https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics
Discussions
Open Access

Multi-model ensemble projection of global dust cycle by the end of 21st century using CMIP6 data

Yuan Zhao[1], Xu Yue[1], Yang Cao[2], Jun Zhu[1], Chenguang Tian[1], Hao Zhou[2], Yuwen Chen[1], Yihan Hu[1], Weijie Fu[1] and Xu Zhao[1]

[1] Jiangsu Key Laboratory of Atmospheric Environment Monitoring and Pollution Control, Collaborative Innovation Center of Atmospheric Environment and Equipment Technology, School of Environmental Science and Engineering, Nanjing University of Information Science & Technology (NUIST), Nanjing, 210044, China

[2] Climate Change Research Center, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100029, China

Corresponding author: Xu Yue (Email: yuexu@nuist.edu.cn)

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

Abstract

As a natural aerosol with the largest emissions on land, dust has important impacts on atmospheric environment and climate systems. Both the emissions and transport of dust aerosols are tightly connected to meteorological conditions and as a result are confronted with strong modulations by the changing climate. Here, we project the changes of global dust emissions and loading by the end of the 21st century using an ensemble of model outputs from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project version 6 (CMIP6) under four Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs). Based on the validations against site-level observations, we select 5 out of 10 models and estimate an ensemble global dust emission of 3311 Tg a^{-1} (1Tg = 10^{12}g) at present day, in which 75% is dry deposited and 25% is wet deposited. Compared to 2005-2014, global dust emissions show varied responses with a reduction of 15.8 Tg a^{-1} under the SSP3-7.0 scenario but increased emissions up to 53.4 Tg a^{-1} under the SSP5-8.5 scenario at 2090-2099. For all scenarios, the most significant increase of dust emissions appears in North Africa (0.4%-4.7%) due to the combined effects of reduced relative humidity and precipitation but strengthened surface wind. In contrast, all scenarios show decreased emissions in central Asia and Taklimakan (-0.6% to -20%) and Middle East (0 to -2.8%) because of the increased precipitation but decreased wind speed regionally. The dust loading shows uniform increases over North Africa (1%-12.5%) and the downwind Atlantic following the increased emissions, but decreases over East Asia (-3.4% to -15.2%) and the downwind Pacific due to enhanced local precipitation that promotes wet deposition. As a result, global dust loading will increase by 2.1%-9.3% at the end of the 21st century under different climate scenarios, suggesting a likely strengthened radiative and climatic perturbations by dust aerosols in a warmer climate.

Keywords: CMIP6, dust emissions, concentrations, climate change, ensemble projection

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics
Discussions
Open Access

1 Introduction

Dust aerosol is one of the major air pollutants with strong climatic and environmental effects. Suspended dust aerosols can absorb and scatter solar radiation, and act as condensation nuclei so as to change the cloud optical properties (Tegen et al., 2004; Penner et al., 2006; Forster et al., 2008). Dust deposition can change the albedo of snow and ice and transport mineral elements to the ocean (Jickells et al., 2005; Mahowald et al., 2005; Wittmann et al., 2017). Furthermore, strong dust storms present as a serious threat to human society by reducing road visibility that influences traffic safety (Middleton, 2017), carrying bacteria and viruses that affects public health (Goudie, 2014), and reducing crop yields that endangers the food supply (Stefanski and Sivakumar, 2009). In light of the great impacts of dust on climate and environment, it is of significant importance to study the spatiotemporal characteristics and future changes of global dust aerosols.

The dust cycle consists of three major processes including emission, transport, and deposition (Schepanski, 2018), which are mainly related to meteorological conditions, such as precipitation, humidity, surface wind speed, and turbulent mixing (Liu et al., 2004; Shao et al., 2011; Csavina et al., 2014). Low humidity and/or strong surface wind are in favor of dust emissions (Csavina et al., 2014). Atmospheric humidity has a tight coupling effect with soil moisture, which controls the threshold of friction velocity and dust emission intensity (Munkhtsetseg et al., 2016). Strong winds and the associated pressure systems promote the momentum of surface layer and consequently increase dust mobilizations (Li et al., 2022). The transport of dust aerosols is related to atmospheric circulation and turbulent mixing, which determine the horizontal and vertical distribution of dust aerosol particles, respectively (Zhang et al., 2014; Fernandes et al., 2020). The deposition process includes dry and wet settlement, in which the dry deposition is an effective way to remove large particles while wet deposition dominates the removal of fine particles (Breuning-Madsen and Awadzi, 2005; Yue et al., 2009). Therefore, the spatiotemporal variations of dust aerosols are closely related to meteorological factors.

Climate change exerts significant impacts on the global dust cycle. A study using the RegCM3 model showed that dust emissions and the column burden would increase respectively by 2% and 14% in eastern Asia at 2091-2100 relative to 1991-2000 (Zhang et al., 2016). In contrast, the earlier study projected the reductions of dust emissions by 26% using the ECHAM4-OPYC model and 19% using the HADCM3 model in the same region by the midcentury (Tegen et al., 2004). Compared to these studies based on 1-2 models, the ensemble projections using multiple models from the Climate Model

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

Inter-comparison Project (CMIP) showed great potentials of indicating the uncertainties in the estimate of global dust cycle. Wu et al. (2020) evaluated 15 dust models in CMIP phase 5 (CMIP5) and found that the uncertainty was relatively small for the dust belt extending from North Africa to East Asia, but the uncertainties in other regions such as Australia and North America were large. Based on the multi-model ensemble from CMIP5 data, Pu and Ginoux (2018) estimated an increase of dust optical depth in central Arabian Peninsula and a decrease over northern China in the late half of the 21st century under a strong warming scenario. Zong et al. (2021) also projected that dust emissions would decrease in East Asia by the end of 21st century under the same climate scenario. However, the different features of future global dust cycles and the related drivers under varied climate scenarios remain unclear.

Compared to CMIP5 models, more dust emission schemes are coupled with dynamic vegetation in the CMIP phase 6 (CMIP6) models to optimize land surface emission processes (Zhao et al., 2022). However, such improvement may instead amplify the uncertainties of dust simulations, because the predicted vegetation change may be inconsistent with the observed tendencies (Wu et al., 2020). As a result, it is important to validate the simulated present-day dust cycle before the application of different models in the future projection (Aryal and Evans, 2021). In this study, we project the future changes in global dust cycles by the end of 21st century under four different climate scenarios based on the multi-model ensemble mean from CMIP6 models. We select a total of 10 climate models providing dust emissions, depositions, and concentrations for all the four scenarios and validate the simulated near-surface dust concentrations at 18 ground sites. The models with reasonable performance are selected to project future changes in dust emissions and loadings by the years 2090-2099 relative to the present day (2005-2014). The changes in associated meteorological conditions are further explored to identify the main causes of the changes in the global dust cycle.

2 Methods and data

2.1 Model data

We select all available CMIP6 models providing complete variables of dust cycle (emission, dry/wet deposition, and concentration) and the associated meteorology (surface wind, relative humidity, precipitation) for both present day and four future scenarios under the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) of SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5,

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

SSP3-7.0, and SSP5-8.5, which represent future climate with the low to high anthropogenic radiative forcings. A total of 10 models with different spatial resolutions are selected, including CESM2-WACCM, CNRM-ESM2-1, GFDL-ESM4, INM-CM4-8, INM-CM5-0, MIROC6, MIROC-ES2L, MRI-ESM2-0, NorESM2-LM, UKESM1-0-LL (Table 1). Different models may have varied numbers of ensemble runs for dust cycle variables (Table S1). To facilitate the comparison, we select r1i1p1f1 for all models but r1i1p1f2 for models without r1i1p1f1. To facilitate the model validation and inter-comparison, we interpolate all model data with different spatial resolution to the same of 1°×1°. We use the average data from 2005 to 2014 to indicate conditions at present day and that from 2090 to 2099 as the future period. We project the changes in dust cycle using the multi-model ensemble median (MMEM) values between future and present day, and explore the causes of changes by linking the simulated dust cycle with meteorological variables from individual models.

2.2 Measurement data

We use dust concentrations observed at 18 ground sites operated by University of Miami to validate dust concentrations at the lowest level of the 10 models. All these sites are located on the islands with 7 in the Atlantic, 7 in the Pacific, 3 in the Southern Ocean, and 1 in the Indian Ocean. Most of these sites were built near the dust source regions with the longest period of 17 years. Although the observed data are not continuous at all sites, they provide the most valuable spatiotemporal information of global dust concentrations and have been widely used in the evaluations of dust models (Ginoux et al., 2001; Yue et al., 2009; Wu et al., 2020). By comparing with these observations, we select 5 out of 10 climate models capturing the reasonable features and magnitude of dust distribution for the future projections.

2.3 Dust emission schemes

The vertical emission flux F_i for a specific dust size bin i in most of climate models can be derived using the generic equation:

$$F_i = \mathrm{C} \cdot \rho_d \cdot E \cdot f_m \cdot \alpha \cdot M_i \quad (1)$$

Here, C is a tunable parameter set to derive the reasonable dust climatology in individual models. ρ_d is the density of dust particle. E is the impetus composed of wind friction speed (U_f) above the threshold values (U_t) for saltation. The value of U_t

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

is dependent on soil moisture. f_m is the erodibility potential of bare soil suitable for dust mobilization, which is usually parameterized as the cover fraction of a grid cell excluding snow, ice, lake, and vegetation. α is sandblasting mass efficiency related to clay fraction (%clay). M_i is the mass distribution of the specific dust size bin i. The detailed parameterizations for each component of Equation (1) are shown for 5 selected models in Table 2. In general, the main factors influencing dust emissions include wind friction velocity, threshold wind speed, soil moisture, clay content, soil bareness, and dust particle size. These variables are used either as individual factors or in multiple components of Eq. 1. For example, in CESM2-WACCM, NorESM2-LM, and UKESM1-0-LL, the clay fraction is used to calculate both sandblasting mass efficiency and the threshold of wind friction speed (Lawrence et al., 2019). In CNRM-ESM2-1, f_m, soil moisture, and %clay are combined to calculate U_t rather than acting as individual components of F_i (Zakey et al., 2006).

3 Results

3.1 Model validations

Fig. 1a shows the spatial distribution of ground-based sites for dust observations. These sites cover a wide range of oceanic areas with different distances to source regions. Compared to observed concentrations, the simulations yield correlation coefficients (R) of 0.11-0.89 for 10 climate models, among which 7 models show R of higher than 0.8. The normalized standard deviations (NSD, standard deviation of the model divided by that of the observations) range from 0.1 to 2.5, indicating large differences in the simulated magnitude of dust concentrations among climate models. With the validations, we select 5 models for the further analyses including CESM2-WACCM, CNRM-ESM2-1, GFDL-ESM4, NorESM2-LM and UKESM1-0-LL, which yield NSD between 0.25 and 1.5 and correlation coefficients higher than 0.8 against observations.

The ensemble median of dust concentrations from 5 selected CMIP6 models is compared to observations at 18 stations (Fig. 2). The models reproduce observed magnitude at 6 sites (Figs 2a-2f) downwind of Saharan dust sources with relative mean biases ranging from -40% to 22%. For these sites, the model ensemble also captures reasonable dust seasonality except for the underestimation of peak values in summer for Barbados (Fig. 2a) and those in spring for Cayenne (Fig. 2b). For the rest sites, the multi-model ensemble prediction overestimates dust concentrations at 1 site in the North Atlantic (Fig. 2g), 3 sites in the southern ocean (Figs 2h-2j), and 3 sites in the

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

central Pacific (Fig. 2k-2m), most of which are far away from dust source regions. In contrast, model simulations underestimate dust concentrations at 1 site in the Indian Ocean (Fig. 2n) and 2 sites at the offshore of East Asia (Figs 2o-2p), likely because climate models underestimate source strength in Middle East and Central Asia. In sum, the simulated dust concentrations show smaller spatial gradients than observations.

3.2 Dust cycle at present day

Based on the selected models, the ensemble median dust emissions, concentrations, and depositions are assessed for 2005-2014 (Fig. 3). About 87% of dust emissions are located in the Northern Hemisphere, with hotspots over North Africa, Middle East, and central Asia and Taklimakan (Fig. 3a). The source intensity is much smaller in the Southern Hemisphere, with moderate emissions over Australia, South Africa, and southern South America. The global total dust emission from the ensemble of models is about 3311 Tg, to which the emissions from Africa alone contribute by 63% (Table 3).

The spatial distribution of dust deposition resemble that of emissions but with much larger coverage. Dry deposition is usually confined to the source regions (Fig. 3c) because dust particles with large size are more likely to settle down and cannot travel far away from the source. In contrast, wet deposition is more dispersed (Fig. 3d) because small particles can be transported long distances to the downwind areas and finally washed out by rain. On the global scale, the annual total dry deposition is 2463 Tg, more than three times of the 815 Tg by wet deposition.

The dust budget (emission minus deposition) shows net sources of 376 Tg a^{-1} in Africa and 71 Tg a^{-1} in Asia (Table 3). Meanwhile, the ocean acts as a net sink with the largest strength of -262 Tg a^{-1} in the Atlantic and the secondary of -138 Tg a^{-1} in the Indian Ocean due to their vicinity to the source regions on the land. Following the emission pattern, dust loading shows high values (>120 mg m^{-2}) around the source regions especially North Africa and decreases gradually towards global oceans (Fig. 3b).

3.3 Projection of future dust emissions

We calculate the changes of dust emissions at the end of the 21st century (2090-2099) relative to the present day (2005-2014). Global total emissions increase under three scenarios, with the largest change of 53.4 Tg a^{-1} (1.61%) in the SSP5-8.5 scenario (Fig. 4d). However, the total emissions show a moderate reduction of -15.8 Tg a^{-1} (-

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

0.48%) in the SSP3-7.0 scenario (Fig. 4c). The most significant changes are located at the major dust source regions, such as North Africa and Middle East. Dust emissions in North Africa increase in all four scenarios, though with regional heterogeneous responses and varied magnitude of 4.2-49.4 Tg a^{-1} (0.4%-4.7%). The secondary enhancement is found at Australia with increases of 1.0-9.1 Tg a^{-1} (2.2%-20.7%) under the four scenarios. In contrast, dust emissions in central Asia and Taklimakan show decreases of -0.6 to -18.8 Tg a^{-1} (-0.6% to -20.0%), which are stronger than the enhancement in North Africa under the SSP3-7.0 scenario (Table 4). Furthermore, dust emissions over Middle East decrease in most scenarios especially for SSP3-7.0, in which the regional reduction dominates the global decline of dust emissions (Fig. 4c).

We further explore the associated changes in meteorological conditions at the source regions (Fig. 5). For North America, regional precipitation shows limited changes under all four scenarios because the baseline rainfall is very low (Fig. S1). The ensemble projections show decreased relative humidity of -4.5% to -15.4% and increased surface wind speed of 0.2%-1.8% over North Africa for all scenarios, contributing to the largest enhancement of regional dust emissions. Similarly, projections show decreased precipitation and relative humidity but increased surface wind over South Africa, resulting in the increase of local emissions. As a comparison, precipitation, relative humidity, and surface wind all show decreasing trends in Australia, where the dust emissions increase for all scenarios. It indicates that the effect of drier conditions overweighs the decreased momentum for dust emissions in this specific region. Among the total of 18 regions with increased dust emissions under the four scenarios, 17 show decreased relative humidity by at least 0.5%, 14 show decreased precipitation, and 11 show increase wind speed (Fig. 5).

In contrast, the future dust emissions decrease in central Asia, Taklimakan and Middle East under most scenarios (Fig. 4). Climate projections show increased precipitation (Fig. S1) and relative humidity (Fig. S2), but decreased wind speed (Fig.S3) over the source regions in central Asia and Taklimakan. All these changes in meteorological conditions tend to inhibit regional dust mobilization. The most significant reduction of 20.0% occurs in SSP5-8.5 scenario, in which regional precipitation increases by 0.21 mm day^{-1}, and surface wind speed decreases by 0.1 m s^{-1}. For Middle East, relative humidity decreases (Fig. S2) due to limited changes in precipitation (Fig. S1) under the global warming scenarios. However, such tendency is overweighed by the decreased wind speed (Fig. S3), leading to a decline of regional dust emissions in Middle East for most scenarios. Specifically, almost all the 10 regions

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.
Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

with reduced dust emissions under the four scenarios show increased regional precipitation but decreased wind speed, though 4 regions (all in Middle East for the four scenarios) show decreased relative humidity (Fig. 5).

We select four regions with significant emission changes to quantify the sensitivity of dust emissions to meteorological perturbations (Fig. 6). In these regions, we find positive correlations between the changes in dust emissions and that of wind speed for all models and scenarios. The largest correlation coefficient of 0.8 is derived over North Africa (Fig. 6a). In contrast, both precipitation and relative humidity are negatively correlated with dust emissions across models and scenarios, though such correlations are moderate for relative humidity in central Asia and Taklimakan (Fig. 6f). On average, we derive the increases of dust emissions by 40.5-114.6 Tg per 0.1 m s^{-1} increase in surface wind (Figs 6a-6d), 8.2-138.7 Tg per 1% reduction in relative humidity (Figs 6e-6h), and 25.6-416.2 Tg per 0.1 mm day^{-1} reduction in precipitation (Figs 6i-6l) over the main dust source regions based on the multi-model ensemble projections. Following these sensitivities, the inter-model spread of meteorological changes leads to the large uncertainties in the projection of future dust emissions. Among the five climate models, UKESM1-0-LL shows the largest reductions of wind speed while the highest enhancement of precipitation in most of source regions, resulting in the largest decline of dust emission for this model under all the four scenarios (Fig. 6). In contrast, CNRM-ESM2-1 exhibits the largest increase of wind speed and the consequent dust emissions in North Africa. Meanwhile, CESM2-WACCM yields the highest enhancement of dust emissions in Australia where this model projects the largest reduction of precipitation.

3.4 Projection of future dust loading

The dust column concentrations show more continuous changes than dust emissions (Fig. 7). By the end of the 21st century, dust loading increases along the "North Africa-Atlantic-North America" and "Australia-South Africa-South America" belts, but decreases along the "central Asia-East Asia-North Pacific" belt. Such pattern is in general consistent among all four future scenarios with the strongest magnitude under the SSP5-8.5 scenario. The loading in Middle East shows mixed responses with increasing trend in the SSP5-8.5 scenario but decreasing trends in other scenarios. On the global scale, dust loading increases by 0.37-1.65 Tg (2.1%-9.3%) with enhancement of column concentrations in most regions except for Asia and its downwind regions (Fig. 7 and Table S2).

We select four dust source regions and two non-source areas in Asia to analyze the driving factors for the changes in dust loading (Fig. 8). Analyses show positive

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

correlation coefficients ranging from 0.79 to 0.92 between dust loading and emissions. In contrast, negative correlations from -0.33 to -0.79 are yielded between the loading and precipitation. The higher magnitude of correlations in the former relationship suggests that the changes of emission dominate the variations of dust loading. However, the role of precipitation cannot be ignored as it can magnify the impact of emissions. For example, dust emissions in the source region of South Africa increase by 2.1%-17.1% under different scenarios (Table 4), while dust loading in this region increases by 2.3%-53.5% (Table S1). The higher enhancement of dust loading than emissions is mainly attributed to the decreased precipitation (Fig. S1), which reduces the proportion of wet deposition to the total deposition (Fig. S4).

For the non-source areas such as East Asia and South Asia, the moderate changes of dust emissions cannot explain the significant reductions in dust loading. Instead, the strong enhancement of regional precipitation (Fig. S1) helps promote wet deposition of dust in Asia, leading to the reduced amount of suspended particles (Fig. 7) and the increased percentage of wet-to-total deposition (Fig. S4). Studies have projected that global warming tends to enhance East Asian summer monsoon and South Asian summer monsoon, leading to increased precipitation in the middle and low latitudes of Asia (Sabade et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2022). These changes are not favorable for regional dust mobilization but tend to decrease dust loading through increased wet deposition.

4 Conclusions and discussion

Based on the multi-model ensemble approach, our study projected the changes of dust emissions and loadings by the end of 21st century relative to present day. It is found that dust emissions likely increase in Africa and Australia but decrease in Asia. Such a pattern is consistent among different climate scenarios though the magnitude of regional changes show some variations. As a result, the net changes of global dust emissions vary among future scenarios with the moderate changes in SSP3-7.0 due to the strongest emission reduction over Asia, but the large increase of 4.7% in SSP5-8.5 because of the prominent dust emission enhancement in Africa. The changes of dust loading in general follow that of emissions but with associated impacts of precipitation, which magnify the changes of dust loading through less wet deposition over regions with increased emissions (e.g. South Africa) but more deposition over regions with increased precipitation (e.g., East Asia).

Our projection revealed large uncertainties in the future global dust cycle. These

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.
Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics
Discussions

uncertainties are firstly originated from the discrepancies in the dust emission schemes and the size bins/ranges employed by different climate models. To limit the negative impacts of model diversity, we validated the simulated low-level dust concentrations and selected the models with reasonable performance. The ensemble mean of these selected models could better capture the observed magnitude and distribution of dust concentrations (Fig. 2). However, such validations excluded half of the available models, potentially increasing the uncertainties of multi-model ensemble due to the small sample size. Based on the recent evaluations (Wu et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022), the latest version of CMIP models did not improve the performance in the simulated dust cycles, including concentrations, deposition, and optical depth, suggesting that the more validations may rule out even more available models for the future projection. As a result, the observation-based constraint of emission schemes (e.g, adjusting the tunable parameter C in Equation 1) and size bins (e.g., extending or reducing the size range) in individual models is a requisite step to reduce the uncertainties in modeling the global dust cycle.

Even though the inter-model variability can not be excluded, we applied the multi-model ensemble approach to minimize the projection biases from individual models. We used the median instead of mean values from the selected models so that our projections reflected the tendency of the majority models rather than that of the single model with maximum changes. At present day, the ensemble projection reasonably captures the observed dust concentrations for most sites. The largest emission from Africa accounts for 63% of the global emissions, similar to the estimates by previous studies (Wu et al., 2020; Aryal and Evans, 2021; Zhao et al., 2022). The global mean burden of 19 Tg is different by -6 Tg to 7 Tg compared to the three datasets used by Zhao et al. (2022). In the future, our ensemble projected increases of dust emissions in North Africa and Australia while the reductions in central Asia are consistent with the results predicted using two different models (Tegen et al., 2004).

Our sensitivity analyses showed consistent dependence of dust emissions and loadings to meteorological variables among models and scenarios (Figs 6 and 8). With such physical constraints, the trends of dust emissions are determined by the changes of regional to global meteorological fields, especially wind speed and precipitation. For example, models show contrasting tendencies of surface wind over North Africa (Fig. 6a) and precipitation in Australia (Fig. 6l), leading to large inter-model variability with opposite signs for the changes in dust emissions by the end of 21st century. Given the importance of climatic change, we checked the ensemble changes in precipitation (Fig.

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

S5) and surface wind speed (Fig. S6) with all available CMIP6 models (32 models as listed in Table S3) and found that the main features of increased drought and wind speed over North Africa and South Africa while enhanced rainfall over Asia was retained, indicating that the main patterns of the changes in both dust emissions and loadings in our projections are solid. As a result, we suggest that dust emissions over the main source regions will likely enhance in a warming climate, contributing to the increased dust aerosol particles and radiative perturbations by the end of the 21st century.

Data availability. The model output data from CMIP6 were downloaded from https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/search/cmip6/.

Author contributions. XY conceived the study. XY and YZ designed the research, conducted the data analysis and paper writing. YaC, JZ, CT and HZ provided paper writing advices and helped with data analysis procedures. YuC, YH, WF and XZ provided scientific advices. All co-authors contributed to improve the manuscript.

Competing interests. The contact author has declared that none of the authors has any competing interests.

Acknowledgements. This research was jointly supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province (grant no. BK20220031) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 42275128).

© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

References

Aryal, Y. N. and Evans, S.: Global Dust Variability Explained by Drought Sensitivity in CMIP6 Models, J. Geophys. Res.: Earth Surf., 126, e2021JF006073, doi: 10.1029/2021JF006073, 2021.

Breuning-Madsen, H. and Awadzi, T. W.: Harmattan dust deposition and particle size in Ghana, Catena, 63, 23-38, doi: 10.1016/j.catena.2005.04.001, 2005.

Csavina, J., Field, J., Félix, O., Corral-Avitia, A. Y., Sáez, A. E., and Betterton, E. A.: Effect of wind speed and relative humidity on atmospheric dust concentrations in semi-arid climates, Sci. Total Environ., 487, 82-90, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.03.138, 2014.

Dunne, J. P., Horowitz, L. W., Adcroft, A. J., Ginoux, P., Held, I. M., John, J. G., Krasting, J. P., Malyshev, S., Naik, V., Paulot, F., Shevliakova, E., Stock, C. A., Zadeh, N., Balaji, V., Blanton, C., Dunne, K. A., Dupuis, C., Durachta, J., Dussin, R., Gauthier, P. P. G., Griffies, S. M., Guo, H., Hallberg, R. W., Harrison, M., He, J., Hurlin, W., McHugh, C., Menzel, R., Milly, P. C. D., Nikonov, S., Paynter, D. J., Ploshay, J., Radhakrishnan, A., Rand, K., Reichl, B. G., Robinson, T., Schwarzkopf, D. M., Sentman, L. T., Underwood, S., Vahlenkamp, H., Winton, M., Wittenberg, A. T., Wyman, B., Zeng, Y., and Zhao, M.: The GFDL Earth System Model Version 4.1 (GFDL ‐ ESM 4.1): Overall Coupled Model Description and Simulation Characteristics, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 12, e2019MS002015, doi: 10.1029/2019MS002015, 2020.

Evans, S., Ginoux, P., Malyshev, S., and Shevliakova, E.: Climate ‐ vegetation interaction and amplification of Australian dust variability, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43, 11823–11830, doi: 10.1002/2016GL071016, 2016.

Fernandes, R., Dupont, S., and Lamaud, E.: Origins of Turbulent Transport Dissimilarity Between Dust and Momentum in Semiarid Regions, J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos., 125, e2019JD031247, doi: 10.1029/2019jd031247, 2020.

Forster, P., Ramaswamy, V., Artaxo, P., Berntsen, T., Betts, R., Fahey, D. W., Haywood, J., Lean, J., Lowe, D. C., Raga, G., Schulz, M., Dorland, R. V., Bodeker, G., Etheridge, D., Foukal, P., Fraser, P., Geller, M., Joos, F., Keeling, C. D., Keeling, R., Kinne, S., Lassey, K., Oram, D., O'Shaughnessy, K., Ramankutty, N., Reid, G., Rind, D., Rosenlof, K., Sausen, R., Schwarzkopf, D., Solanki, S. K., Stenchikov, G., Stuber, N., Takemura, T., Textor, C., Wang, R., Weiss, R., Whorf, T., Nakajima, T., Ramanathan, V., Ramaswamy, V., Artaxo, P., Berntsen, T., Betts, R., Fahey, D. W., Haywood, J., Lean, J., Lowe, D. C., Myhre, G., Nganga, J., Prinn, R., Raga, G., Schulz, M., and Dorland, R. V.: Changes in Atmospheric Constituents and in Radiative Forcing, Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK2008.

Ginoux, P., Chin, M., Tegen, I., Prospero, J. M., Holben, B., Dubovik, O., and Lin, S.-J.: Sources and distributions of dust aerosols simulated with the GOCART model, J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos., 106, 20255-20273, doi: 10.1029/2000JD000053, 2001.

Goudie, A. S.: Desert dust and human health disorders, Environ. Int., 63, 101-113, doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2013.10.011, 2014.

Jickells, T. D., An, Z. S., Andersen, K. K., Baker, A. R., Bergametti, G., Brooks, N.,

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Cao, J. J., Boyd, P. W., Duce, R. A., Hunter, K. A., Kawahata, H., Kubilay, N., laRoche, J., Liss, P. S., Mahowald, N., Prospero, J. M., Ridgwell, A. J., Tegen, I., and Torres, R.: Global Iron Connections Between Desert Dust, Ocean Biogeochemistry, and Climate, Science, 308, 67-71, doi: 10.1126/science.1105959, 2005.

Lawrence, D. M., Fisher, R. A., Koven, C. D., Oleson, K. W., Swenson, S. C., Bonan, G., Collier, N., Ghimire, B., Kampenhout, L. v., Kennedy, D., Kluzek, E., Lawrence, P. J., Li, F., Li, H., Lombardozzi, D., Riley, W. J., Sacks, W. J., Shi, M., Vertenstein, M., Wieder, W. R., Xu, C., Ali, A. A., Badger, A. M., Bisht, G., Broeke, M. v. d., Brunke, M. A., Burns, S. P., Buzan, J., Clark, M., Craig, A., Dahlin, K., Drewniak, B., Fisher, J. B., Flanner, M. G., Fox, A. M., Gentine, P., Hoffman, F., Keppel-Aleks, G., Knox, R., Kumar, S., Lenaerts, J., Leung, L. R., Lipscomb, W. H., Lu, Y., Pandey, A., Pelletier, J. D., Perket, J., Randerson, J. T., Ricciuto, D. M., Sanderson, B. M., Slater, A., Subin, Z. M., Tang, J., Thomas, R. Q., Martin, M. V., and Zeng, X.: The Community Land Model version 5: Description of new features, benchmarking, and impact of forcing uncertainty, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 11, 4245-4287, doi: 10.1029/2018MS001583, 2019.

Li, J., Hao, X., Liao, H., Yue, X., Li, H., Long, X., and Li, N.: Predominant Type of Dust Storms That Influences Air Quality Over Northern China and Future Projections, Earth's Future, 10, e2022EF002649, doi: 10.1029/2022ef002649, 2022.

Liu, X., Yin, Z., Zhang, X., and Yang, X.: Analyses of the spring dust storm frequency of northern China in relation to antecedent and concurrent wind, precipitation, vegetation, and soil moisture conditions, J. Geophys. Res., 109, D16210, doi: 10.1029/2004JD004615, 2004.

Mahowald, N. M., Baker, A. R., Bergametti, G., Brooks, N., Duce, R. A., Jickells, T. D., Kubilay, N., Prospero, J. M., and Tegen, I.: Atmospheric global dust cycle and iron inputs to the ocean, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 19, GB4025, doi: 10.1029/2004GB002402, 2005.

Marticorena, B., Bergametti, G., Aumont, B., Callot, Y., N'Doum, C., and Legrand, M.: Modeling the atmospheric dust cycle 2. Simulation of Saharan dust sources, J. Geophys. Res., 102, 4387-4404, doi: 10.1029/96JD02964, 1997.

Middleton, N. J.: Desert dust hazards: A global review, Aeolian Res., 24, 53-63, doi: 10.1016/j.aeolia.2016.12.001, 2017.

Munkhtsetseg, E., Shinoda, M., Gillies, J. A., Kimura, R., King, J., and Nikolich, G.: Relationships between soil moisture and dust emissions in a bare sandy soil of Mongolia, Particuology, 28, 131-137, doi: 10.1016/j.partic.2016.03.001, 2016.

Nabat, P., Somot, S., Mallet, M., Michou, M., Sevault, F., Driouech, F., Meloni, D., Sarra, A. d., Biagio, C. D., Formenti, P., Sicard, M., Léon, J. F., and Bouin, M. N.: Dust aerosol radiative effects during summer 2012 simulated with a coupled regional aerosol–atmosphere–ocean model over the Mediterranean, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15, 3303–3326, doi: 10.5194/acp-15-3303-2015, 2015.

Oleson, K. W., Lawrence, D. M., Flanner, M. G., Kluzek, E., Levis, S., Swenson, S. C., Thornton, E., Dai, A., Decker, M., Dickinson, R., Feddema, J., Heald, C. L.,

© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

Lamarque, J. F., Niu, G., Qian, T., Running, S., Sakaguchi, K., Slater, A., Stöckli, R., Wang, A., Yang, L., Zeng, X., and Zeng, X.: Technical Description of version 4.0 of the Community Land Model (CLM)(No. NCAR/TN-478+STR), University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, 266, 10.5065/D6FB50WZ, 2010.

Penner, J. E., Quaas, J., Storelvmo, T., Takemura, T., Boucher, O., Guo, H., Kirkeva, A., and Seland, Ø.: Model intercomparison of indirect aerosol effects, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 3391–3405, doi: 10.5194/acp-6-3391-2006, 2006.

Pu, B. and Ginoux, P.: How reliable are CMIP5 models in simulating dust optical depth?, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18, 12491-12510, doi: 10.5194/acp-18-12491-2018, 2018.

Sabade, S. S., Kulkarni, A., and Kripalani, R. H.: Projected changes in South Asian summer monsoon by multi-model global warming experiments, Theor. Appl. Climatol., 103, 543-565, doi: 10.1007/s00704-010-0296-5, 2011.

Schepanski, K.: Transport of Mineral Dust and Its Impact on Climate, Geosciences, 8, 151, doi: 10.3390/geosciences8050151, 2018.

Shao, Y., Wyrwoll, K. H., Chappell, A., Huang, J., Lin, Z., McTainsh, G. H., Mikami, M., Tanaka, T. Y., Wang, X., and Yoon, S.: Dust cycle: An emerging core theme in Earth system science, Aeolian Res., 2, 181-204, doi: 10.1016/j.aeolia.2011.02.001, 2011.

Stefanski, R. and Sivakumar, M. V. K.: Impacts of sand and dust storms on agriculture and potential agricultural applications of a SDSWS, IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci, 7, 012016, doi: 10.1088/1755-1307/7/1/012016, 2009.

Tegen, I., Werner, M., Harrison, S. P., and Kohfeld, K. E.: Relative importance of climate and land use in determining present and future global soil dust emission, Geophys. Res. Lett., 31, L05105, doi: 10.1029/2003GL019216, 2004.

Wang, T., Miao, J., Sun, J., and Fu, Y.: Intensified East Asian summer monsoon and associated precipitation mode shift under the 1.5 °C global warming target, Adv. Clim. Change Res., 9, 102-111, doi: 10.1016/j.accre.2017.12.002, 2018.

Wittmann, M., Groot Zwaaftink, C. D., Steffensen Schmidt, L., Guðmundsson, S., Pálsson, F., Arnalds, O., Björnsson, H., Thorsteinsson, T., and Stohl, A.: Impact of dust deposition on the albedo of Vatnajökull ice cap, Iceland, The Cryosphere, 11, 741-754, doi: 10.5194/tc-11-741-2017, 2017.

Woodward, S.: Mineral Dust in HadGEM2, Hadley Centre Technical Note, 087, Met Office Hadley Centre, Fitzroy Road, Exeter, EX1 3PB, United Kingdom. https://library.metoffice.gov.uk/Portal/Default/en-GB/RecordView/Index/2522462011.

Wu, C., Lin, Z., He, J., Zhang, M., Liu, X., Zhang, R., and Brown, H.: A process-oriented evaluation of dust emission parameterizations in CESM: Simulation of a typical severe dust storm in East Asia, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 8, 1432-1452, doi: 10.1002/2016MS000723, 2016.

Wu, C., Lin, Z., and Liu, X.: The global dust cycle and uncertainty in CMIP5 (Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 5) models, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 20, 10401-10425, doi: 10.5194/acp-20-10401-2020, 2020.

Wu, Q., Li, Q., Ding, Y., Shen, X., Zhao, M., and Zhu, Y.: Asian summer monsoon responses to the change of land–sea thermodynamic contrast in a warming climate: CMIP6 projections, Adv. Clim. Change Res., 13, 205-217, doi: 10.1016/j.accre.2022.01.001, 2022.

Yue, X., Wang, H., Wang, Z., and Fan, K.: Simulation of dust aerosol radiative feedback using the Global Transport Model of Dust: 1. Dust cycle and validation, J. Geophys. Res., 114, D10202, doi: 10.1029/2008JD010995, 2009.

Zakey, A. S., Solmon, F., and Giorgi, F.: Implementation and testing of a desert dust module in a regional climate model, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 4687–4704, doi: 10.5194/acp-6-4687-2006, 2006.

Zhang, D., Gao, X., Zakey, A., and Giorgi, F.: Effects of climate changes on dust aerosol over East Asia from RegCM3, Adv. Clim. Change Res., 7, 145-153, doi: 10.1016/j.accre.2016.07.001, 2016.

Zhang, J., Shao, Y., and Huang, N.: Measurements of dust deposition velocity in a wind-tunnel experiment, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 8869-8882, doi: 10.5194/acp-14-8869-2014, 2014.

Zhao, A., Ryder, C. L., and Wilcox, L. J.: How well do the CMIP6 models simulate dust aerosols?, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 22, 2095-2119, doi: 10.5194/acp-22-2095-2022, 2022.

Zong, Q., Mao, R., Gong, D., Wu, C., Pu, B., Feng, X., and Sun, Y.: Changes in Dust Activity in Spring over East Asia under a Global Warming Scenario, Asia-Pac. J. Atmos. Sci., 57, 839-850, doi: 10.1007/s13143-021-00224-7, 2021.

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.



Figure 1. (a) Locations of 18 observation stations in the University of Miami Ocean Aerosol Network and the (b) evaluation of simulated dust concentrations from CMIP6 models at these stations.

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.



Figure 2. Comparison of monthly dust concentrations (units: μg m^{-3}) between ensemble simulations by CMIP6 models and observations at 18 sites. The solid lines represent ensemble mean of simulations with shadows indicating inter-model spread. The points are the monthly mean of observations with errorbars indicating year-to-year variability. The time span of observations at each site is shown in the upper right corner of each panel.

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions



Figure 3. Multi-model ensemble of (a) emissions, (b) column concentration, (c) dry deposition, and (d) wet deposition of dust aerosols at present day (2005-2014). The box regions on (a) are dust sources of North Africa (NAF), Middle East (MEA), central Asia and Taklimakan (CAT), Australia (AUS), North America (NAM), South America (SAM), and South Africa (SAF). The detailed results for individual models are shown in Fig. S7.

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions



Figure 4. Multi-model ensemble projection of the changes in dust emissions by the end of 21st century (2090-2099) relative to present day (2005-2014) under four different anthropogenic emission scenarios. The detailed projections at 2090-2099 for individual models are shown in Fig. S8-S11 under four different scenarios.

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.



Figure 5. Changes of meteorological factors over main dust emission regions under four SSP scenarios by the end of 21st century (2090-2099) relative to present day (2005-2014). Each box column represents a future climate scenario, including SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5, SSP3-7.0 and SSP5-8.5. Each row represents a meteorological factor, including precipitation (top), relative humidity (middle), and surface wind (bottom). Regions with emissions increasing are marked with red bars, while regions with emissions decreasing are marked with blue bars.

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.
Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics
Discussions



Figure 6. Relationships between the changes of dust emissions and the changes of meteorological factors. Each column represents a source region, including North Africa (NAF), central Asia and Taklimakan (CAT), Middle East (MEA), and Australia (AUS). Each row represents a meteorological factor, including surface wind (top), relative humidity (middle), and precipitation (bottom).

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.



Figure 7. Multi-model ensemble projection of the changes in dust column concentrations by the end of 21st century (2090-2099) relative to present day (2005-2014). Dotted areas represent changes significant at 90% level. Two additional box areas are selected for South Asia and East Asia.

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.
Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics
Discussions



Figure 8. Relationships between the changes of dust column concentrations and the change of influencing factors. From left to right, each column represents a specific region including North Africa (NAF), central Asia and Taklimakan (CAT), Middle East (MEA), Australia (AUS), South Asia (SAS) and East Asia (EAS). Each row represents an influencing factor, including dust emissions (top) and precipitation (bottom).

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

607 **Table 1.** The information of CMIP6 models

Model [a]	Nation	Resolution
CESM2-WACCM	U.S.	1.25°×0.94°
CNRM-ESM2-1	France	1.4°×1.4°
GFDL-ESM4	U.S.	1.25°×1°
INM-CM4-8	Russia	2°×1.5°
INM-CM5-0	Russia	2°×1.5°
MIROC-ES2L	Japan	2.8°×2.8°
MIROC6	Japan	1.4°×1.4°
MRI-ESM2-0	Japan	1°×1°
NorESM2-LM	Norway	2°×2°
UKESM1-0-LL	U.K.	1.875°×1.25°

[a] The models selected for future projections are bolded.

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Table 2. The parameterization schemes of dust emission function

Model	E	M_i	f_m	%clay	Reference
CESM2-WACCM	$U_f^{\,3}(1-\frac{U_t}{U_f})(1+\frac{U_t}{U_f})^2$	3 source modes, 4 dust bins	Fraction of grid cell excluding snow, lake and vegetation; depends on liquid water and ice contents in top soil layer	Used to calculate the sandblasting mass efficiency and U_t	Oleson et al. (2010) Wu et al. (2016)
NorESM2-LM					
UKESM1-0-LL	$U_f^{\,3}(1+\frac{U_t}{U_f})(1-(\frac{U_t}{U_f})^2)$	9 dust bins	Considering grid cell fractions of vegetation		Woodward, (2011)
CNRM-ESM2-1		3 dust bins	Using roughness length	Used to calculate the U_t	Marticorena et al. (1997) Zakey et al. (2006) Nabat et al. (2015)
GFDL-ESM4	$U_f^{\,2}(U_f-U_t)$	5 dust bins	Using leaf area index and stem area index	/	Evans et al. (2016) Dunne et al. (2020)

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.
Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Table 3. The summary of dust cycle at present day

Region	Emission Tg a^{-1}	Dry Deposition Tg a^{-1}	Wet Deposition Tg a^{-1}	Budget* Tg a^{-1}
Africa	2171	1541	254	376
Asia	893	591	231	71
Australia	255	182	27	45
South America	80	47	22	11
North America	26	20	9	-2
Europe	6	14	32	-40
the Pacific Ocean	/	14	43	-57
the Indian Ocean	/	61	77	-138
the Atlantic Ocean	/	115	147	-262
the Arctic Ocean	/	0.3	2.1	-2.4

*Budget = Emission - Dry Deposition - Wet Deposition

https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-760
Preprint. Discussion started: 6 February 2023
© Author(s) 2023. CC BY 4.0 License.
Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Table 4. Multi-model ensemble projection of the absolute (Tg a^{-1}) and relative changes (%) in dust emissions by the end of this century (2090-2099)

Region	SSP1-2.6		SSP2-4.5		SSP3-7.0		SSP5-8.5	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
NAF	19.1	1.8	10.3	1.0	4.2	0.4	49.4	4.7
CAT	-0.6	-0.6	-5.1	-5.4	-17.7	-18.8	-18.8	-20.0
MEA	-0.6	-0.2	-6.2	-2.5	-6.9	-2.8	-0.1	0.0
AUS	3.8	8.7	9.1	20.7	1.0	2.2	8.7	19.9
NAM	0.1	3.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	-1.4	0.0	-1.2
SAM	1.1	14.9	0.7	10.4	0.3	4.6	0.0	0.6
SAF	0.6	2.1	0.8	3.0	4.5	17.1	3.9	14.6

* The scope of each region is shown in Figure 1a