Historical and future changes in air pollutants from CMIP6 models
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Figure S1 – Definition of regions used in the study, based on those used in Phase 2 of the Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollutants (HTAP2)

Figure S2 – Seasonal mean surface $O_3$ concentrations from UKESM1 in a) December January, February (DJF) and c) June, July, August (JJA) over the 2005-2014 period. Difference between the UKESM1 mean and TOAR observations for b) DJF and d) JJA.
Figure S3 – Seasonal mean surface $O_3$ concentrations from BCC-ESM1 in a) December January, February (DJF) and c) June, July, August (JJA) over the 2005-2014 period. Difference between the BCC-ESM1 mean and TOAR observations for b) DJF and d) JJA.

Figure S4 – Seasonal mean surface $O_3$ concentrations from CESM2 in a) December January, February (DJF) and c) June, July, August (JJA) over the 2005-2014 period. Difference between the CESM2 mean and TOAR observations for b) DJF and d) JJA.
Figure S5 – Seasonal mean surface O\textsubscript{3} concentrations from GFDL-ESM4 in a) December January, February (DJF) and c) June, July, August (JJA) over the 2005-2014 period. Difference between the GFDL-ESM4 mean and TOAR observations for b) DJF and d) JJA.

Figure S6 – Seasonal mean surface O\textsubscript{3} concentrations from GISS-E2-1-H in a) December January, February (DJF) and c) June, July, August (JJA) over the 2005-2014 period. Difference between the GISS-E2-1-H mean and TOAR observations for b) DJF and d) JJA.
Figure S7 – Annual mean PM$_{2.5}$ dust component calculated for each individual CMIP6 model over the period 2005-2014

Figure S8 – Annual mean PM$_{2.5}$ SO$_4$ component calculated for each individual CMIP6 model over the period 2005-2014
Figure S9 – Annual mean PM$_{2.5}$ BC component calculated for each individual CMIP6 model over the period 2005-2014.

Figure S10 – Annual mean PM$_{2.5}$ OA component calculated for each individual CMIP6 model over the period 2005-2014.
Figure S11 – Annual mean PM$_{2.5}$ SS component calculated for each individual CMIP6 model over the period 2005-2014

Figure S12 – Annual and seasonal mean PM$_{2.5}$ NO$_3$ (nitrate) component calculated for each individual CMIP6 model that made the data available over the period 2005-2014
Figure S13 – Regional surface air temperature response across 5 CMIP6 models (CESM2-WACCM, CNRM-ESM2-1, GFDL-ESM4, MIROC-ES2L and UKESM1) for the Tier 1 future scenarios. Each line represents a multi-model mean across the region with shading representing the +/- 1 standard deviation in the mean. The multi-model regional mean value (+/- 1 standard deviation) for the year 2005-2014 is shown in the top left corner of each panel.
Figure S14 – Annual mean surface O$_3$ concentrations and future response in ssp370 across four different CMIP6 models. Top row shows the 2005-2014 annual mean surface O$_3$ concentrations in each model from the historical simulations. Middle row shows the surface O$_3$ response in 2050, relative to 2005-2014 mean, in each model for ssp370. Bottom row shows the same as the middle but for 2100. No data is presented in 2100 for BCC-ESM1 as data for ssp370 only extended out to 2055.
Figure S15 – Annual mean emissions of total biogenic volatile organic compounds across CMIP6 models. Top row shows the 2005-2014 annual mean emissions in each model from the historical simulations. Middle row shows 2050 change in emissions, relative to 2005-2014 mean, in each model for ssp370. Bottom row shows the same as the middle but for 2100.
Figure S16 – Annual mean surface PM$_{2.5}$ black carbon concentrations and future response in ssp370 across four different CMIP6 models. Top row shows the 2005-2014 annual mean surface PM$_{2.5}$ black carbon concentrations in each model from the historical simulations. Middle row shows the decadal mean surface PM$_{2.5}$ black carbon response in 2050 (2045-2055), relative to 2005-2014 mean, in each model for ssp370. Bottom row shows the same as the middle but for 2095 (2090-2100).
Figure S17 – same as Fig S16 but for PM$_{2.5}$ sulphate

Figure S18 – same as Fig S16 but for PM$_{2.5}$ organic aerosol
Figure S19 – same as Fig S16 but for PM$_{2.5}$ dust

Figure S20 – same as Fig S16 but for PM$_{2.5}$ sea salt