Responses to Reviewer 1’s comments

This paper explores the performance of 14 CMIP6 models in simulating the spatial distribution, temporal variations, and components of PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations in China by comparing the models' historical run from 2000–2014 with satellite-based total PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations and ground-based PM$_{2.5}$ components data derived from the literature. It is found that PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations are generally underestimated, especially in eastern China. The concentrations of five individual components (OC, BC, sulfate, nitrate, and ammonium) are also largely underestimated. The potential causes of model biases and climate impacts on aerosol radiative forcing are also discussed. Overall, the paper is well-written, offering a thorough analysis and discussion that enhances our current understanding of the capabilities of the latest Earth system models. I have a few minor suggestions for the authors to consider.

Reply: We thank a lot the Reviewer #1 for the comments. We have studied the comments carefully and tried to incorporate as many suggested changes as possible, which have greatly helped us in improving the manuscript. Our responses to the comments and suggestions are as follows. The original comments are in green while our replies are in black.

1. Since the satellite-based PM$_{2.5}$ is one of the primary datasets used to validate CMIP6 output, it would be informative to include details about the dataset in section 2.2. This could involve specifying the aerosol species simulated by the GEOS-Chem model, discussing the accuracy of this dataset in comparison with PM$_{2.5}$ ground observations (if available), and providing information on the ground observations in China used in the dataset.

Reply: As suggested, we have added the description in Lines 175-182 and cited it here:

“The GEOS-Chem aerosol simulations include primary and secondary carbonaceous aerosols, sulfate, nitrate, ammonium, mineral dust, and sea salt. The dataset provides the annual average PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations during the period 2000–2014 with a high spatial resolution of 0.01° × 0.01° (~1 × 1 km$^2$). The adjusted satellite-derived PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations over Asia are compared with surface PM$_{2.5}$ observations collected from the Global Burden of Disease (GBD) collaborators during the period 2008–2013 ($\text{Mean}_{\text{satellite}} = 61.5 \mu g \text{m}^{-3}$ versus $\text{Mean}_{\text{obs}} = 59.1 \mu g \text{m}^{-3}$) (van Donkelaar et al., 2016) and from the China National Environmental Monitoring Center (CNEMC) during the period 2015–2019 ($\text{Mean}_{\text{satellite}} = 45.9 \mu g \text{m}^{-3}$ versus $\text{Mean}_{\text{obs}} = 43.4 \mu g \text{m}^{-3}$) (van Donkelaar et al., 2021).”

2. It may be helpful to explain why dust and sea salt concentrations are excluded from the PM$_{2.5}$ component analysis. For instance, are the ground observations available for these components?

Reply: Thanks for pointing it out. As suggested, we have added the explanation in Lines 148-150 and cited it here:

“In evaluating PM$_{2.5}$ components (Sect. 4), the evaluation of dust and sea salt concentrations is excluded due to the lack of available ground-based observations. We compare OC, BC, sulfate, nitrate, and ammonium simulations with the observed data available for these components.”

3. In Section 3.2, is the positive trend in PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations in eastern China consistent with
findings from previous studies? Do the emissions also show a positive trend in the same period?

Reply: The positive trend in PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations over eastern China is consistent with findings from previous studies. The aerosol optical depth (AOD) retrieved from the MODerate resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) over eastern China increased from 2000 to 2013 and decreased from 2015 to 2018 (de Leeuw et al., 2022). Geng et al. (2021) developed an air pollutant database named Tracking Air Pollution in China (TAP, http://tapdata.org.cn/) using information from monitor-, satellite-, and simulation-based sources. The TAP data also captures the PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations increasing rapidly before 2006 and dropping sharply after 2013.

CMIP6 emissions over eastern China also have a positive trend in the same period (Fig. R1). We have added the explanation in Lines 244-246 and cited it here:

“The positive trend of satellite data over the eastern regions is consistent with findings from previous studies of AOD and PM$_{2.5}$ (de Leeuw et al., 2022; Geng et al., 2021), as caused mainly by emission changes (Hoesly et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2022).”

![Figure R1. Trends of CMIP6 emissions for BC, CO, NH$_3$, NMVOC, NOx, OC, and SO$_2$ over eastern China from 2000 to 2014.](image)

4. In line 85, I’m not sure Sockol and Griswold (2017) examined PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations.

Reply: Thanks for pointing it out. We have modified the expression in Lines 83-86 and cited it here:

“Several studies have evaluated total PM$_{2.5}$ simulations of CMIP models over China, using AOD data from satellite retrievals (Sockol and Small Griswold, 2017; Michou et al., 2020) and ground-based aerosol networks (Mortier et al., 2020).”

5. In line 214, none of the correlations in Fig. 2 are greater than 0.9.

Reply: The correlation coefficient mentioned in Line 214 is the spatial correlation between
simulations and satellite-based data over the eastern regions. We wanted to show that four models reproducing the spatial pattern over the eastern regions well with correlation coefficients greater than 0.9.

To make it clearer, we have added the spatial correlation coefficient values over the eastern and western regions into Table S2, respectively. We have also modified the expression in Lines 226-228 and cited it here:

“Nevertheless, the spatial pattern over the eastern regions is well simulated by four models (GFDL-ESM4, GISS-E2-1-OMA, MIROC-ES2L, and MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM) \((R > 0.9, \text{as shown in Table S2})\) with the maximum center over North China correctly reproduced.”

**Table S2.** The specific values of \(a_1\) and \(a_2\) from Eq. 1. The average, trend, and spatial correlation coefficients of PM\(_{2.5}\) concentrations over the eastern regions and western regions during 2000—2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Eastern regions Average (µg m(^{-3}))</th>
<th>Trend (µg m(^{-3}) yr(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Spatial Corr.</th>
<th>Western regions Average (µg m(^{-3}))</th>
<th>Trend (µg m(^{-3}) yr(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Spatial Corr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satellite-based</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFDL-ESM4</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.06*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total PM(_{2.5}) from Direct ESM output</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISS-E2-1-OMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIROC-ES2L</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI-ESM2-0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NorESM2-LM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NorESM2-MM</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total PM(_{2.5}) from Eq. 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC-ESM1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESM2-WACCM</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRM-ESM2-1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC-Earth3-AerChem</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISS-E2-1-MATRIX</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends are estimated using the Theil-Sen Median method (Theil, 1950; Sen, 1968). Significant changes are identified using the non-parametric Mann-Kendall test (Kendall, 1938). * represents non-significant monotonous change at p = 0.05. b Spatial correlation coefficients between simulations and satellite-based data over the eastern and western regions are calculated. The spatial correlation coefficients of 14 models are at the 0.05 significance level.

6. In Fig. 2, what does NMB stand for? Normalized mean bias?

Reply: Thanks for pointing it out. NMB stands for normalized mean bias (i.e., NMB = (Mean_{simulation} / Mean_{observation} − 1) × 100%). Mean_{simulation} and Mean_{observation} are the spatial average of simulated and observed concentrations, respectively. We have added the definition of NMB in Lines 269-273 and Lines 764-765, and cited it here:

Lines 269-273: “The national average of the 14-model mean (6.5 μg m⁻³, normalized mean bias (NMB) = −59.0%), which are spatially coincidently sampled with the ground-based observations (i.e., model values are obtained from grid cells with available observations), severely underestimates the observations, especially over parts of North China with the bias reaching −40 μg m⁻³ (Fig. 5 b).”

Lines 766-767: “R stands for spatial correlation, and NMB stands for normalized mean bias.”

7. In Fig. 4, consider marking the area where correlations are statistically significant.

Reply: As suggested, we have marked the regions where the correlation coefficient is at the 0.05 significance level.

Figure 4. Spatial distribution of correlation coefficients between modeled and satellite-based data for interannual variations of annual mean total PM_{2.5} concentrations during 2000–2014. Black dots indicate a significance level of 0.05.

8. In Fig. 6, what do the dotted black lines denote?
Reply: The dotted black lines denote the spatial correlation coefficient value of 0.5. We plotted the dotted black lines as references to compare the correlations of 14 models more clearly. We have added the description of dotted black lines behind Fig. 6 (Line 784) and cited it here:

“The black dotted lines denote the spatial correlation coefficient value of 0.5.”

Reference


