

Response to Review 1

Adrienne Jeske and Holger Tost

May 26, 2025

We thank Wiebke Frey (referee 1) for the detailed comments and the comprehensive remarks. They are very helpful and allow us to improve our manuscript. In the following, we respond to all comments. The referees comments are *italic and blue* our answers are displayed in upright font and black.

1 General comments:

Section 2:

I suggest re-ordering this section to have the model and submodel described first and then the simulation setup as the last subsection.

We re-orderd the section as suggested. We added

”The submodel CONVECT by Tost et al. (2006) is applied with the Tiedtke-Nordeng scheme to calculate the parametrised convective properties needed in CVTRANS to calculate the convective exchange matrix.” to make clear that CONVECT and CVTRANS were used.

In addition, I am surprised that the CVTRANS does not get mentioned in the simulation setup – but it is used? Additionally, the simulation setup describes the setup of the global simulations, but nothing is mentioned in the manuscript about the setup for the simulations in section 3.1, other then different versions of CVTRANS.

We describe the simulation setups used in 3.1 and 3.2:

”The submodel CONVECT by (Tost et al., 2006) is applied with the Tiedtke-Nordeng scheme to calculate the parametrised convective properties needed in CVTRANS to calculate the convective exchange matrix. Three simulations were performed with slightly different CVTRANS versions: (1) One with the old version of CVTRANS but including the Convective Exchange Matrix (CVTRANSold), (2) one with CVTRANS 3.0 and enhanced turbulent mixing (CVTRANSturb), and (3) one with the standard CVTRANS 3.0. (CVTRANSnew). (1) and (2) are only used to show the impact the turbulent mixing has on the transport by one deep convective event. Therefore, only a short simulation period is chosen. The simulation period of (3) spans the time from the beginning of 1979 until the end of 2020, because (3) is used to study the climate impact on the convective transport in this study.”

Table 1: Three global simulations were performed with different setups to test the effect of turbulent mixing on the convective transport. The simulations only vary in the used version and configuration of CVTRANS as listed above and in the simulation time.

Name	Version	Turbulence adjustment	Used in Section
CVTRANSold	v2	no adjustment	3.1
CVTRANSturb	v3	strong turbulence	3.1
CVTRANSnew	v3	weak turbulence	3.1 & 3.2

CVTRANS and convective exchange matrix:

Do I understand correctly, that the exchange matrix is a tool that does not itself calculate the transport but uses the transport as calculated by CVTRANS? This could be a bit clearer in the description.

Yes, that is correct. We added ”The redistribution is calculated with the transport routine within the submodule

CVTRANS.” in the caption of Fig. 1. Further, we changed the text and wrote ”The time integration, i.e., the vertical redistribution by convective transport of the pseudo tracer field, is performed based on the transport routine in CVTRANS compare Tost et al. (2010). The considered processes are shown in Fig. 1(b). The time integration results in the convective exchange matrix (**TrMa**).”.

Regarding section 3.1, where you only compare the exchange matrices of different versions of CVTRANS: How can you know that the transport itself is simulated well? Thus, that all your results and conclusions of the following global study are meaningful? This is a crucial point, so please elaborate.

Tost et al. (2010) showed in their publication that CVTRANS can reproduced observed profiles of (non-soluble) tracers well. The convective exchange matrix itself does not affect the convective transport itself. It is only a tool for tracing and calculation. The changes we performed concerning the turbulence are only bug fixes. We avoid large changes in the simulation results by using CVTRANS 3.0 with relatively small turbulent mixing and not using the version CVTRANS_{turb} in Section 3.2.

We added ”This submodel can reproduce observed changes of the vertical profiles of non-soluble tracers due to convection sufficiently well (Tost et al., 2010).” to justify the use of CVTRANS and to be even more clear, we inclosed ”The goal of the modifications is to overcome the issues with the missing turbulent mixing and not to alter the results of the simulations strongly from the original version, as it is the case for CVTRANSturb because Tost et al. (2010) showed already that CVTRANSold reproduces observed vertical tracer profiles. Therefore, in Sec. 3.2 CVTRANSnew is applied to investigate historical changes in the convective transport characteristics, because the deviations between CVTRANSnew and CVTRANSold are smaller than the ones between CVTRANSturb and CVTRANSold.” in Sec. 3.1.

In section 3.2 you – for the first time – mention CVTRANS 3.0. Is that the version CVTRANSnew (section 3.1) or CVTRANSturb, or yet a different version? Would probably be good to also mention version names in section 3.1 (also for CVTRANSold).

We added the Tabel 1 for clarity and described all simulation setups in the simulation setup section former Section 2.2 now Section 2.4.

Model levels:

As model levels are arbitrary, your reader (and I) might (or do) struggle when you indicate the analysed altitude level by model level numbers. Sometimes, you provide the respective altitude in hPa in brackets, sometimes you reverse the annotation the “hPa (model level #)”, sometimes only hPa, sometimes only model level number (for example throughout the second half of page 7).

Thank you for pointing out that the notation using the model level is confusing. We agree. Sadly, we can not use pressure levels instead because transport artefacts would arise due to the interpolation; e.g., the vertical extend of the model levels in mountain areas is compressed in comparison to the levels in grid boxes over the ocean. If we want to interpolate from model levels to pressure levels and make use of the same pressure levels for all boxes (i.e., the vertical global mean pressure profiles) we would lose some matrix entries in mountain areas. Moreover, we would divide entries of the convective exchange matrix from one to two levels due to the interpolation from two model levels to the pressure level chosen in between. In the worst case, that could lead to the display of convective transport where no convection took place. For this reason, we decided to stick to model levels and only to refer to associated pressure levels.

You are right that we should stick to one notation. We are now using the roughly pressure levels in hPa or terms as upper troposphere / lower stratosphere and denote the model levels in brackets. Furthermore, we adapted Fig. 1 and the former Fig. S1 now Fig. 2. Now, these Figures contain information about the order of the model levels.

Please, 1) stay consistent and 2) provide a ‘human readable’ format, like hPa. If you really want to keep the model levels in the text, than please put these into brackets. Also, when you talk about higher/lower levels, it is sometimes not clear whether you mean higher/lower in model level world or in ‘real’ world. This needs more clarity!

We changed that accordingly.

On lines 221-225 you make a remark on the model levels vs hPa for the global simulations. Please, to also help your reader here, provide a ‘human readable’ altitude equivalent for the whole profile, such that your reader can identify whether a certain model level might be rather located in e.g. the BL, lower free troposphere, upper troposphere, tropopause region, etc. It should suffice to at least say which model levels they “roughly correspond to”. Also here,

use the ‘human readable’ format in the description of your results.

Concerning our remark on lines 221 to 225 we added a table with reference values to the supplements:

Table 2: Reference values for the tropopause and the boundary layer height. In this table information, is provided which model and approximate pressure levels correspond to the simulated tropopause. Additionally, the approximate reference model level and heights in meters are shown for the boundary layer height. In this study, we relate the tropics to the area between 30°N and 30°S and the extra-tropics to the area between 30°N/S and 60°N/S. We do not claim that this table is exact nor includes all possible model levels, pressures and heights of the tropopause and the boundary layer. The given values should be considered as rough guidance only.

Reference	Model level tropics	Pressure tropics	Model level extra-tropics	Pressure extra-tropics
Tropopause	15 to 4	340 to 60 hPa (130 to 100 hPa)	19 to 6	410 to 110 hPa (390 to 170 hPa)
Reference	Model level tropics	Height tropics	Model level extra-tropics	Height extra-tropics
Boundary layer	31 to 22	0 to 3000 m	31 to 19	0 to 4400 m

At the same time, I am wondering, that e.g. in Figures 8, 9, and 10 you provide equivalent pressure levels that do not change between the figures, even though following your remark, I would have expected this?

The pressure levels in the in Figures 8, 9, and 10 (and 4, 5) refer to the a standard pressure of 1013.25 hPa in the lowest level. It is not a mean profile. To address this issue we added ”The equivalent pressure is presented alongside the model levels to allow a rough estimation of the pressure. This equivalent vertical pressure is based on a vertical profile when the pressure in the box closest to the surface is 1013 hPa.”

Grammar:

Throughout the manuscript, I had to re-read several sentences as the order of the words in the sentences was mixed up (wrong sentence structure), e.g. “mostly starts/starts mostly” or the placement of the verb. I believe, a lot of text editors have a grammar check, please make use of it! I won’t correct these instances in the detailed comments.

This is absolutely right. We tried to improve the language and the grammar.

2 Detailed comments:

line 24: “... and the related scavenging”

Scavenging of what? (aerosols, tracers, ...)

We changed ”... and the interplay of convective transport and the related scavenging ...” to ”... and the interplay of convective transport and the related scavenging of tracers ...”

line 27: “... it is a hot topic in literature”

If this is a hot topic, then I would expect more references and their conclusions in the following. However, there are basically three studies mentioned, of which only one is from the recent years (Lepore et al., 2021). However, you mainly focus only on one study (Stevenson et al., 2005). I think, the discussion around the Stevenson paper could be condensed while the introduction would severely benefit from including more references and details about the conclusions of other recent studies looking at this ‘hot topic’.

We appreciate your comment a lot and agree fully. Our formulation ”hot topic” was most unfortunate. We used a different formulation, shortened the discussion about Stevenson et al. (2005) and included two more studies (a recent one and one a bit older, but it is supporting the point we want to make).

line 34: “Thereby” I think, this is not the right word, did you mean “They found that” or something along that line?

We removed this sentence from the manuscript to shorten the discussion about the study by Stevenson et al. (2005) (see your comment above).

line 41: “Therefore, this study” -> ‘Therefore, our study’

We changed that.

line 42: typo ‘specifically influence’

We corrected the typo.

line 42/43: check for missing commas (,). We added the commas and rewrote the question(s) because it was a bit complicated. Now: ”How does climate change specifically influence the convective transport? How has the transport efficiency and extent of the updraft, the downdraft, and the balancing subsidence changed with time?”

line 68/69: shorten to “... utilising EMAC.” (had been introduced in the subsection before)

We shortened the sentence and adapted it to plural form to take also the different simulation setups into account (compare major comments). We wrote ”Three dimensional global simulations have been conducted with the convective exchange matrix implemented utilising EMAC.”

line 69: “10 Pa” – Do you mean 10 hPa?

Yea, we meant 10 hPa and changed that in the manuscript. Thank you!

line 70: T63 – for readers not familiar with EMAC, please state what this resolution means in terms of spatial resolution (km).

We included additional information about the special resolution in km.

lines 80-83: These are rather statements for the acknowledgements.

We removed the sentence regarding the computational resources within the paper. We mention them in the acknowledgments.

line 86/87: Here, you state that the convection is parameterised based on Lawrence and Rasch (2005), while in the results, you often stress the Tiedtke-Nordeng convection parameterisation. Which is used?

The Tiedtke-Nordeng scheme is used within the submodel CONVECT to calculate the convection in EMAC. The bulk formulation as used by Lawrence and Rasch (2005) is utilised by Tost et al. (2010) to parameterise the convective transport (not the convection itself). The convection parameterisation (in our case) Tiedtke-Nordeng provides necessary quantities, i.e., the mass fluxes which are used in the convective transport parameterisation to calculate the redistribution of tracers / air masses. Beyond that, both are independent of each other. We agree that our formulation was unfortunate. We wrote ”a single plume/bulk convective transport parameterisation” instead of ”a single plume / bulk convection parameterisation”.

line 120: “A formulation following...” Unspecific – what exact formulation? Or is there only one, then say “the formulation”

We changed ”A formulation...” to ”The formulation ...”.

lines 122-124: “The adaptive time stepping by Ouwersloot et al. (2015) must be applied” & “Hence, we argue that adaptive time stepping should be applied “ Double! Please remove redundancy.

We removed ”Hence, we argue that adaptive time stepping should be applied in every simulation using CVTRANS.”.

line 130: What is “C”?

The concentration of a tracer or air mass. We added ”Thereby, C denotes the concentration of a tracer.” after equation (4).

line 132: “First, in every vertical model level (1,2,...,N)” Please include the information about the model level ordering that follows in lines 143/144 here, to avoid confusion (e.g. otherwise the reader would think that in line 143 i should be smaller j not the other way around).

We added: ”An important remark: By definition, the vertical model level with the highest number, level N , is closest to the surface.”

line 146: “in the electronically supplements” -> remove ‘electronically’

We removed the whole sentence “The illustration Fig. S1 in the electronically supplements can be used as guideline for the interpretation of the convective exchange matrix” because we decided to follow your advice to include Fig. S1 in the paper itself.

Figure 1: I would suggest to include model level numbers (1, 2, ..., N) in the Figure to help guide the reader. You mention downdraft and large-scale subsidence in the caption, I would suggest to also include these with arrows in the schematic in the middle of the figure for completeness.

We included the model levels in Fig. 1. Now, downdraft and subsidence are incorporated as well.

Section 3.1

I am missing information on the simulated case. Nothing is mentioned in the simulation setup section, neither is it here (the only mention is in line 167 “for one exemplary deep convective event”). Is the case that you simulate an idealised storm, or is it a real case?

We changed Section 2 and explain the simulation setups in this section. To be more specific we also change “We performed three simulations to demonstrate the effects of the described changes in the submodel CVTRANS.” to “We performed three global simulations to demonstrate the effects of the described changes in the submodel CVTRANS (Table 1).” in Section 3.1.

For the comparison, we had chosen an arbitrary deep convective event which occurred in the simulations. In all three simulations, the same convective event is simulated because the changes in CVTRANS have no feedback on the meteorology. This is the case because no chemistry is considered. Every other deep convective event from the simulations could have been selected also to show the differences between the three configurations of CVTRANS qualitatively.

To make the reader aware, we decided to write in the caption of the former Fig. 2 “Convective exchange matrix for one snapshot of one specific event.”

line 173: “... and subsides...” -> remove ‘and’

We deleted “and”.

line 174: “The large scale subsidence together with the downdraft balance the updraft.” Are there no large scale upward motions in the model?

There are large scale upward motions. However, large scale processes and convection as well as convective transport are treated separately and independently as long as convection parameterisations are considered. Therefore, the large scale motion is not able to balance the convective induced movements. This has a rat tail but it is a general issue with coarse resolution model simulations. However, we cannot perform climate and especially not fully coupled chemistry-climate simulations at convection permitting scales within a reasonable amount of computing time at this point. Maybe that will become feasible in the future with increasing computer power.

We added in the paper that we refer large scale subsidence as the grid-scale subsidence and we added “Synoptic-scale processes are not considered.” in the caption of Fig.1. We hope that makes it easier to understand for the reader.

line 175/176: “This is realised by allowing the subsidence to transport mass to the model level directly below the original level only “

Why does this make the subsidence slower?

Velocity is distance divided by time: If we now prescribe that a molecule is only allowed to subside one model level instead of multiple levels, we decrease the distance it can possibly cover within the same amount of time. Therefore, the effective velocity will be smaller.

Thank you for pointing out that this is not as clear for the reader on first sight. We included “by reducing the transport distance” in the paper to make it more obvious.

Figure 3: Comparing to Figure 2, it seems that in some places of the figure there should be a coloured shading, e.g. around origin level 16/destination level 26-31.Maybe adapt the colour scale?

We changed the colour scale of Fig. 3 (now Fig. 4).

line 232: “The convective transport based on the Tiedtke-Nordeng convection parameterisation indicates typical features. “ Are these features typical for the Tiedtke-Nordeng parameterisation? How is it different for other

parameterisations? Please discuss/describe. If it is not specific for this parameterisation, the sentence could be removed because of redundancy. We removed the sentence.

line 233: “reaches not” -> ‘does not reach’

We changed that.

line 239: a) “distinguishable increase” – increase compared to what? b) “lowest three model levels” Is that now level 1-3, or 31-29? See main comment on model levels.

a) We reformulated the sentence. Now: ”For the lower to mid-tropospheric origin levels, the downdrafts transports air mass especially to the three levels closest to the surface.”

b) We wrote ”three levels closest to the surface” instead of ”lowest three model levels”.

lines 241-243: These sentences are somewhat contradictory: The upward transport to these levels has been strengthened, but at the same time these levels are only occasionally influenced by convection? Maybe better to discuss together with the matrices that separate tropics from subtropics?

As you supposed, we decided to remove the sentence here as we discuss the differences between tropics and extra-tropics later anyway.

line 259: “Thereby, overshooting is defined as events where the updraft mass flux reached beyond the tropopause in one column” Thereby is probably not the right word. Do you mean that the Tiedtke-Nordeng scheme defines overshooting like this? Is that definition consistent with the definition of overshooting in Wu et al. (2023), which you compare to in the following? As convective overshooting does not only happen at the tropopause, definitions might differ and thus, would need to be discussed here.

This is a good point. Thanks you for bringing it to our attention. We change the from ”Thereby, overshooting is defined as events where the updraft mass flux reached beyond the tropopause in one column” to ”We define one (tropopause) overshooting event as an event when the updraft mass flux associated with one convective event reaches beyond the independently calculated tropopause in one column and at the same time step.”

We do not make use of the same definition of overshooting convections as Wu et al. (2023). Wu et al. (2023) use the term tropical overshooting deep convection without defining it specifically. They mainly look at deep convective events reaching approximately altitudes between 14.5 and 18.5 km. They sometimes show deep convection which at least reaches above 15.5 km (see their Fig. 1) and also show overshooting convection based on model results when the deep convective cloud top height penetrates higher as the tropical cold point tropopause height in their Fig. 3. We agree that our comparison to Wu et al. (2023) was not explicit and specific enough. Therefore, we decided to compare only the changes Wu et al. (2023) detected for tropical overshooting convection reaching beyond the cold point tropopause with our results.

line 273: “The upward transport has decreased...” Repeat what you are comparing.

We added ”for the most recent time period in comparison to the 1980ies” at the end of the sentence.

line 275: “Less deep updraft convective mass fluxes...” Do you mean ‘Fewer occurrences of ...’?

Yes, indeed. We reformulated and wrote ”Deep updraft convective mass fluxes occurred less...”.

Figure 6 (caption): “colors” in the caption of Fig. 5 you use ‘colours’, please check consistency of the usage of British vs American English throughout the manuscript.

We changed that. Thanks!

line 314: “A similar picture...” Similar to what? Actually, I have the impression that the whole sentence is not necessary and can be removed.

We deleted the statement.

line 319: “ The downdrafts shift to higher origin levels. “ Here, I am not sure what you refer to with ‘higher levels’ is it higher model level numbers (so lower levels in the atmosphere) or higher in the sense of altitude in the atmosphere? See also major comment on model levels; I would strongly suggest using a notation that goes from low levels at the ground to high levels at altitude.

We used the pressure notation with the model level information in brackets to be more clear and wrote “The downdrafts shift as well to starting levels located further up with regard to the surface,... “

line 329: remove ‘although’

We removed ”although”.

line 329/330: “A shift of the downdrafts“

A shift from where to where?

We rewrote the whole section to increase the comprehensibility.

Figure 11/line 349: Do I understand correctly, that you identify transport from the boundary layer to the upper troposphere based on the transport that happens within one 12min time step? Is that not too short? I would think, that the BL to UT transport happens on time scales of about 30min (e.g. Thompson et al., 1997), so that would be 2-3 time steps in your simulation. Thus, you would underestimate the transport if only using one time step?

In general, yes the transport of one convective event would be underestimated. However, we aimed to show how the convective transport had changed in average over roughly the past 40 years. The climate signal is not underestimated using the model time step especially because our focus lies on the convective transport patterns. Fig. 11 cannot be used to give a direct estimate how much material is reaching the upper troposphere in general. To investigate this, the convective exchange matrix needs to be applied consecutively for the duration of each convective event. Depending on the specific question, the use of tracers might also be an option. However, this is beyond the scope of this study.

lines 357-360: Why are too high precipitation rates an indicator for overestimated convective transport?

We explained it further in the manuscript

”(2) It can be assumed that the Tiedtke-Nordeng scheme does not perform sufficiently well in these areas in general, because the precipitation rates calculated with the Tiedtke-Nordeng convection parameterisation within EMAC are too high compared to observations in these areas, as shown by Tost et al. (2006) in their Fig. 2. As the freshly formed precipitation is proportional to the updraft mass flux, a too strong updraft mass flux results in both an overestimation of the convective precipitation and of the convective upward mass transport.”

line 449: “... convection reaches further...” -> reaches ‘higher’

To be more specific we decided to use the term ”penetrates higher”.

lines 454-459: Here, you compare updraft speeds as studied by Del Genio et al and mass fluxes. These are not directly comparable, as for the calculation of the mass fluxes you need to take into account the updraft width/area (or area fraction). Did you check whether this also changed?

The convective mass fluxes in EMAC with resolution T63 are given with regard to the whole model box. A convective fraction is not considered. Therefore, changes in the updraft mass flux can be directly linked to the updraft velocity as long as the grid box size is taken into account.

We also analysed whether the areas of convective activity changed substantially over time; however, this is not the case, such that the strengthening of the updraft mass flux is directly proportional to an increase in vertical velocity.

line 462: “high altitude levels” -> Would be good to stick to the UT/LS notation to make clear what exactly you identify as high altitude here.

We decided to shorten this paragraph. Therefore, the phrase you are referring to was removed.

line 466: “... at lower temperatures as the colder point tropopause...” Did you mean ‘at the cold point tropopause’?

Yes, we mean ‘at the cold point tropopause’ and changed that in the manuscript.

line 470: typo CVTRANS

Thank you! We corrected the typo.

line 470/471: I suggest to swap the two sentence parts (before/after the comma) to start the conclusions more general.

We wrote "We investigated the changes in convective transport due to climate change applying the submodel CVTRANS which ..."

line 471: "Thus"

I don't think, thus is the right word here – do you want to say that you take CVTRANS a step further (further to where?) because you apply it?

We changed the formulation to "We made the following adjustments to CVTRANS: (1) established consistency with the underlying convection scheme (Tiedtke-Nordeng) concerning the turbulent detrainment and entrainment."

line 473/474: "(2) In addition, the entrained air into the downdraft can be directly detrain in the same level of the downdraft comparable to the proceed concerning the updraft."

I don't understand what you want to say here, please rephrase.

We reformulated and wrote "(2) In addition, the entrained air into the downdraft can be directly detrain at the same level. This is comparable to the procedure for the updraft that was already included in CVTRANS before."

line 475: "more realistic handling of the turbulent mixing"

We wrote instead "more consistet handling of the turbulent mixing".

I am not a 10% convinced here. At the end of section 3.1 you even state that "the transport to the upper troposphere by CVTRANSturb is not efficient enough". How do infer, that your setup results in a more realistic handling of turbulent mixing? In fact, I only see the differences between the CVTRANS versions described (in section 3.1), but no discussion about which version provides the most realistic treatment anywhere in the manuscript. That relates to my comment on CVTRANS version, which version do you refer to in the conclusions, which version do you use in the global simulations, which versions are CVTRANSold/CVTRANSnew/CVTRANSturb?

We incorporated in Sec. 3.1:

"The goal of the modifications is to overcome the issues with the missing turbulent mixing and not to alter the results of the simulations strongly from the original version as it is the case for CVTRANSturb because Tost et al. (2010) showed already that CVTRANSold reproduces observed vertical tracer profiles. Therefore, in Sec. 3.2 CVTRANSnew is applied to investigate historical changes in the convective transport characteristics, because the deviations between CVTRANSnew and CVTRANSold are smaller as the ones between CVTRANSturb and CVTRANSold."

and include the following statement in the conclusions:

"We used the old version of CVTRANS (CVTRANSold) which performs reasonable well in comparison to observations (Tost et al., 2010) in order to contrast it to the new version of CVTRANS with the adaptations for the turbulence (CVTRANSnew). CVTRANSturb is similar to CVTRANSnew but with enhanced turbulence. The latter was used to demonstrate the sensitivity of the convective transport to turbulence, but this version inhibits the transport to the upper troposphere to a great extend. Short-cutting the convective transport to such an extend is not beneficial keeping in mind that CVTRANSold performs well as pointed out by Tost et al. (2010). Therefore, CVTRANSnew is used a compromise to keep the results close to the ones of CVTRANSold and to include the consistent turbulent entrainment and detrainment."

To make the point more obvious, we changed panel (b) of Fig. 3. It shows now the CVTRANSturb-CVTRANSold and not CVTRANSnwe-CVTRANSturb.

line 476: "redistribution OF air masses"

We inserted "of".

line 478: "... disentangled from the other processes."

What are 'the other processes'? If you write 'the', you have to be specific.

We removed "the".

line 483/484: Remove "Respectively"

Done.

line 484: replace model level notation. A lot of people read the conclusions before the main manuscript, thus, they

will not understand which altitude you are looking at.

We removed the model levels in the conclusions and used reference terms, e.g., free troposphere.

line 486: “smaller mean transport” -> ‘weaker mean transport’

We changed this as suggested.

line 489: “first insights in “ -> insights into

We adapted the formulation.

line 490: “becomes emerging” -> emerges

line 490: “climate change open the path for higher but in total less upward transport” -> climate change opens the path for stronger but in total weaker upward transport

These formulations are no longer included in the manuscript.

line 491: “Furthermore, this study...”

Do you really mean ‘this study’, or ‘the convective exchange matrix’?

We mean the convective exchange matrix. However, we removed this sentence because the manuscript is quite long.

Supplement:

Figure S1: I think this figure is extremely helpful and should thus be included into the main manuscript, including a good description of the figure in the main text.

I think, that “Very small to zero transport” in the figure is already an interpretation of simulations you run, while it should rather describe the potential process – which would be (in the style as you describe the updrafts) “extreme downdrafts”. Also, what about upper level downdrafts?

We included Fig. S1 (now Fig. 2) and a description of the figure in the paper. We rewrote “Very small to zero transport”. Now, the statement “Extremely strong downward motion” is included.

We added a second panel to the former Fig. S1 to make the difference between the tropics and mid latitudes more obvious for the reader.

References

- M. G. Lawrence and P. J. Rasch. Tracer transport in deep convective updrafts: Plume ensemble versus bulk formulations. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 62(8):2880 – 2894, 2005. doi: 10.1175/JAS3505.1. URL <https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/atsc/62/8/jas3505.1.xml>.
- D. Stevenson, R. Doherty, M. Sanderson, C. Johnson, B. Collins, and D. Derwent. Impacts of climate change and variability on tropospheric ozone and its precursors. *Faraday Discuss.*, 130:41–57, 2005. doi: 10.1039/B417412G. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/B417412G>.
- H. Tost, P. Jöckel, and J. Lelieveld. Influence of different convection parameterisations in a gcm. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 6(12):5475–5493, 2006. doi: 10.5194/acp-6-5475-2006. URL <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/6/5475/2006/>.
- H. Tost, M. G. Lawrence, C. Brühl, P. Jöckel, and The GABRIEL Team and The SCOUT-O3-DARWIN/ACTIVE Team. Uncertainties in atmospheric chemistry modelling due to convection parameterisations and subsequent scavenging. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10(4):1931–1951, 2010. doi: 10.5194/acp-10-1931-2010. URL <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/10/1931/2010/>.
- X. Wu, Q. Fu, and C. Kodama. Response of tropical overshooting deep convection to global warming based on global cloud-resolving model simulations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 50(14):e2023GL104210, 2023. doi: 10.1029/2023GL104210. URL <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2023GL104210>. e2023GL104210 2023GL104210.