

1 **Manuscript # acp-2020-3**

2
3 **Responses to Referee #3**

4
5 Review of “Source attribution of Arctic aerosols and associated Arctic warming
6 trend during 1980-2018” by Ren et al.

7 This paper presents a modelling study of the impacts of changing SO₄ and BC
8 on the Arctic atmospheric composition, radiative forcing, and temperature.
9 Modelled and measured SO₄ and BC are presented in the Arctic from 1980-
10 2018 at a handful of surface measurement sites. A tagged version of CAM5 is
11 used to quantify the source contributions from different continental geographic
12 regions to the Arctic BC and SO₄ concentrations both at the surface and in the
13 vertical column. The paper present interesting results that are important for
14 understanding the rapidly warming Arctic. The authors conclude that about 20%
15 of Arctic warming can be attributed to the combination of BC and SO₄.

16
17 We thank the reviewer for all the insightful comments. Below, please see our
18 point-by-point response (in blue) to the specific comments and suggestions
19 and the changes that have been made to the manuscript, in an effort to take
20 into account all the comments raised here.

21
22 I suggest only the following minor revisions below before publishing:
23 lines 130-131: is there a primary reference for CAM5 and CESM that you can
24 reference here?

25 **Response:**

26 Thanks for the suggestion. We have now added the primary reference for
27 CESM as follows: “The global aerosol-climate model CAM5, which is the
28 atmospheric component of the earth system model CESM (Community Earth
29 System Model, Hurrell et al., 2013) developed at the National Center for
30 Atmospheric Research (NCAR), is used to simulate Arctic aerosols and climate
31 for years 1980–2018 (after one-year model spin-up).”

32
33 lines 143-144: what is the source for the specified sea surface temperatures,
34 sea ice concentrations, etc?

35 **Response:**

36 Sea surface temperatures and sea ice concentrations are created from the
37 merged Reynolds/HADISST products, as described in Hurrell et al. (2008).
38 Solar radiation and GHGs follow the CMIP6 configuration for AMIP-type of
39 simulations. We have now included these details in the manuscript.

40
41 lines 209-210: was the modelled precipitation compared to measured
42 precipitation? Was wet deposition of model validated against measurements?

43 **Response:**

44 The performance of CAM5 in aerosol wet deposition and transport to the Arctic

45 has been specifically evaluated and improved in previous studies (e.g., Liu et
46 al., 2011; Wang et al., 2013; Qian et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2018a. To address
47 this comment and follow a suggestion from one of the other reviewers, we have
48 revised the sentence to “According to previous CAM5 studies on aerosol wet
49 removal and long-range transport, the model underestimates aerosol
50 concentrations in spring, likely due to biases in parameterizations of convective
51 transport and wet scavenging of aerosols (Bond et al., 2013, Liu et al., 2011,
52 Wang et al., 2013; Qian et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2018a).”

53

54 Fig 5/line 241: it needs to be clarified that Fig 5 is the model average in the
55 Arctic (>66.5 °N).

56 Response:

57 Following the suggestion, we have now revised the sentence to “The absolute
58 and relative source contributions of emissions from the major source regions to
59 the simulated annual mean near-surface sulfate and BC concentrations
60 averaged over the Arctic (66.5°N–90°N) are shown in Fig. 5.”

61

62 line 252: was that rise in BC seen in the observations? e.g., consistent with BC
63 seen at Alert?

64 Response:

65 Yes, we have now revised the sentence to “Simulated Arctic BC concentration
66 also shows a considerable decline before 2000, but a slight rise after 2000,
67 which is consistent with the BC observations at Alert.”

68

69 line 263: “in the Arctic” ... and Russia?

70 Response:

71 Yes, we have now revised the sentence to “To further reduce present-day or
72 future aerosols in the Arctic, efforts can be made to control local sources in the
73 Arctic as well as emissions from Russia.”

74

75 line 316: is the effect of BC deposition on snow/reduction of albedo included in
76 this? I think not because that effect is discussed later, but could clarify here that
77 this value is just for atmospheric BC effect.

78 Response:

79 No, the effect of BC deposition on snow/reduction of albedo is not included in
80 it. This value is for atmospheric BC effect only. We have now revised the text
81 to “The Arctic sulfate exerts a negative RF_{ari} primarily by scattering incoming
82 solar radiation back into the space, with the forcing in a range of $-0.4\sim 0 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$.
83 The atmospheric BC can absorb solar radiation in the atmosphere and leads to
84 a positive RF_{ari} of $0.1\sim 0.4 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ in the Arctic.”

85

86 Section 5/line 400: Can you add some discussion as to how the model bias
87 affects your conclusions? E.g. would your estimates of SO_4 and BC
88 temperature impacts be greater or lesser if the model were corrected to

89 accurately reflect the measurements?

90 Response:

91 Thanks for the suggestion. We have now revised the sentence to “Considering
92 that the model underestimates the magnitude of sulfate and BC concentrations,
93 the estimated impact on Arctic temperature from sulfate and BC could be even
94 larger if the model were able to accurately reproduce the measurements in the
95 Arctic.”

96

97 Data availability: please add where the Arctic BC & SO₄ measurements can be
98 found in this section (e.g., EBAS database link).

99 Response:

100 Added.

101

102 Figs 1-2, and 5-7: please make sure the regional colours are consistent in all of
103 these plots. e.g., colour X for RBU, colour Y for EUR, etc, in all 5 figures the
104 same.

105 Response:

106 We have now made the regional colors consistent in all plots.

107

108 Fig 3 (4): Clarify in the caption that the black is from measurements, and the
109 blue and green are modelled. E.g., “Measured seasonal means are denoted
110 by...”. “Stacked contours represent the modelled Arctic...”

111 Response:

112 Thanks for the suggestion. We have now revised the figure caption to:

113 Figure 3. Surface concentrations of sulfate aerosols ($\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$) in spring (March–
114 May) and summer (June–August) at four locations (Alert, Station Nord, Ny-
115 Alesund, Kevo) in the Arctic during 1980–2018. Seasonal means are denoted
116 by solid black circles, medians as short horizontal bars, and the 25th to 75th
117 percentile ranges as vertical bars. Stacked colors represent modeled
118 contributions from the Arctic (blue) and non-Arctic anthropogenic source region
119 (green). The observations denoted by solid black circles are obtained from
120 European Monitoring and Evaluation Programme and World Data Centre for
121 Aerosols database (<http://ebas.nilu.no>) and Breider et al. (2017). Black
122 triangles at Ny-Alesund for the period 1980–1981 show mean observations
123 from Heintzenberg and Larssen (1983). Black diamond at Ny-Alesund in
124 summer shows median non-sea-salt sulfate concentration from Maenhaut et al.
125 (1989). Open circles in the spring for Ny-Ålesund are March–April mean values
126 (Sirois and Barrie, 1999). Note that the vertical coordinates use logarithmic
127 scales.

128

129 Fig 3: why is Barrow not shown? Fig 4: why is St Nord not shown? Fig 5:
130 specify that this is the Arctic (>66.5 °N) average. As mentioned above, use the
131 same regional colour scheme here as in Fig 1(a) & Fig 2. Fig 6 & 7: match the
132 regional colours to Fig 5.

133 Response:

134 The data of Barrow and St Nord sites are relatively scarce. We only selected
135 sites with more than 20 observation samples.

136 Following the suggestion, the caption Figure 5 has been revised to “Time series
137 (1980–2018) of absolute (left, $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$) and relative (right, %) contributions of
138 emissions from the major source regions to the simulated annual mean near-
139 surface sulfate and BC concentrations averaged over the Arctic (66.5°N – 90°N).

140

141 Fig 2, Fig 5, Fig 6 and Fig 7 have now been revised to use the same regional
142 color scheme.

143

144

145 Reference:

146 Breider, T. J., Mickley, L. J., Jacob, D. J., Ge, C., Wang, J., Sulprizio Payer, M.,
147 Croft, B., Ridley, D. A., McConnell, J. R., Sharma, S., Husain, L., Dutkiewicz,
148 V. A., Eleftheriadis, K., Skov, H., and Hopke, P. K.: Multidecadal trends in
149 aerosol radiative forcing over the Arctic: Contribution of changes in
150 anthropogenic aerosol to Arctic warming since 1980, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*,
151 122, 3573–3594, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD025321>, 2017.

152

153 Bond, T. C., Doherty, S. J., Fahey, D. W., Forster, P. M., Berntsen, T.,
154 DeAngelo, B. J., Flanner, M. G., Ghan, S., Kärcher, B., Koch, D., Kinne, S.,
155 Kondo, Y., Quinn, P. K., Sarofim, M. C., Schultz, M. G., Schulz, M.,
156 Venkataraman, C., Zhang, H., Zhang, S., Bellouin, N., Guttikunda, S. K., Hopke,
157 P. K., Jacobson, M. Z., Kaiser, J. W., Klimont, Z., Lohmann, U., Schwarz, J. P.,
158 Shindell, D., Storelvmo, T., Warren, S. G., and Zender, C. S.: Bounding the role
159 of black carbon in the climate system: A scientific assessment, *J. Geophys.*
160 *Res.-Atmos.*, 118, 5380–5552, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50171>, 2013.

161

162 Heintzenberg, J., Larssen, S.: SO₂ and SO₄ = in the Arctic: Interpretation of
163 observations at three Norwegian Arctic-Subarctic stations, *Tellus B*, 35B(4),
164 255–265, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0889.1983.tb00028.x>, 1983.

165

166 Hurrell, J. W., Holland, M. M., Gent, P. R., Ghan, S., Kay, J. E., Kushner, P. J.,
167 Lamarque, J. F., Large, W. G., Lawrence, D., Lind- say, K., Lipscomb, W. H.,
168 Long, M. C., Mahowald, N., Marsh, D. R., Neale, R. B., Rasch, P., Vavrus, S.,
169 Vertenstein, M., Bader, D., Collins, W. D., Hack, J. J., Kiehl, J., and Marshall,
170 S.: The Community Earth System Model A Framework for Collaborative
171 Research, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 94, 1339–1360,
172 <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00121.1>, 2013.

173

174 Hurrell, J.W., J.J. Hack, D. Shea, J.M. Caron, and J. Rosinski,: A New Sea
175 Surface Temperature and Sea Ice Boundary Dataset for the Community
176 Atmosphere Model. *J. Climate*, 21, 5145–5153,

177 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JCLI2292.1>, 2008.

178

179 Liu, J., Fan, S., Horowitz, L.W., and Levy II, H.: Evaluation of factors controlling
180 long-range transport of black carbon to the Arctic, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116,
181 D04307, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JD015145>, 2011.

182

183 Maenhaut, W., Cornille, P., Pacyna, J. M., & Vitols, V.: Arctic air chemistry trace
184 element composition and origin of the atmospheric aerosol in the Norwegian
185 Arctic, *Atmos. Environ.*, 23(11), 2551–2569, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-6981(89)90266-7)
186 [6981\(89\)90266-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-6981(89)90266-7), 1989.

187

188 Qian, Y., Wang, H., Zhang, R., Flanner, M. G., Rasch, P. J.: A sensitivity study
189 on modeling black carbon in snow and its radiative forcing over the Arctic and
190 Northern China. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 9,064001, [https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/6/064001)
191 [9326/9/6/064001](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/6/064001), 2014.

192

193 Sirois, A., & Barrie, L. A.: Barrie (Arctic lower tropospheric aerosol trends and
194 composition at Alert, Canada: 1980–1995, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104(D9), 11,599–
195 11,618, <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JD900077>, 1999.

196

197 Wang, H., Easter, R. C., Rasch, P. J., Wang, M., Liu, X., Ghan, S. J., Qian, Y.,
198 Yoon, J.-H., Ma, P.-L., and Vinoj, V.: Sensitivity of remote aerosol distributions
199 to representation of cloud–aerosol interactions in a global climate model,
200 *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 6, 765–782, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-6-765-2013>,
201 2013.

202