# Weak liquid water path response in ship tracks: Supplementary Material

Anna Tippett<sup>1</sup>, Edward Gryspeerdt<sup>1</sup>, Peter Manshausen<sup>2</sup>, Philip Stier<sup>2</sup>, and Tristan W. P. Smith<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, Imperial College London, London, UK

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

<sup>3</sup>UCL Energy Institute, University College London, London, UK

### 1 Null experiment with uncorrelated winds and satellite data



**Figure S1.** The 3 cases investigated in this study: the 2018 ship tracks case, the first null experiment (with both winds and MODIS data from 2019), and the second null experiment (with winds from 2018 and MODIS data from 2019). The uncorrelated null experiment has significantly different response to the correlated null experiment, recovering more of a null response.

We consider an analogy to the null experiment of Manshausen et al. (2023), as seen in Tab. 1, where the ship locations and ERA5 winds are from the year before the satellite overpass. These winds that are used to predict the ship track locations will be essentially uncorrelated to the cloud properties retrieved, and therefore the assumption that each ship track is randomly oriented with respect to the background gradient is perhaps more valid.

5

In Fig. S1, we find that the  $N_d$  and LWP responses in the "uncorrelated null experiment" (red line) are much closer to zero compared to the "correlated null experiment" (orange line). The only difference between these two cases is the year from which the winds that are used to predict the ship track locations are taken, highlighting the importance of the correlation between the winds and the cloud properties in the null experiment. The LWP response in this uncorrelated null experiment is still weakly

10 negative, but is consistent with the LWP response in the null experiment of Manshausen et al. (2023). This may be due to there still being some correlation between winds of different years, or shipping routes being similar from year to year.



Figure S2. (a) Regional "enhancements" in the uncorrelated null experiment ship tracks (where winds and cloud data are from different years), averaged over the 36 hour length of track and central track location binned to 10°. (b) Correlation between the **mean** second derivative in LWP (local maxima) and **mean** windspeed (from ERA5). False enhancements are much closer to zero, and we do not see much correlation in yearly means of LWP and windspeed.

In Fig. S2a, we show the regional "enhancements" in LWP from our analogy to the null experiement of Manshausen et al. (2023). Fig. S2b shows the correlation between means of the LWP second derivatives and the windspeed. This essentially demonstrates that it is the correlation between winds and cloud properties in weather systems that is important for this bias,

15 rather than than climatological gradients.

#### 2 Filters on response in entire Atlantic region

If we do not subset our tracks into those in the Namibian stratocumulus deck, we obtain the  $N_d$  and LWP responses in Fig. S3. The LWP response, when compositing this large region with multiple cloud regimes, is found to be close to zero for all times,



Figure S3. Time evolution of  $N_d$  and LWP responses in (a,b) polluted and clean, (c,d) stable (high EIS) and unstable (low EIS), and (e,f) precipitating and non-precipitating background environments, for the Atlantic region of this study. A weak LWP response is seen in all cases and there is much more noise in the response.

and insensitive to the background environment of the ship tracks. The stark difference between these responses and those found

20 in the Namibian stratocumulus deck suggests that the cloud regime is an important control on the LWP response to aerosol perturbations, and that the marine stratocumulus deck is much more sensitive to aerosol loading than shallow cumulus clouds.

## 3 LWP sensitivities and radiative forcing

EIS bounds (K)	$\beta_{L-N}$	$\pm$ (95% conf. interval)
< -13.8	NaN	NaN
-13.8 to 2.1	0.091	0.077
2.1 to 3.9	0.730	0.020
3.9 to 6.9	-0.026	0.011
> 6.9	0.030	0.023

#### Table S1. EIS bins and LWP sensitivities

Following the method of Manshausen et al. (2022), we calculate the sensitivity to LWP adjustments for different EIS bins  $(\beta_{L-N})$ .

25 
$$\beta_{L-N} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\ln\mathrm{LWP}}{\mathrm{d}\ln N_d} = \frac{\ln\epsilon_L}{\ln\epsilon_N}$$
 (1)

where  $\epsilon_L$  and  $\epsilon_N$  are the corrected enhancements in LWP and  $N_d$ . We calculate the LWP enhancement after 5 hours, and the  $N_d$  enhancement before 5 hours (following Manshausen et al., 2022), to provide an estimate on the sensitivity to changes in  $N_d$ .

This is done for four different EIS bins, and the values of  $\beta_{L-N}$  for each EIS bin can be found in Tab. S1. We extrapolate 30 this globally to estimate the radiative forcing due to LWP adjustments, and the global distribution of the forcing can be seen in Fig. S4.

It is worth noting that we do not see a strong control of EIS on the LWP response, and therefore this method to calculate the forcing may not be entirely appropriate, however we use it for the sake of consistency between studies and purely to obtain an estimate of the forcing.





Figure S4. Radiative forcing from LWP adjustments to  $N_d$  perturbations

## 35 References

Manshausen, P., Watson-Parris, D., Christensen, M. W., Jalkanen, J.-P., and Stier, P.: Invisible ship tracks show large cloud sensitivity to aerosol, Nature, 610, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05122-0, number: 7930 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 2022.

Manshausen, P., Watson-Parris, D., Christensen, M. W., Jalkanen, J.-P., and Stier, P.: Rapid saturation of cloud water adjustments to shipping emissions, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 23, 12545–12555, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-23-12545-2023, publisher: Copernicus

40 GmbH, 2023.