Reply to reviewer 1

Thank you for your valuable comments. This study indeed aims to explore the potential decoupling between aerosol emissions and their direct effects. We acknowledge your concerns regarding the modelling approach employed to estimate historical aerosol forcing in MPI-ESM1.2 through the use of the MACv2-SP parametrization. In this response, we aim to provide clarity on our methodology by providing a description of the MACv2-SP parametrisation and specific results from our study.

1. MACv2-SP combines ground-based measurements of a 2005 aerosol climatology with emission estimates to represent historical changes in aerosol direct and indirect effects. Emissions estimates of SO2, NH3 as well as BC (CEDS) are accounted for in the scaling of the 2005 climatology (See Stevens et al. [2017]: Section 4: 'Time-varying forcing', Table 5,6, Figure 9,10). By weighting the radiative properties of these three compounds with their respective emission estimates, the changes in aerosol properties in time and space are represented. We acknowledge the limitation of this representation, which only takes into account these three (major) species and does not include interactive processes with the atmosphere. Nevertheless, Stevens [2015] argues that this representation of emissions successfully capture the main features seen in more complex models, both in terms of global signal and regional patterns. We intend to clarify and elaborate the representation of the time-varying forcing in the manuscript. While aerosol removal processes are not explicitly represented in MPI-ESM1.2 with MACv2-SP, they are recorded in the in-situ measurements and thus included implicitly in the MACv2-SP representation, and we argue that this provides a sufficient representation of aerosol forcing in the context of this study.

   While we acknowledge your concern regarding the time-variation of aerosol forcing, we intend to provide specific results for the reference year of 2005, since it directly applies the measured aerosol climatology. Utilizing the MACv2-SP parametrisation and our PRP approach, we calculate instantaneous aerosol radiative forcing and derive annual means. Notably, in 2005, European, North American, and South Asian sources exhibit similar emission levels (refer to Table 6 in Stevens et al. [2017]), yet significant differences in direct effect efficiency are observed (as shown in Response Table 1). By normalizing the forcing by the respective AOD values (accounting for implicit regional processes), we observe a reduction in the regional efficiency spread. Furthermore, when analysing clear-sky aerosol forcing while accounting for regional cloud-masking effects, the spread is reduced further.

   Through our analysis of 2005 forcing and investigation of regional forcing disparities, we infer that a shift in emission patterns could potentially lead to a decoupling between global emissions and direct effect. Our study demonstrates this by the use of parametrised aerosol forcing and PRP approach to effectively distinguish between direct and indirect effects within MPI-ESM1.2. We note that a decoupling between direct effect and emissions does not necessarily imply a strong decoupling in total aerosol forcing, as the indirect effect is usually dominant in ESM [Fiedler et al., 2023] and more consistent with emissions (see Figure 1 and 2b). Such decomposition between direct and indirect effects is not as straightforward in models that use interactive aerosol modules. This complicates a direct comparison with models that explicitly represent aerosol processes. Acknowledging the limitations of our methodology, we constrain the focus of our study to radiative transfer processes in ESM and show that MACv2-SP is a valuable tool in this context.

2. We would like to address the comparison of the present-day aerosol direct effect magnitude

Source region	Emissions	AOD	ADE	ADE/E	ADE/AOD
Europe	16.41	2.79	-0.012	-0.72	-4.22
North America	17.45	1.16	-0.025	-1.46	-22.0
East Asia	37.36	4.26	-0.086	-2.30	-20.18
South Asia	17.17	4.74	-0.152	-8.85	-32.06
North Asia	1.70	0.55	-0.005	-3.09	-9.54
North Africa	4.88	0.24	-0.003	-0.63	-12.64
South America	4.15	0.45	-0.012	-2.83	-26.07
Maritime Continent	3.35	1.38	-0.003	-0.80	-1.94
Australia	1.57	0.56	-0.026	-16.73	-47.01

Response Table 1: Aerosol direct effect efficiencies per source region in 2005. Emissions are Equivalent SO2 in Tg SO2, AOD $[10^{-3}]$, Aerosol Direct Effect (ADE) in $[\text{Wm}^{-2}]$, ADE/E in $[10^{-3} \ \text{Wm}^{-2}]$ per emission unit, ADE/AOD in $[\text{Wm}^{-2}]$ per AOD unit

to the CMIP6 model mean. Referring to AR6, chapter 7, Table 7.6 [Forster et al., 2021], the Direct Effect CMIP6 average and 5-95% confidence range is $-0.25 \pm 0.40 \ \text{Wm}^{-2}$, Bellouin et al. [2020] reports a present day Direct Effect ranging from -0.37 to -0.12 Wm^{-2}, whereas our study reports -0.324 Wm^{-2} (Figure 3.c). For the total aerosol radiative forcing, AR6 reports the CMIP6 average and 5-95% confidence range of $-1.11 \pm 0.38 \ \text{Wm}^{-2}$, Bellouin et al. [2020] report a present day total aerosol radiative forcing of -2.0 to 0.4 Wm^{-2} with a 90% likelihood, whereas our calculations stands at -0.76 Wm^{-2} (Figure 3.a). Other recent studies of aerosols radiative effects in CMIP6, such as Fiedler et al. [2023] and Smith et al. [2020], report a present day aerosol Effective Radiative Forcing ranging from -1.47 to -0.59 Wm^{-2} and from -1.37 to -0.63 Wm^{-2} respectively. Results from our PRP calculations align with other studies using different methods (e.g. Mauritsen et al. [2019], Fiedler et al. [2017]). Specifically, our results fall within the ranges cited above, particularly those from the AR6 assessment and Bellouin et al. [2020] study. This indicates that the magnitude of the present-day aerosol direct radiative forcing estimated in our study is not larger than the CMIP model mean and is consistent with the assessment provided in the AR6 report. It is important to clarify that MACv2-SP considers SO2, NH3, and BC as precursors. All emissions are presented in SO2 equivalent units, accounting for the respective contributions of these precursors. We acknowledge the need for clearer explanations in both the manuscript and figure captions about this.

3. We acknowledge your confusion regarding the discussion on SSA and biomass aerosols. While we extensively reference Stevens et al. [2017], we recognize the need for clearer information on the design of MACv2-SP plumes. We thus intend to clarify the effect of SSA in the manuscript as follow. Each plume represents anthropogenic aerosol emissions, accouting for SO2, NH3 and BC. The industrial plumes (Europe, North America, East and South Asia) emphasise the industrial aerosols, while the biomass plumes (North and South Central Africa, South America, Maritime Continental and Australia) emphasise aerosols resulting from anthropogenic biomass burning. This distinction is essential to reflect the dominance of specific aerosol species in each plume type. SSA values are uniformly set for both types of plumes based on measurements, as validated by Stevens [2015] to effectively capture temporal trends and regional patterns when compared to models integrating more complex aerosol processes.

4. The aerosol forcing in MPI-ESM1.2 falls within the mid CMIP6 range. In the paragraph starting on line 200 we refer to other studies that did extensive intercomparison between

CMIP6 models (such as Fiedler et al. [2023]); this type of comparison is outside the scope of the present study. As mentioned in Section 2, MPI-ESM1.2 successfully represents the historical surface temperature evolution, in particular it closely matches temperature records during the period 1950-1980 ("dampened warming" period), where the wider spread in CMIP6 models is observed [Mauritsen and Roeckner, 2020, Flynn and Mauritsen, 2020]. This makes us believe that MACv2-SP representation of aerosols is reasonable.

In summary, here is what we intend to include in the revised version of the manuscript:

- Scatter points on Figure 2 and 4 to highlight 2005 values (as presented here in Response Table 1), as well as more details on the temporal consistency of the plume efficiencies.

- A more exhaustive description of the MACv2-SP aerosol representation in the method Section, especially summarizing Section 4 on Time-varying forcing in Stevens et al. [2017].

- Clearer description of the effect of SSA and of the SO2-equivalent emission unit.

References

Bjorn Stevens, Stephanie Fiedler, Stefan Kinne, Karsten Peters, Sebastian Rast, Jobst Müsse, Steven J. Smith, and Thorsten Mauritsen. MACv2-SP: a parameterization of anthropogenic aerosol optical properties and an associated Twomey effect for use in CMIP6. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 2017. doi: 10.5194/gmd-10-433-2017.

Bjorn Stevens. Rethinking the lower bound on aerosol radiative forcing. *Journal of Climate*, 28(12): 4794–4819, jun 2015. doi: 10.1175/jcli-d-14-00656.1.

Stephanie Fiedler, Twan van Noije, Christopher J. Smith, Olivier Boucher, Jean-Louis Dufresne, Alf Kirkevåg, Dirk Olivié, Rovina Pinto, Thomas Reerink, Adriana Sima, and Michael Schulz. Historical Changes and Reasons for Model Differences in Anthropogenic Aerosol Forcing in CMIP6. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 50(15), aug 2023. doi: 10.1029/2023gl104848.

P. Forster, T. Storelvmo, K. Armour, W. Collins, J.-L. Dufresne, D. Frame, D.J. Lunt, T. Mauritsen, M.D. Palmer, M. Watanabe, M. Wild, and H. Zhang. The earth's energy budget, climate feedbacks, and climate sensitivity. *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S.L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M.I. Gomis, M. Huang, K. Leitzell, E. Lonnoy, J.B.R. Matthews, T.K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu, and B. Zhou (eds.)].*, page 923–1054, 2021. doi: 10.1017/9781009157896.009.

N. Bellouin, J. Quaas, E. Gryspeerdt, S. Kinne, P. Stier, D. Watson-Parris, O. Boucher, K. S. Carslaw, M. Christensen, A.-L. Daniau, J.-L. Dufresne, G. Feingold, S. Fiedler, P. Forster, A. Gettelman, J. M. Haywood, U. Lohmann, F. Malavelle, T. Mauritsen, D. T. McCoy, G. Myhre, J. Mülmenstädt, D. Neubauer, A. Possner, M. Rugenstein, Y. Sato, M. Schulz, S. E. Schwartz, O. Sourdeval, T. Storelvmo, V. Toll, D. Winker, and B. Stevens. Bounding Global Aerosol Radiative Forcing of Climate Change. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.1029/2019RG000660. URL https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019RG000660.

Christopher J. Smith, Ryan J. Kramer, Gunnar Myhre, Kari Alterskjær, William Collins, Adriana Sima, Olivier Boucher, Jean-Louis Dufresne, Pierre Nabat, Martine Michou, Seiji Yukimoto, Jason Cole, David Paynter, Hideo Shiogama, Fiona M. O'Connor, Eddy Robertson, Andy Wiltshire, Timothy Andrews, Cécile Hannay, Ron Miller, Larissa Nazarenko, Alf Kirkevåg, Dirk Olivié, Stephanie Fiedler, Anna Lewinschal, Chloe Mackallah, Martin Dix, Robert Pincus, and Piers M. Forster. Effective radiative forcing and adjustments in CMIP6 models. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20(16):9591–9618, aug 2020. doi: 10.5194/acp-20-9591-2020.

Thorsten Mauritsen, Jürgen Bader, Tobias Becker, Jörg Behrens, Matthias Bittner, Renate Brokopf, Victor Brovkin, Martin Claussen, Traute Crueger, Monika Esch, Irina Fast, Stephanie Fiedler, Dagmar Fläschner, Veronika Gayler, Marco Giorgetta, Daniel S. Goll, Helmuth Haak, Stefan Hagemann, Christopher Hedemann, Cathy Hohenegger, Tatiana Ilyina, Thomas Jahns, Diego Jiménéz de-la Cuesta, Johann Jungclaus, Thomas Kleinen, Silvia Kloster, Daniela Kracher, Stefan Kinne, Deike Kleberg, Gitta Lasslop, Luis Kornblueh, Jochem Marotzke, Daniela Matei, Katharina Meraner, Uwe Mikolajewicz, Kameswarrao Modali, Benjamin Möbis, Wolfgang A. Müller, Julia E. M. S. Nabel, Christine C. W. Nam, Dirk Notz, Sarah-Sylvia Nyawira, Hanna Paulsen, Karsten Peters, Robert Pincus, Holger Pohlmann, Julia Pongratz, Max Popp, Thomas Jürgen Raddatz, Sebastian Rast, Rene Redler, Christian H. Reick, Tim Rohrschneider, Vera Schemann, Hauke Schmidt, Reiner Schnur, Uwe Schulzweida, Katharina D. Six, Lukas Stein, Irene Stemmler, Bjorn Stevens, Jin-Song Storch, Fangxing Tian, Aiko Voigt, Philipp Vrese, Karl-Hermann Wieners, Stiig Wilkenskjeld, Alexander Winkler, and Erich Roeckner. Developments in the MPI-M Earth System Model version 1.2 (MPI-ESM1.2) and Its Response to Increasing CO2. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11(4):998–1038, apr 2019. doi: 10.1029/2018ms001400.

S. Fiedler, B. Stevens, and T. Mauritsen. On the sensitivity of anthropogenic aerosol forcing to model-internal variability and parameterizing a Twomey effect. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 9(2):1325–1341, jun 2017. doi: 10.1002/2017ms000932.

Thorsten Mauritsen and Erich Roeckner. Tuning the MPI-ESM1.2 Global Climate Model to Improve the Match With Instrumental Record Warming by Lowering Its Climate Sensitivity. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 12(5), may 2020. doi: 10.1029/2019ms002037.

Clare Marie Flynn and Thorsten Mauritsen. On the climate sensitivity and historical warming evolution in recent coupled model ensembles. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 2020. doi: 10.5194/acp-20-7829-2020.

Reply to reviewer 2

Thank you for your insightful comments on our manuscript. We appreciate your attention to detail and would like to address the concerns you raised regarding the radiative forcing efficiency within the MACv2-SP aerosol prescription. We acknowledge the critical role of parametrisation choices in determining aerosol radiative forcing as well as the limitations of this method, and understand your point about the inherent influence of these choices. It is important to note that MACv2-SP was specifically developed to capture aerosol radiative effects on climate using ground-based and satellite measurements as well as emission inventories of key precursors such as SO2, NH3, and BC. In addition, MACv2-SP has been designed to be lightweight and easy to use in different climate models in the CMIP6 framework. Furthermore, Stevens [2015] argues that this representation successfully replicates key features observed in more complex models, both globally and regionally. To address your comments effectively, we will provide additional details on the construction of MACv2-SP to offer further clarity on our analysis. We also recognize the importance of a thorough understanding of Stevens et al. [2017] for contextualizing our work, particularly Section 4: "Time-varying forcing".

Answers to main comments

1. We understand your concern about the strength of the South Asian plume. MACv2-SP uses CEDS emission inventories for scaling the forcing, including SO2, NH3 and BC for all plumes. Both reflective and absorbing aerosols are considered. MACv2-SP has been designed to fit climatological values of aerosol properties at the year 2005. "High-quality data by ground-based sun-photometer" are merged onto "global model background maps from AeroCom" [Stevens et al., 2017]. Different aerosol properties are considered: AOD at 440, 550 and 870 nm, absorbing AOD at 550 nm and coarse and fine-mode aerosol particles [Stevens et al., 2017]. Using this aerosol climatology retrieved from direct measurements, our calculation indicate a strong direct effect efficiency from South Asia, both against emissions and AOD in 2005 (see Response Table 1). Since that the year 2005 applies aerosol climatology from measurements and AeroCom, we are uncertain why South Asian aerosols would be expected to be strongly absorbing.

    Furthermore, there must have been a misunderstanding about Section 3.5. We do suggest that SSA significantly drives direct effect forcing efficiency (line 174-175: "a new simulation where the SSA was set to the same value for all sources, substantially reducing the spread"). SSA does have an influence on the forcing, which explains the difference between plumes dominated by industrial aerosols and plumes dominated by biomass burning aerosols. But we emphasize that since the recent increases in biomass burning in the Southern Hemisphere have a minor contribution to the total aerosol direct effect, they have a minimal impact on the global forcing-to-emission decoupling.

2. Emission rates are used to scale the 2005 aerosol climatology derived from measurements and AerCom [Stevens et al., 2017]. Analysis of the year 2005, where the measured climatology is applied (without any scaling), already suggests a strong regional dependence of the direct effect (see Response Table 1. Figure 2.c suggests that the difference between regions is in large part explain by cloud masking. Furthermore, Figure 4.a shows that the spread is reduced when considering AOD instead of emissions. To explain this, we do speculate that some aerosol processes are implicitly recorded in the instrumental measurements, such as aerosol removal. We do not completely understand your concern about the influence of residence times on radiative forcing, since we observe this discrepancy between emissions and AOD in 2005. Longer residence time results in greater measured AOD per unit of emission, resulting in greater forcing efficiency per unit of emission. Since the forcing is scaled with emissions inventories, the discrepancy is spread over time. Response Table 1 highlights the emissions and forcing values for each plume in the year 2005. The efficiencies in the Table are directly calculated from 2005 for comparison with the ones calculated in the manuscript figures. While in the manuscript we calculated the efficiencies via linear regression both against emissions and AODs, we acknowledge that we should more explicitly state that these efficiencies are consistent with emissions and thus time. We intent to clarify this in the manuscript.

Other comments

1. Lines 21-23: Both direct and indirect effect and aerosol-radiation (ari) and aerosol-cloud interactions (aci) appear in the literature, and we find that the direct and indirect effect terminology are more intuitive and connect better with the framework of radiative forcing as an instantaneous effect on the radiative balance and subsequent interactions and adjustments within the climate system.

Source region	Emissions	AOD	ADE	ADE/E	ADE/AOD
Europe	16.41	2.79	-0.012	-0.72	-4.22
North America	17.45	1.16	-0.025	-1.46	-22.0
East Asia	37.36	4.26	-0.086	-2.30	-20.18
South Asia	17.17	4.74	-0.152	-8.85	-32.06
North Asia	1.70	0.55	-0.005	-3.09	-9.54
North Africa	4.88	0.24	-0.003	-0.63	-12.64
South America	4.15	0.45	-0.012	-2.83	-26.07
Maritime Continent	3.35	1.38	-0.003	-0.80	-1.94
Australia	1.57	0.56	-0.026	-16.73	-47.01

Response Table 1: Aerosol direct effect efficiencies per source region in 2005. Emissions are Equivalent SO2 in Tg SO2, AOD [10^{-3}], Aerosol Direct Effect (ADE) in [Wm^{-2}], ADE/E in [10^{-3} Wm^{-2}] per emission unit, ADE/AOD in [Wm^{-2}] per AOD unit

2. Line 29: We appreciate that you highlight the relevance of Quaas et al. [2022]. Section 5 of their work emphasizes the close relationship between clear-sky solar ERFaer trends and trends in sulfate precursors, noting significant declines in major source regions from North America, Europe, and East Asia, alongside increases in India and surrounding regions. These findings align with our results across the 4 major industrial plumes and address your concerns regarding the strength of South Asia and the dominance of sulfate in MACv2-SP. Notably, their study supports our results by indicating that trends in sulfate precursors are driving aerosol forcing increases in regions like 'India and surrounding areas' (referred to as South Asia in MACv2-SP) over recent decades. We intend to include this comparison into the manuscript in Section 3.2.

3. Line 73: We systematically employ the two-sided PRP method described in Klocke et al. [2013].To keep our text concise, we opted not to delve into a detailed explanation of the PRP methodology in this paper. The original forward PRP (Wetherald and Manabe [1988]) consists in sequentially substituting specific state variable fields from the current climate state into a reference state, while keeping all other variables constant at the reference level. This partial perturbation approach allows for assessing each variable's contribution to the total radiative forcing. However, the perturbation is sensitive to the state in which it is introduced [Colman and McAvaney, 1997] and de-correlating fields when substituting them introduces unintended perturbations [Klocke et al., 2013]. The proposed method to partially address these approximations is to apply the partial radiative perturbation forward and backward. The backward perturbation consists in substituting the variable fields from the reference state into the current state. By averaging the results of forward and backward computations (two-sided approach), a more accurate estimation of forcing is achieved. We judge that a detailed description of this methodology would be too technical for the scope of this paper, thus we refer the reader to Klocke et al. [2013] and Colman and McAvaney [1997] for a more comprehensive description.

4. Line 103: As mentioned earlier, emissions in Tg of SO2 equivalent are calculated taking into account SO2, NH3 and BC emission inventories from CEDS. We acknowledge that we should more explicitly highlight this in the paper and intent to do so in the revised version, since we use SO2 equivalent as a unit in our main results. For a full description of SO2 equivalent calculation, the reader can refer to Stevens et al. [2017].

5. Line 128: You are right that absorption prevails in the presence of clouds only if the aerosols are above clouds. We will mention this in section 3.3.

6. We use the MACv2-SP version from Stevens et al. [2017] that integrates the CEDS emission estimates used for CMIP6 historical forcing input data. As mentioned previously, the MACv2-SP reference year 2005 uses instrumental measurements of the aerosol climatology. Since our results for the year 2005 already suggest a regional dependence of the aerosol efficiency and imply the decoupling, we do not think that more recent emission estimates would affect the results. The emission estimates are only used to scale the 2005 reference to represent the time-varying forcing. In the context of our study, this helps to clearly observe the decoupling in Figure 1, but our key results are the spatial representation with Figure 2,3 and 4.

Additionally, the results from Quaas et al. [2022] uses these 2021 updated CEDS emission estimates. Using this new dataset they obtain the results discussed in our answer to your comment on Line 29.

Since their results are consistent with our results, we believe that this update would have little effect on our results, and is unlikely to impact the outcomes of our research.

In summary, here is what we intend to include in the revised version of the manuscript:

- Scatter points on Figure 2 and 4 to highlight 2005 values (as presented here in Response Table 1), as well as details on the temporal-consistency of the plume efficiencies.

- A more exhaustive description of the MACv2-SP aerosol representation, especially summarizing Section 4 on Time-varying forcing in Stevens et al. [2017] (as formulated in this answer to reviewer 2).

- Clarity on the effect of SSA and on the SO2-equivalent emission unit.

References

Bjorn Stevens. Rethinking the lower bound on aerosol radiative forcing. *Journal of Climate*, 28(12):4794–4819, jun 2015. doi: 10.1175/jcli-d-14-00656.1.

Bjorn Stevens, Stephanie Fiedler, Stefan Kinne, Karsten Peters, Sebastian Rast, Jobst Müsse, Steven J. Smith, and Thorsten Mauritsen. MACv2-SP: a parameterization of anthropogenic aerosol optical properties and an associated Twomey effect for use in CMIP6. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 2017. doi: 10.5194/gmd-10-433-2017.

Johannes Quaas, Hailing Jia, Chris Smith, Anna Lea Albright, Wenche Aas, Nicolas Bellouin, Olivier Boucher, Marie Doutriaux-Boucher, Piers M. Forster, Daniel Grosvenor, Stuart Jenkins, Zbigniew Klimont, Norman G. Loeb, Xiaoyan Ma, Vaishali Naik, Fabien Paulot, Philip Stier, Martin Wild, Gunnar Myhre, and Michael Schulz. Robust evidence for reversal of the trend in aerosol effective climate forcing. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 22(18):12221–12239, September 2022. ISSN 1680-7324. doi: 10.5194/acp-22-12221-2022.

Daniel Klocke, Johannes Quaas, and Bjorn Stevens. Assessment of different metrics for physical climate feedbacks. *Climate Dynamics*, 2013. doi: 10.1007/s00382-013-1757-1.

R. T. Wetherald and S. Manabe. Cloud Feedback Processes in a General Circulation Model. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 1988. doi: 10.1175/1520-0469(1988)045⟨1397:cfpiag⟩2.0.co;2.

R. A. Colman and B. J. McAvaney. A study of general circulation model climate feedbacks determined from perturbed sea surface temperature experiments. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 1997. doi: 10.1029/97jd00206.