

AERO-MAP: A data compilation and modelling approach to understand spatial variability in fine and coarse mode aerosol composition

Natalie M. Mahowald¹, Longlei Li¹, Julius Vira², Marje Prank², Douglas S. Hamilton³, Hitoshi Matsui⁴, Ron L. Miller⁵, P. Louis Lu^{1,6}, Ezgi Akyuz⁷, Daphne Meidan¹, Peter Hess⁸, Heikki Lihavainen⁹, Christine Wiedinmyer¹⁰, Jenny Hand¹¹, Maria Grazia Alaimo¹², Célia Alves¹³, Andres Alastuey¹⁴, Paulo Artaxo¹⁵, Africa Barreto¹⁶, Francisco Barraza¹⁷, Silvia Becagli¹⁸, Giulia Calzolari¹⁸, Shankaraman Chellam¹⁹, Ying Chen²⁰, Patrick Chuang²¹, David D. Cohen²², Cristina Colombi²³, Evangelia Diapouli²⁴, Gaetano Dongarra¹², Konstantinos Eleftheriadis²⁴, Johann Engelbrecht²⁵, Corinne Galy-Lacaux²⁶, Cassandra Gaston²⁷, Dario Gomez²⁸, Yenny González Ramos^{29,16}, Roy M. Harrison³⁰, Chris Heyes³¹, Barak Herut^{32,33}, Philip Hopke^{34,35}, Christoph Hüglin³⁶, Maria Kanakidou^{37,38,39}, Zsafia Kertesz⁴⁰, Zbigniew Klimont³¹, Katriina Kyllönen², Fabrice Lambert^{41,42}, Xiaohong Liu⁴³, Remi Losno⁴⁴, Franco Lucarelli¹⁸, Willy Maenhaut⁴⁵, Beatrice Marticorena⁴⁶, Randall V. Martin⁴⁷, Nikolaos Mihalopoulos^{37,48}, Yasser Morera-Gómez⁴⁹, Adina Paytan⁵⁰, Joseph Prospero²⁶, Sergio Rodríguez^{51,16}, Patricia Smichowski²⁸, Daniela Varrica¹², Brenna Walsh⁴⁷, Crystal Weagle⁴⁸, Xi Zhao⁴³

¹Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 14853, USA

²Finnish Meteorological Institute, Helsinki, Finland

³Department of Marine, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, North Carolina State, Raleigh, NC, USA

⁴Graduate School of Environmental Studies, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan 464-8601

⁵National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Institute for Space Studies, Columbia University, NY, NY 10025

⁶Earth and Climate Section, Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University, Durham, NC, 27708, USA

⁷Eurasia Institute of Earth Sciences, Istanbul Technical University, 34467 Istanbul, Turkey

⁸Department of Biological and Environmental Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca NY, USA

⁹SIOS Knowledge Centre, Postboks 156, 9171 Longyearbyen, Norway

¹⁰Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences at the University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA

¹¹Cooperative Institute for Research in the Atmosphere, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA,

¹²Dip. Scienze della Terra e del Mare, University of Palermo, Italy

¹³Centre for Environmental and Marine Studies (CESAM), Department of Environment, University of Aveiro, 3810-193, Aveiro, Portugal

¹⁴Institute of Environmental Assessment and Water Research (IDAEA-CSIC), 08034, Barcelona, Spain

¹⁵Instituto de Fisica, Universidade de Sao Paulo, 05508-090, Sao Paulo, SP, Brazil

- 30 ¹⁶ Izaña Atmospheric Research Center (IARC), Agencia Estatal de Meteorología (AEMET), Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain
- 31 ¹⁷ Saw Science, Invercargill, New Zealand
- 32 ¹⁸ Department of Physics and Astronomy, Universita di Firenze and INFN-Firenze, 50019 Sesto Fiorentino, Italy
- 33 ¹⁹ Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-3136, USA
- 34 ²⁰ Dept. Environ. Sci. Engr. Fudan University Jiangwan Campus 2005 Songhu Road, Shanghai, China
- 35 ²¹ Earth & Planetary Sciences Department, Institute of Marine Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA, 95064 ,
- 36 USA.
- 37 ²² Centre for Accelerator Science, Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation, New Illawarra Rd, Lucas
- 38 Heights, NSW, Australia
- 39 ²³ Environmental Monitoring Sector, Arpa Lombardia, Via Rosellini 17, 20124 Milan, Italy
- 40 ²⁴ Environmental Radioactivity & Aerosol Technology for Atmospheric & Climate impact Lab, INRaSTES, N.C.S.R.
- 41 Demokritos, 15341 Ag. Paraskevi, Attiki, Greece
- 42 ²⁵ Desert Research Institute (DRI), 2215 Raggio Parkway, Reno, Nevada 89512-1095
- 43 ²⁶ Laboratoire d'Aerologie, Universite de Toulouse, CNRS, Observatoire Midi Pyrenees, Toulouse, France
- 44 ²⁷ Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, University of Miami, Miami, FL, 33149, US
- 45 ²⁸ Comision Nacional de Energia Atomica, Gerencia Química, Av. Gral Paz 1499, B1650KNA, San Martin, Buenos Aires,
- 46 Argentina
- 47 ²⁹ Scientific Department, CIMEL, Paris, France.
- 48 ³⁰ School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT,
- 49 United Kingdom
- 50 ³¹ Energy, Climate and Environment Program, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, 2361 Laxenburg,
- 51 Austria
- 52 ³² Israel Oceanographic & Limnological Research, Tel Shikmona, Haifa, 31080, Israel
- 53 ³³ University of Haifa, Haifa, 3103301, Israel
- 54 ³⁴ Clarkson University, Potsdam, NY, USA,
- 55 ³⁵ Department of Public Health Sciences, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Rochester, NY, USA,
- 56 ³⁶ Swiss Federal Laboratories for Materials Science and Technology(EMPA), CH-8600 Duebendorf, Switzerland
- 57 ³⁷ Environmental Chemical Processes Laboratory (ECPL), Department of Chemistry, University of Crete, Heraklion, Greece.
- 58 ³⁸ Center of Studies of Air quality and Climate Change, Institute for Chemical Engineering Sciences, Foundation for
- 59 Research and Technology Hellas, Patras, Greece.
- 60 ³⁹ Excellence Chair, Institute of Environmental Physics, University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany
- 61 ⁴⁰ HUN-REN Institute for Nuclear Research (ATOMKI), Debrecen, Hungary
- 62 ⁴¹ Geography Institute, Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile, Santiago, 7820436, Chile
- 63 ⁴² Center for Climate and Resilience Research, Santiago, Chile
- 64 ⁴³ Department of Atmospheric Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843
- 65 ⁴⁴ Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris, Universite de Paris, Paris, France
- 66 ⁴⁵ Department of Chemistry, Ghent University, Gent, Belgium
- 67 ⁴⁶ Laboratoire Interuniversitaire des Systemes Atmospheriques (LISA), Universit«es Paris Est-Paris Diderot-Paris 7, UMR
- 68 CNRS 7583, Cr«eteil, France
- 69 ⁴⁷ Energy, Environmental and Chemical Engineering, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA.
- 70 ⁴⁸ Institute for Environmental Research and Sustainable Development, National Observatory of Athens, Pendeli, Greece

⁴⁹ Universidad de Navarra, Instituto de Biodiversidad y Medioambiente BIOMA, Irunlarrea 1, 31008, Pamplona, España

⁵⁰ Earth and Planetary Science, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA, USA

⁵¹ Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, IPNA CSIC, Tenerife, Canary Islands, Spain.

Correspondence to: Natalie M. Mahowald (mahowald@cornell.edu)

Abstract. Aerosol particles are an important part of the Earth-climate system, and their concentrations are spatially and temporally heterogeneous, as well as variable in size and composition. Particles can interact with incoming solar radiation and outgoing long wave radiation, change cloud properties, affect photochemistry, impact surface air quality, change the albedo of snow and ice, and modulate carbon dioxide uptake by the land and ocean. High particulate matter concentrations at the surface represent an important public health hazard. There are substantial datasets describing aerosol particles in the literature or in public health databases, but they have not been compiled for easy use by the climate and air quality modelling community. Here we present a new compilation of PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ surface observations, including measurements of aerosol composition, focusing on the spatial variability across different observational stations. Climate modelers are constantly looking for multiple independent lines of evidence to verify their models, and in situ surface concentration measurements, taken at the level of human settlement, present a valuable source of information about aerosols and their human impacts that are complementary to the column averages or integrals often retrieved from satellites. We demonstrate a method for comparing the datasets to output from global climate models that are the basis for projections of future climate and large-scale aerosol transport patterns that influence local air quality. Annual trends and seasonal cycles are discussed briefly and included in the compilation. Overall, most of the planet or even the land fraction does not have sufficient observations of surface concentrations, and especially particle composition, to characterize and understand the current distribution of particles. Climate models without ammonium nitrate aerosols omit ~10% of the globally averaged surface concentration of aerosol particles in both PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ size fractions, with up to 50% of the surface concentrations not included in some regions. In these regions, climate model aerosol forcing projections are likely to be incorrect, as they do not include important trends in short lived climate forcers.

1 Introduction

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports (IPCC, 2021; Gulev et al., 2021; Szopa et al., 2021) and other community assessments have highlighted the role of uncertainties in human-induced changes to aerosol concentration and composition in limiting our ability to project future climate. Aerosol particles are also a major contributor to air pollution, which reduces life expectancy and quality of life (Burnett et al., 2018). Aerosol particles are suspended liquids or solids in the atmosphere originating from diverse natural and anthropogenic sources and composed of a wide variety of chemicals

103 (e.g., sea salts, dust, sulfate, nitrate, black carbon, organic carbon). Particles interact with incoming solar radiation, outgoing
104 long wave radiation, change cloud properties and lifetimes, and modify atmospheric photochemistry (Mahowald et al., 2011;
105 Kanakidou et al., 2018; Bellouin et al., 2020). Once deposited on the surface, they can modify land and ocean
106 biogeochemistry, as well as the albedo of snow and ice surfaces (Mahowald et al., 2017; Hansen and Nazarenko, 2004;
107 Skiles et al., 2018). Satellite remote sensing retrievals provide important information about the temporal and spatial
108 distribution of aerosol particles, but challenges remain in quantifying the aerosol size and chemical composition (Kahn et al.,
109 2005; Tanré et al., 1997; Remer et al., 2005, Castellanos et al., 2024). In addition, the AERONET surface remote sensing
110 network provides some information about loading, size and absorbing aerosol properties related to composition (Holben et
111 al., 2001; Dubovik et al., 2002; Schuster et al., 2016; Gonçalves Ageitos et al., 2023; Obiso et al., 2023). Both the
112 magnitude of the aerosol effects on climate, and sometimes their sign, are dependent on the composition and size of particles
113 (Mahowald et al., 2011, 2014a; Bond et al., 2013; IPCC, 2021). In addition, one cannot understand the impact of humans on
114 aerosol particles without identifying the sources of particles, which determine their chemical composition. Obtaining
115 information about the composition and size of particles in many cases requires in situ observations, which are often limited
116 in space and time (Hand et al., 2017; Philip et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2018; Collaud Coen et al., 2020).

117 The climate and aerosol modelling community, especially under the auspices of AEROCOM, has compiled datasets and
118 organized comparison projects that have provided substantial information to improve aerosol models (Huneeus et al., 2011;
119 Textor and others, 2006; Dentener et al., 2006; Schulz et al., 2006; 2012; Gliš et al., 2021) or knowledge of the aerosol
120 impacts like cloud condensation nucleation (Laj et al., 2020; Fanourgakis et al., 2019). However, most of the available data
121 comes from North America and Europe (e.g., Szopa et al., 2021; Reddington et al., 2017). In addition, previous compilation
122 studies have focused primarily on understanding fine aerosol particles (here defined as particles with a diameter less than 2.5
123 μm) and improving model simulation of these particles, because of their importance for air quality, respiratory health, cloud
124 interactions and short-wave forcing (Collaud Coen et al., 2020; Bellouin et al., 2020; Fanourgakis et al., 2019; Reddington et
125 al., 2017). Coarse mode particles (defined as those particles with a diameter larger than 2.5 μm) are important for long wave
126 radiation interactions, cloud seeding and for biogeochemistry, but these interactions have received less attention (Jensen and
127 Lee, 2008; Mahowald et al., 2011; Karydis et al., 2017; Chatziparaschos et al., 2023). In contrast to the many fine aerosol
128 compilations and comparisons (usually considering particles with aerodynamic diameter less than 2.5 μm or $\text{PM}_{2.5}$), there are
129 fewer studies focusing on aerosol compilations for both fine and coarse particles, and their comparison to models (Kok et al.,
130 2014b; Albani et al., 2014b; Huneeus et al., 2011; Gliš et al., 2021; Kok et al., 2021). Nonetheless, there are many
131 observations of the coarse particle mass with diameter less than 10 μm (PM_{10}) (e.g., Hand et al., 2017), and most climate
132 models include these particles (e.g., Huneeus et al., 2011). Compilations of in situ data are available for dust and iron
133 particles (Kok et al., 2014b; Albani et al., 2014b; Mahowald et al., 2009) and for sea salts (Gong et al., 1997). Other studies
134 have focused on the important topics of wet deposition (Vet et al., 2014) or trends in aerosol properties (e.g., AOD, surface
135 PM) (Mortier et al., 2020; Aas et al., 2019). Observations of PM_{10} or coarse and fine particles are available for many regions

136 and individual sites (e.g., Malm et al., 2007; Hand et al., 2019; Maenhaut and Cafmeyer, 1998; Artaxo and Maenhaut, 1990;
137 McNeill et al., 2020) but have not previously been compiled into one database that would facilitate the evaluation of global
138 climate models that are an important tool for projections of future climate change, air quality and their impacts upon human
139 society. Aerosol modelers need as much information as possible about the observed composition of the particles and their
140 transport. Thus, there is a need to compile both PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ in situ concentration data into one database to make it easy
141 for modellers to compare global model results with observations. One goal the aerosol community should work towards is
142 making aerosol measurement datasets publicly and conveniently available, while acknowledging the principal investigators
143 who produced these datasets, which we hope this paper serves as a step towards achieving.

144 The current generation of Earth system models used for the IPCC simulations tends to include the dominant aerosol species
145 (desert dust, sea spray, black carbon (BC), organic matter (OM) and sulfate) while omitting other potentially important
146 aerosol constituents. For example, some Earth system models ignore ammonium nitrate particles although these are known
147 to be important for climate and biogeochemistry, and are impacted by human activities (Paulot et al., 2016; Adams et al.,
148 1999; Thornhill et al., 2021). In this study, we use available observations to compare to a global model estimate of the total
149 PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, and deduce the importance of these often-neglected aerosol species. We also propose a method for
150 comparing species that are often not directly measured (such as dust or sea salts) using their elemental composition. Note
151 that we exclude super coarse (>PM₁₀) particles here because of the sparsity of available measurements, although studies have
152 suggested their importance for climate interactions (e.g., Adebyi et al., 2023).

153
154 Climate modelers are constantly looking for multiple independent lines of evidence to verify their models, and in situ surface
155 concentration data presents a valuable source of information about aerosols often near human society. Understanding spatial
156 variability in aerosols, and the composition of those aerosols is key to understanding how aerosols in different regions have
157 evolved in the past, and how they will evolve in the future. Some regions are dominated by fossil fuel derived aerosols, which
158 may have peaked in magnitude, even as greenhouse gas concentrations continue to increase, while in other regions aerosols
159 are driven by agriculture or by natural aerosols (Bauer et al., 2016; Turnock et al., 2020; Kok et al., 2023). In addition, different
160 aerosol species have different impacts on climate: for example, knowing whether aerosols are scattering or absorbing changes
161 the sign of the interaction (Li et al, 2022). Some aerosols also serve as better cloud or ice nuclei than others, while
162 biogeochemical impacts are very sensitive to composition (Mahowald et al., 2011). Knowing even the order of magnitude in
163 regions with aerosols (e.g., contrasting 0.1 to 0.001) is important for aerosol-cloud interactions that can be non-linear especially
164 at low aerosol levels (Carslaw et al., 2013). Having surface concentration observational dataset with large spatial coverage
165 based on independent data can be valuable for aerosol model comparisons, especially for models with a global domain. We
166 focus most of this paper on the spatial distribution of climatological mean, as that is easily obtained from models, and the most
167 important variable for many climate impacts like radiative effects or aerosol-cloud interactions, except for aerosols dispersed
168 by large infrequent events (e.g., Clark et al., 2015; Fasullo et al., 2022). Since aerosols are thought to cause between 2 and 10

million deaths per year (Landrigan et al., 2018; Lelieveld et al., 2019; Murray et al., 2020; Vohra et al., 2021), understanding and being able to model correctly the annual mean aerosol concentrations in the surface layer is vital and thus this dataset provides valuable information towards understanding aerosol contributions to mortality. Nonetheless, there have been trends in emissions especially of anthropogenic aerosols over the last 40 years (Quaas et al., 2022; Bauer et al., 2022), and we consider these as well.

For this study we focus on the following: a) identifying and compiling available $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} aerosol data, including aerosol composition, into a new publicly available database (AERO-MAP) for the modelling community across as much of the globe as possible; b) presenting a methodology to compare the spatial distribution of the climatological mean observations to the aerosols in an Earth system model; c) briefly present some temporal trends and comparisons available from this dataset and d) identifying the measurement and modelling gaps from this comparison. While our model evaluation is not exhaustive, we hope that the convenience of this observational compilation enables an expanding and more thorough set of comparisons by future investigators.

2 Description of Methods

2.1 Observational data

PM observations are made by multiple networks, or during specific field campaigns, and for different size cut-offs, with and without a description of chemical composition. Datasets were identified by advertising at international meetings (Wiedinmyer et al., 2018), searching the literature, contacting principal investigators and accessing publicly available datasets. As expected, most of the observations are over North America or Europe, with much of the rest of the land areas and most of the ocean much more poorly observed (Fig. 1; Supplemental dataset 1). For this study, we include both $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} daily (or multiple day averages) data sets that were made available by the investigators or are available from public web sites (Fig. 1; supplemental dataset 1). Some measurement sites measure $PM_{2.5}$ and coarse ($PM_{2.5}$ to PM_{10}) aerosols. For those sites, we convert the latter to PM_{10} for comparison. Some measurement sites have only a few observations of composition or mass, while others have multiple years: we included less complete datasets at sites in regions with limited data (e.g., field data: these are identified as station datasets with less than one year of data in supplemental datasets). In some poorly measured regions, we include total suspended particles (TSP) datasets (information on the size fraction measured is in the Supplemental dataset). The time period for different datasets is included in the supplemental dataset 1.

Detailed studies have shown that PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ samplers can differ in the sharpness of their size cut-off (Hand et al., 2019). As an example, comparisons between data from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Federal Reference Method sites and data from the Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments (IMPROVE) network show that

the coarse matter from collocated sites in both networks were offset by 28% (Hand et al., 2019). There was a bias when data were compared (slope of 0.9), but the correlation coefficient was high (0.9) suggesting overall a good agreement. We focus here on surface station measurements of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, since our model and most models only consider mass up to PM₁₀. For that reason, our model deposition is not directly comparable to observational bulk/total atmospheric deposition since larger particles may dominate the deposition close to the source areas (Kok et al., 2017; Mahowald et al., 2014; Neff et al., 2013). Measuring absolute dry and wet deposition rates is also technically more challenging (especially dry deposition, since the particles can be re-entrained into the atmosphere), but worthwhile (Heimbürger et al., 2012; Prospero et al., 1996). In regions with little data (e.g., outside of North America and Europe) we include measurements of total suspended particulates (TSP) with the PM₁₀, because of the lack of size-resolved data. Data from the Japanese air quality network use a different inlet for the PM₁₀ cutoff as well, which will include a slightly larger size fraction (<https://tenbou.nies.go.jp/download/>). In addition to particulate matter in the PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} size fractions, we also compile the following observations to compare to the model: black carbon (BC), elemental carbon (EC), organic carbon (OC) (or particulate organic material, OM, that is here considered to be 1.8 x OC in mass; Aiken et al., 2008; Font et al., 2024; Turpin & Lim, 2001), sulfate, nitrate, aluminum, sodium and chloride. To include both BC (based on light absorption measurements) and EC (based on thermal oxidation induced combustion measurements) data are also a source of uncertainty, both are proxies of the soot combustion particles since they are based on different measurements techniques, and there is no accepted equivalence between them (Mbengue et al., 2021). Details on the measurement methods and types are shown in Table 1 and vary between measurements of fine and coarse, versus PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀, with different measurement types for elemental and chemical analysis (Table 1). Details on how the model is compared to data for different elements are in Section 2.3.

For this paper, we focus on the climatological means for 1986-2023 and decadal means for 2010-2019. The first period is chosen as the full duration of the individual data sets comprising the compilation are available; the second is chosen to recognize decadal variations in anthropogenic emission within the longer period and isolate a particular decade when data is most plentiful. In addition, annual means for each year the data is available is also calculated, as well as the climatological monthly means. The temporal means are calculated for all values at each station that are above the detection limit and reported here. At some stations or times, concentrations can be below the detection limit, and excluding these data or time periods could bias our average values. We focus on the stations that have more than 50% of the data above the detection limit, and exclude other sites. For those included stations, if the values were reported as below the detection limit, we include in the average one-third of the minimum detection limit. The reported detection limits should bound the upper limit of aerosol mass and allow us to include sites, whose observations were otherwise too low to include, while reducing the potential biasing of our compilation towards higher values (Supplemental dataset 1).

Our goal is to create easy-to-use datasets for model-data comparisons. Included in this dataset are several files with different levels of description and analysis. One file provides traceability information, including a detailed citation, type and number

of measurements included, as well as time period, climatological and decadal (2010-2019) means and standard deviations for each time period (Supplemental dataset 1). For each station dataset included in the database, there will be one line in this file. This means that for some stations (for example K-puszt), there are multiple lines in the supplemental file indicating the two different time periods where measurements were made as well as the two sizes that are measured during each time period. For each station dataset, there are latitude, longitudes, annual mean values, number of observations, year extent of the observations, standard deviations, etc, as well as the citation and where to obtain the data. There are also several netcdf files available at <https://zenodo.org/records/11391232> for this dataset. The most useful is likely to be the Allobervation.AEROMAP.nc file, which contains the same quantitative data for each station dataset as the supplement, except that the data is processed to be only PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ (with some TSP data in places with little data, as discussed above). That means PM_{2.5} and coarse aerosol mass are added together if the station datasets are collocated to create a PM₁₀ dataset (e.g., see Table 1). In addition, this file contains climatological monthly means, and annual means for each year for each station dataset, so that temporal information is also easily available. Another file includes the climatological mean observations averaged up to a 2°×2° grid that is used for plotting the figures shown in the paper (Allobervation.AEROMAP.2x2.nc). As indicated in the data availability, only the time-means are available and the underlying data for some datasets cannot be openly published, but please contact the authors (identified by the citation) if other time periods are desired.

The location of each site is as accurate as possible and for most sites is accurate to less than 1km. Some datasets provided more limited information and those locations are accurate only to less than 10km (data downloaded from the following air quality networks: Mexico City: <http://www.aire.cdmx.gob.mx/default.php?opc=%27aKBh%27>, South Africa <https://saaqis.environment.gov.za/>, India: <https://app.cpcbcr.com/ccr/#/caaqm-dashboard-all/caaqm-landing/data> and Chile: <https://sinca.mma.gob.cl/index.php/>).

2.2 Model description

Most of the simulations of aerosol particles were conducted using the aerosol parameterizations within the Community Atmosphere Model, version 6 (CAM6), the atmospheric component of the Community Earth System Model (CESM) developed at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) (Hurrell et al., 2013; Scanza et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2012). The aerosol module in this version is closely related to the module used in the Energy Exascale Earth System Model (Golaz et al., 2019; Caldwell et al., 2019). Simulations were conducted at approximately 1°×1° horizontal resolution with 56 vertical layers for four years, with the last three years (2013-2015) used for the analysis (Computational and Information Systems Laboratory, 2019). The model simulates three-dimensional transport and wet and dry deposition for gases and particles by nudging toward MERRA2 winds (Gelaro et al., 2017).

261 The model included prognostic dust, sea salts, BC, OM, and sulfate particles in the default version, using a modal scheme
262 based on monthly mean emissions for the year 2010 (Liu et al., 2012, 2016; Li et al., 2021). The model includes separate
263 primary and secondary organic species which are both emitted directly, but the primary organic and black carbon aerosols
264 are allowed to age in the model from hydrophobic to hydroscopic, and their optical properties also change (Liu et al., 2016).
265 The coarse mode is included for sulfate, dust and sea salts. For this study, the coarse size mode (mode 3) was returned to the
266 size parameters used in the previous version of the model: CAM5 (geometric standard deviation of 1.8) to better simulate
267 coarse mode particles, and improve the dry deposition scheme and optics used in the model for simulating coarse mode
268 particles like dust as described in Li et al. (2022).

269 Desert dust is entrained into the atmosphere in dry, sparsely vegetated regions subject to strong winds. We use the Dust
270 Entrainment and Deposition scheme (Zender et al., 2003) with the emitted size distribution given by the updated Brittle
271 Fragmentation Theory (Kok et al., 2014b, a) with improved incorporation of aspherical particles for optics and deposition (Li
272 et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2021; Kok et al., 2017). Anthropogenic emissions of sulfate, OM, and BC follow the Climate
273 Model Intercomparison Project 6 historical data for 2010 (Gidden et al., 2019). Emissions and mean concentrations for each
274 of these constituents are included in Table 2.

275 **2.2.1 Modelling of additional aerosol sources and types**

276 Ammonium nitrate aerosol particles are not included in the standard CAM6, but are thought to be important for aerosol
277 optical depth and surface concentrations (Paulot et al., 2016; Adams et al., 1999; Thornhill et al., 2021; Bauer et al., 2007,
278 2016), so they are included in this study. Nitrate can also react with dust particles, for example, but that is ignored in this
279 study (Dentener et al., 1996). Ammonium nitrate particles require tropospheric chemistry interactions because the nitrogen-
280 containing particles are both a source and a sink for gaseous nitrogen species, which are key elements of tropospheric
281 photochemistry and the particles are in chemical equilibrium with the gas phase (e.g., Nenes et al., 2021; Baker et al., 2021;
282 Bauer et al., 2007; 2016), so simulations using the CAM-CHEM model with tropospheric photochemistry are used covering
283 the same time period (Vira et al., 2022). Simulations with chemistry were conducted at $2^\circ \times 2^\circ$ resolution and are linearly
284 interpolated to $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ resolution used for the other modelled particles. Sulfate in the CAM6 is assumed to be in the form of
285 ammonium sulfate and the nitrate is assumed to be in the form of ammonium nitrate for these studies, so as a rough
286 approximation only the model ammonium nitrate is compared to the observed nitrogenous aerosol optical depth.
287 Ammonium nitrate is assumed to only form when there is surplus ammonium (and nitrate) after the ammonium sulfate is
288 formed. While aerosol amounts are simulated, ammonium nitrate aerosol optical depth is not calculated within the model
289 but offline. The model does calculate sulfate aerosol optical depth, which has a roughly similar increase in size with
290 humidity compared to nitrates, and similar optical properties as long as the nitrates and sulfates are in similar size fractions
291 (Paulot et al., 2016; Bellouin et al., 2020). Therefore the aerosol optical depth from ammonium nitrate (per unit mass) is
292 assumed to be proportional to the sulfate aerosol optical depth per unit mass in each grid box at each time interval. Detailed

comparison of the nitrate and ammonia particles, and other species was conducted in Vira et al. (2022). Overall, the model can simulate some of the spatial distribution, but overestimates the nitrate aerosol amounts (Vira et al. 2022).

2.3 Model-observation comparison methodology

Comparisons of the observations to model concentrations were done using BC, OC, SO_4^{2-} , Al, NO_3^- , NH_4^+ , and Na composition measurements. Some of these elements/compounds map directly onto model constituents (BC, OC, SO_4^{2-} , NO_3^- , and NH_4^+), while others serve as proxies for modelled constituents (Al for dust, Na for sea salts, S for sulfate, etc.). We summarize the relationships used to obtain the values from the model (Table S1), and what observations are combined to include as much information as possible from the observations. (Table S2). We use non-sea-salt sulfate in ocean regions for estimating sulfate. We use the mean Na amounts in sea salt (31%; Schlesinger, 1997) to characterize the Na amounts and include the soluble Na measurements as well (Na^+) if available when Na measurements are not available. Note that Cl cannot be used to evaluate sea salts as the Cl is degassed from aerosols, primarily due to sulfate interactions (e.g., Pio and Lopes, 1998). Some observing networks like IMPROVE use a composite of elements to deduce dust amounts (e.g., Hand et al., 2017). We do not choose to do this for two reasons: 1) at some sites not all the elements are available, and 2) because these elements derive not only from desert dust, but also from industrial sources. Note that model values come from the midpoint of the bottom level of the model (~30 m) while the observations are usually taken at 2 or 10 m high. There are several sources of measurement differences between different networks as well as between model and observations. Modelled values of PM content, which assume dry particles, are used here, while gravimetric measurements in some networks are equilibrated at 50% relative humidity, thus 5-25% of the mass of measured PM can be water (Prank et al., 2016; Burgos et al., 2020). In addition, comparisons of coarse mode composition at co-located sites in the US show that the inlet type can cause ~30% difference in measured mass (Hand et al., 2017). We include these differences in our error estimate in Section 3.2.

For the most part, we use model output for which there is a one- to-one relationship with what is being measured (BC, sulfate, etc). However, for dust this is not straightforward, as dust is composed of multiple elements. Here we use Al as a proxy for dust, as it is relatively constant (~7%) in dust (as opposed to Ca, which varies highly, or Fe which varies moderately) (Zhang et al., 2015). Al sources are primarily from dust (Mahowald et al., 2018). Assumptions about the model composition and how they are compared to observations are summarized in Table S1. For example, OM is assumed to be 1.8 times OC if OC measurements are available but not OM measurements. Different ratios of OM to OC appear in the literature, but 1.8 appears to be the best average for a mixture of aged and fresh plumes (Aiken et al., 2008; Font et al., 2024; Turpin & Lim, 2001).

Harmonizing models with different types of measurements is critical, and yet a difficult task (Huang et al., 2021). Models operate with the geometric or aerodynamic particle diameter, whereas in practise the measurements are done with a variety

of particle equivalent diameter, e.g., optical, volume equivalent, projected-area equivalent or aerodynamic diameter, depending on the instrument used (Hinds, 1999; Reid et al., 2003; Rodríguez et al., 2012). In the inlets of the samplers used for the mass-measurements and collection of PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ particles for subsequent chemical analysis, such size cut-off at 2.5 µm and 10 µm is defined in terms of aerodynamic diameter (i.e., Stokes diameter (involving size and shape) weighed by the square root of the particle density; Hinds, 1999). The sharpness of the cut-off of such inlets influences the PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ mass concentration (Hand et al., 2019; Wilson et al., 2002). The PM₁₀ size cut-off aerodynamic diameter is equivalent to PM_{6.3} geometric diameter for spherical dust particles (Hinds, 1999; Rodríguez et al., 2012) and to PM_{6.9} in the case of dust elliptical particles (Huang et al., 2021). Similarly, for dust, PM_{2.5} (aerodynamic diameter) is equivalent to PM_{1.6} (geometric diameter). These differences are important to keep in mind, but the information is not available for all networks, so we include the size cutoff as an uncertainty in the model/data comparisons as described in Section 3.2.

For ease of viewing the data in this paper in the densely sampled regions as well as to compare model output to more representative spatial scales, observational records from different sites were combined into a mean within a grid cell that is two times the model resolution, or approximately $2^\circ \times 2^\circ$. This process averages the observations over a spatial scale appropriate for comparison with the chemistry model (Schutgens et al., 2016). We provide both the climatological annual average data at each site as well as the $2^\circ \times 2^\circ$ grid-averaged data (with the modelled data at doi: 10.5281/zenodo.10459654, Mahowald et al., 2024). In this dataset, the number of station datasets included in the average is included (stations) and the number of observations add up across all the station datasets included.

Notice that we include both urban regions and rural or remote sites into the same dataset. Some of the original metadata did not include the resolution of the location to better than 0.1 degrees, so that the coordinates of the locations here provided with the gridded data should not be used for finer resolution studies. Because of the importance and size of megacities, which cross multiple grid boxes, as well as the difficulty in separating urban vs. rural sites, we include urban and rural air quality data in the same dataset, and previous studies show the expected differences between urban and rural concentrations and trends (e.g., Hand et al., 2019).

Statistical comparison across the globe and different regions are included in the supplemental tables. These include model and observational averages, Kendall correlation coefficients (rank correlations), linear regression slopes and uncertainties, as well as root mean squared differences. We also include the fraction of the model/data comparison which is outside the error bounds defined in Section 3.2. These results are included in tables in the supplement and referred to in the text as appropriate.

There are multiple sources of uncertainties in the observations used in the model-data comparisons of PM concentrations at the global model grid scale: errors in the measurements, differences in measurement methods, variability in aerosol concentrations during events versus background conditions, spatial variability within a model grid box, and interannual

variability. To assess the size of these uncertainties, we look at the normalized standard deviation (defined as the standard deviation over the mean) due to these factors in the observations for within year, within a $2^{\circ} \times 2^{\circ}$ degree grid and for interannual variability. To evaluate within year and between year variability, we focus on stations that have more than 10 years of data. To evaluate spatial variability within grid boxes, we use grid boxes that have more than 10 stations within them. Notice that these grid boxes are likely to lie close to cities and fossil fuel source regions, because the measurement network is more dense there, perhaps exaggerating the importance of spatial variability. In addition, different measurement methods (dry vs. moist aerosol mass, different inlet geometries) complicate the comparison of data. We assume here a measurement method uncertainty of 30% that is on the high side of previous studies (Prank et al., 2016; Burgos et al., 2020; Hand et al., 2017). Many of the measurements also include an assessment of their uncertainty or of the minimum detected limit: we use that to assess the average uncertainty of individual measurements (measurement errors).

2.4 Temporal aerosol variability

While the main goal of this study is to highlight and compile in one place the many surface concentration observational datasets available to compare against models, and we focus on the climatological annual mean, the datasets also include temporal variability. Annual means, standard deviations and the number of observations for each station for each year are included to allow for analysis of interannual variability or trends. In addition, the climatological monthly mean, standard deviation and number of observations is also available in order to assess the seasonal cycle. These values are all available in the Allobservations.AEROMAP.nc file available at doi: 10.5281/zenodo.10459654.

To illustrate the included data, the trends in the $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} aerosols are calculated over 2000-2023, over 8 different regions: North America, South America, Africa, Europe and Asia. Only data after 2000 is included because there is much more data after 2000 than prior (see Section 3.1). All station datasets with more than 8 years of data are included in the calculation. In order to decrease the bias and uncertainty due to the large temporal and spatial variability (similar to Hand et al., 2024), we divide the annual mean at each station by the climatological annual mean over the two time periods, and average this with the other stations within the region. We then use a Theil regression which calculates the slopes excluding different datapoints and takes the median slope to reduce dependence on outliers (Hand et al., 2024). Median, 33 and 66 percentile slopes are calculated to show the median and 1-sigma uncertainties for each region.

The seasonal cycle of aerosols can provide important information about the source strength and variability, as well as meteorological constraints (Gui et al., 2021; Rasch et al., 2000). To illustrate the value of the evaluation of the seasonal cycle in models, we calculate the climatological monthly mean in the observations and model and compare the correlation of these values, as well as the standard deviation of the 12 month means in the model versus the observations. This method

allows us to separately evaluate the seasonal cycle from the spatial distribution. The correlation is only calculated at stations where the seasonal cycle is large enough: in math terms our criteria is where the observed standard deviation across months is larger than half of the average observed within month variability.

3 Results

3.1 AEROMAP observational data set

First, we assessed the amount of data and the number of station datasets within each $\sim 2^\circ \times 2^\circ$ gridded area (Fig. 1). The observational dataset provides coverage predominately over North America and Europe for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} , as noted by previous studies (e.g., Szopa et al., 2021), but in addition we provide here a synthesis of more air quality data in other regions, especially Asia (Fig. 1). This compilation data set comprises most of the individual observations (at daily or longer time periods) of total $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ (Fig. 1a, 1e: blue bars) and most of the observing stations (Fig. 1e and blue line). Approximately 15,000 stations and over 20 million observations are included in this compilation.

Notice that there are two to three orders of magnitude more individual observations for the total mass (PM) of particles compared to information about the composition of particles (Fig. 1e), which is shown also by contrasting the spatial distribution of measurements between $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ and measured amounts of OM (Fig. 1a versus 1b), as well as a large difference between the number of station datasets measuring the total mass versus the speciated aerosol particles like OM (Fig. 1c versus 1d). While this dataset presents a huge increase in the amount of data available to the aerosol modelling community (for example, an eight-fold increase compared to the datasets included in Reddington et al., 2017), still the dominant proportion of the total $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ or PM_{10} data are clustered over a few industrialized land regions, and there is little composition information over most of the globe (Fig. 1).

3.2 Uncertainties in model-data comparisons

Our goal in this study was to identify observational datasets and compile them together into one easy-to-use dataset for climate and air quality modelers. To do that we collect all available datasets, prioritizing long-term stations with composition data, but in regions with few measurements, we include only PM data, or data collected during field campaigns, which may last only a month or two. Previous studies have shown that even a 1-day average aerosol measurements, carried out on cruises, can constrain aerosol concentrations within a order of magnitude (1-sigma) for phosphorus in dust, which varies spatially by 4 orders of magnitude (Mahowald et al., 2008). Other studies have highlighted that even for particles that have highly variable sources, such as dust, that only a few months of observations are enough to characterize the mean and standard deviation in most places across the globe (Smith et al., 2017). However, that study highlighted that for places where dust events do not occur every year or occur with varying number, like near South America, several years are required to characterize the mean (Smith et al., 2017).

415 Uncertainties in the observation-model comparisons can include both uncertainties in the observations, as well as interannual
416 variability in both the model and observations that are temporally averaged. Uncertainties used in the comparisons of aerosols
417 at the global model grid scale come from multiple sources: errors in the measurements, differences in measurement methods,
418 variability in aerosol concentrations during events versus background conditions, spatial variability within a model grid box,
419 and interannual variability, as discussed in Section 2.3. To assess the size of the variability contribution to the uncertainties,
420 we look at the normalized standard deviation (defined as the standard deviation over the mean) due to these factors in the
421 observations for within year, within grid and interannual variability. Nonetheless, our estimate of spatial variability will
422 underestimate the true value in the absence of sufficient spatial coverage. In addition, different measurement methods (dry vs.
423 moist aerosol mass, different inlet geometries) complicate the comparison of data (Section 2.3 discusses sources of
424 uncertainties in more detail). We assume here a measurement method uncertainty of 30% that is on the high side used in
425 previous studies (Prank et al., 2016; Burgos et al., 2020; Hand et al., 2017). Many of the measurements also include an
426 assessment of their uncertainty: we use that to assess the average uncertainty of individual measurements due to measurement
427 errors.

428 We focus on the uncertainties in the PM_{2.5} measurements first. The largest uncertainties are associated with within-year
429 variability (0.53) (Figure 1f; Table S3). This is because most of the aerosol mass can sometimes come in a few pollution
430 events. Uncertainty due to combining different measurement methods (0.3) and from spatial variability within a model grid
431 cell (0.24) are also important (Figure 1g). Both interannual variability (0.18) and measurement errors (0.08) are smaller but
432 important contributions to uncertainty. The importance of within year variability (which is similar to within month variability:
433 see Table S4) is consistent with studies showing that in most places, there are a few pollution events carrying much of the
434 mass, and with otherwise much lower background concentrations (Luo et al., 2003; Fiore et al., 2022). Obviously, interannual
435 variability is important for secular trends (Gupta et al., 2022; Watson-Parris et al., 2020; Mahowald et al, 2010), but in this
436 compilation the interannual variability is much smaller than the 2-4 orders of magnitude of the spatial variability across the
437 globe, and thus can be neglected for understanding global spatial distributions (Figure 1f).

438 These sources of uncertainties occur simultaneously and if we sum them assuming orthogonality, we obtain an normalized
439 uncertainty of ~0.68 (Table S3), which was interpreted as meaning that model/data comparisons within a factor or three should
440 be considered adequate. To ease the visual evaluation of the comparison we show in the following scatter plots both the 1:1
441 line and the range within a factor of 3. We discuss an example of uncertainties in more detail in Section 3.3. Notice that if we
442 use the same metric (normalized standard deviation) to evaluate the variability across the climatological concentrations
443 measured in the observations at different locations (Figure 3a) or across the grid averages in the model we obtain 1.0 and 2.2,
444 respectively, much larger than the uncertainties (0.6): there is much more variability across different grid boxes (4-5 orders of
445 magnitude: see Figure 2d) than across different years (up to 50% normalized standard deviation; Figure 2f). As expected, the
446 model contains more spatial variability than the observations, as the model reports concentrations in very high (North Africa)

447 and very low (Antarctica) aerosol regions where we have no data, although where we have data, the model simulates a similar
448 range (Figure 3a). For composition measurements, there is larger uncertainty in some individual species (e.g., BC and Al)
449 than for PM. However there are many fewer composition observations (Table S3). Since the statistics of the uncertainty
450 calculations are likely more robust with the bulk PM measurements, as there are an order of magnitude more data for the bulk
451 PM data, we use the uncertainty estimate derived for PM for all of the composition data in this paper.

452 There is time variation in how much data is available for both $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} data (Figure 2a and 2b), with the most data
453 available between 2010 and 2020. Different regions have slightly different trends in the amount of data (Figure 2). For much
454 of this paper we will discuss global and regional comparisons, and the regions we focus on are Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe,
455 North America, South America and the high latitudes (Figure 2c).

456 Trends in aerosols are an important scientific question, although for most of this paper we use the climatological annual
457 mean. What if there were strong trends in the aerosols; would that lead to differences between our climatological means and
458 what we expect for some decades? In order to assess this, we look at the individual annual means for each station with more
459 than 8 years of data and see if the individual annual mean is ever outside of the 3x uncertainty calculated here. Out of the
460 13320 station datasets for $PM_{2.5}$ or PM_{10} which have more than 8 years of data, only 175 (1.3%) have an annual average
461 outside the uncertainty estimated here. Of those with a value outside the uncertainty, only 10 (<0.01%) have a statistically
462 significant trend. This suggests that for the temporal interval we have chosen for the climatology, long term trends are not a
463 significant source of differences in the spatial climatological dataset presented here. Nonetheless, we acknowledge that in
464 regions where aerosol emissions increase and then decrease over our multi-decadal observational record (e.g. China), our test
465 for trends will not reveal where the climatology over the full period is less representative of individual decades. We also
466 supply in the compiled dataset a decadal mean for the time period of 2010-2019, which is made publicly available. A
467 comparison of the climatological mean versus the decadal mean for the $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} concentrations show that for almost
468 all locations, there is a small difference between the two values, and they lie on a one-to-one line (Figure 2d and 2e; Table
469 S4). There are a few station datasets (<5%) which have a difference between the climatological mean and the decadal
470 mean that is larger than 20%, and very few (<0.05%) have a difference which is larger than the uncertainties described in
471 this section (factor of 3; Table S4). The biggest difference between the climatological and decadal average values is the
472 number of station datasets and observations and thus spatial coverage: we lose between 20% and 100% of the station
473 datasets, depending on the size and composition, when we use the decadal means (Table S5). This is because even though
474 this is the most observed decade, still some datasets are outside this time period. In order to emphasize the spatial
475 distribution of the datasets, and because the climatological values are so similar to the decadal means, we will show just the
476 climatological values in the next few sections, although both are available (Supplemental dataset 1 and
477 <https://zenodo.org/records/10459654>).

3.3 PM_{2.5} model-data comparison

Modelled concentrations of PM_{2.5} are more often compared against observations than for PM₁₀ or other size fractions, and comprise an important portion of the particulate matter associated with human activities. Therefore, we describe first the observational synthesis and comparison to model results for PM_{2.5}. Because the high number of observations in some parts of the world would make the figures unreadable, the observations are gridded onto an approximately 2°×2° grid for comparisons with the model, although individual data points are still difficult to read (Fig. 3a). The maps illustrate where the observational comparison in the scatter plot is made, and focused maps of each major region are available in the supplement (Figure S1) as well as global and regional statistics (Table S5). As expected, in the model the highest concentrations are over the desert dust regions, such as North Africa, and over heavily industrialized regions in Asia. For the heavily industrialized regions in Asia, these high values are consistent with the observations, but the regions in North Africa with the highest modelled values do not have similar observational validation for high concentration values due to a lack of data (Fig. 3a).

Overall, the model is able to simulate much of the spatial variability in PM_{2.5} over two orders of magnitude (Fig. 3a and 3c), however there is a tendency to overestimate in the PM_{2.5} over India and China (Fig. 3b), although the mean over all the regions is within the 3x uncertainty (Fig. 3c: bold symbols). In addition, there are some observations (globally ~6% Table S6) that are outside the 3x uncertainty estimates (Figure 3c and 3d). The scatterplots show the comparisons of the model to the observations using the gridded data (Fig. 3c) and all original data (Fig. 3d), and the correlation coefficients are similar (0.60 vs. 0.67 in Fig 3c and Fig 3d, respectively). It is interesting that the correlation using the ungridded data (Fig 3d) is slightly higher, perhaps because the model does better in regions with more data, although this is not a statistically significant result. The averages over different regions show that on average, the model is simulating the regions within the uncertainty (bold black symbols in Fig 3d; Table S5).

As an example of the source of the uncertainties discussed in Section 3.2, we discuss the differences over India and China in the Asia region in more detail. It seems likely that at least some of these errors are due to an overestimate in the emission databases, since satellite based remote sensing has suggested that models overestimate in SO₂ over China (Luo et al., 2020). In addition, these discrepancies could be due to an error in the aerosol transport or chemical modelling, such as incorrect reaction rates or deposition rates or the alternatively due to differences in the time period: the observations are more recent while the assumptions for the emissions are for the year 2010 (Quass et al., 2021). The comparison using the decadal averages (2010-2019) show similar biases (Figure S2) as expected since the decadal averages are so similar to the climatological averages (Figure 2d), which suggests the time differences may not be the most important factor. In addition, notice that once averaged over the 2°×2° grids more observations are within a factor of 3, our uncertainty bound (contrast 3c and 3d). However, there could also be methodological and analytical differences due to which group or network did the observations or the exact locations of the different monitors. Much of the data in those regions are not usually included in routinely used previous compilations of data (e.g., Reddington et al., 2017), so the fact that previous model studies have not

510 been able to assess emission datasets in these regions could also partially explain this discrepancy. Comparison between
511 different observations in some cities (Fig. 4) shows that in these grid boxes there can be very large differences (~factor of 3)
512 between the annually averaged values reported at nearby stations within 1° distance radially. Notice that the AirNow
513 measurements (<https://www.airnow.gov/international/us-embassies-and-consulates/> on the US embassies) tend to be
514 higher than those reported from government air quality networks. The sites compared are in large cities and thus are likely to
515 have strong local sources and intense gradients in pollutants. For now, we keep in mind this large difference, but continue to
516 use the observations. As indicated below, in these regions we do not have measurements of composition so we do not know
517 which constituents are poorly simulated in our emissions or transport modelling. More statistics describing the model data
518 comparisons are shown in Table S5.

519 Next, we consider the composition of the PM_{2.5} aerosol in the model versus the observations. The model simulates high and
520 low values of sulfate observed with a correlation coefficient of 0.64. Sulfate particles concentration are on the high side in
521 the model in several regions: more so in North America, Africa, but less so for Europe and other regions (Fig. 5a and b;
522 Figure S3; Table S5), although all of the regional means are within the 3x uncertainty (bold symbols in Fig. 5b). Previous
523 studies have compared SO₄²⁻ aerosol observations to some model simulations and have not noted this bias (e.g., Barrie et al.,
524 2001; Aas et al., 2019) but this bias was seen in this model and attributed to the simple chemistry included in the model (Liu
525 et al., 2012; Yang et al., 2018). About 18% of the climatological mean model values are outside the 3x uncertainty, and a
526 larger fraction is outside for Africa, Australia and South America, where there is less data (Table S5).

527 BC comparisons suggest the model results are roughly able ($r=0.63$, within the 3x uncertainty) to capture the spatial
528 dynamics of this aerosol across more than 2 orders of magnitude, although in some regions model values are on the low side
529 (Europe and Asia) (Fig. 5c and d; Fig. S4; Table S5). This is similar to previous model intercomparisons (Koch et al., 2009;
530 Bond et al., 2004, 2013; Liu et al., 2012, 2016). About 18% of the model values are outside the uncertainty bounds, and
531 many of these values come from Europe, where 36% of the values in Europe are outside the uncertainty bounds (Table S5).
532 Simulations of OM in the default model (Fig. 5e) suggest that the model is within the uncertainty of most of the data, and the
533 regional averages are close to the 1:1 line (Fig. 5f). Correctly modelling organic material is very difficult both due to the
534 sparsity of data for comparison, as well as the importance of both primary and secondary OM in PM (Heald et al., 2010;
535 Kanakidou et al., 2005; Olson et al., 1997; Tsigaridis et al., 2014), and previous studies with this model have noted an
536 overestimate in comparison with surface observations (Liu et al., 2012).

537 As a proxy for sea salts, we use the elemental data of the major component, Na, and we see the highest values over oceans
538 and lower values over land, as expected and seen in the observations (Fig. 5g). Although most of the data is within the
539 uncertainties (30% is outside the uncertainties; Table S5), the model tends to be too high at low Na and too low at high Na in
540 North America, where much of the data are available (Fig. 5g and h; also seen in slopes Table S5), which has been seen

541 previously with this model (Liu et al., 2012). Notice that we do not include industrial emissions of Na, but the
542 concentrations far inland include some Na, suggesting land-based natural or industrial sources. As a proxy for dust, we use
543 Al amounts (Fig. 5i and j), which globally and over dust regions are dominated by dust, although there are few observational
544 datasets in high dust regions. The comparisons suggest the model is able to simulate dust (correlation coefficient=0.5, Table
545 S5) across 4 orders of magnitude, similar to previous studies (Liu et al., 2012; Albani et al., 2014a; Li et al., 2022; Huneus
546 et al., 2011) although there is a tendency for a high bias in the models over low dust regions and a low bias in high dust
547 regions, similar to sea salts (Fig. 5i and 5j; also seen in the slopes in Table S5). One reason for this overestimate of PM_{2.5}
548 aerosol mass for constituents like sea salt and dust that are predominantly in the coarse mode, is that the coarse mode in this
549 model has a wide enough standard deviation that it contributes significantly to the PM_{2.5} size fraction (Ke et al., 2022; Li et
550 al., in prep.). Better resolution of the coarse mode aerosol may be required to better simulate these aerosols (Ke et al., 2022;
551 Li et al., in prep.).

552 Next, we consider the ammonium nitrate that requires complicated gas-aerosol phase equilibrium to correctly simulate (e.g.,
553 Bauer et al., 2007; Thornhill et al., 2021; Adams et al., 2001; Regayre et al., 2018; Seinfeld and Pandis, 2006; Wolff, 1984).
554 To summarize these complicated interactions, because SO₄²⁻ is a stronger acid than NO₃⁻ in the atmosphere, the basic NH₄⁺ is
555 preferentially found with SO₄²⁻. Thus NO₃⁻ particles will only form if there is sufficient NH₄⁺ available. As described in the
556 methods, to include these particles we added to the aerosol mass simulations from a different version of the same model
557 which include chemistry (Vira et al., 2022), and a more process-based source of ammonia (Vira et al., 2020) since the default
558 CESM2 version used here does not include chemistry. Note that even in the chemistry version of the model for CESM2 the
559 complicated gas-aerosol phase thermodynamic equilibrium calculations are not included, which causes errors in the
560 simulation of the amounts of nitrogen aerosol (e.g., Bauer et al., 2007; Thornhill et al., 2021; Adams et al., 2001; Regayre et
561 al., 2018; Nenes et al., 2021). Thus while the NH₃ agricultural emission scheme used in this model is state-of-the-art, the
562 lack of an adequate gas-aerosol phase separation may lead to biases as discussed in Vira et al. (2022). In addition, recent
563 studies have suggested that emissions of NH₄ from vehicles should be 1.8x higher than previously estimated (Toro et al.,
564 2024), highlighting the difficulty of adequate emission datasets for nitrogenous aerosol precursors. NO₃⁻ particles compared
565 against available observations show that over 2 orders of magnitude, the model results are able to simulate the spatial
566 variability (correlation coefficient=0.55), but the model tends to overestimate the observations by about a factor of 2 (except
567 in South America), similar to what was seen in Vira et al., (2022) (Fig. 5k, 5l, Table S5). The model surface concentration
568 NO₃ values are with most of the data within the uncertainties (Fig. 5k and l; 46% are outside the uncertainty bounds in Table
569 S6). The model and data distribution of NH₄⁺ show the high values of NH₄⁺ over agricultural regions especially (e.g., Vira et
570 al., 2022), like the mid-western US or central Europe (Fig. 5m and Fig. 5n; correlation coefficient=0.52). The NH₄⁺ in the
571 simulation used here compares well to available observations across the different regions by having the regional averages
572 being close to the 1:1 line (Fig. 5n), most of the individual model-data comparisons being within the uncertainties at most
573 observational sites (Fig. 5m and n; and 16% of the data is outside the uncertainty bounds in Table S5).

How would these comparisons change if we used the decadal 2010-2019 averages instead of the climatological averages of the observations? As expected from the similarity between the observations averaged over these two time periods (Section 3.2; Table S4) the results do not substantially change (>20%) in most regions where there is a similar amount of data (Fig. S2a; Table S6). But for some regions and composition datasets, there is much less data (>25% less data), and in those cases, there can be large differences between using the decadal averages versus the climatological averages (Table S6). This suggests that using the climatological averages for our comparisons for PM_{2.5} allows us to include more data and evaluate more regions, without including much bias, since interannual variability is a small source of uncertainty compared to other uncertainties (Table S4).

3.4 PM₁₀ model-data comparison

PM₁₀ was the first size selective standard for particulate air quality until more studies showed that smaller particles (PM_{2.5} or PM₁) were more relevant for health impacts and PM_{2.5} standards were added (e.g., <https://www.epa.gov/pm-pollution/timeline-particulate-matter-pm-national-ambient-air-quality-standards-naaqs>, accessed October 4, 2023). However, there are still many PM₁₀ measurements routinely made (Fig 1d; Fig. 7a). The model is able to simulate PM₁₀ concentrations across 2 orders of magnitude with some skill (correlation=0.55; Fig. 7a and 6b), as most of the data is within the uncertainties (Fig. 5a, b and c; 8% of data is outside the uncertainty Table S7). Gridding the data before comparing to the model results in a slightly higher correlation across space as including all data (0.55 vs. 0.72; Fig 5b vs. c). More statistical comparisons are shown in Table S7. The regional averages are all within the uncertainty bounds for all regions.

There are fewer comparisons with PM₁₀ composition data available in the literature: usually only sea salts and dust are compared to observations that include the coarse mode (Gong et al., 2003; Ginoux et al., 2001; Albani et al., 2014b; Mahowald et al., 2006). Comparisons for SO₄²⁻ suggest that the model can estimate the distribution of the high and low concentrations (correlation coefficient=0.43), but tends to over predict PM₁₀ values across most regions (Africa, Australia, Europe, North America and South America), as many observations are too high and outside the uncertainty bounds (Fig. 7a and b.; Table S7 indicates 48% of the model values are outside the uncertainty bounds). For BC, the PM₁₀ simulation captures the range of values (correlation coefficient of 0.47), with most of the model results within the uncertainty bounds of the observations across all the regions (Fig. 7c and d; 16% outside the uncertainty bounds in Table S7). There is suggestion in the observations that there may be some fraction of BC in the coarse mode, since there is more BC in PM₁₀ than in PM_{2.5}, but in the simulations used here there is no mass in the coarse mode (compare Fig. 7c versus 5c). The model-data comparisons simulations for OM suggest a good spatial distribution of OM (correlation coefficient=0.43) and the modelled regional averages are similar to the observations. Again, the model does not simulate coarse mode OM currently, and does not include primary biogenics (Jaenicke, 1979; Mahowald et al., 2008), and yet can match the observations. The limited Na (indicating sea salt) data suggest the model can simulate the spatial distribution (correlation coefficient=0.49), but tends to overestimate and has many observations outside the error bound (Fig. 7g and h; 50% of the observations are outside the

uncertainty bounds in Table S7), as was seen previously (Liu et al., 2012). Most of the regional averages, however, are just on the line of the uncertainty bounds (Fig. 7h). Comparisons with Al (used here as a proxy for dust) show that the spatial variability is correlated between model and observations (correlation coefficient of 0.46), but the model overpredicts the concentrations in high dust regions and underestimates in low dust region (Fig 7i and 7j; 54% of the observations are outside the uncertainty bounds in Table S7). The largest overestimates are in Asia and Africa (Fig 7i and 7j). Dust models are compared against aerosol optical depth, deposition and surface concentrations and it is currently not possible to simulate all of these different types of measurements at the same time, consistent with previous studies with this model (Li et al., 2022; Kok et al., 2014b; Albani et al., 2014a; Matsui and Mahowald, 2017; Zhao et al., 2022), and indeed across most dust models (Huneus et al., 2011).

The model simulations of NO_3^- suggest too high values in high NO_3^- areas, and too low in low NO_3^- regions, especially in the limited data for the South American region (Fig. 7k and l; Table S7 shows 69% of the data is outside the uncertainty bounds). NH_4^+ shows a slightly better comparison to the limited available data (Fig. 7m and n) as seen in Vira et al. (2022). As discussed earlier, the model does not include other forms of nitrate aerosols which may be important, such as the reaction of nitrate with dust aerosols (Wolff, 1984; Dentener et al., 1996; Xu and Penner, 2012).

If we compared instead to the decadal averages rather than the climatological averages, we would obtain similar results in many cases (Fig. 2b; Table S8), but being limited to decadal averages reduces substantially the amount of observations available for comparison. The few regions which lose less than 25% of the data sets when we temporally limit our comparison have similar statistics similar as in the $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ comparisons. Again, this suggests that using the climatological averages includes more regions in the comparisons without evidence that it increases bias, because of the small amount of interannual variability in this data set (Section 3.2).

3.5 Temporal variability

This paper emphasizes the expanded spatial coverage in this compiled dataset with the spatial comparisons in Section 3.2-3.5, but the dataset also contains temporal variability as well. To illustrate the type of temporal data within this dataset we present briefly some common metrics. First, we consider what trends this data suggests in the surface concentrations for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} . Because most of this data comes from after 2000 (Figure 2a and 2b), we focus on the trends between 2000-2023. We also average by region in order to obtain a large-scale trend in surface concentrations (see details of methods in Section 2.5). Overall, the observations suggest that there is a statistically significant (1-sigma) decrease in aerosols over this time period of about 1% per year for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ for North America, South America, Africa, and Europe, but not a statistically significant change over Asia and Australia (Figure 8a). These downward trends are similar to those seen in other studies including North America and Europe (Hand et al., 2024; Gui et al., 2021; Gupta et al., 2020; Mortier et al., 2020) and South America (Mortier et al., 2020), and the more ambivalent signals over Asia and Australia have also been seen (Gui et al.,

2021; Gupta et al., 2020; Mortier et al., 2020). For PM₁₀, there are different trends: North America and Europe have a statistically significant downward trend of about 1%/year while Asia has a larger downward trend of about 3% per year, but the error bar overlaps the 0 line for the south American, Africa and Australian regions, indicating that those regions do not have statistically significant downward trends. There are no other studies we know of that looked at trends in PM₁₀ specifically. Note that we do not compare against the model results here, as our example model simulation does not include emission trends, but these datasets include each station's annual average so that more detailed comparisons could be conducted. In addition, apparently these trends do occur long enough to cause a large bias in the climatology (Section 3.2)

Next, we use the climatological monthly mean data for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ and compare against the model to see how well the models simulate the seasonal cycle. There are many ways to evaluate the seasonality in the literature (Gleckler et al., 2008; Henriksson et al., 2011; Huneus et al., 2011; Rasch et al., 2000). We chose one way here, but this dataset could be used in other ways as well. The models can simulate the timing of the seasonal cycle well across most regions as seen in correlations between the climatological monthly mean in the model and observation (Figure 9a and 9b), but there are several regions where the model is not capturing the timing of the seasonal cycle (e.g., northern India, Turkey, New Zealand). The spatial distribution of the size of the seasonal cycle (defined here as the standard deviation in the climatological monthly mean) is less well simulated than the annual mean (contrast Fig. 8d with Fig. 3c and 8f with 6c: the correlation coefficients are smaller and there is more spread in the comparisons with the scatter plot). Examining whether this is a model-specific result or more generally occurs in the models would help discriminate between errors in the input emission datasets or meteorological errors in the model (e.g., Huneus et al., 2011).

3.6 Data and model coverage

The compilation shown here is the most comprehensive currently available for describing the spatial variability of the total mass and composition of in situ particulate surface concentration data, and yet it highlights the lack of sufficient data to constrain the current global distribution of particles and their composition (Fig. 10a and b). Only 3% of the grid boxes (2°×2°) have PM_{2.5} data (about 10% of land grid boxes), and only 0.3% have sufficient data to constrain most of the composition (defined as having 90% of the variables considered here: total mass, SO₄²⁻, BC, OM, Na or Cl, Al or dust, NO₃⁻ and NH₄⁺). There are even less data available to characterize PM₁₀ (Fig. 10b), which is less important for air quality and aerosol-cloud interactions but more important for aerosol-biogeochemistry interactions and long wave interactions (Mahowald et al., 2011; Li et al., 2022a; Lim et al., 2012; Kanakidou et al., 2018). Because of the high spatial and temporal variability of coarse aerosols and the lack of satellite or other remote sensing data to characterize coarse sizes, this lack of data is a severe handicap in constraining aerosol radiative forcing, its uncertainties and other impacts of particles in the climate system. Indeed, many of these regions have also been identified as regions lacking sufficient remote sensing data for climate and air quality purposes (Millet et al., 2024).

673 In this paper, we included nitrate aerosols, which are not included in the default CESM simulations conducted for climate,
674 and represent about 10% of the globally averaged surface concentration mass (Table 2; Fig. S18 and S19). When we look
675 spatially, the default particles are the dominant particles over most of the planet (Fig. 11), but in many regions for both PM_{2.5}
676 and PM₁₀, the default aerosol scheme includes less than 50% of the aerosol particles (Fig. 10a and c), with substantial
677 contributions from the nitrate particles that we add to the simulation (Fig. 10b and d). The CESM2 (and some other climate
678 models) do not include nitrogen particles (NO₃⁻ and NH₄⁺), because of the substantial complexity and computation load of
679 chemistry and gas-aerosol equilibrium (Bauer et al., 2007; Thornhill et al., 2021; Adams et al., 2001; Regayre et al., 2018)).
680 Previous studies have highlighted the importance of nitrogen particles for climate, air quality and ecosystem impacts (e.g.,
681 Adams et al., 2001; Bauer et al., 2007, 2016; Kanakidou et al., 2016; Baker et al., 2021). Changes in nitrogen aerosol
682 precursor emissions are likely to follow different future trajectories than SO₄²⁻, BC or OC, whose anthropogenic sources are
683 mostly fossil fuel derived and should decrease in the future as renewable energy resources expand (Gidden et al., 2019).
684 Ammonia has substantial sources from agriculture, which will likely to stay constant or expand (Gidden et al., 2019;
685 Klimont et al., 2017; Bauer et al., 2016). This suggests there could be a substantial bias, especially regionally, in both
686 historical and future aerosol forcings due to the exclusion of these important sources (e.g., Bauer et al., 2007; Thornhill et al.,
687 2021; Adams et al., 2001; Regayre et al., 2018).

688 4. Conclusions

689 In this study, we collect aerosol surface concentration datasets and present a new aerosol compilation (AERO-MAP)
690 designed to evaluate the spatial and temporal variability of particulate matter in Earth system and air quality models. The in
691 situ surface measurements complement the column totals typically retrieved by satellites. This dataset includes both total
692 mass and composition, where available, including 15,000 station datasets and over 20 million daily to weekly averaged
693 measurements. Climatological and decadal averages (2010-2019) are presented, and we recommend that the climatological
694 averages be used, because they include more datasets, and multi-decadal and decadal means are extremely similar when
695 compared (Section 3.2). Spatial variability of aerosols (Figure 1f and Section 3.2) is important to simulate accurately in
696 models, as a prerequisite to identifying their human impacts. In addition, we make available annual means across time, and
697 the climatological monthly means so that temporal trends can be assessed. Here we expand beyond the usual limited
698 coverage of North America and Europe to present a more global view for observations of both PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ (Fig. 1).
699 Unfortunately, there are still very limited data characterizing both the surface concentration, size and composition of aerosol
700 particles (Fig. 10), and the locations where we lack data have also been identified as lacking sufficient remote sensing data as
701 well (Millet et al., 2024). While satellite remote sensing can indicate the total atmospheric loading during cloud free
702 conditions, it cannot yet provide information about the size or composition of particles (Kahn et al., 2005; Tanré et al., 1997;
703 Remer et al., 2005). Surface based remote sensing may provide more information about size and absorption properties
704 (Holben et al., 2001; Dubovik et al., 2002; Schuster et al., 2016; Gonçalves Ageitos et al., 2023; Obiso et al., 2023), but

single scattering albedo, for example, is only available under very high (>0.4 AOD) aerosol loading conditions, and thus is not available most of the time and space (Dubovik et al, 2002). Knowing the size and the composition of aerosols is key to their impacts on air quality and climate (Mahowald et al., 2011). Knowing what particles are dominant in a region is required, as fossil fuel derived aerosols will likely be reduced, while agriculturally based aerosols may well increase (Gidden et al., 2019). We also present a method that is generalizable to other models that use this dataset to evaluate both mass and composition for intercomparison projects and improvements in air quality and Earth system models. The novel aspect of this paper is to present this compilation in an easy to use netcdf format and some example comparisons that can be used in the future to evaluate and improve model simulations for individual models or for AEROCOM intercomparisons. The underlying data could also be used for data assimilation efforts or for estimating from the observations what the contributions are from different aerosols (e.g., similar to Prank et al., 2016).

This study has highlighted the value of surface concentration data by showing that it can identify where models do well or poorly not just for total mass, but also for different compositions and size, complimenting other data sources, such as remote sensing. A recent, independent and complementary effort collects all atmospheric composition data (not just aerosols) from many networks into one easy to use framework called GHOST (Globally harmonised dataset of surface atmospheric composition measurements; Bowdalo et al., 2024). The approach used in GHOST includes presenting the data in netcdf format, at the original resolution, with meta data about measurement type, etc. included, and is an important step forward (Bowdalo et al., 2024). At this point GHOST only includes a subset of the data available in this study: we hope that the GHOST effort can be expanded to include more spatial variability and be maintained into the future.

This study also highlights the importance of including all aerosol components into the models, and shows that in the CESM2 approximately 10% is missing. In many places, there is 50% of the particulate mass missing, due to lack of the nitrate particles (Fig. 10; Paulot et al., 2016; Adams et al., 1999; Thornhill et al., 2021). Because these particles are largely driven by agricultural sources and not fossil fuels, their concentrations will be hardly affected by the transition to renewable energy and may increase if agricultural production expands with population. Therefore, these nitrate aerosol particles represent important air quality and climate impacts that should be represented more accurately in future studies.

Data availability: The data compiled here is available as a csv table with citations as a supplemental data 1. This same file is available as well as gridded datasets with the compiled observations and modelled data in netcdf format at

731 <https://zenodo.org/records/10459654>, **10.5281/zenodo.11391232** Mahowald et al., 2024. Additional underlying datasets
732 available by request to mahowald@cornell.edu.

733 **Code availability:** The model used here is a version of the Community Earth System Model, and the modifications and input
734 files to that code are available at <https://zenodo.org/records/10459654>, Mahowald et al., 2024.

735 **Author contributions:** NMM designed and oversaw the implementation of the approach with the advice of HL, CW, RVM
736 and JL, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. JV, PH, LLi, ZK, CD, SR, TB and DH assisted in the version of the
737 model and emission datasets used. EA, DM, HM and LLu authors assisted in the compilation and conversion of the data,
738 CH, ZKl contributed emission datasets, XL and XZ contributed model code, MGA, CA, AA, PA,AB, FB, SB, GC, SC, YC,
739 PC, DC, CC, ED, GD, JE, KE, CG-L, CG, DG, YGR, HH, RH, CH, BH, PH, CH, MK, ZKe, KK, FL XL, RL, RL, WM,
740 BM, RLM, RVM, NM, YM-G, AP, JP, SR, PS, DV, BW authors contributed data. All authors edited the manuscript.

741 **Competing interests:** The authors declare that the only conflict of interest is that Maria Kanakidou, Xiaohong Liu, Willy
742 Maenhaut, and Sergio Rodriguez are editors at Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics.

743 **Acknowledgments**

744 NMM and LL would like to acknowledge support from DOE (DE-SC0021302), as well as from Paul Ekhart (EBAS), the
745 many freely available air quality websites acknowledged in the paper: EBAS (<https://ebas.nilu.no/>)--including data affiliated
746 with ACTRIS (Aerosol Clouds and Trace gas Research Infrastructure), EMEP (European Monitoring and Evaluation
747 Programme), GAW-WDCA (Global Atmosphere Watch-World Data Centre for Aerosols), EANET Acid Deposition
748 Monitoring Network in (East Asian)--All Indian Air Quality Management data (<https://app.cpcbcr.com/ccr/#/caaqm->
749 [dashboard-all/](https://app.cpcbcr.com/ccr/#/caaqm-)[caaqm-landing/data](https://app.cpcbcr.com/ccr/#/caaqm-)), Australian National Air Pollution Monitoring Database (<https://osf.io/jxd98/>), South
750 African Air Quality Information System (<https://saaqis.environment.gov.za/>), Mexico City Air quality data
751 (<http://www.aire.cdmx.gob.mx/default.php?opc=%27aKBh%27>), Chile (Sistema de Informacion Nacional de Calidad del
752 Aire--<https://sinca.mma.gob.cl/index.php/>), Japan's NIES (National Institute for Environmental studies-
753 <https://tenbou.nies.go.jp/download/>), Turkey Air Quality Monitoring Network, Israel Air Quality Monitoring website, US
754 EPA CASNET and IMPROVE, US AIRNOW, New Zealand Stats now website, Chilean
755 (<https://www.stats.govt.nz/indicators>), Chinese Air Quality data collected together (<https://osf.io/jxd98/>) and Canadian

756 National Air Quality Surveillance (<https://data.ec.gc.ca/data/air/monitor/national-air-pollution-surveillance-naps->
757 [program/Data-Donnees](https://data.ec.gc.ca/data/air/monitor/national-air-pollution-surveillance-naps-program/Data-Donnees)). FB and FL would like to acknowledge support from the Ministerio del Medio Ambiente de Chile
758 (<https://mma.gob.cl>) and Fondecyt 1231682. SC is grateful for financial support from the Texas Air Research Center and the
759 Texas Commission on Environmental Quality. PA acknowledges funding from Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado
760 de São Paulo (FAPESP), grants number 2017-17047-0 and 2023/04358-9. RVM acknowledges funding from NSF Grant
761 2020673. MK and NM acknowledge support by Greece and the European Union (European Regional Development Fund)
762 via the project PANhellenic infrastructure for Atmospheric Composition and climatE chAnge (PANACEA, MIS 5021516).
763 CGL and BM acknowledge support of CNRS, IRD and ACTRIS-France to the International Network to study Atmospheric
764 Deposition and Atmospheric chemistry in AFrica programe (INDAAF). HM acknowledges support by the MEXT/JSPS
765 KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP19H05699, JP19KK0265, JP20H00196, JP22H03722, JP22F22092, JP23H00515,
766 JP23H00523, JP23K18519, JP23K24976, and JP24H02225, the MEXT Arctic Challenge for Sustainability phase II (ArCS
767 II; JPMXD1420318865) project, and by the Environment Research and Technology Development Fund 2–2301
768 (JPMEERF20232001) of the Environmental Restoration and Conservation Agency. RLM acknowledges support from the
769 NASA Modeling, Analysis and Prediction Program. We acknowledge contributions from Sagar Rathod, Tami Bond, Giles
770 Bergametti, Javier Miranda Martin del Campo, and Xavier Querol. The support to CESAM by FCT/MCTES
771 (UIDP/50017/2020+UIDB/50017/2020+ LA/P/0094/2020) is also acknowledged.

772
773

774 References

- 775 Aas, W., Mortier, A., Bowersox, V., Cherian, R., Faluvegi, G., Fagerli, H., Hand, J., Klimont, Z., Galy-Lacaux, C.,
776 Lehmann, C. M. B., Myhre, C. L., Myhre, G., Olivie, D., Sato, K., Quaas, J., Rao, P. S. P., Schulz, M., Shindell, D.,
777 Skeie, R. B., Stein, A., Takemura, T., Tsyro, S., Vet, R., and Xu, X.: Global and regional trends of atmospheric
778 sulfur, *Sci Rep*, 9, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-37304-0>, 2019.
- 779 Adams, P., Seinfeld, J., and Koch, D.: Global concentrations of tropospheric sulfate, nitrate and ammonium aerosol
780 simulated in a general circulation model, *J. Geophysical Research*, 104, 13791–13823, 1999.
- 781 Adams, P., Seinfeld, J., Koch, D., Mickley, L., and Jacob, D.: General circulation model assessment of direct radiative
782 forcing by sulfate-nitrate-ammonium-water inorganic aerosol system, *J Geophys Res*, 106, 1097–1111, 2001.

783 Adebisi, A., Kok, J. F., Murray, B. J., Ryder, C. L., Stuut, J.-B. W., Kahn, R. A., Knippertz, P., Formenti, P., Mahowald, N.
784 M., Pérez García-Pando, C., Klose, M., Ansmann, A., Samset, B. H., Ito, A., Balkanski, Y., Di Biagio, C.,
785 Romanias, M. N., Huang, Y., and Meng, J.: A review of coarse mineral dust in the Earth system, *Aeolian Res*, 60,
786 100849, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeolia.2022.100849>, 2023.

787 Aiken, A. C., Decarlo, P. F., Kroll, J. H., Worsnop, D. R., Huffman, J. A., Docherty, K. S., et al. (2008). O/C and OM/OC
788 ratios of primary, secondary, and ambient organic aerosols with high-resolution time-of-flight aerosol mass
789 spectrometry. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 42(12), 4478–4485. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es703009q>

790 Alastuey, A., Querol, X., Aas, W., Lucarelli, F., Pérez, N., Moreno, T., Cavalli, F., Areskoug, H., Balan, V., Catrambone,
791 M., Ceburnis, D., Cerro, J. C., Conil, S., Gevorgyan, L., Hueglin, C., Imre, K., Jaffrezo, J. L., Leeson, S. R.,
792 Mihalopoulos, N., Mitosinkova, M., O'Dowd, C. D., Pey, J., Putaud, J. P., Riffault, V., Ripoll, A., Sciare, J.,
793 Sellegri, K., Spindler, G., and Yttri, K. E.: Geochemistry of PM10 over Europe during the EMEP intensive
794 measurement periods in summer 2012 and winter 2013, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 16, 6107–6129,
795 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-6107-2016>, 2016.

796 Albani, S., Mahowald, N. M., Perry, A. T., Scanza, R. A., Zender, C. S., Heavens, N. G., Maggi, V., Kok, J. F., and Otto-
797 Bliesner, B. L.: Improved dust representation in the Community Atmosphere Model, *J Adv Model Earth Syst*, 6,
798 541–570, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013MS000279>, 2014a.

799 Albani, S., Mahowald, N., Perry, A., Scanza, R., Zender, C., and Flanner, M. G.: Improved representation of dust size and
800 optics in the CESM, *Journal of Advances in Modeling of Earth Systems*, 6, doi:10.1002/2013MS000279, 2014b.

801 Almeida, S. M., Pio, C. A., Freitas, M. C., Reis, M. A., and Trancoso, M. A.: Source apportionment of fine and coarse
802 particulate matter in a sub-urban area at the Western European Coast, *Atmos Environ*, 39, 3127–3138,
803 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.01.048>, 2005.

804 Amato, F., Alastuey, A., Karanasiou, A., Lucarelli, F., Nava, S., Calzolari, G., Severi, M., Becagli, S., Gianelle, V. L., Colombi,
805 C., Alves, C., Custódio, D., Nunes, T., Cerqueira, M., Pio, C., Eleftheriadis, K., Diapouli, E., Reche, C., Minguillón,
806 M. C., Manousakas, M. I., Maggos, T., Vratolis, S., Harrison, R. M., and Querol, X.: AIRUSE-LIFE+: A harmonized
807 PM speciation and source apportionment in five southern European cities, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 16, 3289–3309,
808 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-3289-2016>, 2016.

809 Andreae, T. W., Andreae, M. O., Ichoku, C., Maenhaut, W., Cafmeyer, J., Karnieli, A., and Orlovsky, L.: Light scattering by
810 dust and anthropogenic aerosol at a remote site in the Negev desert, Israel, *Journal Geophysical Research*, 107,
811 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JD900252>, 2002.

812 Arimoto, R., Duce, R. A., Ray, B. J., and Tomza, U.: Dry deposition of trace elements to the western North Atlantic, *Global*
813 *Biogeochem Cycles*, 17, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001GB001406>, 2003.

814 Artaxo, P. and Maenhaut, W.: Aerosol characteristics and sources for the Amazon Basin during the wet season, *J Geophys*
815 *Res*, 95, 16971–16985, 1990.

816 Artaxo, P., Martins, J. V., Yamasoe, M. A., Procopio, A. S., Pauliquevis, T. M., Andrae, M. O., Guyon, P., Gatti, L. V., and
817 Leal, A. M. C.: Physical and chemical properties of aerosol particles in the wet and dry seasons in Rondonia,
818 Amazonia, *J Geophys Res*, 107, 8081, doi: 10.1029/2001JD0000666, 2002.

819 Baker, A.R., Kanakidou, M., Nenes, A., Myriokefalitakis, S., Croot, P. L., Duce, R.A., Yuan Gao, Y., Guieu, C, Ito, A.,
820 Jickells, T.D., Mahowald, M.A, Middag, R., Perron, M.M.G., Sarin, MM., Shelley, R., Turner D.R: Changing
821 atmospheric acidity as a modulator of nutrient deposition and ocean biogeochemistry, *Science Advances*, 2021 (7)
822 eabd8800, 2021

823 Barkley, A. E., Prospero, J. M., Mahowald, N., Hamilton, D. S., Popendorf, K. J., Oehlert, A. M., Pourmand, A., Gatineau,
824 A., Panechou-Pulcherie, K., Blackwelder, P., and Gaston, C. J.: African biomass burning is a substantial source of
825 phosphorus deposition to the Amazon, Tropical Atlantic Ocean, and Southern Ocean, *Proceedings of the National*
826 *Academy of Sciences*, 116, 16216–16221, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906091116>, 2019.

827 Barraza, F., Lambert, F., Jorquera, H., Villalobos, A. M., and Gallardo, L.: Temporal evolution of main ambient PM_{2.5}
828 sources in Santiago, Chile, from 1998 to 2012, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 17, 10093–10107, [https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-10093-2017)
829 [17-10093-2017](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-10093-2017), 2017.

830 Barrie, L. A., Yi, Y., Leaitch, W. R., Lohmann, U., Kasibhatla, P., Roelofs, G. J., Wilson, J., McGovern, F., Benkovitz, C.,
831 Mélières, M. A., Law, K., Prospero, J., Kritz, M., Bergmann, D., Bridgeman, C., Chin, M., Christensen, J., Easter,
832 R., Feichter, J., Land, C., Jeuken, A., Kjellström, E., Koch, D., and Rasch, P.: A comparison of large-scale
833 atmospheric sulphate aerosol models (COSAM): Overview and highlights, *Tellus B Chem Phys Meteorol*, 53, 615–
834 645, <https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusb.v53i5.16642>, 2001.

835 Bauer, S. E., Koch, D., Unger, N., Metzger, S. M., Shindell, D. T., and Streets, D. G.: Nitrate aerosols today and in 2030: a
836 global simulation including aerosols and tropospheric ozone, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 5043–5059,
837 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-5043-2007>, 2007.

838 Bauer, S. E., Tsigaridis, K., and Miller, R.: Significant atmospheric aerosol pollution caused by world food cultivation,
839 *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43, 5394–5400, doi:10.1002/2016GL068354, 2016.

840 Bauer, S.E., Tsigaridis, K., Faluvegi, G., Nazarenko, L., Miller, R.L., Kelley, M., and Schmidt, G.: The turning point of the
841 aerosol era. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 14, no. 12, e2022MS003070, doi:10.1029/2022MS003070, 2022.

842 Bellouin, N., Quaas, J., Gryspeerdt, E., Kinne, S., Stier, P., Watson-Parris, D., Boucher, O., Carslaw, K. S., Christensen, M.,
843 Daniau, A. L., Dufresne, J. L., Feingold, G., Fiedler, S., Forster, P., Gettelman, A., Haywood, J. M., Lohmann, U.,
844 Malavelle, F., Mauritsen, T., McCoy, D. T., Myhre, G., Mülmenstädt, J., Neubauer, D., Possner, A., Rugenstein,
845 M., Sato, Y., Schulz, M., Schwartz, S. E., Sourdeval, O., Storelvmo, T., Toll, V., Winker, D., and Stevens, B.:
846 Bounding Global Aerosol Radiative Forcing of Climate Change, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019RG000660>, 1 March
847 2020.

848 Bergametti, G., Gomes, L., Doude-Gaussen, G., Rognon, P., and Le Coustumer, M. N: African dust observed over the
849 Canary Islands: source-regions identification and the transport pattern for some summer situations, *J Geophys Res*,
850 94, 14855–14864, 1989.

851 Bond, T., Doherty, S. J., Fahey, D., Forster, P., Bernsten, T., DeAngelo, B., Flanner, M., Ghan, S., Karcher, B., Koch, D.,
852 Kinne, S., Kondo, Y., Quinn, P. K., Sarofim, M., Schultz, M., Venkataraman, C., Zhang, H., Zhang, S., Bellouin,
853 N., Guttikunda, S., Hopke, P., Jacobson, M., Kaiser, J. W., Klimont, Z., Lohman, U., Schwartz, J., Shindel, D.,
854 Storelvmo, T., Warren, S., and Zender, C.: Bounding the role of black carbon in the climate system: A scientific
855 assessment, *J Geophys Res*, D118, 5380–5552; doi:10.1002/jgrd_50171, 2013.

856 Bond, T. C., Streets, D. G., Yarber, K. F., Nelson, S. M., Woo, J.-H., and Klimont, Z.: A technology-based global inventory
857 of black and organic carbon emissions from combustion, *J Geophys Res*, 109, doi:10.1029/2003JD003697, 2004.

858 Bouet, C., Labiadh, M. T., Rajot, J. L., Bergametti, G., Marticorena, B., des Tureaux, T. H., Ltifi, M., Sekrafi, S., and Féron,
859 A.: Impact of desert dust on air quality: What is the meaningfulness of daily PM standards in regions close to the
860 sources? The example of Southern Tunisia, *Atmosphere (Basel)*, 10, <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos10080452>, 2019.

861 Bowdalo, D., Basart, S., Guevara, M., Jorba, O., Pérez García-Pando, C., Jaimes Palomera, M., et al. (2024). GHOST: a
862 globally harmonised dataset of surface atmospheric composition measurements. *Earth System Science Data*, 16(10),
863 4417–4495. <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-16-4417-2024>

864 Bozlaker, A., Buzcu-Güven, B., Fraser, M. P., and Chellam, S.: Insights into PM10 sources in Houston, Texas: Role of
865 petroleum refineries in enriching lanthanoid metals during episodic emission events, *Atmos Environ*, 69, 109–117,
866 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.11.068>, 2013.

867 Bullard, J., Baddock, M., McTainsh, G., and Leys, J.: Sub-basin scale dust source geomorphology detected using MODIS,
868 *Geophys Res Lett*, 35, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL033928>, 2008.

869 Burnett, R., Chen, H., Szyszkowicz, M., Fann, N., Hubbell, B., Pope, C. A., Apte, J. S., Brauer, M., Cohen, A., Weichenthal,
870 S., Coggins, J., Di, Q., Brunekreef, B., Frostad, J., Lim, S. S., Kan, H., Walker, K. D., Thurston, G. D., Hayes, R.
871 B., Lim, C. C., Turner, M. C., Jerrett, M., Krewski, D., Gapstur, S. M., Diver, W. R., Ostro, B., Goldberg, D.,
872 Crouse, D. L., Martin, R. v., Peters, P., Pinault, L., Tjepkema, M., van Donkelaar, A., Villeneuve, P. J., Miller, A.
873 B., Yin, P., Zhou, M., Wang, L., Janssen, N. A. H., Marra, M., Atkinson, R. W., Tsang, H., Thach, T. Q., Cannon, J.
874 B., Allen, R. T., Hart, J. E., Laden, F., Cesaroni, G., Forastiere, F., Weinmayr, G., Jaensch, A., Nagel, G., Concin,
875 H., and Spadaro, J. v.: Global estimates of mortality associated with longterm exposure to outdoor fine particulate
876 matter, *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 115, 9592–9597, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1803222115>, 2018.

877 Burgos, M. A., E. Andrews, G. Titos, A. Benedetti, H. Bian, V. Buchard, G. Curci, Z. Kipling, A. Kirkevåg, H. Kokkola, A.
878 Laakso, J. Letertre-Danczak, M. T. Lund, H. Matsui, G. Myhre, C. Randles, M. Schulz, T. van Noije, K. Zhang, L.
879 Alados-Arboledas, U. Baltensperger, A. Jefferson, J. Sherman, J. Sun, E. Weingartner, and P. Zieger (2020), A
880 global model-measurement evaluation of particle light scattering coefficients at elevated relative humidity,
881 *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20, 10231-10258, doi:10.5194/acp-20-10231-2020.

882 Caldwell, P. M., Mametjanov, A., Tang, Q., van Roekel, L. P., Golaz, J. C., Lin, W., Bader, D. C., Keen, N. D., Feng, Y.,
883 Jacob, R., Maltrud, M. E., Roberts, A. F., Taylor, M. A., Veneziani, M., Wang, H., Wolfe, J. D., Balaguru, K.,
884 Cameron-Smith, P., Dong, L., Klein, S. A., Leung, L. R., Li, H. Y., Li, Q., Liu, X., Neale, R. B., Pinheiro, M., Qian,
885 Y., Ullrich, P. A., Xie, S., Yang, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhang, K., and Zhou, T.: The DOE E3SM Coupled Model Version
886 1: Description and Results at High Resolution, *J Adv Model Earth Syst*, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001870>,
887 2019.

888 Carslaw, K. S., Lee, L., Reddington, C., Pringle, K., Rap, A., Forster, P., Mann, G., Spracklen, D., Woodhouse, M., Regayre,
889 L., and Pierce, J.: Large contribution of natural aerosols to uncertainty in indirect forcing, *Nature*, 503, 67–71, 2013.

890 Castellanos, P., Colarco, P., Espinosa, W. R., Guzewich, S. D., Levy, R. C., Miller, R. L., et al. (2024, March 15). Mineral
891 dust optical properties for remote sensing and global modeling: A review. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. Elsevier
892 Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2023.113982>

893 Chatziparaschos, M., Daskalakis, N., Myriokefalitakis, S., Kalivitis, N., Nenes, A., Gonçalves Ageitos, M., Costa-Surós, M.,
894 Pérez García-Pando, C., Zanolli, M., Vrekoussis, M., and Kanakidou, M.: Role of K-feldspar and quartz in global
895 ice nucleation by mineral dust in mixed-phase clouds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 23, 1785–1801,
896 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-23-1785-2023>, 2023.

897 Chen, Y., Street, J., and Paytan, A.: Comparison between pure-water- and seawater-soluble nutrient concentrations of
898 aerosol particles from the {Gulf} of {Aqaba}, *Mar Chem*, 101, 141–152,
899 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marchem.2006.02.002>, 2006.

900 Chuang, P., Duvall, R., Shafer, M., and Schauer, J.: The origin of water soluble particulate iron in the Asian atmospheric
901 outflow, *Geophys Res Lett*, 32, doi:10.1029/2004GL021946, 2005.

902 Cipoli, Y. A., Alves, C., Rapuano, M., Evtyugina, M., Rienda, I. C., Kováts, N., Vicente, A., Giardi, F., Furst, L., Nunes, T.,
903 and Feliciano, M.: Nighttime–daytime PM10 source apportionment and toxicity in a remoteness inland city of the
904 Iberian Peninsula, *Atmos Environ*, 303, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2023.119771>, 2023.

905 Clark, S. K., Ward, D. S., and Mahowald, N. M.: The sensitivity of global climate to the episodicity of fire aerosol emissions,
906 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 120, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD024068>, 2015.

907 Cohen, D., Garton, D., Stelcer, E., Hawas, O., Wang, T., Pon, S., Kim, J., Choi, B., Oh, S., Shin, H.-J., Ko, M., and
908 Uematsu, M.: Multielemental analysis and characterization of fine aerosols at several key ACE-Asia sites, 109,
909 doi:10.1029/2003JD003569, 2004.

910 Collaud Coen, M., Andrews, E., Lastuey, A., Petkov Arsov, T., Backman, J., Brem, B. T., Bukowiecki, N., Couret, C.,
911 Eleftheriadis, K., Flentje, H., Fiebig, M., Gysel-Beer, M., Hand, J. L., Hoffer, A., Hooda, R., Hueglin, C., Joubert,
912 W., Keywood, M., Eun Kim, J., Kim, S. W., Labuschagne, C., Lin, N. H., Lin, Y., Lund Myhre, C., Luoma, K.,
913 Lyamani, H., Marinoni, A., Mayol-Bracero, O. L., Mihalopoulos, N., Pandolfi, M., Prats, N., Prenni, A. J., Putaud,
914 J. P., Ries, L., Reisen, F., Sellegri, K., Sharma, S., Sheridan, P., Patrick Sherman, J., Sun, J., Titos, G., Torres, E.,
915 Tuch, T., Weller, R., Wiedensohler, A., Zieger, P., and Laj, P.: Multidecadal trend analysis of in situ aerosol

radiative properties around the world, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 20, 8867–8908, [https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-8867-](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-8867-2020)
2020, 2020.

Computational and Information Systems Laboratory: Cheyenne: HPE/SGI ICE XA System (NCAR Community Computing)., <https://doi.org/10.5065/D6RX99HX>, 2019.

da Silva, L. I. D., de Souza Sarkis, J. E., Zotin, F. M. Z., Carneiro, M. C., Neto, A. A., da Silva, A. dos S. A. G., Cardoso, M. J. B., and Monteiro, M. I. C.: Traffic and catalytic converter - Related atmospheric contamination in the metropolitan region of the city of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, *Chemosphere*, 71, 677–684, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2007.10.057>, 2008.

Dentener, F. J., Carmichael, G. R., Zhang, Y., Lelieveld, J., and Crutzen, P. J.: Role of mineral aerosol as a reactive surface in the global troposphere, *J Geophys Res*, 101, 22,822-869,889, 1996.

Dentener, F., Kinne, S., Bond, T., Boucher, O., Cofala, J., Generoso, S., Ginoux, P., Gong, S., Hoelzemann, J. J., Ito, A., Marelli, L., Penner, J., Putaud, J.-P., Textor, C., Schulz, M., van der Werf, G. R., and Wilson, J.: Emissions of primary aerosol and precursor gases in the years 2000 and 1750: prescribed data-sets for AeroCom, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 6, 4321–4344, 2006.

Dongarrà, G., Manno, E., Varrica, D., and Vultaggio, M.: Mass levels, crustal component and trace elements in PM10 in Palermo, Italy, *Atmos Environ*, 41, 7977–7986, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2007.09.015>, 2007.

Dongarrà, G., Manno, E., Varrica, D., Lombardo, M., and Vultaggio, M.: Study on ambient concentrations of PM10, PM10-2.5, PM2.5 and gaseous pollutants. Trace elements and chemical speciation of atmospheric particulates, *Atmos Environ*, 44, 5244–5257, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.08.041>, 2010.

Dubovik, O., Smirnov, A., Holben, B. N., King, M. D., Kaufman, Y. J., ECK, T. F., and Slutsker, I.: Accuracy assessments of aerosol optical properties retrieved from Aerosol Robotic Network (AERONET) Sun and sky radiance measurements, *J Geophys Res*, 105, 9791–9806, 2000.

Dubovik, O., Holben, B., Eck, T. F., Smirnov, A., et al.: Variability of absorption and optical properties of key aerosol types observed in worldwide locations, *Journal of Atmospheric Science*, 590–608, 2002.

Engelbrecht, Johann, Eric V. McDonald, John A. Gillies, R. K. M. Jayanty, Gary Casuccio & Alan W. Gertler (2009) Characterizing Mineral Dusts and Other Aerosols from the Middle East, Part 1: Ambient Sampling, *Inhalation Toxicology*, 21:4, 297-326, DOI: 10.1080/08958370802464273, 2009.

Fanourgakis, G. S., Kanakidou, M., Nenes, A., Bauer, S. E., Bergman, T., Carslaw, K. S., Grini, A., Hamilton, D. S., Johnson, J. S., Karydis, V. A., Kirkevåg, A., Kodros, J. K., Lohmann, U., Luo, G., Makkonen, R., Matsui, H., Neubauer, D., Pierce, J. R., Schmale, J., Stier, P., Tsigaridis, K., Van Noije, T., Wang, H., Watson-Parris, D., Westervelt, D. M., Yang, Y., Yoshioka, M., Daskalakis, N., Decesari, S., Gysel-Beer, M., Kalivitis, N., Liu, X., Mahowald, N. M., Myriokefalitakis, S., Schrödner, R., Sfakianaki, M., Tsimpidi, A. P., Wu, M., and Yu, F.: Evaluation of global simulations of aerosol particle and cloud condensation nuclei number, with implications for cloud droplet formation, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 19, 8591–8617, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-8591-2019>, 2019.

950 Fasullo, J. T., Lamarque, J. F., Hannay, C., Rosenbloom, N., Tilmes, S., DeRepentigny, P., Jahn, A., and Deser, C.: Spurious
 951 Late Historical-Era Warming in CESM2 Driven by Prescribed Biomass Burning Emissions, *Geophysical Research*
 952 *Letters*, 49, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL097420>, 28 January 2022.

953 Fiore, A. M., Milly, G. P., Hancock, S. E., Quiñones, L., Bowden, J. H., Helstrom, E., Lamarque, J. F., Schnell, J., West, J.
 954 J., and Xu, Y.: Characterizing Changes in Eastern U.S. Pollution Events in a Warming World, *Journal of*
 955 *Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 127, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JD035985>, 2022.

956 Font, A., F. de Brito, J., Riffault, V., Conil, S., Jaffrezo, J. L., & Bourin, A. (2024). Calculations of the conversion factor
 957 from organic carbon to organic matter for aerosol mass balance. *Atmospheric Pollution Research*, 15(12).
 958 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apr.2024.102301>

959 Formenti, P., Elbert, W., Maenhaut, W., Haywood, J., and Andreae, M. O.: Chemical composition of mineral dust aerosol
 960 during the Saharan Dust Experiment (SHADE) airborne campaign in the Cape Verde region, September 2000, *J.*
 961 *Geophys. Res.*, 108, 8576, doi:10.1029/2002JD002648, 2003.

962 Furu, E., Katona-Szabo, I., Angyal, A., Szoboszlai, Z., Török, Z., and Kertész, Z.: The effect of the tramway track construction
 963 on the aerosol pollution in Debrecen, Hungary, in: *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research, Section B:*
 964 *Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms*, 124–130, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nimb.2015.08.014>, 2015.

965 Furu, E., Angyal, A., Szoboszlai, Z., Papp, E., Török, Z., and Kertész, Z.: Characterization of Aerosol Pollution in Two
 966 Hungarian Cities in Winter 2009–2010, *Atmosphere (Basel)*, 13, <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos13040554>, 2022.

967 Fuzzi, S., Decesari, S., Facchini, M., Cavalli, F., Emblico, L., Mircea, M., Andreae, M., Trebs, I., Hoffer, A., Guyon, P.,
 968 Artaxo, P., Rizzo, L., Lara, L., Pauliquevis, T., Maenhaut, W., et al.: Overview of the inorganic and organic
 969 composition of size-segregated aerosol in Rondonia, Brazil from the biomass-burning period to the onset of the wet
 970 season., *J Geophys Res*, 112, doi:10.1029/2005JD006741, 2007.

971 García, M. I., Rodríguez, S., and Alastuey, A.: Impact of North America on the aerosol composition in the North Atlantic
 972 free troposphere, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 17, 7387–7404, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-7387-2017>, 2017.

973 Gelaro, R., McCarty, W., Suárez, M. J., Todling, R., Molod, A., Takacs, L., Randles, C. A., Darmenov, A., Bosilovich, M.
 974 G., and Reichle, R.: The modern-era retrospective analysis for research and applications, version 2 (MERRA-2), *J*
 975 *Clim*, 30, 5419–5454, 2017.

976 Gianini, M. F. D., Gehrig, R., Fischer, A., Ulrich, A., Wichser, A., and Hueglin, C.: Chemical composition of PM10 in
 977 Switzerland: An analysis for 2008/2009 and changes since 1998/1999, *Atmos Environ*, 54, 97–106,
 978 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.02.037>, 2012a.

979 Gianini, M. F. D., Fischer, A., Gehrig, R., Ulrich, A., Wichser, A., Piot, C., Besombes, J. L., and Hueglin, C.: Comparative
 980 source apportionment of PM10 in Switzerland for 2008/2009 and 1998/1999 by Positive Matrix Factorisation,
 981 *Atmos Environ*, 54, 149–158, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.02.036>, 2012b.

982 Gidden, M. J., Riahi, K., Smith, S. J., Fujimori, S., Luderer, G., Kriegler, E., Van Vuuren, D. P., Van Den Berg, M., Feng,
 983 L., Klein, D., Calvin, K., Doelman, J. C., Frank, S., Fricko, O., Harmsen, M., Hasegawa, T., Havlik, P., Hilaire, J.,

- Hoesly, R., Horing, J., Popp, A., Stehfest, E., and Takahashi, K.: Global emissions pathways under different socioeconomic scenarios for use in CMIP6: A dataset of harmonized emissions trajectories through the end of the century, *Geosci Model Dev*, 12, 1443–1475, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-1443-2019>, 2019.
- Ginoux, P., Chin, M., Tegen, I., Prospero, J. M., Holben, B. N., Dubovik, O., and Lin, S.-J.: Sources and distribution of dust aerosol particles with the GOCART model, *J Geophys Res*, 106, 20255–20273, 2001.
- Gleckler, P., Taylor, K. E., and Doutriaux, C.: Performance metrics for climate models, *J Geophys Res*, 113, D06104, doi:10.1029/2007JD008972, 2008.
- Gliß, J., Mortier, A., Schulz, M., Andrews, E., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S. E., Benedictow, A. M. K., Bian, H., Checa-Garcia, R., Chin, M., Ginoux, P., Griesfeller, J. J., Heckel, A., Kipling, Z., Kirkevåg, A., Kokkola, H., Laj, P., Le Sager, P., Lund, T. M., Lund Myhre, C., Matsui, H., Myhre, G., Neubauer, D., Van Noije, T., North, P., Olivié, D. J. L., Rémy, S., Sogacheva, L., Takemura, T., Tsigaridis, K., and Tsyro, S. G.: AeroCom phase III multi-model evaluation of the aerosol life cycle and optical properties using ground- And space-based remote sensing as well as surface in situ observations, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 21, 87–128, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-87-2021>, 2021.
- Golaz, J. C., Caldwell, P. M., van Roekel, L. P., Petersen, M. R., Tang, Q., Wolfe, J. D., Abeshu, G., Anantharaj, V., Asay-Davis, X. S., Bader, D. C., Baldwin, S. A., Bisht, G., Bogenschütz, P. A., Branstetter, M., Brunke, M. A., Brus, S. R., Burrows, S. M., Cameron-Smith, P. J., Donahue, A. S., Deakin, M., Easter, R. C., Evans, K. J., Feng, Y., Flanner, M., Foucar, J. G., Fyke, J. G., Griffin, B. M., Hannay, C., Harrop, B. E., Hoffman, M. J., Hunke, E. C., Jacob, R. L., Jacobsen, D. W., Jeffery, N., Jones, P. W., Keen, N. D., Klein, S. A., Larson, V. E., Leung, L. R., Li, H. Y., Lin, W., Lipscomb, W. H., Ma, P. L., Mahajan, S., Maltrud, M. E., Mametjanov, A., McClean, J. L., McCoy, R. B., Neale, R. B., Price, S. F., Qian, Y., Rasch, P. J., Reeves Eyre, J. E. J., Riley, W. J., Ringler, T. D., Roberts, A. F., Roesler, E. L., Salinger, A. G., Shaheen, Z., Shi, X., Singh, B., Tang, J., Taylor, M. A., Thornton, P. E., Turner, A. K., Veneziani, M., Wan, H., Wang, H., Wang, S., Williams, D. N., Wolfram, P. J., Worley, P. H., Xie, S., Yang, Y., Yoon, J. H., Zelinka, M. D., Zender, C. S., Zeng, X., Zhang, C., Zhang, K., Zhang, Y., Zheng, X., Zhou, T., and Zhu, Q.: The DOE E3SM Coupled Model Version 1: Overview and Evaluation at Standard Resolution, *J Adv Model Earth Syst*, 11, 2089–2129, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001603>, 2019.
- Gonçalves Ageitos, M., Obiso, V., Miller, R. L., Jorba, O., Klose, M., Dawson, M., Balkanski, Y., Perlwitz, J., Basart, S., Di Tomaso, E., Escribano, J., Macchia, F., Montané, G., Mahowald, N., Green, R. O., Thompson, D. R., and Pérez García-Pando, C.: Modeling dust mineralogical composition: sensitivity to soil mineralogy atlases and their expected climate impacts. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 23, no. 15, 8623–8657, doi:10.5194/acp-23-8623-2023, 2023.
- Gong, S. L., Barrie, L. A., Prospero, J. M., Savoie, D. L., Ayers, G. P., Blanchet, J.-P., and Spacek, L.: Modeling sea-salt aerosol particles in the atmosphere 2. Atmospheric concentrations and fluxes, *J Geophys Res*, 102, 3819–3830, 1997.

1016 Gong, S. L., Zhang, X. Y., Zhao, T. L., McKendry, I. G., Jaffe, D. A., and Lu, N. M.: Characterization of soil dust aerosol in
 1017 China and its transport and distribution during 2001 ACE-Asia: 2. Model simulation and validation, *J Geophys Res*,
 1018 108, 4262, 2003.

1019 Gui, K., Che, H., Zheng, Y., Wang, Y., Zhang, L., Zhao, H., et al. (2021). Seasonal variability and trends in global type-
 1020 segregated aerosol optical depth as revealed by MISR satellite observations. *Science of the Total Environment*, 787.
 1021 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147543>

1022 Gulev, S. K., Thorne, P. W., Ahn, J., Dentener, F. J., Domingues, C. M., Gerland, S., Gong, D., Kaufman, D. S., Nnamchi,
 1023 H. C., Quaas, J., Rivera, J. A., Sathyendranath, S., Smith, S. L., Trewin, B., von Schuckmann, K., and Vose, R. ,S.:
 1024 Chapter 2: Changing State of the Climate System., in: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis*.
 1025 Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
 1026 Change, edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V. , Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen,
 1027 Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K.,
 1028 Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and
 1029 New York, NY, USA, 287–422, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.004>, 2021.

1030 Gupta, G., Venkat Ratnam, M., Madhavan, B. L., and Narayanamurthy, C. S.: Long-term trends in Aerosol Optical Depth
 1031 obtained across the globe using multi-satellite measurements, *Atmos Environ*, 273,
 1032 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2022.118953>, 2022.

1033 Hand, J. L., Gill, T. E., and Schichtel, B. A.: Spatial and seasonal variability in fine mineral dust and coarse aerosol mass at
 1034 remote sites across the United States, *J Geophys Res*, 122, 3080–3097, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD026290>,
 1035 2017.

1036 Hand, J. L., Gill, T. E., and Schichtel, B. A.: Urban and rural coarse aerosol mass across the United States: Spatial and
 1037 seasonal variability and long-term trends, *Atmos Environ*, 218, 117025,
 1038 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.117025>, 2019.

1039 Hand, J. L., Prenni, A. J., & Schichtel, B. A. (2024). Trends in Seasonal Mean Speciated Aerosol Composition in Remote
 1040 Areas of the United States From 2000 Through 2021. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 129(2).
 1041 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JD039902>

1042 Hansen, J. and Nazarenko, L.: Soot climate forcing via snow and ice albedos, *PNAS*, 101, 423–428,
 1043 [doi/10.1073/pnas.0307157100](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0307157100), 2004.

1044 Heald, C., Ridley, D., Kreidenweis, S., and Drury, E.: Satellite observations cap the atmospheric organic aerosol budget,
 1045 *Geophys Res Lett*, 37, L24808; [doi:10.1029/2010GL045095](https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL045095), 2010.

1046 Heimburger, A., Losno, R., Triquet, S., Dulac, F., and Mahowald, N.: Direct measurement of atmospheric iron, cobalt and
 1047 aluminum-derived dust deposition at Kerguelen Islands, *Global Biogeochem Cycles*, 26,
 1048 [doi:10.1029/2012GB004301](https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GB004301), <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GB004301>, 2012.

1049 Henriksson, S. V., Laaksonen, A., Kerminen, V. M., Räisänen, P., Järvinen, H., Sundström, A. M., and De Leeuw, G.:
 1050 Spatial distributions and seasonal cycles of aerosols in India and China seen in global climate-aerosol model, *Atmos*
 1051 *Chem Phys*, 11, 7975–7990, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-7975-2011>, 2011.

1052 Herut, B. and Krom, M.: Atmospheric input of nutrients and dust to the SE Mediterranean, in: *The Impact of Desert Dust*
 1053 *Across the Mediterranean*, edited by: Guerzoni, S. and Chester, R., 349–360, 1996.

1054 Herut, B., Nimmo, M., Medway, A., Chester, R., and Krom, M.D.: Dry atmospheric inputs of trace metals at the
 1055 Mediterranean coast of Israel (SE Mediterranean): sources and fluxes. *Atmos. Environ.*, 35, 803–813, 2001.

1056 Hinds, W. C., *Aerosol Technology, Properties, Behavior and Measurement of Airborne Particles*, John Wiley, New York,
 1057 1999.

1058 Holben, B. N., Tanre, D., Smirnov, A., ECK, T. F., Slutsker, I., Abuhassan, N., et al. (2001). An emerging ground-based
 1059 aerosol climatology: Aerosol optical depth from AERONET. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 106(D11), 12067–
 1060 12097.

1061 Hsu, C. Y., Chiang, H. C., Lin, S. L., Chen, M. J., Lin, T. Y., and Chen, Y. C.: Elemental characterization and source
 1062 apportionment of PM10 and PM2.5 in the western coastal area of central Taiwan, *Science of the Total*
 1063 *Environment*, 541, 1139–1150, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.09.122>, 2016.

1064 Huang, Y., Adebisi, A. A., Formenti, P., and Kok, J. F.: Linking the Different Diameter Types of Aspherical Desert Dust
 1065 Indicates That Models Underestimate Coarse Dust Emission, *Geophys Res Lett*, 48,
 1066 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL092054>, 2021.

1067 Hueglin, C., Gehrig, R., Baltensperger, U., Gysel, M., Monn, C., and Vonmont, H.: Chemical characterisation of PM2.5,
 1068 PM10 and coarse particles at urban, near-city and rural sites in Switzerland, *Atmos Environ*, 39, 637–651,
 1069 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2004.10.027>, 2005.

1070 Huneus, N., Schulz, M., Balkanski, Y., Griesfeller, J., Prospero, J., Kinne, S., Bauer, S., Boucher, O., Chin, M., Dentener,
 1071 F., Diehl, T., Easter, R., Fillmore, D., Ghan, S., Ginoux, P., Grini, A., Horowitz, L., Koch, D., Krol, M. C.,
 1072 Landing, W., Liu, X., Mahowald, N., Miller, R., Morcrette, J.-J., Myhre, G., Penner, J., Perlwitz, J., Stier, P.,
 1073 Takemura, T., and Zender, C. S.: Global dust model intercomparison in AeroCom phase i, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 11,
 1074 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-7781-2011>, 2011.

1075 Hurrell, J. W., Holland, M. M., Gent, P. R., Ghan, S., Kay, J. E., Kushner, P. J., Lamarque, J.-F., Large, W. G., Lawrence,
 1076 D., Lindsay, K., Lipscomb, W. H., Long, M. C., Mahowald, N., Marsh, D. R., Neale, R. B., Rasch, P., Vavrus, S.,
 1077 Vertenstein, M., Bader, D., Collins, W. D., Hack, J. J., Kiehl, J., and Marshall, S.: The community earth system
 1078 model: A framework for collaborative research, *Bull Am Meteorol Soc*, 94, [https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-](https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00121.1)
 1079 00121.1, 2013.

1080 IPCC: Summary for Policymakers, in: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I*
 1081 *to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V.,
 1082 P., Zhai, A., Pirani, S.L., Connors, C., Péan, S., Berger, N., Caud, Y., Chen, L., Goldfarb, M. I., Gomis, M.,

1083 Huang, K., Leitzell, E., Lonnoy, J. B. R., Matthews, T. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R.,
 1084 and Zhou B., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 3–32, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.001>,
 1085 2021.

1086 Jaenicke, R.: Abundance of cellular material and proteins in the atmosphere, *Science* (1979), 308, 73,
 1087 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1106335>, 2005.

1088 Jensen, J. B. and Lee, S.: Giant sea-salt aerosols and warm rain formation in marine stratocumulus, *J Atmos Sci*, 65, 3678–
 1089 3694, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JAS2617.1>, 2008.

1090 Kahn, R. A., Gaitley, B., Martonchik, J., Diner, D. J., Crean, K., and Holben, B.: MISR global aerosol optical depth
 1091 validation based on two years of coincident AERONET observations, *J Geophys Res*, 110,
 1092 doi:10.1029/2004JD004706, 2005.

1093 Kalivitis, N., E. Gerasopoulos, M. Vrekoussis, G. Kouvarakis, N. Kubilay, N. Hatzianastassiou, I. Vardavas, and N.
 1094 Mihalopoulos (2007), Dust transport over the eastern Mediterranean derived from Total Ozone Mapping
 1095 Spectrometer, Aerosol Robotic Network, and surface measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D03202,
 1096 doi:10.1029/2006JD007510, 2007.

1097 Kaly, F., Marticorena, B., Chatenet, B., Rajot, J. L., Janicot, S., Niang, A., Yahi, H., Thiria, S., Maman, A., Zakou, A.,
 1098 Coulibaly, B. S., Coulibaly, M., Koné, I., Traoré, S., Diallo, A., and Ndiaye, T.: Variability of mineral dust
 1099 concentrations over West Africa monitored by the Sahelian Dust Transect, *Atmos Res*, 164–165, 226–241,
 1100 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2015.05.011>, 2015

1101 Kanakidou, M., Seinfeld, J., Pandis, S., Barnes, I., Dentener, F., Facchini, M., et al.: Organic aerosol and global climate
 1102 modeling: a review, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 5, 1053–1123, 2005.

1103 Kanakidou M., Myriokefalitakis S., Tsigaridis K.: Aerosols in atmospheric chemistry and biogeochemical cycles of
 1104 nutrients, *Environ. Res. Lett.* 13 063004, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aabcbdb>

1105 Kanakidou, M., Myriokefalitakis, S., Daskalakis, N., Fanourgakis, G., Nenes, A., Baker, A., et al. (2016). Past, present and
 1106 future atmospheric nitrogen deposition. *Journal of Atmospheric Science*, 73, 2039–2047; DOI: 10.1175/JAS-D-15-
 1107 0278.1.

1108 Karydis, V. A., Tsimpidi, A. P., Bacer, S., Pozzer, A., Nenes, A., and Lelieveld, J.: Global impact of mineral dust on cloud
 1109 droplet number concentration, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 5601–5621, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-5601-2017>,
 1110 2017.

1111 Ke, Z., Liu, X., Wu, M., Shan, Y., and Shi, Y.: Improved Dust Representation and Impacts on Dust Transport and Radiative
 1112 Effect in CAM5, *J Adv Model Earth Syst*, 14, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021MS002845>, 2022.

1113 Klimont, Z., Kupiainen, K., Heyes, C., Purohit, P., Cofala, J., Rafaj, P., Borken-Kleefeld, J., and Schöpp, W.: Global
 1114 anthropogenic emissions of particulate matter including black carbon, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 17, 8681–8723,
 1115 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-8681-2017>, 2017.

1116 Koch, D., Schulz, M., Kinne, S., McNaughton, C., et al.: Evaluation of black carbon estimations in global aerosol models,
1117 Atmos Chem Phys, 9, 9001–9026, 2009.

1118 Kok, J. F., Mahowald, N. M., Fratini, G., Gillies, J. A., Ishizuka, M., Leys, J. F., Mikami, M., Park, M.-S., Park, S.-U., van
1119 Pelt, R. S., and Zobeck, T. M.: An improved dust emission model - Part 1: Model description and comparison
1120 against measurements, Atmos Chem Phys, 14, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-13023-2014>, 2014a.

1121 Kok, J. F., Albani, S., Mahowald, N. M., and Ward, D. S.: An improved dust emission model - Part 2: Evaluation in the
1122 Community Earth System Model, with implications for the use of dust source functions, Atmos Chem Phys, 14,
1123 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-13043-2014>, 2014b.

1124 Kok, J. F., Ridley, D. A., Zhou, Q., Miller, R. L., Zhao, C., Heald, C. L., Ward, D. S., Albani, S., and Haustein, K.: Smaller
1125 desert dust cooling effect estimated from analysis of dust size and abundance, Nat Geosci, 10, 274–278,
1126 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2912>, 2017.

1127 Kok, J. F., Adebisi, A. A., Albani, S., Balkanski, Y., Checa-Garcia, R., Chin, M., Colarco, P. R., Hamilton, D. S., Huang, Y.,
1128 Ito, A., Klose, M., Leung, D. M., Li, L., Mahowald, N. M., Miller, R. L., Obiso, V., Pérez García-Pando, C., Rocha-
1129 Lima, A., Wan, J. S., and Whicker, C. A.: Improved representation of the global dust cycle using observational
1130 constraints on dust properties and abundance, Atmos Chem Phys, 21, 8127–8167, [https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-8127-2021)
1131 8127-2021, 2021.

1132 Kok, J. F., Storelvmo, T., Karydis, V. A., Adebisi, A. A., Mahowald, N. M., Evan, A. T., He, C., and Leung, D. M.: Mineral
1133 dust aerosol impacts on global climate and climate change, Nature Reviews Earth and Environment, 4, 71-86,
1134 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-022-00379-5>, 2023.

1135

1136 Kubilay, N., Nickovic, S., Moulin, C., and Dulac, F.: An illustration of the transport and deposition of mineral dust onto the
1137 eastern Mediterranean, Atmos Environ, 34, 1293–1303, 2000.

1138 Kyllönen, K., Vestenius, M., Anttila, P., Makkonen, U., Aurela, M., Wängberg, I., Nerentorp Mastromonaco, M., and
1139 Hakola, H.: Trends and source apportionment of atmospheric heavy metals at a subarctic site during 1996–2018,
1140 Atmos Environ, 236, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2020.117644>, 2020.

1141 Laing, J. R., Hopke, P. K., Hopke, E. F., Husain, L., Dutkiewicz, V. A., Paatero, J., and Viisanen, Y.: Long-term particle
1142 measurements in Finnish Arctic: Part I - Chemical composition and trace metal solubility, Atmos Environ, 88, 275–
1143 284, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.03.002>, 2014a.

1144 Laing, J. R., Hopke, P. K., Hopke, E. F., Husain, L., Dutkiewicz, V. A., Paatero, J., and Viisanen, Y.: Long-term particle
1145 measurements in Finnish Arctic: Part II - trend analysis and source location identification, Atmos Environ, 88, 285–
1146 296, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.01.015>, 2014b.

1147 Laj, P., Bigi, A., Rose, C., Andrews, E., Lund Myhre, C., Collaud Coen, M., Lin, Y., Wiedensohler, A., Schulz, M., A.
1148 Ogren, J., Fiebig, M., Glib, J., Mortier, A., Pandolfi, M., Petäjä, T., Kim, S. W., Aas, W., Putaud, J. P., Mayol-
1149 Bracero, O., Keywood, M., Labrador, L., Aalto, P., Ahlberg, E., Alados Arboledas, L., Alastuey, A., Andrade, M.,

Artinano, B., Ausmeel, S., Arsov, T., Asmi, E., Backman, J., Baltensperger, U., Bastian, S., Bath, O., Paul Beukes, J., T. Brem, B., Bukowiecki, N., Conil, S., Couret, C., Day, D., Dayantolis, W., Degorska, A., Eleftheriadis, K., Fetfatzis, P., Favez, O., Flentje, H., I. Gini, M., Gregorič, A., Gysel-Beer, M., Gannet Hallar, A., Hand, J., Hoffer, A., Hueglin, C., K. Hooda, R., Hyvärinen, A., Kalapov, I., Kalivitis, N., Kasper-Giebl, A., Eun Kim, J., Kouvarakis, G., Kranjc, I., Krejci, R., Kulmala, M., Labuschagne, C., Lee, H. J., Lihavainen, H., Lin, N. H., Löschau, G., Luoma, K., Marinoni, A., Martins Dos Santos, S., Meinhardt, F., Merkel, M., Metzger, J. M., Mihalopoulos, N., Anh Nguyen, N., Ondracek, J., Pérez, N., Rita Perrone, M., Pichon, J. M., Picard, D., Pichon, J. M., Pont, V., Prats, N., Prenni, A., Reisen, F., Romano, S., Sellegri, K., Sharma, S., Schauer, G., Sheridan, P., Patrick Sherman, J., Schütze, M., Schwerin, A., Sohmer, R., Sorribas, M., Steinbacher, M., Sun, J., Titos, G., et al.: A global analysis of climate-relevant aerosol properties retrieved from the network of Global Atmosphere Watch (GAW) near-surface observatories, *Atmos Meas Tech*, 13, 4353–4392, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-13-4353-2020>, 2020.

Landrigan, P. J., Fuller, R., Acosta, N. J. R., Adeyi, O., Arnold, R., Basu, N. (Nil), et al. (2018, February 3). The Lancet Commission on pollution and health. *The Lancet*. Lancet Publishing Group. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)32345-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32345-0)

Lelieveld, J., Klingmüller, K., Pozzer, A., Burnett, R. T., Haines, A., & Ramanathan, V. (2019). Effects of fossil fuel and total anthropogenic emission removal on public health and climate. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(15), 7192–7197. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1819989116>

Li, J., Carlson, B. E., Yung, Y. L., Lv, D., Hansen, J., Penner, J. E., Liao, H., Ramaswamy, V., Kahn, R. A., Zhang, P., Dubovik, O., Ding, A., Lacis, A. A., Zhang, L., and Dong, Y.: Scattering and absorbing aerosols in the climate system, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-022-00296-7>, 1 June 2022a.

Li, L., Mahowald, N. M., Miller, R. L., Pérez García-Pando, C., Klose, M., Hamilton, D. S., Gonçalves Ageitos, M., Ginoux, P., Balkanski, Y., Green, R. O., Kalashnikova, O., Kok, J. F., Obiso, V., Paynter, D., and Thompson, D. R.: Quantifying the range of the dust direct radiative effect due to source mineralogy uncertainty, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 21, 3973–4005, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-3973-2021>, 2021.

Li, L., Mahowald, N. M., Kok, J. F., Liu, X., Wu, M., Leung, D. M., et al. (2022). Importance of different parameterization changes for the updated dust cycle modeling in the Community Atmosphere Model (version 6.1). *Geoscientific Model Development*, 15(22), 8181–8219. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-8181-2022>

Li, L., Mahowald, N. M., Liu, X., Ke, Z., Leung, D. M., Kok, F., Gonçalves Ageitos, M., Pérez García-Pando, C., Miller, R. L., Obiso, V., Formenti, P., Albani, S., Adebisi, A. A., Di, C., Brodrick, P. G., Thompson, D. R., Green, R. O., and Clark, R. N.: Modeling Large Dust Aerosols in the Community Earth System Model, *Journal of Advances in the Modeling of the Earth System*, in prep.

Lim, S. S., Vos, T., Flaxman, A. D., Danaei, G., Shibuya, K., Adair-Rohani, H., and AlMazroa, M. ; A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990–2010: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010., *Lancet*, 380, 2224–2260, 2012.

1184 Liu, X., Easter, R. C., Ghan, S. J., Zaveri, R., Rasch, P., Shi, X., Lamarque, J.-F., Gettelman, A., Morrison, H., Vitt, F.,
 1185 Conley, A., Park, S., Neale, R., Hannay, C., Ekman, A., Hess, P., Mahowald, N., Collins, W., Iacono, M.,
 1186 Bretherton, C., Flanner, M., and Mitchell, D: Toward a minimal representation of aerosols in climate models:
 1187 Description and evaluation in the Community Atmosphere Model CAM5, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 5,
 1188 709-739, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-709-2012, 2012.

1189 Liu, X., Ma, P. L., Wang, H., Tilmes, S., Singh, B., Easter, R. C., Ghan, S. J., and Rasch, P. J.: Description and evaluation of
 1190 a new four-mode version of the Modal Aerosol Module (MAM4) within version 5.3 of the Community Atmosphere
 1191 Model, *Geosci Model Dev*, 9, 505–522, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-505-2016>, 2016.

1192 Lucarelli, F., Calzolari, G., Chiari, M., Giannoni, M., Mochi, D., Nava, S., and Carraresi, L.: The upgraded external-beam
 1193 PIXE/PIGE set-up at LABEC for very fast measurements on aerosol samples, *Nucl Instrum Methods Phys Res B*,
 1194 318, 55–59, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nimb.2013.05.099>, 2014.

1195 Lucarelli, F., Barrera, V., Becagli, S., Chiari, M., Giannoni, M., Nava, S., Traversi, R., and Calzolari, G.: Combined use of
 1196 daily and hourly data sets for the source apportionment of particulate matter near a waste incinerator plant,
 1197 *Environmental Pollution*, 247, 802–811, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.11.107>, 2019.

1198 Luo, C., Mahowald, N. M., and del Corral, J.: Sensitivity study of meteorological parameters on mineral aerosol mobilization,
 1199 transport, and distribution, *Journal of Geophysical Research D: Atmospheres*, 108, 2003.

1200 Luo, J., Han, Y., Zhao, Y., Liu, X., Huang, Y., Wang, L., Chen, K., Tao, S., Liu, J., and Ma, J.: An inter-comparative evaluation
 1201 of PKU-FUEL global SO₂ emission inventory, *Science of the Total Environment*, 722,
 1202 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137755>, 2020.

1203 Mackey, K. R. M., Hunter, D., Fischer, E. V., Jiang, Y., Allen, B., Chen, Y., Liston, A., Reuter, J., Schladow, G., and Paytan,
 1204 A.: Aerosol-nutrient-induced picoplankton growth in Lake Tahoe, *J Geophys Res Biogeosci*, 118, 1054–1067,
 1205 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrg.20084>, 2013.

1206 Maenhaut, W., Cafmeyer, J., Ptasiński, J., Andreae, M. O., Andreae, T. W., Elbert, W., Meixner, F. X., Karnieli, A., and
 1207 Ichoku, C.: Chemical composition and light scattering of the atmospheric aerosol at a remote site in the Negev
 1208 desert, Israel, *J. Aerosol Sci.*, 28 (suppl.), 73–74, 1997b.

1209 Maenhaut, W. and Cafmeyer, J.: Long-Term Atmospheric Aerosol Study at Urban and Rural Sites in Belgium Using Multi-
 1210 Elemental Analysis by Particle-Induced X-Ray Emission Spectrometry and Short-Irradiation Instrumental Neutron
 1211 Activation Analysis, *X-Ray Spectrometry*, 27, 236–246, [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4539\(199807/08\)27:4<236::AID-XRS292>3.0.CO;2-F](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4539(199807/08)27:4<236::AID-XRS292>3.0.CO;2-F), 1998.

1213 Maenhaut, W., Salomonovic, R., Cafmeyer, J., Ichoku, C., Karnieli, A., and Andreae, M. O.: Anthropogenic and natural
 1214 radiatively active aerosol types at Sede Boker, Israel, *J. Aerosol Sci.*, 27 (suppl.), 47–48,
 1215 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-8502\(96\)00096-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-8502(96)00096-1), 1996a.

1216 Maenhaut, W., Koppen, G., and Artaxo, P.: Long-term atmospheric aerosol study in Cuiabá, Brazil: Multielemental
 1217 composition, sources, and impact of biomass burning, in: *Biomass Burning and Global Change*, vol. 2, Biomass

Burning in South America, Southeast Asia, and Temperate and Boreal Ecosystems, and the Oil Fires of Kuwait, edited by: Levine, J. S., MIT Press, Cambridge Massachusetts, 637–652, 1996b.

Maenhaut, W., Salma, I., Cafmeyer, J., Annegard, H., and Andreae, M.: Regional atmospheric aerosol composition and sources in the eastern Transvaal, South Africa and impact of biomass burning, *J Geophys Res*, 101, 23631–23650, 1996c.

Maenhaut, W., Francois, F., Cafmeyer, J., Gilot, C., and Hanssen, J. E.: Long-term aerosol study in southern Norway, and the relationship of aerosol components to source, in: *Proceedings of EUROTRAC Symposium '96*, vol. 1, Clouds, Aerosols, Modelling and Photo-oxidants, edited by: Borrell, P. M., Comput. Mech. Publ., South Hampton, UK), 277–280, 1997a.

Maenhaut, W., Fernandez-Jimenez, M.-T., and Artaxo, P.: Long-term study of atmospheric aerosols in Cuiaba, Brazil: Multielemental composition, sources and source apportionment, *J. Aerosol Sci.*, 30 (suppl., 259–260, 1999.

Maenhaut, W., Fernandez-Jimenez, M.-T., Vanderzalm, J. L., Hooper, B., Hooper, M. A., and Tapper, N. J.: Aerosol composition at Jabiru, Australia, and impact of biomass burning, *J. Aerosol Sci.*, 31 (suppl., 745–746, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-8502\(00\)90755-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-8502(00)90755-9), 2000a.

Maenhaut, W., Fernandez-Jimenez, M.-T., Rajta, I., Dubtsov, S., Meixner, F. X., Andreae, M. O., Torr, S., Hargrove, J. W., Chimanga, P., and Mlambo, J.: Long-term aerosol composition measurements and source apportionment at Rukomechi, Zimbabwe, *J. Aerosol Sci.*, 31 (suppl., 228–229, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-8502\(00\)90237-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-8502(00)90237-4), 2000b.

Maenhaut, W., De Ridder, D. J. A., Fernandez-Jimenez, M.-T., Hooper, M. A., Hooper, B., and Nurhayati, M.: Long-term observations of regional aerosol composition at two sites in Indonesia, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. B.*, 189, 259–265, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-583X\(01\)01054-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-583X(01)01054-0), 2002a.

Maenhaut, W., Fernandez-Jimenez, M.-T., Rajta, I., and Artaxo, P.: Two-year study of atmospheric aerosol particles in Alta Floresta, Brazil: Multielemental composition and source apportionment, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research B*, 189, 243–248, 2002b.

Maenhaut, W., Raes, N., Chi, X., Cafmeyer, J., Wang, W., and Salma, I.: Chemical composition and mass closure for fine and coarse aerosols at a kerbside in Budapest, Hungary, in spring 2002, *X-Ray Spectrometry*, 34, 290–296, <https://doi.org/10.1002/xrs.820>, 2005.

Maenhaut, W., Raes, N., Chi, X., Cafmeyer, J., and Wang, W.: Chemical composition and mass closure for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ aerosols at K-puszt, Hungary, in summer 2006, in: *X-Ray Spectrometry*, 193–197, <https://doi.org/10.1002/xrs.1062>, 2008.

Maenhaut, W., Nava, S., Lucarelli, F., Wang, W., Chi, X., and Kulmala, M.: Chemical composition, impact from biomass burning, and mass closure for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ aerosols at Hyytiälä, Finland, in summer 2007, *X-Ray Spectrometry*, 40, 168–171, <https://doi.org/10.1002/xrs.1302>, 2011.

1251 Mahowald, N., Li, L., Vira, J., Prank, M., Hamilton, D. S., Matsui, H., Miller, R. L., Lu, L., Akyuz, E. A., Daphne, M., Hess,
 1252 P., Lihavainen, H., Wiedinmyer, C., Hand, J., Alaimo, M. G., Alves, C., Alastuey, A., Artaxo, P., Barreto, A.,
 1253 Barraza, F., Becagli, S., Calzolari, G., Chellam., S., Chen, Y., Chuang, P., Cohen, D. Colombi, C., Diapouli, E.
 1254 Dongarra, G., Eleftheriadis, K., Galy-Lacaux, C., Gaston, C., Gomez, D., Gonzalez Ramos, Y., Hakola, H.,
 1255 Harrison, R., Heyes, C., Herut, B., Hopke, P., Huglin, C., Kanakidou, M., Kertesz, Z., Klimont, Z., Kyllonen, K.,
 1256 Lambert, F., Liu, X., Losno, R., Lucarelli, F., Maenhaut, W., Marticorena, B., Martin, R., Mihalopoulos, N.,
 1257 Morera-Gomez, Y. Paytan, A., Prospero, J., Rodriguez, S., Smichowski, P., Varrica, D., Walsh, B. Weagle, C.,
 1258 Zhao, X. (2024). Datasets for: AERO-MAP: A data compilation and modelling approach to understand the fine and
 1259 coarse mode aerosol composition (January 4, 2024 version) [Data set]. Zenodo.
 1260 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10459654>
 1261 Mahowald, N., Lamarque, J.-F., Tie, X., and Wolff, E.: Sea salt aerosol response to climate change: last glacial maximum,
 1262 pre-industrial, and doubled-carbon dioxide climates, *J Geophys Res*, 111, D05303; doi:10.1029/2005JD006459,
 1263 2006.
 1264 Mahowald, N., Jickells, T. D., Baker, A. R., Artaxo, P., Benitez-Nelson, C. R., Bergametti, G., Bond, T. C., Chen, Y.,
 1265 Cohen, D. D., Herut, B., Kubilay, N., Losno, R., Luo, C., Maenhaut, W., McGee, K. A., Okin, G. S., Siefert, R. L.,
 1266 and Tsukuda, S.: Global distribution of atmospheric phosphorus sources, concentrations and deposition rates, and
 1267 anthropogenic impacts, *Global Biogeochem Cycles*, 22, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GB003240>, 2008.
 1268 Mahowald, N. M., Kloster, S., Engelstaedter, S., Moore, J. K. K., Mukhopadhyay, S., McConnell, J. R. R., et al. (2010).
 1269 Observed 20th century desert dust variability: impact on climate and biogeochemistry. *Atmospheric Chemistry and*
 1270 *Physics*, 10(22), 10875–10893. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-10875-2010>
 1271 Mahowald, N., Ward, D. S., Kloster, S., Flanner, M. G., Heald, C. L., Heavens, N. G., Hess, P. G., Lamarque, J.-F., and
 1272 Chuang, P. Y.: Aerosol Impacts on Climate and Biogeochemistry, *Annu Rev Environ Resour*, 36, 45–74,
 1273 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-042009-094507>, 2011.
 1274 Mahowald, N. M., Engelstaedter, S., Luo, C., Sealy, A., Artaxo, P., Benitez-Nelson, C., Bonnet, S., Chen, Y., Chuang, P. Y.,
 1275 Cohen, D., Dulac, F., Herut, B., Johansen, A. M., Kubilay, N., Losno, R., Maenhaut, W., Paytan, A., Prospero, J.
 1276 M., Shank, L. M., and Siefert, R. L.: Atmospheric Iron Deposition: Global Distribution, Variability, and Human
 1277 Perturbations, *Annual Review of Marine Science of Marine Science*, 1, 245–278,
 1278 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.marine.010908.163727>, 2009.
 1279 Mahowald, N. M., Scanza, R., Brahney, J., Goodale, C. L., Hess, P. G., Moore, J. K., and Neff, J.: Aerosol Deposition
 1280 Impacts on Land and Ocean Carbon Cycles, *Curr Clim Change Rep*, 3, 16–31, [https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-017-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-017-0056-z)
 1281 [0056-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-017-0056-z), 2017.
 1282 Mahowald, N. M., Hamilton, D. S., Mackey, K. R. M., Moore, J. K., Baker, A. R., Scanza, R., and Zhang, Y.: Aerosol trace
 1283 metal deposition dissolution and impacts on marine microorganisms and biogeochemistry, *Nature Communication*,
 1284 81, 1–15, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04970-7>, 2018.

1285 Malm, W., Pitchford, M., McDade, C., and Ashbaugh, L.: Coarse particle speciation at selected locations in the rural
1286 continental United States, *Atmos Environ*, 41, 225–2239, 2007.

1287 Marshak, A., Ackerman, A., da Silva, A. M., Eck, T., Holben, B., Kahn, R., et al. (2021, November 1). Aerosol properties in
1288 cloudy environments from remote sensing observations. A review of the current state of knowledge. *Bulletin of the*
1289 *American Meteorological Society*. American Meteorological Society. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-20-0225.1>

1290 Mbengue, S., Zikova, N., Schwarz, J., Vodička, P., Šmejkalová, A. H., and Holoubek, I.: Mass absorption cross-section and
1291 absorption enhancement from long term black and elemental carbon measurements: A rural background station in
1292 Central Europe, *Science of the Total Environment*, 794, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.148365>, 2021.

1293 Marticorena, B., Chatenet, B., Rajot, J., Traore, S., Diallo, A., Kone, I., Maman, A., NDiaye, T., and Zakou, A.: Temporal
1294 variability of mineral dust concentrations over West Africa: analyses of a pluriannual monitoring from the AMMA
1295 Sahelian Dust Transect, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 2010–8899, 2010.

1296 Matsui, H. and N. Mahowald (2017), Development of a global aerosol model using a two-dimensional sectional method: 2.
1297 Evaluation and sensitivity simulations, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 9, 1887-1920,
1298 doi:10.1002/2017MS000937.

1299 McNeill, J., Snider, G., Weagle, C. L., Walsh, B., Bissonnette, P., Stone, E., Abboud, I., Akoshile, C., Anh, N. X.,
1300 Balasubramanian, R., Brook, J. R., Coburn, C., Cohen, A., Dong, J., Gagnon, G., Garland, R. M., He, K., Holben,
1301 B. N., Kahn, R., Kim, J. S., Lagrosas, N., Lestari, P., Liu, Y., Jeba, F., Joy, K. S., Martins, J. V., Misra, A., Norford,
1302 L. K., Quel, E. J., Salam, A., Schichtel, B., Tripathi, S. N., Wang, C., Zhang, Q., Brauer, M., Gibson, M. D.,
1303 Rudich, Y., and Martin, R. V.: Large global variations in measured airborne metal concentrations driven by
1304 anthropogenic sources, *Sci Rep*, 10, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-78789-y>, 2020.

1305 Mihalopoulos N., E. Stephanou, M. Kanakidou, S. Pilitsidis and P. Bousquet, Tropospheric aerosol ionic composition above
1306 the Eastern Mediterranean Area, *Tellus B*, 49B, 314-326, 1997.

1307 Millet, D. B., Palmer, P. I., Levelt, P. F., Gallardo, L., & Shikwambana, L. (2024, October 1). Coordinated Geostationary,
1308 Multispectral Satellite Observations Are Critical for Climate and Air Quality Progress. *AGU Advances*. John Wiley
1309 and Sons Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024AV001322>

1310 Mirante F., Oliveira C., Martins N., Pio C., Caseiro A., Cerqueira M., Alves C., Oliveira C., Oliveira J., Camões F., Matos
1311 M., and Silva H.: Carbonaceous content of atmospheric aerosols in Lisbon urban atmosphere. European
1312 Geophysical Union General Assembly, 2-7 May, Vienna, Austria, 2010.

1313 Mirante, F., Alves, C., Pio, C., Pindado, O., Perez, R., Revuelta, M. A., and Artiñano, B.: Organic composition of size
1314 segregated atmospheric particulate matter, during summer and winter sampling campaigns at representative sites in
1315 Madrid, Spain, *Atmos Res*, 132–133, 345–361, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2013.07.005>, 2013.

1316 Mkoma, S. L.: Physico-chemical characterisation of atmospheric aerosols in Tanzania, with emphasis on the carbonaceous
1317 aerosol components and on chemical mass closure, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium, 2008.

1318 Mkoma, S. L., Maenhaut, W., Chi, X., Wang, W., and Raes, N.: Characterisation of PM10 atmospheric aerosols for the wet
1319 season 2005 at two sites in East Africa, *Atmos Environ*, 43, 631–639,
1320 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.10.008>, 2009.

1321 Morera-Gómez, Y., Elustondo, D., Lasheras, E., Alonso-Hernández, C. M., and Santamaría, J. M.: Chemical characterization
1322 of PM10 samples collected simultaneously at a rural and an urban site in the Caribbean coast: Local and long-range
1323 source apportionment, *Atmos Environ*, 192, 182–192, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2018.08.058>, 2018.

1324 Morera-Gómez, Y., Santamaría, J. M., Elustondo, D., Lasheras, E., and Alonso-Hernández, C. M.: Determination and source
1325 apportionment of major and trace elements in atmospheric bulk deposition in a Caribbean rural area, *Atmos*
1326 *Environ*, 202, 93–104, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.01.019>, 2019.

1327 Mortier, A., Gliß, J., Schulz, M., Aas, W., Andrews, E., Bian, H., Chin, M., Ginoux, P., Hand, J., Holben, B., Zhang, H.,
1328 Kipling, Z., Kirkevåg, A., Laj, P., Lurton, T., Myhre, G., Neubauer, D., Olivie, D., von Salzen, K., Skeie, R. B.,
1329 Takemura, T., and Tilmes, S.: Evaluation of climate model aerosol trends with ground-based observations over the
1330 last 2 decades - an AeroCom and CMIP6 analysis, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 20, 13355–13378,
1331 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-13355-2020>, 2020.

1332 Murray, C. J. L., Aravkin, A. Y., Zheng, P., Abbafati, C., Abbas, K. M., Abbasi-Kangevari, M., et al. (2020). Global burden
1333 of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of
1334 Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet*, 396(10258), 1223–1249. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30752-2)
1335 [6736\(20\)30752-2](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30752-2)

1336 Nava, S., Lucarelli, F., Amato, F., Becagli, S., Calzolari, G., Chiari, M., Giannoni, M., Traversi, R., and Udisti, R.: Biomass
1337 burning contributions estimated by synergistic coupling of daily and hourly aerosol composition records, *Science of*
1338 *the Total Environment*, 511, 11–20, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.11.034>, 2015.

1339 Nava, S., Calzolari, G., Chiari, M., Giannoni, M., Giardi, F., Becagli, S., Severi, M., Traversi, R., and Lucarelli, F.: Source
1340 apportionment of PM2.5 in Florence (Italy) by PMF analysis of aerosol composition records, *Atmosphere (Basel)*,
1341 11, <https://doi.org/10.3390/ATMOS11050484>, 2020.

1342 Neff, J., Reynolds, M. P., Munson, S., Fernandez, D., and Belnap, J.: The role of dust storms in total atmospheric particle
1343 concentration at two sites in the western U.S., *J Geophys Res*, 118, 11,201–11,212, 2013.

1344 Nenes, A., Pandis, S. N., Kanakidou, M., Russell, A., Song, S., Vasilakos, P., and Weber, R. J.: Aerosol acidity and liquid
1345 water content regulate the dry deposition of inorganic reactive nitrogen, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 21, 6023–6033,
1346 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-6023-2021>, 2021.

1347 Nyanganyura, D., Maenhaut, W., Mathutu, M., Makarau, A., and Meixner, F. X.: The chemical composition of tropospheric
1348 aerosol particles and their contributing sources to a continental background site in northern Zimbabwe from 1994 to
1349 2000, *Atmos. Environ.*, 41, 2644–2659, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2006.11.015>, 2007.

Obiso, V., Gonçalves Ageitos, M., Pérez García-Pando, C., Schuster, G. L., Bauer, S. E., Di Biagio, C., Formenti, P., Perlwitz, J. P., Tsigaridis, K., and Miller, R. L., 2023: Observationally constrained regional variations of shortwave absorption by iron oxides emphasize the cooling effect of dust. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, submitted.

Oliveira, C., Pio, C., Caseiro, A., Santos, P., Nunes, T., Mao, H., Luahana, L., and Sokhi, R.: Road traffic impact on urban atmospheric aerosol loading at Oporto, Portugal, *Atmos Environ*, 44, 3147–3158, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.05.027>, 2010.

Oliveira C., PAHLIS Team: Atmospheric pollution in Lisbon urban atmosphere. European Geosciences Union General Assembly, 19-24 Apr., Vienna, Austria, 2009.

Olson, J., Prather, M., Berntsen, T., Carmichael, G., Chatfield, R., Connell, P., Derwent, R., Horowitz, L., Jin, S., Kanakidou, M., Kasibhatla, P., Kotamarthi, R., Kuhn, M., Law, K., Penner, J., Perliski, L., Sillman, S., Stordal, F., Thompson, A., and Wild, O.: Results from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climatic Change Photochemical Model Intercomparison (PhotoComp), *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 102, 5979–5991, <https://doi.org/doi:10.1029/96JD03380>, 1997.

Paulot, F., Ginoux, P., Cooke, W. F., Donner, L. J., Fan, S., Lin, M. Y., Mao, J., Naik, V., and Horowitz, L. W.: Sensitivity of nitrate aerosols to ammonia emissions and to nitrate chemistry: Implications for present and future nitrate optical depth, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 16, 1459–1477, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-1459-2016>, 2016.

Pérez, N., Pey, J., Querol, X., Alastuey, A., López, J. M., and Viana, M.: Partitioning of major and trace components in PM₁₀-PM_{2.5}-PM₁ at an urban site in Southern Europe, *Atmos Environ*, 42, 1677–1691, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2007.11.034>, 2008.

Philip, S., Martin, R. v., Snider, G., Weagle, C. L., van Donkelaar, A., Brauer, M., Henze, D. K., Klimont, Z., Venkataraman, C., Guttikunda, S. K., and Zhang, Q.: Anthropogenic fugitive, combustion and industrial dust is a significant, underrepresented fine particulate matter source in global atmospheric models, *Environmental Research Letters*, 12, 1–46, 2017.

Pio, C., Rienda, I. C., Nunes, T., Gonçalves, C., Tchepel, O., Pina, N. K., Rodrigues, J., Lucarelli, F., and Alves, C. A.: Impact of biomass burning and non-exhaust vehicle emissions on PM₁₀ levels in a mid-size non-industrial western Iberian city, *Atmos Environ*, 289, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2022.119293>, 2022.

Pio, C. A., & Lopes, D. A. (1998). Chlorine loss from marine aerosol in a coastal atmosphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres*, 103(D19), 25263–25272. <https://doi.org/10.1029/98JD02088>

Prank, M., Sofiev, M., Tsyro, S., Hendriks, C., Semeena, V., Francis, X. V., Butler, T., Van Der Gon, H. D., Friedrich, R., Hendricks, J., Kong, X., Lawrence, M., Righi, M., Samaras, Z., Sausen, R., Kukkonen, J., and Sokhi, R.: Evaluation of the performance of four chemical transport models in predicting the aerosol chemical composition in Europe in 2005, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 16, 6041–6070, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-6041-2016>, 2016.

Prospero, J., Bullard, J., and Hodkins, R.: High-Latitude Dust Over the North Atlantic: Inputs from Icelandic Proglacial Dust Storms, *Science* (1979), 335, 1078–1082, 2012.

Prospero, J., Barkely, A., Gaston, C., Gatineau, A., Campos y Sanasano, A., and Pulcherie, K. P.: Data From: Characterizing and quantifying African dust transport and deposition to South America: Implications for the phosphorus budget in the Amazon Basin, Miami, <https://doi.org/10.17604/vrsh-w974>, 2020.

Prospero, J. M.: Long-range transport of mineral dust in the global atmosphere: Impact of African dust on the environment of the southeastern United States, *Proc. Natl. Academy Science*, 96, 3396–3403, 1999.

Prospero, J. M., Uematsu, M., and Savoie, D. L.: Mineral Aerosol Transport to the Pacific Ocean, in: *Chemical Oceanography*, vol. 10, Academic Press Limited, 187–218, 1989.

Prospero, J.: The atmospheric transport of particles to the ocean, in: *Particle Flux in the Ocean*, edited by: Ittekkot, I., Schaffer, P., Honjo, S., and Depetris, P. J., John Wiley, New York, 1996.

Prospero, J. M., Barrett, K., Church, T., Dentener, F., Duce, R. A., Galloway, J. N., Levy, H., Moody, J., and Quinn, P.: Atmospheric deposition of nutrients to the North Atlantic Basin, *Biogeochemistry*, 35, 27–73, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02179824>, 1996.

Putaud, J.-P., Raes, F., Dingenen, R. Van, U. Baltensperger, Brüggemann, E., Facchini, M.-C., Decesari, S., Fuzzi, S., R. Gehrig, Hüglin, C., Laj, P., Lorbeer, G., Maenhaut, W., N. Mihalopoulos, Müller, K., Querol, X., Rodriguez, S., Schneider, J., G. Spindler, ten Brink, H., Törseth, K., and Wiedensohler, A.: A European aerosol phenomenology. 2: chemical characteristics of particulate matter at kerbside, urban, rural and background sites in Europe, *Atmos Environ*, 38, 2579–2595, 2004.

Putaud, J. P., Van Dingenen, R., Alastuey, A., Bauer, H., Birmili, W., Cyrys, J., Flentje, H., Fuzzi, S., Gehrig, R., Hansson, H. C., Harrison, R. M., Herrmann, H., Hitztenberger, R., Hüglin, C., Jones, A. M., Kasper-Giebl, A., Kiss, G., Kousa, A., Kuhlbusch, T. A. J., Löschau, G., Maenhaut, W., Molnar, A., Moreno, T., Pekkanen, J., Perrino, C., Pitz, M., Puxbaum, H., Querol, X., Rodriguez, S., Salma, I., Schwarz, J., Smolik, J., Schneider, J., Spindler, G., ten Brink, H., Tursic, J., Viana, M., Wiedensohler, A., and Raes, F.: A European aerosol phenomenology - 3: Physical and chemical characteristics of particulate matter from 60 rural, urban, and kerbside sites across Europe, *Atmos Environ*, 44, 1308–1320, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2009.12.011>, 2010.

Quass, J., Jia, H., Smith, C., Albright, A. L., Aas, W., Bellouin, N., Boucher, O., Doutriaux-Boucher, M., Forster, P. M., Grosvenor, D., Jenkins, S., Klimont, Z., Loeb, N. G., Ma, X., Naik, V., Paulot, F., Stier, P., Wild, M., Myhre, G., and Schulz, M.: Robust evidence for reversal of the trend in aerosol effective climate forcing, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 22, 12221–12239, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-12221-2022>, 2022.

Rasch, P. J. J., Feichter, J., Law, K., Mahowald, N., Penner, J., Benkovitz, C., Genthon, C., Giannakopoulos, C., Kasibhatla, P., Koch, D., Levy, H., Maki, T., Prather, M., Roberts, D. L. L., Roelofs, G.-J. G. J., Stevenson, D., Stockwell, Z., Taguchi, S., Kritz, M., Chipperfield, M., Baldocchi, D., McMurphy, P., Barrie, L., Balkanski, Y., Chatfield, R., Kjellstrom, E., Lawrence, M., Lee, H. N. N., Lelieveld, J., Noone, K. J. J., Seinfeld, J., Stenchikov, G., Schwartz, S., Walcek, C., Williamson, D., Feichter, H., Law, K., Mahowald, N., Penner, J., Benkovitz, C., Genthon, C., Giannakopoulos, C., Kasibhatla, P., Koch, D., Levy, H., Maki, T., Prather, M., Roberts, D. L. L., Roelofs, G.-J. G.

J., Stevenson, D., Stockwell, Z., Taguchi, S., Chipperfield, M., Baldocchi, D., McMurry, P., Barrie, L., Balkanski, Y., Chatfield, B., Jacob, D., Kritz, M., Lawrence, M., Lee, H. N. N., Leaitch, R., Lelieveld, J., Noone, K. J. J., Seinfeld, J., Stenchikov, G., Schwarz, S., Walcek, C., and Williamson, D.: An Assessment of Scavenging and Deposition Processes in Global Models: Results from the WCRP Cambridge Workshop of 1995, *Tellus*, 52B, 1025–1056, 2000.

Reddington, C. L., Carslaw, K. S., Stier, P., Schutgens, N., Coe, H., Liu, D., et al. (2017). The global aerosol synthesis and science project (GASSP): Measurements and modeling to reduce uncertainty. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 98(9), 1857–1877. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00317.1>

Regayre, L. A., Johnson, J. S., Yoshioka, M., Pringle, K. J., Sexton, D. M. H., Booth, B. B. B., Lee, L. A., Bellouin, N., and Carslaw, K. S.: Aerosol and physical atmosphere model parameters are both important sources of uncertainty in aerosol ERF, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 18, 9975–10006, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-9975-2018>, 2018.

Reid, J. S., Jonson, H., Maring, H., Smirnov, A., Savoie, D., Cliff, S., Reid, E., Livingston, J., Meier, M., Dubovik, O., and Tsay, S.-C.: Comparison of size and morphological measurements of dust particles from Africa, *J Geophys Res*, 108, 8593: doi:10.29/2002JD002485, 2003.

Remer, L., Kaufman, Y., Tanre, D., Mattoo, S., Chu, D., Martins, J., Li, R., Ichoku, C., Levy, R., Kleidman, R., Eck, T., Vermote, E., and Holbren, B.: The MODIS aerosol algorithm, products and validation, *J Atmos Sci*, 62, 947–973, 2005.

Remer, L. A., Kleidman, R. G., Levy, R. C., Kaufman, Y. J., Tanré, D., Mattoo, S., et al. (2008). Global aerosol climatology from the MODIS satellite sensors. *Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres*, 113(14). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009661>

Rodríguez, S., Alastuey, A., Alonso-Pérez, S., Querol, X., Cuevas, E., Abreu-Afonso, J., Viana, M., Pérez, N., Pandolfi, M., and De La Rosa, J.: Transport of desert dust mixed with North African industrial pollutants in the subtropical Saharan Air Layer, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 11, 6663–6685, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-6663-2011>, 2011.

Rodríguez, S., Alastuey, A., and Querol, X.: A review of methods for long term in situ characterization of aerosol dust, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeolia.2012.07.004>, October 2012.

Rodríguez, S., Cuevas, E., Prospero, J. M., Alastuey, A., Querol, X., López-Solano, J., García, M. I., and Alonso-Pérez, S.: Modulation of Saharan dust export by the North African dipole, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 15, 7471–7486, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-7471-2015>, 2015.

Salma, I., Maenhaut, W., Annegarn, H. J., Andreae, M. O., Meixner, F. X., and Garstang, M.: Combined application of INAA and PIXE for studying the regional aerosol composition in Southern Africa, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 101, 2361–23650, 1997.

Savoie, D. L., Prospero, J. M., Larsen, R. J., Huang, R., Izaguirre, M. A., Huang, T., Snowdon, T., Custals, L., and Sanderson, C.: Nitrogen and sulfur species in Antarctic aerosols at Mawson, Palmer Station, and Marsh (King George Island), *J Atmos Chem*, 17, 95–122, 1993.

1452 Sayer, A. M., Govaerts, Y., Kolmonen, P., Lipponen, A., Luffarelli, M., Mielonen, T., et al. (2020). A review and framework
1453 for the evaluation of pixel-level uncertainty estimates in satellite aerosol remote sensing. *Atmospheric Measurement*
1454 *Techniques*, 13(2), 373–404. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-13-373-2020>

1455 Scanza, R., Mahowald, N., Ghan, S., Zender, C., Kok, J., Liu, X., and Zhang, Y.: Dependence of dust radiative forcing on
1456 mineralogy in the Community Atmosphere Model, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 15, 537–561, 2015.

1457 Schlesinger, W. H. (1997). *Biogeochemistry: an analysis of global change* (2nd ed.). San Diego: Academic Press.

1458 Schulz, M., Textor, C., Kinne, S., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., Bernsten, T., et al. (2006). Radiative forcing by aerosols as
1459 derived from the AeroCom present-day and preindustrial simulations. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 6(12),
1460 2006–5225.

1461 Schulz, M., Prospero, J. M., Baker, A. R., Dentener, F., Ickes, L., Liss, P. S., Mahowald, N. M., Nickovic, S., García-Pando,
1462 C. P., Rodríguez, S., Sarin, M., Tegen, I., and Duce, R. A.: Atmospheric transport and deposition of mineral dust to
1463 the ocean: Implications for research needs, *Environ Sci Technol*, 46, <https://doi.org/10.1021/es300073u>, 2012.

1464 Schuster, G. L., Dubovik, O., and Arola, A.: Remote sensing of soot carbon – Part 1: Distinguishing different absorbing
1465 aerosol species, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 1565–1585, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-1565-2016>, 2016.

1466 Schutgens, N. A. J., Gryspeerdt, E., Weigum, N., Tsyro, S., Goto, D., Schulz, M., and Stier, P.: Will a perfect model agree
1467 with perfect observations? The impact of spatial sampling, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 16, 6335–6353,
1468 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-6335-2016>, 2016.

1469 Seinfeld, J. H. and Pandis, S. N.: *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics: From Air Pollution to Climate Change*, 2006.

1470 Silva, H.F., Matos, M. J., Oliveira, C., Ferreira, A. F., Oliveira, J. C., Cantinho, P., Calado, M., Oliveira, C., Martins, N., Pio,
1471 C., and Camões M. F. : Effect of climate on PM concentration and size distribution in two sites in the city of
1472 Lisbon, Encontro de Jovens Químicos Portugueses, Aveiro, 21 to 23 of April, 2010.

1473 Skiles, S. M. K., Flanner, M., Cook, J. M., Dumont, M., and Painter, T. H.: Radiative forcing by light-absorbing particles in
1474 snow, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0296-5>, 1 November 2018.

1475 Smichowski, P., Gómez, D. R., Dawidowski, L. E., Giné, M. F., Bellato, A. C. S., and Reich, S. L.: Monitoring trace metals
1476 in urban aerosols from Buenos Aires city. Determination by plasma-based techniques, *Journal of Environmental*
1477 *Monitoring*, 6, 286–294, <https://doi.org/10.1039/b312446k>, 2004.

1478 Smith, M. B., Mahowald, N. M., Albani, S., Perry, A., Losno, R., Qu, Z., Marticorena, B., Ridley, D. A., and Heald, C. L.:
1479 Sensitivity of the interannual variability of mineral aerosol simulations to meteorological forcing dataset, *Atmos*
1480 *Chem Phys*, 17, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-3253-2017>, 2017.

1481 Swap, R., Garstang, M., Greco, S., Talbot, R., and Kallberg, P.: Saharan dust in the Amazon Basin, *Tellus*, 44B, 133–149,
1482 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusb.v44i2.15434>, 1992.

1483 Szopa, S., Naik, V., Adhikary, B., Artaxo, P., Bernsten, T., Collins, W. D., Aas, W., Akritidis, D., Allen, R. J., Kanaya, Y.,
1484 Prather, M. J., Kuo, C., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L.,
1485 Gomis, M., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J., Maycock, T., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and

Zhou, B.: Chapter 6: Short-lived Climate Forcers, in: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V. , Zhai, P., A. Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C. S., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B., Cambridge University Press, , Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 816–921, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.008>, 2021.

Tanré, D., Kaufman, Y. J., Herman, M., and Mattoo, S.: Remote sensing of aerosol properties over oceans using the MODIS/EOS spectral radiances, *J Geophys Res*, 102, 16,916-971,988, 1997.

Textor, C. and others: Analysis and quantification of the diversities of aerosol life cycles within AeroCOM, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 6, 1777–1813, 2006.

Thornhill, G., Collins, W., Olivíé, D., B. Skeie, R., Archibald, A., Bauer, S., Checa-Garcia, R., Fiedler, S., Folberth, G., Gjermundsen, A., Horowitz, L., Lamarque, J. F., Michou, M., Mulcahy, J., Nabat, P., Naik, V., M. O’Connor, F., Paulot, F., Schulz, M., E. Scott, C., Séférian, R., Smith, C., Takemura, T., Tilmes, S., Tsigaridis, K., and Weber, J.: Climate-driven chemistry and aerosol feedbacks in CMIP6 Earth system models, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 21, 1105–1126, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-1105-2021>, 2021.

Toro, C., Sonntag, D., Bash, J., Burke, G., Murphy, B. N., Seltzer, K. M., Simon, H., Shephard, M. W., and Cady-Pereira, K. E.: Sensitivity of air quality to vehicle ammonia emissions in the United States, *Atmos Environ*, 327, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2024.120484>, 2024.

Tørseth, K., Aas, W., Breivik, K., Fjæraa, A. M., Fiebig, M., Hjellbrekke, A. G., Lund Myhre, C., Solberg, S., and Yttri, K. E.: Introduction to the European Monitoring and Evaluation Programme (EMEP) and observed atmospheric composition change during 1972-2009, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-5447-2012>, 2012.

Tsigaridis K., N. Daskalakis, M. Kanakidou, P. J. Adams, P. Artaxo, R. Bahadur, Y. Balkanski, S. E. Bauer, N. Bellouin, A. Benedetti, T. Bergman, T. K. Berntsen, J. P. Beukes, H. Bian, K. S. Carslaw, M. Chin, G. Curci, T. Diehl, R. C. Easter, S. J. Ghan, S. L. Gong, A. Hodzic, C. R. Hoyle, T. Iversen, S. Jathar, J. L. Jimenez, J. W. Kaiser, A. Kirkevåg, D. Koch, H. Kokkola, Y. H Lee, G. Lin, X. Liu, G. Luo, X. Ma, G. W. Mann, N. Mihalopoulos, J.-J. Morcrette, J.-F. Müller, G. Myhre, S. Myriokefalitakis, N. L. Ng, D. O'Donnell, J. E. Penner, L. Pozzoli, K. J. Pringle, L. M. Russell, M. Schulz, J. Sciare, O. Seland, D. T. Shindell, S. Sillman, R. B. Skeie, D. Spracklen, T. Stavrakou, S. D. Steenrod, T. Takemura, P. Tiitta, S. Tilmes, H. Tost, T. van Noije, P. G. van Zyl, K. von Salzen, F. Yu, Z. Wang, Z. Wang, R. A. Zaveri, H. Zhang, K. Zhang, Q. Zhang, and X. Zhang, The AeroCom evaluation and intercomparison of organic aerosol in global models, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 14, pp. 10845-10895, 2014.

Turnock, S. T., Allen, R. J., Andrews, M., Bauer, S. E., Deushi, M., Emmons, L., Good, P., Horowitz, L., John, J. G., Michou, M., Nabat, P., Naik, V., Neubauer, D., O’Connor, F. M., Olivíé, D., Oshima, N., Schulz, M., Sellar, A., Shim, S., Takemura, T., Tilmes, S., Tsigaridis, K., Wu, T., and Zhang, J.: Historical and future changes in air pollutants from CMIP6 models, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 20, 14547–14579, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-14547-2020>, 2020.

1520 Turpin, B. J., & Lim, H. J. (2001). Species contributions to pm2.5 mass concentrations: Revisiting common assumptions for
 1521 estimating organic mass. *Aerosol Science and Technology*, 35(1), 602–610. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02786820119445>

1522 Uematsu, M., Duce, R. A., Prospero, J. M., Chen, L., Merrill, J. T., & McDonald, R. L. (1983). Transport of Mineral Aerosol
 1523 From Asia Over the North Pacific Ocean. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 88(C9), 5343–5352.

1524 Vanderzalm, J. L., Hooper, M. A., Ryan, B., Maenhaut, W., P. Martin, P. R., Rayment, and Hooper, B. M.: Impact of
 1525 seasonal biomass burning on air quality in the “Top End” of regional northern Australia, *Clean Air Environ.*
 1526 *Qual.*, 37, 28–34, 2003.

1527 Vet, R., Artz, R. S. R. S., Carou, S., Shaw, M., Ro, C.-U. C.-U., Aas, W., Baker, A., Bowersox, V. C., Dentener, F., Galy-
 1528 Lacaux, C., Hou, A., Pienaar, J. J., Gillett, R., Forti, M. C. C., Gromov, S., Hara, H., Khodzher, T., Mahowald, N.
 1529 M. N. M., Nickovic, S., Rao, P. S. P., Reid, N. W. N. W., Dentener, F., Galy-Lacaux, C., Hou, A., Gillett, R., Forti,
 1530 M. C. C., Gromov, S., Hara, H., Khodzher, T., Mahowald, N. M. N. M., Nickovic, S., Reid, N. W. N. W., Vet, R.,
 1531 Artz, R. S., Carou, S., Shaw, M., Ro, C.-U., Aas, W., Baker, A., Bowersox, V. C., Dentener, F., Galy-Lacaux, C.,
 1532 Hou, A., Pienaar, J. J., Gillett, R., Forti, M. C., Gromov, S., Hara, H., Khodzher, T., Mahowald, N. M., Nickovic,
 1533 S., Rao, P. S. P., and Reid, N. W. N. W.: A global assessment of precipitation chemistry and depositoin of sulfur,
 1534 nitrogen, sea salt , base cations, organic acids, acidity and pH and phosphorus, *Atmospheric Enviroment*, 93, 3–100,
 1535 2014.

1536 Vira, J., Hess, P., Melkonian, J., and Wieder, W. R.: An improved mechanistic model for ammonia volatilization in Earth
 1537 system models: Flow of Agricultural Nitrogen version 2 (FANv2), *Geosci Model Dev*, 13, 4459–4490,
 1538 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-4459-2020>, 2020.

1539 Vira, J., Hess, P., Ossohou, M., and Galy-Lacaux, C.: Evaluation of interactive and prescribed agricultural ammonia
 1540 emissions for simulating atmospheric composition in CAM-chem, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 22, 1883–1904,
 1541 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-1883-2022>, 2022.

1542 Virkkula, A., Aurela, M., Hillamo, R., Makela, T., Pakkanen, T., Kerminen, V. M., Maenhaut, W., Francois, F., and
 1543 Cafmeyer, J.: Chemical composition of atmospheric aerosol in the European subarctic: Contribution of the Kola
 1544 Peninsula smelter areas, central Europe and the Arctic Ocean, *Journal Geophysical Research*, 104, 23,681–23,696,
 1545 <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JD900426>, 1999.

1546 Vogel, A., Alessa, G., Scheele, R., Weber, L., Dubovik, O., North, P., & Fiedler, S. (2022). Uncertainty in Aerosol Optical
 1547 Depth From Modern Aerosol-Climate Models, Reanalyses, and Satellite Products. *Journal of Geophysical*
 1548 *Research: Atmospheres*, 127(2). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JD035483>

1549 Vohra, K., Vodonos, A., Schwartz, J., Marais, E. A., Sulprizio, M. P., & Mickley, L. J. (2021). Global mortality from
 1550 outdoor fine particle pollution generated by fossil fuel combustion: Results from GEOS-Chem. *Environmental*
 1551 *Research*, 195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.110754>

1552 Watson-Parris, D., Bellouin, N., Deaconu, L. T., Schutgens, N. A. J., Yoshioka, M., Regayre, L. A., Pringle, K. J., Johnson,
 1553 J. S., Smith, C. J., Carslaw, K. S., and Stier, P.: Constraining Uncertainty in Aerosol Direct Forcing, *Geophys Res*
 1554 *Lett*, 47, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL087141>, 2020.

1555 Wiedinmyer, C., Lihavainen, H., Mahowald, N., Alastuey, A., Albani, S., Artaxo, P., Bergametti, G., Batterman, S.,
 1556 Brahney, J., Duce, R., Feng, Y., Buck, C., Ginoux, P., Chen, Y., Guieu, C., Cohen, D., Hand, J., Harrison, R.,
 1557 Herut, B., and Zhang, Y.: COARSEMAP: synthesis of observations and models for coarse-mode aerosols, Fall
 1558 American Geophysical Union, 2018.

1559 Wilson, W. E., Chow, J. C., Claiborn, C., Fusheng, W., Engelbrecht, J., and Watson, J. G.: Monitoring of particulate matter
 1560 outdoors, 1009–1043 pp., 2002.

1561 Winker, D., Hunt, W., & McGill, M. (2007). Initial performance assessment of CALIOP. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
 1562 34(L19803), doi:10.1029/2007GL030135.

1563 Wolff, G. T. (1984), On the nature of nitrate in coarse continental aerosols, *Atmospheric Environment*, 977–981 pp., 1984.

1564 Xiao, Y. H., Liu, S. R., Tong, F. C., Kuang, Y. W., Chen, B. F., and Guo, Y. D.: Characteristics and sources of metals in
 1565 TSP and PM_{2.5} in an urban forest park at Guangzhou, *Atmosphere (Basel)*, 5, 775–787,
 1566 <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos5040775>, 2014.

1567 Xu, L. and Penner, J. E.: Global simulations of nitrate and ammonium aerosols and their radiative effects, *Atmos Chem*
 1568 *Phys*, 12, 9479–9504, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-9479-2012>, 2012.

1569 Yang, Y., Wang, H., Smith, S. J., Zhang, R., Lou, S., Yu, H., Li, C., and Rasch, P. J.: Source Apportionments of Aerosols
 1570 and Their Direct Radiative Forcing and Long-Term Trends Over Continental United States, *Earths Future*, 6, 793–
 1571 808, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018EF000859>, 2018.


1572 Zender, C., Bian, H., and Newman, D.: Mineral Dust Entrainment and Deposition (DEAD) model: Description and 1990s
 1573 dust climatology, *J Geophys Res*, 108, 4416, doi:10.1029/2002JD002775, 2003.

1574 Zhang, J., & Christopher, S. (2003). Long wave radiative forcing of Saharan dust aerosols estimated from MODIS, MISR
 1575 and CERES observations on TERRA. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30(23), 2188, doi:10.1029/2003GL018479.

1576 Zhang, Y., Mahowald, N., Scanza, R. A., Journet, E., Desboeufs, K., Albani, S., Kok, J. F., Zhuang, G., Chen, Y., Cohen, D.,
 1577 D., Paytan, A., Patey, M. D., Achterberg, E. P., Engelbrecht, J. P., and Fomba, K. W.: Modeling the global
 1578 emission, transport and deposition of trace elements associated with mineral dust, *Biogeosciences*, 12,
 1579 <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-12-5771-2015>, 2015.

1580 Zhao, A., Ryder, C. L., and Wilcox, L. J.: How well do the CMIP6 models simulate dust aerosols?, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 22,
 1581 2095–2119, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-2095-2022>, 2022.

1582 Zihan, Q. and Losno, R.: Chemical properties of continental aerosol transported over the Southern Ocean: Patagonian and
 1583 Namibian sources, Paris, France, 215 pp., 2016.



1586

1587 **Figure 1:** Distribution of observations in the data base, showing the number of observations of PM_{2.5} (a) and
1588 PM₁₀ organic carbon (OC) (b) (with the colors indicating different numbers using the top color bar), as well as
1589 the number of stations within each 2x2 grid locations for PM_{2.5} (c) and PM₁₀ OC (d) (using the second color bar),
1590 showing that there is much more PM_{2.5} or PM₁₀ data, in contrast to speciated data. e) The number of observations
1591 (bars) for total particulate matter (PM) or speciated data is summarized for the PM_{2.5} (blue) and PM₁₀ (orange)
1592 fraction using the left-hand side y-axis. The number of stations included in the study is shown as a dotted line (e)
1593 and uses the right-hand size y-axis. f) Normalized (1 standard deviation over the mean) observational uncertainty
1594 for PM_{2.5} from measurement errors, interannual variability, measurement method, within grid variability and

1595 within year variability at the same station. Interannual variability and within grid uncertainty are defined as the
 1596 normalized standard deviation in the variability for stations that have more than 10 years of data. Within grid
 1597 variability is the normalized standard deviation of 2x2 grid cells that have more than 10 stations. Measurement
 1598 errors are the normalized standard deviation of the reported measurement errors for PM_{2.5}. Measurement method
 1599 error derives from differences between different measurement methods (e.g., Prank et al., 2016; Burgos et al.,
 1600 2020; Hand et al., 2017). The stations included derive from the following sources (see supplemental dataset for
 1601 more details): Alastuey et al., 2016; Almeida et al., 2005; Amato et al., 2016; Andreae et al., 2002; Arimoto et al.,
 1602 2003; Artaxo et al., 2002; Barkley et al., 2019; Barraza et al., 2017; Bergametti et al., 1989; Bouet et al., 2019;
 1603 Bozlaker et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2006; Chuang et al., 2005; Cipoli et al., 2023; Cohen et al., 2004; da Silva et
 1604 al., 2008; Dongarrà et al., 2007, 2010; Engelbrecht et al., 2009; Formenti et al., 2003; Fuzzi et al., 2007; Hand et
 1605 al., 2017; Heimbürger et al., 2012; Herut and Krom, 1996; Herut et al., 2001; Hsu et al., 2016; Hueglin et al.,
 1606 2005; Furu et al., 2022, 2015; Gianini et al., 2012a, b; Kalivitis et al., 2007; Kaly et al., 2015; Kubilay et al.,
 1607 2000; Kyllönen et al., 2020; Laing et al., 2014b, a; Lucarelli et al., 2014, 2019; Mackey et al., 2013; Maenhaut et
 1608 al., 1996c, a, b, 1997a, b, 1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2002a, b, 2005, 2008, 2011; Maenhaut and Cafmeyer, 1998; Malm
 1609 et al., 2007; Marticorena et al., 2010; Mihalopoulos et al., 1997; Mirante et al., 2010, 2013; Mkoma, 2008;
 1610 Mkoma et al., 2009; Morera-Gómez et al., 2018, 2019; Nava et al., 2015, 2020; Nyanganyura et al., 2007;
 1611 Oliveira, 2009; Oliveira et al., 2010; Pérez et al., 2008; Pio et al., 2022; Prospero et al., 1989, 2012, 2020;
 1612 Prospero, 1996, 1999; Putaud et al., 2004, 2010; Rodríguez et al., 2011, 2015; Salma et al., 1997; Savoie et al.,
 1613 1993; Silva et al., 2010; Smichowski et al., 2004; Swap et al., 1992; Tørseth et al., 2012; Uematsu et al., 1983;
 1614 Vanderzalm et al., 2003; Virkkula et al., 1999; Xiao et al., 2014; Zihan and Losno, 2016. Data from several
 1615 online networks are also included (e.g., <https://www.airnow.gov/international/us-embassies-and-consulates/>,
 1616 <https://quotsoft.net/air/>, <https://app.cpcbcr.com/ccr/#/caaqm-dashboard-all/caaqm-landing/data>,
 1617 <https://sinca.mma.gob.cl/index.php/>. <https://tenbou.nies.go.jp/download/>). See the supplemental data set for more
 1618 details and the doi links for the datasets.






Figure 2: The temporal change in the number of observations of PM_{2.5} (a) and PM₁₀ (b) available in this study (black) and by region: Dark blue: Australia, Blue: Asia, Light Blue: Europe, Yellow: Africa, Orange: South America, Red/orange: North America and Red: High latitudes; the regions are shown in (c), and are used throughout this study. Scatterplots comparing the climatological mean versus the decadal (2010-2019) mean surface concentration for PM_{2.5} (d) and PM₁₀ (e), using symbols which indicate the region of the dataset point plotted.


a. PM_{2.5} (ug/m³)




b. PM_{2.5} (ug/m³)



c. PM_{2.5} ug/m³



d. PM_{2.5} ug/m³ (ungridded)



△ Africa • Australia * North America + High Latitudes
× Asia □ Europe ◇ South America

Figure 3: Model results and gridded observations for PM_{2.5} in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ spatially mapped globally (a) and focused on just Asia (b) where the model is plotted as the background and the observations are circles with the colors indicating the amount of PM_{2.5} using the same scale. A comparison of the model (x-axis) to the observations (y-axis) is shown for the gridded data (c) and including all stations (d). In the scatter plots, the color and symbols indicate the regions, the bold black symbols are the average across each region (indicated by the symbol), the

1632 dotted line is the 1:1 line and the dashed lines are the factor of 3 uncertainty estimates. More statistics are shown
1633 in Table S7, and maps focused on different regions are available in Figure S1.

1634






Figure 4: Comparison of PM_{2.5} observations from the US Embassy’s AirNow network (<https://www.airnow.gov/international/us-embassies-and-consulates/>) versus observations from the Chinese air quality network (downloaded from <https://quotsoft.net/air/>) (Beijing 39.9N 116.4E, Guangzhou 23N 113E, Shanghai 31N 121E) and the Indian (Chennai 13N 80E, Kolkata 23N 88E, New Delhi 27N 77E) network (<https://app.cpcbcr.com/ccr/#/caaqm-dashboard-all/caaqm-landing/data>); and observations (Barraza et al., 2017) from Santiago, Chile (23.7S 70.4W) against the Chilean air quality network (<https://sinca.mma.gob.cl/index.php/>). The numbers after each city name are the number of stations found within 1° distance of the AirNow (or Chile observations) station.


a. SO_4 PM_{2.5} $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$




b. SO_4 PM_{2.5} $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$




c. BC PM_{2.5} $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$




d. BC PM_{2.5} $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$




e. OM PM_{2.5} $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$




f. OM PM_{2.5} $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$




g. Na PM_{2.5} $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$



h. Na PM_{2.5} $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$





1650 **Figure 5:** Model results and gridded observations for different types of PM_{2.5} in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ spatially mapped globally
1651 where the model is plotted as the background and the observations are circles with the colors indicating the
1652 amount PM_{2.5} using the same scale for (a) SO_4^{2-} , (c) BC (black carbon), (e) OM (organic material=1.8 times
1653 organic carbon (OC)), (g) Na, (i) Al, (k) NO_3^- , (m) NH_4^+ . A scatter plot comparison of the model (x-axis) to the

1654 observations (y-axis) is shown for the gridded observational data for for (b) SO_4^{2-} , (d) BC (f) OM, (h) Na, (j) Al,
1655 (l) NO_3^- , (n) NH_4^+ . In the scatter plots, the colors and symbols indicate the regions, the bold black symbols are
1656 the average across each region (indicated by the symbol), the dotted line is the 1:1 line and the dashed lines are
1657 the factor of 3 uncertainty estimates. More statistics are shown in Table S5, and the maps focused on specific
1658 regions are available in Figure S3-S9 for SO_4^{2-} , BC, OM, Na, Al, NO_3^- , and NH_4^+ , respectively.

1659






Figure 6: Model results and gridded observations for PM₁₀ in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ spatially mapped globally (a). A comparison of the model (x-axis) to the observations (y-axis) is shown for the gridded data (b) and including all stations (c). In the scatter plots, the colors and symbols indicate the regions, the bold black symbols are the average across each region (indicated by the symbol), the dotted line is the 1:1 line and dashed lines are the factor of 3 uncertainty estimates. More statistics are shown in Table S7, and maps focused on different regions are shown in Fig. S10


a. SO_4 PM10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$




b. SO_4 PM10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$




c. BC PM10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$




d. BC PM10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$




e. OM PM10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$




f. OM PM10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$



g. Na PM10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$



h. Na PM10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$






Figure 7: Model results and gridded observations for different types of PM₁₀ in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ spatially mapped globally where the model is plotted as the background and the observations are circles with the colors indicating the amount PM₁₀ using the same scale for (a) SO₄⁺², (c) BC (black carbon), (e) OM (organic material=1.8 times organic carbon (OC)), (g) Na, (i) Al, (k) NO₃⁻, (m) NH₄⁺. A scatter plot comparison of the model (x-axis) to the observations (y-axis) is shown for the gridded observational data for (b) SO₄², (d) BC (f) OM, (h) Na, (j) Al, (l) NO₃⁻, (n) NH₄⁺. In the scatter plots, the colors and symbols indicate the regions, the bold black symbols are the average across each region (indicated by the symbol), the dotted line is the 1:1 line and the dashed lines are the

1676 factor of 3 uncertainty estimates. More statistics are shown in Table S7, and the maps focused on specific
1677 regions are available in Figure S11-S17 for SO_4^{2-} , BC, OM, Na, Al, NO_3^- , and NH_4^+ , respectively.

1678






Figure 8: Trends in the observations of aerosols in different regions during the 1980-2000 and 2000-2024 time periods for PM_{2.5} (a) and PM₁₀ (b). Error bars indicate the 1-sigma uncertainty using a Thiel regression approach.


a. Seasonal Correlation PM2.5




b. Seasonal Correlation PM10




c. Seasonal Std. Dev. PM2.5




d. Seasonal Std dev. PM2.5



e. Seasonal Std. Dev. PM10




f. Seasonal Std. Dev. PM10



△ Africa ● Australia ✱ North America + High Latitudes
× Asia □ Europe ◇ South America

Figure 9: Model data comparison for the seasonal cycle. The correlation coefficient between the 12 climatological monthly means in the observations and the model for those station datasets with a larger seasonal cycle than within monthly variability (see Section 2.5 for more details), averaged to $2^\circ \times 2^\circ$ grid for plotting for PM_{2.5} (a) and PM₁₀ (b). A comparison of the magnitude seasonal cycle in the observations versus the model (defined as the standard deviation of the 12 climatological monthly means) spatially for (c) PM_{2.5} and (e) PM₁₀ and a scatterplot for PM_{2.5}


1690 (d) and PM₁₀ (f). The correlation coefficient is only calculated in locations where the standard deviation from the
1691 seasonal cycle is stronger than the within month variability (see Section 2.5 for details).




1693 **Figure 10:** Observational coverage (%) for gridded observations, showing within each grid box (2°x2°) the % of
1694 the constituents that are measured assuming that PM, SO₄²⁻, BC, OM, Na, Al, NO₃⁻, and NH₄⁺ are required to
1695 constrain the PM distribution for (a) PM_{2.5} and (b) PM₁₀.

1696


a. PM_{2.5} concentration default sources (%)



b. PM_{2.5} concentration new sources (%)



c. PM₁₀ concentration default sources (%)



d. PM₁₀ concentration new sources (%)





Figure 11: Modelled estimates of what percent of the surface concentration of PM_{2.5} is considered in the default CAM6 climate model (a) or is new in this study (b). Similarly PM₁₀ is shown for the default model (c) and new sources in this study (d). The new sources added in this study are the nitrogen oxides as described in Section 2.3.

1704 Table 1: Aerosol measurement types.

Composition	Measurement Method	Variables		Example Networks	Example Citations
Fine and Coarse	Stacked Filter Unit (SFU)	Fine, Coarse		U. Gent	Maenhaut et al., 2002a
PM2.5 and PM10	Reference Method/Federal Equivalent Method (FRM/FEM),	PM2.5, PM10		IMPROVE, CASNET, EMEP	Hand et al, 2019, Putaud et al., 2004
PM2.5 and PM10	Hi Vol Sampler			EMEP, SINCA	Putaud et al., 2004
Elemental	Particle Induced x-ray emission Spectrometry (PIXE), Instrumental nuclear activation analysis (INAA)	Al, S, Na		U. Gent, EMEP	Maenhaut et al., 2002a
Elemental	Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS)	Al, S, Na		EMEP, SPARTAN	Putaud et al., 2004; Phillip et al., 2017
Elemental	XRF	Al, S, Na		IMPROVE, CASNET	Hand et al, 2019
Chemistry	Ion Chromatography	SO4--, NO3-, NHr		IMPROVE, CASNET, EMEP	Hand et al, 2019, Putaud et al., 2004
Carbonaceous	Thermal Optical Reflectance	EC, OC		IMPROVE, CASNET	Hand et al, 2019
	Evolved Gas Analysis Non-dispersive Infrared (EGA+NDIR)	OC, EC		EMEP	Putaud et al., 2004

1705

1706

1707 Table 2: Global Aerosol Modelling Budgets

1708 Global modelled deposition (Tg/year), percentage of aerosol that is PM2.5, and globally and annually averaged surface
1709 concentration (µg/m³) and aerosol optical depth for each of the sources used in the model. An asterisk indicates that there
1710 are additions to the model from the default CAM6.

	PM10	PM2.5		
	Deposition (Tg/year)	%	Conc (µg/m³)	AOD (unitless)

Sulfate	121	100	2.1	0.018
Black carbon	10	100	0.5	0.009
Primary organic aerosol	34	100	1.6	0.008
Secondary organic aerosol	37	100	1.0	0.007
Sea salts	2520	3	13.0	0.045
Dust	2870	1	19.4	0.030
NH ₄ NO ₃ *	20	100	0.4	0.013

1711

1712

1713