

Response Letter

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

We sincerely thank you for facilitating the review process and providing valuable feedback. The comments received have been instrumental in enhancing our manuscript's quality and clarity. We have carefully considered all the comments and have made comprehensive revisions to address each point raised. Our detailed responses to the reviewers' comments are provided below.

Yours sincerely,
Yibo Xue and co-authors

Reviewer #1

General comments:

In this study, titled “Impacts of mesh refinement on the simulation of a long-range transported extreme dust storm over East Asia in the global variable-resolution model (iAMAS v2.6.3)” by Xue et al., the authors conducted three experiments, with the highest model resolution increased from 50 km to 16 km to 4 km, to simulate an extreme dust storm event in East Asia. The authors analyzed the impact of model resolution on simulated dust aerosol properties and processes.

Specific comments:

- *1. In section 2.2, Dust emission scheme, the authors could highlight the factors affected by model resolution.*

Response: Thank you for your thoughtful comment on the resolution-dependent factors affecting dust emission. We have revised Section 2.2 to clarify the factors through which horizontal resolution affects dust emission (see Section 2.2 on Page 8, Lines 207-211). The same S04 formulation and parameter settings are used in all three experiments; therefore, horizontal resolution does not directly modify the dust-emission parameterization. Instead, mesh refinement affects dust emission through resolution-dependent changes in the factors controlling emission, including topography, land-surface heterogeneity, and near-surface meteorological forcing. In particular, these changes influence the spatial variability of surface friction velocity and the frequency and magnitude of its exceedance above the saltation threshold, thereby affecting the magnitude and spatial distribution of simulated dust emissions. In the revised manuscript (Section 2.2), we have added the following explanation: “For dust emission specifically, mesh refinement affects the model-resolved representation of topography, land-surface heterogeneity, and near-surface meteorological forcing, particularly the spatial variability of surface friction velocity and the frequency and magnitude of its exceedance above the saltation threshold.”

- *2. Line 179-180: Add more information about the dust source function (e.g., definition, range, physical meaning) and model resolution in Figure 1. Same for Figure 1 title. Do variable-resolution models use the same dust source function, with 50 km resolution?*

Response: Thank you for your thoughtful comment on the dust source function and its representation across different model resolutions. We have revised Section 2.2 and the caption of Fig. 1 to provide the definition, physical meaning, value range, and horizontal resolution of the dust source function (see Section 2.2 on Pages 8-9, Lines 216-224, and Fig. 1). The source function is defined as a dimensionless weighting factor representing the relative availability of erodible sediments and the associated dust-emission potential under otherwise identical forcing conditions (Ginoux et al., 2001). The source-function values in the dataset used here range from 0 to 0.38, with larger values indicating greater dust-source potential. The original source-function

dataset has a horizontal resolution of approximately 0.7° , and the same dataset is mapped onto the three model meshes rather than being independently prescribed for each configuration. The mapped source-function fields remain within the original value range of 0-0.38. In the revised manuscript (Section 2.2), we have added a detailed explanation: “Fig. 1 shows the dust source function used in the model. It is a dimensionless weighting factor representing the relative availability of erodible sediments and the associated dust-emission potential under otherwise identical forcing conditions (Ginoux et al., 2001). The source function represents a relative indicator of dust source potential rather than a direct measure of soil erodibility. The source function ranges from 0 to 0.38 and has a horizontal resolution of approximately 0.7° . The same dataset is mapped onto the three model meshes, and the resulting source-function fields all retain the same value range of 0-0.38.”




Fig. 1. Spatial distribution of the dust source function used in all three mesh configurations. This dimensionless field represents relative dust-source potential, with values ranging from 0 to 0.38 in the dataset used here. The source-function dataset has a horizontal resolution of approximately 0.7° . The boxes denote the major dust source and downwind regions analyzed in this study.

Reference:

Ginoux, P., Chin, M., Tegen, I., Prospero, J. M., Holben, B., Dubovik, O., and Lin, S.-J.: Sources and distributions of dust aerosols simulated with the GOCART model, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 106, 20255-20273, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JD000053>, 2001.

- *3. Line 304-306: Since the resolution of ERA5 data is 0.25-degree and lower than that of variable-resolution models, how does the interpolation, from low to high resolution, affect the simulation results? Also, “Meteorological initial conditions and surface boundary fields are obtained from the ERA5 reanalysis at 6-hourly intervals”, does the model read initial conditions every 6 hour?*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on the ERA5 interpolation and the updating procedure of meteorological fields. We have revised Section 2.4 to clarify the influence of interpolating the 0.25° ERA5 fields onto the refined iAMAS meshes and to distinguish the initialization and reinitialization of the meteorological fields from the 6-hourly updating of sea surface temperature and sea-ice fraction (see Section 2.4 on Pages 13-15, Lines 350-388). The ERA5 atmospheric fields are interpolated onto each native iAMAS mesh using the same preprocessing procedure, thereby providing a consistent large-scale initial atmospheric state for all three experiments. This interpolation does not create independent meteorological information at spatial scales finer than the original 0.25° ERA5 resolution. Therefore, although the ERA5 fields are represented on the 16 and 4 km meshes, their initial spatial variability remains constrained by the original ERA5 resolution, with limited representation of local gradients and mesoscale structures. During subsequent model integration, dynamically consistent finer-scale features can develop through the model dynamics and the resolution-dependent representation of topography, land-surface heterogeneity, and physical processes. Thus, the differences among the simulations reflect subsequent model evolution and the resolution-dependent representation of atmospheric and surface processes after interpolation onto the different native meshes. We have also corrected the inaccurate statement that “Meteorological initial conditions and surface boundary fields are obtained from the ERA5 reanalysis at 6-hourly intervals.” The model does not read or replace the meteorological initial conditions every 6 h. The meteorological fields are initialized from ERA5 at 00:00 on 8 March and reinitialized once at 00:00 on 12 March, whereas sea surface temperature and sea-ice fraction are updated from ERA5 every 6 h. During the reinitialization on 12 March, the chemical tracers, including dust, are retained from the end of the spin-up period to ensure their continuity.

In the revised manuscript (Section 2.4), we have added a detailed explanation:

“The ERA5 atmospheric fields at 0.25° resolution are interpolated onto each native iAMAS mesh, providing a consistent large-scale initial state for all three experiments. The interpolation does not introduce additional fine-scale meteorological information, and the initial variability on the refined meshes therefore remains constrained by the ERA5 resolution. Finer-scale features can subsequently develop through the model dynamics and the resolution-dependent representation of topography and physical processes. Sea surface temperature and sea-ice fraction are prescribed from ERA5 and updated every 6 h during the simulation. All experiments cover 8-20 March 2021. The period from 00:00 on 8 March to 00:00 on 12 March is used as a spin-up period to allow dust and chemical fields to evolve from the prescribed initial state before the target event. During this period, dust emission, transport, and removal processes are continuously simulated, allowing the chemical fields to adjust with the meteorological conditions. The objective of this spin-up is to allow the aerosol fields to dynamically evolve before the event

simulation rather than to achieve a long-term aerosol climatological equilibrium. In the present simulations, only mineral dust aerosols are included, and the analysis focuses on the total dust burden during this intense dust event. Although the smallest dust particles may require a longer spin-up to approach equilibrium because of their longer atmospheric lifetimes, they account for only a small fraction of the total dust mass. Pre-event dust emissions are relatively weak in the simulations, and the dust burden during the analysis period is expected to be mainly influenced by emissions associated with the event. The same initial chemical conditions and spin-up procedure are applied to all mesh configurations, providing a consistent basis for evaluating the impacts of mesh refinement. Using a commonly employed meteorological reinitialization strategy in atmospheric and aerosol modeling (Zhao et al., 2010; Feng et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024), the meteorological fields are initialized from ERA5 at 00:00 on 8 March and reinitialized only once, at 00:00 on 12 March, to maintain a reliable large-scale atmospheric state. During this reinitialization, the meteorological state is replaced by the ERA5-based fields, whereas the prognostic chemical tracers, including dust, are carried forward directly from the final state of the spin-up integration and used as the chemical initial conditions for the subsequent simulation, rather than being reset to prescribed or default values. This provides a more appropriate initial aerosol state for the subsequent integration (Feng et al., 2023). The chemical tracer fields therefore remain continuous across the restart, while dust emission, transport, and deposition continue to evolve online in response to the reinitialized meteorological conditions. The continuity of dust fields across the meteorological reinitialization was verified by examining dust burden evolution, which showed no apparent discontinuity before and after the restart (Fig. S1).”

Reference:

- Feng, J., Zhao, C., Du, Q., Xu, M., Gu, J., Hu, Z., and Chen, Y.: Simulating atmospheric dust with a global variable-resolution model: Model description and impacts of mesh refinement, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 15, e2023MS003636, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003636>, 2023.
- Zhao, C., Liu, X., Leung, L. R., Johnson, B., McFarlane, S. A., Gustafson, W. I., Jr., Fast, J. D., and Easter, R.: The spatial distribution of mineral dust and its shortwave radiative forcing over North Africa: Modeling sensitivities to dust emissions and aerosol size treatments, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 8821-8838, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-8821-2010>, 2010.
- Li, G., Zhao, C., Xu, M., Feng, J., Zhong, L., Li, R., and Fu, Y.: Simulating moisture transport over the Tibetan Plateau in summer of 2015 across scales with a global variable-resolution model (MPAS-A), *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 129, e2023JD040205, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JD040205>, 2024.

● 4. *Figure 2: The grid lines and differences in grid sizes in (a)-(c) are not clear.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful suggestion. We have revised and redrawn Fig. 2 (see Fig. 2). We added enlarged views covering the refined and transition regions to clearly illustrate the changes in mesh spacing and facilitate readers' understanding.




Fig. 2. (a) Global quasi-uniform mesh of 50 km (U50 km); (b, c) Global variable-resolution meshes of 16-50 km (V16 km) and 4-50 km (V4 km), refined over the major dust source regions in East Asia; (d, e) Spatial distributions of mesh spacing (cell size) for V16 km and V4 km. The black solid circles denote the refinement regions, and the black dashed circles indicate the outermost boundary of the refinement transition zone.

- *5. When evaluating the simulated large-scale circulation and wind speed, the authors could quantify the model performance using spatial correlation coefficients, scatterplot, root mean square error, etc. This can provide evidence for the descriptions such as “generally well reproduced”, “reasonably represented”, “comparable spatial pattern”, “broadly*

consistent” (Line 365-370). For 10-m wind speed, besides temporal correlation coefficients in Table 2, the scatterplot (like Figure 6) could be used to show how well the models capture the extreme wind speed in dust source regions.

Response: Thank you for your constructive suggestion and for suggesting quantitative evaluations of large-scale circulation and 10 m wind speed. We have revised the manuscript and added quantitative evaluations of the simulated large-scale circulation to support qualitative descriptions such as “generally well reproduced”, “reasonably represented”, “comparable spatial pattern”, and “broadly consistent” (see Section 3.1.1 on Page 17, Lines 459-465; Table 2 and Table S1). We have also added a scatterplot comparing simulated and observed daily mean 10 m wind speeds over the dust source regions and expanded the corresponding quantitative analysis in the manuscript (see Section 3.1.2 on Page 19, Lines 523-529; Fig. S5). The quantitative results support that all three simulations reproduce the broad synoptic-scale circulation, with spatial pattern correlations of 0.89-0.91 for mean sea level pressure and 0.97-0.98 for the 500 hPa geopotential height. The representation of the 850 hPa wind field generally shows closer agreement with ERA5 with mesh refinement: the wind-speed correlation increases from 0.69 in U50 km to 0.76 in V4 km, while the RMSE decreases from 3.69 to 3.29 m s⁻¹, and the corresponding vector correlation increases from 0.78 to 0.84 (Tables 2 and S1). For daily mean 10 m wind speed, the pooled station–day correlation increases from 0.64 in U50 km to 0.71 in V16 km and 0.75 in V4 km, while the NMB changes from +5.1% to –0.7% and –4.1%, respectively (Fig. S5). These results provide quantitative support for the descriptions of the simulated mid- and lower-tropospheric circulation and near-surface wind distribution.

In the revised manuscript (Section 3.1.1), we have added a detailed explanation:

“The quantitative evaluation further shows comparable performance among the three simulations in reproducing mean sea level pressure, with spatial correlations of 0.89-0.91, while mesh refinement generally enhances the agreement with ERA5 for the mid- and lower-tropospheric circulation. From U50 km to V4 km, the root mean square error (RMSE) decreases from 27.80 to 23.60 gpm for the 500 hPa geopotential height and from 3.69 to 3.29 m s⁻¹ for the 850 hPa wind speed, while the 850 hPa vector correlation increases from 0.78 to 0.84 (Tables 2 and S1).”

The corresponding text in the revised manuscript (Sections 3.1.2) reads as follows:

“To further evaluate near-surface winds over the dust source regions, Fig. S5 compares simulated and observed daily mean 10-m wind speeds during 13-16 March 2021. With mesh refinement, the correlation coefficient (r) increases from 0.64 in U50 km to 0.71 in V16 km and 0.75 in V4 km, while the normalized mean bias (NMB) changes from +5.1% to –0.7% and –4.1%, respectively. Both refined simulations show smaller absolute biases than U50 km, with the smallest absolute bias occurring in V16 km.”

Table 2. Evaluation of simulated mean sea level pressure, 500 hPa geopotential height, and 850 hPa wind speed against ERA5 during 13-16 March 2021.

Experiment	MSLP (hPa)			Z500 (gpm)			WS850 (m s^{-1})		
	r	RMSE	MB	r	RMSE	MB	r	RMSE	MB
U50 km	0.89	4.38	+1.84	0.97	27.80	-1.95	0.69	3.69	+0.75
V16 km	0.90	4.07	+1.82	0.98	24.15	-5.95	0.73	3.41	+0.44
V4 km	0.91	4.18	+2.02	0.98	23.60	-8.12	0.76	3.29	+0.36

Notes: r denotes the spatial pattern correlation coefficient. RMSE and MB denote root mean square error and mean bias, respectively. MSLP, Z500, and WS850 denote mean sea level pressure, 500 hPa geopotential height, and 850 hPa wind speed, respectively. The values are averages of the daily evaluation metrics calculated over 75–140°E and 33–57°N during 13-16 March 2021.

Table S1. Evaluation of the simulated 850 hPa wind vectors and wind components against ERA5 during 13-16 March 2021.

Experiment	Vector	U850 (m s^{-1})		V850 (m s^{-1})	
	r	RMSE	MB	RMSE	MB
U50 km	0.78	3.22	+0.63	3.72	-0.07
V16 km	0.82	2.92	+0.44	3.30	+0.01
V4 km	0.84	2.81	+0.37	3.09	-0.01

Notes: Vector r denotes the area-weighted centered vector pattern correlation coefficient calculated jointly from the 850 hPa zonal and meridional wind components. U850 and V850 denote the 850 hPa zonal and meridional wind components, respectively. All values are averages of the daily evaluation metrics calculated during 13-16 March 2021.




Fig. S5. Scatterplots of simulated versus observed daily mean 10-m wind speeds at collocated NOAA surface stations over the combined dust source regions during 13-16 March 2021. The solid line indicates 1:1 agreement, whereas the dashed lines mark the factor-of-two bounds. The correlation coefficient (r) and normalized mean bias (NMB) are calculated from all pooled station-day samples for each experiment.

- *6. Line 367: For mean sea level pressure in TKD region, ERA5 shows a low pressure and wind convergence, but models do not capture this, especially during March 15-16. Since TKD is a key source of dust, this bias may affect dust transport. Are the model results regridded to ERA5 grids? If so, the authors could show the differences between simulations and ERA5 in supplementary information.*

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment on the circulation discrepancy over the TKD and the comparison with ERA5. We have revised the inaccurate description and redrawn Figs. 3 and S4 after regridding the model fields onto the 0.25° ERA5 comparison grid. We have also added daily model-minus-ERA5 differences in mean sea level pressure and 850 hPa wind vectors

in Fig. S2 (see Section 3.1.1 on Page 17, Lines 465-472; Fig. 3, S2 and S4). The results show that, although the simulations reproduce the broad synoptic-scale circulation, they do not fully capture the low-pressure system and associated low-level wind convergence over the Taklimakan Desert (TKD), particularly on 15-16 March. We acknowledge this regional discrepancy and clarify that it may introduce uncertainty into the simulated local wind forcing, dust emission, and initial transport from this important source region. In the revised manuscript (Section 3.1.1), we have added the following explanation: “The broad spatial distribution and day-to-day evolution of mean sea level pressure are also reproduced, including the Siberian–Mongolian high-pressure system. Nevertheless, ERA5 shows a localized low-pressure system accompanied by low-level wind convergence over the TKD, particularly on 15-16 March, whereas these features are not clearly captured by the simulations (Fig. S2). This regional discrepancy may contribute to uncertainty in the representation of local wind forcing, dust emission, and initial dust transport from the TKD.”




Fig. 3. Daily mean sea level pressure (shading, hPa), 500 hPa geopotential height (contours, gpm), and 850 hPa wind vectors for ERA5 and iAMAS simulations (U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km) during 13-16 March 2021. All model fields were interpolated onto the 0.25° ERA5 grid for comparison.




Fig. S2. Daily differences in MSLP (shading; model minus ERA5, hPa) and 850 hPa wind vectors (vectors; model minus ERA5, m s^{-1}) for the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km simulations during 13-16 March 2021. All model fields were interpolated onto the native 0.25° ERA5 grid before calculating the differences.




Fig. S4. Daily mean geopotential height at 700 hPa (shading, gpm) and 700 hPa wind vectors for ERA5 and iAMAS simulations (U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km) during 13-16 March 2021. All model fields were interpolated onto the native 0.25° ERA5 grid for comparison.

- *7. Line 381-382: Figure 3 does not show the information about “terrain transitions”, and the audiences might not be familiar with the definitions of Hexi Corridor/Mongolian Plateau. The authors could overlay the winds on topography and highlight the regions with significant differences in winds if possible.*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on the terrain-related description and the presentation of wind fields. We have revised the manuscript by removing the description of terrain-related wind variations that was not directly supported by the original Fig. 3 and by adding Fig. S3, in which the daily mean 850 hPa winds from ERA5 and the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km simulations are overlaid on a common terrain-height field during 13-16 March 2021 (see Section 3.1.1 on Page 18, Lines 479-483; Fig. S3). The newly added terrain-overlaid wind fields provide the topographic context for evaluating the spatial differences in the simulated low-level circulation. The revised analysis shows that all simulations reproduce the broad evolution of the 850 hPa circulation, while some localized differences in wind magnitude and direction occur among the simulations, particularly over northern China during 14-16 March. These variations are mainly located near regions with strong elevation gradients, as illustrated in Fig. S3. In the revised manuscript (Section 3.1.1), we have added the following explanation: “Although the three simulations reproduce the broad evolution of the low-level flow, some localized differences in wind magnitude and direction are evident among the simulations, particularly over northern China during 14-16 March. The terrain-overlaid wind fields show that these variations are mainly located near regions with strong elevation gradients (Fig. S3).”




Fig. S3. Terrain height (shading; m) and daily mean 850 hPa winds (vectors; m s^{-1}) from ERA5 and the U50, V16, and V4 simulations during 13-16 March 2021.

- 8. Line 463: What do the authors mean by “more spatially diffuse”? The dust in U50 goes farther from source to downwind regions? On March 16 (Figure 5), over the downwind Shandong Peninsula, V16 and V4 show larger concentrations ($>500 \text{ ug/m}^3$) than U50 does ($200\text{-}500 \text{ ug/m}^3$). This suggests that dust in V16 and V4 goes farther. Where are “elevated background concentrations” (Line 465-466) located at? For the “positive mean bias presented in Fig. 6” (Line 466-467), most of the observed concentrations are below 400 ug/m^3 while simulated concentrations are $200\text{-}1300 \text{ ug/m}^3$, so, I guess these points are associated with stations in northwestern regions in Figure 6 where all three models show higher bias in concentrations.

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on the interpretation of dust transport differences and model biases. We have revised the manuscript and removed the inaccurate descriptions “more spatially diffuse”, “elevated background concentrations”,

and “positive mean bias presented in Fig. 6” (see Section 3.1.3 on Page 21, Lines 567-577). The revised text now describes the differences among the simulations in terms of the continuity, intensity, and spatial organization of the transported dust plume. In particular, on 16 March, the V16 km and V4 km simulations produce higher PM₁₀ concentrations over the downwind Shandong Peninsula than the U50 km simulation, indicating stronger dust transport toward this region in the refined simulations. The corresponding text in the revised manuscript (Section 3.1.3) reads as follows: “In the U50 km experiment, the high-concentration band along the main southeastward transport pathway is less continuous, and the simulated PM₁₀ concentrations over downstream regions, particularly the Shandong Peninsula on 16 March, are lower than those in the V16 km and V4 km experiments. The V16 km simulation better maintains the band-like structure of the transported dust plume across eastern China, while the V4 km simulation shows more pronounced localized concentration maxima and spatial variability. In particular, both refined simulations produce higher PM₁₀ concentrations over the downwind Shandong Peninsula, consistent with stronger transport toward this region. These results suggest that mesh refinement influences both the intensity and spatial organization of the transported dust plume.”

● *9. Line 489-492: How about the effects of dry deposition near dust source regions on dust concentrations/transport?*

Response: Thank you for your helpful suggestion on the role of dry deposition in regulating dust concentrations and transport. We have revised the manuscript to explicitly consider the role of dry deposition in the resolution-dependent differences in dust concentrations and transport. In Section 3.1.3, we now clarify that the simulated differences in dust transport may result from the combined effects of the spatiotemporal evolution of dust emissions, circulation-related wind changes, dry deposition, and wet scavenging (see Section 3.1.3 on Page 22, Lines 592-594). In addition, dry deposition over the source and near-source regions is quantified and discussed in Section 3.2.1 and Table S8 (see Section 3.2.1 on Page 27, Lines 760-767; Table S8). The results show that dry deposition varies with mesh refinement. Compared with U50 km, the V4 km simulation produces higher total dry deposition over the analyzed source regions, with particularly large increases over the MGD and HC–WIM. This enhanced near-source removal may remove part of the additionally emitted dust before the remaining airborne dust is transported downstream, and may therefore influence the resolution-dependent differences in downstream dust concentrations and transport.

We have added the following explanation in Section 3.1.3 of the revised manuscript: “These resolution-dependent differences in the simulated spatial distribution of dust transport may result from the combined effects of the spatiotemporal evolution of dust emissions, circulation-related wind changes, dry deposition, and wet scavenging.”

We have also added a detailed discussion of dry deposition in source and near-source regions in Section 3.2.1: “Meanwhile, dry deposition over the source and near-source regions also varies with mesh refinement (Table S8). Compared with U50 km, V4 km generally produces higher total dry deposition, particularly over the MGD and HC–WIM, which may remove part of the additionally emitted dust before the remaining airborne dust is transported downstream. The combined effects of resolution-dependent changes in emissions, dry deposition, and circulation may contribute to the differences in the intensity and

Table S8. Total dust dry deposition over different regions during 13-17 March 2021.

Region*	U50 km (Tg)	V16 km (Tg)	V4 km (Tg)	V16 km Relative Change (%)**	V4 km Relative Change (%)**
TKD	12.269	10.360	15.663	-15.56	27.66
MGD	34.551	39.980	64.754	15.71	87.42
HC-WIM	18.956	22.252	35.103	17.39	85.18
LP	2.432	2.717	3.723	11.72	53.08

* The locations and spatial extents of the analyzed regions are shown in **Fig. 1**. ** Relative change (%) is calculated relative to the U50 km simulation.

- *10. Section 3.1.4: The authors could compare the simulated spatial distribution of AOD with satellite observations/reanalysis data. Does the model output include dust optical depth? If so, the authors could evaluate it using observation/reanalysis data such as MERRA2. What other aerosol species are considered in the model? The biases in anthropogenic aerosols could affect the model performance in simulating AOD in the downwind regions of dust.*

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment and suggestion on the AOD evaluation and aerosol composition. We have revised the manuscript and added Fig. S6, which compares the daily spatial distributions of MODIS AOD with the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km simulations, together with Table S3, which summarizes the spatial correlations and biases of the 14-18 March mean AOD fields (see Section 3.1.4 on Page 24, Lines 653-660; Fig. S6, Table S3). For the satellite reference, MODIS AOD was obtained from the Terra+Aqua MAIAC Climate Modeling Grid (MCD19A2CMG, Collection 6.1) product at 550 nm. The native 0.05° MODIS AOD fields were aggregated to a common 0.25° grid using spatial averaging, and the simulated AOD fields were interpolated onto the same grid. For each day, simulated AOD was retained only at grid cells with valid MODIS retrievals to ensure consistent spatial sampling (see Section 2.5 on Pages 16-17, Lines 439-447). For the model-satellite comparison, simulated AOD was sampled using the same grid-cell-by-day availability as MODIS during 14-18 March 2021. MODIS and simulated AOD were then averaged over the matched valid dates at each grid cell, and the spatial correlation coefficient, RMSE, and mean bias were calculated from the resulting paired multi-day mean fields. As shown in Table S3, the spatial correlations range from 0.57 to 0.62, showing a positive spatial association between the simulated and observed regional AOD fields, while notable differences in spatial pattern and magnitude remain. Regarding the aerosol composition, only mineral dust aerosols are simulated in the present configuration, while anthropogenic and other non-dust aerosol species are not included. Thus, the simulated AOD represents the optical contribution of mineral dust. We acknowledge that non-dust aerosols may contribute to the observed MODIS AOD and

therefore affect the model–observation comparison, particularly over downwind regions. In addition, MODIS MAIAC AOD retrievals over land are subject to uncertainties associated with surface reflectance characterization, cloud screening, and assumed aerosol optical properties, which can be substantial over bright arid surfaces (Lyapustin et al., 2018; Ji et al., 2024).

We have added the following description of the MODIS AOD dataset in Section 2.5 of the revised manuscript: “In the present simulations, only mineral dust aerosols are included. MODIS AOD is obtained from the Terra+Aqua MAIAC Climate Modeling Grid (MCD19A2CMG, Collection 6.1) product at 550 nm. The native 0.05° AOD fields are aggregated to a 0.25° comparison grid for evaluation against the simulations. MODIS MAIAC AOD retrievals over land are subject to uncertainties associated with surface reflectance characterization, cloud screening, and assumptions about aerosol optical properties (Lyapustin et al., 2018). These uncertainties can be substantial over bright land surfaces, particularly in arid and desert regions (Ji et al., 2024).”

We have also added a detailed description of the simulated AOD evaluation against MODIS observations in Section 3.1.4 of the revised manuscript: “Further evaluation against MODIS shows that the simulations capture some of the broad spatial features of AOD, although differences in spatial details and magnitude remain (Fig. S6). For the 14-18 March mean fields, the spatial correlations range from 0.57 to 0.62, and positive mean biases are present in all three simulations (Table S3). The MODIS comparison may be affected by retrieval uncertainties associated with surface reflectance characterization, cloud screening, and assumed aerosol optical properties, particularly over bright arid surfaces (Lyapustin et al., 2018; Ji et al., 2024).”




Fig. S6. Daily spatial distributions of MODIS-retrieved and simulated AOD at 550 nm during 14–18 March 2021. For each day, simulated AOD is shown only at grid cells with valid MODIS retrievals to ensure a consistent spatial comparison.

Table S3. Spatial evaluation of the simulated 14-18 March 2021 mean AOD fields against MODIS satellite retrievals.

Experiment	r	RMSE	Mean bias
U50 km	0.61	0.87	0.49
V16 km	0.57	1.02	0.55
V4 km	0.62	1.62	0.86

Notes: MODIS and simulated AOD were averaged at each grid cell over 14-18 March 2021 using only dates with valid MODIS retrievals at that grid cell. The spatial correlation coefficient (r), root mean square error (RMSE), and mean bias (MB) were then calculated from the resulting multi-day mean fields.

References:

Ji, W., Yang, L., Tian, X., Bilal, M., Pei, X., Zheng, Y., Lu, X., and Cheng, X.: Long-term validation and error analysis of DB and MAIAC aerosol products over bright surface of China, Atmos. Res., 297, 107106, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2023.107106>, 2024.

Lyapustin, A., Wang, Y., Korkin, S., and Huang, D.: MODIS Collection 6 MAIAC algorithm, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 11, 5741-5765, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-11-5741-2018>, 2018.

- *11. Line 583-585: What does “the strongest” mean? It refers to magnitude or spatial range? What do the authors mean by “consistent enhancement”?*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on the ambiguous descriptions of emission differences. We have revised the manuscript by removing the ambiguous phrases “the strongest” and “consistent enhancement” (see Section 3.2.1 on Page 27, Lines 742-743). The revised text now states that the difference maps show spatially extensive positive emission anomalies over the southern Mongolian Plateau, thereby describing only the spatial pattern supported by the figure. The revised description in Section 3.2.1 is as follows: “The difference maps show spatially extensive positive emission anomalies over the southern Mongolian Plateau.”

- *12. Line 643-645: Both the model resolution and topography can affect the low-level circulation. Therefore, to separate these two factors, the authors may need to use higher-resolution model with coarse-resolution topography. In TKD (40°N, 90°E), the topography differences are small (<10m, Figure 9 d, e), but the differences in wind friction field are relatively large (-0.2~-0.3, Figure 10 d, e).*

Response: Thank you for your constructive suggestion on the effects of model resolution and topography on low-level circulation and friction velocity. We agree that both horizontal model resolution and topographic representation can affect the low-level circulation and friction velocity, and that their individual contributions cannot be strictly separated in the present experiments. We have therefore removed the original discussion that directly linked terrain differences to changes in low-level circulation and friction velocity and revised the corresponding interpretation (see Section 3.2.2 on Page 29, Lines 812-817). In particular, we note that relatively large friction-velocity differences occur over parts of the TKD where the corresponding terrain-height differences are small, indicating that the friction-velocity response cannot be explained by terrain representation alone. We further clarify that resolution-dependent changes in atmospheric dynamics, boundary-layer processes, and the grid-scale representation of land-surface properties may also contribute to these differences. However, the present experiments do not allow these individual effects to be quantified separately. Dedicated sensitivity experiments, such as using a high-resolution atmospheric mesh with coarse-resolution topography, would be required to separate the effects of atmospheric resolution and topographic representation, and such experiments will be considered in future work. We have revised the discussion in Section 3.2.2 of the revised manuscript as follows: “Notably, relatively large u^* differences occur over parts of the TKD where the corresponding terrain-height differences are small (Figs. 9d, e and 10d, e), indicating that the friction-velocity response cannot be explained by terrain representation alone. Resolution-dependent changes in atmospheric dynamics, boundary-layer processes, and the grid-scale

representation of land-surface properties may also contribute to these differences.”

- *13. Figure 12: With mesh refinement, dust burden decreases in the region with large topography gradient (30–40°N, 105°E). This may be related to higher topography blocking dust transport. In northeastern China (40–45°N, 110–130°E), V16km shows decreases in dust burden, but V4km shows increase. Which model has model performance regarding this? The authors may compare the simulation results with observations/reanalysis data of dust burden or optical depth.*

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment on the regional dust burden differences and observational evaluation. We have revised the corresponding discussion and added a regional comparison of the simulated 550 nm AOD with MODIS observations over northeastern China (40–45°N, 110–130°E) during 14–18 March 2021 (see Section 3.2.3 on Page 32, Lines 900–907; Table S10). MODIS and simulated AOD were averaged over matched valid dates at each grid cell, and the statistics were calculated from the resulting paired multi-day mean fields. All three simulations show positive mean AOD biases, with spatial correlations ranging from 0.51 to 0.65. However, the quantitative interpretation of this comparison is subject to MODIS retrieval uncertainties (Lyapustin et al., 2018; Ji et al., 2024). AOD also represents column-integrated aerosol extinction rather than a direct measurement of dust mass loading. In the absence of valid AERONET observations within this region during the evaluation period, the available observations are insufficient to establish which configuration more accurately represents the regional dust mass loading. We have also added the following discussion in Section 3.2.3 of the revised manuscript: “Relative to U50 km, dust mass loading decreases in V16 km but increases in V4 km over northeastern China. A supplementary evaluation against MODIS shows positive AOD biases in all three simulations (Table S10). The quantitative interpretation of this comparison is limited by MODIS retrieval uncertainties (Lyapustin et al., 2018; Ji et al., 2024) and the absence of valid AERONET observations in this region during the evaluation period. The available observations therefore provide insufficient evidence to determine which configuration more accurately represents the regional dust mass loading.”

Table S10. Regional evaluation of simulated 550 nm AOD against MODIS over northeastern China during 14–18 March 2021.

Experiment	r	RMSE	MB
U50 km	0.51	0.77	+0.59
V16 km	0.65	0.64	+0.48
V4 km	0.58	0.72	+0.55

Notes: Northeastern China is defined as 40–45°N and 110–130°E. Statistics are calculated from the 14–18 March mean fields using collocated grid cells and dates with valid MODIS retrievals.

References:

Ji, W., Yang, L., Tian, X., Bilal, M., Pei, X., Zheng, Y., Lu, X., and Cheng, X.: Long-term validation and error analysis of DB and MAIAC aerosol products over bright surface of China, Atmos. Res., 297, 107106, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2023.107106>, 2024.

Lyapustin, A., Wang, Y., Korkin, S., and Huang, D.: MODIS Collection 6 MAIAC algorithm, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 11, 5741-5765, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-11-5741-2018>, 2018.

- *14. Figure 13: The authors may change the range of colorbar to show values below 10 mg/m²/day, because the current figure shows precipitation decrease (Figure 13c, blue color) but wet scavenging does not (Figure 13f, white color) as the changes are less than 10 mg/m²/day. Changing colorbar could be more consistent with Table 5 which shows wet scavenging in NCP decreases (from 6.733 to 1.109 mg/m²/day) and support the conclusion “precipitation differences ... modulate dust removal” (Line 755-757).*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on the visualization of wet-scavenging changes in Fig. 13. We have revised the color range of Fig. 13 to resolve wet-scavenging changes smaller than 10 mg m⁻² day⁻¹ (see Fig. 13). In the revised Fig. 13f, the decrease in dust wet scavenging over the NCP is now more clearly visible and is consistent with Table 6, which shows a reduction from 6.733 to 1.109 mg m⁻² day⁻¹. This revision provides clearer support for our conclusion that resolution-dependent precipitation differences modulate regional dust removal.




Fig. 13. (a–b) Spatial distributions of period-mean total precipitation rate (mm day⁻¹) from the U50 km and V4 km simulations

during 13-17 March 2021. (c) Difference in period-mean total precipitation rate between V4 km and U50 km. (d–e) Spatial distributions of period-mean dust wet scavenging rate ($\text{mg m}^{-2} \text{ day}^{-1}$) from the U50 km and V4 km simulations during 13-17 March 2021. (f) Difference in period-mean dust wet scavenging rate between V4 km and U50 km. The dashed outline denotes the refinement region.

- *15. Line 764-767: What do the authors mean by “more consistent”? How to quantify it? Do you mean the contribution from emission changes to dust burden changes is larger than that from wet removal changes? Also, in these source regions, what are the changes in dust dry deposition as the model resolution increases?*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on the interpretation of dust-burden changes and removal processes. We have deleted the ambiguous statement “more consistent” and revised the corresponding discussion by adding an analysis of dry deposition over the source regions (see Section 3.2.4 on Page 34, Lines 964-969; Table S8). The present diagnostics do not allow us to quantitatively separate the relative contributions of emission changes and wet removal changes to the dust-burden response. We have therefore revised the text to avoid implying that one process contributes more strongly than the other. The dry-deposition results further show that the response is region dependent. Over the TKD, total dry deposition changes non-monotonically with mesh refinement, whereas it increases with mesh refinement over the MGD, HC–WIM, and LP (Table S8). Together with the concurrent changes in wet scavenging, these results indicate that the dust-burden response reflects the combined influence of resolution-dependent changes in emissions, transport, and removal processes. We have revised the discussion in Section 3.2.4 of the revised manuscript as follows: “Meanwhile, total dry deposition shows a non-monotonic response over the TKD but increases with mesh refinement over the HC–WIM (Table S8). The increase in dust mass loading over these regions occurs alongside weaker wet scavenging and resolution-dependent changes in dry deposition, reflecting the combined effects of emissions, transport, and removal processes.”

Table S8. Total dust dry deposition over different regions during 13-17 March 2021.

Region*	U50 km (Tg)	V16 km (Tg)	V4 km (Tg)	V16 km Relative Change (%)**	V4 km Relative Change (%)**
TKD	12.269	10.360	15.663	–15.56	27.66
MGD	34.551	39.980	64.754	15.71	87.42
HC–WIM	18.956	22.252	35.103	17.39	85.18
LP	2.432	2.717	3.723	11.72	53.08

* The locations and spatial extents of the analyzed regions are shown in Fig. 1. ** Relative change (%) is calculated relative to the U50 km simulation.

- *16. Line 776: Besides “precipitation structure”, how about the effects of model resolution on clouds? How does the in-cloud and below-cloud wet scavenging change as model resolution increases?*

Response: Thank you for your helpful suggestion regarding cloud processes and wet scavenging. We agree that resolution-dependent changes in cloud properties and in-cloud and below-cloud scavenging warrant further consideration. The current model configuration does not represent the role of dust as ice-nucleating particles. The available diagnostics allow us to evaluate total wet scavenging, but do not separately quantify the contributions of in-cloud and below-cloud scavenging or their changes with resolution. We have therefore revised the discussion to describe enhanced wet scavenging in V4 km as one possible contributor to the reduced dust loading over the YRD, without attributing this response solely to precipitation structure or to a specific scavenging mechanism. We have also clarified the current model configuration and outlined relevant directions for future research (see Section 3.2.4 on Page 35, Lines 977-985). We have revised the discussion in Section 3.2.4 of the revised manuscript as follows: “The reduced dust loading over the YRD may reflect a combined response of transport and removal processes, with enhanced wet scavenging in V4 km representing one possible contributing pathway. The current model configuration does not represent the role of dust as ice-nucleating particles. Future work could examine resolution-dependent changes in cloud and precipitation properties, including the potential role of dust as ice-nucleating particles, and distinguish the contributions of in-cloud and below-cloud scavenging. Dedicated process-isolation experiments and dust-budget analyses could further clarify the relative roles of emission, transport, and deposition.”

Reviewer #2

General comments:

This manuscript investigates the impacts of mesh refinement on the simulation of an extreme East Asian dust storm using a global variable-resolution model. The study is interesting and provides useful insights into how increasing resolution affects near-surface winds, dust emission, and long-range transport. I have several comments that may help improve the manuscript.

Specific comments:

- *1. Contributions of dust-emitting area and emission intensity. The authors have already discussed the changes in saltation occurrence frequency and emission intensity, which helps explain the enhanced dust emission at finer resolution. However, it would be useful to further quantify the contributions from active dust-emitting area and emission intensity per unit area, and directly compare these quantities among U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km. This would provide a clearer explanation for the substantial increase in total dust emission with mesh refinement.*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on separating the effects of active emitting area and emission intensity on dust emission changes. We have added a quantitative comparison of the active dust-emitting area fraction and the mean emission intensity over active grid cells for the major source regions (see Section 3.2.1 on Page 26, Lines 727-736; Table S6). Relative to U50 km, the active-area fraction decreases by 7.73-28.04% in V16 km and 11.74-46.49% in V4 km, whereas the corresponding emission intensity over active grid cells increases by 29.50-127.37% and 57.81-241.14%, respectively. The increase in total dust emission with mesh refinement therefore occurs despite a reduction in the active emitting area and is accompanied by substantially stronger emission intensity within the active source areas. We have added the following explanation in Section 3.2.1 of the revised manuscript: “To distinguish the responses of active emitting area and emission intensity, we quantified the time-mean active dust-emitting area fraction and the time-mean emission intensity over active grid cells (Table S6). Across the major source regions, the active-area fraction decreases relative to U50 km by 7.73-28.04% in V16 km and 11.74-46.49% in V4 km. In contrast, the mean emission intensity over active cells increases by 29.50-127.37% in V16 km and 57.81-241.14% in V4 km. This opposite response is evident across all four source regions, showing that the increase in total dust emission with mesh refinement occurs despite a reduction in the active emitting area and is accompanied by substantially stronger emission intensity within the active source areas.”

Table S6. Time-mean active dust-emitting area fraction and time-mean emission intensity over active grid cells in the major dust source regions during 13-17 March 2021.

Region	Experiment	Active-area fraction (%)	Emission intensity over active area ($\mu\text{g m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	Active-area change relative to U50 km (%)	Intensity change relative to U50 km (%)
TKD	U50 km	41.34	348.43	–	–
	V16 km	35.01	507.87	–15.31	+45.76
	V4 km	31.02	549.84	–24.96	+57.81
MGD	U50 km	53.32	759.70	–	–
	V16 km	49.20	1014.32	–7.73	+33.52
	V4 km	47.06	1255.29	–11.74	+65.23
HC–WIM	U50 km	59.13	255.53	–	–
	V16 km	52.97	330.91	–10.42	+29.50
	V4 km	47.91	423.21	–18.98	+65.62
LP	U50 km	6.99	77.57	–	–
	V16 km	5.03	176.37	–28.04	+127.37
	V4 km	3.74	264.62	–46.49	+241.14

Notes: Active emitting grid cells are defined as grid cells with positive dust emission flux at each hourly time step. The active-area fraction is first calculated at each time step as the area of active emitting grid cells divided by the total area of the corresponding region and is then averaged over 13-17 March 2021. The emission intensity is first calculated at each time step as the area-weighted mean dust emission flux over active emitting grid cells and is then averaged over the same period. Relative changes are calculated with respect to the U50 km simulation.

- *2. PDF of friction velocity. The manuscript suggests that the increase in dust emission is mainly associated with stronger extreme friction velocity rather than more frequent saltation. I suggest providing the probability density distributions (PDFs) of friction velocity for the three resolutions, with the threshold friction velocity indicated, to clearly show how mesh refinement modifies the high- u^* tail.*

Response: Thank you for your constructive suggestion on the friction-velocity distributions and their relation to dust emission changes. We have added area-weighted probability density functions (PDFs) of the normalized friction velocity u^*/u_t^* for the three mesh configurations over the major dust source regions, with $u^*/u_t^*=1$ explicitly indicating the saltation threshold (see Section 3.2.2 on Page 30, Lines 839-847; Fig. S8). This analysis allows the below-threshold range and the upper tail of the normalized friction-velocity distribution to be directly compared among the three resolutions. The finer-mesh simulations

generally show enhanced probability density over the below-threshold range, consistent with the reduced saltation occurrence frequency shown in Fig. 11. Meanwhile, modest enhancements in the far-right tail are evident in several source regions, particularly the MGD and HC–WIM. These results show that the enhanced dust emission with mesh refinement cannot be explained simply by more frequent saltation-favorable conditions and that large normalized friction-velocity exceedances can still occur even as the overall saltation frequency decreases. We have added the following discussion in Section 3.2.2 of the revised manuscript: “To examine the distributional changes in friction velocity relative to the saltation threshold, Fig. S8 presents the area-weighted probability density functions (PDFs) of the normalized friction velocity u^*/u_t^* , where $u^*/u_t^*=1$ denotes the saltation threshold. Compared with U50 km, the finer-mesh simulations generally show enhanced probability density over the below-threshold range, consistent with the reduced $f_{saltation}$ shown in Fig. 11. Meanwhile, modest enhancements in the far-right tail are evident in several source regions, particularly the MGD and HC–WIM, indicating that large normalized friction-velocity exceedances can still occur despite a lower overall saltation frequency.”




Fig. S8. Area-weighted probability density functions of the normalized friction velocity u^*/u_t^* over the (a) TKD, (b) MGD, (c) HC-WIM, and (d) LP during 13-17 March 2021 for the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km simulations. The vertical dashed line at $u^*/u_t^*=1$ denotes the saltation threshold.

- *3. Does the resolution effect converge? Dust emission continuously increases from U50 km to V16 km and V4 km. This raises an important question: would dust emission continue to increase if the model resolution were further refined? The authors do not necessarily need to conduct additional simulations, but the possible resolution limit or convergence of dust emission should be discussed.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on the resolution dependence and potential convergence of dust emission. We have added a discussion of the resolution dependence of dust emission to assess whether the increase with mesh refinement shows

any indication of convergence (see Section 3.2.1 on Page 26, Lines 721-727). Specifically, we compared the incremental changes between successive mesh configurations. Over East Asia, total dust emission increases by 35.24% from U50 km to V16 km, whereas the increase from V16 km to V4 km is reduced to 14.59%. This smaller increment suggests a reduced sensitivity of dust emission to further mesh refinement at finer resolution. However, the present three mesh configurations are insufficient to determine whether this behavior represents the onset of resolution convergence. Determining whether dust emission approaches a resolution-converged regime would require additional simulations at resolutions finer than V4 km. We have added the following discussion in Section 3.2.1 of the revised manuscript: “Although total dust emission continues to increase with mesh refinement, the relative increase over East Asia decreases from 35.24% between U50 km and V16 km to 14.59% between V16 km and V4 km (Table 4). This smaller increment suggests a reduced sensitivity of dust emission to further mesh refinement at finer resolution. However, the present simulations are insufficient to determine whether this behavior represents the onset of resolution convergence, which would require additional simulations at resolutions finer than V4 km.”

- *4. Reduced dust loading around the Qaidam Basin. Figure 12 shows decreased dust mass loading around the Qaidam Basin in the refined simulations. The reason for this regional decrease is unclear. Please clarify whether it is related to changes in local emission, terrain-modulated transport, or deposition/removal processes.*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on the processes responsible for the reduced dust loading over the Qaidam Basin. We have added a quantitative comparison of local dust emission, dry removal, and wet scavenging over the Qaidam Basin region to clarify the processes associated with the localized decrease in dust mass loading (see Section 3.2.3 on Page 32, Lines 892-900; Table S9). Specifically, from V16 km to V4 km, the area-weighted mean dust emission flux decreases by approximately 14%, indicating reduced local dust emission that may partly contribute to the lower dust loading. In contrast, both dry removal and wet scavenging also decrease in V4 km, indicating that the reduced dust loading cannot be attributed to enhanced local removal. These results suggest that the localized decrease in dust mass loading is associated partly with reduced local emission, while resolution-dependent changes in dust transport over the complex terrain surrounding the Qaidam Basin may also contribute. We have added the following discussion in Section 3.2.3 of the revised manuscript: “A localized decrease in dust mass loading is also evident around the Qaidam Basin in V4 km relative to V16 km. To examine this regional response, we further compared the local dust emission and removal processes over the Qaidam Basin region (Table S9). From V16 km to V4 km, the mean dust emission flux decreases by approximately 14%, whereas both dry removal and wet scavenging also decrease, indicating that the lower dust loading cannot be attributed to enhanced local removal. The reduced local emission may partly contribute to this feature, while resolution-dependent changes in dust transport over the surrounding complex terrain may also play a role.”

Table S9. Area-weighted mean dust emission and removal diagnostics over the Qaidam Basin region during 13-17 March 2021.

Process	U50 km	V16 km	V4 km	V16 vs. U50 (%)	V4 vs. V16 (%)	V4 vs. U50 (%)
Dust emission flux ($\mu\text{g m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)	53.604	65.508	56.572	+22.21	-13.64	+5.54
Dry-removal flux ($\mu\text{g m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)	31.690	35.151	21.114	+10.92	-39.93	-33.37
Wet-scavenging rate ($\text{mg m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$)	492.376	411.431	154.461	-16.44	-62.46	-68.63

Notes: The Qaidam Basin analysis region is defined as 90–100°E and 35–39.5°N. All quantities are area-weighted mean values over the analysis region during 13-17 March 2021. Dry removal includes dry deposition and gravitational settling, whereas wet scavenging includes both large-scale and convective scavenging components. Relative changes are calculated between the corresponding mesh configurations.

Minor comments:

- *1. Figure 4. Figure 4 contains too many wind-field panels, making detailed comparison difficult. I suggest selecting one or two representative days and enlarging the panels so that the differences among observations and the three simulations can be more clearly examined.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on improving the clarity and presentation of Fig. 4. We have revised Fig. 4 by retaining only the results for 14-15 March 2021 and enlarging the corresponding panels to facilitate a clearer comparison between the NOAA surface-station observations and the three simulations (see Fig. 4). These two days were selected as representative periods during the development of the dust event. The revised figure provides a more focused view of the spatial differences in daily mean 10-m wind speed among the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km simulations and the collocated observations.




Fig. 4. Spatial distribution of daily mean 10-m wind speed (shading, m s⁻¹) from the iAMAS simulations (U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km), with collocated NOAA surface-station observations (453 stations) overlaid as colored markers, during 14-15 March 2021. These two days are selected as representative periods during the development of the dust event. The dashed outline denotes the refinement region.

- *Question 2: Figure 5. The current design makes it difficult to distinguish station observations from the background PM₁₀ shading, particularly over regions with high concentrations. Please redesign the figure using clearer station symbols, outlines, or another approach to improve the distinction between observations and simulations.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on improving the visual clarity of Fig. 5. We have revised Fig. 5 to improve the visual distinction between the surface PM₁₀ observations and the simulated PM₁₀ fields (see Fig. 5). Specifically, we reduced the

size of the observation-station markers to minimize overlap with the background PM₁₀ shading and to make the spatial distribution of both the observations and simulations more clearly distinguishable, particularly over regions with high PM₁₀ concentrations.




Fig. 5. Spatial distribution of daily mean surface PM₁₀ concentrations over eastern China from the iAMAS simulations during 14-17 March 2021. Shading denotes simulated PM₁₀ concentrations from the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km configurations, and colored markers denote CNEMC observations at 192 collocated monitoring stations.

Reviewer #3

General Comments:

This manuscript investigates the impacts of mesh refinement on the simulation of an extreme East Asian dust storm using the variable-resolution iAMAS model. While the topic is relevant and the study presents some interesting results, I have some concerns about the current manuscript. Important aspects of the model implementation and experimental design are not sufficiently documented, and the mechanistic interpretation is not adequately supported by the analyses presented. In several places, diagnostic or statistical relationships are interpreted as physical mechanisms without clear process-level attribution. Moreover, the conclusions are largely drawn from a single event, raising concerns about their robustness and general applicability.

In its current form, I do not think the manuscript provides sufficient evidence to support several of its main conclusions. Substantial revisions are required before the manuscript can be considered for publication. In particular, the authors need to clearly address the methodological uncertainties, strengthen the mechanistic attribution, and better establish the robustness and novelty of the results. The major issues listed below should be fully addressed in a revised manuscript.

Major comments:

- *1. The resolution dependence of dust emissions and its novelty need to be better addressed (Sects. 2.2 and 3.2.2): The nonlinear and threshold dependence of dust emission on surface wind speed, and the resulting sensitivity of dust emissions to model resolution, have been well documented in previous studies (e.g., Ridley et al., 2013; Meng et al., 2021). In particular, Ridley et al. (2013) demonstrated strong resolution dependence of dust emissions in GEOS-Chem due to the nonlinear response of dust emission to resolved surface winds, while Meng et al. (2021) developed grid-independent high-resolution dust emissions to reduce this artificial resolution dependence. These studies are directly relevant to the central issue of this manuscript but are not discussed. The authors should compare the magnitude and behavior of the resolution sensitivity found here with previous studies and clarify what new physical insight is provided by the variable-resolution framework, rather than presenting the resolution dependence itself as a new mechanism.*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on clarifying the novelty of this study and its relationship with previous investigations of resolution-dependent dust emissions. We agree that the resolution dependence of dust emissions associated with the nonlinear and threshold-dependent response of dust emission schemes to surface winds has been well documented, particularly by Ridley et al. (2013) and Meng et al. (2021). We have therefore added discussions of these studies and clarified the distinction between the established resolution sensitivity of dust emissions and the additional insights provided by the present variable-resolution simulations (see Introduction on Pages 3-4, Lines 62-98; Section 2.2 on Page 8, Lines 200-207; Section 3.2.2 on Pages 30-31, Lines 854-874; Section 3.2.3 on Pages 32-33, Lines 913-920, Lines 930-936; Section 3.2.4 on Pages 34-35, Lines

969-980). Specifically, we have incorporated the findings of Ridley et al. (2013), who demonstrated the resolution dependence of dust emissions in GEOS-Chem associated with the representation of high-wind events at different resolutions, and Meng et al. (2021), who developed a grid-independent high-resolution dust emission approach to reduce artificial resolution sensitivity. However, conventional global-model applications are generally limited in their ability to achieve kilometer-scale resolution without substantially increasing the computational cost over the global domain. WRF-Chem can resolve local processes at kilometer-scale resolution over prescribed domains, but its simulations remain constrained by the domain extent and lateral boundary conditions. We now explicitly clarify that the purpose of this study is not to establish resolution dependence itself, but to examine how regional mesh refinement within a global variable-resolution framework modifies the resolved conditions controlling dust emission and how these locally induced changes subsequently influence long-range dust transport and downwind dust loading. In Section 3.2.2, we further compare our results with these previous studies and clarify the physical insight obtained for the March 2021 event. The results show that mesh refinement does not simply increase the frequency of saltation occurrence. Instead, over the major dust source regions, the area-averaged saltation frequency decreases while extreme friction-velocity exceedances become stronger, indicating a shift toward less frequent but more intense erosion-favorable conditions. We also compare this response with Feng et al. (2023), who reported reduced annual-mean dust emissions over East Asia with increasing resolution using a GOCART formulation driven by 10-m wind speed. This comparison indicates that the sign and magnitude of the resolution response can depend on how mesh refinement modifies the wind variables controlling the respective nonlinear emission formulations. Beyond the source-region emission response, the simulations reveal contrasting changes in downwind dust loading. During 13-17 March 2021, total dust emissions over East Asia increase by 35.24% in V16 km and 54.98% in V4 km relative to U50 km (Table 4). However, the downwind loading response is spatially heterogeneous: dust mass loading over the NCP increases by 43.49% and 63.66%, respectively, whereas the corresponding changes over the YRD are +7.69% and -30.49% (Table 5). In V4 km, the reduced YRD dust loading coincides with enhanced precipitation and an increase in the regional wet scavenging rate from 11.117 to 25.041 mg m⁻² day⁻¹ relative to U50 km (Fig. 13; Table 6). These results suggest that enhanced source emissions do not necessarily translate into higher dust loading throughout the downwind region, and that precipitation-related removal may contribute to the regional contrasts during transport. The additional insight provided by this study is therefore the event-specific relationship between source emission changes and the spatially heterogeneous response of transported dust, examined within a global framework with regional refinement to 4 km. We have highlighted these findings and their physical interpretation in Sections 3.2.3-3.2.4 and included the relevant manuscript excerpts below.

We have added the following background discussion in the Introduction of the revised manuscript: “Previous studies have used global models to simulate dust emissions, transport, and spatiotemporal variations, including those over East Asia, and to assess their climatic and radiative implications (Grini et al., 2005; Sun et al., 2012; Kok et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2019). However, significant uncertainty remains in simulating extreme dust events. A main limitation is that many global models still use relatively

coarse horizontal meshes. Enhancing model resolution has been shown to improve simulations of severe dust events, as it enables a clearer depiction of land–atmosphere coupling and surface heterogeneity (Feng et al., 2023; Chappell et al., 2024). Nevertheless, the high computational cost of global models makes uniformly high-resolution simulations difficult to perform routinely (Feng et al., 2023). To achieve higher spatial resolution at lower computational cost, regional models have been widely employed to simulate dust emission, transport, and deposition and their subsequent environmental effects (Konaré et al., 2008; Marsham et al., 2011). However, regional models rely on prescribed lateral boundary conditions from larger-scale models, whose spatial and temporal resolution may constrain the representation of meteorological and aerosol conditions entering the regional domain, particularly for long-range dust transport. Moreover, adequately representing both dust source regions and long-range transport pathways often requires sufficiently large regional domains, which can substantially increase the computational cost of high-resolution simulations (Pérez et al., 2006; Feng et al., 2023). Furthermore, previous studies have shown that simulated dust emissions can be sensitive to model resolution because of their nonlinear dependence on surface winds and the thresholds required for dust emission. Ridley et al. (2013) found higher dust emissions at finer resolutions in the Goddard Earth Observing System–Chemistry (GEOS-Chem), highlighting that coarse-grid averaging can underestimate emissions because of the nonlinear response of dust emission to surface winds and unresolved subgrid wind variability. Meng et al. (2021) addressed this dependence by developing an offline dust emission approach driven by native high-resolution meteorological fields to provide consistent emissions across model resolutions. However, the response of dust emissions to mesh refinement can vary with changes in near-surface winds and emission-threshold exceedances. For example, Feng et al. (2023) reported reduced dust emissions following refinement to 16 km over North Africa and East Asia in a global variable-resolution model, associated with weaker near-surface winds and less frequent dust emission events. These findings motivate further investigation of how regional mesh refinement within a global variable-resolution framework modifies dust emission and subsequently affects long-range transport and downwind dust loading during extreme dust events.”

We have also added the following explanation in Section 2.2 of the revised manuscript: “The same S04 formulation and parameter settings are applied in all three experiments. Previous studies have demonstrated that dust emission exhibits resolution dependence because threshold-based dust emission schemes respond nonlinearly to resolved surface winds (Ridley et al., 2013; Meng et al., 2021). Building upon these findings, this study investigates how regional mesh refinement within a global variable-resolution framework affects the coupled dust lifecycle during long-range transport through changes in surface dynamics, emission processes, transport, and removal.”

We have further clarified the physical interpretation and novelty of our results in Section 3.2.2 of the revised manuscript as follows: “This behavior is consistent with previous studies showing that the resolution sensitivity of dust emissions is closely related to the nonlinear response of threshold-based emission schemes to resolved wind variability (Ridley et al., 2013; Meng et al., 2021). However, unlike previous studies that primarily examined resolution-dependent changes in emission magnitude or

approaches to reduce such sensitivity, our results show that, for this dust event, mesh refinement in a global variable-resolution framework does not simply increase the frequency of saltation occurrence. Over the major dust source regions, mesh refinement reduces the area-averaged saltation frequency while enhancing extreme friction-velocity exceedances, indicating a shift toward less frequent but more intense erosion-favorable conditions. This result contrasts with the reduced annual-mean dust emissions over East Asia reported by Feng et al. (2023), who found that their GOCART formulation, driven by 10-m wind speed, responded to weaker near-surface winds and fewer emission events associated with better-resolved topographic complexity. In contrast, the S04 scheme used here is controlled by threshold friction velocity and saltation flux. Although mesh refinement reduces the area-averaged saltation frequency, it strengthens extreme friction-velocity exceedances. Thus, the opposite emission responses likely reflect differences in how mesh refinement modifies the wind variables controlling the respective nonlinear emission formulations, rather than a uniformly positive or negative effect of increasing resolution.”

We have also highlighted the following results concerning regional dust loading and downwind transport in Section 3.2.3: “At the regional scale, the largest relative increases occur over the NCP, where dust mass loading rises from 3.897 Tg in U50 km to 5.592 Tg in V16 km (+43.49%) and 6.378 Tg in V4 km (+63.66%) (Table 5). In contrast, over the LP and YRD, V16 km produces slightly higher dust loading than U50 km, with increases of +7.62% and +7.69%, respectively, whereas V4 km yields lower values than U50 km, with changes of -5.18% and -30.49%, respectively. These regional contrasts indicate that mesh refinement does not simply produce a uniform increase in dust loading, but instead modifies its regional distribution.”

“The circulation fields show a broadly similar synoptic evolution across the three simulations, with persistent westerly and northwesterly flows during 13-16 March providing favorable pathways for dust transport from the MGD, TKD, and HC-WIM toward northern and eastern China (Fig. 3). Consistently, the distribution of daily dust mass loading shows that the main dust plume develops over the source regions during 14-16 March and is subsequently transported eastward along the prevailing flow, with stronger and more spatially organized loading in the refined simulations (Fig. S9).”

The potential contribution of wet scavenging to these downwind differences is discussed in Section 3.2.4: “By contrast, over the downwind YRD, the wet scavenging rate increases from 11.117 to 25.041 $\text{mg m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$, and the total dust wet scavenging increases from 0.014 to 0.033 Tg (Table 6). This enhanced removal coincides with the 30.49% reduction in dust mass loading over the YRD in V4 km relative to U50 km (Table 5). The V16 km simulation does not show such an enhancement over the YRD, with a wet scavenging rate of 10.865 $\text{mg m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$ and total wet scavenging of 0.015 Tg, both close to the U50 km values (Table S12). The stronger wet scavenging over the YRD in V4 km than in V16 km suggests a more pronounced resolution-dependent variation in precipitation-related removal along the dust transport pathway. The reduced dust loading over the YRD may reflect a combined response of transport and removal processes, with enhanced wet scavenging in V4 km representing one possible contributing pathway.”

References:

- Chappell, A., Hennen, M., Schepanski, K., Dhital, S., and Tong, D.: Reducing resolution dependency of dust emission modeling using albedo-based wind friction, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 51, e2023GL106540, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GL106540>, 2024.
- Feng, J., Zhao, C., Du, Q., Xu, M., Gu, J., Hu, Z., and Chen, Y.: Simulating atmospheric dust with a global variable-resolution model: Model description and impacts of mesh refinement, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 15, e2023MS003636, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003636>, 2023.
- Grini, A., Myhre, G., Zender, C. S., and Isaksen, I. S. A.: Model simulations of dust sources and transport in the global atmosphere: Effects of soil erodibility and wind speed variability, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 110, D02205, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JD005037>, 2005.
- Konaré, A., Zakey, A. S., Solmon, F., Giorgi, F., Rauscher, S., Ibrah, S., and Bi, X.: A regional climate modeling study of the effect of desert dust on the West African monsoon, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 113, D12206, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009322>, 2008.
- Kok, J. F., Ridley, D. A., Zhou, Q., Miller, R. L., Zhao, C., Heald, C. L., Ward, D. S., Albani, S., and Haustein, K.: Smaller desert dust cooling effect estimated from analysis of dust size and abundance, *Nat. Geosci.*, 10, 274-278, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2912>, 2017.
- Marshall, J. H., Knippertz, P., Dixon, N. S., Parker, D. J., and Lister, G. M. S.: The importance of the representation of deep convection for modeled dust-generating winds over West Africa during summer, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, L16803, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL048368>, 2011.
- Meng, J., Martin, R. V., Ginoux, P., Hammer, M., Sulprizio, M. P., Ridley, D. A., and van Donkelaar, A.: Grid-independent high-resolution dust emissions (v1.0) for chemical transport models: application to GEOS-Chem (12.5.0), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 14, 4249-4260, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-4249-2021>, 2021.
- Pérez, C., Nickovic, S., Baldasano, J. M., Sicard, M., Rocadenbosch, F., and Cachorro, V. E.: A long Saharan dust event over the western Mediterranean: Lidar, sun photometer observations, and regional dust modeling, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 111, D15214, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JD006579>, 2006.
- Ridley, D. A., Heald, C. L., Pierce, J. R., and Evans, M. J.: Toward resolution-independent dust emissions in global models: Impacts on the seasonal and spatial distribution of dust, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 2873-2877, <https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.50409>, 2013.
- Sun, H., Pan, Z., and Liu, X.: Numerical simulation of spatial-temporal distribution of dust aerosol and its direct radiative effects on East Asian climate, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 117, D13206, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD017219>, 2012.

Wu, M., Liu, X., Yang, K., Luo, T., Wang, Z., Wu, C., Zhang, K., Yu, H., and Darmanov, A.: Modeling dust in East Asia by the Community Earth System Model (CESM) and sources of biases, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 124, 8043-8064, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD030799>, 2019.

- *2. The opposite resolution response compared with Feng et al. (2023) deserves careful explanation (Introduction and Sect. 3.2.2): Feng et al. (2023), using a closely related global variable-resolution modeling framework, reported decreased dust emissions over East Asia with mesh refinement, attributed to reduce near-surface winds associated with better-resolved complex terrain. In contrast, the present study finds a substantial increase in dust emissions with increasing resolution and attributes this to stronger local wind/friction-velocity extremes. Why does mesh refinement produce opposite responses in these two studies? Is the difference related to synoptic conditions, season, source regions, resolution range, or other aspects of the model configuration? This apparent contradiction should be explicitly discussed and may provide important insight into when and why mesh refinement increases or decreases dust emissions.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful suggestion on the contrasting resolution responses between this study and Feng et al. (2023) and the need for further physical interpretation. We have added discussions of the contrasting resolution responses between Feng et al. (2023) and the present study (see Introduction on Page 4, Lines 91-98; Section 3.2.2 on Page 31, Lines 864-876; see Conclusions on Page 37, Lines 1048-1050). In the Introduction, we now clarify that the response of dust emissions to mesh refinement is not necessarily uniform and cite Feng et al. (2023) as an example in which refinement reduced dust emissions over East Asia. In Section 3.2.2, we further discuss the physical and methodological differences between the two studies. Feng et al. (2023) used a GOCART-based emission formulation driven by 10-m wind speed and found that mesh refinement weakened regional near-surface winds and reduced the frequency of emission events, in association with better-resolved topographic complexity, leading to lower dust emissions. In contrast, the S04 scheme used in this study is controlled by threshold friction velocity and saltation flux. Our results show that mesh refinement reduces the area-averaged saltation frequency but strengthens extreme friction-velocity exceedances. The opposite emission responses therefore likely reflect differences in how mesh refinement modifies the wind variables controlling the respective nonlinear emission formulations, rather than a universally positive or negative effect of increasing resolution. We also note that Feng et al. (2023) mainly examined an annual East Asian response using U120 km and V16 km meshes, whereas the present study focuses on an extreme March 2021 dust event using U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km meshes. Differences in synoptic conditions, season, source regions, and resolution range may therefore also contribute to the contrast. A more systematic investigation of how different dust emission schemes respond to mesh refinement will be pursued in future work.

We have added the following background discussion in the Introduction of the revised manuscript: “However, the response of dust emissions to mesh refinement can vary with changes in near-surface winds and emission-threshold exceedances. For example,

Feng et al. (2023) reported reduced dust emissions following refinement to 16 km over North Africa and East Asia in a global variable-resolution model, associated with weaker near-surface winds and less frequent dust emission events. These findings motivate further investigation of how regional mesh refinement within a global variable-resolution framework modifies dust emission and subsequently affects long-range transport and downwind dust loading during extreme dust events.”

We have further discussed the contrasting responses and their possible causes in Section 3.2.2 of the revised manuscript as follows: “This result contrasts with the reduced annual-mean dust emissions over East Asia reported by Feng et al. (2023), who found that their GOCART formulation, driven by 10-m wind speed, responded to weaker near-surface winds and fewer emission events associated with better-resolved topographic complexity. In contrast, the S04 scheme used here is controlled by threshold friction velocity and saltation flux. Although mesh refinement reduces the area-averaged saltation frequency, it strengthens extreme friction-velocity exceedances. Thus, the opposite emission responses likely reflect differences in how mesh refinement modifies the wind variables controlling the respective nonlinear emission formulations, rather than a uniformly positive or negative effect of increasing resolution. Future work will systematically compare the responses of different dust emission schemes to mesh refinement under otherwise consistent model configurations.”

We have also clarified this future research direction in the Conclusions of the revised manuscript: “Future work is also needed to systematically compare the responses of different dust emission schemes to mesh refinement and to better quantify their implications for regional dust emissions and long-range transport.”

Reference:

Feng, J., Zhao, C., Du, Q., Xu, M., Gu, J., Hu, Z., and Chen, Y.: Simulating atmospheric dust with a global variable-resolution model: Model description and impacts of mesh refinement, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 15, e2023MS003636, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003636>, 2023.

- *3. S04 Scheme, land surface properties, and dust source function details: Since this study focuses primarily on dust simulation, a more detailed explanation of the S04 dust emission scheme and its key differences from S11 should be provided in the text. Furthermore, while the physical emission processes are described, the manuscript should elaborate on how land surface properties (e.g., soil moisture, vegetation cover, snow cover) modulate dust emissions. Lastly, please clarify the definition of the "dust source function" used in the model. Does it specifically represent soil erodibility?*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on the dust emission scheme, land-surface controls, and the definition of the dust source function. We have added discussions of the S04 dust emission scheme, the role of land-surface properties in regulating dust emission, and the definition and physical meaning of the dust source function to provide a more complete description of the dust emission parameterization used in this study (see Section 2.2 on Pages 8-9, Lines 195-224). Specifically, we clarify that S04

retains a more explicit representation of saltation bombardment and aggregate disintegration than the more simplified S11 formulation. We have also added a description of how land-surface conditions regulate dust emission by modifying the threshold conditions for saltation initiation. Soil moisture increases particle cohesion and suppresses dust release, whereas vegetation and snow cover reduce the availability of exposed erodible surfaces and thereby limit saltation activity. Furthermore, we clarify that the dust source function is a dimensionless weighting factor representing the relative availability of erodible sediments and the associated dust-emission potential under otherwise identical forcing conditions. It therefore represents a relative indicator of dust source potential rather than a direct quantitative measure of soil erodibility. We have also added its value range, horizontal resolution, and clarified that the same source-function dataset is applied in all three mesh configurations.

We have added the following detailed explanation in Section 2.2 of the revised manuscript: “In this study, we adopted the S04 formulation. Compared with S01, S04 simplifies the emission formulation while retaining physically based representations of saltation bombardment and aggregate disintegration. Unlike the more simplified S11 scheme, S04 preserves a more explicit representation of these key emission mechanisms for size-resolved dust emission simulations (Shao, 2001, 2004; Shao et al., 2011). The same S04 formulation and parameter settings are applied in all three experiments. Previous studies have demonstrated that dust emission exhibits resolution dependence because threshold-based dust emission schemes respond nonlinearly to resolved surface winds (Ridley et al., 2013; Meng et al., 2021). Building upon these findings, this study investigates how regional mesh refinement within a global variable-resolution framework affects the coupled dust lifecycle during long-range transport through changes in surface dynamics, emission processes, transport, and removal. For dust emission specifically, mesh refinement affects the model-resolved representation of topography, land-surface heterogeneity, and near-surface meteorological forcing, particularly the spatial variability of surface friction velocity and the frequency and magnitude of its exceedance above the saltation threshold. Land-surface conditions also regulate dust emission by modifying the threshold conditions for saltation initiation. Soil moisture increases particle cohesion and suppresses dust release, whereas vegetation and snow cover reduce the availability of exposed erodible surfaces and thereby limit saltation activity (Shao and Lu, 2000; Ginoux et al., 2001; Shao, 2004). These changes subsequently modify the magnitude and spatial distribution of dust emissions. Fig. 1 shows the dust source function used in the model. It is a dimensionless weighting factor representing the relative availability of erodible sediments and the associated dust-emission potential under otherwise identical forcing conditions (Ginoux et al., 2001). The source function represents a relative indicator of dust source potential rather than a direct measure of soil erodibility. The source function ranges from 0 to 0.38 and has a horizontal resolution of approximately 0.7° . The same dataset is mapped onto the three model meshes, and the resulting source-function fields all retain the same value range of 0-0.38.”

References:

- Feng, J., Zhao, C., Du, Q., Xu, M., Gu, J., Hu, Z., and Chen, Y.: Simulating atmospheric dust with a global variable-resolution model: Model description and impacts of mesh refinement, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 15, e2023MS003636, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003636>, 2023.
- Shao, Y.: A model for mineral dust emission, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 106, 20239-20254, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JD900171>, 2001.
- Shao, Y.: Simplification of a dust emission scheme and comparison with data, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 109, D10202, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JD004372>, 2004.
- Shao, Y., Ishizuka, M., Mikami, M., and Leys, J. F.: Parameterization of size-resolved dust emission and validation with measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 116, D08203, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JD014527>, 2011.
- Shao, Y., and Lu, H.: A simple expression for wind erosion threshold friction velocity, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 105, 22437-22443, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JD900304>, 2000.
- Ginoux, P., Chin, M., Tegen, I., Prospero, J. M., Holben, B., Dubovik, O., and Lin, S.-J.: Sources and distributions of dust aerosols simulated with the GOCART model, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 106, 20255-20273, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JD000053>, 2001.
- Ridley, D. A., Heald, C. L., Pierce, J. R., and Evans, M. J.: Toward resolution-independent dust emissions in global models: Impacts on the seasonal and spatial distribution of dust, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 2873-2877, <https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.50409>, 2013.
- Meng, J., Martin, R. V., Ginoux, P., Hammer, M., Sulprizio, M. P., Ridley, D. A., and van Donkelaar, A.: Grid-independent high-resolution dust emissions (v1.0) for chemical transport models: application to GEOS-Chem (12.5.0), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 14, 4249-4260, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-4249-2021>, 2021.

- *4. The aerosol spin-up period appears too short (Sect. 2.4, around Lines 304–315): The simulation starts on 8 March, providing only about four days of aerosol spin-up before the meteorological reinitialization on 12 March. Four days may be insufficient, particularly for the smaller dust size bins with relatively long atmospheric lifetimes. The authors should either use a longer spin-up period (e.g., 10 days to two weeks), provide a sensitivity test, or provide sufficient evidence demonstrating that a four-day spin-up is adequate for the aerosol fields considered in this study.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on the adequacy of the aerosol spin-up period and the continuity of chemical fields across the meteorological reinitialization. We have added a discussion of the purpose and implementation of the aerosol spin-up period, as well as the continuity of chemical fields across the meteorological reinitialization (see Section 2.4 on Pages 14-15, Lines 359-388; Fig. S1). We clarify that the four-day spin-up period is designed to allow the dust and chemical fields to dynamically evolve from the prescribed initial conditions before the target event, rather than to achieve a long-term aerosol

climatological equilibrium. We acknowledge that a longer spin-up may be required for the smallest dust particles with relatively long atmospheric lifetimes. However, the present study focuses on the total dust burden associated with an intense dust-storm event, for which the smallest size fractions make a relatively limited contribution to the total dust mass. In addition, pre-event dust emissions in the simulations are relatively weak, so the dust burden during the analyzed period is expected to be dominated by emissions associated with the event itself. The same initial chemical conditions and spin-up procedure are applied to all three mesh configurations, providing a consistent basis for the resolution-sensitivity comparison. Importantly, the meteorological reinitialization on 12 March does not reinitialize the aerosol fields. The prognostic chemical tracers, including dust, are retained from the end of the spin-up integration and continue to evolve through the analyzed event. As shown in Fig. S1, the regional dust burden evolves smoothly during the 12 h before and after the meteorological reinitialization, with no apparent discontinuity or abnormal change in any of the three mesh configurations. This indicates that the adopted spin-up and restart procedure provides a continuous dynamically evolved dust state for the subsequent event simulation, without introducing an apparent artificial disturbance at the transition. We therefore consider the adopted spin-up appropriate for the event-focused and resolution-sensitivity analysis conducted here, while recognizing that it does not imply full equilibration of the longest-lived fine dust fractions.

We have added the following detailed explanation in Section 2.4 of the revised manuscript: “All experiments cover 8-20 March 2021. The period from 00:00 on 8 March to 00:00 on 12 March is used as a spin-up period to allow dust and chemical fields to evolve from the prescribed initial state before the target event. During this period, dust emission, transport, and removal processes are continuously simulated, allowing the chemical fields to adjust with the meteorological conditions. The objective of this spin-up is to allow the aerosol fields to dynamically evolve before the event simulation rather than to achieve a long-term aerosol climatological equilibrium. In the present simulations, only mineral dust aerosols are included, and the analysis focuses on the total dust burden during this intense dust event. Although the smallest dust particles may require a longer spin-up to approach equilibrium because of their longer atmospheric lifetimes, they account for only a small fraction of the total dust mass. Pre-event dust emissions are relatively weak in the simulations, and the dust burden during the analysis period is expected to be mainly influenced by emissions associated with the event. The same initial chemical conditions and spin-up procedure are applied to all mesh configurations, providing a consistent basis for evaluating the impacts of mesh refinement. Using a commonly employed meteorological reinitialization strategy in atmospheric and aerosol modeling (Zhao et al., 2010; Feng et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024), the meteorological fields are initialized from ERA5 at 00:00 on 8 March and reinitialized only once, at 00:00 on 12 March, to maintain a reliable large-scale atmospheric state. During this reinitialization, the meteorological state is replaced by the ERA5-based fields, whereas the prognostic chemical tracers, including dust, are carried forward directly from the final state of the spin-up integration and used as the chemical initial conditions for the subsequent simulation, rather than being reset to prescribed or default values. This provides a more appropriate initial aerosol state for the subsequent integration (Feng et al., 2023). The

chemical tracer fields therefore remain continuous across the restart, while dust emission, transport, and deposition continue to evolve online in response to the reinitialized meteorological conditions. The continuity of dust fields across the meteorological reinitialization was verified by examining dust burden evolution, which showed no apparent discontinuity before and after the restart (Fig. S1).”




Fig. S1. Temporal evolution of dust burden during the 12 h before and after the meteorological reinitialization at 00:00 on 12 March 2021 for the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km simulations. (a) Dust burden from bins a01–a06, corresponding to dust size bins 1–6 in Table 1; (b) Total dust burden from all bins a01–a08, corresponding to dust size bins 1–8 in Table 1. The vertical dashed line denotes the meteorological reinitialization time.

Reference:

Feng, J., Zhao, C., Du, Q., Xu, M., Gu, J., Hu, Z., and Chen, Y.: Simulating atmospheric dust with a global variable-resolution model: Model description and impacts of mesh refinement, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 15, e2023MS003636, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003636>, 2023.

- *5. The meteorological reinitialization procedure needs further clarification and justification (Sect. 2.4, around Lines 308–315): The meteorological fields are reinitialized on 12 March while the chemical tracers are retained. The authors*

explain that this approach is intended to reduce meteorological drift while maintaining continuity of the chemical fields. However, retaining the aerosol fields while replacing the meteorological state may introduce inconsistency between the two. The authors should clarify how the reinitialization is technically implemented and, more importantly, demonstrate or provide evidence that this procedure does not introduce significant discontinuities or affect the subsequent dust emission, transport, and deposition during the analyzed event.

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on the technical implementation and potential impacts of the meteorological reinitialization procedure. We have clarified the technical implementation of the meteorological reinitialization procedure and added an evaluation of its potential impact on dust continuity (see Section 2.4 on Pages 14-15, Lines 374-388; Fig. S1). Specifically, the meteorological fields were replaced by the ERA5-based fields at 00:00 on 12 March 2021, while the prognostic chemical tracers, including dust fields, were directly carried forward from the preceding spin-up simulation without reinitialization. Meteorological reinitialization is a commonly employed strategy in atmospheric and aerosol modeling to constrain meteorological drift (Zhao et al., 2010; Feng et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024). Rather than resetting the dust fields to prescribed or default values, the chemically evolved dust fields from the preceding integration are used as the chemical initial conditions for the subsequent simulation, providing a more appropriate initial aerosol state (Feng et al., 2023). As shown in Fig. S1, the regional dust burden exhibits a smooth temporal evolution during the 12 h before and after the reinitialization for all three mesh configurations, with no apparent discontinuity or abnormal change after the meteorological fields were updated. This result indicates that the reinitialization procedure does not introduce an apparent artificial discontinuity in the regional dust burden. Following the reinitialization, dust emission, transport, and deposition continue to be calculated online in response to the updated meteorological conditions.

We have added the following detailed explanation in Section 2.4 of the revised manuscript: “Using a commonly employed meteorological reinitialization strategy in atmospheric and aerosol modeling (Zhao et al., 2010; Feng et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024), the meteorological fields are initialized from ERA5 at 00:00 on 8 March and reinitialized only once, at 00:00 on 12 March, to maintain a reliable large-scale atmospheric state. During this reinitialization, the meteorological state is replaced by the ERA5-based fields, whereas the prognostic chemical tracers, including dust, are carried forward directly from the final state of the spin-up integration and used as the chemical initial conditions for the subsequent simulation, rather than being reset to prescribed or default values. This provides a more appropriate initial aerosol state for the subsequent integration (Feng et al., 2023). The chemical tracer fields therefore remain continuous across the restart, while dust emission, transport, and deposition continue to evolve online in response to the reinitialized meteorological conditions. The continuity of dust fields across the meteorological reinitialization was verified by examining dust burden evolution, which showed no apparent discontinuity before and after the restart (Fig. S1).”




Fig. S1. Temporal evolution of dust burden during the 12 h before and after the meteorological reinitialization at 00:00 on 12 March 2021 for the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km simulations. (a) Dust burden from bins a01–a06, corresponding to dust size bins 1–6 in Table 1; (b) Total dust burden from all bins a01–a08, corresponding to dust size bins 1–8 in Table 1. The vertical dashed line denotes the meteorological reinitialization time.

Reference:

Feng, J., Zhao, C., Du, Q., Xu, M., Gu, J., Hu, Z., and Chen, Y.: Simulating atmospheric dust with a global variable-resolution model: Model description and impacts of mesh refinement, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 15, e2023MS003636, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003636>, 2023.

- 6. Aerosol–meteorology interactions need to be clarified and separated from the resolution effect (Sects. 2.4 and 3.2.4):** It is unclear whether the direct and indirect effects of aerosols, particularly dust, are activated in these experiments. This needs to be explicitly stated. If aerosol–radiation and/or aerosol–cloud interactions are included, the interpretation becomes considerably more complicated because mesh refinement changes dust emissions and distributions, which can in turn modify radiation, clouds, precipitation, and other meteorological fields. The meteorological differences among U50, V16, and V4 may therefore reflect both (1) the direct effect of mesh refinement on meteorology and (2) aerosol–meteorology feedbacks induced by resolution-dependent dust emissions and distributions. These contributions

need to be distinguished. If aerosol feedbacks are active, sensitivity experiments with these feedbacks turned off, or other quantitative analyses, would be needed to determine their relative contributions.

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on distinguishing aerosol–meteorology interactions from resolution effects. We have added explicit descriptions of the aerosol–meteorology coupling used in the experiments and revised the related discussion to distinguish the effects of mesh configuration from aerosol feedbacks (see Section 2.4 on Page 15, Lines 403-404; Section 3.2.4 on Page 35, Lines 977-985). Specifically, aerosol–radiation feedback is turned off in all experiments, and dust is not coupled to cloud microphysics as cloud condensation nuclei or ice nuclei. Therefore, the resolution-dependent changes in dust emissions and distributions analyzed in this study do not feed back to the simulated meteorological fields through dust radiative effects or dust-induced ice nucleation. Dust transport, dry deposition, and wet scavenging remain active and respond to the simulated meteorological conditions. We have also revised Section 3.2.4 to avoid implying a two-way dust–cloud–precipitation feedback and to focus on how precipitation and atmospheric transport differences among the mesh configurations affect dust wet removal and downstream dust distributions. We have added the following detailed explanation in Section 2.4 of the revised manuscript: “Aerosol–radiation feedback is turned off in all experiments, and dust is not coupled to cloud microphysics as cloud condensation nuclei or ice nuclei.”

We have also revised the discussion in Section 3.2.4 of the revised manuscript as follows: “The reduced dust loading over the YRD may reflect a combined response of transport and removal processes, with enhanced wet scavenging in V4 km representing one possible contributing pathway. The current model configuration does not represent the role of dust as ice-nucleating particles. Future work could examine resolution-dependent changes in cloud and precipitation properties, including the potential role of dust as ice-nucleating particles, and distinguish the contributions of in-cloud and below-cloud scavenging. Dedicated process-isolation experiments and dust-budget analyses could further clarify the relative roles of emission, transport, and deposition.”

- *7. The mechanistic attribution remains incomplete (Sect. 3.2): The diagnostic analyses of terrain, surface winds, friction velocity, dust emissions, transport, and wet scavenging are useful, but they do not fully isolate the contributions of individual processes. Since these processes change simultaneously with mesh refinement, their concurrent changes alone are not sufficient to establish causality or quantify their relative contributions. Additional process-level analyses or sensitivity experiments would strengthen the mechanistic attribution. For example, using the same dust emissions across different-resolution simulations could help separate emission-related effects from those of transport and removal. A quantitative dust budget would also help distinguish the contributions of emission, transport, dry deposition, and wet deposition. If such analyses are not feasible, the mechanistic conclusions should be appropriately qualified.*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on the limitations of the mechanistic attribution in Section 3.2. We have revised the mechanistic interpretation throughout Section 3.2 to more clearly distinguish the process-level diagnostics from a

quantitative attribution of individual contributions (see Section 3.2 on Pages 25-35, Lines 681-985). In particular, we now explicitly state at the beginning of Section 3.2 that dust emission, transport, and removal processes vary concurrently among the mesh configurations and that the following diagnostics are intended to provide a process-based interpretation of their coupled responses, rather than to quantitatively isolate the contribution of each individual process. Accordingly, we have revised several statements in Sections 3.2.1–3.2.4 that previously implied stronger causal or relative attribution. The friction-velocity analysis is now interpreted in terms of the threshold-based and nonlinear response of the S04 emission scheme, while the discussion of regional dust loading emphasizes the combined responses of emission, transport, and removal rather than attributing the loading differences to a single process. Similarly, for the YRD, enhanced wet scavenging is described as a process that may contribute to the reduced downstream dust burden rather than as a quantitatively isolated cause. These revisions retain the process-level diagnostic evidence while limiting the mechanistic interpretation to what can be supported by the present experimental design. A quantitative separation of the relative contributions of emission, transport, dry deposition, and wet deposition would require dedicated process-isolation experiments and dust-budget analyses, which are identified as directions for future work.

Major revisions in Section 3.2 are as follows:

At the beginning of Section 3.2, we added the following clarification: “These differences likely reflect the combined responses of dust emission, transport, and removal processes to mesh refinement, rather than changes in dust emission magnitude alone. The following analyses examine the concurrent responses of dust emission, transport, and removal to mesh refinement and provide a process-based interpretation of these differences. Because these processes vary simultaneously among the experiments, the diagnostics are not intended to quantitatively isolate the contribution of each individual process. The diagnosed responses are specific to the March 2021 event and should not be interpreted as a universal response of dust emission and transport to mesh refinement under all meteorological conditions.”

In Section 3.2.2, we revised the interpretation of the friction-velocity diagnostics as follows: “The opposite responses of $f_{saltation}$ and S_3 provide a process-based interpretation of the apparent contrast between increasing region-integrated dust emissions (Table 4) and decreasing saltation occurrence frequency in some regions (Fig. 11). Stronger extreme exceedances can occur despite a lower overall saltation frequency, potentially increasing the contribution of high-amplitude events to the nonlinear emission response and thereby allowing total dust emission to increase even when saltation occurs less frequently in an area-averaged sense.”

In Section 3.2.3, we emphasized that regional dust-loading differences reflect multiple concurrent processes: “Regional differences in dust mass loading are consistent with the combined responses of emission, transport, and removal processes discussed throughout Section 3.2.”

In Section 3.2.4, we further qualified the role of wet scavenging and explicitly identified the need for process-isolation analyses: “The reduced dust loading over the YRD may reflect a combined response of transport and removal processes, with

enhanced wet scavenging in V4 km representing one possible contributing pathway. The current model configuration does not represent the role of dust as ice-nucleating particles. Future work could examine resolution-dependent changes in cloud and precipitation properties, including the potential role of dust as ice-nucleating particles, and distinguish the contributions of in-cloud and below-cloud scavenging. Dedicated process-isolation experiments and dust-budget analyses could further clarify the relative roles of emission, transport, and deposition.”

- *Question 8: The conclusions rely on a single dust event and their robustness needs to be demonstrated (Sects. 3.2 and 4): The proposed mechanisms are derived entirely from the March 2021 event. However, the response of surface winds and dust emissions to mesh refinement may depend strongly on synoptic conditions, source regions, season, and background meteorology. This concern is particularly relevant given the opposite resolution response reported by Feng et al. (2023). I strongly recommend adding several dust events under different meteorological conditions to test whether the proposed mechanisms are robust. If additional cases are not feasible, the conclusions should be substantially narrowed and explicitly presented as findings specific to this event.*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on the event-specific nature and robustness of the diagnosed resolution responses. We have added explicit statements to clarify the event-specific scope of the diagnosed resolution responses and have correspondingly narrowed the mechanistic interpretation and conclusions to avoid generalizing the findings beyond the March 2021 dust event (see Section 3.2 on Pages 25-35, Lines 681-985; Section 4 on Pages 35-37, Lines 987-1052). Specifically, at the beginning of Section 3.2, we now state that the diagnosed responses are specific to the March 2021 event and should not be interpreted as a universal response of dust emission and transport to mesh refinement under all meteorological conditions. The discussion of the friction-velocity and dust-emission response has also been explicitly framed in the context of this event. In particular, the decrease in area-averaged saltation frequency together with enhanced extreme friction-velocity exceedances is now presented as an event-specific response rather than as a general consequence of mesh refinement. This interpretation is also consistent with our comparison with Feng et al. (2023), which further illustrates that the direction of the dust-emission response to mesh refinement may differ across model formulations and meteorological settings. Feng et al. (2023) primarily examined the annual-scale response of dust emissions to mesh refinement, whereas the present study focuses on the response during a single extreme dust event. The contrast between the two studies may therefore reflect not only differences between annual-scale statistical behavior and event-scale responses, but also differences in the dust emission formulations. Specifically, Feng et al. (2023) used the GOCART scheme driven by 10-m wind speed, whereas the S04 scheme used here is controlled by threshold friction velocity and saltation flux. These differences suggest that the resolution response may depend jointly on the prevailing meteorological conditions and the formulation of the dust emission scheme. A systematic assessment across additional dust events and different emission schemes will therefore be needed to further establish the robustness and scheme dependence of the

diagnosed resolution responses. We have likewise revised Section 4 to limit the broader conclusions to the present event and explicitly state that the process responses identified here should be regarded as specific to the March 2021 event, because the relative roles of terrain-induced wind variability, circulation-related transport pathways, and precipitation-related removal may depend on the prevailing synoptic conditions and regional hydrometeorological environment. Accordingly, assessment across additional dust events and different synoptic conditions is needed before the robustness and broader applicability of these resolution responses can be established.

Major revisions in Sections 3.2 and 4 are as follows:

At the beginning of Section 3.2, we added: “The diagnosed responses are specific to the March 2021 event and should not be interpreted as a universal response of dust emission and transport to mesh refinement under all meteorological conditions.”

In Section 3.2.2, we further clarified the contrast with Feng et al. (2023): “This result contrasts with the reduced annual-mean dust emissions over East Asia reported by Feng et al. (2023), who found that their GOCART formulation, driven by 10-m wind speed, responded to weaker near-surface winds and fewer emission events associated with better-resolved topographic complexity. In contrast, the S04 scheme used here is controlled by threshold friction velocity and saltation flux. Although mesh refinement reduces the area-averaged saltation frequency, it strengthens extreme friction-velocity exceedances. Thus, the opposite emission responses likely reflect differences in how mesh refinement modifies the wind variables controlling the respective nonlinear emission formulations, rather than a uniformly positive or negative effect of increasing resolution. Future work will systematically compare the responses of different dust emission schemes to mesh refinement under otherwise consistent model configurations.”

In Section 4, we further narrowed the conclusions and explicitly stated the event-specific scope of the present findings: “These findings motivate further assessment of how robust these resolution effects are across additional strong dust events and under alternative model settings. Because this study focuses on a single extreme dust event, the process responses identified here should be regarded as specific to the March 2021 event, as the relative roles of terrain-induced wind variability, circulation-related transport pathways, and precipitation-related removal may depend on the prevailing synoptic conditions and regional hydrometeorological environment. Dedicated sensitivity experiments using a high-resolution atmospheric mesh with coarse-resolution topography would be valuable for separating the effects of atmospheric mesh spacing from those of terrain representation. Future work is also needed to systematically compare the responses of different dust emission schemes to mesh refinement and to better quantify their implications for regional dust emissions and long-range transport.”

- *9. The observational constraints remain limited for a single-case study (Sects. 2.5 and 3.1): The authors acknowledge the limited AERONET coverage (23 sites). However, the evaluation relies largely on event-mean AOD, which provides limited information on the timing and evolution of the dust plume. PM_{10} is also not a direct measurement of dust. Given that the conclusions are based on a single event, stronger observational constraints would be helpful. The authors should consider*

evaluating the temporal evolution of the event and, if available, include satellite observations or measurements of the vertical dust distribution to better constrain the simulated dust transport. As highlighted in the Introduction, a key strength of the iAMAS global variable-resolution model is its seamless global-to-regional multi-scale capability. However, the current manuscript focuses mainly on source and near-source regions (e.g., Gobi and Taklimakan). To fully evaluate the model's capability in capturing long-range transboundary transport, additional validation over downwind remote regions should be included. Incorporating available surface PM_{10} networks and AERONET AOD data in South Korea and Japan would significantly strengthen the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on strengthening the observational evaluation of dust transport and the limitations of the current validation approach. We agree that the observational evaluation based solely on event-mean AOD provides limited information on the spatial evolution and long-range transport of the dust plume. However, the available AERONET observations during this extreme dust event have limitations in temporal continuity and spatial coverage, which prevents a comprehensive assessment of plume evolution using AERONET alone. To strengthen the observational constraints, we have expanded the AERONET evaluation by including additional observations over downwind regions. Specifically, the available AERONET sites are grouped into China, South Korea, and Japan, and regional statistics are calculated to further evaluate the simulated long-range dust transport over remote regions. In addition, we have incorporated daily MODIS AOD retrievals to evaluate the spatial evolution and transport pathway of the dust plume during 14-18 March 2021. The spatial correlation coefficient (r), RMSE, and mean bias between the simulated and MODIS AOD fields are further calculated to quantitatively assess the correspondence between the simulated and satellite-retrieved AOD distributions (see Section 3.1.4 on Pages 23-24, Lines 642-657; Fig. 7, Fig. S6, Table S2 and Table S3). The results show that the simulations capture some of the broad spatial features of the dust plume, with moderate spatial correlations against MODIS retrievals ($r = 0.57-0.62$). The additional AERONET evaluation over China, South Korea, and Japan provides further observational constraints on the simulated column aerosol loading over downwind regions during the dust event.

We have revised the observational evaluation discussion in Section 3.1.4 of the revised manuscript as follows: “The scatterplot (Fig. 7d) provides a quantitative evaluation of the collocated AERONET observations and simulations. Correlations are high across the three configurations ($r = 0.81-0.86$), indicating that the model captures the observed variability of AOD across the available sites. The U50 km configuration shows a correlation coefficient of 0.86 and a negative bias (NMB = -67.82%). This underestimation is markedly reduced in the V16 km ($r = 0.81$, NMB = -11.24%) and V4 km ($r = 0.85$ and NMB = -8.80%) configurations, indicating reduced bias in the simulated AOD magnitude at these sites. To evaluate the simulated long-range dust transport over downwind regions, the available AERONET sites are grouped into China, South Korea, and Japan (Table S2). The simulations show some consistency with observations across the evaluated regions, although regional differences in AOD magnitude remain. Further evaluation against MODIS shows that the simulations capture some of the broad spatial features of

AOD, although differences in spatial details and magnitude remain (Fig. S6). For the 14-18 March mean fields, the spatial correlations range from 0.57 to 0.62, and positive mean biases are present in all three simulations (Table S3).”




Fig. 7. (a–c) Spatial distribution of mean AOD at 500 nm averaged over 13-18 March 2021 from the iAMAS simulations using the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km mesh configurations, with collocated AERONET observations overlaid as markers. (d) Scatterplot of simulated versus observed period-mean AOD at 500 nm at the collocated AERONET sites, with the correlation coefficient (r) and normalized mean bias (NMB) reported for each configuration. The dashed outline denotes the refinement region.

Table S2. Evaluation of simulated AOD against AERONET observations at sites over China, South Korea, and Japan during 13-18 March 2021.

Region	Sites	U50 km r	U50 km	V16 km r	V16 km	V4 km r	V4 km
			NMB (%)		NMB (%)		NMB (%)
China	10	0.97	-54.18	0.96	-16.37	0.97	-16.03
South Korea	5	0.86	-55.18	0.72	+41.53	0.84	+36.92
Japan	5	0.92	-70.92	0.98	+47.92	0.97	+20.08

Notes: AERONET sites in China, South Korea, and Japan are selected from the observational sites shown in Fig. 7. The simulated

and observed AOD values are averaged over 13-18 March 2021 using only dates with available AERONET retrievals at each site. The spatial correlation coefficient (r) and normalized mean bias (NMB) are calculated using the collocated site-based mean AOD values.




Fig. S6. Daily spatial distributions of MODIS-retrieved and simulated AOD at 550 nm during 14-18 March 2021. For each day, simulated AOD is shown only at grid cells with valid MODIS retrievals to ensure a consistent spatial comparison.

Table S3. Spatial evaluation of the simulated 14-18 March 2021 mean AOD fields against MODIS satellite retrievals.

Experiment	r	RMSE	MB
U50 km	0.61	0.87	0.49
V16 km	0.57	1.02	0.55
V4 km	0.62	1.62	0.86

Notes: MODIS and simulated AOD are averaged at each grid cell over 14-18 March 2021 using only dates with valid MODIS retrievals at that grid cell. The spatial correlation coefficient (r), root mean square error (RMSE), and mean bias (MB) are then calculated from the resulting multi-day mean fields.

● *10. Reconciling PM_{10} and AOD validations across mesh resolutions: There is an apparent discrepancy in model*

performance between surface PM_{10} and column AOD. Why does U50 km show the lowest AOD values while significantly overestimating surface PM_{10} ? Conversely, V4 km shows good agreement for both metrics. Did the different horizontal resolutions affect the vertical mixing or size distribution of dust particles? Please provide a more detailed explanation connecting the spatial plume structure, vertical distribution, and AOD/ PM_{10} mechanics. Additionally, if spatial plume distribution strongly drives AOD accuracy, AERONET sites nearer to the source regions should be included in the analysis if available.

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on reconciling the different responses of surface PM_{10} and column AOD across mesh configurations and clarifying the related physical mechanisms. We have revised the discussion and added diagnostics of the vertical dust distribution and size-related characteristics (see Section 3.1.4 on Page 24, Lines 665-679; Table S4). We clarify that surface PM_{10} reflects local near-surface particle mass, whereas AOD represents vertically integrated aerosol extinction. The additional diagnostics show larger dust mass fractions below 1 km and smaller fractions above 2 km in the refined simulations, while the column fine-dust fraction changes only modestly, indicating limited changes in the bulk fine-to-coarse mass partitioning. We now discuss how mesh refinement may influence the vertical dust distribution through changes in terrain-related flows, source emissions, and the balance between resolved vertical transport and boundary-layer mixing. In particular, stronger emissions in the refined simulations may increase the supply of recently emitted dust at low levels, while subsequent transport and removal further modify its vertical distribution. These processes may jointly contribute to the diagnosed differences in vertical dust mass fractions. We also clarify that an overestimate of local near-surface PM_{10} does not necessarily imply an overestimate of column-integrated extinction. Differences in plume position and vertical extent at the respective observation sites may therefore contribute to the positive surface PM_{10} bias and negative AOD bias in U50 km.

We have also revised the discussion in Section 3.1.4 of the revised manuscript as follows: “Surface PM_{10} and AOD constrain different aspects of the simulated dust plume, with PM_{10} reflecting local near-surface particle mass and AOD representing vertically integrated aerosol extinction. Mesh refinement can influence the vertical dust distribution through changes in terrain-related flows, source emissions, and the balance between resolved vertical transport and boundary-layer mixing. The stronger emissions diagnosed in the refined simulations may increase the supply of recently emitted dust at low levels, while subsequent transport and removal modify its vertical distribution. These processes may jointly contribute to the larger dust mass fractions below 1 km and smaller fractions above 2 km in the refined simulations (Table S4). The column fine-dust fraction changes only modestly, indicating limited changes in the bulk fine-to-coarse mass partitioning. An overestimate of local near-surface PM_{10} does not necessarily imply an overestimate of column-integrated extinction. Differences in plume position and vertical extent at the respective observation sites may therefore contribute to the positive surface PM_{10} bias and negative AOD bias in U50 km.”

Table S4. Vertical distribution and size-related characteristics of simulated dust over the MGD, NCP, and YRD during 13-18 March 2021.

Region	Experiment	Dust mass fraction below 1 km AGL (%)	Dust mass fraction above 2 km AGL (%)	Column fine-dust mass fraction (%)
MGD	U50 km	42.36	38.61	16.48
	V16 km	45.59	34.00	16.26
	V4 km	62.04	17.96	16.51
NCP	U50 km	9.97	75.22	16.78
	V16 km	22.42	61.32	17.17
	V4 km	29.57	54.31	18.33
YRD	U50 km	6.60	86.69	17.07
	V16 km	14.77	76.03	17.51
	V4 km	15.28	69.63	17.88

Notes: AGL denotes above ground level. Dust mass fractions below 1 km and above 2 km are calculated relative to the total dust mass within each region. Fine dust refers to particles with diameters $\leq 2.5 \mu\text{m}$.

- *Question 11: Improved agreement with PM_{10} and AOD does not necessarily imply more realistic dust emissions (Sects. 3.1.3–3.1.4 and 3.2.1): The manuscript should avoid implying that improved PM_{10} /AOD agreement validates the larger dust emission flux. Better agreement of V4 with observed PM_{10} and AOD does not directly demonstrate that the larger dust emission flux is more realistic, because PM_{10} and AOD are also controlled by transport, vertical mixing, and dry and wet deposition. The authors should therefore avoid using improved PM_{10} /AOD performance as direct validation of the increased dust emission flux. The discussion should clearly distinguish among the resolution sensitivity of dust emissions, improvement in simulated atmospheric dust concentrations/loading, and accuracy of the emission flux itself.*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on distinguishing the resolution sensitivity of dust emissions from the evaluation of simulated atmospheric dust concentrations and loading. We agree with the reviewer that improved agreement with observed PM_{10} and AOD does not directly demonstrate that the larger simulated dust emission flux is more realistic. We have therefore reviewed the relevant discussion and revised the manuscript to avoid using the improved PM_{10} /AOD performance of the refined simulations as validation of the increased dust emission flux (see Section 3.1.3-3.1.4 and 3.2.1 on Pages 20-28, Lines 557-785). In the revised text, we explicitly distinguish between the resolution sensitivity of simulated dust emissions and the agreement of simulated atmospheric dust concentrations and column aerosol loading with observations, without interpreting the latter as direct validation of the emission flux itself. Specifically, the PM_{10} and AOD evaluations in Sects. 3.1.3-3.1.4 are now

interpreted only as observational constraints on the simulated atmospheric dust distribution. The larger dust emissions in the refined simulations are discussed separately in Section 3.2.1 as a resolution-dependent model response. We have also clarified that the differences in simulated PM₁₀ and AOD among the mesh configurations likely reflect the combined responses of dust emission, transport, and removal processes to mesh refinement, rather than changes in dust emission magnitude alone.

Major revisions in the manuscript are quoted below:

In Section 3.1.3, we clarify the multiple processes affecting the simulated dust distribution: “These resolution-dependent differences in the simulated spatial distribution of dust transport may result from the combined effects of the spatiotemporal evolution of dust emissions, circulation-related wind changes, dry deposition, and wet scavenging.”

In Section 3.1.4, we clarify what the observational comparisons constrain: “Surface PM₁₀ and AOD constrain different aspects of the simulated dust plume, with PM₁₀ reflecting local near-surface particle mass and AOD representing vertically integrated aerosol extinction.”

At the beginning of Section 3.2, we further qualify the interpretation of the differences among the simulations: “These differences likely reflect the combined responses of dust emission, transport, and removal processes to mesh refinement, rather than changes in dust emission magnitude alone. The following analyses examine the concurrent responses of dust emission, transport, and removal to mesh refinement and provide a process-based interpretation of these differences. Because these processes vary simultaneously among the experiments, the diagnostics are not intended to quantitatively isolate the contribution of each individual process.”

- *Question 12: The attribution of the YRD dust reduction to enhanced precipitation and wet scavenging needs stronger evidence (Sect. 3.2.4): The manuscript attributes the reduced dust loading over the YRD in V4 primarily to enhanced precipitation and wet scavenging. However, dust emissions, dynamical transport, PBL mixing, convection, gravitational settling, and dry deposition all change simultaneously among the experiments. These processes are also closely linked to the meteorological fields, which themselves are affected by the change in model resolution. Therefore, the concurrent increase in wet scavenging and decrease in dust loading does not, by itself, establish a causal relationship. A quantitative regional dust budget separating emission, transport convergence/divergence, dry deposition, and wet deposition would provide much stronger support for this conclusion. The authors should quantify the relative contributions of these processes to the dust-loading differences over the YRD rather than inferring the dominant mechanism mainly from their spatial and temporal correspondence.*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on the attribution of the YRD dust-loading reduction and the need for a more cautious mechanistic interpretation. We agree with the reviewer that the concurrent enhancement of wet scavenging and reduction in dust loading over the YRD does not, by itself, demonstrate that wet scavenging is the dominant cause of the reduced dust

loading, because transport and other removal processes also vary among the mesh configurations. We have therefore revised Section 3.2.4 to avoid attributing the YRD dust-loading reduction primarily to enhanced precipitation and wet scavenging and to qualify the corresponding mechanistic interpretation (see Section 3.2.4 on Page 34-35, Lines 966-985). Specifically, the revised text now describes the enhanced wet scavenging over the YRD in V4 km as occurring concurrently with the reduced regional dust loading. The reduced dust loading is interpreted as a combined response of emission, transport, and removal processes, with enhanced wet scavenging in V4 km identified as one possible contributing pathway rather than as the dominant mechanism. We have also revised the conclusion of this section to state that mesh refinement can affect precipitation-related dust wet-removal processes, rather than implying that enhanced wet scavenging alone explains the YRD dust-loading reduction. Because the present experiments do not quantitatively isolate the relative contributions of emission, transport, dry deposition, and wet deposition, we now identify dedicated process-isolation experiments and regional dust-budget analyses as necessary for such quantitative attribution in future work.

Major revision in Section 3.2.4 is as follows: “The increase in dust mass loading over these regions occurs alongside weaker wet scavenging and resolution-dependent changes in dry deposition, reflecting the combined effects of emissions, transport, and removal processes. By contrast, over the downwind YRD, the wet scavenging rate increases from 11.117 to 25.041 mg m⁻² day⁻¹, and the total dust wet scavenging increases from 0.014 to 0.033 Tg (Table 6). This enhanced removal coincides with the 30.49% reduction in dust mass loading over the YRD in V4 km relative to U50 km (Table 5). The V16 km simulation does not show such an enhancement over the YRD, with a wet scavenging rate of 10.865 mg m⁻² day⁻¹ and total wet scavenging of 0.015 Tg, both close to the U50 km values (Table S12). The stronger wet scavenging over the YRD in V4 km than in V16 km suggests a more pronounced resolution-dependent variation in precipitation-related removal along the dust transport pathway. The reduced dust loading over the YRD may reflect a combined response of transport and removal processes, with enhanced wet scavenging in V4 km representing one possible contributing pathway. The current model configuration does not represent the role of dust as ice-nucleating particles. Future work could examine resolution-dependent changes in cloud and precipitation properties, including the potential role of dust as ice-nucleating particles, and distinguish the contributions of in-cloud and below-cloud scavenging. Dedicated process-isolation experiments and dust-budget analyses could further clarify the relative roles of emission, transport, and deposition.”

Minor comments:

- *1. Section 2.4: Please provide the total number of grid cells and, if available, the computational cost for U50, V16, and V4.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on providing the grid-cell numbers and computational information for the three mesh configurations. We have added the total number of grid cells for the three mesh configurations in Section 2.4 (see Section

2.4 on Page 13, Lines 343-347). Specifically, the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km mesh configurations contain a total of 237430, 268888, and 858645 grid cells globally, respectively. For the 12-day simulations, the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km configurations require an average of approximately 0.37, 0.71, and 3.89 hours per simulated day using 720, 720, and 1920 CPU cores, respectively. We have added the following information in Section 2.4 of the revised manuscript: “The U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km mesh configurations contain a total of 237430, 268888, and 858645 grid cells globally, respectively. For the 12-day simulations, the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km configurations require an average of approximately 0.37, 0.71, and 3.89 hours per simulated day using 720, 720, and 1920 CPU cores, respectively.”

- *2. Section 2.5 and 3.1: Please clarify how the surface wind, PM_{10} , and AERONET observations are collocated with the model grids, particularly given the different grid spacing among the three experiments.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on clarifying the collocation method between observations and model grids with different spatial resolutions. We have added a description of the collocation method used for the station-based evaluations (see Section 2.5 on Page 16, Lines 437-439). Specifically, for each surface wind, PM_{10} , and AERONET observation site, the corresponding model value is extracted from the geographically nearest model grid cell in each native mesh configuration. This procedure is applied independently to the U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km experiments to account for their different grid spacing. We have added the following description in Section 2.5 of the revised manuscript: “For each observation site, the corresponding model value is extracted from the geographically nearest model grid cell in each native mesh configuration.”

- *3. Section 3.2.2: Please clarify the temporal resolution used to calculate u^* , u_t^* , the threshold-exceedance frequency, and S_3 .*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on clarifying the temporal resolution used for the friction-velocity diagnostics and related threshold-based metrics. We have added a clarification of the temporal resolution used for these diagnostics (see Section 3.2.2 on Pages 29-30, Lines 825-827). Specifically, the calculations use hourly u^* and u_t^* fields during 13-17 March 2021, and the threshold-exceedance frequency and S_3 are calculated from the corresponding hourly samples. We have added the following clarification in Section 3.2.2 of the revised manuscript: “The calculations use hourly u^* and u_t^* fields during 13-17 March 2021, from which the threshold-exceedance frequency and S_3 are derived.”

- *4. Section 2.5 and 3.1.3: PM_{10} is used as a proxy for dust. Please briefly discuss the possible contribution of non-dust aerosols to the observed PM_{10} during the event.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on clarifying the limitations of using PM_{10} as a proxy for dust. We have added a brief discussion of the possible contribution of non-dust aerosols to the observed PM_{10} during the event (see Section 2.5 on Pages

15-16, Lines 415-425). Specifically, we now clarify that although the elevated PM₁₀ concentrations during this strong dust event were strongly influenced by mineral dust and therefore provide a useful observational constraint for dust model evaluation, PM₁₀ is not a dust-specific measurement and may also contain contributions from anthropogenic and other non-dust aerosol components. Accordingly, observed PM₁₀ is interpreted as an approximate observational constraint on near-surface dust conditions rather than as a direct measurement of dust alone. We have added the following clarification in Section 2.5 of the revised manuscript: “During this strong dust storm event, PM₁₀ increased substantially at many observational sites, providing a useful observational constraint for evaluating simulated near-surface dust conditions. Ground-based observations from sites located in the source and downwind regions shown in Fig. 1 indicate that the coarse-particle fraction, calculated as $(PM_{10}-PM_{2.5})/PM_{10}$, accounted for approximately 70% of total PM₁₀ during 13-18 March 2021, suggesting a substantial contribution from coarse-mode particles. Nevertheless, PM₁₀ is not a dust-specific measurement and may also contain contributions from anthropogenic and other non-dust aerosol components. Therefore, observed PM₁₀ should be regarded as an approximate observational constraint on near-surface dust conditions rather than a direct measurement of dust alone.”

- *5. Section 3.1: Please report the number of observations used in each statistical comparison, particularly for the regional PM₁₀ and surface-wind evaluations.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on clarifying the number of observations used in the statistical evaluations. We have added the number of observation stations used in the evaluations to the caption of Table 3 and the captions of Figs. 4 and 5 in Section 3.1 (see the caption of Table 3 and the captions of Figs. 4 and 5). Specifically, Table 3 reports 13, 25, 16, 18, 28, and 19 NOAA stations for the regional wind evaluations over the TKD, MGD, HC–WIM, LP, NCP, and YRD, respectively. Fig. 4 now indicates that 453 NOAA surface stations are used for the 10-m wind comparison, and Fig. 5 specifies that 192 collocated CNEMC monitoring stations are used for the surface PM₁₀ evaluation.

- *6. Lines 60–62: The sentence describing regional model limitations is oversimplified. Please expand it to provide a more precise description, such as highlighting the “limited representation of lateral boundary conditions in regional models”.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on improving the description of the limitations of regional models, particularly regarding lateral boundary conditions. We have expanded the description of regional-model limitations to provide a more precise explanation of how lateral boundary conditions affect long-range dust simulations (see Introduction on Page 4, Lines 75-82). Specifically, we now clarify that regional models rely on prescribed lateral boundary conditions from larger-scale models, and that the spatial and temporal resolution of these boundary conditions may constrain the representation of meteorological and aerosol conditions entering the regional domain, particularly for long-range dust transport. We have also clarified that large regional domains are often required to represent complete dust source regions and transport pathways. We have added the following

clarification in the Introduction of the revised manuscript: “However, regional models rely on prescribed lateral boundary conditions from larger-scale models, whose spatial and temporal resolution may constrain the representation of meteorological and aerosol conditions entering the regional domain, particularly for long-range dust transport. Moreover, adequately representing both dust source regions and long-range transport pathways often requires sufficiently large regional domains, which can substantially increase the computational cost of high-resolution simulations (Pérez et al., 2006; Feng et al., 2023).”

References:

- Pérez, C., Nickovic, S., Baldasano, J. M., Sicard, M., Rocadenbosch, F., and Cachorro, V. E.: A long Saharan dust event over the western Mediterranean: Lidar, sun photometer observations, and regional dust modeling, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 111, D15214, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JD006579>, 2006.
- Feng, J., Zhao, C., Du, Q., Xu, M., Gu, J., Hu, Z., and Chen, Y.: Simulating atmospheric dust with a global variable-resolution model: Model description and impacts of mesh refinement, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 15, e2023MS003636, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003636>, 2023.

- *7. Lines 76–78: The description of regional model constraints is too simplified. Regional models are limited in dust simulations not only due to their strong dependency on global driver models, but also because running large domains at high resolution to cover long-range transport pathways incurs substantial computational costs.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on further clarifying the computational limitations of regional models for long-range dust simulations. We have expanded the discussion of the computational challenges associated with high-resolution regional dust simulations, particularly for long-range transport studies (see Introduction on Page 4, Lines 75-82). Specifically, we now clarify that adequately representing both dust source regions and long-range transport pathways requires sufficiently large regional domains. When combined with high spatial resolution, these large domains substantially increase computational costs and may limit the feasibility of regional simulations for multi-scale dust transport studies. The corresponding clarification has been incorporated into the Introduction of the revised manuscript as follows: “However, regional models rely on prescribed lateral boundary conditions from larger-scale models, whose spatial and temporal resolution may constrain the representation of meteorological and aerosol conditions entering the regional domain, particularly for long-range dust transport. Moreover, adequately representing both dust source regions and long-range transport pathways often requires sufficiently large regional domains, which can substantially increase the computational cost of high-resolution simulations (Pérez et al., 2006; Feng et al., 2023).”

Reference:

Pérez, C., Nickovic, S., Baldasano, J. M., Sicard, M., Rocadenbosch, F., and Cachorro, V. E.: A long Saharan dust event over the western Mediterranean: Lidar, sun photometer observations, and regional dust modeling, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 111, D15214, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JD006579>, 2006.

Feng, J., Zhao, C., Du, Q., Xu, M., Gu, J., Hu, Z., and Chen, Y.: Simulating atmospheric dust with a global variable-resolution model: Model description and impacts of mesh refinement, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 15, e2023MS003636, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003636>, 2023.

- *8. Lines 121–123: Please provide a clearer rationale for selecting the March 2021 event. How severe was this dust storm compared to other major East Asian dust events or observation campaign periods?*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment on clarifying the rationale for selecting the March 2021 dust storm event. We have added a clearer description of the severity of the March 2021 dust storm to provide a stronger rationale for selecting this event (see Introduction on Page 6, Lines 140-143). During this event, the dust plume covered more than 3.8×10^6 km² over China, and the daily regional-mean dust optical depth reached the highest or close-to-highest levels observed over the past two decades in northern China (Gui et al., 2022). We have added the following description in the Introduction of the revised manuscript: “During this event, the dust plume covered more than 3.8×10^6 km² over China, and the daily regional-mean dust optical depth reached the highest or close-to-highest levels observed over the past two decades in northern China (Gui et al., 2022).”

Reference:

Gui, K., Yao, W., Che, H., An, L., Zheng, Y., Li, L., Zhao, H., Zhang, L., Zhong, J., Wang, Y., and Zhang, X.: Record-breaking dust loading during two mega dust storm events over northern China in March 2021: aerosol optical and radiative properties and meteorological drivers, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 22, 7905–7932, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-7905-2022>, 2022.

- *9. Lines 424–450: Have you evaluated the model against hourly surface wind speed observations? In high and complex terrain, comparing daily mean wind speed is insufficient because the model does not use daily winds dynamically, and sub-daily peak winds drive threshold exceedance. How do the normalized mean biases (NMBs) in wind speed quantitatively impact dust emission amounts across the different experiments? Providing a quantitative assessment of emission variability relative to hourly wind speed biases would help readers better understand the underlying sensitivity.*

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment on evaluating sub-daily surface wind variability and its relationship with dust emission responses. We have added an evaluation of 3-hourly surface wind speeds against collocated NOAA observations and a

quantitative comparison between wind-speed biases and dust emission responses among the three mesh configurations (see Section 3.2.1 on Page 26, Lines 710-720; Table S5). Specifically, Table S5 summarizes the 3-hourly wind-speed normalized mean biases (NMBs), the biases of the 95th-percentile wind speeds representing strong-wind conditions, and the corresponding dust emission amounts for each mesh configuration. The results show that mesh refinement generally reduces the magnitude of the 3-hourly wind-speed NMB over the major dust source regions while dust emissions increase. For example, over the MGD region, the 3-hourly wind-speed NMB changes from -16.97% in U50 km to -11.91% in V4 km, accompanied by an increase in dust emission from 140.841 Tg to 232.920 Tg (+65.38%). The P95 wind-speed biases, however, show region-dependent responses and do not decrease uniformly with mesh refinement. Thus, the wind-speed bias changes should not be interpreted as a direct quantitative explanation for the emission differences among the simulations. Rather, these diagnostics provide a sub-daily observational assessment of the resolved wind field, while the dust-emission response also depends on the nonlinear threshold behavior of friction velocity and saltation in the S04 scheme. We have added the following discussion in Section 3.2.1 of the revised manuscript: “To further quantify the relationship between wind-speed biases and dust emission changes, Table S5 summarizes the 3-hourly surface wind statistics and corresponding emission responses among the three mesh configurations. The results show that mesh refinement generally reduces the wind-speed biases over major dust source regions and is accompanied by increased dust emissions. For example, over the MGD region, the wind-speed NMB changes from -16.97% in U50 km to -11.91% in V4 km, while the dust emission increases by 65.38%. The refined simulations also show reduced P95 wind-speed biases over some major source regions, particularly the TKD and MGD, indicating an improved representation of strong-wind conditions in these regions, which is accompanied by enhanced dust emission.”

Table S5. Comparison of 3-hourly surface wind-speed biases, extreme wind representation, and dust emission responses under different mesh configurations during 13-17 March 2021.

Region	Mesh	3-hourly wind	P95 wind bias	Dust emission	Emission change
		NMB (%)	(%)	(Tg)	relative to U50 (%)
TKD	U50 km	+61.17	+45.08	72.401	—
	V16 km	+48.86	+31.35	102.021	+40.91
	V4 km	+33.76	+34.97	105.412	+45.59
MGD	U50 km	-16.97	-17.36	140.841	—
	V16 km	-15.24	-13.87	194.115	+37.83
	V4 km	-11.91	-5.96	232.920	+65.38
HC-WIM	U50 km	+10.39	+9.39	33.760	—
	V16 km	+2.95	+11.50	44.497	+31.80

	V4 km	+2.05	+12.49	52.172	+54.54
LP	U50 km	+24.21	+14.81	1.625	—
	V16 km	+21.25	+38.97	1.911	+17.60
	V4 km	−3.14	+17.76	2.642	+62.58

Notes: Wind-speed statistics are calculated using collocated NOAA 3-hourly surface observations. The P95 wind bias represents the relative difference between simulated and observed 95th-percentile 3-hourly wind speeds. Dust emission changes are calculated relative to the U50 km simulation.

- *10. Please use terms such as “improvement” with caution, as the response to increasing resolution is not always monotonic across U50, V16, and V4.*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment regarding the interpretation of resolution-dependent changes and the use of terms such as “improvement”. We agree with the reviewer that the impacts of increasing resolution are not necessarily monotonic across U50 km, V16 km, and V4 km. We have therefore carefully checked and revised the descriptions in the Results section, especially those related to model evaluation and the impacts of mesh refinement. The wording has been adjusted to avoid implying that higher resolution always leads to improved performance and to emphasize that the response to mesh refinement depends on the evaluated process and region ([see Section 3 on Pages 17-35, Lines 449-985](#)).