\Delta y$  would be the same, i.e.,  $k = 1$  in Eq. (22). Eq. (27) is then the same as Eq. (18), and using the same estimate  $B/A = 500$  as in Section 2.2 yields  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt} = 500$ .

20 Accounting for higher computational cost when increasing horizontal resolution ( $k > 1$ ) results in a higher optimal ratio. The dashed lines in Fig. 1 show the optimal  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  ratios derived for  $k = 2$  and  $k = 3$ . For  $k = 2$  we find  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt} = 1000$ , and for  $k = 3$  we find  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt} = 1500$ . It is actually remarkable that the dependence of this optimal ratio on  $k$  is linear rather than exponential. The reason is that it is based on the relative contributions of numerical diffusion in the horizontal vs. vertical directions; if numerical diffusion is caused by a coarse horizontal grid, then increasing vertical resolution (even if cheap) will

25 not provide benefit.

### 3 Atmospheric plume simulation in the GFDL-FV3 dynamical core

We conduct an 8-day simulation of a chemically inert plume in the GFDL-FV3 (<https://www.gfdl.noaa.gov/fv3/>, “FV3” hereinafter) global 3D dynamical core, with realistic sheared/stretched turbulent flow generated through a baroclinic instability test. FV3 uses the cubed-sphere geometry of Putman and Lin (2007) and the vertically-Lagrangian discretization of Lin (2004).

30 [It includes a capability for transporting inert chemicals \(“tracers”\).](#) The horizontal tracer transport algorithm is a high-

dimension extension of the third-order Piecewise Parabolic Method (PPM) (Lin and Rood, 1996) but is formally second-order accurate due to operator splitting between the two dimensions (Ullrich et al. 2010). The cubed-sphere grid avoids the polar singularity in the regular latitude-longitude grid and therefore permits efficient global high-resolution simulations on massively parallel machines. An intuitive explanation of the cubed-sphere geometry and resolution notation can be found at [http://acmg.seas.harvard.edu/geos/cubed\\_sphere.html](http://acmg.seas.harvard.edu/geos/cubed_sphere.html). FV3 has been implemented as a dynamical core in many global models including the NASA Goddard Earth Observing System (GEOS-5), the NCAR Community Earth System Model (CESM), the NCEP Global Forecast System (GFS) and the High-Performance version of GEOS-Chem (GCHP) (see <https://www.gfdl.noaa.gov/fv3/fv3-applications/>).

10 Numerical diffusion takes place in FV3 during Eulerian horizontal advection (due to finite differencing of the spatial derivatives) and during vertical remapping of the Lagrangian surfaces to the model grid (due to interpolation error). Vertical remapping can use a larger time step than horizontal advection, but the interpolation scheme can be very diffusive if monotonicity is required. Our own comparisons of the vertically Lagrangian scheme to a high-order Eulerian scheme show that they have similar vertical diffusion (Appendix B).

15

An effective way to emulate realistic turbulent atmospheric flows in a dynamical core is the baroclinic instability test, originally developed by Jablonowski and Williamson (2006) as a dynamical core benchmark and subsequently used in tracer transport simulations (Jablonowski et al., 2008; Ullrich et al., 2016). Baroclinic instability is the main mechanism for cyclogenesis in mid-latitudes. Instability can be triggered by applying a small perturbation to an initial reference state in geostrophic and hydrostatic balance. Starting from the initial perturbation, the baroclinic wave typically becomes observable around model day 4 and generates strong cyclones by day 8 (Jablonowski and Williamson 2006).

25 Here we ~~first run~~initialize the baroclinic instability simulation for 8 days so that cyclones become intense enough for realistic flow shearing/stretching. We then ~~place~~initialize an inert tracer plume ~~of uniform VMR = 1.0~~with uniform mixing ratio at the location where flow stretching is the strongest. ~~This~~initial plume extends horizontally and vertically over a number of grid cells depending on the grid resolution, as detailed below. We continue the simulation for 8 days and diagnose the transport of the plume. Tracer transport ~~uses the same grid resolution as the dynamics and~~involves solely advection. There is no subgrid turbulent diffusion or convection.

30 We conduct simulations at horizontal cubed-sphere resolutions ranging from C48 ( $\approx 200$  km) to C384 ( $\approx 25$  km) and vertical resolutions ranging from L20 (20 vertical layers) to L160. The vertical layers are equally spaced in pressure from the surface (1000 hPa in the reference state) to 1 hPa altitude. Thus L20 has a vertical resolution of 50 hPa, corresponding to 0.6 km in the free troposphere at 600 hPa, which is roughly the vertical resolution of the GEOS-FP product used in the current version

of GEOS-Chem. L160 has a vertical resolution of 6 hPa (roughly 80 m in the free troposphere), well beyond the resolution of any of the current global models. [The same grid resolution is used for computing dynamics and tracer transport.](#)

5 The time step for the Lagrangian remapping is 30 minutes for the lowest horizontal resolution case (C48) and is reduced proportionally at higher horizontal resolutions. Within this time step are 8 sub-steps for horizontal dynamics calculations. The frequency of horizontal tracer advection calculations is determined on-the-fly based on the CFL criterion.

10 The plume is initialized with a uniform mixing ratio ~~VMR = 1.0~~ [normalized to unity](#) over a horizontal area corresponding to  $6 \times 6$  C48 grid squares (roughly  $1000 \text{ km} \times 1000 \text{ km}$ ), and vertically in a single layer in the L20 case (roughly 0.6 km thick) centered at 625 hPa (4 km) altitude. Thus our coarsest simulation C48L20 resolves the initial plume with  $6 \times 6 \times 1$  grid cells, while our finest simulation C384L160 resolves it with  $48 \times 48 \times 8$  grid cells. The initialization is intended to describe a pollution plume once it has been lifted to the free troposphere and undergone fast initial horizontal fanning (Andreae et al., 1988; Heald et al., 2003). CTMs are generally successful at simulating this initial fanning but then fail to preserve the plume's [coherent structure](#) during the subsequent intercontinental transport (Heald et al., 2006; Zhang et al., 2008). The sensitivity of our results to the initial plume size will be discussed [in Section 4.3](#).

## 4 Results and discussion

### 4.1 Plume transport and stretching

20 Fig 2 shows the surface pressures and 700 hPa wind fields on Day 8 of the plume simulation, at C48L20 and C384L20 resolutions. The simulation describes a typical quasi-geostrophic system at mid-latitudes with low and high pressure centers and the associated geostrophic winds. We find that increasing the horizontal resolution intensifies the cyclones, as shown in previous studies (Jablonowski and Williamson, 2006; Lauritzen et al., 2010), while increasing vertical resolution from L20 to L160 has almost no effect. Hence the GCM emphasis on increasing horizontal resolution.

25 Also shown in Fig 2 is the local Lyapunov exponent  $\lambda = \partial u / \partial x$  of the wind field.  ~~$\lambda$  is, which defines~~ the rate constant at which nearby air parcels separate in the direction of the flow, i.e., the intensity of flow stretching. (Rastigejev et al., 2010) showed theoretically that the Lyapunov exponent should be a predictor of numerical diffusion in Eulerian models, and Eastham and Jacob (2017) confirmed this in GEOS-Chem model simulations. We calculate the Lyapunov exponent locally by (Eastham and Jacob 2017):

$$\lambda \approx \frac{|\Delta u| + |\Delta v|}{\Delta x + \Delta y}, \quad (28)$$

30

where  $\Delta u$  and  $\Delta v$  are the changes in wind speeds between the local grid cell and the grid cell downwind, and  $\Delta x$  and  $\Delta y$  are the corresponding grid spacings. Between 30°N and 60°N where the plume transport takes place, the Lyapunov exponents are of order  $10^{-5}\text{s}^{-1}$ , consistent with values derived from the GEOS-FP wind data (Eastham and Jacob, 2017). Higher horizontal resolution increases stretching because small-scale eddies are better resolved, which offsets some of the ~~gains in reduction~~  
5 ~~in~~ numerical diffusion (Rastigejev et al., 2010). We find a mean 700 hPa vertical wind speed  $w$  at 30°-60°N of  $-0.1 \pm 1.0 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$  ( $\pm$  one standard deviation), typical of the range of large-scale vertical wind speeds in the real atmosphere. Thus the FV3 simulation provides a realistic environment to investigate how global-scale transport of chemical plumes is sensitive to model grid resolution. It does not account for deep convection or boundary layer turbulence, but our focus here is on the free troposphere under the prevailing stable conditions that allow for plume preservation during global-scale transport. The plume  
10 may originate from a convective updraft, and it may be eventually entrained and mixed in the turbulent boundary layer, but we are not concerned with these plume initialization and termination processes.

Fig 3 illustrates the evolution of the plume over the 8-day period in the C384L160 case ( $\approx 25 \text{ km}$ , 6 hPa resolution). The plume is initialized over Alaska, reaches eastern North America by Day 4, and Eurasia by Day 8, with strong filamentation along the  
15 way due to wind shear. Such rapid transport and filamentation is typical of free tropospheric plumes at northern mid-latitudes (Stohl et al., 2002). The plume gradually subsides and disperses-dilutes vertically over the 8-day period, again typical of observations (Crawford et al., 2004). The spreading and dilution of the plume apparent in Fig. 3 is due in part to the plotting of column and meridional average ~~VMRs~~ mixing ratios for visualization purposes; the actual numerical diffusion is less and can be quantified by the ~~VMR~~ mixing ratio decay and entropy increase for the actual plume, as described ~~below~~ in Section 4.2.

## 20 4.2 Numerical diffusion at different grid resolutions

Exact solution to the advection equation conserves the ~~VMR~~ mixing ratio, even for divergent or sheared flow (Chapter 7.2 of Brasseur and Jacob, 2017). Our simulation includes advection as the only process. It follows that any ~~VMR~~ mixing ratio decay in the model plume must be due solely to numerical diffusion and provides a metric for this diffusion.

25 Fig. 4 shows the rate of decay of the maximum mixing ratio in the plume ~~VMR~~ for the different horizontal and vertical resolutions of our simulations. The time scale for this decay diagnoses the rate of plume dissipation from numerical diffusion and can be used to compare different grid resolutions (Eastham and Jacob, 2017; Rastigejev et al., 2010).

At the lowest resolution (C48L20), the maximum ~~VMR~~ mixing ratio in the plume drops from 1.0 to 0.1 after 8 days. Such  
30 rapid diffusion is consistent with the mid-latitudes results of Eastham and Jacob (2017) using GEOS-FP winds. Starting from C48L20, solely increasing the vertical resolution has no benefit in reducing numerical diffusion (Fig. 4, top left panel). Solely increasing horizontal resolution has some benefit for the first 4 days of aging, but by day 5 the benefit is gone (Fig. 4, bottom

left panel). This is consistent with the theory in Section 2.1 that inadequate resolution in one direction will limit the overall accuracy, making grid refinement in the other direction useless.

However, once the resolution of one dimension is high enough that it is no longer a limiting factor, grid refinement in the other direction becomes effective. This is illustrated in the right panels of Fig. 4. Increasing vertical resolution in a C384 simulation has sustained benefit from L20 to L160, and increasing horizontal resolution in a L160 simulation has sustained benefit from C48 to C384. At the highest resolution (C384L160), the decay in the maximum ~~VMR~~-[mixing ratio](#) is only 35% after 8 days of transport, a drastic improvement over the simulation cases presented by Rastigejev et al. (2010) and Eastham and Jacob (2017).

The behavior of decay rates in Fig. 4 lends further insights into numerical diffusion. We see that the decay rates are initially slow and then abruptly increase. This is because the plume is initially well resolved on the grid, but as the plume gradually filaments and becomes poorly resolved fast numerical diffusion takes over. Increasing horizontal resolution delays the onset of this fast numerical diffusion, as seen most dramatically in the bottom left panel of Fig. 4. Thus a factor in the choice of resolution should be the extent of time over which the model plumes must be preserved, considering that molecular diffusion will eventually dissipate the plumes in the actual atmosphere as they filament down to the millimeter Kolmogorov scale (Chapter 8 of Brasseur and Jacob 2017). Observations show that intercontinental free tropospheric plumes can retain their structure for at least a week (Heald et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2008), so there is benefit in the highest range of resolutions investigated in our simulations.

Fig. 5 shows the vertical profile of maximum ~~VMRs~~-[mixing ratios](#) for each model level after 8 days of simulation, at the lowest model resolution (C48L20), the highest model resolution (C384L160), and intermediate cases where only horizontal or vertical resolution is increased from the low-resolution case (C384L20, C48L160). Starting from C48L20, solely increasing either the horizontal resolution (to C384L20) or the vertical resolution (to C48L160) has limited improvement on the vertical profile. This is the familiar picture of models being unable to preserve the vertical structure of pollution plumes on intercontinental scales (Heald et al., 2003). Increasing both horizontal and vertical resolutions (to C384L160) drastically improves the preservation of the vertical profile and largely fixes the problem. The surface concentrations are close to zero in all cases but this is because the FV3 dynamical core does not include boundary layer physics. From the concentrations at 900-950 hPa we can conclude that the high-resolution simulation when implemented in a full GCM would lead to much stronger localized impact of the subsiding plume on surface concentrations.

Maximum ~~VMR~~-[mixing ratio](#) in the plume is an extreme value diagnostic that is relevant for plume observation and impact but is an imperfect measure of plume ~~dissipation~~-[dilution](#) (Eastham and Jacob, 2017). As shown in Fig. 3, the plume shears into multiple filaments as it ages but the maximum ~~VMR~~-[mixing ratio](#) diagnoses just one of these filaments. Also, numerical diffusion will first erode the plume as its edges while preserving the maximum ~~VMR~~-[mixing ratio](#) at the center. Eastham and

Jacob (2017) used the expanding size of the plume as an alternate diagnostic but this relies on an arbitrary concentration threshold.

As a more general diagnostic of plume preservation, we calculate the entropy that takes into account all grid cells in the global domain (Lauritzen and Thuburn 2012). The entropy  $S$  of a 3D [VMR-mixing ratio](#) field can be calculated by

$$S = -k \sum_{i=1}^n m_i C_i \log C_i, \quad (29)$$

where  $n$  is the total number of grid cells of index  $i$ ,  $C_i$  is the [VMR-mixing ratio](#),  $m_i$  is the mass of air in the grid cell, and  $k$  is a scaling factor such that the initial entropy is unity. Pure advection conserves entropy but diffusion increases it, and  $S$  is maximized when the [VMR-mixing ratio](#) field  $C$  becomes uniform (complete mixing). A non-monotonic advection scheme can unphysically decrease entropy, but here we use strictly monotonic schemes in both horizontal and vertical, so the best possible simulation would preserve the entropy.

Fig. 6 shows the increase in entropy as the plume [dilutes](#)~~decays~~ at different model grid resolutions. Results are similar to the maximum [VMR-mixing ratio](#) diagnostic (Fig. 4) in showing the limiting effects of either horizontal or vertical resolution, and the benefit of coupling the two to improve the simulation. One difference is the absence of a time lag for plume ~~dissipation~~[dilution](#). Whereas the maximum [VMR-mixing ratio](#) is initially sheltered from numerical diffusion if the plume is resolved by a number of grid cells, numerical diffusion erodes the plume edges and the thinner filaments and this is captured by the entropy diagnostic. The entropy diagnostic also shows a slowdown of plume ~~dissipation~~[dilution](#) with time, particularly at coarse resolution, and this is due to the smoothing of the plume that allows concentration gradients to be better represented by the numerical schemes. At that point, however, the plume may already be too [dilute](#)~~issipated~~. Ultimately, the choice of maximum [VMR-mixing ratio](#) or entropy as a diagnostic of plume dissipation may depend on the application, but the implied requirements for grid resolution are similar. This is discussed further below ([Section 4.3](#)).

### 4.3 Optimal combination of horizontal and vertical grid resolution

The results from Section 4.2, following on the theoretical analysis of Section 2, show that preserving plumes in global models may be limited by either horizontal or vertical resolution. It follows that there must be an optimal ratio of horizontal to vertical grid spacing  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt}$  for simulating the global-scale transport of plumes, as there is for the dynamical criteria reviewed in the Introduction. We derived such a ratio from theoretical analysis in Section 2, and here we derive it from the FV3 plume simulations.

Fig. 7 illustrates the trade-offs between horizontal and vertical resolution in the FV3 plume simulations, presented in a similar manner to the results of the theoretical analysis in Fig. 1. The contours measure the preservation of the plume after 8 days, as diagnosed by either the maximum [VMR-mixing ratio](#) or the entropy, using the Day 8 data from Figs. 4 and 6 with additional

simulations at intermediate resolutions to better define the contours. As in Section 2.3, we aim to ~~maximize VMR~~[preserve the maximum mixing ratio](#) and/or minimize entropy under the computational trade-offs  $\Delta z \Delta x^3 = P$  and  $\Delta z \Delta x^2 = P$ . The solid lines show the computational trade-offs. Along each trade-off line, it is generally beneficial to move away from  $\Delta x/\Delta z < 100$  (the upper left region of Fig. 7,  $\Delta x = 25\text{-}50$  km,  $\Delta z = 0.6$  km) [and to ward](#)  $\Delta x/\Delta z \sim 1000$  (the bottom region of Fig. 7,  $\Delta x = 50\text{-}200$  km,  $\Delta z = 0.08$  km), since it leads to better preservation of the plume without incurring more computational cost. Thus we already see that the current generation of models ( $\Delta x/\Delta z \sim 20$ ) is out of balance in privileging horizontal over vertical resolution.

As in Section 2.3, the optimal ratio  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt}$  is defined by the point where the computational trade-off line parallels the contour line. Different ratios  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  are shown as yellow dashed lines in Fig. 7. For the  $\Delta z \Delta x^2 = P$  trade-off (white solid lines), the optimal range of  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  is in the range 700-1500, consistent with the theoretical derivation in Section 2.3 that  $\Delta x/\Delta z \sim 1000$ . The  $\Delta z \Delta x^3 = P$  trade-off (the red solid lines in Fig. 7) leads to a higher  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt}$  around 1500, again consistent with the theoretical analysis.

We conducted sensitivity tests with plumes of different initial vertical thicknesses [and horizontal extents](#), and found similar results. Thicker plumes have better initial preservation of the maximum ~~VMR~~[mixing ratio](#) but this [advantage](#) is rapidly ~~lost~~[dissipate](#) as the plume filaments. Although the theoretical analysis of Section 2 implies that  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt}$  should depend on the plume size, this applies to the stretched rather than to the initial plume. During model transport, plumes of different initial thicknesses tend to be stretched to similar steady-state thicknesses where the stretching rate (thinning the plume) is balanced by the numerical diffusion rate (thickening the plume) (Rastigejev et al., 2010).

The estimated  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt}$  should not greatly depend on the advection scheme used, since fast numerical diffusion occurs when the plume has filamented to the point where gradients cannot be resolved and any advection scheme collapses to first-order accurate. One concern is whether FV3 represents realistically the ratio of vertical-to-horizontal shear that would occur in a wet atmosphere; this should be tested in simulations in an actual GCM. Nevertheless, it appears that the vertical resolution requirements for global simulation of chemical plumes are much larger than the ratio  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt} \sim 100$  derived from dynamical concerns of resolving fronts and gravity waves, and that current models have woefully inadequate vertical resolutions.

[Our recommendation to increase vertical resolution in the free troposphere is specific to global models, and our emphasis on an optimal  \$\Delta x/\Delta z\$  is to make the point that the simulation of global-scale plumes with large horizontal/vertical aspect ratios \(reflecting the strong horizontal wind shear and vertically stable conditions of the free troposphere\) is currently limited by vertical rather than by horizontal model resolution. The situation would be very different in cloud-resolving models \( \$\Delta x < 1\$  km\) where turbulence is much more isotropic.](#)

## 5 Conclusions and implications for global modeling of chemical plumes

Current global models are unable to simulate the observed persistence of chemical plumes in the free troposphere on intercontinental scales. The plumes ~~disperse~~dilute too rapidly due to numerical diffusion in sheared flow. This is a major problem for global simulations of atmospheric composition and for diagnosing intercontinental pollution influences on surface air quality. We investigated how this problem could be solved through increasing horizontal and vertical grid resolutions, and in what optimal combination. We used for this purpose the GFDL-FV3 global dynamical core to perform plume transport simulations, driven by flow with realistic shear as generated from a baroclinic instability test. The flexibility of this dynamical core allowed us to conduct simulations over cubed-sphere horizontal resolutions ranging from C48 ( $\approx 200$  km) to C384 ( $\approx 25$  km) and vertical resolutions ranging from L20 (50 hPa) to L160 (6 hPa).

We began with a theoretical analysis of the plume advection problem to show that numerical diffusion may be limited by either horizontal grid resolution ( $\Delta x$ ) or vertical resolution ( $\Delta z$ ). This analysis must take into account that increasing horizontal resolution is more costly than increasing vertical resolution, as expressed by  $\Delta x^k \Delta z = P$  where  $P$  denotes the amount of computational resources available and  $k = 2$  (fixed time step) or  $k = 3$  (time step adjusted for the CFL condition). We derived from this analysis an optimal ratio  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt} \approx k(w/2u)(L/H)^2 \sim 1000$  for resolving the long-range transport of plumes, where  $u$  and  $w$  are the horizontal and vertical components of the wind, and  $L$  and  $H$  are the horizontal and vertical dimensions of the plume. This is much larger than the optimal ratio  $(\Delta x/\Delta z)_{opt} \sim 100$  derived from dynamical considerations of resolving fronts and gravity waves. Current global atmospheric models have  $\Delta x/\Delta z \sim 20$  in the free troposphere ( $\Delta x \sim 10$  km,  $\Delta z \sim 0.5$  km), with an emphasis on continued improvement in horizontal resolution to the neglect of vertical resolution. This explains why excessively fast ~~dissipation~~dilution of chemical plumes takes place in these models. The problem would not apply in the boundary layer, where plumes are more isotropic (much lower  $L/H$ ) and models have larger  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  ratios. But global-scale plume transport takes place exclusively in the free troposphere.

We applied the FV3 dynamical core to simulate the transport over 8 days of a chemically inert free tropospheric plume at northern mid-latitudes. Transport in the dynamical core is solely by advection, and exact solution should therefore preserve the initial ~~volume~~mixing ratio (VMR) in the plume. We diagnosed numerical diffusion over the 8-day simulation by the decay of the maximum ~~VMR~~mixing ratio and the increase in entropy. We demonstrated how improvements in preserving the plume during transport can be limited by either horizontal or vertical resolution, in a manner consistent with the theoretical analysis. Our highest-resolution simulation (C384L160) preserved the maximum ~~VMR~~mixing ratio in the plume to within 35% after 8 days in strongly sheared flow, retained the vertical structure of the plume, and led to much larger local intercontinental impacts on surface air than the coarser-resolution simulations. The required vertical resolution in the free troposphere is 6 hPa ( $\approx 80$  m), considerably finer than in current global models.

There are strong reasons for GCMs to focus on horizontal resolution as computational resources increase, as this allows better representation of cyclogenesis and other aspects of the meteorological simulation. However, simulations of global chemical transport require higher vertical resolution in the free troposphere. Considering that the free troposphere accounts for only about a third of all vertical levels in the current generation of models, adding vertical resolution only to that part of the atmosphere would not be expensive. A proper vertical resolution in the free troposphere would also benefit the simulation of water vapor with implications for the radiative budget and for cloud formation. Within the framework of current GCMs, it may be possible to improve chemical transport by conducting off-line CTM simulations with high vertical resolution, interpolating the meteorological archive from the parent GCM. The feasibility of such hybrid-resolution simulations has been studied by Methven and Hoskins (1999). [Adaptive mesh refinement \(AMR\) is also a computationally efficient approach to improve plume simulations](#) (Semakin and Rastigejev, 2016), [but implementing AMR in existing CTMs requires significant engineering efforts especially on parallelization](#).

## 6 Code availability

The FV3 source code was obtained from <https://www.gfdl.noaa.gov/cubed-sphere-quickstart/>. All scripts for model configuration and data analysis are available at [https://github.com/JiaweiZhuang/FV3\\_util](https://github.com/JiaweiZhuang/FV3_util) (Zhuang, 2017). A Python package named “cubedsphere” (<https://github.com/JiaweiZhuang/cubedsphere>, Zhuang and Rothenberg, 2017) was developed by the lead author for analyzing data on the cubed-sphere grid. We use xarray (Hoyer and Hamman, 2017) to process NetCDF data that are larger than computer memory.

## Appendix A: Relating $\partial^2 C / \partial t^2$ and $\partial^2 C / \partial x^2$ through the advection equation

Following Odman (1997), we start with the 1-D advection equation

$$20 \quad \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} = 0. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The equation is solved by the 1-D upwind scheme

$$\frac{C(n+1,i) - C(n,i)}{\Delta t} + u \frac{C(n,i) - C(n,i-1)}{\Delta x} = 0. \quad (\text{A2})$$

25 Using the Modified Equation Approach introduced in Section 2, we find the numerical scheme better represents the equation

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} = -\frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial t^2} + \frac{u \Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + o(\Delta t + \Delta x). \quad (\text{A3})$$

Apply the operation  $(\Delta t/2)(\partial/\partial t)$  to Eq. (A3),

$$\frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[ \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} \right] = \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[ -\frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial t^2} + \frac{u \Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + o(\Delta t + \Delta x) \right]. \quad (\text{A4})$$

The right hand-side of Eq. (A4) only contains high-order terms such as  $\Delta t^2$  and  $\Delta t \Delta x$  so can be simply written as  $o(\Delta t + \Delta x)$ :

$$5 \quad \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial t^2} + \frac{u \Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial t \partial x} = o(\Delta t + \Delta x). \quad (\text{A5})$$

Perform Eq. (A3) – Eq. (A5) to cancel the  $(\Delta t/2)(\partial^2 C/\partial t^2)$  term:

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} = \frac{u \Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial t \partial x} + \frac{u \Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + o(\Delta t + \Delta x). \quad (\text{A6})$$

Compared to Eq. (A3), the second-order time derivative  $(-\Delta t/2)(\partial^2 C/\partial t^2)$  is now replaced by the mixed-derivative  $(u \Delta t/2)(\partial^2 C/\partial t \partial x)$ .

10

To further eliminate this mixed-derivative, apply the operation  $(u \Delta t/2)(\partial/\partial x)$  to Eq. (A6)

$$\frac{u \Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} \right] = \frac{u \Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ -\frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial t^2} + \frac{u \Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + o(\Delta t + \Delta x) \right]. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Again, the right hand-side of Eq. (A7) can be simply written as  $o(\Delta t + \Delta x)$ :

$$15 \quad \frac{u \Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x \partial t} + \frac{u^2 \Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} = o(\Delta t + \Delta x). \quad (\text{A8})$$

Perform Eq. (A6) + Eq. (A8) to cancel the  $(u \Delta t/2)(\partial^2 C/\partial x \partial t)$  term

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} = -\frac{u^2 \Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + \frac{u \Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + o(\Delta t + \Delta x). \quad (\text{A9})$$

Now all time derivatives except the original  $\partial C/\partial t$  are removed. The time step  $\Delta t$  can also be removed by introducing the CFL

20 number  $\alpha = u \Delta t/\Delta x$ . The first term on the right-hand side of Eq. (A9) becomes

$$-\frac{u^2 \Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} = -\alpha \frac{u \Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

Thus Eq. (A9) can be further simplified to

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} = (1 - \alpha) \frac{u \Delta x}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + o(\Delta t + \Delta x). \quad (\text{A11})$$

25

From Eq. (A3) to Eq. (A11), the time-derivative  $(\Delta t/2)(\partial^2 C/\partial t^2)$  is approximated by the spatial derivative  $(au\Delta x/2)(\partial^2 C/\partial x^2)$ . This means that, as long as the CFL condition is satisfied, the time discretization error will not limit the overall accuracy. This conclusion still applies to a 3-D advection equation, although the above mathematical derivation will produce mixed derivatives like  $\partial^2 C/\partial x\partial y$ , so a compact formula like Eq. (A11) cannot be easily obtained.

## 5 Appendix B: Comparing vertical numerical diffusion in FV3 and TPCORE schemes

Here we use the GEOS-Chem CTM to compare vertical numerical diffusion in FV3's advection scheme to that in TPCORE, a 3D Eulerian advection scheme (Lin and Rood, 1996). TPCORE is the standard advection scheme in the "classic" version of the GEOS-Chem CTM (Bey et al., 2001), while FV3 is used in the High-Performance version of GEOS-Chem (GCHP; Long et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2017). Unlike FV3, TPCORE uses a regular latitude-longitude geometry and a vertically-Eulerian  
10 discretization. When the CFL number is less than one, the horizontal tracer transport uses the monotonic PPM as in FV3; otherwise, a semi-Lagrangian method is used. The vertical tracer transport uses PPM with Huynh's second constraint (Huynh, 1997). We use a C48 horizontal resolution for GEOS-Chem with FV3 and a corresponding  $2^\circ \times 2.5^\circ$  resolution for GEOS-Chem with TPCORE. Both versions use the native GEOS-FP 72-level hybrid sigma-pressure vertical coordinate and a time step of 15 minutes.

15

We use the idealized Hadley-like circulation test in the 2012 Dynamical Core Model Intercomparison Project (Kent et al. 2014) to benchmark the vertical diffusion in both models. The simulation is illustrated by Fig. B1. The initial tracer layer (Fig. B1, left panel) is advected in the vertical by a Hadley-like flow (Fig. B1, middle panels) and then gets reverted to the original state by a reverse flow (Fig. B1, right panels). The true solution at the final state should be the same as the initial condition, and the  
20 deviation from the initial condition is due to numerical error. The error norm can be calculated by

$$l = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n m_i |C_i - C_{i,true}|}{\sum_{i=1}^n m_i |C_{i,true}|} \quad (B1)$$

where  $n$  is the total number of grid cells of index  $i$ ,  $m_i$  is the mass of air in the grid cell,  $C_i$  is the ~~V~~MR [mixing ratio](#) at the final state and  $C_{i,true}$  is the ~~V~~MR [mixing ratio](#) at the initial state. We find  $l = 19.0\%$  for TPCORE and  $l = 16.2\%$  for FV3, indicating  
25 that the vertically Lagrangian scheme in FV3 has a diffusion similar to the Eulerian scheme in TPCORE.

[There are many equivalences between remapping schemes and advection schemes. For example, both higher-order remapping and higher-order advection schemes are not monotonic by default, and need additional limiters or constraints to prevent overshoots. If gradients are sharp, monotonic limiters will degrade higher-order schemes to first-order, at the expense of  
30 making the schemes more diffusive. Increasing the grid resolution will make both remapping and advection schemes more](#)

[accurate and less diffusive. Due to these similarities between advection and remapping, our Eulerian-based theoretical analysis in Section 2 should also apply to vertically Lagrangian schemes.](#)

5 *Acknowledgements.* The authors would like to thank Lucas Harris, Xi Chen and S. J. Lin at GFDL for general guidance on the GFDL-FV3 model. Resources supporting this work were provided by the NASA High-End Computing (HEC) Program through the NASA Advanced Supercomputing (NAS) Division at Ames Research Center. This work was supported by the NASA Modeling, Analysis, and Prediction (MAP) Program.

## References

- 10 Andreae, M. O., Browell, E. V., Garstang, M., Gregory, G. L., Harriss, R. C., Hill, G. F., Jacob, D. J., Pereira, M. C., Sachse, G. W., Setzer, a. W., Dias, P. L. S., Talbot, R. W., Torres, a. L. and Wofsy, S. C.: Biomass-burning emissions and associated haze layers over Amazonia, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 93(D2), 1509–1527, doi:10.1029/JD093iD02p01509, 1988.
- Balaji, V.: Climate Computing: The State of Play, *Comput. Sci. Eng.*, 17(6), 9–13, doi:10.1109/MCSE.2015.109, 2015.
- Bey, I., Jacob, D. J., Yantosca, R. M., Logan, J. A., Field, B. D., Fiore, A. M., Li, Q., Liu, H. Y., Mickley, L. J. and Schultz,  
15 M. G.: Global modeling of tropospheric chemistry with assimilated meteorology: Model description and evaluation, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 106(D19), 23073–23095, 2001.
- Crawford, J. H., Heald, C. L., Fuelberg, H. E., Morse, D. M., Sachse, G. W., Emmons, L. K., Gille, J. C., Edward, D. P., Deeter, M. N., Chen, G., Olson, J. R., Connors, V. S., Kittaka, C. and Hamlin, A. J.: Relationship between measurements  
20 of pollution in the Troposphere (MOPITT) and in situ observations of CO based on a large-scale feature sampled during TRACE-P, *J. Geophys. Res. D Atmos.*, 109(15), 1–10, doi:10.1029/2003JD004308, 2004.
- D’Isidoro, M., Maurizi, A. and Tampieri, F.: Effects of resolution on the relative importance of numerical and physical horizontal diffusion in atmospheric composition modelling, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10(13), 6213, doi:10.5194/acp-10-6213-2010, 2010.
- Dritschel, D. G. and McKiver, W. J.: Effect of Prandtl’s ratio on balance in geophysical turbulence, *J. Fluid Mech.*, 777, 569–  
25 590, doi:10.1017/jfm.2015.348, 2015.
- Durrant, D. R.: *Numerical Methods for Fluid Dynamics: With Applications to Geophysics.*, 2010.
- Eastham, S. D. and Jacob, D. J.: Limits on the ability of global Eulerian models to resolve intercontinental transport of chemical plumes, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17(4), 2543–2553, doi:10.5194/acp-17-2543-2017, 2017.
- Goldstein, A. H., Millet, D. B., McKay, M., Jaeglé, L., Horowitz, L., Cooper, O., Hudman, R., Jacob, D. J., Oltmans, S. and  
30 Clarke, A.: Impact of Asian emissions on observations at Trinidad Head, California, during ITCT 2K2, *J. Geophys. Res. D Atmos.*, 109(23), 1–13, doi:10.1029/2003JD004406, 2004.
- Haarsma, R. J., Roberts, M. J., Vidale, P. L., Catherine, A., Bellucci, A., Bao, Q., Chang, P., Corti, S., Fučkar, N. S., Guemas,


- V., Von Hardenberg, J., Hazeleger, W., Kodama, C., Koenigk, T., Leung, L. R., Lu, J., Luo, J. J., Mao, J., Mizielinski, M. S., Mizuta, R., Nobre, P., Satoh, M., Scoccimarro, E., Semmler, T., Small, J. and Von Storch, J. S.: High Resolution Model Intercomparison Project (HighResMIP v1.0) for CMIP6, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 9(11), 4185–4208, doi:10.5194/gmd-9-4185-2016, 2016.
- 5 Haiden, T., Janousek, M., Bidlot, J., Ferranti, L., Prates, F., Vitart, F., Bauer, P. and Richardson, D. S.: Evaluation of ECMWF forecasts, including the 2016 resolution upgrade, ECMWF Tech. Memo., 792(January 2017) [online] Available from: <http://www.ecmwf.int/sites/default/files/elibrary/2015/15275-evaluation-ecmwf-forecasts-including-2014-2015-upgrades.pdf>, 2016.
- Heald, C. L., Jacob, D. J., Fiore, A. M., Emmons, L. K., Gille, J. C., Deeter, M. N., Warner, J., Edwards, D. P., Crawford, J.  
10 H., Hamlin, A. J., Sachse, G. W., Browell, E. V., Avery, M. A., Vay, S. A., Westberg, D. J., Blake, D. R., Singh, H. B., Sandholm, S. T., Talbot, R. W. and Fuelberg, H. E.: Asian outflow and trans-Pacific transport of carbon monoxide and ozone pollution: An integrated satellite, aircraft, and model perspective, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 108(D24), n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2003JD003507, 2003.
- Heald, C. L., Jacob, D. J., Park, R. J., Alexander, B., Fairlie, T. D., Yantosca, R. M. and Chu, D. A.: Transpacific transport of  
15 Asian anthropogenic aerosols and its impact on surface air quality in the United States, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 111(14), doi:10.1029/2005JD006847, 2006.
- Holton, J. R.: *An Introduction to Dynamic Meteorology*, Elsevier., 2004.
- Hoyer, S. and Hamman, J. J.: xarray: N-D labeled Arrays and Datasets in Python, *J. Open Res. Softw.*, 5, 1–6, doi:10.5334/jors.148, 2017.
- 20 Hudman, R. C., Jacob, D. J., Cooper, O. R., Evans, M. J., Heald, C. L., Park, R. J., Fehsenfeld, F., Flocke, F., Holloway, J., Hübler, G., Kita, K., Koike, M., Kondo, Y., Neuman, A., Nowak, J., Oltmans, S., Parrish, D., Roberts, J. M. and Ryerson, T.: Ozone production in transpacific Asian pollution plumes and implications for ozone air quality in California, *J. Geophys. Res. D Atmos.*, 109(23), 1–14, doi:10.1029/2004JD004974, 2004.
- Huynh, H. T.: Schemes and constraints for advection, in *Fifteenth International Conference on Numerical Methods in Fluid  
25 Dynamics*, pp. 498–503, Springer., 1997.
- Ingram, W. J.: On the robustness of the water vapor feedback: GCM vertical resolution and formulation, *J. Clim.*, 15(9), 917–921, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(2002)015<0917:OTROTW>2.0.CO;2, 2002.
- Jablonowski, C. and Williamson, D. L.: A baroclinic instability test case for atmospheric model dynamical cores, *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 132(621C), 2943–2975, doi:10.1256/qj.06.12, 2006.
- 30 Jablonowski, C., Lauritzen, P. H., Nair, R. D. and Taylor, M.: Idealized test cases for the dynamical cores of atmospheric general circulation models: a proposal for the NCAR ASP 2008 summer colloquium, Manuscr. May/29/2008, to be Submitt. as an NCAR Tech. Rep. J. Pap., 2008.
- Kent, J., Jablonowski, C., Whitehead, J. P. and Rood, R. B.: Assessing Tracer Transport Algorithms and the Impact of Vertical Resolution in a Finite-Volume Dynamical Core, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 140(5), 1620–1638, doi:10.1175/mwr-d-11-

00150.1, 2012.


- Kent, J., Ullrich, P. A. and Jablonowski, C.: Dynamical core model intercomparison project: Tracer transport test cases, Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., 140(681), 1279–1293, doi:10.1002/qj.2208, 2014.
- Lane, D. E., Somerville, R. C. J. and Iacobellis, S. F.: Sensitivity of cloud and radiation parameterizations to changes in vertical resolution, J. Clim., 13(5), 915–922, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(2000)013<0915:SOCARP>2.0.CO;2, 2000.
- 5 Lauritzen, P. H. and Thuburn, J.: Evaluating advection/transport schemes using interrelated tracers, scatter plots and numerical mixing diagnostics, Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., 138(665), 906–918, doi:10.1002/qj.986, 2012.
- Lauritzen, P. H., Jablonowski, C., Taylor, M. A. and Nair, R. D.: Rotated Versions of the Jablonowski Steady-State and Baroclinic Wave Test Cases: A Dynamical Core Intercomparison, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 2(4), n/a-n/a, doi:10.3894/james.2010.2.15, 2010.
- 10 Liang, Q., Jaeglé, L., Hudman, R. C., Turquety, S., Jacob, D. J., Avery, M. A., Browell, E. V., Sachse, G. W., Blake, D. R., Brune, W., Ren, X., Cohen, R. C., Dibb, J. E., Fried, A., Fuelberg, H. E., Porter, M. J., Heikes, B. G., Huey, G., Singh, H. B. and Wennberg, P. O.: Summertime influence of Asian pollution in the free troposphere over North America, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 112(12), 1–20, doi:10.1029/2006JD007919, 2007.
- 15 Lin, M., Fiore, A. M., Horowitz, L. W., Cooper, O. R., Naik, V., Holloway, J., Johnson, B. J., Middlebrook, A. M., Oltmans, S. J., Pollack, I. B., Ryerson, T. B., Warner, J. X., Wiedinmyer, C., Wilson, J. and Wyman, B.: Transport of Asian ozone pollution into surface air over the western United States in spring, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 117(4), n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2011JD016961, 2012.
- Lin, S.-J.: A “Vertically Lagrangian” Finite-Volume Dynamical Core for Global Models, Mon. Weather Rev., 132(10), 2293–2307, doi:10.1175/1520-0493(2004)132<2293:AVLFDC>2.0.CO;2, 2004.
- 20 Lin, S.-J. and Rood, R. B.: Multidimensional flux-form semi-Lagrangian transport schemes, Mon. Weather Rev., 124(9), 2046–2070, 1996.
- Lindzen, R. S. and Fox-Rabinovitz, M.: Consistent Vertical and Horizontal Resolution, Mon. Weather Rev., 117(11), 2575–2583, doi:10.1175/1520-0493(1989)117<2575:CVAHR>2.0.CO;2, 1989.
- 25 Long, M., Eastham, S., Zhuang, J., Yantosca, R., Sulprizio, M., Lundgren, E., Martin, R., Auer, B. and Thompson, M.: Since IGC7: High-Performance GEOS-Chem ( GCHP ) and Flexible Chemistry ( FlexChem ), 8th Int. GEOS-Chem Meet. (IGC8), Harvard Univ. 2017. [online] Available from: [http://acmg.seas.harvard.edu/presentations/IGC8/talks/MonA\\_Overview\\_long\\_michael.pdf](http://acmg.seas.harvard.edu/presentations/IGC8/talks/MonA_Overview_long_michael.pdf), 2017.
- Lucchesi, R.: File Specification for GEOS-5 FP. GMAO Office Note No. 4 (Version 1.1), 61 pp, [online] Available from: [https://gmao.gsfc.nasa.gov/products/documents/GEOS\\_5\\_FP\\_File\\_Specification\\_ON4v1\\_1.pdf](https://gmao.gsfc.nasa.gov/products/documents/GEOS_5_FP_File_Specification_ON4v1_1.pdf), 2017.
- 30 Methven, J. and Hoskins, B.: The advection of high-resolution tracers by low resolution winds, J. Atmos. Sci., 56(18), 3262–3285, 1999.
- Michalakes, J., Benson, R., Black, T., Duda, M., Govett, M., Henderson, T., Madden, P., Mozdzyński, G., Reinecke, A. and Skamarock, W.: Evaluating Performance and Scalability of Candidate Dynamical Cores for the Next Generation Global

- Prediction System, [online] Available from: [https://www2.cisl.ucar.edu/sites/default/files/Michalakes\\_Slides.pdf](https://www2.cisl.ucar.edu/sites/default/files/Michalakes_Slides.pdf), 2015.
- Neuman, J. A., Trainer, M., Aikin, K. C., Angevine, W. M., Brioude, J., Brown, S. S., De Gouw, J. A., Dube, W. P., Flynn, J. H., Graus, M., Holloway, J. S., Lefer, B. L., Nedelec, P., Nowak, J. B., Parrish, D. D., Pollack, I. B., Roberts, J. M., Ryerson, T. B., Smit, H., Thouret, V. and Wagner, N. L.: Observations of ozone transport from the free troposphere to the Los Angeles basin, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 117(5), doi:10.1029/2011JD016919, 2012.
- Newell, R. E., Thouret, V., Cho, J. Y. N., Stoller, P., Marenco, A. and Smit, H. G.: Ubiquity of quasi-horizontal layers in the troposphere, *Nature*, 398(6725), 316–319, doi:10.1038/18642, 1999.
- Nowak, J. B., Parrish, D. D., Neuman, J. A., Holloway, J. S., Cooper, O. R., Ryerson, T. B., Nicks, J. K., Flocke, F., Roberts, J. M., Atlas, E., de Gouw, J. A., Donnelly, S., Dunlea, E., Hübler, G., Huey, L. G., Schauffler, S., Tanner, D. J., Warneke, C. and Fehsenfeld, F. C.: Gas-phase chemical characteristics of Asian emission plumes observed during ITCT 2K2 over the eastern North Pacific Ocean, *J. Geophys. Res. D Atmos.*, 109(23), 1–18, doi:10.1029/2003JD004488, 2004.
- Odman, M. T.: A quantitative analysis of numerical diffusion introduced by advection algorithms in air quality models, *Atmos. Environ.*, 31(13), 1933–1940, doi:10.1016/S1352-2310(96)00354-8, 1997.
- Pecnick, M. J. and Keyser, D.: The effect of spatial resolution on the simulation of upper-tropospheric frontogenesis using a sigma-coordinate primitive equation model, *Meteorol. Atmos. Phys.*, 40(4), 137–149, doi:10.1007/BF01032454, 1989.
- Pope, V. D., Pamment, J. A., Jackson, D. R. and Slingo, A.: The representation of water vapor and its dependence on vertical resolution in the Hadley center climate model, *J. Clim.*, 14(14), 3065–3085, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(2001)014<3065:TROWVA>2.0.CO;2, 2001.
- Putman, W. M. and Lin, S.-J.: Finite-volume transport on various cubed-sphere grids, *J. Comput. Phys.*, 227(1), 55–78, doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2007.07.022, 2007.
- Rastigejev, Y., Park, R., Brenner, M. P. and Jacob, D. J.: Resolving intercontinental pollution plumes in global models of atmospheric transport, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 115(2), doi:10.1029/2009JD012568, 2010.
- Schubert, S. D., Rood, R. B. and Pfaendtner, J.: An Assimilated Dataset for Earth Science Applications, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 74(12), 2331–2342, doi:10.1175/1520-0477(1993)074<2331:AADFES>2.0.CO;2, 1993.
- Semakin, A. N. and Rastigejev, Y.: Numerical Simulation of Global-Scale Atmospheric Chemical Transport with High-Order Wavelet-Based Adaptive Mesh Refinement Algorithm, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 144(4), 1469–1486, doi:10.1175/mwr-d-15-0200.1, 2016.
- Stohl, A., Eckhardt, S., Forster, C., James, P. and Spichtinger, N.: On the pathways and timescales of intercontinental air pollution transport, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 107(D23), 1–17, doi:10.1029/2001JD001396, 2002.
- Stoller, P., Cho, J. Y. N., Newell, R. E., Thouret, V., Zhu, Y., Carroll, M. a., Albercook, G. M., Anderson, B. E., Barrick, J. D. W., Browell, E. V., Gregory, G. L., Sachse, G. W., Vay, S., Bradshaw, J. D. and Sandholm, S.: Measurements of atmospheric layers from the NASA DC-8 and P-3B aircraft during PEM-Tropics A, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104(D5), 5745, doi:10.1029/98JD02717, 1999.
- Thouret, V., Cho, J. Y. N., Newell, R. E., Marenco, A. and Smit, H. G. J.: General characteristics of tropospheric trace


- constituent layers observed in the MOZAIC program, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105(D13), 17379, doi:10.1029/2000JD900238, 2000.
- Tompkins, A. M. and Emanuel, K. A.: The vertical resolution sensitivity of simulated equilibrium temperature and water-vapour profiles, *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 126(565), 1219–1238, doi:10.1002/qj.49712656502, 2000.
- 5 Ullrich, P. A., Jablonowski, C. and van Leer, B.: High-order finite-volume methods for the shallow-water equations on the sphere, *J. Comput. Phys.*, 229(17), 6104–6134, doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2010.04.044, 2010.
- Ullrich, P. A., Jablonowski, C., Reed, K. A., Zarzycki, C., Lauritzen, P. H., Nair, R. D., Kent, J. and Verlet-Banide, A.: Dynamical Core Model Intercomparison Project (DCMIP2016) Test Case Document, 2016.
- Warming, R. F. and Hyett, B. J.: The modified equation approach to the stability and accuracy analysis of finite-difference  
10 methods, *J. Comput. Phys.*, 14(2), 159–179, doi:10.1016/0021-9991(74)90011-4, 1974.
- Warner, T. T.: *Numerical Weather and Climate Prediction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge., 2010.
- Wild, O. and Prather, M. J.: Global tropospheric ozone modeling: Quantifying errors due to grid resolution, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 111(11), doi:10.1029/2005JD006605, 2006.
- Yang, C., Xue, W., Fu, H., You, H., Wang, X., Ao, Y., Liu, F., Gan, L., Xu, P. and Wang, L.: 10M-core scalable fully-implicit  
15 solver for nonhydrostatic atmospheric dynamics, in *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, p. 6, IEEE Press., 2016.
- Yu, K., Keller, C. A., Jacob, D. J., Molod, A. M., Eastham, S. D. and Long, M. S.: Errors and improvements in the use of archived meteorological data for chemical transport modeling, *Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss.*, (July), 1–22, doi:10.5194/gmd-2017-125, 2017.
- 20 Zhang, L., Jacob, D. J., Boersma, K. F., Jaffe, D. a., Olson, J. R., Bowman, K. W., Worden, J. R., Thompson, a. M., Avery, M. a., Cohen, R. C., Dibb, J. E., Flock, F. M., Fuelberg, H. E., Huey, L. G., McMillan, W. W., Singh, H. B. and Weinheimer, A. J.: Transpacific transport of ozone pollution and the effect of recent Asian emission increases on air quality in North America: an integrated analysis using satellite, aircraft, ozonesonde, and surface observations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8(20), 6117–6136, doi:10.5194/acp-8-6117-2008, 2008.
- 25 Zhang, L., Jacob, D. J., Yue, X., Downey, N. V., Wood, D. A. and Blewitt, D.: Sources contributing to background surface ozone in the US Intermountain West, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14(11), 5295–5309, doi:10.5194/acp-14-5295-2014, 2014.
- Zhuang, J.: JiaweiZhuang/FV3\_util: v0.1, , doi:10.5281/zenodo.1095689, 2017.
- Zhuang, J. and Rothenberg, D.: JiaweiZhuang/cubedsphere: v0.1, , doi:10.5281/zenodo.1095677, 2017.




**Figure 1.** Optimal combination of horizontal and vertical grid resolutions ( $\Delta x$  and  $\Delta z$ ) for minimizing numerical diffusion of chemical plumes within a given amount of computational resources. Results are from the theoretical analysis of Section 2.3. The filled contours show the magnitude of the numerical diffusion term  $D$  from Eq. (23) as a function of  $\Delta x$  and  $\Delta z$  with  $B/A = 500$ . The solid lines indicate a fixed amount of computational resources ( $P$ ) in the trade-off between horizontal and vertical resolution, either using a fixed time step ( $\Delta z \Delta x^2 = P$ ) or accounting for the CFL condition ( $\Delta z \Delta x^3 = P$ ). The dashed lines from Eq. (27) indicate the corresponding optimal  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  ratios to minimize numerical diffusion.




**Figure 2.** Atmospheric flow generated by the FV3 dynamical core in a baroclinic instability test, 16 days after initialization of the test and 8 days after the release of the chemical plume. Shown are surface pressures, 700 hPa flow streamlines, and Lyapunov exponents  $\lambda = \partial u / \partial x$  measuring the stretching of the flow. The top row shows results from the lowest horizontal resolution (C48,  $\approx 200$  km) and the bottom row shows results from the highest horizontal resolution (C384,  $\approx 25$  km), both with 20 vertical levels (L20). Increasing vertical resolution has little effect on the dynamics, as discussed in the text.




**Figure 3.** 8-day simulation of plume transport in the FV3 dynamical core at C384L160 resolution ( $\approx 25$  km in horizontal and 6 hPa in vertical). The plume is initialized at 625 hPa over Alaska with a volume-normalized mixing ratio (VMR) of unity over a domain  $1000 \times 1000$  km<sup>2</sup> in the horizontal and 50 hPa thickness in the vertical. The left panels show the vertical and longitudinal transport of the plume as the meridionally averaged mixing ratio VMR. The right panels show the horizontal transport of the plume as column-averaged mixing ratios. Because VMRs-mixing ratios are plotted here as meridional or vertical averages, the values are much lower than the actual values in the plume.



**Figure 4.** Plume [dilution](#)[decay](#) due to numerical diffusion at different model grid resolutions. The plume is released in the free troposphere at northern mid-latitudes with an initial [volume-mixing ratio \(VMR\)](#) of unity. Plume [dilution](#)[decay](#) is measured by the decrease in the maximum [VMR-mixing ratio](#) as a function of time. Model horizontal resolution is defined by a cubed-sphere grid ranging from C48 ( $\approx 200$  km) to C384 ( $\approx 25$  km). Vertical resolution is defined by an equally spaced isobaric grid ranging from L20 (20 levels, each 50 hPa thick) to L160 (160 levels, each 6 hPa thick).




**Figure 5.** Vertical profile of the maximum VMR-mixing ratio for each model vertical level after 8 days of simulation, at low model resolution (C48L20), high model resolution (C384L160), and intermediate cases where only horizontal resolution or vertical resolution is increased from the low-resolution case (C384L20, C48L160).




**Figure 6.** Same as Fig. 4 but with entropy instead of maximum [VMR-mixing ratio](#) as a diagnostic for numerical diffusion. The entropy is initialized on Day 0 with a value of 1. Pure advection conserves entropy but diffusion increases it.

## Trade-off space for minimizing numerical diffusion (from simulation)



**Figure 7.** Optimal combination of horizontal and vertical grid resolutions ( $\Delta x$  and  $\Delta z$ ) for minimizing numerical diffusion of chemical plumes within a given amount of computational resources. Results are from the FV3 simulation (data from Fig. 4 and 6) and can be compared to Fig. 1 that shows similar results from theoretical analysis. The filled contours show the maximum plume [VMR-mixing ratio](#) (left panel) or entropy (right panel) on Day 8 of the simulations as metrics of numerical diffusion. High maximum [VMR-mixing ratio](#) and low entropy are indicative of low numerical diffusion. The red dots are the data points used to construct the contours, each point corresponding to a simulation at a given resolution. The [straight-solid](#) lines indicate a fixed amount of computational resources ( $P$ ) in the trade-off between horizontal and vertical resolution, either using a fixed time step ( $\Delta z \Delta x^2 = P$ ) or accounting for the CFL condition ( $\Delta z \Delta x^3 = P$ ). The yellow dashed lines show different  $\Delta x/\Delta z$  ratios (700, 1000, 1500).



**Figure B1.** Comparing vertical diffusion in the GEOS-Chem CTM using either the TPCORE Eulerian advection scheme (top panels) or the FV3 vertically Lagrangian advection scheme (bottom panels). A Hadley-like circulation test is applied to both schemes with rising motion in the first 12 hours followed by return to the original state in the next 12 hours (Kent et al., 2014). The tracer field is independent of longitude. The true solution at the final state ( $t = 24$  h) should be the same as the initial condition, and the deviation from the initial condition is due to numerical error. [The error \(right two panels\) is defined as final state minus initial state.](#)