# Supplementary material

## Global Dust Optical Depth Climatology Derived from CALIOP and MODIS Aerosol Retrievals on Decadal Time Scales: Regional and Interannual Variability

## Qianqian Song<sup>1,2</sup>, Zhibo Zhang<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Hongbin Yu<sup>3</sup>, Paul Ginoux<sup>4</sup>, Jerry Shen<sup>3,#</sup>

- 1. Physics Department, UMBC, Baltimore, Maryland, USA
- 2. Joint Center of Earth Systems Technology, UMBC, Baltimore, Maryland, USA
- 3. Earth Sciences Division, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, USA
- 4. NOAA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, Princeton, New Jersey, USA.

Correspondence to: Zhibo Zhang, Zhibo.Zhang@umbc.edu

# who worked as summer intern at NASA Goddard Space Flight Center during June–August 2020.

### **DAOD derived from CALIOP and MODIS observations**



#### CALIOP Daytime & Nighttime seasonal mean DAOD (2007~2019)

Figure S1 Seasonal mean DAOD derived from CALIOP daytime (column 1) and nighttime (column 2) observations. Column 3 indicates the difference of daytime and nighttime DAOD, which is expressed as  $\frac{DAOD_{daytime}-DAOD_{nighttime}}{DAOD_{nighttime}}$ 

**Table S1.** Summary of Quality Assurance procedures in CALIOP- and MODIS-based DAOD retrievals.

	Quality Assurance (references)					
CALIOP	(a) Select cloud-free columns or columns with high-level					
	optically thin clouds using CALIOP L2 cloud layer produc					
	(Yu et al. 2015a)					
	(b) Use CAD score between -90 and -100 (Yu et al. 2019)					
	(c) Use EXT_QC values of 0, 1, 18, and 16 (Winker et al. 2013)					
MODIS (Ocean)	QAC>=0 (Levy et al. 2013), AOD <0 was excluded					
MODIS (Land)	Retrieved aerosol properties with a standard deviation less than					
	0.15 among 10x10 pixels are assumed cloud free and are					
	flagged with the highest quality flag (QA=3). Here we use					
	products of QA=3 following the recommendation of Hsu et al.					
	(2013)					



Figure S2. Region definition based on Ridley et al. 2016.



**Figure S3.** Compare seasonal mean DAOD (2004~2008) from Ridley et al. 2016 with our (2007~2019) seasonal mean DAOD based on CALIOP (blue markers) and MODIS (red markers) for each region. Each number in this plot represent the corresponding regions indicated in Figure S2.  $B_r^{Modis} = \overline{DAOD}_{Modis} / \overline{DAOD}_{Ridley} - 1$ ,  $B_r^{Caliop} =$ 

 $\overline{DAOD}_{Caliop}/\overline{DAOD}_{Ridley}$  – 1. The specific values of seasonal mean DAOD from MODIS and CALIOP retrievals for the 14 regions are shown in Table S2.



Figure S4. Region definition based on Proestakis et al. 2018.



**Figure S5.** Compare seasonal mean DAOD (2007~2015) from Proestakis et al. 2018 with our seasonal mean DAOD (2007~2015) based on CALIOP (blue markers) and MODIS (red markers). Each number in the plot represent the corresponding regions in Figure S4.  $B_r^{Modis} = \overline{DAOD}_{Modis} / \overline{DAOD}_{Proestakis} - 1$ ,  $B_r^{Caliop} = \overline{DAOD}_{Caliop} / \overline{DAOD}_{Proestakis} - 1$ . The specific values of seasonal mean DAOD from MODIS and CALIOP retrievals for the 6 regions are shown in Table S3.

Region	Latitude	D	DJF MAM		JJA		SON		
	Longitude	MODIS	CALIOP	MODIS	CALIOP	MODIS	CALIOP	MODIS	CALIOP
(1)	(2.5, 38.75)	0.106	0.060	0.148	0.082	0.185	0.114	0.090	0.053
	(-50, -22.5)								
(2)	(25, 40)	0.107	0.048	0.200	0.126	0.204	0.140	0.134	0.082
	(-5, 30)								
(3)	(7.5, 32.5)	0.180	0.111	0.274	0.192	0.355	0.294	0.177	0.145
	(-22.5, -5)								
(4)	(7.5, 25)	0.252	0.164	0.441	0.340	0.404	0.384	0.224	0.201
	(-5, 10)								
(5)	(7.5, 25)	0.183	0.109	0.325	0.272	0.295	0.261	0.177	0.139
	(10, 40)								
(6)	(25, 40)	0.130	0.090	0.280	0.203	0.242	0.193	0.169	0.134
	(30, 50)								
(7)	(0, 25)	0.118	0.088	0.224	0.182	0.403	0.311	0.144	0.115
	(40, 67.5)								
(8)	(25, 50)	0.103	0.053	0.197	0.156	0.252	0.197	0.132	0.096
	(50, 67.5)								
(9)	(18, 50)	0.084	0.051	0.164	0.160	0.258	0.213	0.100	0.115
	(67.5, 72.5)								
(10)	(30, 50)	0.094	0.054	0.233	0.107	0.132	0.102	0.077	0.082
	(72.5, 90)								
(11)	(35, 50)	0.105	0.043	0.205	0.085	0.062	0.047	0.047	0.042
	(90, 112)								
(12)	(-57.5, -40)	0.027	0.009	0.013	0.008	0.011	0.009	0.022	0.007
	(-80, -55)								
(13)	(-36.5, -18)	0.030	0.009	0.022	0.009	0.026	0.017	0.043	0.019
	(15, 38)								
(14)	(-36.5, -20)	0.028	0.021	0.012	0.010	0.009	0.006	0.020	0.018
	(120, 150)								

 Table S2. MODIS-based and CALIOP-based DAOD for regions indicated in Figure S2.

|--|

Region	(Latitude)(Longitude)	DJF		MAM		JJA		SON	
		MODIS	CALIOP	MODIS	CALIOP	MODIS	CALIOP	MODIS	CALIOP
(1)	(35, 45) (70, 115)	0.113	0.074	0.309	0.139	0.121	0.088	0.082	0.080
(2)	(30, 35) (80, 102)	0.075	0.006	0.164	0.025	0.040	0.013	0.051	0.005
(3)	(35, 45) (115, 125)	0.101	0.065	0.148	0.111	0.101	0.043	0.071	0.048
	(30, 35) (102,125)								
	(20,30) (95,125)								
(4)	(5, 30) (65, 95)	0.073	0.048	0.170	0.172	0.277	0.175	0.098	0.077
(5)	(20,45) (125, 155)	0.051	0.034	0.117	0.056	0.071	0.012	0.041	0.017
(6)	(5, 20) (95, 155)	0.057	0.012	0.081	0.016	0.069	0.011	0.061	0.009



**Figure S6**. 2007~2019 Seasonal mean DAOD uncertainties induced by DPR assumptions. For each season in each grid, DAOD uncertainty is defined as  $\frac{(DAOD^{high}-DAOD^{low})/2}{DAOD^{mean}}$ %, where  $DAOD^{high}$  is derived from high dust scenario with  $\delta_d = 0.20$  and  $\delta_{nd} = 0.02$ ,  $DAOD^{low}$  is derived from low dust scenario with  $\delta_d = 0.30$  and  $\delta_{nd} = 0.07$ ,  $DAOD^{mean}$  is the average of the two scenarios.



**Figure S7.** Comparison of CALIOP TAOD against MODIS TAOD over dust-laden regions indicated in Figure 8. Color represents the probability density using gaussian kernel density estimation. Grey points represent data points within the lowest 5% of data density. Those grey points are excluded in the linear regression analysis.



Figure S8. Same as Figure 14, except for TAOD.



Figure S9. Same as Figure 16, except for inter-spring variability.



**Figure S10.** Inter-spring series of EVI, surface wind speed and precipitation along with inter-spring series of DAOD from MODIS (red curves) and CALIOP (blue curves). R is Pearson's linear correlation coefficient between each variables and time series. Positive R indicates the variable increase with time, and vice versa.

### **Comparison with previous studies**

Our MODIS DAOD study and Voss and Evan 2020 use the similar method to derive DAOD. However, there is a subtle difference in our MODIS over ocean retrieval methodology, which is the main reason causing the non-negligible difference in our over-ocean mean DAOD. We use MODIS over ocean retrievals to determine  $f_c$ ,  $f_d$ ,  $f_m$ , while Voss and Evan 2020 determine those parameters based on AERONET stations dominated by each aerosol type.  $f_c$ ,  $f_d$ ,  $f_m$  used in those two studies are shown in Table S4.

Based on Eq. (2) and (3) in the paper, we derived the relationship of DAOD ( $\tau_d$ ) with each of parameters ( $f_c, f_d, f_m$ ):

$$\tau_d = \frac{(\tau - \tau_m)f_c + \tau_m f_m - \tau f}{f_c - f_d}$$

Then, the change of  $\tau_d$  with respect to each of the three parameters  $f_c$ ,  $f_d$ ,  $f_m$  are expressed as:

 $\frac{\partial \tau_d}{\partial f_c} = \frac{\tau_c}{(f_c - f_d)}, \ \frac{\partial \tau_d}{\partial f_d} = \frac{\tau_d}{(f_c - f_d)}, \ \frac{\partial \tau_d}{\partial f_m} = \frac{\tau_m}{(f_c - f_d)}.$  Based on Table S4,  $f_c$  is much larger than  $f_d$  in both studies, so that  $(f_c - f_d) > 0$ . In addition,  $\tau_c$ ,  $\tau_d$  and  $\tau_m$  are always larger than zero. Therefore, we have  $\frac{\partial \tau_d}{\partial f_c} > 0, \ \frac{\partial \tau_d}{\partial f_d} > 0, \ \frac{\partial \tau_d}{\partial f_m} > 0$ . This means that  $\tau_d$  is positively proportional to  $f_c$ ,  $f_d$ ,  $f_m$ , respectively. In other words,  $\tau_d$  increases as each of those parameters increasing.

**Table S4.**  $f_c$ ,  $f_d$ ,  $f_m$  used in over-ocean Aqua MODIS Collection 6 DAOD retrieval and in Voss and Evan 2020. The last column shows the relationship of each parameter with the retrieved DAOD, '+' means DAOD increases as the parameter increasing, '-' means DAOD decreases as the parameter increasing.

	Aqua MODIS C6	Voss and Evan 2020	Relation with $\tau_d$
$f_c$	0.89	0.79	+
$f_d$	0.31	0.35	+
$f_m$	0.48	0.34	+

It turns out that we used significantly larger  $f_c$  and  $f_m$ , while a slightly smaller  $f_d$ , in comparison with VE20. Because the derived DAOD is positively proportional to these parameters, the use of larger  $f_c$  and  $f_m$ , is probably the reason for a larger DAOD in our study.