Role of atmospheric aerosols in severe winter fog over Indo Gangetic Plains of India: a case study
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Abstract

Winter fog and severe aerosol loading in the boundary layer over north India, especially in the Indo-Gangetic Plain (IGP), cause disruption in the daily lives of millions of people in the region. To understand better the role of atmospheric aerosols on the occurrence, spatial extent, and persistence of winter fog in the IGP, several model simulations have been performed using the Weather Research and Forecasting model coupled with chemistry (WRF-Chem). Results from WRF-Chem represented relative humidity (RH) and fog formation in agreement with observations when using the ERA-Interim reanalysis data as meteorological initial/boundary conditions and soil nudging were applied. WRF-Chem successfully simulates the spatial distribution and magnitude of PM$_{2.5}$ when evaluated with observations from the Central Pollution Control Board of India (CPCB) monitoring network. However, the aerosol composition predicted by WRF-Chem was quite different from measurements obtained during the Winter Fog Experiment (WiFEX) in Delhi, with chloride aerosol fraction being strongly underpredicted (~66.6%). By investigating a fog event on December 23-24, 2017 over central IGP, we found that the aerosol-radiation feedback weakens turbulence, lowers the boundary layer height, and increases PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations and RH within the boundary layer. The increase in RH is found to be important for fog formation and it promoted the growth of aerosol size and increased aerosol activation in the polluted environment over IGP. Loss of aerosols through deposition of cloud droplets is found to be a significant aerosol loss process during fog. The internal mixing of absorbing aerosols and hygroscopic growth reduces the single scattering albedo impacting aerosol-radiation feedbacks. Aqueous-phase chemistry increases the PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations during fog events which subsequently participates in aerosol-radiation feedback. With aerosol-radiation interaction and aqueous phase chemistry, fog formation began 1-2 hours earlier and caused a longer fog duration than when these processes were not included in the WRF-Chem simulation. These processes were also found to increase RH, stabilize the boundary layer, increase PM$_{2.5}$ promoting aerosol activation, and thus increasing the...
fog water content over IGP. This suggests that the aerosol-radiation feedback and secondary aerosols play an important role in the air quality and in the intensity and lifetime of fog over IGP.

1 Introduction

The Indo-Gangetic Plain (IGP; 21°35′-32°28′N latitude, and 73°50′-89°49′E longitude) in the northern part of the Indian subcontinent is one of the most densely populated and heavily polluted regions in South Asia. The rapid population and economic growth in the IGP region over the last decade have increased air pollution over this region. This is evident from the increasing trend in AOD and NOx over India reported in recent studies (Dey and Di Girolamo, 2011; Ghude et al., 2013; Krishna Moorthy et al., 2013), which has slowed and reversed only recently (Sarkar et al., 2019). The high concentration of aerosols along the IGP and their adverse effects on human health and the environment are increasing (Ghude et al., 2016). Consequently, more than 500 million people living in the IGP breathe air that exceeds the National Ambient Air Quality (NAAQ) Standards, which has reduced the life expectancy of the people (Debnath et al., 2022; Lelieveld et al., 2015). Lelieveld et al. (2015) estimated a very high number of premature deaths (0.716 million per year) linked to aerosols (PM$_{2.5}$), thus making Southeast Asia one of the largest regions affected by premature mortality globally.

One of the major environmental concerns in the IGP is the urban air quality during winter, especially over the mega-cities, e.g., Delhi, located in the north-western part of IGP (Ghude et al., 2020; Jena et al., 2021; Sengupta et al., 2022). Several urban air pollution hotspots along the IGP extend from northwest to east with monthly average PM$_{2.5}$ greater than 200 µg m$^{-3}$ (National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)=60 µg m$^{-3}$, 24 hr average) in the winter season (Bharali et al., 2019; Krishna et al., 2019). IGP is dominated mainly by fine mode particulates, especially over central to eastern IGP, during post-monsoon and winter (Kumar et al., 2018). Biomass burning (agricultural waste burning, domestic heating, etc.) is an important contributor to the observed high PM$_{2.5}$ loading over IGP during these seasons (Kulkarni et al., 2020; Pant et al., 2015; Pawar and Sinha, 2022; Sharma et al., 2010; Yadav et al., 2020). Delhi is affected substantially by the emissions from agricultural waste burning in the north-western states of Punjab and Haryana during the post-monsoon (October-November) season (Badarinath et al., 2009; Jethva et al., 2018; Kumar et al., 2021). Studies showed that PM$_{2.5}$ increased from ~50 µg m$^{-3}$ to as high as 300 µg m$^{-3}$ (Ojha et al., 2020), and AOD reached 0.98 with the presence of absorbing aerosols (Singh et al., 2018) during the peak biomass burning in post-monsoon.

IGP experiences fog (both radiation and advection fog) every winter after the passage of the synoptic wind system called the “Western Disturbances”. The number of low visibility days due to haze/fog formation has been increasing significantly (Ghude et al., 2017; Jenamani, 2007; Singh and Dey, 2012), impacting socio-economic activities, e.g., aviation (Kulkarni et al., 2019). The increase in the intensity and regional extent of fog over IGP is consistent with the increasing trend in aerosol concentration due to increasing anthropogenic emissions (Sarkar et al., 2006; Syed et al., 2012).
Several factors control the formation and persistence of fog in the IGP, e.g., stable boundary layer, cold temperature, availability of moisture (supplied by the Western Disturbances and irrigation activities), and the aerosol number and composition (Acharja et al., 2022; Dhangar et al., 2021). It has also been suggested that the atmospheric rivers (moisture incursion from Arabian Sea) act as a source of water vapor over IGP, which fuels the intensification of fog and haze (Verma et al., 2022) during winter. The high aerosol concentration in the boundary layer influences fog formation (Gautam et al., 2007; Safai et al., 2019) over the IGP by providing the needed cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) for activation into fog droplets. In addition, aerosols induce surface cooling by reducing solar radiation at the surface while warming the lower troposphere by absorption (Ding et al., 2016; Yu et al., 2002). A reduction in surface-reaching solar radiation by ~19% has been reported during winter over Kanpur in the IGP (Dey and Tripathi, 2007). The reduced solar flux affects the boundary layer stability and depth by suppressing the thermals and thus further increasing the surface aerosol concentration via aerosol-radiation feedback, which is very strong over the IGP (Bharali et al., 2019). Kumar et al., (2020) have shown that aerosol-radiation feedback significantly improves the accuracy of PM$_{2.5}$ and temperature forecasts in Delhi. Srivastava et al., (2018) reported that the direct aerosol forcing over polluted regions is very large with values up to $-80.0 \pm 7.2$ W m$^{-2}$ over the IGP in the winter season.

Aerosol-radiation interaction determines that the aerosol distribution is critical for the evolution of fog (Bodaballa et al., 2022; Steeneveld et al., 2015), while microphysics is important for fog formation and dispersal (Boutle et al., 2018; Maalick et al., 2016). Although the relationship between the aerosol chemical composition and aerosol activation to CCN has not been fully understood yet, studies have found that the chemical composition and mixing state of aerosols affect the hygroscopicity (κ) of aerosols (Bodaballa et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2013; Moore et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2014a). Fog processes involve a complex interplay between local meteorology, radiation, microphysics, and aerosol chemistry, making it difficult to understand the fog lifecycle (Acharja et al., 2022; Maalick et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2014b). There is considerable heterogeneity in the spatial and temporal aerosol properties over IGP and the poor estimates of their mixing state. Therefore, prediction of fog by weather models is still challenging with biases in fog's onset and dispersal timings.

Previous studies have focussed on the impacts of meteorological conditions, topography, or anthropogenic emissions on the poor air quality and intensification of fog during winter over IGP (e.g. Hakkim et al., 2019). However, studies on the effect of feedback induced by the aerosols on the meteorological conditions and thus on aerosol concentration are very limited over this region, except for a few above-mentioned studies which discuss how the aerosol-radiation feedback favors haze and fog during winter. Moreover, fog can provide a medium for aqueous-phase reactions. While several earlier studies have reported an increase in secondary aerosols during fog over IGP, a sensitivity study examining the impact of fog on aqueous phase chemistry has not yet been done over IGP.

In the present work, we aim to find the suitable chemistry/physics as well as the meteorology initial/boundary conditions that lead to improved simulations of fog events in the Weather Research and
Forecasting model coupled with chemistry (WRF-Chem; (Fast et al., 2006; Grell et al., 2005; Powers et al., 2017). We also explore the role of aerosol-radiation feedback on fog properties as the high aerosol loadings in northern India can impact the heating rates, temperature inversions, and boundary layer height. The role of aqueous chemistry on fog properties and vice-versa is also investigated.

2 Methodology

Fig. 1 shows the IGP study region for the simulations. Fog occurred on both 23rd and 24th December 2017 (Fig. 1a, b). The fog region is located over an area with high PM$_2.5$ anthropogenic emissions (Fig. 1c). The IGP is a large region with varying meteorology and aerosol characteristics, therefore, it is divided into three areas, northwest (NWIGP), central (CIGP), and east (EIGP) which are marked by the black rectangles in Fig.1c. Although biomass burning and anthropogenic emissions dominate throughout the IGP during post-monsoon and winter season, the north-westerly wind system results in the gradient distribution of AOD over this region. The downwind regions, CIGP and EIGP are influenced by the long-range transport from the NWIGP, resulting in high AOD with dominant fine particulates over CIGP and EIGP, especially during post-monsoon and winter (Kedia et al., 2014; Kumar et al., 2018). Therefore, representative stations from each region are considered for the sensitivity analyses. Nine stations have been considered which include, Amritsar, IGI Airport (Indira Gandhi International Airport, Delhi), IHBAS (Delhi), Dwarka (Delhi), RKP (Delhi) in the North-West IGP; Kanpur, Lucknow in Central IGP and Patna, Muzaffarpur in East IGP.

2.1 Modeling

The WRF-Chem model version 4.0.3 has been used for this study. The model domain is centered at Delhi (77.1°E, 28.7°N) with 300 grid points in the east-west, 170 grid points in the south-north direction (Fig. 1c), and 50 vertical eta levels with the model top at 50 hPa. The horizontal grid spacing of the domain is 10 km, while the vertical grid spacing varies from higher resolution (~200 m) in the boundary layer to coarser resolution (~1200 m) near the model top. To quantify the impact of aerosol-radiation (AR) feedback and aqueous chemistry on the fog properties, we conduct sensitivity simulations (Table 1) for December 20–24, 2017. Three experiments (EXP1, EXP2, and EXP3) have been designed with different combinations of meteorological initial/lateral boundary conditions and planetary boundary layer (PBL) physics to identify the best configuration for meteorological simulations. Experiment 1 (EXP1) uses the National Centers for Environmental Predictions (NCEP) Final Analysis (GFS-FNL; 1° x1°, 6 hourly) meteorology data for initial and boundary conditions and the YSU (Yonsei University; (Hong et al., 2006) PBL scheme. Experiments 2 and 3 (EXP2, EXP3) use ERA-Interim Project (1.125° x 0.703°, 6 hourly) for meteorology initial and boundary conditions, while the PBL options were the YSU PBL scheme and ACM2 (Asymmetric Convective Model version 2) scheme, respectively. ACM2 is a hybrid of the original nonlocal closure (Pleim and Chang, 1992) and a local closure eddy diffusion scheme (Pleim, 2007a, 2007b). The YSU PBL option was coupled with the Noah LSM while ACM2 was coupled with Pleim-Xiu LSM.
The advantage of Pleim-Xiu LSM (PX-LSM) is that it allows nudging of soil moisture and temperature to improve the prediction of meteorology near the surface (Xiu and Pleim 2001; Pleim and Xiu 2003; Gilliam et al. 2006) which Noah LSM does not include. The PX-LSM includes two-layer soil (0–1 and 1–100 cm) model, canopy moisture, and aerodynamic and stomatal resistance. Ground surface (1 cm) temperature is calculated from the surface energy balance using a force-restore algorithm for heat exchange within the soil. Although the two-layer approach in PX-LSM is less detailed than the multilayer soil models such as the Noah LSM (four soil layers; Chen and Dudhia 2001), it performs well with realistic initialization for soil moisture and through dynamic adjustment in the model simulation where soil moisture is indirectly nudged according to differences in 2-m temperature (T2) and 2-m relative humidity (RH) between the model and observation (Pleim and Xiu, 2003). Soil moisture nudging adjusts the surface evaporation (direct soil surface evaporation, vegetative evapotranspiration, and evaporation from wet canopies) which then affects the partitioning of available surface energy into latent and sensible heat flux and thus reduces errors in T2 and 2-m RH.

For EXP2, meteorological initial conditions were refreshed every 24 hours, while EXP3 was a continuous run but soil moisture was nudged to the Era-Interim dataset to improve the prediction of surface fluxes. All other physics and chemistry options are the same for all the experiments except the surface physics option, which changes with the PBL scheme used. The deposition of cloud droplets is an important moisture and aerosol sink during fog events. For all these simulations, the deposition velocity of cloud droplets was reduced to 0.01 m s\(^{-1}\) based on Stoke’s Law and previous studies (Katata et al., 2015; Tav et al., 2018) because its default value (0.1 m s\(^{-1}\)), is large.

To examine the radiative effects of aerosols and aqueous phase chemistry additional simulations have been done using the meteorological configuration in EXP3, with aerosol-radiation (wFB) feedback plus aqueous chemistry (wAq.chem), without aerosol-radiation feedback (nFB) but with aqueous chemistry, and without aqueous chemistry (noAq.chem) but with aerosol-radiation feedback. The analysis has been done for the fog events on 23\(^{st}\) and 24\(^{st}\) December 2017 as

\[
\text{Impact of radiation feedback} = wFB - nFB
\]

\[
\text{Impact of aqueous phase chemistry} = wAq.chem - noAq.chem
\]

Emissions used in the WRF-Chem simulations are from the EDGAR-HTAP v2 (Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research- Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution; 0.1° x 0.1°) inventory for anthropogenic emissions and FINN v2.2 (Fire INventory from NCAR; 1 km x 1 km) fire emission inventory (Wiedinmyer et al., 2011). Trash-burning emissions (Chaudhary et al., 2021) are also included in the simulations. The model calculates the biogenic emissions online using MEGAN v2.04 (Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature) (Guenther et al., 2006). The initial and lateral boundary conditions for chemical constituents are from the global chemistry transport model CAM-Chem (Community Atmosphere Model with Chemistry) (Emmons et al., 2020).

The MOZART (Model for Ozone and Related chemical Tracers) chemical mechanism (Emmons et al., 2010) is used for gas-phase chemistry, which includes 85 gas-phase species, 39...
photolysis, and 157 gas-phase reactions. It has been updated to include an explicit treatment of aromatic compounds HONO, C$_2$H$_2$, and isoprene oxidation scheme (Knott et al., 2014). The lumped toluene used by Emmons et al., (2010) has been speciated into benzene, toluene, and lumped isomers of xylenes (Knott et al., 2014). For this study, HCl emissions, transport, dry, and wet deposition are represented. However, HCl gas-phase reaction is not included in MOZART.

The Model for Simulating Aerosol Interactions and Chemistry (MOSAIC) with four size bins (0.039–0.156, 0.156–0.625, 0.625–2.500, and 2.5–10.0 µm dry diameters) coupled with MOZART gas-phase chemistry is used (Fast et al., 2006; Zaveri et al., 2008). The bin sizes are defined by their lower and upper dry particle diameters, so there is no transfer of particles between bins during water uptake or loss. It is assumed that aerosols in each bin are internally mixed with the same chemical composition while they are externally mixed in different bins.

The aerosol composition includes sulfate (SO$_4^{2-}$), ammonium (NH$_4^+$), nitrate (NO$_3^-$), aerosol water, sea salt (Na$^+$, Cl$^-$), methanesulfonate (CH$_3$SO$_3$), carbonate (CO$_3^{2-}$), calcium (Ca$^+$), black carbon (BC), organic mass (OC), and unspecified inorganic species such as silica, inert minerals, and trace metals lumped together as other inorganic mass (OIN). For OC, primary OC and secondary OC are represented separately, where the latter is simulated using the volatility basis set (VBS) approach. Reactive inorganic species such as potassium (K$^+$) and magnesium (Mg$^+$) are usually present in much smaller amounts and are equivalent to Na$^+$ since their sulfate, nitrate, and chloride salts are similar in terms of their solubility in water.

MOSAIC treats condensation and evaporation of trace gases to/from particles, nucleation (new particle formation), and coagulation. Aerosol coagulation (Brownian) is based on (Jacobson et al., 1994) and nucleation is based on (Wexler et al., 1994) parameterization of H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O homogeneous nucleation. Sulfate, nitrate, chloride, and ammonium aerosols are mainly formed through oxidation and neutralization/condensation of gas precursors. Gas-phase sulfuric acid (H$_2$SO$_4$) is produced by the gas-phase oxidation of SO$_2$ by OH and nitric acid (HNO$_3$) formation is via the oxidation of NO$_2$ by OH. HCl is a primary emission product. The neutralization/condensation of H$_2$SO$_4$, HCl, and HNO$_3$ with NH$_3$ produces ammonium such as ammonium sulfate (NH$_4$)$_2$SO$_4$, ammonium bisulfate (NH$_4$HSO$_4$), ammonium chloride (NH$_4$Cl) and ammonium nitrate (NH$_4$NO$_3$), respectively. The thermodynamic modules in MOSAIC for the dynamic gas-particle partitioning of aerosols MTEM (Multicomponent Taylor Expansion Method) and MESA (Multicomponent Equilibrium Solver for Aerosols) calculate the activity coefficient in aqueous phase aerosols and compute the intraparticle solid-liquid phase equilibrium respectively (Zaveri et al., 2005, 2008). The Adaptive Step Time-split Euler Method (ASTEM) coupled with MESA-MTEM dynamically integrates the mass transfer equations.

Aqueous-phase chemistry uses a bulk water approach employing the Fahey and Pandis (2001) mechanism. It calculates sulfate formation, formaldehyde oxidation, and non-reactive uptake of nitric acid, hydrochloric acid, ammonia, and other trace gases (Chapman et al., 2009; Pye et al., 2020). Aqueous-phase sulfate is produced via oxidation of SO$_2$ by H$_2$O$_2$, O$_3$, TMI (Transition metal Ion: Fe(III),
Mn(II)) catalyzed O$_2$ and NO$_2$. TMI concentrations are prescribed in the model to 0.01 μg m$^{-3}$ for Fe(III) and 0.005 μg m$^{-3}$ for Mn(II) (Martin and Good, 1991). The Fe(III) values are within the range of water soluble iron in winter time aerosol reported in India (Kumar and Sarin, 2010). Wet removal (scavenging), is represented by the (Neu and Prather, 2012) scheme for trace gases and Easter et al., (2004) for aerosols.

The WRF-Chem simulations include interactions with radiation, i.e., direct aerosol effect and effect on photolysis rates. Aerosol cloud interactions are not possible when using the ACM2 PBL scheme because the ACM2 PBL scheme does not provide the exchange coefficient for heat, which is required to calculate the activation fraction for mass and number for each bin/mode.

### 2.2 Observations

To evaluate the model output, observations of aerosols and meteorology have been obtained from several satellites as well as ground-based measurement platforms. To examine the aerosol loading and spatial and temporal distribution, daily Level 2 Aerosol Optical Depth (AOD) retrievals from the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) aboard Terra and Aqua satellites are obtained at the spatial resolution of 10 km x 10 km (at nadir) pixel array. It provides aerosol properties from the Dark Target (DT) algorithm applied over the ocean and dark land (e.g., vegetation) and Deep Blue (DB) algorithms over the entire land areas, including both dark and bright surfaces. Each MOD04.L2 (Terra) / MYD04.L2 (Aqua) products are available at a 5-minute time interval with an output grid of 135 pixels in width by 203 pixels in length.

The Indian National Satellites (INSAT-3D) in the geostationary orbit at inclinations of 82º longitude provide an imager fog product (3DIMG.L2C_FOG) with a spatial resolution of 4 km every 30 min (www.mosdac.gov.in). For daytime, the visible channel observation is used to detect fog, whereas thermal infrared is used to reduce false alarms such as medium/high clouds and snow areas. INSAT 3D’s ‘day microphysics’ data component analyzes solar reflectance at three wavelengths: 0.5 μm (visible), 1.6 μm (shortwave infrared), and 10.8 μm (thermal infrared). Night-time fog is derived from TIR-1 (12.0 μm and 10.0 μm) and MIR (10.8 μm and 3.9 μm) channel brightness temperature over the Indian region. INSAT-3D provides fog intensity varying from 1 to 4 indicating SHALLOW for visibility > 600 m; MODERATE, DENSE, and VERY DENSE, respectively for visibility varying from 0 to 500 m (Banerjee and Padmakumari, 2020). If the visibility is greater than 700 m it indicates no fog while visibility > 1000 m represents very clear skies. Validation of INSAT-3D fog products over the IGP shows a 66%-68% probability of detection and a 10% false alarm rate. It also captures the entire life cycle of fog from formation to dissipation. However, detecting fog during multilayer clouds is still challenging with INSAT-3D (Arun et al., 2018; Chaurasia and Gohil, 2015; Chaurasia and Jenamani, 2017).
Ground-based monitoring sites provide hourly data of relative humidity, surface temperature, and wind speed measured by the Central Pollution Control Board, CPCB (http://cpcb.nic.in). In addition, measurements of several aerosols, trace gases, and meteorology at Delhi (IGI Airport) from the Winter Fog Experiment (WiFEX) for the period December 10-31, 2017, have also been used to validate the model output. The WiFEX, an initiative of the Ministry of Earth Sciences (MoES), India, is a ground-based measurement campaign at the IGI Airport Delhi to understand fog’s physical and chemical features. Additional details of the WiFEX project and related publications can be found in Ghude et al., (2017).

3 Meteorology Evaluation

Previous studies simulating fog highlight the importance of high model vertical resolution (Pithani et al., 2019; Van Der Velde et al., 2010) for representing the fog formation and the growth of the fog layer, model initialization (Yadav et al., 2022), initial relative humidity (Bergot and Guedalia, 1994; Pithani et al., 2020), and PBL schemes (Chen et al., 2020; Pithani et al., 2019). In the present study, 2-m relative humidity (RH2), 2-m temperature (T2), and 10-m wind speed (WS) from WRF-Chem have been validated using ground-based measurements from CPCB monitoring network and WiFEX campaign for several stations across the IGP. The NWIGP stations include Amritsar, IGI (Indira Gandhi International Airport), and RKP (Rama Krishna Puram) site in Delhi; Kanpur and Lucknow in central IGP; and Patna in the East IGP. The comparison of WRF-Chem results with observations shows that RH and T2 are sensitive to the choice of the meteorological initial and boundary conditions (Fig. S1). WRF-Chem compares better with the observations for simulations driven by the ERA-Interim reanalysis than with GFS-FNL reanalysis since ERA-Interim provides more realistic RH than GFS-FNL (Figs. S2 a-f). For example, RH from EXP1 (GFS) varies from 10 to 50%, while RH from EXP2 and EXP3 varies from 30 to 100%, which is closer to observation, especially for NWIGP and CIGP. For EIGP, RH from EXP1 (GFS) compares better than ERA-Interim, which overestimates the observed RH. ERA-Interim and YSU PBL scheme showed damping of RH continuously increasing the bias in RH with time (not shown), which was corrected in EXP2 by refreshing meteorology every day at 00h UT during the model simulation. In addition, maps of surface RH and T2 (Figs. S2 g-j) show that the GFS-FNL dataset has lower relative humidity throughout the domain as compared to ERA-Interim. There are differences in simulated 2-m temperature between these two datasets which are of smaller relative magnitude compared to the RH.

The GFS-FNL driven meteorology EXP1 has a warm bias in NWIGP and CIGP, especially during night-time, while over EIGP, the model prediction agrees well with observations. EXP2 with the ERA-Interim driven meteorology and YSU PBL scheme also shows good agreement between modeled and observed T2 in EIGP. The ERA-Interim driven meteorology with the ACM2 PBL scheme in EXP3 has a cold bias of up to 7ºC over EIGP during daytime from 22nd to 24th December. The wind speed evaluation shows that WRF-Chem is over-predicting wind speed. However, it is also possible that some
CPCB stations (e.g., Amritsar and RK Puram) have a wind speed low bias due to the low measurement height and obstructions such as tall trees near the monitoring station. Note that at other sites (e.g., over IGI-Delhi and Kanpur) the model measurement agreement is better.

The WRF-Chem performance has been statistically assessed against observation using the Taylor Diagram (Taylor, 2001), which provides a statistical summary of how well the model output agrees with the observation in terms of the Pearson correlation, the root-mean-square error (RMSE), and the ratios of their variances (Fig. 2). The percentage bias has also been included to further evaluate the WRF-Chem results. In Fig. 2, better agreement of WRF-Chem results with observations are shown by the marker’s proximity to the “OBS” dashed black line. The WRF-Chem RH has a good correlation for all three experiments with $r^2 > 0.75$ at all the locations in IGP for all the experiments. However, the RMSE and the standard deviations are larger for the EXP1. The relative bias is also large (>20%) for EXP1 (GFS-FNL) compared to EXP2 and EXP3 which lie closer to the dashed black line indicating that the simulated RH variations are similar to observations. For all the experiments, WRF-Chem T2 agrees well with observations with a correlation between 0.8 and 0.95. The points are concentrated near the dashed line showing a low RMSE and standard deviation for T2, signifying a good agreement of simulated T2 with observation in terms of temporal variation but the T2 relative bias is large for EXP1 (>20%). The RMSE and relative bias for EXP1 are larger for several of the stations. The temporal variability of T2 and RH are predicted well for all the combinations of inputs (Fig. S1), however, the accuracy of simulated T2 and RH is sensitive to the choice of meteorological initial/boundary conditions. WRF-Chem predicted RH and T2 agree better with observations when initialized with ERA-Interim meteorology than with GFS-FNL.

The WRF-Chem runs driven by ERA-Interim with YSU (EXP2) and ACM2 PBL (EXP3) schemes predicted the surface meteorology better over the IGP than the WRF-Chem run driven by GFS (EXP1). By examining the modeled cloud water content in the lowest model level with the INSAT-3D satellite fog intensity for the 23rd and 24th December 2017 (Fig. 3), it is apparent that WRF-Chem with the ACM2 PBL scheme compared qualitatively well with observations obtained from INSAT-3D satellite in terms of fog coverage over CIGP, while the WRF-Chem run with the YSU PBL scheme did not produce widespread fog. However, there is also fog over EIGP in WRF-Chem with the ACM2 PBL scheme although it is not observed by the satellite. This is because the model has a cold bias in T2 and a high surface RH over East IGP with ACM2 PBL and Pleim-Xiu surface scheme as discussed earlier, which favors the formation of fog in this region. The time series in Fig. 4 shows that EXP3 is capable of predicting the duration of fog on 23rd and 24th December. There is a data gap from INSAT 3D observations because it is unable to capture fog during daytime in the presence of mid and high-level clouds.

In conclusion, EXP3 is the best configuration for predicting fog formation where the ERA-Interim meteorology, the ACM2 PBL and surface schemes, and soil moisture nudging is used in the WRF-Chem simulation. Therefore, the evaluation of predicting AOD, surface aerosol concentrations,
and aerosol composition as well as analysis of the impact of aerosols on fog formation uses the EXP3 configuration.

4 Aerosol Evaluation

Aerosol is an important factor in correct prediction of fog (Maalick et al., 2016; Stolaki et al., 2015) as the number of fog droplets depends on the aerosol size distribution and concentration. Aerosols as CCN can affect the liquid water content in fog and therefore an increase in aerosol concentration can significantly affect fog lifetime (Stolaki et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2014b). AOD retrievals from the MODIS satellite have been used to validate the modeled AOD (Fig. 5). It is observed that the model captures several important features of the MODIS retrieved AOD spatial distribution but at the same time somewhat struggles to reproduce the observed AOD magnitude in some parts of the domain. One possible reason for the underestimation would be the EDGAR-HTAP emission inventory, which has a low bias for residential sector PM$_{2.5}$ emissions in India (Sharma et al., 2022). For instance, the model successfully predicts high aerosol loading seen by MODIS on 20 and 21 December over CIGP and EIGP. This is the region with dense fog both in model and observation. Higher AOD (>0.5) over CIGP and EIGP can be attributed to the accumulation of aerosols that are transported by north-westerly winds to these regions from NWIGP (Dey and Di Girolamo, 2011; Jain et al., 2020; Jethva et al., 2018; Kumar et al., 2018; Yadav et al., 2020). However, WRF-Chem underestimates AOD over the NWIGP (AOD<0.3) throughout the simulation period and during 23-24 December over CIGP and EIGP where the latter may be related to enhanced scavenging of aerosols by fog droplets.

The west to east gradient in aerosol loading over IGP is consistent with surface PM$_{2.5}$ distribution (Fig. 6a). Surface PM$_{2.5}$ concentration is highest in EIGP (>100 µg/m$^3$) and it decreases gradually towards NWIGP (~60-80 µg/m$^3$). The time series of PM$_{2.5}$ from CPCB measurements and the model at stations representative of each region in IGP shows that simulated PM$_{2.5}$ compares well with observation in terms of day-to-day variation over most of the locations in the IGP (Fig. 6 b-e). The comparison is good over Amritsar (an NWIGP location), where PM$_{2.5}$ is mostly primary aerosols from local emissions e.g., residential heating related biomass burning. Agricultural waste burning is at its peak during post monsoon months (Oct-Nov) whereas during winter burning for residential heating increases and the stable boundary layer confines these emissions near the surface (Kumar et al., 2021; Pawar and Sinha, 2022). PM$_{2.5}$ at Amritsar shows a bimodal distribution with morning and evening peaks whereas it is absent in the model likely due to the absence of diurnal variations in the WRF-Chem anthropogenic emissions.

At Delhi, the daily variations are predicted well although WRF-Chem underestimates PM$_{2.5}$ observations during the first 4 days. Delhi experiences severe air pollution and haze with high PM loading (> 500 µg m$^{-3}$) (Bharali et al., 2019). The model is successful in predicting the high PM$_{2.5}$ episode on the 24th of Dec. However, it fails to predict the composition correctly (Fig. 7). Although simulated SO$_2$ and NH$_3$ are comparable with observation, sulfate, and ammonium are underestimated...
in the model. SO$_4^{2-}$ is underestimated by ~9 µg m$^{-3}$, while NH$_4^+$, NO$_3^-$ and Cl$^-$ are underestimated by ~30 µg m$^{-3}$, ~19 µg/m$^3$ and ~40 µg/m$^3$ on average, respectively. This leads to the underestimation of PM$_{2.5}$ over Delhi. Studies report very high chloride over the IGP with values exceeding 100 µg m$^{-3}$ (Lalchandani et al., 2021) during winter emitted from increased trash burning and industrial emissions (Pant et al., 2015; Patil et al., 2013). Our model includes HCl emissions from trash burning but emissions from other sources (e.g., industries) are unaccounted for in the model which likely leads to the underestimation in modeled chloride.

Over the CIGP and EIGP, the underestimation in PM$_{2.5}$ is mostly observed at the east IGP locations during the dense fog. It is well known that the hygroscopic aerosols grow in size and are deposited to the surface during fog (Gupta and Mandariya, 2013; Kaul et al., 2011). PM$_{2.5}$ shows an increase initially with the onset of fog and then it decreases as the aerosols grow and get deposited through fog droplets. A two order higher deposition rate (Fig. 6 f, g) during fog compared to the deposition rate of dry aerosol results in the lower PM$_{2.5}$ over CIGP and EIGP during fog events.

Previous studies have reported that models tend to underestimate the AOD observation (David et al., 2018; Pan et al., 2015) during the post-monsoon and winter when agricultural waste burning and anthropogenic emissions dominate. While anthropogenic emissions include a contribution from the residential sector, the emissions from small-scale burning for residential heating over IGP especially during winter are likely underestimated in the current emission inventory (Sharma et al., 2022). This leads to an underestimation of aerosol concentration in the model. Other possible causes for the underestimation are the biases in the simulated meteorology (Govardhan et al., 2015; Kumar et al., 2015; Pan et al., 2015) which affects the aerosol concentration. We corrected some of the biases in meteorology as discussed earlier however there are still residual biases in the simulated meteorology e.g., overestimation of wind speed by WRF-Chem. We also observe underestimation of secondary aerosols over NWIGP which contribute significantly to the aerosol loading over IGP. Secondary aerosol formation is substantial over CIGP and EIGP in the model compared to NWIGP which will be discussed in a later section. Several modeling studies have shown significant improvements in forecasting surface PM$_{2.5}$ by assimilation of satellite AOD and PM$_{2.5}$ (Ghude et al., 2020; Jena et al., 2020; Kumar et al., 2020) suggesting the importance of correct initialization of the model in simulating aerosols over IGP.

5 Effect of Aerosol Radiation feedback

Interactions of aerosols with radiation affects temperature and surface heat fluxes, thereby weakening the turbulence in the PBL and stabilizing the boundary layer height (Fig. 8b) compared to the clean environment (Fig. 8a). In the presence of well mixed aerosols within the PBL, the radiative effect of aerosols lowers the noontime PBL height (Fig. 8b). However, the presence of absorbing aerosols in the PBL warms the air and changes the thermodynamics. Three cases are shown in Fig. 8(c-e) where increases of scattering aerosol concentrations at the top of PBL (Fig. 8c) increases scattering of radiation by the aerosol layer and reduces the surface reaching solar radiation similar to Fig. 8b.
Higher concentrations of absorbing aerosols at the top of PBL (Fig. 8d) warms the air above the boundary layer and strengthens the capping inversion stabilizing the PBL and suppressing its growth. The shallow PBL and weakened daytime vertical mixing confines aerosols and water vapor near the surface and worsens the air quality of a region. The aerosols trapped in the stagnant PBL further affects the radiation flux at the surface and creates a positive feedback loop wherein the PBL is continually suppressed until interrupted by some synoptic weather phenomenon, such as the western disturbances in the IGP. On the other hand, higher concentration of absorbing aerosols within the PBL (Fig. 8e) warms the air in the PBL and this results in the higher PBL height. The raised PBL decreases the aerosol concentration near the surface which is termed as a negative feedback effect.

The aerosol radiation feedback can affect shortwave heating rates (SWHR). The high aerosol loading over the IGP (Fig. 6 and Fig. 7) allows the AR feedback to reduce the PBL height by more than 140 m throughout the IGP compared to the surrounding region with AR feedback (Fig. 9a). The difference in PBL height with and without aerosol radiation feedback is largest during noontime. The suppressed PBL is due to the decrease in the surface heating flux and the consequent weakening of turbulence in the PBL. The surface solar radiation flux (SWF) decreases by 5-35 % while the surface latent heat (LH) and sensible heat (HFX) fluxes decrease by 5-35 % and 10-60 %, respectively (Fig. S3). The stable, shallow PBL reduces the vertical mixing of aerosols and moisture and confines them near the surface, resulting in increased PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations and RH near the surface with AR feedback (Fig. 9). Although T2 should decrease with the reduction in surface SWF, T2 shows mixed signals with both cooling and warming over IGP. While surface cooling is observed over NWIGP and EIGP, T2 increases with AR feedback over most of CIGP. The response of AR feedback to T2 varies in these three regions probably due to differences in the distribution and types of aerosols and the presence of fog. Increase in surface concentration of PM$_{2.5}$ occurs more over NWIGP and EIGP with increase in BC and OIN over NWIGP, and sulfate aerosol over EIGP which results in the surface cooling due to positive AR feedback in these two regions.

Over the CIGP, the AR feedback causes a depletion of surface PM$_{2.5}$ (Fig. 9d). Examining further, the time variation of the changes in PBL height, T2, and RH between the simulations with and without aerosol-radiation feedback (Fig. 9g) shows an increase in T2 while the surface fluxes, sensible heat flux, latent heat flux, and downward shortwave radiation flux decrease over CIGP (Fig. 9h). AR feedback affects mostly the lower atmosphere at multiple levels; however, our finding suggests that the decreased shortwave radiation flux decreases the surface fluxes and thus the turbulence in the boundary layer resulting in a reduced PBL height on both days. Figure 9 g and h clearly show a decrease in HFX and LH following the decrease in SWF. Moreover, we observe that the PBL height is sensitive to latent heat flux likely due to its strong dependence on moisture availability (Xiu and Pleim, 2001; Zhang and Anthes, 1982).

The impact of AR feedback on T2 depends on factors such as the presence of absorbing aerosols and their vertical distribution via heating or increased SWF (as observed in CIGP, Fig. S3). Absorbing
aerosols in WRF-Chem include BC and OIN (other inorganic aerosols), which both increase near the surface (Fig. 9e, Fig. S4) due to their confinement in the stable PBL. Some areas in the fog-affected region show a decrease in BC as well as SO$_4^{2-}$ which is likely due to their hygroscopic growth, increase in activation to fog droplets, and then dry deposition in dense fog. The increase in RH favours the growth of aerosols in size by the uptake of water and also the formation of secondary aerosols. As a result, AR feedback changes the absorbing to scattering ratio of aerosols over IGP indicated by the decrease in SSA (Single Scattering Albedo; Fig. S5). A decrease in SSA is found in CIGP throughout the boundary layer while it is negligible in NWIGP. SSA increases in EIGP in the PBL and decreases near the top of PBL. Similar observation has been made by Ramachandran et al., (2020) where SSA decreases with increasing altitude due to absorbing carbonaceous aerosols at higher elevations which contributes $\geq$75$\%$ to the aerosol absorption over IGP. Increased shortwave heating (Fig. 10) is probably caused by the increased absorbing aerosols near the surface which overwheels the surface cooling due to reduced shortwave radiation at the surface.

The increase in 2-m RH is substantial over CIGP on 24$^{th}$ December (Fig. 9g) compared to the previous day following the decrease in PBL height which constrains the moisture near the surface. The decrease in RH by 2$\%$ or more when aerosol-radiation feedback is included compared to no aerosol-radiation feedback is likely due to increase in T2. However, the increase in RH in the afternoon associated with a decrease in LH and PBL height is important for the air to saturate which then favors the formation of fog in a polluted environment. Note that the increase in T2 with AR feedback is very small ($<0.5^\circ$C) which reduces further after noon (~12:30 pm IST) on both days.

Another important factor that can affect the extent of change in PBL height is the distribution of aerosols in the vertical (illustrated in Fig. 8). The pressure-time cross-sections of differences in T, PM$_{2.5}$, BC, and SO$_4^{2-}$ between aerosol radiation (AR) feedback (wFB) and no aerosol radiation feedback (nFB) for three regions, NWIGP, CIGP, and EIGP are shown in Fig. 11. The difference in the PBL height reaches a maximum with the AR feedback during midday (12:30-15:30 IST). Increase in temperature in the boundary layer is observed with AR feedback particularly at the upper PBL in all the regions of IGP. This induces a temperature inversion resulting in a stable and suppressed PBL. In all the regions the decrease in PBL height (100-200 m) is larger on 24$^{th}$ December compared to 23$^{rd}$ December. The difference in the PBL height on 23$^{rd}$ and 24$^{th}$ December with AR feedback on these days is possibly controlled by the aerosol distribution during the previous day or early morning on the same day. For example, in all the regions an increase in PM$_{2.5}$ is observed the previous night (23:30 onwards) till ~11:30 of December 24, with increased BC over NWIGP and CIGP whereas both BC and SO$_4^{2-}$ over EIGP. The increased PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations suppress the development of the PBL after sunrise with AR feedback on December 24 compared to that on December 23, leading to the observed differences in $\Delta$PBL height on these two days. Increase in BC concentrations in NWIGP and CIGP are found above the PBL on 24$^{th}$ December whereas BC concentrations decrease within the PBL. This BC concentration gradient creates a temperature inversion, for example between 10:30-14:30 IST. The increase in BC...
warms the air in the PBL; however, the warming is not strong enough to cause negative feedback over CIGP. On 23rd December a small increase in BC is uniform throughout the PBL, while there is a decrease in SO$_4^{2-}$ concentrations, resulting in a warmer PBL (Fig. 11) with AR feedback.

In EIGP, BC distribution is similar to that in CIGP with AR feedback while there is a substantial increase in sulfate aerosol in the PBL. This results in the strongest extinction in EIGP as evident from the largest difference in PBL height and surface cooling with AR feedback among the three regions. Although ∆PBL is small on 23rd December, it still results in the accumulation of aerosols during night-time (~23:30 pm onwards) which further strengthens the AR feedback effect the next day in NWIGP and CIGP. Thus, AR feedback stabilizes the PBL, increases PM$_{2.5}$ and RH in the PBL making conditions favourable for persistence of fog over IGP.

6 Effect of Aqueous phase chemistry

In this section we discuss the impact of aqueous phase chemistry on aerosol composition and its interaction with meteorology. There is a considerable difference in the surface concentration of PM$_{2.5}$ (>16 µg m$^{-3}$) in the absence of aqueous chemistry over CIGP and EIGP where fog occurs (Fig. 12a) while the difference is negligible over NWIGP where fog does not occur. This is due to the formation of secondary aerosols through aqueous phase chemistry and the hygroscopic growth of aerosols during fog in these regions with the inclusion of aqueous chemistry in the model. In the region between CIGP and EIGP (83E-84E; marked by the box in Fig. 12a), PM$_{2.5}$ concentration is less in the simulation with aqueous-phase chemistry than without aqueous-phase chemistry because deposition of fog water aerosols to the surface increases as the fog thickens (Fig. 13, Fig. S6). Figure 13 shows the relation between formation of secondary aerosols, deposition flux of PM$_{2.5}$, and fog with and without aqueous phase chemistry. During the fog event, the secondary aerosols (SO$_4^{2-}$, NH$_4^+$) increase significantly by 4-10 µg m$^{-3}$ due to aqueous phase chemistry adding to the PM$_{2.5}$ burden over IGP. The intensity of fog is high around midnight December 24-25 compared to that on 23rd and 24th (1:30-11:30 IST)) which increases the dry deposition flux of PM$_{2.5}$ causing a sharp drop in the PM$_{2.5}$ concentration on 24th December compared to the previous night’s fog event. The observed change in PM$_{2.5}$ over a region is the net result of the formation of secondary aerosols and its deposition with fog droplets.

The composition distribution of PM$_{2.5}$ (Fig. 12b) has a similar distribution for the simulations with and without aqueous phase chemistry over NWIGP where fog did not occur. The primary aerosols are higher (BC > 9%, OC ~ 16-30%, OIN > 50%), than the secondary aerosols (<5%). While the model requires fog for accelerated formation of secondary inorganic aerosol, experimental data (Fig. 7) supports significant formation of secondary inorganic aerosol at elevated RH levels even in haze aerosol (Acharjya et al., 2022). On the other hand, the central and east IGP stations are fog-covered and therefore, there is an increase in secondary aerosols esp. SO$_4^{2-}$ and NH$_4^+$ when aqueous phase chemistry is included in the simulation. SO$_4^{2-}$ is chemically produced via aqueous phase chemistry in cloud water, hence the abrupt increase whereas NH$_4^+$ maintains a gas-aerosol and gas-cloud equilibrium with NH$_3$ and SO$_4^{2-}$.
via neutralizing the drop or aerosol. NO$_3^-$ is high in the model compared to SO$_4^{2-}$ and NH$_4^+$ and it decreases by ~1-2 % with aqueous phase chemistry. We observe a small increase in NO$_3^-$ during fog, however it drops as fog intensifies, more rapidly than that without aqueous phase chemistry likely due to increase in dry deposition. This results in lower average NO$_3^-$ to PM$_{2.5}$ ratio with aqueous phase chemistry. Moreover, NO$_3^-$ is high over the fog covered CIGP and EIGP compared to NWIGP, suggesting that transport and chemistry of NO$_3^-$ in CIGP and EIGP produce more HNO$_3$. Aerosol NO$_3^-$ is also in equilibrium with HNO$_3$ and it is formed only if excess NH$_3$ is available beyond the sulfate neutralization. Thus, NH$_4^+$ and NO$_3^-$ changes are likely due to changing the partitioning between gas and liquid based on the production of sulfate.

PM$_{2.5}$ is mostly composed of organic aerosols (OA) over CIGP and EIGP whereas it is OIN (dust) and OA over NWIGP. Although observational studies report Cl$^-$ as one of the largest contributors (12-17%) to PM$_{2.5}$ after the organics (Lalchandani et al., 2021; Pant et al., 2015) during winter, Cl$^-$ is largely underestimated by the model as discussed in section 4 and contributes only ~3%. A small increase (2-4%) in secondary organic aerosols (SOA) from glyoxal production in aerosols occurs for the simulation with aqueous phase chemistry included during intense fog, suggesting there are feedbacks between cloud chemistry (without glyoxal aqueous chemistry) and aerosol chemistry. However, similar to NO$_3^-$, average SOA (ASOA (anthropogenic)+BSOA (biogenic) + GlySOA) shows a decrease when aqueous phase chemistry is included. SOA contributes significantly to organic aerosol loading over IGP (Kaul et al., 2011; Mandariya et al., 2019).

The WRF-Chem results on aerosol composition behave similarly to observational studies. For example, Ram et al., (2012) reported an increase of EC, OC, and WSOC concentrations by ~30% during fog and haze events at Allahabad, a location in the Central IGP, and a marginal increase of these constituents at Hisar (NWIGP). Several studies report an increase in inorganic ions (NH$_4^+$, NO$_3^-$, and SO$_4^{2-}$) during fog over IGP and elsewhere (Gundel et al., 1994; Ram et al., 2012). Recent studies suggest that a significant fraction of atmospheric particulate matter in the IGP is comprised of carbonaceous aerosol (~30–35% of the PM) and water-soluble inorganic species (~10–20% of the PM) during October–January when emissions from biomass burning (including residential heating) are dominant over IGP (Ram et al., 2014; Rengarajan et al., 2007; Tare et al., 2006).

Both the simulations with and without aqueous-phase chemistry include the AR feedback. The increased PM$_{2.5}$ with aqueous phase chemistry interacts with radiation and adds to the AR feedback. Since the secondary inorganic aerosols are scattering aerosols, the increased scattering of radiation further reduces the solar radiation reaching the surface (Fig. 14a). Over CIGP the presence of higher aerosol loading reduces the T2 during daytime, particularly on the 24$^{th}$ of December which then reduces the PBL height and increases RH near the surface (Fig. 14b). These conditions favor fog formation over the CIGP. Further, the fog water content with aqueous-phase chemistry is higher than that without aqueous-phase chemistry on 24$^{th}$ December post-midnight (Fig. 13b). This is likely due to saturation of
air due to increase in RH and lower T2, induced by the AR feedback caused by the increase in PM$_{2.5}$. Although the difference in T2 is small (<0.4), favourable conditions mentioned above are conducive to fog formation. Another reason for increase in fog water content is the increase in the size of aerosols such as sulfate which grows in size by water uptake and are activated to form fog.

7 Effect of AR feedback and aqueous chemistry on the duration of fog

Aerosol and its radiative effects impact the lifetime of fog over a region and hence its distribution. Figure 15(a) shows the time-series of fog liquid water content (LWC) from WRF-Chem and fog intensity from INSAT-3D satellite similar to Fig. 4, for all three experiments with aqueous chemistry plus AR feedback, aqueous chemistry without AR feedback, and without aqueous chemistry but with AR feedback. The fog starts forming one hour earlier with AR feedback than without AR feedback. In the simulation without aqueous phase chemistry, fog formation is delayed by an hour or two compared to the simulation with aqueous chemistry plus AR feedback. Fog cover occurs for both the simulations with and without aqueous chemistry, however the fog water content is greater with aqueous chemistry than without aqueous chemistry. Fog dissipation usually occurs after sunrise when the shortwave radiative warming at the surface warms the air, which results in PBL mixing. In addition, absorbing aerosols like BC affect fog dissipation by increasing the radiative heating in and above the fog. We find an increase in BC and shortwave heating in the PBL with AR feedback (Fig. 10,11) and warming over CIGP with AR feedback. Fog intensity starts to decrease after 01 UTC (06:30 IST), however, in our study, we find that the fog dissipates completely in the afternoon (~10 UTC or 15:30 IST) for both the simulations with AR feedback and no aqueous chemistry while an hour later without AR feedback. The AR feedback induces radiative cooling of the surface and increases surface PM$_{2.5}$, which contributes to fog as CCN. Increase in CCN at 0.02% supersaturation, a value typical of fog, is observed on 24th December with AR feedback as compared to no AR feedback (Fig. 15b). As discussed in earlier sections the impact of AR feedback is more on 24th December than that on 23rd which increases RH and CCN on 24th. This facilitates the growth of aerosol and their activation to form fog droplets. Thus, AR feedback produces more fog droplets in polluted conditions and makes fog dense as indicated by the rapid increase in LWC with AR feedback. Shao et al. (2023) examined aerosol-fog interactions for two consecutive fog events by comparing WRF-Chem results with current emissions strengths to those with low emission strengths. They show that the first fog event promotes formation of the second fog event leading to wider fog distribution, and longer fog lifetime favoured by multiple feedbacks including AR feedback i.e., low temperature, high humidity and high stability similar to our study. While Shao et al. (2023) observe a delay in dissipation of the first event and early formation of second fog event, we find an early dissipation and early formation of fog with AR feedback as discussed earlier in this section. Dry deposition (ddmass) also increases in dense fog which causes rapid loss in CCN and activated aerosols during fog with AR feedback as in Fig. 15 (b and c). Thus, aqueous phase chemistry...
8 Conclusions

The effects of aerosol-radiation (AR) feedback and aqueous chemistry in air quality and fog have been assessed over IGP. We carried out three experiments using WRF-Chem testing different combinations of PBL schemes and meteorology initial and boundary conditions. The best representation of surface meteorology for the IGP region for the case study (December 20–25, 2017) used ERA-Interim reanalysis to drive the meteorology and ACM2 PBL scheme with soil moisture nudging to ERA-Interim. With this meteorology configuration for WRF-Chem, evaluation of aerosol concentrations with measurements and the impact of aerosols on atmospheric processes during fog were examined. AOD regional distribution is predicted well by the model for most of the IGP. However, AOD is underestimated over NWIGP likely due to an underestimation of fugitive emissions during wintertime cold spells. PM$_{2.5}$ daily variation concentrations are predicted well over IGP however secondary aerosols are underestimated. Increased dry deposition of PM$_{2.5}$ with cloud water droplets is observed during fog.

The AR interactions showed a significant impact on meteorology and air quality over IGP. A WRF-chem simulation with AR interactions resulted in a lower PBL height by ~50-270 m compared to a simulation without AR interactions leading to accumulation of aerosols and moisture near the surface. Reduced surface shortwave radiation flux and the surface sensible and latent heat fluxes due to aerosol radiative effect suppressed the turbulence resulting in a stable PBL. The shallow PBL further increased surface PM$_{2.5}$ (> 8 ug m$^{-3}$) and RH (2-8%) over IGP and this positive feedback mechanism promoted thickening of fog over IGP. However, an increase in absorbing aerosols in the PBL gave negative feedback, increasing the shortwave heating and temperature particularly over CIGP. Fog forms when air is saturated which occurs when the surface temperature is reduced or the moisture content increases causing saturation of air. This study suggests that increase in RH saturated the air and the increase in aerosols favoured fog formation as depicted by the thickening of fog intensity. Aqueous phase chemistry on the other hand contributed significantly to secondary aerosols in the fog, especially sulfate aerosols, indicating substantial formation of secondary aerosols in the cloud. The underpredicted secondary aerosols over NWIGP where no fog occurred implies underestimation of formation of aerosols through gas and aerosol chemistry in the model. This underestimation could also be linked to an underestimation of pH in the default MOSAIC scheme (Ruan et al., 2022) which slows the secondary aerosol formation, or an underestimation of the aqueous sulfur oxidation in haze aerosol at > 80% RH before the onset of fog (Acharja et al., 2022), or missing multiphase oxidation processes (Wang et al., 2022). We also observed that AR feedback with aqueous chemistry initiated the fog formation 1-2 hours earlier than the initiation time in the simulation without AR feedback and without aqueous phase chemistry whereas AR feedback alone led to early dissipation of fog. In addition, fog acted as an important sink of aerosols...
in a polluted environment with increased dry deposition with cloud water. Thus, AR feedback and aqueous chemistry play a significant role in modulating the distribution and concentration of aerosols and evolution of fog in the PBL.

The large emission of aerosols and trace gases in the IGP makes the atmospheric dynamics as well as chemistry complex, suggesting the need for more studies using both models and ground-based measurements to better understand the processes. While all aerosol types interact with solar radiation and reduce the surface reaching flux, presence of absorbing aerosols in the boundary layer and its vertical distribution plays an important role in modulating the meteorology over IGP. It is therefore crucial to improve the simulation of absorbing aerosols e.g., BC in the vertical as well as at the surface to increase the accuracy in predicting formation as well as the dissipation of fog in this region. Emissions from burning for residential heating are an important source of aerosols in IGP during post-monsoon and winter and the inclusion of these sources in the emission inventory would improve the prediction of wintertime aerosols. For example, the underestimation of chloride aerosol in the model indicates unaccounted emission sources over IGP. Additionally, more detailed modeling studies are required to understand the missing chemical processes if any in the model which leads to biases in sulfate-nitrate and ammonium partitioning between gas and aerosol phases. We find that the change in PBL height with AR feedback is sensitive to changes in LH, signifying the role of soil moisture in PBL dynamics.

Several studies have reported cooling over IGP due to an increase in irrigation (Kumar et al., 2017; Mishra et al., 2020). Further investigations into the role of irrigation in the increasing fog events over NWIGP would help in better understanding the formation and persistence of fog over this region. It can be concluded that fog forecasting is a complex process due to the multiple factors involved and this work suggests that AR feedback is important in fog forecasting while aqueous phase chemistry plays an important role in defining the composition of aerosols over IGP.
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Table 1 Experiment set-up for the study. Numbers in parentheses for the physics options denote the namelist settings of the WRF-Chem model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXP 1</th>
<th>EXP 2</th>
<th>EXP 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology Initial /lateral boundary Condition:</td>
<td>NCEP Final Analysis (GFS-FNL), 1° x 1°, 6 hourly</td>
<td>ERA-Interim Project, 1.125° x 0.703°, 6 hourly</td>
<td>ERA-Interim Project, 1.125° x 0.703°, 6 hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud Physics</td>
<td>Morrison 2-mom (10)</td>
<td>Morrison 2-mom (10)</td>
<td>Morrison 2-mom (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwave Radiation</td>
<td>RRTMG scheme (4)</td>
<td>RRTMG scheme (4)</td>
<td>RRTMG scheme (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortwave Radiation</td>
<td>Goddard shortwave (2)</td>
<td>RRTMG scheme (4)</td>
<td>RRTMG scheme (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Layer Physics</td>
<td>Revised MM5 Monin-Obukhov scheme (1)</td>
<td>Revised MM5 Monin-Obukhov scheme (1)</td>
<td>Pleim-Xiu (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Model</td>
<td>unified Noah land-surface model (2)</td>
<td>NoahMP (4)</td>
<td>Pleim-Xiu (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBL Scheme</td>
<td>YSU scheme (1)</td>
<td>YSU (1)</td>
<td>ACM2 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convective Parameterization</td>
<td>Grell-Freitas (3)</td>
<td>Grell-Freitas (3)</td>
<td>Grell-Freitas (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous simulation</td>
<td>*Meteorology refreshed every 24 hr</td>
<td>**Continuous simulation: Soil nudging included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: The MODIS reflectance (true color) map over Indo Gangetic Plains, India (study region) showing fog and haze cover on 23rd December (a) and 24th December (b) 2017. (c) Anthropogenic emission of PM$_{2.5}$ over IGP for December 2017 obtained from EDGAR-HTAP. The boxes represent the regions Northwest IGP (NWIGP), Central IGP (CIGP), and East IGP (EIGP).
Figure 2 Taylor Diagram of simulated (WRF-Chem) and observed (CPCB) relative humidity (left) and 2-m temperature (right) over IGP. The colors indicate the experiments. The marker (triangles) size varies with a mean bias between the experiments and observation. Upside-down triangles represent positive bias (exp-obs) and vice versa. The stations over IGP are denoted by number 1. Amritsar, 2. IGI Airport (Delhi), 3. IHBAS (Delhi), 4. Dwarka (Delhi), 5. RKP (Delhi), 6. Kanpur, 7. Lucknow, 8. Patna, 9. Muzaffarpur. The locations are marked in Fig. 1a.
Figure 3 Comparison of fog coverage from WRF-Chem and INSAT-3D satellite for 23 and 24 Dec 2017. WRF-Chem fog is represented by surface layer cloud water mixing ratios (in g m$^{-3}$) whereas INSAT-3D provides fog intensity which varies from 0 to 4 indicating SHALLOW, MODERATE, DENSE, and VERY_DENSE, respectively. The rectangle in central IGP is the region for the time series analysis.
Figure 4 Average Hourly variation of fog on 23 and 24 December 2017 from WRF-Chem EXP3 simulation and INSAT-3D satellite between 26°N-28°N,79°E-83°E (region shown in Fig 3). The time is in IST (Indian Standard Time; IST is 5.5 hours ahead of Universal Time Coordinate (UTC)).

Figure 5 Comparison of WRF-Chem AOD with MODIS observation over the model domain on 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 December 2017.
Figure 6 WRF-Chem simulated surface PM$_{2.5}$ map over IGP (a); comparison of WRF-Chem PM$_{2.5}$ with CPCB observation for the period 20-24Dec 2017 for (b) Amritsar, (c) Delhi, (d) Kanpur and (e) Patna. Dry Deposition rate of PM$_{2.5}$ for (f) Kanpur and (g) Patna. The grey dotted line in (d) Kanpur and (e) Patna is fog (QCloud) present during the study period.
Figure 7 Comparison of WRF-Chem simulated ions (SO$_4^{2-}$, NH$_4^+$, NO$_3^-$, Cl$^-$) and trace gases (SO$_2$, NH$_3$ & HCl) with the observation from WIFEX campaign at Delhi.
Figure 8 Schematic diagram of Aerosol Radiation Feedback.
Figure 9 Effect of Aerosol Radiation feedback (wFB-nFB) on (a) PBL height, (b) 2-m temperature, (c) 2-m relative humidity, (d) surface PM$_{2.5}$, (e) surface BC and (f) surface SO$_4$ for December 24 at local noon (13:30-15:30 IST). (g) The time series of $\Delta$PBL, $\Delta$T2, and $\Delta$RH; (h) $\Delta$HFX (sensible heat flux), $\Delta$LH (latent heat flux), and $\Delta$SWF (downward shortwave flux) over CIGP for December 23 and 24. $\Delta$ denotes the difference between with and without AR feedback (wFB-nFB).
Figure 10 Differences in shortwave heating rates (K h⁻¹) between simulations with and without aerosol radiation feedback (a) at the surface, and for pressure-time cross-sections over (b) NWIGP, (c) CIGP. And (d) EIGP for December 23 and 24. The solid and dashed lines are the PBL height with and without AR feedback respectively. The time is in IST.
Figure 11 Pressure-time cross-section of the differences in T, PM$_{2.5}$, BC and SO$_4^{2-}$ between simulations with and without the AR feedback for December 23 and 24. The solid and dashed lines are the PBL height with and without AR feedback respectively. The time is in IST.

Figure 12 (a) Surface ΔPM$_{2.5}$ (wAq.chem-noAq.chem) and (b) pie charts of PM$_{2.5}$ composition distribution for the two cases, with and without Aqueous phase Chemistry for 24 Dec 2017. The stations Delhi, Lucknow (LKN), and Patna are representative of NWIGP, CIGP, and EIGP regions respectively.
Figure 13 Time series of (a) PM$_{2.5}$ and its dry deposition mass concentration change (ddmass), (b) SO$_4^{2-}$, NH$_4^+$ and QCloud with and without aqueous phase chemistry included in the model, averaged over the region bounded by a black rectangle in Fig. 12.
Figure 14 Time series of (a) $\Delta HFX$ (sensible heat flux), $\Delta LH$ (latent heat flux), and $\Delta SWF$ (downward shortwave flux); (b) $\Delta T2$, $\Delta RH$, and $\Delta PBL$ over CIGP (79E-83E, 26N-28N). $\Delta$ denotes the difference between with and without aqueous phase chemistry.
Figure 15 Hourly variation in (a) fog intensity from INSAT-3D and WRF-Chem simulated QCloud cloud (b) WRF-Chem CCN at 0.02% supersaturation, and (c) WRF-Chem number of activated aerosols for, with AR feedback, no AR Feedback, and no Aqueous phase chemistry experiments. (Time in UTC)