



# Radiative impact of improved global parameterisations of oceanic dry deposition of ozone and lightning-generated NO<sub>x</sub>

Ashok K. Luhar<sup>1</sup>, Ian E. Galbally<sup>1</sup>, Matthew T. Woodhouse<sup>1</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Aspendale, 3195, Australia

Correspondence to: Ashok K. Luhar (ashok.luhar@csiro.au)

Abstract. We investigate the impact of recent process-based and empirical improvements to oceanic ozone dry deposition parameterisation and lightning-generated  $NO_x$  (LNO<sub>x</sub>) parameterisation on radiative fluxes by conducting a 5-year simulation

- 10 of the global ACCESS-UKCA chemistry-climate model with radiative feedbacks of ozone and methane included. Both parameterisations increase the global net downward top-of-the-atmosphere (TOA) radiative flux, akin to instantaneous radiative forcing, compared to the base parameterisations. The dry deposition improvement results in a relatively small increase of 4.3 mW m<sup>-2</sup> in the net downward TOA radiative flux. But this increases to 86 mW m<sup>-2</sup> when the improved LNO<sub>x</sub> parameterisation (which increases the LNO<sub>x</sub> production from 4.8 to 6.9 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>) is also used. For comparison, this estimated
- 15 difference in the radiative flux is equivalent to ~18% of the anthropogenic effective radiative forcing (ERF) due to ozone over the years 1750–2019 reported by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report (AR6). Other global changes from the use of the two parameterisations include an increase in the downward longwave radiation and a decrease in the downward shortwave radiation at the Earth's surface, and a decrease of 0.64 years in the methane lifetime against loss due to the hydroxyl radical, with changes being larger in magnitude in the tropics. Although the total global LNOx
- 20 production may be the same, how LNO<sub>x</sub> is distributed spatially makes a difference to radiative transfer. The changes in radiation components and methane lifetime per unit change in LNO<sub>x</sub> and column ozone are also calculated. We estimate that the uncertainty range in the net downward TOA radiation due to reported uncertainty range in global estimates of LNO<sub>x</sub> could be as much as 238 mW m<sup>-2</sup>. LNO<sub>x</sub> has a significant influence on the atmospheric lifetime of CH<sub>4</sub>, and the value of LNO<sub>x</sub> used within a model will influence the ERF and global warming potential of anthropogenic methane.

25





## **1** Introduction

Apart from water vapour, carbon dioxide ( $CO_2$ ), methane ( $CH_4$ ), ozone ( $O_3$ ), nitrous oxide ( $N_2O$ ), and fluorinated gases are the principal greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Being radiatively active, these gases play an important role in the Earth's energy budget and hence climate system. Together with aerosols, their concentrations govern the impedance to transfer and

- 5 loss from the atmosphere of radiative energy. A radiative forcing broadly refers to a change in the top-of-the-atmosphere (TOA) energy budget as a result of an imposed anthropogenic or natural perturbation, for example, changes in aerosol or greenhouse gas concentrations, in downwelling solar radiation, or in land use). The climate system responds to this change by cooling or warming. In the Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), an effective radiative forcing (ERF) is termed as a change in net downward radiative flux at the TOA following a
- 10 perturbation, including effects of any adjustments in both tropospheric and stratospheric temperatures, water vapour, clouds, and some surface properties, for example surface albedo from vegetation changes, but excluding any changes due to the global surface air temperature change (Forster et al., 2021). According to AR6, the total abundance-based anthropogenic ERF due to increases in long-lived well-mixed greenhouse gases over the years 1750–2019 is  $3.32 \pm 0.29$  W m<sup>-2</sup>, of which  $2.16 \pm 0.26$  W m<sup>-2</sup> is due to CO<sub>2</sub>,  $0.54 \pm 0.11$  W m<sup>-2</sup> to CH<sub>4</sub>,  $0.21 \pm 0.03$  W m<sup>-2</sup> to N<sub>2</sub>O and  $0.41 \pm 0.08$  W m<sup>-2</sup> to total halogens (Forster
- 15 et al., 2021). Ozone is a short-lived climate forcer (SLCF) (chemical lifetime of about 22 days in the troposphere), and its anthropogenic ERF for the same period is estimated to be  $0.47 \pm 0.23$  W m<sup>-2</sup>, almost all (95%) of which is due to tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> changes. Thus, tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> provides the third largest anthropogenic ERF, and overall O<sub>3</sub> represents about 16% of the net anthropogenic ERF of  $2.72 \pm 0.76$  W m<sup>-2</sup>, the latter includes an aerosol ERF of  $-1.1 \pm 0.6$  W m<sup>-2</sup> (Forster et al., 2021).

Ozone interacts with down-welling and up-welling solar (or shortwave) and terrestrial (or longwave) radiation. Any changes in the atmospheric distribution of O<sub>3</sub> contribute to changes in its radiative impact. Compared to the long-lived and well-mixed greenhouse gases, O<sub>3</sub> exhibits a highly spatially inhomogeneous distribution in the troposphere because of its short chemical lifetime compared to transport timescales, and therefore, it has strong radiative effects on regional scales.

Ozone is not emitted directly into the atmosphere but is formed in both the stratosphere and troposphere by photochemical reactions involving natural and anthropogenic precursor species. Ozone is an oxidant as well as a precursor to the formation

- 25 of hydroxyl and hydroperoxyl radicals which play a critical role in the tropospheric chemical cycles of many trace gases, e.g., CH<sub>4</sub> and carbon monoxide (CO). The tropospheric budget of O<sub>3</sub> is governed by its production through the photochemical oxidation of CH<sub>4</sub>, CO and non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOC) in the presence of oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>); removal by several chemical reactions; removal by dry deposition at surface of the Earth; and the downward transport of O<sub>3</sub> from the stratosphere.
- 30 This paper extends recent work on improvements to the oceanic O<sub>3</sub> dry deposition parameterisation (Luhar et al., 2018) and lightning-generated NO<sub>x</sub> (referred to as LNO<sub>x</sub>) parameterisation (Luhar et al., 2021) to investigate the impact on radiative transfer of these improvements via the use of the global Australian Community Climate and Earth System Simulator – United





Kingdom Chemistry and Aerosol (ACCESS-UKCA) chemistry-climate model. One of the primary purposes of improving these physico-chemical processes is to improve the overall performance of chemistry-climate and earth system models. Dry deposition is a significant sink of O<sub>3</sub> (Galbally and Roy, 1980; Luhar et al., 2017; Clifton et al., 2020), affecting O<sub>3</sub> mixing ratio, and its long-range transport and lifetime. The improved dry deposition parameterisation is a mechanistic air-sea

- 5 exchange scheme that accounts for the concurrent waterside processes of molecular diffusion,  $O_3$  solubility, first-order chemical reaction of  $O_3$  with dissolved iodide, and turbulent transfer. It is a significant improvement over the assumption in most chemical transport models that the controlling term of surface resistance in the scheme for dry deposition velocity of  $O_3$  at the ocean surface is constant based on Wesely (1989), and leads to a smaller  $O_3$  dry deposition velocity to the ocean (by a factor of 2–3) and a larger tropospheric  $O_3$  burden.
- 10 Although LNO<sub>x</sub> accounts for only about 10% of the global NO<sub>x</sub> source, it has a disproportionately large contribution to the tropospheric burdens of O<sub>3</sub> and the hydroxyl (OH) radical (Dahlmann et al., 2011; Murray, 2016). The impact on both O<sub>3</sub> and the CH<sub>4</sub> lifetime (against loss by tropospheric OH) in turn influences atmospheric radiative transfer. Schumann and Huntrieser (2007) report a large uncertainty range of 2–8 Tg nitrogen (N) yr<sup>-1</sup> in the global amount of LNO<sub>x</sub> generated.

As a side note, while we estimate the globally-averaged direct energy dissipated from lightning flashes to be only  $\sim 0.2$  mW

15 m<sup>-2</sup>, the radiative energy retained in the atmosphere due to the net impact of  $LNO_x$  on  $O_3$  production and  $CH_4$  loss is ~ 40 mW m<sup>-2</sup> per Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> produced due to lightning (see section 3.3), which implies a radiative impact of ~ 80 – 320 mW m<sup>-2</sup> corresponding to the above  $LNO_x$  range, which is roughly three orders of magnitude larger than the direct energy release, a remarkable atmospheric amplifier.

The improved LNO<sub>x</sub> parameterisation by Luhar et al. (2021) is a refinement over the widely-used lightning flash rate parameterisation developed by Price and Rind (1992) (PR92), especially for the ocean for which the PR92 parameterisation greatly underestimates the lightning flash rate and therefore results in a lower tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> burden.

We conduct a number of ACCESS-UKCA model simulations to quantify the effects of the above two parameterisation changes on the net downward shortwave (SW) and longwave (LW) radiative fluxes at the top of the atmosphere (TOA), and the downward surface SW and LW radiative fluxes, and these are reported here. Part of these changes arises due to the changes in

25 atmospheric lifetime of CH<sub>4</sub>, and that is included in the discussion. The calculated changes in the radiative fluxes are also put in the context of the IPCC anthropogenic ERF estimates.

# 2 The ACCESS-UKCA global chemistry-climate model and model setup

We use the United Kingdom Chemistry and Aerosol (UKCA) global atmospheric composition model (Abraham et al., 2012; <u>https://www.ukca.ac.uk</u>) coupled to ACCESS (Australian Community Climate and Earth System Simulator) (Bi et al., 2013;

30 Woodhouse et al., 2015). In the simulations carried out here, ACCESS is essentially the same as the U.K. Met Office's Unified



15



Model (UM) (vn8.4) as the ACCESS specific land-surface and ocean components are not invoked. The UM's original landsurface scheme (viz. JULES) is used and the model is run in atmosphere-only mode with prescribed monthly-mean sea surface temperature (SST) and sea ice fields. The atmosphere component of the UM vn8.4 is the Global Atmosphere (GA 4.0) (Walters et al., 2014). The UKCA configuration used here is the so-called StratTrop (or Chemistry of the Stratosphere and Troposphere

5 (CheST)) (Archibald et al., 2020), which also includes the GLObal Model of Aerosol Processes (GLOMAP)-mode aerosol scheme (Mann et al., 2010).

The tropospheric chemistry scheme includes the chemical cycles of  $O_x$ ,  $HO_x$  and  $NO_x$ , and the oxidation of CO, CH<sub>4</sub>, and other volatile organic carbon (VOC) species (for example, ethane, propane, and isoprene). The Fast-JX photolysis scheme reported by Neu et al. (2007) and Telford et al. (2013) is used.  $O_3$  is coupled interactively between chemistry and radiation. The aerosol

10 section includes sulphur chemistry. The total number of chemical reactions, including those in aerosol chemistry, is 306 across 86 species.

The horizontal resolution of the atmospheric model is  $1.875^{\circ}$  longitude ×  $1.25^{\circ}$  latitude, with 85 staggered terrain-following hybrid-height levels extending from the surface to 85 km in altitude (the so-called N96L85 configuration). The vertical resolution becomes coarser with height, with the lowest 65 levels (altitudes up to ~ 30 km) located within the troposphere and lower stratosphere. The model's dynamical timestep is 20 min, and the UKCA chemical solver is called every 60 min.

A global monthly-varying emissions database for reactive gases and aerosols is used, which includes both anthropogenic, biomass burning and natural components (Woodhouse et al., 2015; Desservettaz et al., 2022). Pre-2000 anthropogenic emissions are prescribed from the Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Model Intercomparison Project (ACCMIP) (Lamarque et al., 2010), and post-2000 from Representative Concentrations Pathway (RCP) 6.0 scenario (van Vuuren et al. 2011).

- 20 Biomass burning emissions are from the GFED4s database (van der Werf et al., 2017). Concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and O<sub>3</sub> depleting substances are prescribed instead of emissions and are from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) and RCP6.0 recommendations. Biogenic emissions are from the Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature Monitoring Atmospheric Composition and Climate project (MEGAN-MACC; Sindelarova et al., 2014). Details of required emissions of other species, and their original sources, including biogenic emissions, chemical precursors and primary
- 25 aerosol are given by Woodhouse et al. (2015).

## 2.1 Model's radiation scheme for gases

ACCESS uses the broadband radiation scheme of Edwards and Slingo (1996), updated and described by Walters et al. (2014), to determine the impact of radiatively active trace gases and aerosols, including clouds, on radiative fluxes, from which heating rates and related quantities may be determined. As UKCA is coupled to this radiation scheme, it is possible calculate the

30 radiative influence of the UKCA gaseous tracer fields (normally O<sub>3</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and O<sub>3</sub> depleting substances) for any specific model configuration. In the present UKCA configuration, mixing ratios of O<sub>3</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O are coupled to the radiation code where O<sub>3</sub> is passed from the modelled 3-D fields.





The Edwards and Slingo (1996) scheme uses the so-called correlated-k method for gaseous absorption for major gases with 6 bands in the shortwave and 9 bands in the longwave regions of the spectrum. In each spectral band, total transmission is determined by summing the results of a number of quasi-monochromatic calculations, each carried out using a two-stream approximation, in which the angular variation of the radiance field is represented simply by an upward and a downward diffuse

- 5 flux, together with a direct solar flux in the shortwave region. Twenty one k terms are used for the major gases in the shortwave bands. Absorption by water vapour (H<sub>2</sub>O), O<sub>3</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>) is included. The treatment of O<sub>3</sub> absorption is as described by Zhong et al. (2008). Forty seven k terms are used for the major gases in the longwave bands. Absorption by H<sub>2</sub>O, O<sub>3</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and halocarbons is included. The treatment of CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> absorption is as described by Zhong and Haigh (2000). Of the major gases considered, H<sub>2</sub>O and O<sub>3</sub> are prognostic, whilst other gases are prescribed using either fixed or time-varying
- 10 mass mixing ratios and assumed to be well mixed. The method of equivalent extinction (Edwards, 1996) is used for minor gases in each band.

## 2.2 Ozone dry deposition scheme for the ocean

Dry deposition flux of  $O_3$  to Earth's surface is usually modelled as the product of  $O_3$  concentration in the air near the surface and a (downward) dry deposition velocity,  $v_d$ , which is calculated as (Wesely, 1989)

$$v_d = \frac{1}{r_a + r_b + r_c'}\tag{1}$$

- 15 where  $r_a$  is the aerodynamic resistance which is the resistance to transfer by turbulence in the atmospheric surface layer,  $r_b$  is the atmospheric viscous (or quasi laminar) sublayer resistance which is the resistance to movement across a thin layer (0.1 – 1 mm) of air that is in direct contact with the surface, and  $r_c$  is the surface resistance which is the resistance to uptake by the surface itself. Various parameterisations are used to calculate these resistances.  $r_c$  is the dominant term in Eq. (1) for O<sub>3</sub> dry deposition to water surfaces, and it is routinely assumed that  $r_c$  for water is constant at  $\approx 2000$  s m<sup>-1</sup> following Wesely's
- 20 (1989) widely used dry deposition parameterisation. Most global chemical transport models, e.g. CAM-chem (Lamarque et al., 2012), GEOS-Chem (Mao et al., 2013) and UKCA, have followed this approach thus far by default, with ACCESS-UKCA using  $r_c = 2200 \text{ sm}^{-1}$ .

Recently, Luhar et al. (2017, 2018) concluded that the use of the above constant  $r_c$  approach in ACCESS-UKCA overestimates O<sub>3</sub> deposition velocities by as much as a factor of 2 to 4 compared to measurements, and does not simulate their observed

25 spatial variability well. Luhar et al. (2018) developed a two-layer process-based parameterisation for  $r_c$  that accounts for the concurrent waterside processes of molecular diffusion, O<sub>3</sub> solubility, first-order chemical reaction of O<sub>3</sub> with dissolved iodide, and turbulent transfer, and found that this parameterisation described the O<sub>3</sub> deposition velocities much better and reduced the global oceanic O<sub>3</sub> deposition to approximately one-third of the default value obtained using Wesely's (1989)  $r_c$  approach. Using the new parameterisation, Luhar et al. (2018) estimated an oceanic dry deposition of 98.4 ± 30.0 Tg O<sub>3</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup> and a global





one of  $722.8 \pm 87.3$  Tg O<sub>3</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup> (averaged over years 2003–2012), which can be compared with the respective values 340 Tg O<sub>3</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup> and  $978 \pm 127$  Tg O<sub>3</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup> obtained by Hardacre et al. (2015) based on 15 global chemistry transport (for year 2001) using Wesely's scheme, demonstrating the large reduction in the oceanic value using the new parameterisation. The new approach has recently been evaluated by other researchers in both global and regional models (Loades et al., 2020; Pound et

5 al., 2020; Barten et al., 2021).

We use both the default and new oceanic dry deposition parameterisations (the latter corresponding to the Ranking 1 configuration in Table 1 of Luhar et al. (2018)).

## 2.3 Lightning-generated NO<sub>x</sub>

NO<sub>x</sub>, which is a mixture of nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and nitric oxide (NO), acts as a precursor to O<sub>3</sub> and OH, which are the
principal tropospheric oxidants. The upper troposphere is where O<sub>3</sub> is most potent as a greenhouse gas. Lightning mainly happens in the tropics related to deep atmospheric convection and is the primary source of NO<sub>x</sub> in the middle to upper troposphere. Schumann and Huntrieser (2007) report a range of 2 - 8 Tg nitrogen (N) yr<sup>-1</sup> produced by lightning globally. The range of global LNO<sub>x</sub> in 16 ACCMIP models in CMIP5 varied between 1.2 to 9.7 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> (Lamarque et al., 2013), whereas in five earth system models in CMIP6 LNO<sub>x</sub> ranged between 3.2 to 7.6 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> (Griffiths et al., 2021; Naik et al., 2021) for

15 the present-day (nominal year 2000) conditions.

The LNO<sub>x</sub> amount in most global models is calculated as

$$LNO_x = P_{NO} \times F, \tag{2}$$

where  $P_{NO}$  is the quantity of NO generated per lightning flash, and *F* is the flash rate. *F* is calculated at every model time step within a model grid, and partitioned into cloud-to-ground (CG) and intracloud (IC) flash components. An emission factor of the amount of NO generated per CG/IC flash is applied, and the calculated mass of NO is then distributed vertically in the grid

20 column (Luhar et al., 2021).

Of all the past techniques used to determine lightning flash rate in global chemistry-climate models and chemical transport models, including ACCESS-UKCA, the PR92 parameterisations are the most commonly used ones. They (or similar) have also been used in most CMIP5 and CMIP6 models.

The PR92 parameterisations for lightning flash rate (flashes per minute) over land  $(F_L)$  and ocean  $(F_O)$  are

$$F_L = 3.44 \times 10^{-5} \, H^{4.9},\tag{3}$$

$$F_0 = 6.4 \times 10^{-4} \, H^{1.73},\tag{4}$$





where H is the height of the convective cloud top (km), which is passed from the model's convective component. The above parameterisations yield flash rates over the ocean that are smaller by approximately 2 to 3 orders of magnitude compared to those calculated for clouds over land.

The oceanic parameterisation Eq. (4) is known to greatly underestimate flash rates. Recently, Luhar et al. (2021) evaluated the PR92 parameterisations and found that while the land parameterisation Eq. (3) gave satisfactory predictions, the oceanic parameterisation Eq. (4) yielded a global mean value of 0.33 flashes s<sup>-1</sup> over the ocean, a much smaller value than 9.16 flashes s<sup>-1</sup> obtained from satellite observations. They formulated the following improved flash-rate parameterisations using the scaling relationships between thunderstorm electrical generator power and storm geometry developed by Boccippio's (2002), together with available data:

$$F_L = 2.40 \times 10^{-5} H^{5.09},\tag{5}$$

$$F_0 = 2.0 \times 10^{-5} H^{4.38}. \tag{6}$$

10 Flash rates obtained using Eq. (6) are approximately two orders of magnitude greater than those obtained using Eq. (4). Eq. (5) performed very similar to Eq. (3) and the new marine parameterisation Eq. (6) gave a global mean marine flash rate of 8.84 flashes s<sup>-1</sup>, which is very close to the observed value of 9.16 flashes s<sup>-1</sup>.

With  $P_{NO} = 330$  moles NO per flash, the use of Eqs. (5) and (6) in ACCESS-UKCA increased the mean total global LNO<sub>x</sub> by 38% from the base value of 4.8 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> (Luhar et al. (2021), with a corresponding increase in tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> burden.

15 We investigate the radiative effects of this change in O<sub>3</sub> due to the change in LNO<sub>x</sub>.

# 2.4 Global model simulations

25

We conducted the following six ACCESS-UKCA simulations for the years 2004–2010 with O<sub>3</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> radiation feedbacks included (except Run E). Considering the first two simulation years as model spin-up time, the output from the model for the five-year 2006–2010 was used for the analysis reported below:

- Base run (Run A): Default model run, with r<sub>c</sub> = 2200 s m<sup>-1</sup> in the oceanic O<sub>3</sub> deposition, and PR92 lightning flash rates (LNO<sub>x</sub> = 4.8 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>),
  - Run B: New process-based oceanic O<sub>3</sub> deposition scheme and PR92 lightning flash rates (LNO<sub>x</sub> = 4.8 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>),
  - Run C: New process-based oceanic O<sub>3</sub> deposition scheme and new lightning flash rates (LNO<sub>x</sub> = 6.9 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>),
  - Run D: New process-based oceanic O<sub>3</sub> deposition scheme, and PR92 lightning flash rates but scaled to give the total global LNO<sub>x</sub> the same as Run C (LNO<sub>x</sub> = 6.9 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>),
  - Run E: Same as Run C, but without the CH<sub>4</sub> radiation feedback (to separate out the radiative effects of O<sub>3</sub> alone) (LNO<sub>x</sub> = 6.9 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>), and
  - Run F: New process-based oceanic  $O_3$  deposition scheme and  $LNO_x = 0$ .



15



Apart from the above changes, the rest of the model setup is the same as described in Section 2 of Luhar et al. (2021). The simulations were nudged to the ECMWF's ERA-Interim reanalyses in the free troposphere involving horizontal wind components and potential temperature given on pressure levels at 6-hourly intervals (Dee et al., 2011). Each model run was initialised using a previously spun-up model output with nudging and the default lightning and dry deposition schemes. The

5 use of nudging does not allow the model changes to adjust synoptic-scale meteorology; hence the results here represent instantaneous radiative responses in the climate system, unlike the ERF which is the sum of the instantaneous radiative forcing (IRF) and the contribution from such adjustments. Due to nudging, responses in the simulation may be dampened, but can be attributed directly to the model perturbations (Fiddes et al., 2018).

The model results were averaged over 5-years for the globe, land, sea, Northern Hemisphere and Southern Hemisphere.

- 10 Differences between the base model run and the other runs were calculated were indexed as follows on x-axis in relevant plots.
  - 1 (dep.)  $= \operatorname{Run} B \operatorname{Base}$
  - $2 (dep. + LNO_x) = Run C Base$
  - 3 (dep. + scaled  $LNO_x$ ) = Run D Base
  - 4 (dep. +  $LNO_x$  + no  $CH_4$ ) = Run E Base
  - 5 (dep. + no  $LNO_x$ ) = Run F Base

# **3** Results and discussion

Monthly-averaged model output for various radiative components and chemical species is used in the following.

## 3.1 Model performance for radiative fluxes

Model output for radiative components includes the incoming (or downward) TOA solar radiation ( $S\downarrow_{TOA}$ ), outgoing (or 20 upward) TOA longwave radiation ( $L\uparrow_{TOA}$ ), outgoing TOA shortwave radiation ( $S\uparrow_{TOA}$ ), incoming longwave radiation at the surface ( $L\downarrow_S$ ), incoming shortwave radiation at the surface ( $S\downarrow_S$ ), outgoing longwave radiation at the surface ( $L\uparrow_S$ ), and outgoing shortwave radiation at the surface ( $S\uparrow_S$ ). The total radiation is the sum of the longwave and shortwave components.

The net downward TOA radiative flux is

$$R_{TOA}^{N} = S \downarrow_{TOA} - (L \uparrow_{TOA} + S \uparrow_{TOA}), \tag{7}$$

where the superscript N signifies net (note that  $S\downarrow_{TOA}$  is the same in all runs and  $L\downarrow_{TOA} = 0$ ). Additional definitions are: the net

25 downward TOA shortwave radiative flux  $S_{TOA}^N = S \downarrow_{TOA} - S \uparrow_{TOA}$  and the net downward TOA longwave radiative flux  $L_{TOA}^N = -L \uparrow_{TOA}$ . The net downward longwave radiation at the surface is equal to  $(L \downarrow_{S} - L \uparrow_{S})$  and net downward shortwave radiation at the surface is equal to  $(S \downarrow_{S} - S \uparrow_{S})$ .





The modelled radiation components from the base run can be compared with the corresponding observations available from NASA's Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) EBAF (Energy Balanced and Filled) Ed4.1 dataset (https://ceres.larc.nasa.gov/data/) for the period 2006–2010 (Loeb et al., 2018; Kato et al., 2018).

The area-weighted global averaged modelled incoming  $S \downarrow_{TOA}$ , and all-sky outgoing  $L \uparrow_{TOA}$  and  $S \uparrow_{TOA}$  radiative fluxes are

- 5 341.44, 240.61 and 102.24 W m<sup>-2</sup>, respectively, in close agreement with the respective observed values of 339.93, 240.10 and 99.19 W m<sup>-2</sup>. The modelled incoming  $L\downarrow_S$  and  $S\downarrow_S$  radiative fluxes are 341.55 and 191.49 W m<sup>-2</sup> compared to the observed averages of 344.57 and 186.48 W m<sup>-2</sup>, respectively. The modelled outgoing  $L\uparrow_S$  and  $S\uparrow_S$  radiative fluxes are 400.07 and 24.83 W m<sup>-2</sup> compared to the observed averages of 398.18 and 23.21 W m<sup>-2</sup>, respectively. Thus, the modelled average total net downward radiation at the surface is 108.14 W m<sup>-2</sup> compared to the observed value of 109.66 W m<sup>-2</sup>.
- 10 The above values can also be compared with a 16-model ensemble from a CMIP5 study (Stephens et al., 2012), which gives the outgoing  $L\uparrow_{TOA}$  and  $S\uparrow_{TOA}$  of 238.6 and 102.2 W m<sup>-2</sup>, respectively, and the incoming  $L\downarrow_S$  and  $S\downarrow_S$  of 339.7 and 190.3 W m<sup>-2</sup>, respectively.

A comparison of the zonal-averaged modelled  $L\uparrow_{TOA} + S\uparrow_{TOA}$ ,  $L\downarrow_S$  and  $S\downarrow_S$  with the corresponding CERES-EBAF data is made in Figure 3 and discussed in section 3.2.

15 Fiddes et al. (2018) obtained similar evaluation results for a very similar setup of ACCESS-UKCA vn8.4 for radiation components averaged over the period of 2000–2009.

## 3.2 Radiative effects of the parameterisation changes

Figure 1a presents a bar chart of the modelled mean (2006–2010) difference ( $\Delta$ ) in the area-weighted net downward TOA total radiation ( $\Delta R_{TOA}^N$ ) between the various runs and the base run for the globe, tropics (< |30°|), non-tropics, land, and ocean (which

- 20 includes all water bodies).  $\Delta R_{TOA}^N$  is akin to radiative forcing, a positive  $\Delta R_{TOA}^N$  means more radiation is retained in the atmosphere due to perturbation to the base model setup. In Figure 1, the absolute values of the total outgoing TOA radiative flux  $(L\uparrow_{TOA} + S\uparrow_{TOA})$  for the base run are also plotted as a reference (corresponding to the right axis). Table 1 presents values of the differences  $\Delta R_{TOA}^N$ ,  $\Delta L\downarrow_s$  and  $\Delta S\downarrow_s$  for the globe, tropics, and non-tropics. It is apparent that with the new oceanic deposition scheme, the net downward TOA radiation  $(R_{TOA}^N)$  is increased by only a relatively very small amount of 4.3 mW
- 25 m<sup>-2</sup>. With the new lightning flash-rate scheme this increase is much greater at 86.3 mW m<sup>-2</sup> due to enhanced tropospheric  $O_3$  production and CH<sub>4</sub> loss as LNO<sub>x</sub> is increased (to 6.9 from the base value 4.8 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>). If we turn off the radiative feedbacks of CH<sub>4</sub> in the model, the increase in the net downward TOA radiative flux is 107.0 mW m<sup>-2</sup>. Therefore, CH<sub>4</sub> feedback negates the positive radiative effect of  $O_3$  by 20.7 mW m<sup>-2</sup>, which is due to enhanced OH concentrations resulting from increased LNO<sub>x</sub> that reduce the tropospheric CH<sub>4</sub> lifetime and increase L $\uparrow_{TOA}$ . (Note that dry deposition is a surface process and, therefore, any





changes to it would influence  $O_3$  in surface air to much greater extent than that at higher altitudes, although the radiative effects of these changes may be small.)

When the default PR92 lightning flash rate scheme is used with a uniform scaling so as to give the total global  $LNO_x$  the same as Run 3 (i.e., 6.9 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>), the increase in the net downward TOA radiation is 70.9 mW m<sup>-2</sup>. Therefore, although the total

5 global LNO<sub>x</sub> is the same in both runs, the new lightning flash rate scheme leads to a larger increase, which implies that how LNO<sub>x</sub> is spatially distributed makes a difference in the radiation impact.

 $LNO_x$  is an important precursor of tropospheric  $O_3$  and OH. Turning off  $LNO_x$  completely in the model causes an extra 190.8 mW m<sup>-2</sup> to leave the atmosphere compared to the base run. This is caused by the lower amount of  $O_3$  due to the absence of  $LNO_x$  in the atmosphere. This increase in outgoing radiation due to reduced upper tropospheric  $O_3$  dominates over the reverse

10 radiation impact of no  $LNO_x$  causing lower OH and a longer  $CH_4$  lifetime.

There may be a small negative contribution to the net downward TOA radiative flux through formation of nitrate aerosols as  $LNO_x$  is increased, but most global chemistry-climate models (including ACCESS-UKCA) do not include nitrate aerosols (e.g., only three of the AerChemMIP models have this capability).

In Figure 1a, the radiation changes relative to the base run are larger in magnitude in the tropics than elsewhere. With the new

15 oceanic deposition scheme, the net downward TOA radiation is increased by 13.7 mW m<sup>-2</sup> in the tropics but is reduced by 5.5 mW m<sup>-2</sup> elsewhere. The contrast in radiation changes over land the ocean is not as stark as that over the tropical and non-tropical regions, except for the no-LNO<sub>x</sub> case.

Figure 1b and Figure 1c are the same as Figure 1a except for the differences in the net downward TOA radiation components  $L_{TOA}^{N}$  and  $S_{TOA}^{N}$ , respectively, and these suggest that when the new LNO<sub>x</sub> scheme is used, the changes in the total net downward

20 TOA radiation are dominated by the changes in the longwave component ( $L_{TOA}^N$ ).

The magnitude of the above modelled net downward TOA radiation differences obtained due to the differences in the representation of two natural processes in the model can be put in the context of the IPCC AR6 reported anthropogenic ERF due to  $O_3$  over the years 1750–2019 of 470 ± 230 mW m<sup>-2</sup> (Forster et al., 2021), noting that the radiation differences calculated here are akin to instantaneous radiative forcing, which excludes any adjustments (e.g., adjustments causing circulation

25 changes) unlike the ERF which is the sum of the IRF and the contribution from the adjustments. For example, the extra radiation of 86.3 mW m<sup>-2</sup> retained by the atmosphere when the new deposition and lightning flash-rate schemes are used, which represents the uncertainty in radiation due to two natural process representation in chemistry-climate models, is 18% of the anthropogenic  $O_3$  radiative forcing.

Figure 2a is a bar chart of the modelled mean difference of the area-weighted downward surface longwave radiative flux  $(\Delta L \downarrow_s)$  between the various runs and the base run. The absolute values of the surface longwave radiative flux for the base run





are also plotted as a reference. Figure 2b is the corresponding plot for the downward surface shortwave radiative flux difference  $(\Delta S \downarrow_S)$ . The LNO<sub>x</sub> increases in the model, compared to the base run, lead to an increase in  $L \downarrow_S$ , and a decrease in  $S \downarrow_S$ .





5



Figure 1: Modelled mean (2006–2010) net downward TOA radiative flux difference between the various model runs and the base run (1 = Run B – Base, 2 = Run C – Base, 3 = Run D – Base, 4 = Run E – Base, 5 = Run F – Base) for the globe, tropics ( $<|30^\circ|$ ), non-tropics, land, and ocean. The plots are for the (a) total radiative flux difference ( $\Delta R_{TOA}^N$ ), (b) longwave radiative flux difference ( $L_{TOA}^N$ ), and (c) shortwave radiative flux difference ( $S_{TOA}^N$ ). The outgoing TOA flux values obtained from the base run are also plotted (corresponding to the right axis).







Figure 2: Modelled mean (2006–2010) downward surface radiative flux difference between the various model runs and the base run
(1 = Run B - Base, 2 = Run C - Base, 3 = Run D - Base, 4 = Run E - Base, 5 = Run F - Base) for the globe, tropics (< |30°), non-tropics, land, and sea. The plots are for the (a) longwave radiative flux difference (ΔL↓s) and (b) shortwave radiative flux difference (ΔS↓s). The downward surface flux (L↓s+S↓s) values obtained from the base run are also plotted (corresponding to the right axis).</li>





Model difference	Globe			Tropics			Non-tropics		
	Δ <b>R<sup>N</sup><sub>TOA</sub></b> (mW m <sup>-2</sup> )	∆L↓ <sub>S</sub> (mW m⁻²)	∆S↓ <sub>S</sub> (mW m <sup>-2</sup> )	Δ <b>R<sup>N</sup><sub>TOA</sub></b> (mW m <sup>-2</sup> )	ΔL↓ <sub>s</sub> (mW m <sup>-2</sup> )	∆S↓ <sub>S</sub> (mW m <sup>-2</sup> )	Δ <b>R</b> <sup>N</sup> <sub>TOA</sub> (mW m <sup>-2</sup> )	∆L↓ <sub>s</sub> (mW m⁻²)	∆S↓ <sub>S</sub> (mW m <sup>-2</sup> )
1 (dep.)	4.3	9.0	7.8	13.7	4.7	17.7	-5.5	13.4	-2.4
2 (dep. + LNO <sub>x</sub> )	86.3	93.1	-72.1	133.4	131.0	-95.3	37.4	53.8	-47.9
3 (dep. + scaled LNO <sub>x</sub> )	70.9	69.7	-44.6	113.0	90.5	-49.5	27.1	48.2	-39.5
4 (dep. + LNO <sub>x</sub> + no CH <sub>4</sub> )	107.0	92.3	-75.6	163.2	135.1	-98.4	48.6	47.9	-51.9
5 (dep. + no LNO <sub>x</sub> )	-190.8	-199.2	204.9	-264.8	-283.7	266.3	-114.1	-111.4	141.1

Table 1: Changes in the net downward total top-of-the-atmosphere (TOA) radiative flux ( $\Delta R_{TOA}^{N}$ ), and in the incoming longwave ( $\Delta L \downarrow s$ ) and shortwave ( $\Delta S \downarrow s$ ) fluxes at the surface, with respect to the base run. Values (mW m<sup>-2</sup>) given for averages over the globe, tropics (< |30°|), and non-tropics over 2006–2010).

5 In Figure 3 (a, b and c), the zonal means of the differences in the modelled radiative fluxes from the base model run for the various other model runs for downward TOA net radiative flux, downward surface longwave radiative flux and downward surface shortwave radiative flux are presented (solid lines). The zonal means of the outgoing TOA radiative flux (L↑<sub>TOA</sub> +S↑<sub>TOA</sub>), downward long wave radiative flux at the surface and downward short wave radiative flux at the surface from the base run, and the corresponding CERES-EBAF data, are also plotted (dotted lines and solid circles, corresponding to the right axis).

In Figure 3a, the minimum in the zonal mean of the modelled  $L\uparrow_{TOA} +S\uparrow_{TOA}$  flux near the equator is mostly due to the high cloud tops associated with the inter-tropical convergence zone (ITCZ), which is a region of persistent thunderstorms, and the subtropical maxima are associated with clear air over deserts and subtropical highs. The radiative flux diminishes towards the poles, with the minimum being in the southern hemisphere polar region. There is a good agreement with the CERES-EBAF

- 15 data, with some model overestimation between 50°N to 50°S and underestimation within 50–70°S. In terms of the differences in net downward total top-of-the-atmosphere (TOA) radiative flux ( $R_{TOA}^N$ ) from the base run, dry deposition has little effect, but increased LNO<sub>x</sub> increases the flux from ~ 50°N to 30°S presumably due to increased emission of LW by O<sub>3</sub> produced by the LNO<sub>x</sub>. Similarly, totally removing the LNO<sub>x</sub> decreases the TOA radiative flux particularly from approximately 30°S to virtually the north pole showing a marked hemispheric asymmetry towards the northern hemisphere. This contrasts, being in
- 20 the opposite hemisphere, to the asymmetric effect of  $LNO_x$  on the downward SW radiation at the surface (Figure 3c).

Downwards longwave radiation at the surface in clear sky conditions is such that 80% originates in the first 500 m of the atmosphere and the major controlling factors are humidity and temperature (Wang and Dickinson, 2013). In Figure 3b for downward long wave radiative flux at the surface, apparent are the characteristic peak in the tropics, the radiative flux





diminishing poleward to a lower level in the northern polar region and to the lowest levels towards the southern hemisphere pole consistent with global climatologies (Wang and Dickinson, 2013). The model agreement with the CERES-EBAF data is excellent. In terms of the differences from the base run, dry deposition has little effect, but increased LNO<sub>x</sub> increases the downward flux from ~ 40°N to 40°S presumably due to increased emission of LW by O<sub>3</sub> produced by the LNO<sub>x</sub>. Similarly,

5 totally removing the LNO<sub>x</sub> decreases LW radiation particularly from ~  $40^{\circ}$ N to  $40^{\circ}$ S. This contrasts with the asymmetric effect of LNO<sub>x</sub> on SW radiation in Figure 3c.

The downward short wave radiative flux at the surface is affected by clouds which reflect and scatter solar radiation (see cloud climatology <u>https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/85843/cloudy-earth</u>). In Figure 3c for downward shortwave radiative flux at the surface, apparent are the characteristic peak from overhead solar radiation in the tropics, the influence of the tropical

- 10 cloud band, the radiative flux diminishing to a low level in the northern polar region presumably due to widespread cloud cover there, and diminishing fluxes in the mid latitudes of the southern hemisphere and then increasing towards the pole consistent with cloud climatologies (<u>https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/85843/cloudy-earth</u>). The model agreement with the CERES-EBAF data is good, with some model overestimation in the tropics. In terms of the differences from the base run, dry deposition has little effect, but increased LNO<sub>x</sub> decreases the downward flux from ~ 20°N to 60°S presumably due to
- 15 increased absorption of SW by O<sub>3</sub> produced by the LNO<sub>x</sub>. Similarly, totally removing the LNO<sub>x</sub> increases SW radiation from  $\sim 40^{\circ}$ N to 70°S. This illustrates the asymmetric effect of LNO<sub>x</sub> in producing O<sub>3</sub> across the hemispheres and consequent asymmetric heating contribution.

Global distribution of the net downward TOA radiative flux difference ( $\Delta R_{TOA}^N$ ) between the model Run C (i.e., the new dry deposition scheme and the new LNO<sub>x</sub> scheme; Diff. 2) and the base run (Figure 4a) is patchy with regions of both increased

- 20 and decreased radiation compared to the base run, but with an overall increase. The difference in the incoming longwave radiative flux at the surface (ΔL↓<sub>S</sub>) (Figure 4b) is positive almost everywhere over the globe, whereas that in the incoming shortwave radiative flux at the surface (ΔS↓<sub>S</sub>) (Figure 4c) has a patchy global distribution with regions of both positive and negative values. The respective area-weighted spatial means of these differences in Figure 4a, b and c are 86.3 ± 387.3, 93.1 ± 184.1 and -72.1 ± 589.9 mW m<sup>-2</sup>, where the standard deviations were obtained from area-weighted variances and their
- 25 relatively large values reflect the spatial heterogeneity of the radiation response.

Figure 4d presents the corresponding difference in lightning flash density ( $\Delta f$ ) between the two models, which shows a larger flash density predicted everywhere by the new LNO<sub>x</sub> scheme, particularly over the ocean in the tropics (LNO<sub>x</sub> is directly proportional to the lightning flash rate in our model). The area-weighted spatial pattern correlation (*r*) between  $\Delta f$  and  $\Delta R_{TOA}^{N}$  is 0.15. The correlation of  $\Delta f$  with  $\Delta L \downarrow_S$  is 0.33 and with  $\Delta S \downarrow_S$  it is -0.14. These relatively low correlations imply that while

30 the LNO<sub>x</sub> production occurs (and changes from model run to run) in one spatial pattern, time is required for chemical processing from NO<sub>x</sub> to O<sub>3</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> and during this time advection and dispersion take place so that the radiative effects occur in a different spatial pattern.







Figure 3: Zonal mean (2006–2010) of radiative flux difference between the various model runs and the base run (1 = Run B – Base, 2 = Run C – Base, 3 = Run D – Base, 4 = Run E – Base, 5 = Run F – Base). The plots (solid lines) are for the (a) net downward TOA radiative flux difference (ΔR<sup>N</sup><sub>TOA</sub>), (b) downward longwave radiative flux difference at the surface (ΔL↓s) and (b) downward shortwave radiative flux difference at the surface (ΔS↓s). The solid lines are running averages (over a moving window of 10 points, i.e., 12.5°). The zonal mean flux values obtained from the base run and the corresponding CERES-EBAF data are also plotted (dotted line and solid circles, corresponding to the right axis).







Figure 4: Global distribution of the radiative flux difference between Run C (i.e., the new dry deposition scheme and the new LNO<sub>x</sub> scheme) and the base run (mean over 2006–2010). The plots are for the (a) net downward TOA radiative flux difference  $(\Delta R_{TOA}^N)$ , (b) incoming longwave radiative flux difference at the surface  $(\Delta L \downarrow_S)$  and (b) incoming shortwave radiative flux difference at the surface  $(\Delta S \downarrow_S)$ . In (d), the corresponding model difference in lightning flash density, given as flashes km<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>, is shown.

#### 3.3 Radiative effects as a function of changes in LNO<sub>x</sub>

Lightning NO<sub>x</sub> production is a natural process with effects on the atmospheric radiation and energy budget via  $O_3$ , CH<sub>4</sub>, and nitrate aerosol. Lightning NO<sub>x</sub> is different from the bulk of other natural and anthropogenic sources of NO<sub>x</sub> in the troposphere in that the release occurs in the upper portion of the troposphere rather than close to the Earth's surface.

In Figure 5a, we plot the change in the modelled net downward total TOA radiation ( $\Delta R_{TOA}^N$ ) as a function of change in the annual-averaged LNO<sub>x</sub> production relative to the base model run. The different points are for different years and different model runs. All runs except Run E (i.e., without the CH<sub>4</sub> radiation feedback) are considered. The plot shows an approximately

- 15 linear increasing change in the net downward total TOA radiation as a function of increase in the  $LNO_x$  production due to the various model parameterisation/configuration changes considered. (There is a relatively large gap between the  $LNO_x = 0$  case and the  $LNO_x = 4.8$  Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> case. To confirm that the linear fit is not unduly dominated by the  $LNO_x = 0$  case and that the linearity is appropriate, an additional model simulation the same as Run C but with the  $LNO_x$  distribution scaled uniformly by 0.35 to give an averaged total  $LNO_x = 2.4$  Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> was made, and the results from the this simulation are also plotted in
- 20 Figure 5-Figure 6 enclosed by a dotted circle and they are included in determining the linear fits.)



25



The slope of the best fit lines in Figure 5a suggests that with a per Tg increase in N production per year due to lightning, there is an increase of 39.6 mW m<sup>-2</sup> (Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>-1</sup> in the net downward TOA radiation, or that much of radiation is retained by the atmosphere. Similarly, based on the slopes of the best fit lines in Figure 5b and Figure 5c, there is an increase of 40.2 mW m<sup>-2</sup> (Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>-1</sup> in the incoming surface longwave radiation, and a decrease of 36.4 mW m<sup>-2</sup> (Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>-1</sup> in the incoming surface

5 shortwave radiation.

Assuming an uncertainty range of 2–8 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> in the global estimates of lightning-generated NO<sub>x</sub> suggested by Schumann and Huntrieser (2007), the uncertainty range in the net downward TOA radiation retained in the atmosphere due to uncertainty in LNO<sub>x</sub> could thus be as much as 237.6 mW m<sup>-2</sup> (recall that this is the net or combined radiative effect of positive  $O_3$  and negative CH<sub>4</sub> feedbacks). Although these cannot be compared directly, this is equivalent to 50% of the present-day

10 anthropogenic ERF of 470 mW m<sup>-2</sup> due to O<sub>3</sub> over the years 1750–2019 reported by IPCC AR6 (Forster et al., 2021). The corresponding uncertainty range is 241.2 mW m<sup>-2</sup> for the surface longwave radiation and 218.4 mW m<sup>-2</sup> for the surface shortwave radiation. Thus, the implications of this uncertainty in LNO<sub>x</sub> for global climate modelling needs investigation and clarification.



Figure 5: Change in the modelled (a) net downward total TOA radiation  $(\Delta R_{TOA}^N)$ , (b) incoming surface longwave radiation  $(\Delta L\downarrow_s)$ , and (c) incoming surface shortwave radiation  $(\Delta S\downarrow_s)$ , as a function of change in the modelled lightning-generated NO<sub>x</sub> ( $\Delta LNO_x$ , Tg N per year) relative to the Base model run. All runs except Run E (i.e., without the CH<sub>4</sub> radiation feedback) are considered. Results from an additional model simulation the same as Run C but with averaged LNO<sub>x</sub> = 2.4 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> are also plotted (enclosed in a dotted circle) to check linearity. The solid circles are the annual means whereas the squares are the mean over 2006–2010. The best fit line is based on all points.

The emission-based ERF due to increases in anthropogenic NO<sub>x</sub> emissions (from 1750 to 2019) based on chemistry-climate models is reported to be negative (at  $-0.29 \pm 0.29$  W m<sup>-2</sup>), which is a net effect of a positive ERF through enhanced tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> production, a negative ERF through reduced CH<sub>4</sub> lifetime, and a small negative ERF contribution through formation of





nitrate aerosols (Naik et al., 2021). As demonstrated in this study, the net instantaneous radiative forcing of  $LNO_x$  is positive as the enhanced  $O_3$  production dominates over the reduced  $CH_4$  lifetime. Notwithstanding the differences between ERF and IRF, this could at least be partially because (a) in the upper to middle troposphere within which  $LNO_x$  is generated, the production efficiency of  $O_3$  per unit of  $NO_x$  is much larger than that close to the Earth's surface, where anthropogenic emissions

5 are mostly released (Dahlmann et al., 2011) and (b) the historical anthropogenic  $NO_x$  emissions were accompanied by emissions of reactive VOCs which affects the subsequent chemistry.

# 3.4 Radiative effects as a function of changes in column O<sub>3</sub>

With the new dry deposition scheme, the tropospheric  $O_3$  burden increases by 1.5% (by 4.2 Tg  $O_3$  from 271.8 Tg  $O_3$ ) over the base run. With both the new dry deposition and LNO<sub>x</sub> schemes this increase in the tropospheric  $O_3$  burden is by 11.7%.

10 Similarly, the increase in the  $O_3$  column is by 0.14 DU for the new dry deposition scheme and 3.75 DU for the new dry deposition and  $LNO_x$  schemes combined (from the base average total column of 304.64 DU, and the base average tropospheric column of 27.82 DU).

Radiation is examined with respect to tropospheric  $O_3$  column changes (Figure 6). Based on Figure 6a, with a per DU increase in  $O_3$ , there is an increase of 22.8 mW m<sup>-2</sup> DU<sup>-1</sup> in the net downward TOA radiation, when the  $O_3$  change is dominated by an

- 15 increase in LNO<sub>x</sub>. This can be compared to normalised radiative forcing calculations reported in the scientific literature. Using the results of 17 atmospheric chemistry models, Stevenson et al. (2013) derived a globally averaged normalized radiative forcing of 42 (range 36–45) mW m<sup>-2</sup> DU<sup>-1</sup> for tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> increase from preindustrial (1750) to present day (2010). Gauss et al. (2003) calculated a normalized radiative forcing of  $36 \pm 3$  mW m<sup>-2</sup> DU<sup>-1</sup> due to changes in tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> between 2000 and 2100 based on the results of 11 models. In our study, the changes in TOA radiative effects per DU, which are primarily
- 20 driven by changes in LNO<sub>x</sub> parameterisation and to a much lesser extend by the O<sub>3</sub> deposition parameterisation (with CH<sub>4</sub> feedbacks included), are about half the radiative forcing per DU as a result of climate-scale changes in tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> (e.g., due to changes in precursor emissions and temperature). The climate-scale changes in radiation due to O<sub>3</sub> are larger, possibly because there are co-emissions of non-NO<sub>x</sub> precursor species (e.g., CH<sub>4</sub> and VOCs) and their feedbacks, whereas in the present case only LNO<sub>x</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> dry deposition changes are considered (together with CH<sub>4</sub> feedbacks). Methane levels and VOC emissions are unchanged.

Similarly, based on Figure 6b and Figure 6c, there is an increase in downward surface longwave radiation  $L\downarrow_S$  by 23.6 mW m<sup>-2</sup> DU<sup>-1</sup> and a decrease in downward surface shortwave radiation  $S\downarrow_S$  by 21.7 mW m<sup>-2</sup> DU<sup>-1</sup>.



5





Figure 6: Change in the modelled (a) net downward total TOA radiation  $(\Delta R_{TOA}^N)$ , (b) incoming surface longwave radiation  $(\Delta L\downarrow s)$ and (c) incoming surface shortwave radiation  $(\Delta S\downarrow s)$ , as a function of change in the modelled tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> column ( $\Delta DU$ ) relative to the Base model run. All runs except Run E (i.e., without the CH<sub>4</sub> radiation feedback) are considered. Results from an additional model simulation the same as Run C but with averaged LNO<sub>x</sub> = 2.4 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> are also plotted (enclosed in a dotted circle) to check linearity. The solid circles are the annual means whereas the squares are the mean over 2006–2010. The best fit line is based on all points.

The above changes in radiation were also examined as a function of changes in tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> burden (plots not shown). The slopes of these plots indicate that there is an increase of 3.3 mW m<sup>-2</sup> (Tg O<sub>3</sub>)<sup>-1</sup> in the net downward TOA radiation, an increase of 3.3 mW m<sup>-2</sup> (Tg O<sub>3</sub>)<sup>-1</sup> in the incoming surface longwave radiation, and a decrease of 3.1 mW m<sup>-2</sup> (Tg O<sub>3</sub>)<sup>-1</sup> in the incoming surface shortwave radiation.

In this paper, we have not explored atmospheric temperature response or any changes in atmospheric heating rates caused by the changes in the radiation balance due to the use of the improved parameterisations.

## 15 3.5 LNO<sub>x</sub> and the tropospheric lifetime of CH<sub>4</sub>

LNO<sub>x</sub> also affects the lifetime of CH<sub>4</sub> due to loss by OH ( $\tau_{CH_4}$ ) in the troposphere (Labrador et al., 2004).  $\tau_{CH_4}$  from Runs A, B, C, D, E and F are 7.61, 7.55, 6.97, 7.17, 6.97 and 9.26 years, respectively. Compared with the previous parameterisations, there is a relatively small decrease of 0.06 years in  $\tau_{CH_4}$  when the new oceanic O<sub>3</sub> dry deposition scheme is used and this decrease is 0.64 years when the improved LNO<sub>x</sub> parameterisation is also used.

20 In Figure 7, the change in  $\tau_{CH_4}$  plotted as a function of change in LNO<sub>x</sub> suggests that there is a shortening of the global mean CH<sub>4</sub> lifetime by 0.31 years per Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> produced due to lightning This change in  $\tau_{CH_4}$  is equivalent to a change of -4.4%  $\tau_{CH_4}$  per Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> produced due to lightning (with respect to the Run C value of  $\tau_{CH_4}$ ), which is close to the average -4.8 (range -6.8 to -2.4) %  $\tau_{CH_4}$  per Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> given by Thornhill et al. (2021) based on four other models. The change in





 $\tau_{CH_4}$  corresponding to an LNO<sub>x</sub> uncertainty range of 2–8 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> (Schumann and Huntrieser, 2007) would be 1.9 years or 27%.

Thus,  $LNO_x$  has, through OH, a significant influence on the atmospheric lifetime of  $CH_4$ , and the value of  $LNO_x$  used within a model will influence the time integrated measures of radiative forcing including the ERF and the global warming potential

5 of anthropogenic CH<sub>4</sub>. The accepted atmospheric lifetime of CH<sub>4</sub> due to reaction with OH, soil removal and stratospheric oxidation is 7.8 years (average over 2000–2009) with a range of 6.5–8.8 years (Saunois et al., 2020). If the intermediate relationships are linear, then the uncertainty in LNO<sub>x</sub> within the models would translate to an uncertainty of  $\pm 16\%$  in the integrated measures of radiative forcing including the ERF and the GWP of anthropogenic CH<sub>4</sub>.



10

Figure 7: Same as Figure 5, except for change in the modelled CH<sub>4</sub> lifetime ( $\Delta \tau_{CH_4}$ ).

# **4** Conclusions

The impact of recently improved global parameterisations of oceanic O<sub>3</sub> dry deposition (Luhar et al., 2018) and lightning-generated NO<sub>x</sub> (Luhar et al., 2021) on radiative transfer was investigated via the use of the ACCESS-UKCA chemistry-climate
 model involving radiative feedbacks of both O<sub>3</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub>. The main radiation components examined were the net downward

top of the atmosphere (TOA) radiative flux, and the incoming longwave and shortwave radiation at the Earth's surface.

The use of the new oceanic dry deposition scheme resulted in a relatively small increase of 4.3 mW m<sup>-2</sup> in the net downward TOA radiative flux, but this increase was much larger at 86.3 mW m<sup>-2</sup>, most of which longwave, when the improved LNO<sub>x</sub>





parameterisation was also used (the latter increased the global  $LNO_x$  production to 6.9 from 4.8 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup>). This radiative flux difference is a net effect (107.0 - 20.7 mW m<sup>-2</sup>) of an increase in  $O_3$  and a decrease in  $CH_4$  lifetime (by 0.64 years) against loss due to an increase in OH. It represents a measure of uncertainty in radiation due to two natural process representation in chemistry-climate models, and, for comparison, is equivalent to ~18% of the IPCC AR6 reported present-day anthropogenic

5 radiative forcing due to  $O_3$ .

Similarly, there was an increase of 93 mW m<sup>-2</sup> in the downward longwave radiation and a decrease of 72 mW m<sup>-2</sup> in the downward shortwave radiation at the Earth's surface. The changes in radiation components and  $CH_4$  lifetime per unit change in LNO<sub>x</sub> and column O<sub>3</sub> were also estimated based on the slopes of linear fits.

The uncertainty range in the net downward TOA radiative flux due to the uncertainty in global estimates of LNO<sub>x</sub> could be as 10 much as 238 mW m<sup>-2</sup>. This value is equivalent to 50% of the present-day anthropogenic radiative forcing due to O<sub>3</sub> of 470 mW m<sup>-2</sup> reported by IPCC AR6. The corresponding modelled uncertainty range is 241 mW m<sup>-2</sup> for the surface longwave radiation and 218 mW m<sup>-2</sup> for the surface shortwave radiation.

The radiation changes due to the two improved parameterisations were larger in magnitude in the tropics than elsewhere. It was also found that when the default PR92 lightning flash rate scheme was used with a uniform scaling so as to give the total

15 global LNO<sub>x</sub> the same as the new scheme, the new scheme yielded a larger net downward TOA radiation by  $\sim$ 15 mW m<sup>-2</sup>, which implies that how LNO<sub>x</sub> is distributed spatially makes a difference to how the radiative transfer is impacted.

Clearly, the impact of  $LNO_x$  on the tropospheric  $O_3$  production and oxidising capacity is considerable, with ramifications on Earth's radiation budget. Similarly,  $LNO_x$  has a significant influence on the atmospheric lifetime of  $CH_4$ , and the value of  $LNO_x$  used within a model may influence the modelled ERF of anthropogenic  $CH_4$ . Recent chemistry-climate modelling

- 20 studies have explored changes in LNO<sub>x</sub> in a future warming climate but there remains a large uncertainty depending on how lightning flash-rate parameterisations are formulated. All CMIP6 Earth system models use flash-rate parameterizations that use convective cloud-top height (as is the case in the present paper) and they project an increase in lightning and hence in LNO<sub>x</sub> in a warmer world of 0.27–0.61 Tg N yr<sup>-1</sup> per °C (Naik et al., 2021; Thornhill et al., 2021). Finney et al. (2018) find that a flash-rate parameterisation based on upward cloud ice flux predicts a decrease in lightning under climate change. Thus,
- 25 despite the improvements in understanding, LNO<sub>x</sub> remains a significant uncertainty for climate and earth system modelling.

### Data availability

30

We used the following sources of the observational datasets for the present study: ERA-Interim global reanalysis data from <a href="https://www.ecmwf.int/en/forecasts/datasets/reanalysis-datasets/era-interim">https://www.ecmwf.int/en/forecasts/datasets/reanalysis-datasets/era-interim</a>. Radiation data used for model comparison purposes were available from NASA's Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) EBAF (Energy Balanced and





Filled) Ed4.1 dataset (<u>https://ceres.larc.nasa.gov/data/</u>). The global model output (in NetCDF) from the ACCESS-UKCA simulations made can be obtained by contacting the corresponding author (Ashok Luhar: <u>ashok.luhar@csiro.au</u>).

# Author contributions

All authors had the initial idea to carry out this work. AKL designed the study, performed the model simulations, analysed

5 model output and data, and prepared the manuscript. IEG co-designed the study, advised on various components of the paper, and contributed to paper writing. MTW advised on model setup. All authors contributed to revisions of the paper.

# **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## Acknowledgements

10 This work was partly supported by the Climate Systems Hub of the National Environmental Science Program (NESP) funded by the Australian Government, and was undertaken with the assistance of resources and services from the National Computational Infrastructure (NCI), which is supported by the Australian government. ERA-Interim data from the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) and radiation data from NASA's Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) were used in this research. We acknowledge Martin Dix for his help with model configuration issues.

15





## References

<u>10229-2021</u>, 2021.

Abraham, N. L., Archibald, A. T., Bellouin, N., Boucher, O., Braesicke, P., Bushell, A., Carslaw, K. S., Collins, W., Dalvi, M., Emmerson, K. M., Folberth, G., Haywood, J., Johnson, C., Kipling, Z., Macintyre, H., Mann, G. W., Telford, P. J., Merikanto, J., Morgenstern, O., O'Connor, F., Ordonez, C., Osprey, S., Pringle, K. J., Pyle, J. A., Rae, J. G. L., Reddington,

5 C. L., Savage, D., Spracklen, D., Stier, P., and West, R.: Unified Model Documentation Paper No. 84 (http://www.ukca.ac.uk/images/b/b1/Umdp\_084-umdp84.pdf): United Kingdom Chemistry and Aerosol (UKCA) Technical Description MetUM Version 8.4. UK Met Office, Exeter (UK), pp. 74, 2012.

Archibald, A. T., O'Connor, F. M., Abraham, N. L., Archer-Nicholls, S., Chipperfield, M. P., Dalvi, et al.: Description and evaluation of the UKCA stratosphere–troposphere chemistry scheme (StratTrop vn 1.0) implemented in UKESM1, Geosci.
Model Dev., 13, 1223–1266, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-1223-2020, 2020.

Barten, J. G. M., Ganzeveld, L. N., Steeneveld, G.-J., and Krol, M. C.: Role of oceanic ozone deposition in explaining temporal variability in surface ozone at High Arctic sites, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 21, 10229–10248, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-</u>

Bi, D. H., Dix, M., Marsland, S. J., O'Farrell, S., Rashid, H. A., Uotila, P., Hirst, A. C., Kowalczyk, E., Golebiewski, M.,

15 Sullivan, A., Yan, H. L., Hannah, N., Franklin, C., Sun, Z. A., Vohralik, P., Watterson, I., Zhou, X. B., Fiedler, R., Collier, M., Ma, Y. M., Noonan, J., Stevens, L., Uhe, P., Zhu, H. Y., Griffies, S. M., Hill, R., Harris, C., and Puri, K.: The ACCESS coupled model: description, control climate and evaluation, Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Journal, 63, 41–64, <u>https://doi.org/10.22499/2.6301.004</u>, 2013.

Boccippio, D. J.: Lightning scaling relations revisited, J. Atmos. Sci., 59, 1086–1104, <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-</u> 20 0469(2002)059<1086:LSRR>2.0.CO;2, 2002.

Clifton, O. E., Fiore, A. M., Massman, W. J., Baublitz, C. B., Coyle, M., Emberson, L., et al.: Dry deposition of ozone over land: processes, measurement, and modelling, Reviews of Geophysics, 58, e2019RG000670, <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2019RG000670</u>, 2020.

Dahlmann, K., Grewe, V., Ponater, M., and Matthes, S.: Quantifying the contributions of individual NO<sub>x</sub> sources to the trend in ozone radiative forcing, Atmos. Environ., 45, 2860–2868, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.02.071, 2011.

Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., Bauer, P., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A. C. M., van de Berg, L., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Delsol, C., Dragani, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A. J., Haimberger, L., Healy, S. B., Hersbach, H., Holm, E. V., Isaksen, L., Kallberg, P., Kohler, M., Matricardi, M., McNally, A. P., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Morcrette, J.-J., Park, B.-K., Peubey, C., de Rosnay, P., Tavolato, C., Thepaut, J.-N., and

30 Vitarta, F.: The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system, Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 137, 553–597, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.828</u>, 2011.



5

10



Desservettaz, M. J., Fisher, J. A., Luhar, A. K., Woodhouse, M. T., Bukosa, B., Buchholz, R. R., et al.: Australian fire emissions of carbon monoxide estimated by global biomass burning inventories: Variability and observational constraints, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 127, e2021JD035925, https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JD035925, 2022.

Edwards, J. M.: Efficient calculation of infrared fluxes and cooling rates using the two-stream equations, J. Atmos. Sci., 53, 1921–1932, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1996)053<1921:ECOIFA>2.0.CO;2, 1996.

Edwards, J. M. and Slingo, A.: Studies with a flexible new radiation code. I: Choosing a configuration for a large-scale model, Q. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc., 122, 689-719, https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49712253107, 1996.

Fiddes, S. L., Woodhouse, M. T., Nicholls, Z., Lane, T. P., and Schofield, R.: Cloud, precipitation and radiation responses to large perturbations in global dimethyl sulfide, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18, 10177-10198, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-10177-<u>2018</u>, 2018.

Finney, D. L., Doherty, R. M., Wild, O., Stevenson, D. S., MacKenzie, I. A., and Blyth, A. M.: A projected decrease in lightning under climate change, Nat. Clim. Change, 8, 210-213, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0072-6, 2018.

Forster, P., Storelvmo, T., Armour, K., Collins, W., Dufresne, J. L., Frame, D., Lunt, D. J., Mauritsen, T., Palmer, M. D., Watanabe, M., Wild, M., Zhang, H.: The Earth's Energy Budget, Climate Feedbacks, and Climate Sensitivity. In: Climate

Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the 15 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press. In Press, 2021.

Galbally, I. E. and Roy, C. R.: Destruction of ozone at the Earth's surface, Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 106, 599-620, https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49710644915 1980. 20

Gauss, M., Myhre, G., Pitari, G., Prather, M. J., Isaksen, I. S. A., Berntsen, T. K., Brasseur, G. P., Dentener, F. J., Derwent, R. G., Hauglustaine, D. A., Horowitz, L. W., Jacob, D. J., Johnson, M., Law, K. S., Mickley, L. J., Muller, J.-F., Plantevin, P.-H., Pyle, J. A., Rogers, H. L., Stevenson, D. S., Sundet, J. K., van Weele, M., and Wild, O.: Radiative forcing in the 21st century due to ozone changes in the troposphere and the lower stratosphere, J. Geophys. Res., 108, 4292, https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JD002624, 2003.

25

Griffiths, P. T., Murray, L. T., Zeng, G., Shin, Y. M., Abraham, N. L., Archibald, A. T., Deushi, M., Emmons, L. K., Galbally, I. E., Hassler, B., Horowitz, L. W., Keeble, J., Liu, J., Moeini, O., Naik, V., O'Connor, F. M., Oshima, N., Tarasick, D., Tilmes, S., Turnock, S. T., Wild, O., Young, P. J., and Zanis, P.: Tropospheric ozone in CMIP6 simulations, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 21, 4187-4218, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-4187-2021, 2021.





Kato, S., Rose, F. G., Rutan, D. A., Thorsen, T. E., Loeb, N. G., Doelling, D. R., Huang, X., Smith, W. L., Su, W., and Ham, S.-H.: Surface irradiances of Edition 4.0 Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) Energy Balanced and Filled (EBAF) data product, Journal of Climate, 31, 4501-4527, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0523.1, 2018.

Labrador, L. J., von Kuhlmann, R., and Lawrence, M. G.: Strong sensitivity of the global mean OH concentration and the tropospheric oxidizing efficiency to the source of NO<sub>x</sub> from lightning, Geophysical Research Letters, 31, L06102, https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL019229, 2004.

Lamarque, J.-F., Bond, T. C., Eyring, V., Granier, C., Heil, A., Klimont, Z., Lee, D., Liousse, C., Mieville, A., Owen, B., Schultz, M. G., Shindell, D., Smith, S. J., Stehfest, E., Van Aardenne, J., Cooper, O. R., Kainuma, M., Mahowald, N., McConnell, J. R., Naik, V., Riahi, K., and van Vuuren, D. P.: Historical (1850–2000) gridded anthropogenic and biomass

10 burning emissions of reactive gases and aerosols: methodology and application, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 7017– 7039, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-7017-2010, 2010.

Lamarque, J.-F., Emmons, L. K., Hess, P. G., Kinnison, D. E., Tilmes, S., Vitt, F., Heald, C. L., Holland, E. A., Lauritzen, P. H., Neu, J., Orlando, J. J., Rasch, P. J., and Tyndall, G. K.: CAM-chem: description and evaluation of interactive at mospheric chemistry in the Community Earth System Model, Geosci. Model Dev., 5, 369–411, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-369-2012</u>, 2012.

15 2012.

Lamarque, J.-F., Shindell, D. T., Josse, B., Young, P. J., Cionni, I., Eyring, V., Bergmann, D., Cameron-Smith, P., Collins, W. J., Doherty, R., Dalsoren, S., Faluvegi, G., Folberth, G., Ghan, S. J., Horowitz, L. W., Lee, Y. H., MacKenzie, I. A., Nagashima, T., Naik, V., Plummer, D., Righi, M., Rumbold, S. T., Schulz, M., Skeie, R. B., Stevenson, D. S., Strode, S., Sudo, K., Szopa, S., Voulgarakis, A., and Zeng, G.: The Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Model Intercomparison Project (ACCMIP):

20 overview and description of models, simulations and climate diagnostics, Geosci. Model Dev., 6, 179–206, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-6-179-2013</u>, 2013.

Loades, D. C., Yang, M., Bell, T. G., Vaughan, A. R., Pound, R. J., Metzger, S., Lee, J. D., and Carpenter, L. J.: Ozone deposition to a coastal sea: comparison of eddy covariance observations with reactive air–sea exchange models, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 13, 6915–6931, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-13-6915-2020</u>, 2020.

25 Loeb, N. G., Doelling, D. R., Wang, H., Su, W., Nguyen, C., Corbett, J. G., Liang, L., Mitrescu, C., Rose, F. G., and Kato, S.: Clouds and the Earth's radiant energy system (CERES) energy balanced and filled (EBAF) top-of-atmosphere (TOA) edition-4.0 data product, Journal of Climate, 31, 895-918. <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0208.1</u>, 2018.

Luhar, A. K., Galbally, I. E., Woodhouse, M. T., and Thatcher, M.: An improved parameterisation of ozone dry deposition to the ocean and its impact in a global climate-chemistry model, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 17, 3749–3767, 30 <a href="https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-3749-2017">https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-3749-2017</a>, 2017.



30



Luhar, A. K., Woodhouse, M. T., and Galbally, I. E.: A revised global ozone dry deposition estimate based on a new two-layer parameterisation for air-sea exchange and the multi-year MACC composition reanalysis, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18, 4329–4348, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-4329-2018, 2018.

Luhar, A. K., Galbally, I. E., Woodhouse, M. T., and Abraham, N. L.: Assessing and improving cloud-height-based
parameterisations of global lightning flash rate, and their impact on lightning-produced NO<sub>x</sub> and tropospheric composition in a chemistry–climate model, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 21, 7053–7082, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-7053-2021, 2021.

Mann, G. W., Carslaw, K. S., Spracklen, D. V., Ridley, D. A., Manktelow, P. T., Chipperfield, M. P., Pickering, S. J., and Johnson, C. E.: Description and evaluation of GLOMAP-mode: a modal global aerosol microphysics model for the UKCA composition-climate model, Geosci. Model Dev., 3, 519–551, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-3-519-2010</u>, 2010.

10 Mao, J., Paulot, F., Jacob, D. J., Cohen, R. C., Crounse, J. D., Wennberg, P. O., Keller, C. A., Hudman, R. C., Barkley, M. P., and Horowitz, L. W.: Ozone and organic nitrates over the eastern United States: Sensitivity to iso prene chemistry, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 118, 11256–11268, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50817</u>, 2013.

Murray, L. T.: Lightning NO<sub>x</sub> and impacts on air quality, Current Pollution Reports, 2, 115–133, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40726-016-0031-7, 2016.

15 Neu, J. L., Prather, M. J., and Penner, J. E.: Global atmospheric chemistry: Integrating over fractional cloud cover, J. Geophys. Res., 112, D11306, <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JD008007</u>, 2007.

Naik, V., Szopa, S., Adhikary, B., Artaxo, P., Berntsen, T., Collins, W. D., Fuzzi, S., Gallardo, L., Kiendler Scharr, A., Klimont, Z., Liao, H., Unger, N., Zanis, P.: Short-Lived Climate Forcers. In: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

20 [Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press. In Press, 2021.

Pound, R. J., Sherwen, T., Helmig, D., Carpenter, L. J., and Evans, M. J.: Influences of oceanic ozone deposition on tropospheric photochemistry, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 20, 4227–4239, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-4227-2020</u>, 2020.

25 Price, C. and Rind, D.: A simple lightning parameterization for calculating global lightning distributions, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 97, 9919–9933, <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/92JD00719</u>, 1992.

Saunois, M., Stavert, A. R., Poulter, B., Bousquet, P., Canadell, J. G., Jackson, R. B., et al.: The global methane budget 2000–2017, Earth System Science Data, 12, 1561–1623, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-1561-2020</u>, 2020.

Schumann, U. and Huntrieser, H.: The global lightning-induced nitrogen oxides source, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 7, 3823–3907, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-3823-2007, 2007.



20



Sindelarova, K., Granier, C., Bouarar, I., Guenther, A., Tilmes, S., Stavrakou, T., Müller, J.-F., Kuhn, U., Stefani, P., and Knorr, W.: Global data set of biogenic VOC emissions calculated by the MEGAN model over the last 30 years, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 9317–9341, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-9317-2014, 2014.

Stephens, G. L., Li, J., Wild, M., Clayson, C. A., Loeb, N. G., Kato, S., L'Ecuyer, T., Stackhouse, P. W., Lebsock, M., and

5 Andrews, T.: An update on Earth's energy balance in light of the latest global observations, Nat. Geosci., 5, 691–696, https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1580, 2012.

Stevenson, D. S., Young, P. J., Naik, V., Lamarque, J.-F., Shindell, D. T., Voulgarakis, A., Skeie, R. B. et al.: Tropospheric ozone changes, radiative forcing and attribution to emissions in the Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Model Intercomparison Project (ACCMIP), Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13, 3063–3085, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-3063-2013</u>, 2013.

10 Telford, P. J., Abraham, N. L., Archibald, A. T., Braesicke, P., Dalvi, M., Morgenstern, O., O'Connor, F. M., Richards, N. A. D., and Pyle, J. A.: Implementation of the Fast-JX Photolysis scheme (v6.4) into the UKCA component of the MetUM chemistry-climate model (v7.3), Geosci. Model Dev., 6, 161–177, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-6-161-2013</u>, 2013.

Thornhill, G., Collins, W., Olivié, D., Skeie, R. B., Archibald, A., Bauer, S., Checa-Garcia, R., Fiedler, S., Folberth, G., Gjermundsen, A., Horowitz, L., Lamarque, J.-F., Michou, M., Mulcahy, J., Nabat, P., Naik, V., O'Connor, F. M., Paulot, F.,

15 Schulz, M., Scott, C. E., Séférian, R., Smith, C., Takemura, T., Tilmes, S., Tsigaridis, K., and Weber, J.: Climate-driven chemistry and aerosol feedbacks in CMIP6 Earth system models, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 21, 1105–1126, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-1105-2021, 2021.

van der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Giglio, L., van Leeuwen, T. T., Chen, Y., Rogers, B. M., Mu, M., van Marle, M. J. E., Morton, D. C., Collatz, G. J., Yokelson, R. J., and Kasibhatla, P. S.: Global fire emissions estimates during 1997–2016, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 9, 697–720, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-9-697-2017, 2017.

van Vuuren, D. P., Edmonds, J., Kainuma, M., Riahi, K., Thomson, A., Hibbard, K., Hurtt, G. C., Kram, T., Krey, V., Lamarque, J. F., Masui, T., Meinshausen, M., Nakicenovic, N., Smith, S. J., and Rose, S. K.: The representative concentration pathways: An overview, Climatic Change, 109, 5–31, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0148-z, 2011.

Walters, D. N., Williams, K. D., Boutle, I. A., Bushell, A. C., Edwards, J. M., Field, P. R., Lock, A. P., Morcrette, C. J.,

25 Stratton, R. A., Wilkinson, J. M., Willett, M. R., Bellouin, N., Bodas-Salcedo, A., et al.: The Met Office Unified Model Global Atmosphere 4.0 and JULES Global Land 4.0 configurations, Geosci. Model Dev., 7, 361–386, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-7-361-2014</u>, 2014.

Wang, K., and Dickinson, R. E.: Global atmospheric downward longwave radiation at the surface from ground-based observations, satellite retrievals, and reanalyses, Reviews of Geophysics, 51, 150-185, 10.1002/rog.20009, 2013.





Wesely, M.: Parameterization of surface resistances to gaseous dry deposition in regional-scale numerical-models, Atmos. Environ., 23, 1293–1304, <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2007.10.058</u>, 1989.

Woodhouse, M. T., Luhar, A. K., Stevens, L., Galbally, I., Thatcher, M., Uhe, P., Wolff, H., Noonan, J., and Molloy, S.: Australian reactive-gas emissions in a global chemistry-climate model and initial results, Air Quality and Climate Change, 49,

5 31-38, 2015.

Zhong, W. and Haigh, J. D.: An efficient and accurate correlated-k parameterization of infrared radiative transfer for troposphere–stratosphere–mesosphere GCMs, Atmos. Sci. Lett., 1, 125–135, <u>https://doi.org/10.1006/asle.2000.0022</u>, 2000.

Zhong, W., Osprey, S. M., Gray, L. J., and Haigh, J. D.: Influence of the prescribed solar spectrum on calculations of atmospheric temperature, Geophys. Res. Lett., 35, L22813, <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL035993</u>, 2008.