

A multi-model approach to constrain the atmospheric hydrogen budget

Srinath Krishnan¹, Ragnhild Bieltvedt Skeie¹, Øivind Hodnebrog¹, Gunnar Myhre¹, Maria Sand¹, Marit Sandstad¹, Hannah Bryant², Didier A. Hauglustaine³, Fabien Paulot⁴, Michael Prather⁵, David Stevenson².

¹CICERO Center for International Climate Research, Oslo, Norway

²School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

³Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement (LSCE), CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

⁴Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, Princeton, NJ, USA

⁵Earth System Science Department, University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, USA

Correspondence to: Srinath Krishnan (Srinath.krishnan@cicero.oslo.no)

15 Abstract.

Understanding the global hydrogen (H₂) budget is critical as H₂ is expected to play an important role in future energy systems. Tropospheric H₂ sources include direct emissions and atmospheric production via chemical reactions, while sinks are soil uptake and removal by hydroxyl radical (OH). Large uncertainties remain in quantifying the atmospheric production and loss of H₂ ~~largely due to~~ due to large uncertainties in H₂ uptake in the soil and the lack of global-scale knowledge of the abundance of OH.

We use a suite of global three-dimensional Atmospheric Chemistry Models (ACM) to evaluate key reactive species involved in atmospheric production and loss — formaldehyde (HCHO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and carbon monoxide (CO) — ~~with satellite retrievals.~~ A box model is then used to simulate the evolution of global mean tropospheric H₂ from pre-industrial to present day; to test different relative contributions in atmospheric production from methane and Volatile Organic Compounds; (VOC); and to assess atmospheric loss with different OH concentrations. Isotopic compositions of the different sources and sinks are further used to constrain these ~~sources and sink~~ terms and assess the ~~possibility~~ potential importance of geological sources to the H₂ budget.

Models generally match ~~satellite retrievals~~ each other for HCHO, though model diversity exists for NO₂ and CO. From model evaluations and box model constraints, we estimate atmospheric H₂ production of 37-60 Tg/year, and atmospheric losses of 15-30 Tg/year, suggesting that some top-down literature estimates may overestimate production. Box model results suggest an upper bound of 9 Tg/year for geological sources, considerably lower than the 23 Tg/yr proposed previously. We recommend more isotopic observations and targeted measurement campaigns to further refine the budget.

1 Introduction

A recently recalibrated H₂ observational dataset published by the NOAA Global Monitoring Laboratory showed that the globally averaged tropospheric mole fraction ~~today is ~530~~(nmol/mol of dry air) ~~for the marine boundary layer was 552.8~~ ppb ~~in 2021~~, with an increase of ~~10~~20.2±0.2 ppb ~~over the last decade~~compared to 2010 (Paulot et al., 2024; Pétron et al., 2024). This concentration varies spatially and seasonally because of changing sources and sinks for H₂. Estimates of the Global Warming Potential (GWP) of hydrogen depend on its atmospheric perturbation lifetime, highlighting the need to constrain its sources and sinks. The major H₂ source categories include atmospheric production from the oxidation of methane (CH₄, a ~~volatile organic carbon~~Volatile Organic Carbon, VOC) and ~~non-methane~~Non-Methane VOCs (NMVOCs), as well as surface emissions from incomplete fossil fuel combustion, biomass burning, and nitrogen fixation from soils and oceans. Atmospheric production is estimated to account for up to ~~50~~55% of the total sources, combustion for ~~30~~25-40% and nitrogen fixation for 10-15% (Ehhalt and Rohrer, 2009; Ouyang et al., 2025).

In the atmosphere, H₂ is produced by photolysis of formaldehyde (HCHO), which is formed during the photochemical oxidation of methane with an estimated production range of 15-27 Tg/yr (Novelli et al., 1999; Paulot et al., 2024; Price et al., 2007; Sanderson et al., 2003). The oxidation of other VOCs, including biogenic VOCs also produces HCHO, contributing an additional 9-20 Tg/yr (Derwent and Jenkin, 2024; Novelli et al., 1999; Price et al., 2007). Estimates for atmospheric production using “top-down approaches” such as inverse modeling and seasonal isotopic compositions of H₂ generate much larger estimates for the total atmospheric production of 64-77 Tg/year (Rhee et al., 2006; Xiao et al., 2007) compared to “bottom-up approaches” where local measurements are upscaled to estimate global values (Hauglustaine and Ehhalt, 2002; Novelli et al., 1999; Pieterse et al., 2013; Price et al., 2007). Fossil fuel combustion sources represent hydrogen emissions from technological or man-made sources – 80% of which come from automobile traffic – and ~~releases~~release about 11-20 Tg/yr (Duncan et al., 2007; Ehhalt and Rohrer, 2009). H₂ emissions from biomass burning vary based on biomass type and burn conditions, with global estimates ranging from 8-20 Tg/yr (Andreae and Merlet, 2001; Ehhalt and Rohrer, 2009; Paulot et al., 2024). During nitrogen fixation, H₂ is produced as a by-product during the reduction of nitrogen (N₂) to ammonia (NH₃) by bacteria. While some of this H₂ is recycled, much of it escapes into the atmosphere (Conrad and Seiler, 1980). Global estimates for the H₂ released during N₂ fixation range from 6-12 Tg/year (Price et al., 2007; Rhee et al., 2006; Ehhalt and Rohrer, 2009). Other sources of hydrogen include fermentation, reaction of excited O atoms produced during O₃ photolysis with water molecules, aldehyde photochemistry, photolysis of glyoxal, (and other aldehydes), and increased use of hydrogen in the energy sector which all contribute individually ~1 Tg/year of H₂ (Conrad and Babel, 1989; Ehhalt and Rohrer, 2009; Pérez-Peña et al., 2022; Zimmerman et al., 1982). Leakages of hydrogen from industries or the energy sector are very uncertain but recent estimates suggest 1-2 Tg/yr (Esquivel-Elizondo et al., 2023; Trapani et al., 2025). Additionally, a recent study also suggests potential geological sources that can contribute as much as ~~~223~~223 Tg/year (Zgonnik, 2020).

The two large sinks of hydrogen are the oxidation of H₂ by OH (15-23 Tg/year) (Ehhalt and Rohrer, 2009; Hauglustaine and Ehhalt, 2002; Paulot et al., 2021; Pieterse et al., 2013; Price et al., 2007) and soil uptake (53-88 Tg/year) (Ehhalt and Rohrer,

2009; Pieterse et al., 2011, 2013; Price et al., 2007; Rhee et al., 2006; Sanderson et al., 2003; Xiao et al., 2007; Yver et al., 2011). During soil uptake, the removal of H₂ by soil bacteria is temperature- and moisture-dependent and is mediated through the enzyme activity of soil hydrogenase (Buzzard et al., 2022; Conrad, 1996). The large range in the soil sink reflects the bottom-up and the top-down approaches used to estimate the sink strength.

70 Isotopic studies complement H₂ budget evaluations as each of the sources and sinks have distinct isotopic values, and substantially different kinetic isotopic effects, respectively (Gerst and Quay, 2001; Pieterse et al., 2009; Rhee et al., 2006). The Deuterium/Hydrogen (D/H) isotopic ratios are expressed as $\delta D = (R_{\text{SAMPLE}}/R_{\text{SMOW}} - 1) \times 1000$ (‰), where R_{SAMPLE} is the D/H ratio of sample and R_{SMOW} is that of Standard Mean Ocean Water (SMOW) (=0.015576±0.000006; Hagemann et al., 1970). [Isotopic fractionation usually occurs during chemical or physical transformations leading to an isotopic enrichment](#)
75 [\(more positive δD\) or depletion \(more negative δD\) of the product, depending on the process.](#) Global mean δD of atmospheric H₂ has been observed to be 130‰ with several measurement campaigns being undertaken to measure isotopic values of the sources and fractionation during soil uptake (Batenburg et al., 2011; Gerst and Quay, 2001; Price et al., 2007). These include anthropogenic sources (Vollmer et al., 2010), biomass burning (Röckmann et al., 2010), N₂ fixation (Walter et al., 2012), photochemical oxidation (Rhee et al., 2008; Rice and Quay, 2009), and soil sinks (Rhee et al., 2006). A recent
80 compilation of hydrogen isotopic values produced through different techniques/production means confirm that the isotopic values of [produced resulting](#) H₂ carry the fingerprint of origin (Gibson et al., 2024). ~~Studies such~~ (Pieterse et al., (2011, 2013) ~~have~~ incorporated hydrogen isotopic calculations into the chemical mechanisms in TM5 (a 3-D [Atmospheric Chemistry Models](#), ACM) and refined the H₂ budget. Isotopic values provide independent constraints on the H₂ sources and sinks, and, when combined with hydrogen concentrations can help constrain the atmospheric H₂ budget.

85 Atmospheric production and loss of H₂ depend on the availability and reactivity of the constituent species and their interactions with each other. Photochemical oxidation of CH₄ begins with the reaction with OH (rate-limiting reaction R1) and is followed by a chain of reactions that lead to formaldehyde (HCHO), a fraction of which then photolyzes to generate tropospheric H₂ (R2). Oxidation of NMVOCs also leads to HCHO, although with a more complex chain of reactions (not shown).



The production of tropospheric H₂ from CH₄ or VOCs can be estimated as a function of CH₄ burden, VOC emissions, tropospheric OH concentrations, HCHO yield from oxidation reactions, and the fraction of HCHO that is converted to H₂. Testing the accuracy of estimates from H₂ production from OH reactions is difficult because of the lack of direct
95 measurements of the OH concentrations (Prinn et al., 1995), especially on a global scale (Yang et al., 2025). [Atmospheric Chemistry Models](#) (HCHO yields are also uncertain because of many factors such as the complex chemistry involved and the short lifetime of some VOCs, (Ehhalt and Rohrer, 2009). ACMs) that can simulate [some of](#) these chemical reactions provide [an alternative](#) tool to test our understanding of these reactions.

For the H₂ budget, atmospheric production and loss terms can be assessed by comparing intermediate species in the reaction pathways and chemical species that affect OH. Formaldehyde (HCHO) is a key intermediate pathway during the oxidation of CH₄ and VOCs and a relatively long record of satellite retrievals of tropospheric column HCHO is available (Chance et al., 2000; De Smedt et al., 2008). While not a direct proxy, the tropospheric OH concentration, important for atmospheric loss, is sensitive to nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations (Dalsøren et al., 2016) – which have global satellite retrievals.

One significant drawback of ACMs is the substantial computing time and resources required for simulations. [WeHere, we](#) have developed a box model based on results from the 3-D models in Sand et al. (2023) to calculate changes in H₂ concentrations with different budget terms. We have also integrated an isotopic module into the box model to calculate the isotopic composition of tropospheric H₂ (δD) in addition to concentration. This provides a way to evaluate ACMs that do not include isotopic coupling.

This study is structured as follows: we first investigate ~~the~~ atmospheric production and loss terms in the budget by comparing HCHO, NO₂ and CO in the ACMs used in Sand et al. ~~(2023) against surface and satellite retrievals.(2023)~~. Then, we use a box model to evaluate the temporal evolution of H₂ from pre-industrial to today. Additional simulations with the box model are conducted to evaluate the impact of varying the split between CH₄ and VOCs for atmospheric production, as well as the impact of different OH concentrations on atmospheric loss. ~~As the soil sink term in the ACMs is tuned to reproduce reasonable H₂ concentrations, this study focuses on the chemical production and loss terms.~~ Finally, we combine isotopic values and H₂ concentrations to constrain the contributions of atmospheric production and loss processes to tropospheric H₂ and explore the feasibility of having additional geological sources. Collectively, these approaches help refine the ranges for atmospheric terms and improve our understanding of the budget.

2 Methods

2.1 Multi-model chemistry evaluation

Here, we use the control simulations presented in Sand et al. (2023) for five models - OsloCTM3, UCI CTM, UKCA, LMDZ-INCA and GFDL-AM4.1. For WACCM6, we use a more recent simulation that is set up as the CTRL simulation described in Sand et al. (2023), except that it is run using CESM v. 2.1.2 and with 70 vertical levels (instead of 88 in Sand et al. 2023). All simulations use present-day [\(2010\)](#) atmospheric compositions and fixed hydrogen and methane surface concentrations. Further details on the models are provided in Table 1 and Sand et al. (2023).

~~Monthly model output for HCHO, OH, NO₂ and NO are used to calculate annual averages. To evaluate model chemistry, we compare selected species that are critical to atmospheric production and loss of H₂, namely monthly model output for HCHO, OH, CO, NO₂ and NO. A qualitative comparison for these species is also made between the model results and satellite retrievals.~~ Monthly-averaged satellite data for 2010 are downloaded for TROPOMI (Veeffkind et al., 2012); ~~for the time period between July 2018 - June 2019.~~ The TROPOMI satellite has ~~a~~ global daily coverage and ~~observes~~ [retrieves](#)

multiple atmospheric trace gas components O₃, NO₂, and HCHO with a spatial resolution of 5.5 km × 3.5 km and an equator crossing time at about 13:30 local time. Column-averaged tropospheric values are post-processed to calculate annual averaged values for HCHO, NO₂, and CO (no averaging kernels are applied to the retrievals; vertical profiles are shown in Fig. A1, A2A6, A7). Similarly, MOPITT data for CO (Deeter et al., 2003) are compared to model results. This analysis is limited by the mismatch that arises due to the comparison of the monthly mean model outputs with satellite retrievals taken at a specific overpass time. To test how much this discrepancy can affect our comparison, we run an additional OsloCTM3 simulation for a year where the three hourly outputs are used.

140 **Table 1: Details of the six models used here and Sand et al. (2023).**

Model	Horizontal Res.	Vertical Res. (levels)	Meteorology	Chemistry	Dry deposition Parameterization	Simulation Length (time period averaged; years)	References
GFDL-AM4.1	~100kms	49	Wind speeds nudged to NCEP (6-hourly)	Tropospheric and stratospheric chemistry	Two-layer model; more details in (Paulot et al., 2021)	20 (10)	Dunne et al., 2020; Horowitz et al., 2020
LMDZ-INCA	1.25° x 2.5°	39	ECMWF ERA5	State of the art tropospheric + stratospheric photochemistry	Seasonally and geographically varying dry deposition velocities	20 (3)	Hauglustaine et al., 2004
OsloCTM3	~2.25° x 2.25°	60	ECMWF 3-hourly open IFS	Tropospheric and stratospheric chemistry with 174 components and complex set of bi-molecular, tri-molecular, and heterogenous reactions.	Based on Sanderson (2003) scheme and (Price et al., 2007). More details in Sand et al. (2023)	20 (1)	Søvde et al., 2012
UCI CTM	T159L60N80 (~1.1°)		ECMWF 3-hourly open IFS	Moderate tropospheric chem. with 30 species and 5-species in the stratosphere	Fixed deposition velocity	7 (1)	Prather et al., 2017

UKCA	~1.25° 1.875°	x	85	Model's own	Full version of Chemistry with aerosol climatologies	Sanderson, 2003	14 (1)	Archibald et al., 2020
WACCM6	~1.875° 2.5°	x	70	Model's own	Full tropospheric and stratospheric chemistry, with interactive oxidants and ozone	Computed within the land model	18 (5)	Gettelman et al., 2019

2.2 Description of the isotope-coupled box model

Running the 3-D ACM takes substantial computing resources, limiting its applicability in evaluating the relationship between the different budget terms and the atmospheric concentration of hydrogen. We use a box model that calculates the change in global atmospheric H₂ based on production and loss at every timestep (one month; equation 1)

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = \text{Production} - \text{Loss} = \frac{E + P_{\text{atm}}}{\beta} - C \frac{1}{\tau} \quad (1)$$

where C is concentration in ppb; dC/dt is change in concentration at every timestep; E corresponds to Emissions; P_{atm} is the atmospheric production of H₂; β is a factor used to convert from Tg to ppb; and $\frac{1}{\tau}$ represents the loss terms as a lifetime calculated by $\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{1}{\tau_{OH}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{Soil}}$ where τ_{OH} and τ_{Soil} represent the lifetimes due to the OH radical and the soil-sink, respectively.

Emissions include time-varying emissions of H₂ from anthropogenic sources and biomass burning, and a constant natural source. Atmospheric production is calculated using time-varying methane concentrations and emissions of anthropogenic VOCs (including constant natural emissions). The two loss terms for atmospheric H₂ are represented by the soil-sink lifetime and the atmospheric lifetime.

A key aspect of this simple model is its flexibility, i.e. the model can be adapted to each atmospheric chemistry model. Atmospheric production, β-value (used to convert mass-values, which varies between models, to concentration), and the loss terms vary between the 3-D models and are tied to one another. The anthropogenic and biomass burning emissions for H₂ are adapted for each model. ~~If available, model outputs are used for the split of H₂ atmospheric production from methane and NMVOCs, and natural emissions of NMVOCs.~~ The sinks are determined by setting the atmospheric and soil uptake lifetimes.

We include a function in the box model to calculate the isotopic composition of atmospheric H₂. The different sources and sinks of hydrogen have distinct isotopic signatures. Combining the burden and the isotopic values, we use a mass-balance

165 approach to calculate the isotopic values of tropospheric H₂ at every time step. This is compared with modern-day
observation and acts as a two-pronged check on the total budget. Unless otherwise stated, we use isotopic compositions for
sources and sinks from (Price et al., 2007) which are as follows: Anthropogenic emissions: -196‰; biomass burning: -
290‰; atmospheric production (from CH₄ and NMVOCs): 162‰; Nitrogen fixation: -628‰ (Table 2). Fractionation factors
of 0.943 and 0.58 are used for the soil-sink and OH loss, respectively. The box model does not account for the tropospheric-
170 stratospheric H₂-cycling and the resulting tropospheric H₂-enrichment (Price et al., 2007; Pieterse et al., 2011). The
stratospheric-tropospheric H₂ flux is not diagnostic output in the models considered in this study and ~~remains uncertain.~~
~~This~~this omission can result in a 29-37‰ offset in δD- (Price et al., 2007; Pieterse et al., 2011, 2013).

3 Results

The results section is organized as follows: first, atmospheric production and loss of H₂ are assessed in the six models by
175 comparing key species involved in these reactions ~~with~~and evaluating them against satellite retrievals. Next, the temporal
evolution of H₂ concentrations from the pre-industrial to today is evaluated using the box model. Two specific cases related
to atmospheric production and loss are analyzed. ~~Finally, isotopic values~~Isotopic compositions are calculated in the box
model to evaluate the overall tropospheric H₂ budget. ~~Four~~Five scenarios are ~~used~~explored to demonstrate how a dual
constraint based on concentration and isotopic composition can help constrain the various sources and sinks. An uncertainty
180 analysis is also conducted by running the box model with 100,000 different combinations of sources and sinks picked using
the Monte-Carlo approach to constrain their plausible ranges.

3.1 Atmospheric Production

Table 2: Budget terms from the different ACMs in Sand et al. (2023) and published literature used in the box model study

<u>Model</u>	<u>Sources</u>					<u>Sinks</u>	
	<u>Anthropogenic Sources (Tg/yr)</u>	<u>Biomass Burning (Tg/yr)</u>	<u>Atmospheric Production (Tg/yr)</u>	<u>Nitrogen Fixation (Tg/yr)</u>	<u>Geological Sources (Tg/yr)</u>	<u>Atmospheric Loss (Tg/yr)</u>	<u>Soil Sink Loss (Tg/yr)</u>
<u>OsloCTM3</u>	<u>11.3</u>	<u>11.3</u>	<u>46.9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>28.4</u>	<u>59.5</u>
<u>GFDL-AM4.1</u>	<u>12.2</u>	<u>12.2</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>21.7</u>	<u>56.6</u>
<u>LMDZ-INCA</u>	<u>9.2</u>	<u>9.2</u>	<u>47.1</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>22.5</u>	<u>52</u>
<u>UCI CTM</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>50.7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>59.2</u>
<u>UKCA</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>48.4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>26.8</u>	<u>44.3</u>
<u>WACCM6</u>	<u>29.6</u>	<u>29.6</u>	<u>33.9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>73</u>
<u>Literature</u>							
<u>Seiler and Conrad, 1987</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>90</u>
<u>Warneck, 1988</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>78</u>
<u>Ehhalt, 1999</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>Novelli et al., 1999</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>56</u>

Hauglustaine and Ehhalt, 2002	16	13	31	10	0	15	55
Sanderson et al., 2003	20	20	30.2	8	0	17.1	58.3
Rhee et al., 2006	15	16	64	12	0	19	88
Price et al., 2007	18.3	15.6	34.3	6	0	18	55
Xiao et al., 2007	15	13	77	0	0	18	85
Ehhalt and Rohrer, 2009	11	15	41	9	0	19	60
Pieterse et al., 2011	17	15	37.3	8	0	24.8	62.9

185 **3.1 Atmospheric Production**


190 Table 2 shows the different budget terms from the ACMs and previous literature studies. Atmospheric production values for the ACMs range from 34 Tg/yr (WACCM) to 56 Tg/yr (OsloCTM3) for the models. The lower model values overlap the lower limit of the 38.4 ± 6.1 Tg/yr estimate from Ouyang et al., (2025), with the higher model values exceeding it. The model spread is smaller than the range reported in published studies. HCHO is a key intermediate species in the atmospheric production of tropospheric H₂. Through a series of complex, non-linear reactions, a substantial proportion of CH₄ and NMVOCs are oxidized to HCHO, some of which then photolyzes to produce H₂. Since the photolysis of HCHO is an important source of H₂, correctly capturing the background HCHO concentration is essential for constraining atmospheric H₂ production. A comparison with TROPOMI satellite retrievals shows that all models, except WACCM, produce reasonable formaldehyde concentrations, with global


195 All models show broadly similar annual mean concentrations within 6.5% of the TROPOMI retrieval; Fig. 1, Fig. 2). However, there are notable HCHO spatial patterns, with some regional differences: (Fig.1). GFDL-AM4.1, LMDZ-INCA, and the UCI overestimate have higher HCHO concentrations over South America, Africa, and parts of East Asia. Compared to TROPOMI, OsloCTM3 and UKCA exhibit lower concentrations over land, but higher over the oceans (Fig. 2). The

200 ~~WACCM model underestimates~~A1). WACCM6 produces lower HCHO concentrations, ~~particularly~~ over land, compared to the other models.


205 When compared with TROPOMI satellite retrievals, all models except WACCM6 produce reasonable HCHO concentrations, within 6.5% of the TROPOMI retrieval; Fig. 1, Fig. A1). The multi-model mean for HCHO matches well with the TROPOMI global mean, albeit affected by the lower values from ~~WACCM. The consistent match~~WACCM6. Broadly similar values between HCHO in the models and TROPOMI retrievals suggest that the 3-D models represent the production of atmospheric H₂ ~~reasonably, since HCHO plays a crucial role in the reaction chain, fairly well, however there are several uncertainties that can affect model simulations that have not been explored in this study, such as the uncertainty in the photodissociation of HCHO, and biogenic NMVOC emissions.~~

210 Additionally, we also compared model results against ATom measurement campaigns for nine different regions and four seasons (Figs. ~~A1-A2~~A6-A7). All models have comparably similar vertical profiles. They generally also match the ATom measurements other than in the ~~W~~West Atlantic (A3) in the summer and autumn; and ~~N~~North Pacific (P1) in the summer, and winter.





215 Figure 1: Spatial comparison of formaldehyde between TROPOMI satellite retrievals for ~~2010~~July 2018 – June 2019 and the different Atmospheric Chemistry Models listed in Table 1.



220 **Figure 2:** Comparison of annual mean formaldehyde over ocean, land, and global from TROPOMI satellite retrievals for 2010 (black crosses), six different ACMs (colored circles) and the multi-model mean (inverted triangle).

3.2 Atmospheric ~~Production~~Loss

225 Atmospheric loss in the ACMs ranges from 21 Tg/yr (GFDL-AM4.1) to 28 Tg/yr (OsloCTM3). This spread is larger than 18.4±2.2 Tg/yr for 2010-2020 estimated in Ouyang et al. (2025) and other published studies (Table 2).

The atmospheric loss of H₂ is primarily driven by its reaction with OH, a key oxidant in the atmosphere. Due to the short lifetime of OH (<1 second), direct retrievals of OH concentrations are not possible, therefore limiting a model-data comparison for OH. Indirect approaches, such as the use of a combination of carbon monoxide (CO) and NO_x concentrations have been used to estimate OH levels for urban plumes and specific emission sources (Dalsøren et al., 2016; Lama et al., 2022). Although OH

chemistry is influenced by several factors – such as photolysis reactions, temperature, tropospheric ozone, humidity, methane and NMVOCs - NO_x generally acts to increase OH concentrations and CO ~~tends to reduce~~ the OH concentrations.

In Fig. ~~3A2~~, we ~~plot CO from the two show model outputs for CO, OH, and NO₂ along with satellite datasets, retrievals for CO from TROPOMI, and MOPITT, and NO₂ from TROPOMI alongside model outputs for NO₂, CO, and OH.~~ All models ~~overestimate~~ show broadly similar spatial patterns albeit with some regional differences in magnitude. Compared with satellite retrieval, all models simulate larger values for NO₂, with the global ~~mean~~ means at least twice that of retrievals (Fig. ~~4A4~~). These differences are seen both over land and oceans (Fig. ~~3aA2a~~ and Fig. ~~4A4~~). This overestimation may result from comparing monthly mean outputs with satellite retrievals, which are restricted to specific overpass times and air mass factors. ~~While~~ As the simulation and the satellite reanalysis datasets are for two different time-periods, we cannot replicate the specific air mass factors in OsloCTM3, ~~if the limiting this comparison. But if we restricted~~ mean calculations are ~~restricted~~ restricted to specific satellite overpass times with the 3-hourly OsloCTM3 simulation, OsloCTM3 results show much lower values, bringing the model means closer to TROPOMI values ~~and underestimating the values, with an underestimation~~ (Fig. ~~4aA4a~~). The effect of using the ratio of NO₂ during overpass to the monthly mean for OsloCTM3 for the other models is shown in Fig. ~~A3~~. ~~For CO, A8 where~~ there is general good agreement a decrease in model NO₂ for all models, more in line with the satellite retrieval. Thus, comparing the monthly mean model output with satellite-overpass times only allows for a broad qualitative analysis. Future simulations should save the 3-hourly output so that such comparisons can be made.

For CO, the models are broadly consistent with one other, with a multi-model standard deviation of 0.002 mol CO/m². The inter-model spread is larger over land (0.003 mol CO/m²) than over oceans (0.001 mol CO/m²). These results can be compared against TROPOMI and MOPITT, which are broadly consistent with each other (Fig. A2b), with a global mean difference of 0.002 mol CO/m². Over the oceans, the difference between the two satellite ~~datasets (Fig. 3b)~~ retrievals is 0.003 mol CO/m², while over land it is 0.001 mol CO/m². All ~~the~~ models underestimate CO relative to the satellite retrievals, with large ~~model observation~~ differences (10-20%) ~~observed~~ over the Northern Hemisphere mid- and high latitudes. ~~WACCM~~ WACCM6 and OsloCTM3 have lower CO values compared to GFDL-AM4.1 and LMDZ-INCA models. Although the global mean differences between MOPITT and TROPOMI are similar to the multi-model standard deviation, the models have lower CO over land, compared to the satellite retrievals. All models also do a reasonable job of matching the vertical profiles of CO observed during the ATom campaign (~~supplementary~~ Figs. A1 and A2). GFDL-AM4.1 and INCA have lower NO₂/CO ratio values compared to OsloCTM3, consistent with the elevated OH concentration in OsloCTM3 (Fig. ~~3eA2c~~, d). Our results suggest that OH differences between models could be related to the local chemical environment (NO_x/CO differences) with models showing a larger NO₂/CO ratio having larger OH values or vice versa. This could explain some of the diversity in atmospheric loss of H₂ in the models.





Figure 3: Global maps of annual mean satellite retrievals for (a) NO₂ for TROPOMI and models; (b) CO for MOPITT, TROPOMI and models; (c) NO₂/CO values in the models, and (d) OH in the models other than UCI.




265 ~~Figure 4: Comparison of annual mean (a) NO₂ and (b) CO concentrations over oceans, land, and global domains. Satellite retrievals from TROPOMI are shown as black crosses while MOPITT retrievals are represented by blue crosses. Colored circles denote results from the different ACMs, with the OsloCTM3 (3 hourly output) shown in dark olive green. The inverted triangle indicates the multi model means calculated for model output with monthly means.~~

270 3.3 Box Model

~~In this study,~~ Here, we use the box model for two applications: (1) to model the sensitivity of modelled H₂ concentrations from pre-industrial to 2015, to two input parameters that impact atmospheric production and loss, and (2) evaluate the feasibility of the different sources and sinks using isotopic values.

275 ~~Although~~ 3-D model simulations have been conducted for the modern-day time slices. ~~However,~~ simulating the temporal evolution of tropospheric H₂ ~~between from~~ the pre-industrial period ~~and today to 2015~~ using 3-D models is computationally very intensive and often prohibitive, making box models an attractive alternative (Fig. 52). The box model is initialized using an inferred pre-industrial H₂ concentration of 330 ppb (Patterson et al., 2020, 2021) and ~~then~~ model parameters ~~are~~ chosen based on existing datasets (Table A1). While these choices are not unique, the goal here is to present the model sensitivity to two specific parameter choices – split of atmospheric H₂ production between CH₄ and VOCs, and the
 280 ~~atmospheric H₂ loss mediated by the lifetime of OH. All parameters are adjusted to so that they~~ match the model results for the present-day OsloCTM3 simulations (~~Table A1~~). Panel (a) shows the evolution of the different emission and production terms of the budget in the box model, with anthropogenic emissions of H₂ scaled to CO emissions and atmospheric production following CH₄ concentrations showing a rise after the 1970s. Atmospheric H₂ production from NMVOCs also increases slowly post-1970s from ~20 Tg/yr to ~25 Tg/yr. Nitrogen fixation is set constant at 8 Tg/yr through the simulation and biomass burning emissions are set at 8 Tg/year till the 1990s, following which emissions are allowed to vary. Fig. 5b2b

shows the split between total emissions and atmospheric production and [Fig. 2c](#) shows the resulting evolution of global mean tropospheric concentration of H_2 . Crosses in Figs. [2b](#) and [2c](#) indicate H_2 concentrations from pre-industrial and present-day OsloCTM3 simulations. ~~Although we do not compare box model results with observations, the crosses from the 3-D OsloCTM3 simulations agree well with the observed values.~~



290





Figure 52: Temporal evolution from 1850 to 2015 of (a) emissions and atmospheric production; (b) total atmospheric production and total emissions; and (c) atmospheric concentration of H_2 from pre-industrial to today from the box model fitted to the OsloCTM3 model. The crosses indicate the pre-industrial value (1850) and the modern day (2010) results from the OsloCTM3 modern day (2010).

While the box model allows exploration of various uncertainties in H_2 evolution, such as the impacts of natural vs. anthropogenic emissions, different emission inventories, and the use of variable versus fixed soil-sinks - this study focuses on two specific issues related to atmospheric production and losses. A key question regarding atmospheric production is the significance of the relative contributions of H_2 production from CH_4 or NMVOCs. Total production is the sum of production from CH_4 and NMVOCs (not diagnosed in the ACMs), with the increase in production from CH_4 showing a larger increase over time. ~~In the 1910s, a crossover occurs when production from CH_4 surpasses production by NMVOCs (Fig. 6a).~~ The box model can be used to test the impacts of modifying this split (Fig. 6). ~~In 3). We run two cases - in the control first case, (solid lines in Fig. 3), production from NMVOCs accounts for 44% of the total production (taken from the present day OsloCTM3 3-D simulations) consistent with the estimate of Ehhalt and Rohrer (2009), while in the testsecond case, (dashed lines in Fig. 3), this contribution production from NMVOCs is reduced to 39% following (Paulot et al., 2024). Consequently, For the first case, the crossover when production from CH_4 surpasses production by NMVOCs occurs in the 1950s (solid pink and blue lines in Fig. 3a), while in the second case, this crossover occurs in the 1910s (dashed pink and blue lines in Fig. 3a). In the first case, the pre-industrial H_2 production from NMVOCs decreases from ~ 20 Tg/yr to ~ 13 Tg/yr, while production from CH_4 increases from ~ 14 Tg/yr to ~ 18 Tg/yr (Fig. 6a3a). Total production in 1850 is reduced by ~ 4 Tg/yr with the gap narrowing over time until the 1980s, when both cases converge. The maximum difference in H_2 concentration between the two cases does not exceed ~ 15 ppb.~~







Figure 63: Similar to Fig. 52, but with different relative contributions of atmospheric production via CH₄ and VOCs. Solid lines represent values from a box model simulation with a VOC/CH₄ production ratio of 0.44 from Ehhalt and Rohrer, (2009), while stippled lines indicate results from a box model simulations with the ratio of 0.39 from (Paulot et al., 2024).

In the box model, atmospheric losses are defined by their lifetime, which depend on OH concentrations. We assess the effect of different [temporal evolution of](#) lifetimes due to OH concentrations on tropospheric H₂, by running the model with three different atmospheric lifetimes that correspond to: (1) constant OH concentrations from pre-industrial to today; (2) pre-calculated OH concentrations by combining historical trends from Stevenson et al. (2020) and Skeie et al. (2023); and (3) using a scheme from the Third Assessment Report (TAR) where the OH-sink lifetime is adjusted following (Ehhalt et al., 2001; Table 4.11, footnote b) based on CH₄ concentrations, and emissions of CO, NO_x, and VOCs (Fig. 7-4). [The impact of the different OH concentrations on the OH-sink lifetime is shown in Figure A11.](#) Note that the OH concentrations here only affect the losses/sink term and not atmospheric production. These results indicate that using constant versus pre-determined OH-sink lifetimes produce similar H₂ concentrations ([within 10 ppb](#)) through time. In contrast, applying the TAR scheme leads to higher H₂ concentrations, ~40 ppb greater than the other cases until the early 1970s – a couple of decades after the increase in anthropogenic emissions and a few years after the crossover point when atmospheric production from CH₄ dominates over production from NMVOCs. [This indicates a higher atmospheric lifetime early in the box model simulation \(pre-1940s\) as calculated by CH₄ concentrations, and emissions of CO, NO_x, and VOCs.](#) Notably, all these terms have a [large uncertainties](#). After the 1970s, the H₂ concentration from the three [atmospheric lifetime](#) cases [generally broadly](#) match each other.

Results indicate that the various assumptions in the box model for the split between H₂ production from NMVOCs and CH₄ and for the time evolution of the atmospheric lifetime, which are not provided by the ACMs, have only a small effect on the H₂ concentration over recent decades.

335




340 Figure 74: Similar to Fig. 53, but 7e4c shows the impact of having different atmospheric lifetimes due to different OH concentrations. The three OH-based lifetimes are calculated as Lifetime 0: Time-variant OH based on trends in Stevenson et al (2020) and Skeie et al (2023); Lifetime 1: Constant OH leading to constant atmospheric lifetime; Atm. Lifetime 1: Time-variant OH based on trends in Stevenson et al (2020) and Skeie et al (2023); Atm. Lifetime 32: time-variant OH using equations from the Third Assessment Report (Ehhalt et al., 2001).

345 3.4 Isotopic evaluations using the Box Model

In addition to H₂ concentrations, isotopic values of atmospheric H₂ are ~~also~~ calculated in the box model at every time step, depending on the relative contributions from the different sources and sinks. Fig. 85 shows the hydrogen atmospheric concentration vs. isotopic composition for the different box model simulations fit to match the ACMs (using model parameters as inputs for steady-state 2010 conditions) and from published literature. All the ~~models~~ models' box model simulation results show a narrow range of atmospheric H₂ concentrations (520-540 ppb; by design) and a wider range for isotopic values (20-210‰), with WACCM6 at the lower-end and UKCA at the higher-end. The low enriched isotopic value in WACCM6 is due to the combination of high emissions (anthropogenic and biomass burning sources), low atmospheric H₂ production resulting in more enriched H₂ and high soil sink. The high more negative value for isotopic composition in UKCA is due to high emissions and low soil sink in UKCA, resulting in more depleted H₂. OsloCTM3 has higher atmospheric production, but this is isotopically balanced out by higher soil sink. Published studies have ranges for both predicted H₂ and isotopic values of 365-550 ppb and 0-150‰ respectively. That the isotopic range is large is not surprising as most of these studies look at the concentration budget and not the isotopic budget. For example, Fig. AA9 shows the resulting budgets if isotopic values and fractionation factors for the different sources and sinks are taken from (Pieterse et al., 2011) rather than (Price et al., 2007) ~~(and not including the stratospheric exchange which will enrich all isotopic values)~~ without and with stratospheric enrichment of 29‰. The mean changes for the models and literature values are 7.8‰ and 24.56‰ without stratospheric enrichment and 20.61‰ and 49.61‰ with the stratospheric enrichment respectively. This difference is driven by the Pieterse et al. (2011) having isotopic compositions of -260‰ and 116‰ for biomass burning and atmospheric production of CH₄ instead of -290‰ and 162‰ in Price et al. (2007). We present this spread here, not to evaluate them against models, but to reiterate the benefit of combining H₂ concentrations with δD to

365 constrain the different budget terms.

Global mean H₂ concentration versus isotopic composition







Figure 85: Relationship between atmospheric hydrogen mole fraction and isotopic composition (δD) from different models (triangles) and published literature (circles). The cross indicates the observed range of lower-tropospheric H₂ concentrations between 1991-1996 of 531±6 ppb (Novelli et al., 1999) and δD values (Price et al., 2007; the sensitivity to using values from Pieterse et al., 2011 is shown in Fig. A4A9). The model concentrations are higher than observed possibly because they are calibrated for more recent observations. (Paulot et al., 2024) suggests an increasing trend of -1.7ppb/year. The model concentrations are higher than observed because they are calibrated for more recent observations.

We present four cases where the sources and sinks are modified to demonstrate this approach (Fig. 96): (1) a base case using modern-day values; (2) high atmospheric production where atmospheric production values from a top-down estimate (Rhee et al., 2006) are used; (3) low atmospheric production and; (4) additional geological source of 23 Tg/year as suggested by (Zgonnik, 2020) and (5) the additional geological source of 23 Tg/year along with a high OH sink. To balance the budget for H₂-concentrations, we adjusted the soil sink to account for the additional H₂ (Table 23). These cases are chosen to constrain the range of atmospheric production estimates and potential geological inputs by evaluating the feasibility to fall within observed concentration and isotopic ranges. It should be noted that geological sources can span a wide range of

isotopic values from 0 to -1000‰. We choose a value of -385‰ which is the mean of the white hydrogen values suggested in Gibson et al. (2024). The effect of using a different isotopic value for a geological source is shown in Fig. [A5A10](#).

385 **Table 32: Values used for the emissions, isotopic values for the sources and lifetime and fractionation factors used for the four different cases in the box model [with steady-state 2010 conditions](#).**

Case	Anthropogenic emissions		Biomass Burning		Nitrogen Fixation		Atm. Production		Geological Sources		Atm. Loss		Soil Uptake	
	Emissions (Tg/yr)	δD (‰)	Emissions (Tg/yr)	δD (‰)	Emissions (Tg/yr)	δD (‰)	Emissions (Tg/yr)	δD (‰)	Emissions (Tg/yr)	δD (‰)	Lifetime (yrs)	Fractionation Factor	Lifetime (yrs)	Fractionation Factor
Base case	13.3	-196	13.3	-290	9	-628	46.9	162	0	-385	7.74	0.94	3.41	0.58
High atm. production	13.3	-196	13.3	-290	9	-628	77	162	0	-385	7.74	0.94	2.30	0.58
Low atm. production	13.3	-196	13.3	-290	9	-628	30	162	0	-385	7.74	0.94	3.41	0.58
Geological sources	13.3	-196	13.3	-290	9	-628	46.9	162	20	-385	7.74	0.94	3.00	0.58
Higher OH sink	13.3	-196	13.3	-290	9	-628	46.9	162	20	-385	6	0.94	3.00	0.58



390

Figure





Figure 9: Box model results with isotopic calculations for the Base case (dark blue bars), high atmospheric production (purple), low atmospheric production (pink) and geological sources (yellow) (a) showing the burdens for different sources and sinks used in the box model; (b) isotopic values for the sources used in box model; (c) calculated H₂ concentration; and (d) calculated isotopic values for tropospheric H₂ for the different cases. The dashed black lines show the observed range in (c) H₂ concentration taken here as 530-550 ppb to account for changes in concentrations since Novelli et al. (1999) and (d) H₂ isotopic compositions from Gerst and Quay (2001).

6: Box model results with isotopic calculations for the Base case (dark blue bars), high atmospheric production (purple), low atmospheric production (pink) and geological sources (yellow) (a) showing the burdens for different sources and sinks used in the box model; (b) isotopic values for the sources used in box model; (c) calculated H₂ concentration; and (d) calculated isotopic values for tropospheric H₂ for the different cases. The dashed black lines show the observed ranges with H₂ concentration taken here as 530-560 ppb and H₂ isotopic compositions as 130‰ to 160‰.

405 Fig. [9a6a](#) shows the magnitude of the different sources and sinks for hydrogen in the ~~four~~[five](#) cases and Fig. ~~10b6b~~ shows the isotopic values for the sources used in the box model. The resulting hydrogen concentrations for the four cases are shown in Fig. [9e](#). ~~All four~~[6c](#). By design all ~~four~~[five](#) cases produce atmospheric concentrations that are broadly near the observed concentration range ([530-560 ppb](#), dashed lines). However, the corresponding isotopic compositions are much more sensitive compared to H₂ concentration and fall far outside the observed ranges (~~in this case taken as 530-550 ppb to account~~
410 ~~for an increase in H₂ concentrations since 1991-1996 and~~ 130‰ - 160‰) for the three perturbed cases. This clearly indicates that low and high atmospheric production values do not agree with the observed H₂-isotopic values. Further, a geological source (with a corresponding increase in soil uptake) shows an even bigger shift in δD – not observed today. Uncertainty ranges for the isotopic signatures of each source were used to calculate the maximum possible uncertainty. The most depleted and enriched source combinations were applied to calculate the minimum and maximum ranges shown in Fig. [9d6d](#).
415 These results indicate that while high atmospheric production can be accommodated within the budget if extremely depleted isotopic values are used for the other sources, scenarios with lower atmospheric production and high geological sources do not fit the budget.


We also performed an uncertainty analysis to evaluate the joint uncertainties using the distributions of all the sources and sinks and their isotopic values (ranging from the most negative and most positive values in literature; Fig. 7). Additionally,
420 we also check the impact of the stratospheric contribution to the analysis, by assuming the enrichment of the final atmospheric δD composition by randomly picking a value between 29-37‰. We use a Monte-Carlo approach by randomly picking 100,000 different combinations of sources and sinks to run the box model and check whether the resulting atmospheric concentration and the isotopic composition of atmospheric H₂ is within the ranges of 530-560 ppb (to account for the increasing trend till 2021) and 130‰ - 160‰, respectively. Applying the joint certainly analysis, the 97.5th percentile
425 upper bound on the geological sources decreases from 9.4 Tg/yr in the initial distribution to 6.3 Tg/yr and 7.7 Tg/yr without and with a stratospheric contribution, respectively. Relative to the initial distribution, only 88% and 91% of the geological flux distribution overlap with the 95% constrained intervals without and with a stratospheric contribution, ruling out 12% and 9% of the distribution, respectively.




430 **Figure 7: Joint analysis of the different sources and sinks and isotopic compositions and the resulting probably density function**
changes with and without stratospheric contribution. The distributions for the different sources and sinks are all beta-
distributions within the ranges found in published literature and models, while for geological sources we used a log-normal
distribution for the source term. The isotopic ranges are the minimum and maximum values found in literature. The box model is
run 100,000 times with samples being randomly picked from the distributions. For the stratospheric contributions, a value
between 29-37‰ is also randomly picked and added to calculate the final isotopic composition of the atmospheric H₂.
 435

440 The influence of the individual sources and sinks on the final tropospheric mole fraction and isotopic composition of
 tropospheric H₂ is shown in Fig. 108 as the effect of a 2% change in the source or sink strength. Among the sources,
 atmospheric production has the largest effect on both the tropospheric H₂ and isotopic compositions, with each of the other
 sources having less than 1/3rd of the impact. The two sinks also play a huge role with the soil sink making the isotopic values
 440 more negative, while the OH sink shifting them to more positive values.

Effect of 2% change in Sources/sinks





445 **Figure 108:** Impact of a 2% change in individual sources and sinks on the tropospheric mole fraction and the isotopic composition of H₂.

We extend this analysis by evaluating what adjustments to individual sources would be required to accommodate geological sources. While multiple source-sink combinations exist that fit within the concentration and isotopic constraints, we restrict this sensitivity analysis to emissions from anthropogenic sources, biomass burning, and nitrogen fixation. Based on model evaluations and box model constraints the atmospheric production and soil sink are allowed to vary between 37-60 Tg/yr and 49-77 Tg/yr respectively. The range for soil sink is derived by running the box model across the specified range of atmospheric production values to identify feasible soil sink estimates that satisfy the observed concentration and isotopic constraints for tropospheric H₂.

455 Table 34 shows the maximum geological source consistent with low, mid, and high estimates of the three sources. The results indicate that the maximum plausible geological source, given the constraints is 9 Tg/yr—if we are overestimating N₂ fixation or biomass burning inputs. Thus an estimate of 23 Tg/yr as suggested by Zgonnik (2020) is not possible with our assumed isotopic composition of the geological input. However, greater contributions from isotopically enriched volcanic sources can affect this upper bound.


460


Table 43: Maximum allowable geological source input, constrained by adjusting emissions from anthropogenic, biomass burning, and nitrogen fixation within their respective observed low, mid, and high ranges.

Source Adjusted	Values (Tg/yr)	Maximum geological source possible (Tg/yr)
Anthropogenic	10	6
	13.3	4
	20	0
Biomass Burning	7	9
	13.3	4
	2	-
Nitrogen Fixation	6	9
	9	4
	12	-

465 4 Implications and conclusions

Chemical comparisons for atmospheric production and loss show that ~~our~~the models ~~generally agree with satellite retrievals~~broadly match each other spatially for HCHO, NO₂, and CO. Ranges for the different sources and sinks for the models and from published literature are shown in Fig. 44-9. The ranges for atmospheric production and atmospheric loss budget terms from published literature range from 37-80 Tg/yr and 15-20 Tg/yr. A recently published global hydrogen budget for 2010-2020 suggests values of 38.4 ± 6.1 Tg/yr and 18.4 ± 2.2 Tg/yr for photochemical production and sink, respectively. All model values are below the two highest estimates of atmospheric production using the top-down estimates. Isotopic evaluations using the box model also show that these high values of atmospheric production lie outside the range of observed isotopic ranges (Fig. 96). These suggest that atmospheric production values lie within the range of 37-60 Tg/yr as shown in Fig. 44-9. Atmospheric loss in the models is higher than that ~~observed~~documented in literature – possibly related to ~~the~~ range in OH concentrations in the models (Yang et al., 2024). However, lacking OH observations and to balance the budget, we suggest a larger range for atmospheric loss of 15-30 Tg/yr. Soil sink estimates are constrained to 49-77 Tg/yr, given the new constrained range in atmospheric production.





480


Figure 419: Sources and sinks in the tropospheric hydrogen budget, showing updated ranges for atmospheric production, atmospheric loss based on this study. The grey shaded area with dashed outlines represents previously reported ranges, while the solid white boxes indicate the updated ranges. Model values are shown for the atmospheric production and loss terms that are analyzed in this study.

485

This study is limited by the uncertainties associated with each budget term (both concentrations and isotopic values), whether from observational estimates or models. ~~Using geological sources with isotopic values of 100% to 0%, rather than 385% that we use, would allow for a larger geological input but it would still require a rearrangement of the other budget terms. Another source of uncertainty is the input from stratospheric tropospheric exchange, which can cause an enrichment between 29% (Pieterse et al., 2011) to 37% (Price et al., 2007) or. As this exchange is not included in the box model, it is not accounted for in this study but needs further investigation in the future. (Pieterse et al., 2013) also found that dry deposition plays an important role in the isotopic budget. In this study, because the models have tuned the dry deposition values to produce reasonable concentrations, we do not evaluate or change this term. Other potential additional~~Using

490

495 [geological sources with enriched isotopic values of -100‰ to 0‰, rather than -385‰ that we use, would allow for a larger geological input but it would still require a rearrangement of the other budget terms. Other potential](#) validations of the budget, such as seasonal variations, recent trends and a more detailed analysis of the latitudinal variations of hydrogen are also beyond the scope of the current setup of the box model.




500 **Figure 4210:** An updated estimate of source and sink ranges based on existing literature and this study. Numbers include the range of sources (green) and sinks (brown) in Tg/yr and isotopic values of sources and fractionation factors for the sinks (in purple).

Our results show that six different ACMs with different chemistry schemes show similar ~~rates of~~ HCHO tropospheric mole fraction – a proxy used here to evaluate atmospheric production and broadly match TROPOMI satellite retrievals. There is a larger diversity in OH indicating more uncertainty and a bigger spread for atmospheric losses. These could be related to different chemistry and different NOx/CO chemical environments in the models. We employ a box model to simulate the evolution of atmospheric H₂ from pre-industrial to today, exploring the impacts of having different CH₄/VOC relative contributions for atmospheric production and OH lifetimes for atmospheric losses. The ability of the box model to reproduce the broad trends in H₂-concentrations over time suggests that the budget terms reasonably represent the global H₂ cycle. Using combined constraints from atmospheric concentrations and isotopic values, the box model suggests atmospheric


510

production to be in the range of 37-60 Tg/year. Photochemical losses are constrained to 15-30 Tg/year and soil sink is constrained to 49-77 Tg/yr (Fig. 4210). These values are more consistent with the “bottom-up” estimates and reflect our current understanding based on a combination of model analysis, and expert judgment. Our study highlights the critical need for more isotopic observations of atmospheric H₂ to refine our understanding of the hydrogen budget.


Appendices



ATom2 (winter)



ATom3 (autumn)



520





Figure A1

Figure A1: Comparison of annual mean formaldehyde over ocean, land, and global from TROPOMI satellite retrievals for July 2018-June 2019 (black crosses), six different ACMs (colored circles) and the multi-model mean (inverted triangle). The error bars correspond to the standard deviation from the model mean.




Figure A2: Global maps of annual mean satellite retrievals for (a) NO₂ for TROPOMI and models; (b) CO for MOPITT, TROPOMI and models; (c) NO₂/CO values in the models, and (d) OH in the models other than UCI.




Figure A3: Comparison of annual mean (a) NO₂ and (b) CO concentrations over oceans, land, and global domains. Satellite retrievals from TROPOMI are shown as black crosses while MOPITT retrievals are represented by blue crosses. Colored circles denote results from the different ACMs, with the OsloCTM3 (3-hourly output) shown in dark olive green. The inverted triangle indicates the multi-model means calculated for model output with monthly means. The bars show the standard deviation for the multi-model means.

535

540






Figure A4: Percentage differences in HCHO between TROPOMI satellite data for July 2009 – June 2010 vs. model simulations for 2010.




545

Figure A5: Percentage differences in NO₂, CO, NO₂/CO between TROPOMI satellite data for July 2009 - June 2010 vs. model simulations for 2010.


ATom1 (summer)



ATom2 (winter)




ATom3 (autumn)



550


ATom4 (spring)




555

Figure A6: Vertical profiles of formaldehyde (HCHO) compared against observations from four different ATom campaigns. Each panel corresponds to a specific geographical box, defined by latitude and longitude bounds: P1 (180°W to 135°W, 60°N to 90°N): Polar North Pacific; P2 (180°W to 135°W, 30°N to 60°N): Mid-latitude North Pacific; P3 (180°W to 135°W, 0°N to 30°N): Equatorial North Pacific; P4 (160°E to 135°W, 30°S to 0°S): Equatorial South Pacific; P5 (160°E to 135°W, 60°S to 30°S): Mid-latitude South Pacific; A1a (45°W to 10°W, 30°N to 60°N): Mid-latitude North Atlantic; A1b (45°W to 10°W, 0°N to 30°N): Equatorial North Atlantic; A2 (45°W to 10°W, 30°S to 0°S): Equatorial South Atlantic; A3 (65°W to 30°W, 60°S to 30°N): Western Atlantic; USA (135°W to 80°W, 30°N to 60°N); Canada (135°W to 45°W, 60°N to 90°N); Barbados (80°W to 45°W, 0°N to 30°N).


ATom1 (summer)




ATom1 (summer)




ATom2 (winter)




ATom2 (winter)




ATom3 (autumn)



ATom4 (spring)



ATom3 (autumn)













Figure A2A7: Similar to Fig. A1A6 but for vertical profiles of carbon monoxide against observations from the ATom campaigns.







575

Figure A3: Similar to Fig. 3, but including a column estimating model NO₂ during overpass using the ratio of overpass time NO₂ to monthly mean NO₂ from the 3 hourly OsloCTM3 simulations. A8: Global maps of annual mean satellite retrievals for (a) NO₂ for TROPOMI satellite retrievals for June 2009-June 2010 and models; (b) NO₂ annual mean model NO₂; and (b) model NO₂ during overpass for the models with-calculated as the product of monthly mean values multiplied-by-with the ratio of monthly mean:3-

580 hourly values during overpass for OsloCTM3; (c) CO for MOPITT, TROPOMI and models; (d) NO₂/CO values in the models, and (e) OH in the models other than UCI.





585 **Figure A4A9:** Similar to Fig. 8, but using isotopic compositions for sources and sinks from (Pieterse et al., 2011) and 29‰ as stratospheric contribution.




Figure A5A10: Effect of different isotopic compositions for a geological source of 9 Tg/yr.




Figure A11: Different OH-sink lifetimes used in the box model simulations to test the effect of time varying OH-concentrations on the atmospheric loss. The three OH-based lifetimes are calculated as **Atm. Lifetime 0:** Time-variant OH based on trends in [Stevenson et al \(2020\)](#) and [Skeie et al \(2023\)](#); **Lifetime 1:** Constant OH leading to constant atmospheric lifetime; **Atm. Lifetime 2:** time-variant OH using the following equation from the [Third Assessment Report \(Ehhalt et al., 2001\)](#): $\delta \ln(\text{tropospheric OH}) = -0.32 \delta \ln(\text{CH}_4) + 0.0042 \delta (e - \text{NO}_x) - 1.05e-4 \delta (e - \text{CO}) - 3.15e-4 \delta (e - \text{VOC})$, where CH₄ is in ppb and the (e-X) is in Tg of species X per year.

Table A1: Parameter and input data for the box model. Values in this table is for the setup where the box model is adjusted to OsloCTM3 results from Sand et al. (2024). The model can be adjusted to other ACMs replacing OsloCTM3 values with values from Table 2.

<u>Parameters for all simulations</u>	<u>Parameters modifications for Figures 3</u>	Description and Reference
Reference year (refyr = 2010)		Reference year for which the box model is calibrated to the OsloCTM3.
Pre-industrial concentration (pre_ind_conc = 330 ppb)		Pre-industrial (year 1850) concentration. Taken from Patterson et al. 2021.
Atmospheric production (prod_ref = 46.9 Tg/yr)		Total atmospheric H ₂ production in reference year from OsloCTM3.
Soil sink lifetime (tau_2 = 3.3 years)		H ₂ soil sink lifetime taken from the OsloCTM3 simulation representing the reference year.
Atmospheric lifetime (tau_1 = 6.9 years)		H ₂ atmospheric lifetime taken from the OsloCTM3 simulation representing the reference year.
Nitrogen fixation (nit_fix = 9 Tg/yr)		Nitrogen fixation emissions from soil and ocean. Fixed for all years.
Natural VOC emissions (natvoc = 640,6Tg yr-1)		Natural VOC emissions. Fixed for all years.
Conversion from burden to concentration (beta_h2 = 0.37 ppb/Tg)		Convert mass of H ₂ to concentration in ppb ($5.1352e^9 * 2.0 / 28.97 * 1e^{-9}$)
Fraction of atmospheric production from VOC (frac_voc_org = 0.3944)	<u>frac_voc_org = 0.39 (From Paulot et al., 2024)</u>	Fraction of atmospheric H ₂ production originating from VOC. (1-frac_voc_org) is due to CH ₄ . (Ehhalt and Rohrer, 2009; Paulot et al., 2024)
Anthropogenic H ₂ emissions		Historical anthropogenic H₂ emissions (CEDs21; (Szopa et al.,

		2021))Historical anthropogenic H₂ emissions (CEDS21; O'Rourke et al., 2021))
Biomass burning H ₂ emissions		Historical H ₂ emissions from biomass burning taken from GFED4s (van der Werf et al., 2017). Prior to 1997 a value of 9.1 Tg/yr is used.
Methane concentration		Historical methane concentration. Used to scale the methane fraction of the atmospheric production of H ₂ in time. (Meinshausen et al., 2017)
Anthropogenic VOC emissions		Historical non methane VOC emissions. Used to scale the VOC fraction of the atmospheric production of H ₂ in time. (Hoesly et al., 2018)

590

Code availability

The box model is available at https://github.com/ciceroOslo/simpleH2/tree/simpleH2_plot_preprint_withisohttps://github.com/ciceroOslo/simpleH2/tree/simpleH2_plot_preprint_withiso. WACCM6 simulation output is available at <https://archive.sigma2.no/dataset/cesm2-waccm-data-for-a-multi-model-approach-to-constrain-the-atmospheric-hydrogen-budget>

595

Author Contribution

S.K. led the study and the writing of the article. R.B.S., M.S. and S.K. designed and ran the box model. Ø.H. ran the [WACCM6 model](#), R.B.S. ran the [OsloCTM3](#) model, S.K. ran the UCI CTM model, H.B. ran the UKCA model, D.H. ran the INCA model, and F.P. ran the GFDL model. All the above-mentioned and M.S., G.M., M.P., and D.S. contributed to the design of the study and discussions of the results. All authors contributed to the writing of the article.

600

Competing interests

G.M. is a member of the editorial board of Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics

605 Acknowledgments

The work has received funding from the Norwegian Research Council (80%) and ~~and~~ six industrial partners (20%): Shell, Equinor, Statkraft, Linde, Gassco and Norwegian Shipowners' Associations (HYDROGEN, grants no. 320240) and the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 101137582 (HYway). The OsloCTM3 and WACCM6 simulations were performed on resources provided by Sigma2 - the National Infrastructure
610 for High Performance Computing and Data Storage in Norway (project account NN9188K).

References

- 615 Andreae, M. O. and Merlet, P.: Emission of trace gases and aerosols from biomass burning, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 15, 955–966, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000GB001382>, 2001.
- Batenburg, A. M., Walter, S., Pieterse, G., Levin, I., Schmidt, M., Jordan, A., Hammer, S., Yver, C., and Röckmann, T.: Temporal and spatial variability of the stable isotopic composition of atmospheric molecular hydrogen: observations at six EUROHYDROS stations, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 11, 6985–6999, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-6985-2011>, 2011.
- 620 Buzzard, V., Thorne, D., Gil-Loaiza, J., Cueva, A., and Meredith, L. K.: Sensitivity of soil hydrogen uptake to natural and managed moisture dynamics in a semiarid urban ecosystem, *PeerJ*, 10, e12966, <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.12966>, 2022.
- Chance, K., Palmer, P. I., Spurr, R. J. D., Martin, R. V., Kurosu, T. P., and Jacob, D. J.: Satellite observations of formaldehyde over North America from GOME, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 27, 3461–3464, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000GL011857>, 2000.
- 625 Conrad, R.: Soil microorganisms as controllers of atmospheric trace gases (H₂, CO, CH₄, OCS, N₂O, and NO), *Microbiological Reviews*, 60, 609, <https://doi.org/10.1128/mr.60.4.609-640.1996>, 1996.
- Conrad, R. and Babel, M.: Effect of dilution on methanogenesis, hydrogen turnover and interspecies hydrogen transfer in anoxic paddy soil, *FEMS Microbiology Letters*, 62, 21–27, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6968.1989.tb03654.x>, 1989.
- Conrad, R. and Seiler, W.: Contribution of hydrogen production by biological nitrogen fixation to the global hydrogen
630 budget, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 85, 5493–5498, <https://doi.org/10.1029/JC085iC10p05493>, 1980.
- Dalsøren, S. B., Myhre, C. L., Myhre, G., Gomez-Pelaez, A. J., Søvde, O. A., Isaksen, I. S. A., Weiss, R. F., and Harth, C. M.: Atmospheric methane evolution the last 40 years, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16, 3099–3126, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-3099-2016>, 2016.

- 635 De Smedt, I., Müller, J.-F., Stavrakou, T., van der A, R., Eskes, H., and Van Roozendaal, M.: Twelve years of global observations of formaldehyde in the troposphere using GOME and SCIAMACHY sensors, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 8, 4947–4963, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-4947-2008>, 2008.
- 640 Deeter, M. N., Emmons, L. K., Francis, G. L., Edwards, D. P., Gille, J. C., Warner, J. X., Khatatov, B., Ziskin, D., Lamarque, J.-F., Ho, S.-P., Yudin, V., Attié, J.-L., Packman, D., Chen, J., Mao, D., and Drummond, J. R.: Operational carbon monoxide retrieval algorithm and selected results for the MOPITT instrument, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 108, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JD003186>, 2003.
- Derwent, R. G. and Jenkin, M. E.: Estimation of the atmospheric hydrogen source from the oxidation of man-made and natural non-methane organic compounds using a Master Chemical Mechanism, *Atmospheric Environment*, 339, 120871, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2024.120871>, 2024.
- 645 Duncan, B. N., Logan, J. A., Bey, I., Megretskaia, I. A., Yantosca, R. M., Novelli, P. C., Jones, N. B., and Rinsland, C. P.: Global budget of CO, 1988–1997: Source estimates and validation with a global model, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 112, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD008459>, 2007.
- 650 Ehhalt, D., Prather, M., Dentener, F., Derwent, R., Dlugokencky, E., Holland, E., Isaksen, I., Katima, J., Kirchhoff, V., Matson, P., Midgley, P., Wang, M., Berntsen, T., Bey, I., Brasseur, G., Buja, L., Collins, W. J., Daniel, J., DeMore, W. B., Derek, N., Dickerson, R., Etheridge, D., Feichter, J., Fraser, P., Friedl, R., Fuglestedt, J., Gauss, M., Grenfell, L., Grüber, A., Harris, N., Hauglustaine, D., Horowitz, L., Jackman, C., Jacob, D., Jaeglé, L., Jain, A., Kanakidou, M., Karlsdottir, S., Ko, M., Kurylo, M., Lawrence, M., Logan, J. A., Manning, M., Mauzerall, D., McConnell, J., Mickley, L., Montzka, S., Müller, J. F., Olivier, J., Pickering, K., Pitari, G., Roelofs, G. J., Rogers, H., Rognerud, B., Smith, S., Solomon, S., Stachelin, J., Steele, P., Stevenson, D., Sundet, J., Thompson, A., van Weele, M., Joos, F., and McFarland, M.: Atmospheric Chemistry and Greenhouse Gases, in: *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, 239–288, 2001.
- 655 Ehhalt, D. H.: [Gas phase chemistry of the troposphere, in *Global Aspects of Atmospheric Chemistry \(Topics in Physical Chemistry\)*, vol. 6, edited by R. Zellner, pp. 21 – 109, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.](#)
- 660 [Ehhalt, D. H.](#) and Rohrer, F.: The tropospheric cycle of H₂: a critical review, *Tellus B: Chemical and Physical Meteorology*, 61, 500–535, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0889.2009.00416.x>, 2009.
- Esquivel-Elizondo, S., Hormaza Mejia, A., Sun, T., Shrestha, E., Hamburg, S. P., and Ocko, I. B.: Wide range in estimates of hydrogen emissions from infrastructure, *Front. Energy Res.*, 11, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2023.1207208>, 2023.
- Gerst, S. and Quay, P.: Deuterium component of the global molecular hydrogen cycle, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 106, 5021–5031, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JD900593>, 2001.
- 665 Gibson, J. J., Eby, P., and Jaggi, A.: Natural isotope fingerprinting of produced hydrogen and its potential applications to the hydrogen economy, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 66, 468–478, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2024.04.077>, 2024.
- Hagemann, R., Nief, G., and Roth, E.: Absolute isotopic scale for deuterium analysis of natural waters. Absolute D/H ratio for SMOW, *Tellus*, 22, 712–715, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2153-3490.1970.tb00540.x>, 1970.
- 670 Hauglustaine, D. A. and Ehhalt, D. H.: A three-dimensional model of molecular hydrogen in the troposphere, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 107, ACH 4-1-ACH 4-16, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JD001156>, 2002.

- 675 Hoesly, R. M., Smith, S. J., Feng, L., Klimont, Z., Janssens-Maenhout, G., Pitkanen, T., Seibert, J. J., Vu, L., Andres, R. J., Bolt, R. M., Bond, T. C., Dawidowski, L., Kholod, N., Kurokawa, J., Li, M., Liu, L., Lu, Z., Moura, M. C. P., O'Rourke, P. R., and Zhang, Q.: Historical (1750–2014) anthropogenic emissions of reactive gases and aerosols from the Community Emissions Data System (CEDS), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11, 369–408, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-369-2018>, 2018.
- Lama, S., Houweling, S., Boersma, K. F., Aben, I., Denier van der Gon, H. A. C., and Krol, M. C.: Estimation of OH in urban plumes using TROPOMI-inferred NO₂ and CO, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 22, 16053–16071, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-16053-2022>, 2022.
- 680 Meinshausen, M., Vogel, E., Nauels, A., Lorbacher, K., Meinshausen, N., Etheridge, D. M., Fraser, P. J., Montzka, S. A., Rayner, P. J., Trudinger, C. M., Krummel, P. B., Beyerle, U., Canadell, J. G., Daniel, J. S., Enting, I. G., Law, R. M., Lunder, C. R., O'Doherty, S., Prinn, R. G., Reimann, S., Rubino, M., Velders, G. J. M., Vollmer, M. K., Wang, R. H. J., and Weiss, R.: Historical greenhouse gas concentrations for climate modelling (CMIP6), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10, 2057–2116, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-2057-2017>, 2017.
- 685 Novelli, P. C., Lang, P. M., Masarie, K. A., Hurst, D. F., Myers, R., and Elkins, J. W.: Molecular hydrogen in the troposphere: Global distribution and budget, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 104, 30427–30444, <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JD900788>, 1999.
- 690 [O'Rourke, P. R., Smith, S. J., Mott, A., Ahsan, H., McDuffie, E. E., Crippa, M., Klimont, S., McDonald, B., Wang, Z., Nicholson, M. B., Feng, L., and Hoesly, R. M.: CEDS v-2021-02-05 Emission Data 1975–2019 \(Version Feb-05-2021\), Zenodo \[data set\], <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4509372>, 2021.](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4509372)
- 695 [Ouyang, Z., Jackson, R. B., Saunio, M., Canadell, J. G., Zhao, Y., Morfopoulos, C., Krummel, P. B., Patra, P. K., Peters, G. P., Dennison, F., Gasser, T., Archibald, A. T., Arora, V., Baudoin, G., Chandra, N., Ciais, P., Davis, S. J., Feron, S., Guo, F., Hauglustaine, D., Jones, C. D., Jones, M. W., Kato, E., Kennedy, D., Knauer, J., Lienert, S., Lombardozzi, D., Melton, J. R., Nabel, J. E. M. S., O'Sullivan, M., Pétron, G., Poulter, B., Rogelj, J., Sandoval Calle, D., Smith, P., Suntharalingam, P., Tian, H., Wang, C., and Wiltshire, A.: The global hydrogen budget, *Nature*, 648, 616–624, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-025-09806-1>, 2025.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-025-09806-1)
- 700 Patterson, J. D., Aydin, M., Crotwell, A. M., Petron, G., Severinghaus, J. P., and Saltzman, E. S.: Atmospheric History of H₂ Over the Past Century Reconstructed From South Pole Firn Air, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2020GL087787, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL087787>, 2020.
- Patterson, J. D., Aydin, M., Crotwell, A. M., Pétron, G., Severinghaus, J. P., Krummel, P. B., Langenfelds, R. L., and Saltzman, E. S.: H₂ in Antarctic firn air: Atmospheric reconstructions and implications for anthropogenic emissions, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118, e2103335118, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2103335118>, 2021.
- 705 Paulot, F., Paynter, D., Naik, V., Malyshev, S., Menzel, R., and Horowitz, L. W.: Global modeling of hydrogen using GFDL-AM4.1: Sensitivity of soil removal and radiative forcing, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 46, 13446–13460, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2021.01.088>, 2021.
- Paulot, F., Pétron, G., Crotwell, A. M., and Bertagni, M. B.: Reanalysis of NOAA H₂ observations: implications for the H₂ budget, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 24, 4217–4229, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-24-4217-2024>, 2024.
- 710 Pérez-Peña, M. P., Fisher, J. A., Millet, D. B., Yashiro, H., Langenfelds, R. L., Krummel, P. B., and Kable, S. H.: Evaluating the contribution of the unexplored photochemistry of aldehydes on the tropospheric levels of molecular hydrogen (H₂), *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 22, 12367–12386, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-12367-2022>, 2022.

- Pétron, G., Crotwell, A. M., Mund, J., Crotwell, M., Mefford, T., Thoning, K., Hall, B., Kitzis, D., Madronich, M., Moglia, E., Neff, D., Wolter, S., Jordan, A., Krummel, P., Langenfelds, R., and Patterson, J.: Atmospheric H₂ observations from the NOAA Cooperative Global Air Sampling Network, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 17, 4803–4823, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-17-4803-2024>, 2024.
- 715 Pieterse, G., Krol, M. C., and Röckmann, T.: A consistent molecular hydrogen isotope chemistry scheme based on an independent bond approximation, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 9, 8503–8529, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-9-8503-2009>, 2009.
- 720 Pieterse, G., Krol, M. C., Batenburg, A. M., Steele, L. P., Krummel, P. B., Langenfelds, R. L., and Röckmann, T.: Global modelling of H₂ mixing ratios and isotopic compositions with the TM5 model, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 11, 7001–7026, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-7001-2011>, 2011.
- Pieterse, G., Krol, M. C., Batenburg, A. M., M. Brenninkmeijer, C. A., Popa, M. E., O’Doherty, S., Grant, A., Steele, L. P., Krummel, P. B., Langenfelds, R. L., Wang, H. J., Vermeulen, A. T., Schmidt, M., Yver, C., Jordan, A., Engel, A., Fisher, R. E., Lowry, D., Nisbet, E. G., Reimann, S., Vollmer, M. K., Steinbacher, M., Hammer, S., Forster, G., Sturges, W. T., and Röckmann, T.: Reassessing the variability in atmospheric H₂ using the two-way nested TM5 model, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118, 3764–3780, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50204>, 2013.
- 725 Price, H., Jaeglé, L., Rice, A., Quay, P., Novelli, P. C., and Gammon, R.: Global budget of molecular hydrogen and its deuterium content: Constraints from ground station, cruise, and aircraft observations, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 112, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JD008152>, 2007.
- 730 Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R. F., Miller, B. R., Huang, J., Alyea, F. N., Cunnold, D. M., Fraser, P. J., Hartley, D. E., and Simmonds, P. G.: Atmospheric Trends and Lifetime of CH₃CCl₃ and Global OH Concentrations, *Science*, 269, 187–192, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.269.5221.187>, 1995.
- Rhee, T. S., Brenninkmeijer, C. a. M., and Röckmann, T.: The overwhelming role of soils in the global atmospheric hydrogen cycle, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 6, 1611–1625, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-6-1611-2006>, 2006.
- 735 Rhee, T. S., Brenninkmeijer, C. a. M., and Röckmann, T.: Hydrogen isotope fractionation in the photolysis of formaldehyde, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 8, 1353–1366, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-1353-2008>, 2008.
- Rice, A. L. and Quay, P.: Isotopic Composition of Formaldehyde in Urban Air, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 43, 8752–8758, <https://doi.org/10.1021/es9010916>, 2009.
- 740 Röckmann, T., Gómez Álvarez, C. X., Walter, S., van der Veen, C., Wollny, A. G., Gunthe, S. S., Helas, G., Pöschl, U., Keppler, F., Greule, M., and Brand, W. A.: Isotopic composition of H₂ from wood burning: Dependency on combustion efficiency, moisture content, and δD of local precipitation, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 115, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD013188>, 2010.
- Sand, M., Skeie, R. B., Sandstad, M., Krishnan, S., Myhre, G., Bryant, H., Derwent, R., Hauglustaine, D., Paulot, F., Prather, M., and Stevenson, D.: A multi-model assessment of the Global Warming Potential of hydrogen, *Commun Earth Environ*, 4, 203, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-023-00857-8>, 2023.
- 745 Sanderson, M. G., Collins, W. J., Derwent, R. G., and Johnson, C. E.: Simulation of Global Hydrogen Levels Using a Lagrangian Three-Dimensional Model, *Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry*, 46, 15–28, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024824223232>, 2003.

- 750 Skeie, R. B., Hodnebrog, Ø., and Myhre, G.: Trends in atmospheric methane concentrations since 1990 were driven and modified by anthropogenic emissions, *Commun Earth Environ*, 4, 1–14, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-023-00969-1>, 2023.
- Stevenson, D. S., Zhao, A., Naik, V., O'Connor, F. M., Tilmes, S., Zeng, G., Murray, L. T., Collins, W. J., Griffiths, P. T., Shim, S., Horowitz, L. W., Sentman, L. T., and Emmons, L.: Trends in global tropospheric hydroxyl radical and methane lifetime since 1850 from AerChemMIP, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20, 12905–12920, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-12905-2020>, 2020.
- 755 Szopa, S., Naik, V., Adhikary, B., Artaxo, P., Berntsen, T., Collins, W. D., Fuzzi, S., Gallardo, L., Kiendler-Scharr, A., Klimont, Z., Liao, H., Unger, N., and Zanis, P.: Short-Lived Climate Forcers (Chapter 6), in: *IPCC 2021: 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., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., 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., Yelekci, K., Yu, R., and Zhu, B., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 817–922, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.008>, 2021.
- 760 Trapani, D., Marocco, P., Gandiglio, M., and Santarelli, M.: Hydrogen leakages across the supply chain: Current estimates and future scenarios, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 145, 1084–1095, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2025.06.103>, 2025.
- 765 Veefkind, J. P., Aben, I., McMullan, K., Förster, H., de Vries, J., Otter, G., Claas, J., Eskes, H. J., de Haan, J. F., Kleipool, Q., van Weele, M., Hasekamp, O., Hoogeveen, R., Landgraf, J., Snel, R., Tol, P., Ingmann, P., Voors, R., Kruizinga, B., Vink, R., Visser, H., and Levelt, P. F.: TROPOMI on the ESA Sentinel-5 Precursor: A GMES mission for global observations of the atmospheric composition for climate, air quality and ozone layer applications, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 120, 70–83, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2011.09.027>, 2012.
- 770 Vollmer, M. K., Walter, S., Bond, S. W., Soltic, P., and Röckmann, T.: Molecular hydrogen (H₂) emissions and their isotopic signatures (H/D) from a motor vehicle: implications on atmospheric H₂, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10, 5707–5718, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-5707-2010>, 2010.
- 775 Walter, S., Laukenmann, S., Stams, A. J. M., Vollmer, M. K., Gleixner, G., and Röckmann, T.: The stable isotopic signature of biologically produced molecular hydrogen (H₂), *Biogeosciences*, 9, 4115–4123, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-9-4115-2012>, 2012.
- van der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Giglio, L., van Leeuwen, T. T., Chen, Y., Rogers, B. M., Mu, M., van Marle, M. J. E., Morton, D. C., Collatz, G. J., Yokelson, R. J., and Kasibhatla, P. S.: Global fire emissions estimates during 1997–2016, *Earth System Science Data*, 9, 697–720, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-9-697-2017>, 2017.
- 780 Xiao, X., Prinn, R. G., Simmonds, P. G., Steele, L. P., Novelli, P. C., Huang, J., Langenfelds, R. L., O'Doherty, S., Krummel, P. B., Fraser, P. J., Porter, L. W., Weiss, R. F., Salameh, P., and Wang, R. H. J.: Optimal estimation of the soil uptake rate of molecular hydrogen from the Advanced Global Atmospheric Gases Experiment and other measurements, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 112, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JD007241>, 2007.
- 785 Yang, L. H., Jacob, D. J., Lin, H., Dang, R., Bates, K. H., East, J. D., Travis, K. R., Pendergrass, D. C., and Murray, L. T.: Assessment of Hydrogen's Climate Impact Is Affected by Model OH Biases, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 52, e2024GL112445, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024GL112445>, 2025.
- Yver, C. E., Pison, I. C., Fortems-Cheiney, A., Schmidt, M., Chevallier, F., Ramonet, M., Jordan, A., Søvde, O. A., Engel, A., Fisher, R. E., Lowry, D., Nisbet, E. G., Levin, I., Hammer, S., Necki, J., Bartyzel, J., Reimann, S., Vollmer, M. K., Steinbacher, M., Aalto, T., Maione, M., Arduini, J., O'Doherty, S., Grant, A., Sturges, W. T., Forster, G. L., Lunder, C. R.,

- 790 Privalov, V., Paramonova, N., Werner, A., and Bousquet, P.: A new estimation of the recent tropospheric molecular hydrogen budget using atmospheric observations and variational inversion, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 11, 3375–3392, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-3375-2011>, 2011.
- Zgonnik, V.: The occurrence and geoscience of natural hydrogen: A comprehensive review, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 203, 103140, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2020.103140>, 2020.
- 795 Zimmerman, P. R., Greenberg, J. P., Wandiga, S. O., and Crutzen, P. J.: Termites: A Potentially Large Source of Atmospheric Methane, Carbon Dioxide, and Molecular Hydrogen, *Science*, 218, 563–565, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.218.4572.563>, 1982.

800