

Forest and bioenergy expansion amplifies climate warming by accelerating regional cloud loss

Nanjian Liu^{1,3}, Zhixin Hao^{*1,3}, Siyou Xia⁴, Peng Zhao^{2,3}

1. Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China

2. State Key Laboratory of Mountain Hazards and Engineering Safety, Institute of Mountain Hazards and Environment, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chengdu 610299, China

3. University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

4. Department of Geography, University at Buffalo-SUNY, Buffalo 14261, USA

* Corresponding author: haozx@igsnrr.ac.cn.

Abstract

Land use and ~~land~~ cover change (LUCC) can exacerbate cloud-mediated climate warming. ~~however, yet, the~~ long-term responses of cloud cover to contrasting LUCC pathways remains poorly underexplored/quantified, particularly in comparisons between idealized and realistic forest expansion scenarios, as well as between forest and bioenergy expansion. Here, we performing transient simulations based on the fully coupled Community Earth System Model (CESM) under the SSP1-2.6 scenario to quantify how long-term cloud trends response to large-scale idealized afforestation (AF50, conversion of grassland or shrubland to forest), idealized bioenergy expansion (BE50, sugarcane expansion), and realistic afforestation (REAL). ~~Our results reveal we demonstrate~~ that large-scale idealized

afforestation drives a profound vertical restructuring of cloud cover trends, it steepened the decline of mid-level clouds and significantly accelerated low-level cloud loss from $-0.0153 \pm 0.0030\%/year$ in the control simulation (CTL) to $-0.0175 \pm 0.0036\%/year$ (1.14 times the CTL rate globally and 1.52 times over land). Concurrently, it amplified the global increase in high-level clouds by a factor of 1.5 (from $0.0053 \pm 0.0028\%/year$ to $0.0082 \pm 0.0028\%/year$) and ultimately accelerated total cloud cover loss over land (by 1.05 time). and Bioenergy expansion induced a similar but weaker vertical shift, accelerating the low-level loss rate from $-0.0153 \pm 0.0030\%/year$ in the CTL to $-0.0157 \pm 0.0032\%/year$ (1.03 times the CTL rate globally and 1.23 times over land) loss of low- and mid-level clouds while enhancing high level clouds, thereby amplifying regional warming hotspots via intensified positive shortwave cloud radiative forcing. In contrast, realistic afforestation yields slowed the loss rate of low- and mid-level clouds and yielded a net cooling effect, particularly suppressing warming in the mid-to-high latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere. Analysis employing a coupled, well-trained interpretable machine learning framework reveals that these cloud trends are primarily driven by LUCC-induced atmospheric moisture deficits; changes in relative humidity account for 20.4%, 20.4%, and 15.3% of the low-level cloud change under the AF50, BE50, and REAL scenarios, respectively. The dominant mechanism is that forest expansion-induced surface darkening decreases surface albedo and elevates sensible heat flux, which in turn deepens the planetary boundary layer. This deepening enhances the entrainment of overlying dry air and causes the lifting condensation level to ascend faster than the boundary layer top, which prevents moisture saturation and consequently accelerates low-cloud dissipation. At the same time, it is also subject to remote modulation by planetary Rossby waves. Consequently, this accelerated

depletion of low-level clouds triggers an anomalous positive shortwave cloud radiative forcing, which, combined with enhanced longwave greenhouse warming from a concurrent increase in high-level clouds, synergistically amplifies regional climate warming hotspots.~~Idealized afforestation drives quite rapid low level cloud decline (1.14 times globally, 1.52 times over land), followed by bioenergy expansion (1.03 times globally and 1.23 times over land), primarily driven by reduced total precipitable water and relative humidity, as revealed by an interpretable machine learning framework, which identifies biophysical warming of the boundary layer due to albedo driven surface heating and enhanced sensible heat flux as the dominant mechanism. Forest darkening lowers albedo increases absorbed solar radiation, and elevates sensible heat, thereby drying the boundary layer and suppressing cloud formation. Realistic afforestation, conversely, slows low and mid level cloud loss and suppresses boreal warming. Our results demonstrate that larger-scale forest expansion does not necessarily deliver greater climate cooling benefits; the sign and magnitude of the outcome depend not only on the latitude band of land conversion but, more critically, on the type of land conversion.~~Our findings indicate that more forest expansion does not necessarily produce more positive climate benefits, it largely depends on the type of land conversion and specific latitude bands, and highlights the critical importance of carefully selecting afforestation areas in the future to achieve positive climate benefits. These findings highlight that within currently popular land-based carbon removal strategies, it is imperative to carefully target the geographic locations and land types for future afforestation, while explicitly accounting for the cloud-mediated feedback induced by such large-scale land-use changes.

Keywords: Land use change; afforestation; bioenergy; cloud trend; climate warming

1. Introduction

Large-scale atmospheric circulation systems on Earth directly facilitate cloud formation through thermodynamic uplift and cooling mechanisms (Boucher et al., 2013; Klein et al., 2017; Nomokonova et al., 2020). Clouds play a crucial role in modulating the radiative energy balance at the top of the atmosphere (TOA) and the Earth's surface, with their impacts indirectly linked to temperature variations (Schneider, 1972; Karl et al., 1993; Bretherton et al., 2009; Boehm and Thompson, 2023). For instance, low-level clouds, characterized by high albedo and significant optical depth, exert a substantial net cooling effect by reducing surface solar irradiance. In contrast, optically thinner high-altitude clouds, with an albedo approximately one-eighth that of low clouds, frequently induce net positive radiative forcing (Liou and Ou, 1983). The modulation of radiative balance and temperature by clouds is profoundly contingent upon their physical attributes, including type, thickness, liquid water path, and the dimensions of constituent particles (Albrecht et al., 1989; Stephens, 2005). The characteristics of cloud cover make it possible for them to play an amplifying role in climate warming (Ceppi and Nowack, 2021; Liu et al., 2025).

Clouds have been demonstrated to exert positive cloud feedback in nearly all climate models (Kiehl, 2007; Zelinka et al., 2017). Recent studies integrating satellite observations substantiate this assertion, revealing that cloud belts in equatorial and mid-latitude regions are contracting at a rate of 1.5-3% per decade (Tselioudis et al., 2025). This subtle disparity between incident and reflected radiation, arising from variations in cloud fraction, exacerbates Earth's planetary energy imbalance and amplifies climate warming (Li et al., 2024; Luo et al., 2024a; Mauritsen et al., 2025; Shi et al., 2025). Further evidence indicates that the diminution of low-level cloud cover in certain regions during the initial two

decades of the 21st century has directly intensified anomalous regional temperature elevations, thereby facilitating the emergence of new climate warming hotspots (Tselioudis et al., 2024; Tselioudis et al., 2025). Contemporaneous investigations elucidate that the recent widening of Earth's energy imbalance gap and ~~unprecedented-record-breaking~~ temperature highs are attributable to a marked decline in low-level cloud cover (Loeb et al., 2024; Goessling et al., 2025), with the underlying driver of cloud cover decrease being the escalation of greenhouse gas emissions from anthropogenic activities (Luo et al., 2024^a). Among these, land use changes since the Industrial Revolution have contributed approximately one-third of the greenhouse warming through the emission of greenhouse gases (Houghton, 2002; Goldewijk et al., 2004; Foley et al., 2005; van der Werf et al., 2009; Hong et al., 2021). Nevertheless, it remains unknown whether shifts in surface land cover types will render clouds less climatically beneficial and contribute to the formation of new warming hotspots.

Large-scale land use and ~~land~~-cover change (LUCC) is altering circulation patterns in local and remote regions (Portmann et al., 2022⁴). Forests, as a common form of land cover, are ~~highly-widely favored-recognized for~~ absorbing atmospheric ~~carbon dioxide~~ (CO₂) and mitigating climate warming (Peng et al., 2014). Changes in forests have been observed to exhibit significant interactions in heat fluxes and moisture between the surface and atmosphere from annual to seasonal scales; alterations in turbulence and water cycles will inevitably disrupt the atmospheric background for cloud formation and may reshape climate warming hotspots (Cheng et al., 2024). For instance, darker-colored forests absorb more solar radiation, leading to increased local radiation, whereby the absorbed additional energy is partitioned into sensible heat flux to heat the surface and the atmospheric

设置了格式: 非上标/ 下标

temperature at the bottom of the boundary layer; this absorbed heat promotes the evaporation of surface and atmospheric moisture, thereby facilitating the development of shallow cumulus clouds (Ek and Holtslag, 2004). Compared to other vegetation, forests possess larger leaf area index (LAI) (Alkama and Cescatti, 2016), therefore, large-scale forest expansion enhances evapotranspiration by replacing croplands or grasslands, elevating atmospheric water vapor content and optimizing condensation environments, thereby increasing cloud cover and mitigating regional warming effects. Prior studies in Europe also indicate that forests overhead possess greater potential for cloud formation (Teuling et al., 2017). Another study on afforestation also demonstrates that the presence of forests augments low-level cloud amounts, and it is projected to yield positive climate benefits through such enhanced low-level cloud fraction; however, in regions with snow cover, this may result in diminished cloud amounts and engender converse climate effects (Duveiller et al., 2018; Duveiller et al., 2021; Breil et al., 2024). Recent studies have increasingly emphasized the critical role of cloud feedback in modulating the net climate impacts of land cover changes. For instance, Luo et al. (2024b) demonstrated that decreased cloud cover following deforestation partially offsets the cooling effect caused by increased surface albedo. Furthermore, Dror and Feingold. (2026) quantified how Amazon forest loss alters cloud properties and cloud albedo, exerting an all-sky biophysical top-of-atmosphere cooling feedback. These findings highlight the strong coupling between forest cover dynamics and cloud albedo responses, reinforcing the need to rigorously evaluate cloud-mediated radiative effects in land-use change scenarios.

Another distinctly divergent land use changes, namely the expansion of bioenergy crops, lacks the popularity is less commonly implemented of than forests owing to its

comparatively diminished CO₂ sequestration capacity, yet it can engender sufficiently substantial climate mitigation extents through bio-geochemical and bio-geophysical processes (Georgescu et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2021; Cheng et al., 2024). However, conversely, the cultivation of bioenergy crops may precipitate unintended ramifications, such as the depletion of deep soil moisture and the amplification of water resource deficits (Righelato and Spracklen, 2007; Cheng et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023), with these adverse effects typically manifesting more pronouncedly at regional scales than at global scales (Hallgren et al., 2013). In contradistinction to the elevated evapotranspiration rates of forests, low-transpiration bioenergy crops (such as switchgrass) commonly exhibit lower LAI, a physical attribute that may diminish the efficiency of moisture conveyance between the atmosphere and terrestrial surfaces, thereby impeding enhancements in atmospheric humidity and consequently precipitating reductions in local cloud cover (Bala et al., 2007). Both forest and bioenergy expansions exert varying degrees of influence on temperature, water cycles, and clouds through radiative and non-radiative processes; such influences may render the atmosphere more humid or arid across ranges extending hundreds of kilometers, thereby modulating cloud formation and subsequently reshaping the configuration of warming hotspots via cloud radiative effect (Cerasoli et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021). Although the impacts of LUCC on atmospheric circulation play a pivotal role in projecting future climate changes and have been extensively investigated (Feddema et al., 2005; Swann et al., 2012; Li et al., 2018), comprehension of its effects on long-term trends in cloud cover remains largely unknown, particularly as the expansion of bioenergy has not received commensurate attention to that afforded to forest expansion. Therefore, it is reasonable to hypothesize it is entirely feasible to advance reasonable hypotheses positing

that LUCC affects the generation and trends of local or remote cloud cover through complex or straightforward mechanisms (Hua et al., 2023).

Large-scale LUCC has the potential to reshape future cloud cover trajectories via intricate bio-geophysical feedback. To quantify these effects, we employed the Community Earth System Model (CESM) to conduct transient, fully coupled simulations spanning 2015 to 2100.~~We hypothesize that future large-scale LUCC scenarios will significantly modulate cloud cover trajectories through complex biogeophysical feedback. To test this, we utilized the Community Earth System Model (CESM) to perform fully coupled simulations from 2015 to 2100.~~ Our results demonstrate that while realistic afforestation may offer regional climate benefits, large-scale idealized ~~large-scale~~ forest and bioenergy expansion could exacerbate the decline of mid-to-low-level clouds while accelerating the increase of high-level clouds. These structural shifts in cloud cover amplify shortwave radiative forcing, thereby intensifying the formation of regional warming hotspots. These results highlight the divergent climate impacts of land-cover transitions. While poorly constrained land-management scenarios risk undermining the cooling capacity of clouds and amplifying future climate warming, realistic afforestation pathways can effectively buffer this loss, thereby preserving essential biophysical cooling.~~These findings suggest that future land management strategies may inadvertently diminish the climatic cooling capacity of cloud systems.~~

2. Data and Methods

2.1. Data

The ERA5 reanalysis data from the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF), specifically the 2 m air temperature and cloud cover, were obtained

from the Copernicus Climate Data Store (Muñoz-Sabater et al., 2021) to validate the CESM model simulations of near-surface temperature and cloud fraction. In addition, near-surface temperature fields from the National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) reanalysis were used to further evaluate the Community Earth System Model (CESM) model's temperature simulation performance and are available from <https://psl.noaa.gov/> (Kalnay et al., 1996). The data used to validate the CESM model's capabilities comes from ECMWF Reanalysis v5 (ERA5), downloaded from the Copernicus Climate Service (<https://eds.climate.copernicus.eu/datasets>) (Muñoz-Sabater et al., 2021). National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) temperature, used to validate the simulation performance of temperature, is available from <https://psl.noaa.gov/>. The Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) dataset, used to validate the CESM model's performance in simulating recent precipitation, was obtained from <http://gpcp.umd.edu/> (Adler et al., 2018; Huffman et al., 2023). An additional precipitation dataset is the CPC Merged Analysis of Precipitation (CMAP), which can be downloaded from <https://psl.noaa.gov/data/gridded/data.cmap.html> (Xie and Arkin, 1997). Finally, the core input data in this study is the land use data from Land-Use Harmonization 2 (LUH2) (Hurt et al., 2020), downloaded from <https://svn-ccsm-inputdata.cgd.ucar.edu/trunk/inputdata/>.

2.2. Earth system simulation

We conducted the online simulations with the Community Earth System Model (CESM, version 2.1.3, <https://www.cesm.ucar.edu/models/cesm2>) (Danabasoglu et al., 2020). As a state-of-the-art tool in climate prediction, this model ~~faithfully~~accurately reproduces twentieth-century climate dynamics and surface sea temperatures while demonstrating high skill ~~excelling~~ in projections of essential climate variables and

设置了格式: 默认段落字体, 字体: (默认) + 西文正文 (Calibri), (中文) + 中文正文 (等线), 11 磅

atmospheric circulations (Danabasoglu et al., 2020; Fasullo, 2020). Similar to earlier versions (Lin and Rood, 1997), the atmospheric and land-surface component of CESM employs the Lin-Rood Finite-Volume (FV) dynamical core, though notable improvements have been introduced in atmospheric physics (Lin and Rood, 1997). Compared to its predecessor, ~~the FV1~~, the new generation FV mainly adjusted its cloud parameters (Zhu et al., 2022). CESM incorporates the Community Atmosphere Model Version 6 (CAM6) as its atmospheric component, offering a high-top option (with 70 pressure levels reaching ~130 km) and a standard option (with 32 pressure levels reaching ~40 km). In this study, we utilize the standard low-top setup, which effectively simulates tropospheric atmospheric processes. CAM6 describes the atmospheric motion by the dynamics and sub-grid precipitation, cloud, and turbulence processes by the physics (Worley et al., 2011). Of particular relevance to our study is enhanced cloud-microphysics parameterization in CAM6: the Morrison-Gettelman 2 (MG2) scheme, which overcomes the prior constraint by explicitly predicting raindrop and snow-particle sizes (Morrison and Gettelman, 2008; Gettelman and Morrison, 2015). Accompanying enhancements feature the consolidated turbulence parameterization, incorporating a multivariate binormal probability density function (PDF) to collectively depict sub-grid fluctuations in temperature, humidity, and vertical velocity (Larson, 2017). At the same time, CESM classifies clouds across altitudes according to their cloud top pressure, delineating low-level cloud from 700 hPa to the surface, middle-level cloud from 700–400 hPa, and high-level cloud above 400 hPa (Danabasoglu et al., 2020).

Before launching the simulations, we first evaluated the performance of CESM to reproduce historical climate change. The historical run employed the BHIST compset and

was carried out online at $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ resolution. Monthly output in the period of 1979–2014 were used for model validation; to match the model grid, all observational datasets were conservatively interpolated to the CESM resolution. Annual and seasonal evaluations of temperature and cloud fraction show that CESM satisfactorily captures present-day climate variability (Figs. S124–S627). More importantly, CESM reproduces the spatial patterns of cloud cover trends seen in the reanalysis data (Fig. S3), this is precisely the focus of this study. CESM also reproduces the observed global precipitation reasonably well, with a small global mean bias of only 0.2mm/day (Fig. S6). Then, the specific land-use forcing simulation design is implemented in the Community Land Model Version 5 (CLM5) within CESM. Relative to its predecessors, CLM5 incorporates advances in soil hydrology, crop modeling, fire feedbacks, and biogeochemical cycling, thereby enhancing the representation of anthropogenic land-use change within the climate system (Swenson and Lawrence, 2012; Li et al., 2017; Levis et al., 2018; Lawrence et al., 2019). The idealized simulation experiments in this study were all conducted based on Land-Use Harmonization 2 (LUH2) (Hurtt et al., 2020). CLM5 represents land-surface heterogeneity through a nested sub-grid hierarchy, allowing multiple land-unit to coexist within each grid cell (Oleson et al., 2013). Although CLM5 is not configured with a dynamic vegetation model, the time-varying landuse.timeseries dataset provided by the model allows vegetation's physiological processes (such as photosynthesis, transpiration, etc.) to be explicitly simulated (Lawrence et al., 2019; Cheng et al., 2022).

According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) definition of afforestation, it refers to the establishment of new forests on land that was not previously classified as forest through planting or deliberate seeding (FAO, 2012). This

implies a fundamental change in land use types, for instance, from cropland to forest or from grassland to forest (FAO, 2012). Therefore, ~~in our simulation experiments, we~~ follow ~~ing~~ the FAO definition, ~~we~~ constructed idealized land-use datasets for forest and bioenergy ~~crop~~ expansion simulations. In CLM5, there are eight tree plant functional types (PFTs), indexed from 1 to 8, and 64 crop functional types (CFTs). In CLM5, PFTs and CFTs coexist on nested sub-grid tiles that jointly mediate energy and moisture exchanges between the land surface and the atmosphere (Lawrence et al., 2019; Lombardozzi et al., 2020). We therefore implement forest and bioenergy expansion by altering their fractional areas at the sub-grid scale, consistent with previous studies (Dickinson and Henderson-Sellers, 1988; Swann et al., 2018). Specifically, our simulation experiments comprise a control run (CTL) in which land-cover fractions are held constant at 2015 levels, an idealized 50-% linear afforestation scenario (AF50), an idealized 50-% bioenergy crop expansion scenario (BE50), and a realistic forest expansion scenario (REAL) derived from previous studies (Roe et al., 2021; King et al., 2024; Weber et al., 2024), this land-use pathway exhibits a maximum 26 % forest-expansion pattern by 2100, representing an increase of 7.5 million km² relative to 2015 levels (Fig. S9), primarily distributed across tropical South America, Central Africa, and central North America (Fig. S7; Fig. S8). Regarding the land area changes in the idealized afforestation scenario, approximately 29.3 million km² of grasslands and shrublands are converted to forests by 2100 relative to 2015 levels (Fig. S9), with a widespread global distribution (Fig. S7; Fig. S8). Previous studies suggest that the global extent of grasslands and shrublands is sufficient to support land conversion of this magnitude (Vittorio et al., 2018); furthermore, this approach aligns more closely with the strict definition of afforestation established by the FAO. However, the

设置了格式: 上标

设置了格式: 上标

275 REAL scenario does not strictly qualify as afforestation; it is more consistent with the
276 definitions of reforestation or forest enhancement. Nevertheless, for analytical convenience,
277 it is still referred to as an afforestation simulation in this study. All future-period
278 simulations were conducted with the scientifically validated BSSP126 compset at $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$
279 (`f09_g17_gl4`) horizontal resolution, while the ocean component was run at 0.5° resolution,
280 the restart files for model initialization are derived from the National Center for
281 Atmospheric Research's 500-year equilibrated pre-industrial control simulation (Eyring et
282 al., 2016; Danabasoglu et al., 2020)~~control simulation during the Industrial Revolution~~
283 ~~period~~. In the idealized simulations, forest expansion is restricted to shrublands and
284 grasslands, with the newly forested area distributed evenly among the eight tree PFTs, this
285 practice of fundamentally converting land-cover types is also analogous to previous
286 deforestation studies (Swann et al., 2018), wherein forests are replaced by grasslands or
287 shrublands; bare ground is excluded, although some recent studies (Bastin et al., 2019;
288 Wang et al., 2024; Liang et al., 2025) advocate afforestation on bare soil. Bioenergy
289 expansion is represented by rainfed and irrigated sugarcane and occupies only existing
290 bioenergy land, thereby encroaching neither on forests nor on natural grasslands.
291 Bioenergy expansion is primarily driven by rainfed sugarcane cultivation. Relative to 2015,
292 the cultivated area is projected to increase by 6.4 million km² by the end of the century
293 (Fig. S923). Consistent with the Land Use Model Intercomparison Project (LUMIP)
294 protocol (Lawrence et al., 2016), all experimental setups differ solely in their land-use
295 forcing. Because atmospheric CO₂ is prescribed rather than prognostic, the simulated
296 climate response originates entirely from biophysical processes induced by land cover
297 change (e.g., changes in albedo and evapotranspiration). This configuration effectively

设置了格式: 上标

设置了格式: 下标

~~excludes the offsetting effects of biogeochemical feedback (i.e., carbon sequestration) on short-term climate response. This means that the simulated climate response originates entirely from biophysical processes triggered by land cover change (such as changes in albedo and evapotranspiration), excluding the offsetting effect of biogeochemical feedback (i.e., carbon sequestration) on short-term warming.~~ The climate response is quantified as the difference between each sensitivity experiment and the control run (CTL), with statistical significance ~~assessed-evaluated using via~~ a two-tailed *Student's t* test.

2.3. Attribution of LUCC-induced atmospheric changes to cloud trends

In this study, to ~~analyzedisentangle~~ the driving factors of cloud cover trends ~~induced~~ caused by different LUCC, we ~~apply-employed~~ the explainable Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost) model developed by Chen and Guestrin. (2016), whose proven capacity to ~~capture-resolve complex~~ nonlinear interactions and deliver high predictive skill has made it a workhorse in both atmospheric and ecological modelling (Ren et al., 2024; Flora et al., 2024). After model training, we use the SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) method, based on game theory (Lundberg and Lee, 2017; Lundberg et al., 2020), to uncover the relative contributions and dependencies of key variables to cloud cover trends (Berdugo et al., 2022). Specifically, we constructed ~~twelve-12 independent~~ models for the cloud and climate-change trends driven by LUCC and performed 100 times Bayesian hyperparameter searches (Snoek et al., 2012) and the optimized parameters name and the obtained best values are listed in Table_ S1. These predictors were selected to comprehensively represent the key physical processes controlling cloud formation and long-term trends under land use and cover change (Seneviratne et al., 2010; Stull, 2012; Wood, 2012; Santanello Jr et al., 2018). They can be grouped into several physically

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

meaningful categories: (1) surface energy and moisture fluxes, which directly reflect changes in surface energy partitioning induced by alterations in albedo and vegetation; (2) boundary layer structure, which captures the vertical extent and mixing intensity of the planetary boundary layer; (3) near-surface thermodynamic conditions, which govern saturation and cloud formation; (4) large-scale moisture availability and precipitation; and (5) atmospheric instability. In particular, sensible heat flux and planetary boundary layer height were included to represent critical upstream biophysical processes.

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

2.4. Calculation of cloud radiative effect

Cloud radiative effect (CRE) is commonly used to evaluate the cooling or warming influence of clouds on the Earth-atmosphere system (Goldblatt et al., 2021; Luo et al., 2024a), measured at the top of the atmosphere (TOA), in the atmosphere, or at the surface (Zhang et al., 2022), which consists of shortwave CRE (swCRE), longwave CRE (lwCRE) and netCRE (the sum of swCRE and lwCRE). The lwCRE was calculated as the difference between downward longwave radiation at the surface under cloudy conditions and that under clear sky (Luo et al., 2024a). The swCRE is determined by the difference between downwelling solar flux at surface (FSDS, W/m²) and clear-sky downwelling solar flux at surface (FSDSC, W/m²), as well as upward shortwave radiation at the surface (FSUS, W/m²) and clear-sky (FSUSC, W/m²), as indicated in eq. (1) (Luo et al., 2024a).

设置了格式: 上标

$$\text{swCRE} = \text{FSDS} - \text{FSDSC} - \text{FSUS} + \text{FSUSC} \quad (1)$$

In eq. (1), FSUS and FSUSC are indirectly calculated via FSDS and FSDSC multiply albedo, as shown in eq. (2). FSNS (W/m²) denotes the net shortwave radiation at the surface. The clear-sky albedo is also calculated using a similar equation (Wang et al., 2024).

$$\text{Albedo} = 1 - \left(\frac{\text{FSNS}}{\text{FSDS}} \right) \quad (2)$$

2.5. Quantifying the impacts of land use change

We quantify the climate response to land-use change as the difference between the sensitivity simulations and the control run (CTL), represented by Δ . In this study, the impact of land use change on climate system is quantified as the difference between the control and sensitivity experiments, denoted by the symbol Δ . Using CLDTOT (%) as an example, this effect is formally defined in eq. (3) the effect of land use change on CLDTOT is defined by eq. (3).

$$\Delta \text{CLDTOT} = \text{AF50} - \text{CTL} \quad (3)$$

2.6. PixelGrid-based linear trend analysis

In this study, we conducted ordinary least squares (OLS) fitting through simple linear regression on-at every grid point to investigate the temporal variability patterns of atmospheric variables, encompassing cloud cover. The statistical significance of linear trend and sensitivity for each grid cell was derived from using a Student's t test, as expressed in eq.(4).

$$S = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n (x_{t,i,j} - \bar{x}_{i,j}) (y_{t,i,j} - \bar{y}_{i,j})}{\sum_{t=1}^n (x_{t,i,j} - \bar{x}_{i,j})^2} \quad (4)$$

2.7. Quantification of the inequality of cloud cover trends

Originally developed as an economic metric for wealth distribution (Atkinson, 1970), the Gini coefficient (Gini index) is adapted in this study to assess the spatial disparity of hemispheric cloud cover trends, similar to its recent applications in studies of global precipitation changes and ocean productivity variations (Zhao et al., 2025; Lesk and Mankin, 2026). Eq. (5) presents the continuous form of this index The Gini coefficient (Gini

index) is most often used in economics to measure the state of socio-economic development, and we use it here to analyze the hemispheric inequality of the cloud trend. The continuous equation for the Gini index is shown in eq.(5).

$$\text{Gini index} = 1 - 2 \int_0^1 L(x) dx \quad (5)$$

In this formulation, the Gini index is derived by integrating the area beneath the Lorenz curve. The Gini index is derived through the integration of the area beneath the Lorenz curve $L(x)$, which quantifies the cumulative distribution of the target variable relative to the cumulative spatial area, serving to quantify the cumulative proportion of the target variable relative to the total proportion.

2.8. Surface energy balance decomposition of temperature

To better reveal the impacts of LUCC at different scales on surface thermodynamic temperature, this study employs the surface energy balance equation to dissect the various physical components of surface temperature changes. Through this decomposition method, the surface temperature changes caused by afforestation and bioenergy expansion can be attributed to multiple direct (local) or indirect (non-local) biophysical processes. Previous studies have shown that the linear approximation method via first-order Taylor expansion is sufficiently accurate for assessing surface temperature anomalies induced by large-scale land cover changes (Lee et al., 2011; Devaraju et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2020; Sui et al., 2025). According to the principle of energy conservation, the radiation energy absorbed by the surface must equal the heat released, as described in eq. (6).

$$(1 - \alpha_s)SW_{\downarrow} + LW_{\downarrow} - \varepsilon\sigma T_s^4 = H + LE + G \quad (6)$$

In eq.(6), α_s represents surface albedo (dimensionless), and $SW_{\downarrow}$ denotes downward shortwave radiation (W/m²); thus, $(1 - \alpha_s)SW_{\downarrow}$ represents net shortwave radiation at the

surface (W/m^2) . $LW_{\downarrow}$ denotes downward longwave radiation ~~from~~ at the surface (W/m^2) . ε is surface emissivity (dimensionless), a parameter used to describe how closely the Earth approximates a perfect black-body, with typical values less than 1 (0.7 in this study). σ is the Stefan-Boltzmann constant ($5.671 \times 10^{-8} \text{ W/m}^2 \text{ K}^{-4}$). H represents sensible heat flux (W/m^2) , LE represents latent heat flux (W/m^2) , T_s is surface temperature $(^\circ\text{C})$, and G is surface heat flux (W/m^2) , this value typically varies very little and can therefore be neglected in calculations). Rearranging and transforming the equation yields eq. (7), where ρ is air density (1.29 kg/m^3), C_p is specific heat capacity of air at constant pressure (1030 J/kg/K), r_a is aerodynamic resistance (s/m), T_a is air temperature at 2 meters $(^\circ\text{C})$, and β represents the Bowen ratio (dimensionless).

$$\varepsilon \sigma T_s^4 = (1 - \alpha_s) SW_{\downarrow} + LW_{\downarrow} - \frac{(1 + \beta) \rho C_p}{\beta r_a} (T_s - T_a) \quad (7)$$

Linearizing eq.(7) yields the difference in surface temperature changes ΔT_s between ~~the each~~ sensitivity experiments and the CTL experiment. After linear decomposition, the equation allows the surface temperature change ΔT_s to be explicitly expressed as a function of albedo (α_s), turbulent processes (β), surface roughness or aerodynamic resistance (r_a), cloud radiation effects ($LW_{\downarrow}$ and $SW_{\downarrow}$), and atmospheric feedback (T_a), as shown on the right-hand side (RHS) of eq.(8). The first three physical terms on the RHS represent the local changes induced by LUCC, while the latter three terms indicate non-local responses (Devaraju et al., 2018).

$$\Delta T_s = \left(\frac{-\lambda_0 SW_{\downarrow}}{1 + f} \right) \Delta \alpha + \left[\frac{\lambda_0 H}{(1 + f) \beta^2} \right] \Delta \beta + \left[\frac{f H}{(1 + f) \rho C_p} \right] \Delta r_a + \left[\frac{\lambda_0 (1 - \alpha)}{1 + f} \right] \Delta SW_{\downarrow} + \left(\frac{\lambda_0}{1 + f} \right) \Delta LW_{\downarrow} + \left(\frac{f}{1 + f} \right) \Delta T_a \quad (8)$$

In eq.(8), λ_0 and f represent the temperature sensitivity coefficient and the energy redistribution coefficient, respectively, as defined by eq.(9) and (10). These two parameters respectively describe the response of black-body radiation to temperature and how turbulent fluxes regulate surface temperature (Dickinson, 1983; Lee et al., 2011).

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{4\sigma\epsilon T_s^3} \quad (9)$$

$$f = \frac{\rho C_p}{4\sigma\epsilon T_s^3 \tau_a} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\beta}\right) \quad (10)$$

Finally, we calculate the annual trend of each term using eq. (4). In this way, the long-term trends of each physical term induced by LUCC forcing can be investigated.

2.9 Attribution of non-local temperature responses via horizontal temperature advection

Temperature advection is a primary driver of non-local temperature responses to large-scale LUCC. Changes in surface energy fluxes trigger boundary-layer dynamics and mesoscale circulations that transport thermal local perturbations through wind fields to remote regions (Pielke Sr et al., 1998; Fig. S10). Following previous studies (Kan et al., 2025), we evaluate horizontal temperature advection (T_{adv}) at 850 hPa, the critical interface between the boundary layer and the free troposphere. This is defined in eq. (11), where u and v are the horizontal winds at this standard isobaric level, and $\frac{\partial T}{\partial x}$, $\frac{\partial T}{\partial y}$ represent the zonal and meridional temperature gradients, respectively. Therefore, temperature advection can be decomposed into zonal (T_{adv}^u) and meridional (T_{adv}^v) components. Finally, the difference of temperature advection (ΔT_{adv}) between the sensitivity and control experiments elucidates the atmospheric dynamic mechanisms underpinning LUCC-induced teleconnections.

设置了格式: 字体: 四号, 加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗, 倾斜

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗, 倾斜, 下标

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗, 倾斜

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗, 倾斜

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗, 倾斜

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗, 倾斜, 下标

设置了格式: 字体: 小四, 非加粗

$$T_{adv} = T_{adv}^u + T_{adv}^v = \left(-u \frac{\partial T}{\partial x}\right) + \left(-v \frac{\partial T}{\partial y}\right) \quad (11)$$

2.10 Diagnosing planetary wave activity using Plumb fluxes

To capture the dominant propagation characteristics of Rossby waves in the middle-to-upper troposphere, we evaluated the wave activity at the 500 hPa isobaric level, consistent with previous studies (Harada and Nakagawa, 2017; Kan et al., 2025). This altitude serves as a canonical diagnostic layer for vigorous planetary wave activity, particularly for quasi-stationary and stationary Rossby waves. Located near the mid-to-upper tropospheric jet core, wave activity fluxes at 500 hPa clearly manifest the mid-to-upper atmospheric response to surface perturbations, while mitigating the interference of near-surface friction and turbulent dissipation. Consequently, the wave activity flux (WAF) constitutes an essential tool in atmospheric dynamics for diagnosing Rossby wave energy transport, effectively tracing the propagation pathways, directions, and intensities of planetary waves. In this study, we utilized the two-dimensional WAF formulation (Plumb, 1985). Because this flux is parallel to the Rossby wave group velocity, it intuitively delineates the two-dimensional propagation of planetary wave energy, as detailed in eq. (12).

$$F_s = \frac{p}{p_0} \cos(\varphi) \times \begin{bmatrix} u'^2 - \frac{1}{2\Omega a \sin 2\varphi} \frac{\partial(v'\Phi')}{\partial \lambda} \\ -u'v' + \frac{1}{2\Omega a \sin 2\varphi} \frac{\partial(u'\Phi')}{\partial \lambda} \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

Here, the $\bar{\cdot}$ and $\cdot'$ superscripts denote the zonal mean and the deviation from it, respectively; φ, λ, Φ denotes latitude, longitude, and geopotential height, respectively; $2\Omega \sin(\varphi)$ represents the Coriolis parameter, where a is the Earth's radius and Ω is the Earth's rotation rate. p_0 denotes the near-surface reference pressure (1000 hPa). The u and

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 四号, 加粗

带格式的: 两端对齐, 首行缩进: 2 字符, 段落间距段后: 0 磅, 行距: 2 倍行距

设置了格式: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, (中文) 宋体

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: Times New Roman, 小四

设置了格式: 字体: Times New Roman, 小四

设置了格式: 字体: Times New Roman

设置了格式: 字体: Times New Roman

设置了格式: 字体: Times New Roman

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 倾斜

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 小四

设置了格式: 字体: 倾斜

u denote the zonal and meridional winds, respectively. This set of notations and parameter configurations is consistent with the two-dimensional wave activity flux formulation has been validated in numerous climate modeling studies (Huang and Nakamura, 2016; Kan et al., 2025).

设置了格式: 字体: 倾斜

设置了格式: 字体: Times New Roman, 小四

3. Results

3.1. Long-term response of cloud cover to LUCC forcings

Our simulations demonstrate that distinct land-use forcing significantly altered the global long-term trends in total cloud cover (CLDTOT) and low-level clouds (CLDLOW) (Figure Fig. 1). While CLDTOT exhibited a moderate negative trend in both CTL ($-0.0083 \pm 0.0020 \pm 0.0037\%/year$, $R = -0.6547$) and the bioenergy expansion experiment (BE50, $-0.0083 \pm 0.0020\%/year$, $R = -0.6363$), the idealized (AF50) and realistic afforestation (REAL) scenarios modestly attenuated this decline to $-0.0072 \pm 0.0025\%/year$ and $-0.0069 \pm 0.0021\%/year$, respectively. This suggests that the enhanced evapotranspiration and increased surface roughness associated with afforestation, coupled with a compensatory increase in cloud cover at other cloud-top heights, may provide a buffering effect against the loss of total cloud cover (Duveiller et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2022). Secondly, this global attenuation is largely driven by a weakened cloud loss over the oceans, where the CLDTOT decline rate of $-0.0073 \pm 0.0019\%/year$ in the CTL simulation was mitigated to $-0.0054 \pm 0.0025\%/year$ in AF50 (Fig. S11a,b). Notably, however, idealized afforestation exacerbated the loss of CLDTOT over land, accelerating the decline rate by a factor of 1.05 relative to the CTL run. CLDLOW exhibited the most pronounced and contrasting response, was simulated in CLDLOW. While idealized afforestation accelerated the decline of CLDLOW by a factor of 1.14 relative to the CTL simulation, induced a rapid

loss, representing an approximately 1.14 times increase in loss rate compared to the CTL simulation and this effect was particularly notably strong amplified over land, where the loss rate increased by a factor of 1.52. AF50 accelerated the decline rate by 1.52 times (Figure—Fig. S11e,f). This suggests that the extensive conversion of grasslands or shrublands into forests/afforestation may directly reduce low-level clouds by altering surface evapotranspiration and promoting deeper and well-mixed planetary boundary layer with elevated lifting condensation level (LCL) enhancing boundary layer stability, forming a negative feedback mechanism (Duveiller et al., 2021; Leung et al., 2024; King et al., 2024). This acceleration is consistent with the biophysical mechanism whereby albedo reduction from idealized afforestation increases sensible heat flux and Bowen ratio, driving stronger buoyant turbulence and the development of a deeper, well-mixed planetary boundary layer (Bright et al., 2017). The resulting enhanced entrainment of dry air and faster rise of the lifting condensation level relative to planetary boundary layer top growth suppress low-level cloud formation, particularly over water-limited mid-to-high latitude land regions (Ek and Holtslag, 2004; Bonan, 2008). In stark contrast, the REAL scenario suppressed the global CLDLOW loss rate (from $-0.0153 \pm 0.0030\%$ /year in CTL to $-0.0148 \pm 0.0029\%$ /year) (Fig. 1e,h). Meanwhile, the BE50 scenario induced a marginal acceleration in the decline ($-0.0157 \pm 0.0032\%$ /year), equating to a factor of 1.03 globally and 1.23 specifically over land (reaching $-0.0207 \pm 0.0024\%$ /year) (Fig. S11). Furthermore, all simulations consistently suppressed the loss rate of low-level clouds over the ocean, modifying the trends to $-0.0142 \pm 0.0039\%$ /year for REAL and $-0.0137 \pm 0.0042\%$ /year for BE50 (Fig. S11). In stark contrast, the realistic afforestation scenario suppressed the CLDLOW loss rate, while BE50 induced only a minimal loss rate (1.03 times, 1.23 times


on land). In addition, all simulations suppressed the loss rate of low-level clouds over the ocean (Figure S4). These findings highlight a complex spectrum of biophysical feedback, while extreme land-cover transitions, such as the idealized conversion of grassland or shrubland to forest, trigger strong feedback that accelerate low-level cloud loss, realistic afforestation act as crucial stabilizers against this cloud cover loss.


Medium-level clouds (CLDMED) exhibited a consistent downward response to land-use forcings, with trends ranging from $-0.0101 \pm 0.00640017\%$ /year in CTL to $-0.0121 \pm 0.00730018\%$ /year in AF50, idealized scenarios (AF50 and BE50) induced slightly steeper trends (Fig. 1). Conversely, high-level clouds (CLDHGH) displayed robust positive trends across all land use forcing simulations, with slopes trends varying increasing from $0.0053 \pm 0.004420028\%$ /year in CTL to $0.0082 \pm 0.004390028\%$ /year in AF50. This variation is largely dominated by large-scale thermodynamic forcing, as linear models for CLDHGH explained only captured only a moderate fraction (37%-46%) of the overall variability (Fig. S1e–1m-p). Crucially, both idealized and realistic afforestation amplified this upward trend in CLDHGH. Compared-Relative to CTL run, AF50 enhanced accelerated the global upward trend increase by approximately a factor of 1.5 times, (an effect that was heavily magnified over land (by a factor of 2.28 times on land and) compared to the ocean (1.41) times on ocean), and Similarly, REAL enhanced it by about 1.3 times (2.17 times on land and 1.16 times on ocean). Ocean changes were generally insignificant, possibly due to the buffering effect of remote atmospheric transport (Portmann et al., 2022).

The robust amplification of the CLDHGH positive trend by afforestation, coupled with the acceleration of CLDLOW loss, highlights a critical trade-off in land-based climate

mitigation (Luyssaert et al., 2018). While greenhouse gas-induced warming is known to
elevate high-cloud tops and amplify climate warming. Prior analyses have demonstrated that
greenhouse warming elevates high-level cloud-top heights, thereby amplifying climate
warming (Norris et al., 2016; Zelinka et al., 2016; Luo et al., 2024a). Our findings reveal a
compounding risk, we demonstrate that future large-scale afforestation, particularly under
idealized scenarios, could inadvertently exacerbate this warming by reinforcing the
positive high-level cloud feedback. Our findings indicate that large-scale afforestation in the
future, particularly under idealized global implementation scenarios, could inadvertently
intensify climate warming by amplifying the high-level cloud feedback mechanism.
Moreover, this effect is further compounded by the pronounced accelerated depletion of
low-level clouds over land (as seen in the AF50 scenario), which triggers an adverse
biophysical feedback that fundamentally compromises the anticipated cooling benefits of
forest expansion. the pronounced acceleration of low-level cloud depletion over land in the
AF50 scenario suggests adverse surface biophysical feedback. Conversely, the REAL
scenario exerts a minimal climate perturbation, effectively buffering the background cloud
loss. the minimal interference observed in the REAL scenario. This resilience is largely
driven by the spatially targeted allocation of forest expansion, which often slows cloud loss
rates, is largely attributed to the strategically focused location of forest expansion (King et
al., 2024; Weber et al., 2024; Fig. S12), which constrains cloud feedbacks within the
bounds of natural variability, leading to cloud feedback closer to natural variability.
However, even realistic afforestation carries the risk of exacerbating the increasing trend
of high-level clouds, thereby potentially inducing positive radiative forcing at the top of
the atmosphere. This indicates that large-scale LUCC affects the lower and upper

atmosphere in different ways (Dror and Feingold, 2026). Our findings regarding the divergent directional responses of low and high-level clouds to large-scale LUCC align with simulation evidence from moderate-intensity afforestation scenarios; this suggests that high clouds and deep convection are generally weakly coupled to local surface perturbations, responding primarily to large-scale upper-tropospheric dynamic and thermodynamic conditions rather than to subtle local biophysical forcing (Zhang et al., 2016; King et al., 2024).








Figure 1. Simulated long-term trends and seasonal variations of area-weighted global mean cloud cover. Panels display the time series (2015–2100) for total (a–d), low (e–h), medium (i–l), and high-level (m–p) cloud cover, under CTL, AF50, BE50, and REAL scenarios. In each panel, heatmaps show the monthly variations, while blue and solid lines track the global annual means. Linear trend lines (dashed) and multi-year means (horizontal solid lines) are superimposed, with statistical significance (p) and regression coefficients (R) provided. The shaded areas indicate the 95% confidence intervals (CI). Uncertainty propagation for baseline subtractions was performed via quadrature addition of standard errors (Taylor, 1997; Mastrandrea et al., 2010). **Long-term change and area-weighted global mean trends of cloud cover in different simulations.** The shade indicates 95% confidence interval (CI). When subtracting from the CTL simulation results, the associated uncertainty was propagated using quadrature addition of standard errors (Taylor, 1997; Mastrandrea et al., 2010).

3.2. Spatial response of cloud cover to LUCC forcings

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗, 倾斜

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

Distinct land use forcings exerted pronounced ~~regional-spatially asymmetric~~ impacts on long-term cloud cover trends, ~~characterized by stark~~~~exhibiting substantial~~ geographic heterogeneity ~~across-between~~ hemispheres and ~~between-across~~ land-and-ocean ~~areas~~ ~~partitions~~ (Figure-Fig. 2; Figure-Fig. S122-S155). In the Northern Hemisphere (NH), ~~Both~~ afforestation and bioenergy expansion ~~drove-triggered~~ ~~widespread~~ negative CLDTOT trends ~~in the Northern Hemisphere (NH)~~. Notably, BE50 ~~scenario~~ induced the steepest overall decline (mean CLDTOT trend: -0.0045-%/year), ~~accelerating-amplifying~~ the loss ~~rate at a rate approximately by a factor of 2.43 compared to the times that of~~ AF50 ~~scenario~~ (mean: -0.0019-%/year). However, the most striking ~~spatial anomaly emerged in~~ ~~the feature was the intense, concentrated~~ CLDLOW ~~regime under loss induced by~~ AF50 (mean NH trend: -0.0060-%/year). Negative CLDLOW trends were strongly localized over mid-to-high latitude landmasses in North America and Eurasia, with the intensity of loss in these land regions being 20 times that of the overall Southern Hemisphere (SH). This phenomenon, indicative of exacerbated seasonal losses during summer, was also evident in BE50 and REAL simulations, suggesting a general latitude dependency (Figure-Fig. 3; Figure-Fig. S123-S134). Furthermore, CLDMED trends displayed regional divergence, with BE50 inducing CLDMED increases in Australia and Southeast Asia while AF50 amplified losses in those same regions.

At the global scale, ~~the investigated both~~ LUCC forcings ~~led to~~~~drove~~ a spatial contraction of ~~regional-the~~ cloud loss ~~areas-but~~~~footprint~~, ~~critically~~~~paradoxically~~, ~~an intensification of loss magnitudes~~ accompanied by an intensification of local loss ~~magnitudes~~ (Figure-Fig. S166). For instance, while the AF50 scenario contracted the ~~global CLDTOT loss area by 6.01%~~, the severity of cloud depletion within these confined

regions escalated significantly (Fig. S16a-b). For instance, AF50 contracted the CLDTOT loss area by 6.01%, yet the intensity of losses within those areas increased significantly. This non-linear response demonstrates that idealized afforestation does not trigger a uniform global reduction in cloudiness; instead, it funnels biophysical perturbations into highly sensitive terrestrial regions, thereby generating localized, intense warming hotspots (Fig. 4a). The formation of such regional warming hotspots is largely associated with areas where grasslands or shrublands have transitioned into forests (Fig. S8). This indicates that idealized afforestation does not produce a linear, uniform reduction in cloud cover globally, but rather concentrates climate damage in a few land regions highly sensitive to biophysical forcing, creating highly concentrated climate warming hotspots. Furthermore, both REAL and BE50 scenarios amplified CLDHGH trend increases over Australia, and REAL induced a more intense mean CLDHGH trend in the SH compared to AF50 (Figure Fig. S122g-h). This implies that even realistic afforestation could inadvertently exacerbate regional warming by accelerating high-cloud formation over specific SH oceanic sectors. These results suggest that realistic afforestation may also contribute to warming by accelerating CLDHGH increases over certain SH oceanic regions. Additionally, it is noteworthy that realistic afforestation significantly exacerbates the rate of low-level cloud loss on the western side of South America, even though the forest expansion in this scenario primarily occurs on the southeastern side of the region. This pronounced spatial decoupling highlights critical remote biophysical teleconnections, suggesting that LUCC-induced, cloud-mediated drought risks could be particularly severe in these dynamically linked regions. However, this may lead to unexpected negative impacts on the climate of the other

side, and this indicates that the cloud-mediated drought risks induced by land use changes may be particularly prominent here (Li et al., 2025; Kan et al., 2025).




Figure 2. Spatial patterns of long-term total and low-level cloud cover trends driven by diverse land-use scenarios. Maps display the anomalous annual trends (%/year) of total cloud cover (a–f) and low-level cloud cover (g–l) for both the Northern and Southern Hemispheres. The visualized trends represent the differences (denoted by symbol Δ) between the specific land-use forcings (idealized afforestation, bioenergy expansion, and

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

realistic afforestation) and the control simulation. Blue shading indicates a decreasing trend in cloud cover, while red shading depicts an increasing trend. The cross-hatching highlights grid cells where the long-term trends are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Panel headers provide the regional mean trend, alongside the averages of all positive (Pos) and negative (Neg) grid-level trends within the respective domains. Long-term spatial trends of total and low-level cloud cover induced by the expansion of forest and bioenergy in Northern Hemisphere and Southern Hemisphere. The cross-hatching indicates the grids with a significant trend ($p < 0.05$).




Figure 3. Seasonal and latitudinal distributions of anomalous cloud cover trends under varying land-use scenarios. Heatmaps display the zonally averaged trend differences (%/year) across the seasonal cycle (x-axis, months) and latitudes (y-axis, 90°S to 90°N). Columns differentiate the responses for total (a, e, i), low-level (b, f, j), medium-

level (c, g, k), and high-level (d, h, l) cloud fractions. Rows correspond to the idealized afforestation (a–d), bioenergy expansion (e–h), and realistic afforestation (i–l) scenarios relative to the control run. Black asterisks mark grids where the trends are statistically significant at the 95% confidence level ($p < 0.05$). Responses of cloud cover trends to different land-use changes group by month. The black asterisk indicates the grids with a significant trend ($p < 0.05$).

3.3. The response of temperature and cloud radiative effect to LUCC

Beyond the direct (local) surface albedo effect, distinct land use forcings influence temperature trends and their spatial distribution primarily through indirect (non-local) cloud radiative effects (Schneider, 1972). While increases in temperature at reference height (TREFHT) are ubiquitous across all simulations (Fig. 4e–h), idealized afforestation does not merely amplify this background warming; rather, it coalesces these thermal trends into highly concentrated regional hotspots (Fig. 4a; Fig. S17a,e). This localized warming is predominantly driven by the mid- to high-latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere. To quantify this spatial aggregation, we applied the Gini coefficient to the positive temperature trends in the Northern Hemisphere. Notably, the coefficient shifts from 0.25 in the CTL simulation to 0.31 under the AF50 scenario (Fig. S17a,e). This stark exacerbation in spatial inequality demonstrates that large-scale idealized afforestation induces a highly skewed, uneven warming pattern—disproportionately penalizing specific latitudinal bands rather than distributing the thermal burden uniformly. The pronounced spatial aggregation of warming induced by the AF50 scenario is fundamentally driven by the extensive conversion of native grasslands and shrublands to forests (Fig. S8c). Because these non-forest biomes are inherently concentrated across mid-to-high latitudes (Olson et al., 2001;

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗, 倾斜

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

Dixon et al., 2014), their large-scale replacement disproportionately localizes the adverse biophysical warming effects within these specific latitudinal bands. While most regions show increasing thermodynamic temperature at 2 meter (TREFHT) trends across all simulations, idealized afforestation causes widespread warming and concentrates these trends into specific areas (Figure S9). The expansion of bioenergy crops substantially redistributes the warming hotspots induced by AF50, the intensity is alleviated in many regions (e.g., Southern Ocean, Antarctica), while opposite changes occur elsewhere, such as the Western Pacific, where BE50 reverses AF50's cooling to a warming trend. A similar redistribution of hotspots is observed when comparing AF50 with realistic afforestation; notably, REAL mitigates or offsets the significant warming trends seen in AF50 across mid-to-high latitudes of North America and Eurasia.

The zonal mean latitudinal responses of TREFHT show exhibit a clear stark contrast divergences (Figure Fig. 4d). In the mid-to-high latitudes of the NH, the idealized afforestation AF50 induces drives substantial warming in mid to high latitudes of the NH, in sharp contrast to while REAL causes the greatest cooling trends there the pronounced cooling induced by the REAL scenario. This boreal warming is intricately amplified by accelerating cloud cover losses coupled with severe cloud cover loss; specifically, the loss of low-level clouds primarily through enhanced triggers an anomalous positive swCRE trends from rapid low-level cloud loss that substantially amplifies surface heating (Figure Fig. 4; Figure Fig. 5; Figure Fig. S186-218). Crucially, the top-of-atmosphere (TOA) shortwave cloud radiative effect (swCRE) serves as a robust diagnostic, vividly capturing this signature of cloud-mediated warming amplification (Fig. S20-21). The regions with larger cloud loss magnitudes and stronger temperature rise trends largely overlap,

683 particularly in the boreal region (50°N-90°N). Relative to the global average, AF50 and
 684 BE50 significantly amplified warming here (factors of 2.15 times and 1.71 times,
 685 respectively), while REAL induced cooling (factor of -1.51 times). This pronounced
 686 warming amplification phenomenon is primarily driven by an enhanced atmospheric
 687 feedback trend, further amplified by the accelerated reduction of clouds in the middle and
 688 low-level clouds (Figure-Fig. 5). AF50 caused the low-level cloud loss rate in this region
 689 to be 8.80 times the global average, and BE50's relative amplification was even higher
 690 (13.63 times). Furthermore, the total cloud cover declines significantly contributed to the
 691 temperature rise, showing 8.88 times the global level in AF50 and by a dramatic factor of
 692 26.12-times in BE50. Therefore, under the idealized LUCC scenario, the significant
 693 warming phenomenon simulated in the boreal region is partly attributed to the enhanced
 694 positive trend of swCRE caused by mid-to-low-level cloud loss, although atmospheric
 695 feedback plays a dominant role. A significantly enhanced trend in swCRE ~~can be~~
 696 ~~observed~~ is simulated on the western side of South America, which is associated with
 697 accelerated loss of low-level clouds. Furthermore, at the global scale, the sensitivity of
 698 swCRE to temperature is attenuated under idealized afforestation and bioenergy expansion
 699 scenarios relative to the control. Specifically, the response weakens from $-0.746\text{W/m}^2/^{\circ}\text{C}$
 700 in the control to $-0.741\text{ W/m}^2/^{\circ}\text{C}$ and $-0.742\text{W/m}^2/^{\circ}\text{C}$ in the AF50 and BE50 experiments,
 701 respectively. Conversely, realistic afforestation exhibits an opposing trend
 702 ($-0.749\text{W/m}^2/^{\circ}\text{C}$). In other words, the negative shortwave cloud feedback is weakened by
 703 approximately 0.67% and 0.54% under the two idealized scenarios, whereas realistic forest
 704 expansion strengthens this negative feedback by ~0.40% (Fig. S22).

设置了格式: 上标

设置了格式: 上标

设置了格式: 上标




Figure 4. Spatiotemporal change Long-term trends of reference height temperature at reference height (TREFHT) and shortwave cloud radiative effect (swCRE). (a-d) Spatial patterns and zonal mean distribution of reference height temperature TREFHT induced by different land use and land cover change. (e-l) Seasonal trends in temperature-TREFHT and shortwave cloud radiative effects swCRE (swCRE)

设置了格式: 字体: 加粗

设置了格式: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 小四

grouped by month in different simulation experiments. Given that the global climatological mean of swCRE is approximately -47W/m^2 (Loeb et al., 2024), an enhanced positive trend in swCRE indicates that shortwave radiative cooling of clouds is either weakening or amplifying warming. The black hatching and scatter stippling indicate the grid cells that where trends passed the test of significance are statistically ($p<0.05$) and the shade in (d) indicates standard deviation.





Figure 5. Long-term trends of key physical terms (decomposed by the surface energy balance equation) induced by different LUCC. T_a represents the atmospheric feedback term, albedo denotes the surface albedo term, and SWdown (SW_d) and LWdown (LW_d) indicate the downward shortwave and longwave radiation terms, respectively. The black hatch indicates the grids that passed the test of significance ($p<0.05$).

3.4. Forest and bioenergy-induced hemispheric cloud trends asymmetry

We used the Gini index to quantitatively assess the inequality and spatial concentration of global cloud cover trends due to LUCC (Zhao et al., 2025). A Gini index closer to one signifies a highly unequal distribution, with trends strongly concentrated in specific latitude bands. For CLDTOT, relative to the CTL, idealized afforestation significantly intensified concentrated cloud losses in both hemispheres (e.g., SH downward trends Gini index rose from 0.48 to 0.52, Figure-Fig. 6d, Figure-Fig. S23d40), suggesting amplified local land use impacts (Hua et al., 2023). This concentration effect was most dramatic for CLDLOW in the NH, where AF50 caused the Gini index to rise sharply from 0.41 (CTL) to 0.50 (Fig. 6f; Fig. S23f), indicating a greater concentration of cloud decline areas (Figure-S10f). Bioenergy expansion induced milder asymmetry overall, but still concentrated SH increases in specific CLDTOT and CLDHGH hotspots (Figure-Fig. S11S24).

In stark contrast to idealized expansion, realistic afforestation consistently exerted the minimal influence on cloud trend heterogeneity, remaining closest to the CTL simulation (Figure-Fig. S2512). For CLDTOT, REAL scenario slightly broadened NH increasing trends (Gini index from 0.54 to 0.50) with limited alteration to the overall spatial patterns. For CLDLOW, REAL scenario increased the concentration of NH downward trends, but its impact was far less pronounced than that of AF50 (Gini index from 0.41 to 0.43), this means that realistic afforestation will concentrate the loss of low-level clouds in specific areas. Collectively, these findings reveal that idealized LUCC forcings profoundly disrupt inter-hemispheric cloud homogeneity; by triggering highly concentrated low-level cloud depletion, they risk severe localized climatic perturbations, a hazard largely avoided under the more spatially diffuse impacts of realistic scenariosOverall, these results show that

~~idealized LUCC forcings strongly alter inter-hemispheric cloud heterogeneity, inducing a~~
~~concentrated loss of low-level clouds, a process that is highly disruptive to climate patterns,~~
~~unlike the weaker and less spatially disruptive effects observed under realistic scenarios.~~
Previous studies have established that large-scale land-use changes profoundly perturb
atmospheric dynamics over a radius extending at least 200 kilometers (Chambers and
Artaxo, 2017; Khanna et al., 2017). Crucially, within this expansive dynamic footprint, the
intense spatial aggregation of low-level cloud loss driven by the widespread conversion of
native grasslands and shrublands into forests, holds the potential to precipitate severe
regional droughts. Analogous to the hydrological extremes induced by highly skewed
precipitation patterns (Lesk and Mankin, 2026), this geographically concentrated cloud
loss disrupts the local energy and moisture balance, acting as a potent catalyst for cloud-
mediated drought risks (Miralles et al., 2014; Zhou et al., 2019).






Figure 6. Asymmetry of cloud trends between hemispheres. Lorenz curves of long-term CLDTOT (a-d), CLDLLOW (e-h), CLDMED (i-l), CLDHGH (m-p) trend in the Northern (0° to 90°N) and Southern Hemispheres (0° to 90°S) during the 2015–2100 in CTL run.

The share indicates the percentage of an increase or decrease in the trend. The results of the AF50, BE50, and REAL experiments can be found in Figure S2340-S2512.

3.5. Machine learning reveals the physical drivers of LUCC-induced cloud trends

Possible physical mechanisms of cloud trends change revealed by machine learning

Having established that distinct LUCC markedly changes the spatial distribution of global cloud cover trends, we leveraged an interpretable machine learning framework to

disentangle the underlying physical mechanisms and quantify their relative contributions. The aforementioned analyses indicate that distinct LUC significantly altered the geographic distribution of global cloud cover trends. We employed an interpretable machine learning model to further elucidate the underlying mechanisms and quantify their respective contributions.

Regarding the driving factors for the trend changes in CLDTOT, across all simulations, the trend changes in our machine learning attribution identifies the changes of total precipitable water (Δ TMQ) as the most preeminent important driver of CLDTOT trends in all simulations, with contributions of 20.5%, 26.3%, and 23.1% in the AF50, BE50, and REAL scenarios, respectively (Figure Fig. 7a-c; Fig. 8a-c); The coupling between TMQ and CLDTOT is robustly positive, the direction of influence remains basically consistent (Figure Fig. 9a,f,k,l), meaning that the large-scale LUC-induced TMQ decrease (increase) trend accelerates the loss (increase) rate of CLDTOT, which indicates that large-scale LUC disturbances to the hydrological cycle are the primary macroscopic factor controlling long-term changes in total cloud cover (Pielke Sr et al., 2007). Notably, the dependency of CLDTOT on TMQ under idealized afforestation is highly linear and significantly stronger than in other scenarios, with TMQ depletion directly dictating cloud loss. We also found that the dependence of AF50-induced TMQ on CLDTOT was significantly stronger than that of BE50 and REAL, and was approximately linear. The decreasing trend of TMQ directly drove the decreasing trend of CLDTOT (Figure Fig. 9a,f,k-l). Spatially, however, the regulatory role of TMQ varies by location; the TMQ increase trend induced by idealized forest expansion mainly contributes to the CLDTOT increase trend in tropical regions, while outside the tropics, it is primarily negative

contributions (Fig. ~~are~~ 10a9). These results indicate that the rapid CLDTOT decline across
Northern Hemisphere land (Fig. 2) is fundamentally governed by a chronic deficit in
atmospheric moisture supply~~the rapid loss of CLDTOT in the NH land areas observed in~~
~~Figure 2 is attributed to the long-term loss of atmospheric moisture supply, and this~~
manifests specifically as a trend of significant loss in relative humidity (Fig. S32b). These
dynamics corroborate previous modeling evidence demonstrating that extensive
midlatitude land-cover transitions (from C₃ grasslands to forests) severely exacerbate
lower-tropospheric moisture deficits, driving a concomitant and pronounced depletion of
cloud cover (Laguë and Swann, 2016); the decrease in TMQ directly contributes to the
atmosphere becoming drier. Particularly in water-limited regions of the mid- to high-
latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere, the transpiration induced by forests replacing
grasslands tends to be weak, which implies that the efficiency of water vapor transport
from forests to the atmosphere is lower (Breil et al., 2021). The temperature rise and
relative humidity decrease caused by idealized forest expansion~~AF50~~ are not limited to the
surface. Simulations show that the warming and drying trends extend vertically through
the troposphere (~~Figure Fig. 110~~). The decrease in relative humidity causes the lifting
condensation level (~~LCL~~) of water vapor to rise. If the elevation of the LCL exceeds
the deepening of the planetary boundary layer, boundary-layer moisture fails to reach
saturation, thereby inhibiting cloud development or forcing emerging clouds to
prematurely dissipate in the overlying subsaturated air~~When the rising speed of the LCL~~
~~exceeds the development speed of the boundary layer top, clouds cannot form, or are~~
~~pushed to drier upper levels and dissipate~~ (Romps. 2017; Kutta and Hubbart. 2023). This
thermodynamic decoupling elucidates how idealized forest expansion drives a

设置了格式: 下标

synchronized depletion of mid-level clouds (accelerating by a factor of 1.25 over land). Specifically, surface thermodynamic stress dampens vertical moisture transport by altering boundary-layer stability and depth, effectively suppressing mid-level cloud development. Conversely, the REAL scenario averts this desiccation by optimizing surface-atmosphere heat partitioning; it sustains robust evapotranspiration efficiency and promotes atmospheric cooling, thereby effectively neutralizing the albedo-driven warming (Fig. 11; Fig. S34). This explains the mechanism by which AF50 leads to the synchronous loss of mesosphere clouds (accelerated by 1.25 times over land): thermodynamic disturbances at the land surface suppress moisture supply at vertical heights by affecting boundary layer height and stability, thereby inhibiting mesosphere cloud development. In contrast, the success of the REAL scenario lies in its ability to effectively optimize the heat distribution between the surface and the atmosphere, allowing atmospheric cooling and evapotranspiration efficiency to dominate, thus offsetting the warming effect caused by the decrease in albedo (Figure 10). Previous modeling studies have shown that progressive afforestation in mid-latitudes may suppress moisture supply, thereby causing tropospheric drying; the reduction in cloud fraction across vertical levels is precisely the result of this atmospheric response (Laguë and Swann, 2016). Therefore, in the idealized afforestation simulation, changes in relative humidity can be seen as the second largest driving factor, contributing to 14.1% (Fig. 8a). This total precipitable water-dominated attribution broadly extends to regional total cloud cover losses under bioenergy expansion and realistic afforestation. However, the subsequent hierarchy of contributing factors exhibits distinct scenario-dependent variations, reflecting varying interplay between relative humidity and surface temperature extremes (Fig. 8b-c). This attribution also applies to the regional

CLDTOT losses caused by bioenergy crop expansion and realistic afforestation, with only slight differences in the aspect of the second largest driving factor.

For the attribution of the CLDLOW trends induced by different land-use changes, relative humidity becomes the most important contributing factor, with contributions induced by AF50, BE50, and REAL being 20.4%, 20.4%, and 15.3% respectively (Fig. 7d-f; Fig. 8d-f), among which the relative humidity decline trend induced by idealized afforestation leads to the most severe CLDLOW loss rate, and this impact is mainly concentrated in the mid-to-high latitude regions of the NH (Figure Fig. S2475a). In these regions, idealized afforestation causes surface darkening and a substantial reduction in albedo, leading to increased absorption of surface net solar radiation (Fig. S35; Fig. S36; Fig. S37), particularly during the late afforestation stage (2081–2100), idealized forest expansion induces a pronounced decrease in land surface albedo by 0.0142, a signal that is approximately 2.4 times larger than the global mean (−0.0058). This albedo anomaly triggers a concomitant increase in net surface radiation over land by 2.43 W/m^2 , exceeding the global average (0.74 W/m^2) by a factor of roughly 3.3 (Fig. S37). The additional energy is preferentially partitioned into sensible heat flux (elevated Bowen ratio), suppressing the increase in latent heat flux. Over land areas, the sensible heat flux increases by 0.98 W/m^2 , whereas the latent heat flux increases by only 0.92 W/m^2 , generating strong buoyant turbulence that promotes the development of a deeper and well-mixed planetary boundary layer. Furthermore, this implies that as larger-scale grasslands or shrublands are converted into forests, while the initial latent-heat-dominated evaporative enhancement may slightly promote cloud cover, the subsequent substantial escalation in sensible heat flux significantly accelerates the loss of low- and mid-level clouds. Enhanced vertical mixing

设置了格式: 上标

设置了格式: 上标

设置了格式: 上标

设置了格式: 上标

and entrainment of drier free-tropospheric air dilute boundary-layer moisture while
 warming the lower troposphere, jointly driving the pronounced decline in relative humidity
 and the rise in maximum temperature simulated under the idealized afforestation scenario
 (Fig. S11; Spracklen and Garcia-Carreras, 2015). At the same time, idealized
 afforestationthis simulation induces a significant increase in maximum-temperature in
 response to the substantial and rapid loss of CLDLow (Figure Fig. S3220d,e,g), which
 indicates that the relative humidity decline, and maximum-temperature rise trends induced
 by idealized afforestation jointly amplify the loss rate of CLDLow, and it exhibits a strong
 linear dependency (Figure Fig. S2464a-b). As established by prior studies, afforestation
 across the NH mid-to-high latitudes induces profound surface darkening, which sharply
 reduces albedo and amplifies solar radiation absorption, ultimately driving surface
 warming (Meissner et al., 2003; Swann et al., 2010). Crucially, the magnitude of this
 albedo decline and the subsequent positive radiative forcing per unit of afforested area are
 disproportionately greater in these boreal domains than in any other region (Foley et al.,
 1994; Weber et al., 2024)Afforestation in the mid-to-high-latitude regions of the NH causes
 the surface in these areas to darken, leading to a decrease in albedo, thereby increasing the
 absorption of solar radiation to raise surface temperature (Meissner et al., 2003; Swann et
 al., 2010), and the amount of albedo reduction per unit afforestation in these regions and
 the increased radiative forcing are much higher than in other regions (Foley et al., 1994;
 Weber et al., 2024). The simulation proves that the regions with rapid decline trends in
 CLDLow induced by idealized afforestation simultaneously experience rapid rise trends
 in maximum-temperature and rapid decline in relative humidity (Fig. 2; Fig. S32b,d,e,g).
 While albedo reduction acts as the initial biophysical driver of local surface warming across

NH land areas (Arora and Montenegro, 2011), it cannot directly precipitate the long-term decline of cloud cover. As revealed by our machine learning attribution, the critical missing bridge is governed by atmospheric moisture dynamics. Specifically, under idealized afforestation, the albedo-induced surface warming fundamentally alters surface energy partitioning, heavily skewing it toward sensible heat fluxes. This intense sensible heating drives the development of a deeper, vigorously mixed planetary boundary layer (Fig. S32f). Consequently, enhanced dry-air entrainment from above, coupled with a lifting condensation level that ascends faster than the planetary boundary layer top, severely depresses relative humidity (Fig. S32b). This thermodynamic cascade provides the definitive physical link between surface albedo reduction and low-level cloud cover loss. This is highly consistent with our machine learning results, which parse relative humidity, closely followed by maximum temperature, as the paramount driving factors for accelerated low-level cloud cover loss. Albedo is the main biophysical source affecting temperature changes in the NH land areas (Arora and Montenegro, 2011), but it is unlikely to directly induce long-term loss of cloud cover; the missing bridge in between needs to be supplemented by water vapor supply, therefore relative humidity is parsed by the machine learning model as the most important driving factor for the accelerated loss of CLDLow, with maximum temperature following closely behind.

Machine learning identifies different LUCC-induced trends in total precipitation ($\Delta PRECT$) and atmospheric total precipitable water (ΔTMQ) as the paramount drivers governing mid- and high-level cloud dynamics (Fig. 7g–l), in particular, these two factors contribute more than 40% to the changing trends of mid-level clouds (Fig. 8g–j). The water vapor supply and total precipitation induced by LUCC become the primary factors

913 ~~influencing changes in mid-level and high-level clouds (Figure S13).~~ Large-scale idealized
914 afforestation causes insufficient water supply in the mid-to-high latitude regions of the NH,
915 which also inhibits the development of CLDMED, but the impacts of bioenergy expansion
916 and realistic afforestation are overall positive (~~Figure-Fig. S2497~~). More critically, high-
917 level clouds induce a net warming effect on the climate system due to their strong
918 greenhouse effect in the longwave spectrum (Hartmann et al., 1992; Stephens, 2005).~~More~~
919 ~~noteworthy are the high-level clouds that have a warming effect on the atmosphere;~~ the
920 increase in water vapor induced by large-scale idealized forest expansion leads to an
921 increase in CLDHGH in the mid-to-high latitude regions of the NH (Fig. 11a,d),
922 particularly manifested in cooling and increased humidity in the upper troposphere, which
923 may become an additional source of warming on the basis of mid- and low-level cloud loss
924 (Lian et al., 2022). The increasing trend of longwave cloud radiation at the top of the
925 atmosphere directly corroborates this conclusion (Fig. S20b), however, this is not reflected
926 at the surface level (Fig. S18b). Specifically, in the Northern Hemisphere, the mean
927 positive trend of TOA swCRE rises from 0.0465W/m² in the CTL run to 0.0490W/m² in
928 AF50, reaching 0.0511W/m² in BE50 and 0.0531W/m² in the realistic afforestation
929 scenario. Similarly, regarding the TOA longwave cloud radiative effect in the Northern
930 Hemisphere, the mean positive value surges from 0.0099W/m² in the CTL run to
931 0.0155W/m² in AF50. Therefore, idealized afforestation not only accelerates warming by
932 accelerating the loss of mid- and low-level clouds, but also amplifies warming by
933 promoting the increase of high-level clouds, and the warming induced by high-level clouds
934 also exists in the bioenergy expansion and realistic afforestation simulations. However, in
935 contrast, afforestation in real-world scenarios effectively optimizes the distribution of heat

设置了格式: 上标

设置了格式: 上标


设置了格式: 上标

设置了格式: 上标

设置了格式: 上标

设置了格式: 上标

between the surface and the atmosphere, allowing atmospheric cooling and evapotranspiration efficiency (a positive manifestation of hydrothermal coupling) to dominate, ~~successfully-partially~~ offsetting the warming effects caused by decreased albedo. Admittedly, under realistic afforestation scenarios, the pronounced cooling simulated across the Northern Hemisphere mid-to-high latitudes may not be driven exclusively by positive cloud cover anomalies, as non-local temperature advection likely also plays a substantial modulating role (Kan et al., 2025).






Figure 7. Ranked drivers to cloud cover trends induced by different land-use change scenarios, as revealed by the machine learning model. The SHAP (SHapley Additive exPlanations) summary plots illustrating the impact of each climate features on the predicted changes in (a–c) total cloud (CLDTOT), (d–f) low-level cloud (CLDLOW), (g–i) medium-level cloud (CLDMED), and (j–l) high-level cloud (CLDHGH) under the AF50,

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

BE50, and REAL scenarios relative to the CTL run. ~~Drivers and contribution of CLDTOT and CLDLOW revealed by machine learning response to different land use change.~~ Δ present the difference between sensitivity experiments and CTL. In other words, this represents a machine-learning-driven mechanistic modeling of LUCC-induced cloud cover and climate trends. The contribution is expressed in SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) value, which measure the impact of each driver factor induced by land use change on the model output (Berdugo et al., 2022). The bar chart shown in the illustration represents the percentage contribution. For CLDMED and CLDHGH can be viewed in Figure. S13. Each dot represents an individual data sample. The x-axis (SHAP value) quantifies the directional impact of a specific feature on the model's predicted cloud trend (i.e., a positive SHAP value drives an increasing cloud cover trend, while a negative value drives a decreasing trend). The right-side color bar signifies the actual physical magnitude of the climate feature itself, transitioning from low values (orange) to high values (purple). The relationship between the color and the x-axis reveals the physical driving mechanism. For instance, if a cluster of purple dots (high feature value) is distributed on the positive side of the x-axis (SHAP>0), it physically indicates that an increase in this specific climate feature induced by LUCC strongly drives an increasing trend in cloud cover. Conversely, orange dots on the negative side indicate that a decrease in the feature value contributes to a decreasing cloud cover trend. PRECT, total precipitation (mm/day/year); TMQ, total precipitable water (kg/m²/year); TREFHT, air temperature at reference height (K/year); TREFHTMX, maximum temperature at reference height (K/year); RHREFHT, relative humidity at reference height (%/year); QFLX, evapotranspiration (mm/day/year); CAPE, convective available potential energy (J/kg/year); PBLH, planetary boundary layer height

设置了格式: 字体: 非加粗

(m/year); TREFHTMN, minimum temperature at reference height (K/year); SHFLX, sensible heat flux (W/m²/year); LHFLX, latent heat flux (W/m²/year).




Figure 8. Contribution of cloud cover revealed by machine learning response to different land use change. Δ present the difference between sensitivity experiments and CTL. The contribution is expressed in SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) value, which measure the impact of each driver factor induced by land-use change on the model output (Berdugo et al., 2022).

设置了格式: 字体: 加粗




Figure 89. Dependence plots of the top five important variables for total cloud cover (CLDTOT), as revealed by the machine learning model. The first to third rows represent AF50, BE50 and REAL experiments respectively. The background scatter displays the full samples colored by feature values. The SHAP dependence trend (black solid line) was visualized using Locally Weighted Scatterplot Smoothing (LOWESS) (Cleveland, 1979)

with a smoothing fraction of $\text{frac}=0.3$ (using 30% of nearest neighbors for local regression) and $\text{it}=3$ robust iterations to reduce outlier influence, and **gray** shaded band indicates 95% confidence interval (CI) of LOWESS regression (calculated by a random subsample of 10000 grid cells). The corresponding results for CLDLOW, CLDMED, and CLDHGH are presented in Figure S26, S28, and S30, respectively.





Figure 910. Spatial drivers and contribution of CLDTOT revealed by machine learning response to different land use change. The first to third rows represent AF50, BE50 and REAL experiments respectively. The contribution is expressed in SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) value (Berdugo et al., 2022). The corresponding results for CLDLOW, CLDMED, and CLDHGH are presented in Figure S27, S29, and S31, respectively.






Figure 1011. Vertical profiles of Trends in temperature and relative humidity trends induced by different LUCC at vertical heights. The black asterisks denote grid cells with statistically significant trends. black asterisk indicates the grids that passed the test of significance ($p < 0.05$).

4. Discussions

Our simulation results indicate that two distinctly different future land use methods may significantly alter long-term cloud cover trends in terms of their impact on the magnitude of climate warming, particularly large-scale idealized forest expansion exacerbates cloud-mediated climate warming by substantially accelerating the loss of mid-low level clouds and the increase of high-level clouds. Bioenergy expansion also imposes negative impacts on cloud cover, but the overall intensity is weaker than that of idealized afforestation; this relatively mild negative impact may stem from lower LAI and reduced transpiration, as in previous assessments of this scheme, where bioenergy expansion may be accompanied by depletion of soil moisture and hinder the accumulation of atmospheric humidity (Le et al., 2011; Cheng et al., 2024). We believe that the negative impacts of these two large-scale idealized LUCC forcings on cloud cover originate from their own expansion areas, because in our simulations, the land for forest expansion is taken from grasslands or shrubs, which may lead to an increase in surface radiation absorption; the increased radiation warms the bottom of the convection layer in the form of sensible heat,

thereby imposing more stringent conditions for cloud formation. In contrast, in the bioenergy expansion simulation (irrigated and rained sugarcane), the land comes from the land of other bioenergy crops, which means a reduction in the area of other crops with higher albedo, for example, switchgrass has an overall higher albedo than sugarcane and thus has greater climate cooling potential (Abraha et al., 2021; Lei et al., 2023). When other possible bioenergy crops with greater climate cooling potential are replaced by sugarcane, it may suppress cloud formation due to insufficient cooling, thereby inducing mild cloud loss. Furthermore, since our idealized afforestation scenarios involve converting grasslands or shrubs to forests, although this conforms to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) definition (FAO, 2012), meaning our simulations are neither forest enhancement nor reforestation, it is also essential to consider the potential ecological consequences of such land type conversions. Grasslands, as one of the important terrestrial ecosystems, support unique biodiversity but are also relatively fragile; afforestation in these areas may lead to the loss of flora and fauna, reduced water availability, and increased fires (Veldman et al., 2015a; Veldman et al., 2015b; Parr et al., 2024). Therefore, although the primary goal of idealized afforestation is to enhance terrestrial carbon absorption, it carries the risk of ecological degradation (Cao, 2008; Xiao et al., 2020). Here, our idealized forest expansion simulation experiments ~~isare~~ are not intended to suggest implementing such forest expansion actions; on the contrary, the signal we are sending is cautionary.

On the other hand, we found that idealized and realistic afforestation suppressed the loss trends of total ~~cloud~~ and low-level cloud over the oceans, but idealized bioenergy expansion accelerated their loss trends (~~Figure-Fig. S115~~). The question we need to answer here is actually through what pathways LUCC disturbances on land propagate energy to

the oceans and influence cloud trends. According to previous simulation studies on deforestation, changes in albedo are considered the fundamental source of ocean responses; deforestation increases surface albedo, thereby reducing energy absorption at the surface, so no more heat is allocated to sensible heat flux to heat the convection layer, this process leads to cooling of the convection layer over the oceans (Davin and de Noblet-Ducoudré, 2010). In contrast, in our simulations, the albedo reduction caused by forest expansion (~~although not shown~~[Fig. S35-S37](#)) induces the surface to absorb more solar radiation; the extra radiation is redistributed in the form of sensible heat flux to release into the atmosphere and heat the atmosphere, and the increased heat warms the ocean surface with ample moisture supply, making more water vapor condense into clouds. Therefore, forest expansion overall suppresses the loss rate of total cloud and low-level cloud cover in ocean areas.

Our hypothesis can be verified from ~~Figure-Fig. S3220~~ and ~~Figure-Fig. S3322~~, namely that forest expansion induces increasing trends in maximum temperature and total atmospheric precipitable water over the oceans. However, in bioenergy expansion, we observe overall opposite results (~~Figure—Fig. S3224~~), namely that bioenergy, due to relatively high albedo, does not lead to substantial warming of the oceans, thus there is not enough heat to make moisture evaporate and condense into clouds. In contrast, realistic afforestation overall does not render clouds detrimental to the climate; this difference largely stems from the type of land conversion and the regions involved. In idealized afforestation, forests are derived from grasslands or shrubs, with large amounts of C₃ grasslands distributed in mid-to-high latitude regions of the Northern Hemisphere and C₄

grasslands in tropical areas, whereas forest expansion in realistic afforestation simulations is not like this (Wei et al., 2014; ~~Figure S2Fig. S83~~).

Although our simulations show that large-scale idealized afforestation and bioenergy expansion induce significant declining trends in mid- and low-level cloud cover, the SHAP-based spatial attribution from machine learning clearly demonstrates that these two distinct land-use changes actually trigger multiple competing land-atmosphere coupling processes. The net cloud response is essentially the outcome of the interplay among these competing drivers (Fig. S38–S40), even though the dominant factors identified by machine learning differ across scenarios (Fig. 7). The spatial competing patterns, visually represented by the stippled regions, arise from the competition between surface fluxes and boundary-layer dynamics. On one hand, forest expansion increases leaf area index and surface roughness, thereby enhancing turbulent mixing and evapotranspiration (latent heat flux). This process tends to moisten the lower atmosphere and favor cloud formation, as supported by the increasing trend in total precipitable water induced by idealized afforestation (Fig. S32a). On the other hand, the large-scale replacement of grasslands or shrublands by forests inevitably causes a substantial reduction in surface albedo. The resulting increase in absorbed solar radiation is directly manifested as enhanced sensible heat flux (Fig. S32h). This strong sensible heating deepens the planetary boundary layer and promotes the entrainment of dry air from aloft (as indicated by the rising trend in boundary layer height), generating a strong cloud-suppressing effect. Specifically, in water-limited regions of the Northern Hemisphere mid-to-high latitudes, the modest increase in transpiration resulting from the conversion of grasslands/shrublands to forests is insufficient to offset the strong drying effect driven by sensible heat flux. Compared with

the substantial decline in relative humidity, the increase in total precipitable water remains relatively small. This leads to intense spatial competition between near-surface relative humidity (RHREFHT) and maximum temperature at reference height (TREFHTMX), ultimately causing a sharp reduction in low-level clouds (Fig. S38d, S38e). In the subtropical regions under the BE50 scenario, due to the relatively low transpiration efficiency of bioenergy crops, the dynamic drying effect associated with the rise in planetary boundary layer height (PBLH) becomes the more dominant factor (Fig. S39e). In contrast, the more realistic REAL scenario is constrained by the discontinuous spatial distribution of afforestation patches. Local advective exchange within microclimates exerts a strong physical buffering effect, resulting in a markedly fragmented pattern of large-scale competition. This fragmentation helps mitigate the widespread cloud loss observed under the idealized scenarios (Fig. S40d–f).

These findings align with recent studies highlighting the regime-dependent nature of cloud responses to land-cover change. For example, Xu et al. (2022) and Leung et al. (2024) demonstrated that the sign and magnitude of forest effects on clouds vary substantially with background climate, soil moisture availability, and aerosol conditions. Our results reinforce the view that large-scale idealized afforestation does not produce universally positive cloud feedback; instead, the net cloud response is determined by the balance between competing local processes, which is particularly unfavorable for low-cloud maintenance in water-limited mid-to-high latitude regions.

Recent observational studies have increasingly highlighted that cloud responses can fundamentally alter the net biophysical climate forcing of land-use changes, though the direction of this feedback is highly regime-dependent. For example, recent quantifications

of forest loss present contrasting cloud radiative adjustments: Luo et al. (2024b) demonstrated that global deforestation typically reduces cloud cover, thereby introducing a warming effect that partially offsets the cooling generated by increased surface albedo. Conversely, Dror and Feingold. (2026) observed that deforestation in the Amazon basin increases low-level cloudiness, which acts synergistically to roughly double the top-of-atmosphere cooling effect of surface brightening alone. Despite these regional divergences in deforestation impacts, both studies underscore a critical biophysical framework: the interplay between surface albedo and cloud albedo adjustments. Viewed through this framework, our findings for large-scale idealized afforestation reveal a compounding climate penalty. In our AF50 scenario, forest expansion (large-scale conversion of grasslands or shrublands into forests) substantially decreases surface albedo (a direct warming effect), while the concurrent loss of low-level clouds further diminishes shortwave cloud cooling. Consequently, rather than counteracting one another, these two biophysical responses act synergistically to strongly amplify regional climate warming hotspots, particularly in the water-limited boreal regions.

Our findings underscore that large-scale afforestation, despite being widely promoted as a primary climate mitigation strategy, does not universally guarantee a net cooling effect. The exact climatic outcome is not only contingent upon the background climate, but is also heavily governed by the specific pathways of land-cover types conversion. Particularly over the past few decades, there has been a proliferation of afforestation initiatives implemented in regions naturally occupied by grasslands or shrublands (Veldman et al., 2015a; Cao et al., 2011). Furthermore, efforts aimed at enhancing canopy density within existing forests are conceptually distinct from true afforestation; conflating these practices

can severely distort objective assessments of the true climate mitigation efficiency of forest expansion. It is imperative to reiterate that the idealized afforestation scenario simulated in this study strictly aligns with the standard definition established by the FAO. Consequently, our modeling results offer a critical caveat: when large-scale land-cover conversion adheres rigidly to this foundational definition, the climate mitigation potential traditionally attributed to practical afforestation may be substantially overestimated. This implies that anchoring future climate stabilization strategies heavily upon widespread forest expansion pathways introduces profound risks and uncertainties (Arora and Montenegro, 2011; Veldman et al., 2015a; Weber et al., 2024).

Importantly, the climatic impacts of large-scale LUCC are not strictly confined to the regions where land-cover conversion occurs. Localized biophysical perturbations can instead cascade into far-reaching non-local climate teleconnections (Portmann et al., 2022; Hua et al., 2023). Our diagnostic analysis of horizontal temperature advection in the lower troposphere (850 hPa) demonstrates that, under idealized afforestation and bioenergy expansion scenarios, intense local sensible heating induced by reduced surface albedo generates anomalous wind fields that redistribute thermal energy to adjacent regions (Fig. S41). Specifically, in the idealized afforestation (AF50) scenario, pronounced positive anomalies in total temperature advection develop over the Northern Hemisphere mid- and high latitudes, effectively transporting excess surface heat from afforested areas to downwind non-afforested regions. This advective transport serves as a dynamical bridge, explaining why warming hotspots frequently extend spatially beyond the precise footprint of the land-use forcing. In contrast, realistic afforestation (REAL) mitigates excessive local sensible heat accumulation; the associated weakening of westerlies reduces warm

advection toward Eurasia, thereby accounting for the regional cooling and limiting the extent of non-local warming.

These non-local teleconnections are further amplified through planetary-wave dynamics in the mid- to upper troposphere. The strong surface thermal anomalies triggered by large-scale idealized LUCC perturb the overlying atmosphere, acting as a deep heat source that excites quasi-stationary Rossby waves. Evaluation of the two-dimensional Plumb wave activity flux at 500 hPa reveals that planetary-wave energy emanating from these thermal perturbations exhibits pronounced horizontal propagation (Fig. S42). In the AF50 scenario, the wave activity flux patterns illustrate clear eastward and poleward energy propagation, which conveys additional energy into non-afforested regions across the Northern Hemisphere mid- and high latitudes. This propagation induces non-local warming while driving atmospheric moisture deficits and relative humidity reductions at higher levels, ultimately leading to cloud cover loss. In other words, the dynamical wave propagation forces subsidence and alters atmospheric static stability in regions remote from the initial afforestation sites, synergistically exacerbating remote cloud reduction and reinforcing distant warming hotspots. Consequently, the substantial mid- and low-level cloud loss induced by large-scale idealized forest expansion arises from the tight coupling between local cloud-mediated radiative forcing and large-scale non-local dynamical transport, both of which accelerate cloud dissipation through combined local and remote warming. The planetary-scale wave response to idealized bioenergy expansion is comparatively weaker but similarly promotes non-local warming and modestly amplifies mid- and low-level cloud loss. In stark contrast, realistic afforestation strengthens northerly flows while weakening westerlies over Eurasia, suppressing regional warming and

producing a net remote cooling effect (Fig. S41, S42). This process improves the thermodynamic conditions required for cloud formation, consistent with the simulated increases in mid- and low-level cloud cover over the region (Fig. 2).

Due to the intrinsic uncertainties inherent in individual climate models, particularly concerning the simulation of cloud feedbacks (Ceppi et al., 2024), the evaluation of long-term impacts arising from external forcings such as land use and land cover change can often be robustly achieved through well-validated single-model simulations, as demonstrated in numerous prior studies (Snyder et al., 2004; Arora and Montenegro, 2011; Bauer et al., 2025). However, considering that CESM² may be overly sensitive to aerosol-cloud interactions or thermal disturbances, the simulated cloud cover trend changes induced by LUCC may be an upper limit. While model ensembles or multi-model intercomparison frameworks have been employed to enhance confidence in conclusions (Falloon et al., 2014), they introduce limitations such as computational expense, potential overconfidence due to model dependence—where shared code, parameterizations, and biases among models undermine the assumption of independence (Abramowitz et al., 2019; Knutti et al., 2010)—and challenges in combining projections from a small or unevenly distributed set of models (von Trentini et al., 2020). Despite this, we still recommend, where computational resources permit, the integration of models with different equilibrium climate sensitivity (ECS) characteristics to adequately distinguish between signal and model structure biases (Khan et al., 202⁵³).

Cloud parameterization uncertainties in CESM warrant particular scrutiny because they directly modulate both the local biophysical pathways and the non-local dynamical teleconnections through which LUCC influences cloud cover. CESM employs the

Community Atmosphere Model version 6 (CAM6), whose stratiform cloud microphysics is governed by the MG2 two-moment scheme (Morrison et al., 2020). This scheme prognoses mass and number concentrations for cloud liquid, ice, rain, and snow and incorporates an aerosol-aware heterogeneous ice nucleation parameterization (Fan et al., 2016). However, several aspects of this framework introduce substantial uncertainty. A documented issue with the cloud ice number limiter (nimax) in the default CESM configuration inadvertently suppressed ice production in mixed-phase clouds, altering global cloud phase partitioning and contributing to the model’s high ECS (Gettelman et al., 2019; Zhu et al., 2022). Subsequent analyses have shown that ice nucleation processes influence cloud feedback across a wide range of tropospheric levels and latitudes, not only in extratropical low clouds, and that correcting or perturbing these processes can substantially modify shortwave cloud feedback (McGraw et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2022). Cloud parameterization uncertainties in CESM warrant particular scrutiny because they directly modulate both the local biophysical pathways and the non-local dynamical teleconnections through which LUCC influences cloud cover. In addition, the representation of sub-grid cloud variability in warm rain formation relies on an enhancement factor for auto-conversion that is derived from the Cloud Layers Unified by Binormals (CLUBB) turbulence scheme. This factor has been shown to be substantially overestimated over much of the ocean, leading to excessive auto conversion rates, overly strong aerosol–cloud interaction sensitivity, and biases in liquid water path and cloud optical thickness (Wang et al., 2022). Perturbed-parameter ensemble experiments further demonstrate that simulated cloud properties, precipitation, and radiative effects in CAM6 are highly sensitive to individual microphysical parameters, including those controlling

1228 auto conversion and accretion rates, ice fall speed, and the ice-to-snow conversion
1229 threshold. These sensitivities are especially relevant for LUCC experiments because
1230 afforestation and bioenergy expansion modify surface sensible and latent heat fluxes,
1231 planetary boundary layer stability, and near-surface moisture—processes that interact
1232 intimately with both the macrophysical and microphysical components of the cloud scheme.
1233 Biases in low-cloud simulation or in the phase partitioning of mixed-phase clouds can
1234 therefore either amplify or dampen the simulated cloud loss and the downstream non-local
1235 Rossby wave responses.

1236 Collectively, these parameterization uncertainties imply that the pronounced mid- and
1237 low-level cloud reduction and the resulting remote warming hotspots reported under
1238 idealized expansion scenarios should be interpreted cautiously as potentially lying at the
1239 upper end of the model-dependent range. To reduce these uncertainties, future work should
1240 prioritize targeted sensitivity experiments that systematically perturb key microphysical
1241 parameters (e.g., auto conversion thresholds, ice nucleation rates, and sub-grid variance
1242 formulations), employ higher horizontal resolution, or test alternative microphysics
1243 schemes (such as sectional or bin approaches). Improved observational constraints on
1244 cloud phase partitioning, liquid water path, and aerosol–cloud interactions over regions
1245 undergoing land-cover change will also be essential. In parallel, realistic assessments of
1246 future afforestation or bioenergy deployment require high-resolution, accurate land-cover
1247 datasets capable of reliably distinguishing forest from other vegetation types (Hoffmann et
1248 al., 2023). Generally, higher resolution means better performance in simulating cloud cover
1249 and key atmospheric dynamic processes (Kusunoki, 2026), leading to a more accurate
1250 understanding of the impacts of large-scale land-use change on cloud cover. Taken together,

our findings underscore that effective land-based climate mitigation strategies must extend beyond carbon sequestration targets alone. In addition to incorporating albedo-driven effects, as previous studies have emphasized (Wang et al., 2023), decision-making frameworks should also explicitly account for the potential climate risks arising from changes in cloud cover. On the other hand, due to limitations in model resolution and cloud microphysical parameterization uncertainties (Morrison et al., 2020), which stem from incomplete representations of complex processes such as aerosol-cloud interactions, ice crystal formation, and precipitation efficiency, which can lead to substantial biases in simulated cloud optical properties and lifetime (Fan et al., 2016). These uncertainties often amplify errors in global climate projections, particularly regarding radiative forcing and feedback loops, highlighting the need for enhanced observational constraints and sensitivity analyses to refine model parameterizations. practical reforestation activities need to be guided by higher resolution and more accurate land cover data (Hoffmann et al., 2023), aiming for sufficient resolution to distinguish forests from other ecosystems. Our findings have profound implications for future land management and climate mitigation policies, highlighting that policymakers must move beyond a single carbon sequestration target and incorporate albedo risk into their decision-making framework, as previous studies have suggested (Wang et al., 2023), and also consider cloud-mediated climate risks.

5. Conclusions

We use the current state-of-the-art fully coupled Community Earth System Model (CESM) to simulate-investigate the impact of two distinctly different future land use and cover changes (forest and bioenergy expansion) on long-term cloud cover trends. Simulation results show that future large-scale idealized forest and bioenergy expansions

1274 may exacerbate cloud-mediated regional climate warming, as they accelerate the loss of
1275 mid-low level clouds while enhancing the increase of high-level clouds, thereby
1276 diminishing the overall climate-regulating benefits of cloud cover. Specifically, idealized
1277 afforestation leads to the fastest low-level cloud loss (1.14 times on global, 1.52 times on
1278 land), followed by bioenergy expansion (1.03 times on global and 1.23 times on land),
1279 whereas realistic afforestation mitigates such losses and generates positive climate effects
1280 by preserving or enhancing cloud cover. The loss of mid-low level clouds amplifies the
1281 formation of regional warming hotspots through enhanced shortwave cloud radiative
1282 forcing trends, particularly in mid-to-high latitude regions of the Northern Hemisphere,
1283 where accelerated reductions in mid-low level cloud amounts align with amplified
1284 temperature trends (reaching up to 2.15 times the global average under idealized
1285 afforestation). The hemispheric asymmetry in cloud trends, quantified via Gini coefficients,
1286 further highlights how idealized forest and bioenergy expansions concentrate cloud loss
1287 trends within the latitudinal bands of those expansions, thereby potentially reshaping new
1288 climate warming hotspots. A coupled interpretable machine learning framework further
1289 elucidates the relevant mechanisms underlying cloud trend changes, emphasizing that the
1290 long-term decreasing trends in total atmospheric precipitable water and relative humidity
1291 induced by idealized forest and bioenergy expansions are the primary drivers of the
1292 accelerated loss of mid-low level clouds, which is also modulated by non-local factors.
1293 These results underscore that not all forest expansions yield ~~positive~~ climate cooling
1294 benefits; outcomes critically depend on the type of land conversion and the specific regions
1295 of implementation. This also highlights an important realization: even within bioenergy
1296 crops, the choice of crop function type is just as crucial as the choice of afforestation site.

1297 Therefore, policymakers should prioritize realistic afforestation strategies in suitable
1298 latitudinal zones to maximize carbon sequestration while avoiding unintended cloud-
1299 mediated warming.

1300 **Data availability**

1301 All CESM simulation results and associated procedures are available on request from
1302 the authors. ERA5 data are available for download through the Copernicus Climate Service
1303 (<https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/datasets>) (Muñoz-Sabater et al., 2021). The Global
1304 Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) and CPC Merged Analysis of Precipitation
1305 (CMAP) datasets can be downloaded from <http://gpcp.umd.edu/> and
1306 <https://psl.noaa.gov/data/gridded/data.cmap.html> (Adler et al., 2018; Huffman et al., 2023).
1307 National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) temperature is available from
1308 <https://psl.noaa.gov/> (Kalnay et al., 1996). The Land-Use Harmonization 2 (LUH2) can be
1309 downloaded from <https://svn-ccsm-inputdata.cgd.ucar.edu/trunk/inputdata/> (Hurtt et al.,
1310 2020).

1311 **Author contribution**

1312 Nanjian Liu: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal analysis, Data curation,
1313 Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.
1314 Zhixin Hao: Conceptualization, Methodology, Funding acquisition, Supervision, Project
1315 administration, Writing – review & editing.
1316 Siyou Xia: Writing – review & editing, Language polishing.
1317 Peng Zhao: Software, Visualization, Writing – review & editing.

1318 **Competing interests**

设置了格式: 默认段落字体, 字体: (默认) + 西文正文 (Calibri), (中文) + 中文正文 (等线), 11 磅, 图案: 清除

设置了格式: 默认段落字体, 字体: (默认) + 西文正文 (Calibri), (中文) + 中文正文 (等线), 11 磅, 图案: 清除

设置了格式: 默认段落字体, 字体: (默认) + 西文正文 (Calibri), (中文) + 中文正文 (等线), 11 磅, 图案: 清除

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 42171030). We acknowledge the dendrochronology and paleoenvironmental analysis laboratory of the Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, for the computational support from its high-performance computing platform.

References

- G. L. Stephens, Cloud Feedbacks in the Climate System: A Critical Review. *J. Clim.* 18(2), 237–273 (2005).
- N. G. Loeb, S. H. Ham, R. P. Allan, T. J. Thorsen, B. Meyssignac, S. Kato, G. C. Johnson, J. M. Lyman, Observational Assessment of Changes in Earth’s Energy Imbalance Since 2000. *Surv. Geophys.* 45, 1757–1783 (2024).
- E. L. Davin, N. de Noblet-Ducoudré, Climatic impact of global-scale deforestation: radiative versus non-radiative processes. *J. Clim.* 23(1), 97–112 (2010).
- O. Boucher, D. Randall, P. Artaxo, C. Bretherton, G. Feingold, P. Forster, V.-M. Kerminen, Y. Kondo, H. Liao, U. Lohmann, P. Rasch, S. K. Satheesh, S. Sherwood, B. Stevens, and X.Y. Zhang, Clouds and aerosols. In *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*. (2013).
- C. Lei, J. Chen, G. P. Robertson, Climate cooling benefits of cellulosic bioenergy crops from elevated albedo. *Glob. Change Biol. Bioenergy.* 15(11), 1373–1386 (2023).

1342 S. Cao. Why large-scale afforestation efforts in China have failed to solve the
1343 desertification problem. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 42(6), 1826–1831 (2008).

1344 Y. Xiao, Q. Xiao, X. Sun, Ecological risks arising from the impact of large-scale
1345 afforestation on the regional water supply balance in southwest China. *Sci. Rep.* 10,
1346 4150 (2020).

1347 M. Abraha, J. Chen, S. K. Hamilton, P. Sciusco, C. Lei, G. Shirkey, J. Yuan, & G. P.
1348 Robertson, Albedo-induced global warming impact of Conservation Reserve
1349 Program grasslands converted to annual and perennial bioenergy crops. *Environ.*
1350 *Res. Lett.* 16, 084059 (2021).

1351 G. Tselioudis, W. B. Rossow, F. Bender, L. Oreopoulos, J. Remillard, Oceanic cloud trends
1352 during the satellite era and their radiative signatures. *Clim. Dyn.* 62, 9319–9332
1353 (2024).

1354 J. Foley, R. Defries, G. Asner, C. Barford, G. Bonan, S. Carpenter, F. Chapin, M. Coe, G.
1355 Daily, H. Gibbs, J. Helkowski, T. Holloway, E. Howard, C. Kucharik, C. Monfreda,
1356 A. Patz, I. Prentice, N. Ramankutty, P. Snyder, Global consequences of land use.
1357 *Science.* 309(5734), 570–574 (2005).

1358 X. Q. Li, Q. X. Li, M. Wild, P. Jones, An intensification of surface Earth’s energy
1359 imbalance since the late 20th century. *Commun Earth Environ.* 5, 644 (2024).

1360 R. Portmann, U. Beyerle, E. Davin, E. M. Fischer, S. De Hertog, S. Schemm, Global
1361 forestation and deforestation affect remote climate via adjusted atmosphere and
1362 ocean circulation. *Nat. Commun.* 13, [5569](#), ~~1–11~~ (2022).

1363 W. Hua, L. Zhou, A. Dai, H. Chen, ~~and~~ Y. Liu, Important non-local effects of deforestation
1364 on cloud cover changes in CMIP6 models, *Environ. Res. Lett.* 18, 094047 (2023).

1365 J. R. Taylor. An Introduction to Error Analysis: The Study of Uncertainties in Physical
1366 Measurements [M]. 2nd ed. Sausalito: University Science Books. (1997).

1367 P. Hoffmann, V. Reinhart, D. Rechid, N. de Noblet-Ducoudré, E. L. Davin, C. Asmus, B.
1368 Bechtel, J. Böhner, E. Katragkou, S. Luyssaert. High-resolution land use and land
1369 cover dataset for regional climate modelling: historical and future changes in
1370 Europe. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*. 15, 3819–3852 (2023).

1371 G. R. Leung, L. D. Grant, S. C. van den Heever. Deforestation-Driven Increases in Shallow
1372 Clouds Are Greatest in Drier, Low-Aerosol Regions of Southeast Asia. *Geophys.*
1373 *Res. Lett.* 51(10), e2023GL107678 (2024).

1374 M. D. Mastrandrea, C. B. Field, T. F. Stocker, O. Edenhofer, K. L. Ebi, D. J. Frame, H.
1375 Held, E. Kriegler, K. J. Mach, P. R. Matschoss, G.-K. Plattner, G. W. Yohe, F. W.
1376 Zwiers, Guidance Note for Lead Authors of the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report on
1377 Consistent Treatment of Uncertainties (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
1378 Change, 2010).

1379 H. Morrison, M. van Lier-Walqui, A. M. Fridlind, W. W. Grabowski, J. Y. Harrington, C.
1380 Hoose, A. Korolev, H. E. Kumjian, J. A. Milbrandt, H. Pawlowska, D. P. Posselt,
1381 A. Prabhakaran, K. Shima, B. A. van Dienenhoven, L. Xue. Confronting the
1382 Challenge of Modeling Cloud and Precipitation Microphysics. *J. Adv. Model. Earth*
1383 *Syst.* 12(8), e2019MS001689 (2020).

1384 A. J. Teuling, C. M. Taylor, J. F. Meirink, L. A. Melsen, D. G. Miralles, C. C. van
1385 Heerwaarden, R. Vautard, A. I. Stegehuis, G.-J. Nabuurs & J. Vilà-Guerau de
1386 Arellano, Observational evidence for cloud cover enhancement over western
1387 European forests. *Nat. Commun.* 8, 14065 (2017).

1388 M. Ek, A. A. M. Holtslag, Influence of soil moisture on boundary layer cloud development.
1389 J. Hydrometeorol. 5, 86–99 (2004).

1390 J. J. Feddema, K. W. Oleson, G. B. Bonan, L. O. Mearns, L. E. Buja, G. A. Meehl, W. M.
1391 Washington, The Importance of Land-Cover Change in Simulating Future Climates.
1392 Science. 310(5754), 1674–1678.

1393 T. Mauritsen, Earth's Energy Imbalance More Than Doubled in Recent Decades. AGU
1394 Advances. 6(3), e2024AV001636 (2025).

1395 [S. Kusunoki, Do Higher Horizontal Resolution Models Perform Better? Adv. Atmos. Sci.](#)
1396 [43, 259–262 \(2026\).](#)

1397 G. Duveiller, F. Filippini, A. Ceglar, J. Bojanowski, R. Alkama, A. Cescatti, Revealing
1398 the widespread potential of forests to increase low level cloud cover. Nat Commun.
1399 12, 4337 (2021).

1400 P. K. Snyder, C. Delire, J. A. Foley. Evaluating the influence of different vegetation biomes
1401 on the global climate. Clim. Dyn. 23, 279–302 (2004).

1402 W. S. Cleveland. Robust Locally Weighted Regression and Smoothing Scatterplots. [J. Am.](#)
1403 [Stat. Assoc.](#) ~~Journal of the American Statistical Association.~~ 74(368), 829–836
1404 [\(1979\).](#)

1405 K. N. Liou, S. C. Ou, Theory of equilibrium temperatures in radiative-turbulent
1406 atmospheres. J. Atmos. Sci. 40, 214–229 (1983).

1407 R. A. Houghton, The annual net flux of carbon to the atmosphere from changes in land use
1408 1850–1990. 51(2), 298–313 (2002).

1409 K. K. Goldewijk, N. Ramankutty, Land cover change over the last three centuries due to
 1410 human activities: The availability of new global data sets. *GeoJournal*. 61, 335–344
 1411 (2004).

1412 C. Goldblatt, V. L. McDonald, K. E. McCusker, Earth’s long-term climate stabilized by
 1413 clouds. *Nat. Geosci.* 14, 143–150 (2021).

1414 Y. Cheng, D. M. Lawrence, M. Pan, B. Zhang, N. T. Graham, P. J. Lawrence, Z. Liu, X.
 1415 He, A bioenergy-focused versus a reforestation-focused mitigation pathway yields
 1416 disparate carbon storage and climate responses, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 121 (7),
 1417 e2306775121 (2024).

1418 S. Peng, S. Piao, Z. Zeng, P. Ciais, L. Zhou, L. Z. X. Li, R. B. Myneni, Y. Yin, H. Zeng,
 1419 Afforestation in China cools local land surface temperature. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*
 1420 111 (8), 2915-2919 (2014).

1421 Y. Harada, M. Nakagawa, Extraordinary features of the planetary wave propagation during
 1422 the boreal winter 2013/2014 and the zonal wave number two predominance. *J.*
 1423 *Geophys. Res. Atmos.* 122 (21), 11374–11387 (2017).

1424 C. S. Y. Huang, N. Nakamura, Local finite-amplitude wave activity as a diagnostic of
 1425 anomalous weather events. *J. Atmos. Sci.* 73 (1), 211–229 (2016).

1426 J. Fan, Y. Wang, D. Rosenfeld, X. Liu, Review of aerosol–cloud interactions: Mechanisms,
 1427 significance, and challenges. *J. Atmos. Sci.* 73 (11), 4221-4252 (2016).

1428 K. Oleson, D. Lawrence, G. B. Bonan, Technical description of version 4.5 of the
 1429 Community Land Model (CLM). NCAR Tech. Note NCAR/TN-503+STR.
 1430 National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder. 2013.

1431 Y. Cheng, M. Huang, D. M. Lawrence, K. Calvin, D. L. Lombardozzi, E. Sinha, M. Pan,
 1432 X. He, Future bioenergy expansion could alter carbon sequestration potential and
 1433 exacerbate water stress in the United States. *Sci. Adv.* 8, eabm8237 (2022).
 1434 R. E. Dickinson, Land surface processes and climate—surface albedos and energy balance.
 1435 Adv. Geophys. 25, 305–353 (1983).
 1436 W. Hallgren, C. A. Schlosser, E. Monier, D. Kicklighter, A. Sokolov, J. Melillo, Climate
 1437 impacts of a large-scale biofuels expansion. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 40(8), 1624–1630
 1438 (2013).
 1439 A. L. Swann, I. Y. Fung, S. Levis, G. B. Bonan, S. C. Doney, Changes in Arctic vegetation
 1440 amplify high-latitude warming through the greenhouse effect. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*
 1441 U.S.A. 107, 1295–1300 (2010).
 1442 G. Bala, K. Caldeira, M. Wickett, T. J. Phillips, D. B. Lobell, C. Delire, A. Mirin,
 1443 Combined climate and carbon-cycle effects of large-scale deforestation. *Proc. Natl.*
 1444 *Acad. Sci.* 104, 6550–6555 (2007).
 1445 M. Georgescu, D.B. Lobell, C.B. Field, Direct climate effects of perennial bioenergy crops
 1446 in the United States. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 108 (11), 4307–4312 (2011).
 1447 Z. Li, P. Ciais, J. S. Wright, Y. Wang, S. Liu, J. Wang, L. Z. X. Li, H. Lu, X. Huang, L.
 1448 Zhu, D. S. Goll, W. Li, Increased precipitation over land due to climate feedback
 1449 of large-scale bioenergy cultivation. *Nat. Commun.* 14, 4096 (2023).
 1450 G. van der Werf, D. Morton, R. DeFries et al., CO₂ emissions from forest loss. Nature Nat.
 1451 *Geosci.* 2, 737–738 (2009).

设置了格式: 下标

1452 J. Wang, W. Li, P. Ciais, L. Z. X. Li, J. Chang, D. Goll, T. Gasser, X. Huang, N. Devaraju,
 1453 O. Boucher, Global cooling induced by biophysical effects of bioenergy crop
 1454 cultivation. ~~Nature~~ Nat. Commun. 7255 (2021).
 1455 H. F. Goessling T. Rackow, T. Jung, Recent global temperature surge intensified by record-
 1456 low planetary albedo. Science. 387,68–73 (2025).
 1457 S. A. Klein, A. Hall, J. R. Norris, R. Pincus, Low-Cloud Feedbacks from Cloud-Controlling
 1458 Factors: A Review. Surv. Geophys. 38, 1307–1329 (2017).
 1459 C. L. Boehm, D. W. J. Thompson, The key role of cloud–climate coupling in extratropical
 1460 sea surface temperature variability. J. Clim. 36 (8), 2753–2762 (2023).
 1461 J. T. Kiehl, Twentieth century climate model response and climate sensitivity. Geophys.
 1462 Res. Lett. 34, L22710 (2007).
 1463 C. Shi, T. Wang, G. Wang, H. Letu, The net warming effect of clouds on global surface
 1464 temperature may be weakening or even disappearing. ~~Geosci~~ EOSCI Front ~~RON~~ T.
 1465 16(5), 102107 (2025).
 1466 S. M. Lundberg, S. -I. I. Lee, A unified approach to interpreting model predictions.
 1467 Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. 2017-Decem(Section 2),
 1468 4766–4775 (2017).
 1469 P. V. V. Le, P. Kumar, D. T. Drewry, ~~z~~ Implications for the hydrologic cycle under climate
 1470 change due to the expansion of bioenergy crops in the Midwestern United States.
 1471 Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. ~~U.S.A.~~ 108 (37), 15085-15090 (2011).
 1472 A. L. S. Swann, I Y. Fung, J C H. Chiang, Mid-latitude afforestation shifts general
 1473 circulation and tropical precipitation. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 109 (3), 712–716,
 1474 (2012).

1475 M. Breil, V. K. M. Schneider, J. G. Pinto, The effect of forest cover changes on the regional
1476 climate conditions in Europe during the period 1986–2015. *Biogeosciences*. 21 (3),
1477 811–824 (2024).

1478 Y. Li, S. Piao, L. Z. X. Li, A. Chen, X. Wang, P. Ciais, L. Huang, X. Lian, S. Peng, Z.
1479 Zeng, K. Wang, L. Zhou, Divergent hydrological response to large-scale
1480 afforestation and vegetation greening in China. *Sci. Adv.* 4, eaar4182 (2018).

1481 R. Righelato, D. V. Spracklen, Carbon mitigation by biofuels or by saving and restoring
1482 forests? *Science*. 317, 902 (2007).

1483 M. M. Laguë, ~~Abigail A.~~ L. S. Swann, Progressive Midlatitude Afforestation: Impacts on
1484 Clouds, Global Energy Transport, and Precipitation. *J. Clim.* 29(15), 5561–5573
1485 (2016).

1486 D. V. Spracklen, L. Garcia-Carreras, The impact of Amazonian deforestation on Amazon
1487 basin rainfall. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 42 (21), 9546–9552 (2015).

1488 S. Liang, A D. Ziegler, P B. Reich, K. Zhu, D. Wang, X. Jiang, D. Chen, P. Ciais, Climate
1489 mitigation potential for targeted forestation after considering climate change, fires,
1490 and albedo. *Sci. Adv.* 11, eadn7915 (2025).

1491 T. Nomokonova, K. Ebell, U. Löhnert, M. Maturilli, C. Ritter, The influence of water vapor
1492 anomalies on clouds and their radiative effect at Ny-Ålesund. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*
1493 20(8), 5157–5173 (2020).

1494 P. H. Worley, A. P. Craig, J. M. Dennis, A. A. Mirin, M. A. Taylor, M. Vertenstein,
1495 Performance and Performance Engineering of the Community Earth System Model.
1496 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. 2011.

1497 E. Kutta, J. A. Hubbart, Seasonal Lifting Condensation Level Trends: Implications of
1498 Warming and Reforestation in Appalachia's Deciduous Forest. *Atmosphere*. 14 (1),
1499 98 (2023).

1500 D. M. Romps, Exact Expression for the Lifting Condensation Level. *J. Atmos. Sci.* 74 (12),
1501 3891–3900 (2017).

1502 [R. A. Plumb, On the three-dimensional propagation of stationary waves. *J. Atmos. Sci.* 42](#)
1503 [\(3\), 217–229 \(1985\).](#)

1504 C. Hong, J. A. Burney, J. Pongratz, J. E. M. S. Nabel, N. D. Mueller, R. B. Jackson, S. J.
1505 Davis, Global and regional drivers of land-use emissions in 1961–2017. *Nature*.
1506 589, 554–561 (2021).

1507 S. Cerasoli, J. Yin, A. Porporato, Cloud cooling effects of afforestation and reforestation
1508 at midlatitudes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 118(33), e2026241118 (2021).

1509 J. Wang, W. Li, P. Ciais, L. Z. X. Li, J. Chang, D. Goll, T. Gasser, X. Huang, N. Devaraju,
1510 O. Boucher, Global cooling induced by biophysical effects of bioenergy crop
1511 cultivation. *Nat. Commun.* 12, 7255 (2021).

1512 [J.-F. Bastin, Y. Finegold, C. Garcia, D. Mollicone, M. Rezende, D. Routh, C. M. Zohner,](#)
1513 [T. W. Crowther, The global tree restoration potential. *Science*. 365, 76-79 \(2019\).](#)

1514 [D. Wang, S. Liang, Z. Zeng, Beyond carbon-centric estimates: revisiting the interplay](#)
1515 [between hydroclimatic conditions and dryland forestation. *Sustain. Horiz.* 12,](#)
1516 [100112 \(2024\).](#)

1517 [A. L. S. Swann, M. M. Laguë, E. S. Garcia, J. P. Field, D. D. Breshears, D. J. P. Moore, S.](#)
1518 [R. Saleska, S. C. Stark, J. C. Villegas, D. J. Law, Continental-scale consequences](#)

of tree die-offs in North America: identifying where forest loss matters most.
Environ. Res. Lett. 13, 055014 (2018).

A. V. Di Vittorio, J. Mao, X. Shi, L. Chini, G. Hurtt, W. D. Collins, Quantifying the Effects
of Historical Land Cover Conversion Uncertainty on Global Carbon and Climate
Estimates. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 45 (2), 974-982 (2018).

V. Eyring, S. Bony, G. A. Meehl, C. A. Senior, B. Stevens, R. J. Stouffer, K. E. Taylor,
Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6)
experimental design and organization. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 9(5), 1937–1958 (2016).

R. M. Bright, E. Davin, T. O’Halloran, J. Pongratz, K. Zhao, A. Cescatti, Local temperature
response to land cover and management change driven by non-radiative processes.
Nat. Clim. Change. 7, 296–302 (2017).

Y. Li, B. Huang, C. Tan, X. Zhang, Investigating the global and regional response of
drought to idealized deforestation using multiple global climate models. *Hydrol.
Earth Syst. Sci.* 29, 1637-1658 (2025).

X. Lian, S. Jeong, C.-E. Park, H. Xu, L. Z. X. Li, T. Wang, P. Gentine, J. Peñuelas, S. Piao,
Biophysical impacts of northern vegetation changes on seasonal warming patterns.
Nat. Commun. 13, 3925 (2022).

R. Xu, Y. Li, A. J. Teuling, L. Zhao, D. V. Spracklen, L. Garcia-Carreras, R. Meier, L.
Chen, Y. Zheng, H. Lin, B. Fu, Contrasting impacts of forests on cloud cover based
on satellite observations. *Nat. Commun.* 13, 670 (2022).

J. A. King, J. Weber, P. Lawrence, S. Roe, A. L. S. Swann, M. Val Martin, Global and
regional hydrological impacts of global forest expansion. *JGR-Biogeosciences.*
21(17), 3883–3902 (2024).

1542 H. Zhao, M. Manizza, M. S. Lozier, N. Cassar, Greener green and bluer blue: Ocean
 1543 poleward greening over the past two decades. *Science*. 388_(6753), 1337–1340
 1544 (2025).

1545 N. Khan, M. A. Nasara, Z. Sa'adi, D. P. Awhari, M. I. Asiri, S. Shahid, Z. M. Yaseen,
 1546 Global climate models performance: A comprehensive review of applied
 1547 approaches, recognized issues and possible future directions. *Atmos. Res.* 326,
 1548 108300 (2025).

1549 T. R. Karl, P. D. Jones, R. W. Knight, G. Kukla, N. Plummer, V. Razuvayev, K. P. Gallo,
 1550 J. Lindseay, R. J. Charlson, T. C. Peterson, A new perspective on recent global
 1551 warming: Asymmetric trends of daily maximum and minimum temperature. *Bull.*
 1552 *Amer. Meteor. Soc.* 74, 1007–1024 (1993).

1553 M. Berdugo, J. J. Gaitán, M. Delgado-Baquerizo, T. W. Crowther, V. Dakos, Prevalence
 1554 and drivers of abrupt vegetation shifts in global drylands, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*
 1555 119 (43), e2123393119 (2022).

1556 A. B. Atkinson, On the measurement of inequality. *J. Econ. Theory*, 2(3), 244-263 (1970).

1557 C. Zhou, M. Zelinka, S. Klein, Impact of decadal cloud variations on the Earth's energy
 1558 budget. *Nature-Nat. Geosci.* 9, 871–874 (2016).

1559 F. Kan, H. Xu, S. Tang, J. Peñuelas, X. Lian, C. T. J. Roebroek, N. Anniwaer, K. Wang, S.
 1560 Piao, Diminished biophysical cooling benefits of global forestation under rising
 1561 atmospheric CO₂. *Nat. Commun.* 16, 4410 (2025).

1562 H. Zhang, F. Wang, F. Wang, J. Li, X. Chen, Z. Wang, J. Li, X. Zhou, Q. Wang, H. Wang,
 1563 T. You, B. Xie, Q. Chen, Y. Duan, Advances in cloud radiative feedbacks in global
 1564 climate change (in Chinese). *Scientia Sinica Terrae*, 52(3), 400–417 (2022).

设置了格式: 下标

- M. D. Zelinka, C. Zhou, S. A. Klein, Insights from a refined decomposition of cloud feedbacks. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 43(17), 9259–9269 (2016).
- [D. G. Miralles, A. J. Teuling, C. C. van Heerwaarden, J. Vilà-Guerau de Arellano, Mega-heatwave temperatures due to combined soil desiccation and atmospheric heat accumulation. *Nat. Geosci.* 7, 345–349 \(2014\).](#)
- [S. Zhou, A. P. Williams, A. M. Berg, B. I. Cook, Y. Zhang, S. Hagemann, R. Lorenz, S. I. Seneviratne, P. Gentile, Land-atmosphere feedbacks exacerbate concurrent soil drought and atmospheric aridity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 116 \(38\), 18848–18853 \(2019\).](#)
- P. Ceppi, P. Nowack, Observational evidence that cloud feedback amplifies global warming. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 118 (30), e2026290118 (2021).
- L. Liu, Y. Huang, J. R. Gyakum, Clouds reduce downwelling longwave radiation over land in a warming climate. *Nature.* 637, 868–874 (2025).
- [Z. McGraw, T. Storelvmo, L. M. Polvani, S. Hofer, J. K. Shaw, A. Gettelman, On the links between ice nucleation, cloud phase, and climate sensitivity in CESM2. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 50 \(17\), e2023GL105053 \(2023\).](#)
- [H. Wang, M. Wang, Z. Zhang, V. E. Larson, B. M. Griffin, Z. Guo, Y. Zhu, D. Rosenfeld, Y. Cao, H. Bai, Improving the treatment of subgrid cloud variability in warm rain simulation in CESM2. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* 14 \(9\), e2022MS003103 \(2022\).](#)
- R. A. Pielke Sr, J. Adegoke, A. Beltrán-Przekurat, C. A. Hiemstra, J. Lin, U. S. Nair, D. Niyogi, and T. E. Nobis, An overview of regional land-use and land-cover impacts on rainfall. *Tellus B.* 59 (3), 587–601 (2007).

R. A. Pielke Sr, R. Avissar, M. Raupach, A. J. Dolman, X. Zeng, A. S. Denning,
Interactions between the atmosphere and terrestrial ecosystems: influence on
weather and climate. Glob. Chang. Biol. 4 (5), 461–475 (1998).

E. Kalnay, M. Kanamitsu, R. Kistler, W. Collins, D. Deaven, L. Gandin, M. Iredell, S.
Saha, G. White, J. Woollen, Y. Zhu, M. Chelliah, W. Ebisuzaki, W. Higgins, J.
Janowiak, K. C. Mo, C. Ropelewski, J. Wang, A. Leetmaa, R. Reynolds, R. Jenne,
D. Joseph, The NCEP/NCAR 40-Year Reanalysis Project. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.
77(3), 437-471 (1996).

G. J. Huffman, R. F. Adler, A. Behrangi, D. T. Bolvin, E. J. Nelkin, G. Gu, M. R. Ehsani,
The New Version 3.2 Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) Monthly
and Daily Precipitation Products. J. Clim. 36 (21), 7635-7655 (2023).

R. F. Adler, M. R. P. Sapiiano, G. J. Huffman, J. J. Wang, G. Gu, D. Bolvin, L. Chiu, U.
Schneider, A. Becker, E. Nelkin, P. Xie, R. Ferraro, D. B. Shin, The Global
Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) monthly analysis (new version 2.3) and
a review of 2017 global precipitation. Atmosphere. 9 (4), 138 (2018).

P. Xie, P. A. Arkin, Global precipitation: A 17-year monthly analysis based on gauge
observations, satellite estimates, and numerical model outputs. Bull. Amer. Meteor.
Soc. 78 (11), 2539-2558 (1997).

X. Lee, M. L. Goulden, D. Y. Hollinger, A. Barr, T. A. Black, G. Bohrer, R. Bracho, B.
 Drake, A. Goldstein, L. Gu, G. Katul, T. Kolb, B. E. Law, H. Margolis, T. Meyers,
 R. Monson, W. Munger, R. Oren, K. T. Paw U, A. D. Richardson, H. P. Schmid,
 R. Staebler, S. Wofsy, L. Zhao, Observed increase in local cooling effect of
 deforestation at higher latitudes. Nature. 479_(7373),_384-387_(2011).

J. Q. Chambers, P. Artaxo, Biosphere–atmosphere interactions: Deforestation size influences rainfall. *Nat. Clim. Change.* 7, 175–176 (2017).

J. Khanna, D. Medvigy, S. Fueglistaler, R. Walko, Regional dry-season climate changes due to three decades of Amazonian deforestation. Nat. Clim. Change. 7, 200–204 (2017).

V. M. Bauer, S. Schemm, R. Portmann, J. Zhang, G. K. Eirund, S. J. De Hertog, J. Zibell, [5](#)
Impacts of North American forest cover changes on the North Atlantic Ocean
circulation. *Earth. Syst. Dyn.* 16(2),16, [379-409](#) (2025).

D. M. Olson, E. Dinerstein, E. D. Wikramanayake, N. D. Burgess, G. V. N. Powell, E. C. Underwood, J. A. D'amico, I. Itoua, H. E. Strand, J. C. Morrison, C. J. Loucks, T. F. Allnutt, T. H. Ricketts, Y. Kura, J. F. Lamoreux, W. W. Wettengel, P. Hedao, K. R. Kassem, Terrestrial Ecoregions of the World: A New Map of Life on Earth: A new global map of terrestrial ecoregions provides an innovative tool for conserving biodiversity. BioScience. 51 (11), 933–938 (2001).

A. P. Dixon, D. Faber-Langendoen, C. Josse, J. Morrison, C. J. Loucks, Distribution
mapping of world grassland types. J. Biogeogr. 41 (11), 2003–2019 (2014).

S. H. Schneider, Cloudiness as a Global Climatic Feedback Mechanism: The Effects on the Radiation Balance and Surface Temperature of Variations in Cloudiness. J. ATMOS SCI. 29 (8), 1413-1422 (1972).

M. Breil, E. L. Davin, D. Rechid. What determines the sign of the evapotranspiration response to afforestation in European summer? *Biogeosciences*. 18(4), 1499-1510 (2021).

[D. M. Lawrence, G. C. Hurtt, A. Arneth, V. Brovkin, K. V. Calvin, A. D. Jones, C. D. Jones, P. J. Lawrence, N. de Noblet-Ducoudré, J. Pongratz, S. I. Seneviratne, E. Shevliakova, The Land Use Model Intercomparison Project \(LUMIP\) contribution to CMIP6: rationale and experimental design. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 9 \(9\), 2973-2998 \(2016\).](#)
 J. A. Foley, J. E. Kutzbach, M. T. Coe, S. Levis, Feedbacks between climate and boreal forests during the Holocene epoch. *Nature*. 371, 52–54 (1994).
 M. D. Zelinka, D. A. Randall, M. J. Webb, S. A. Klein, Clearing clouds of uncertainty. ~~Nature~~ *Nat. Clim. Change*. 7, 674–678 (2017).
[M. D. Zelinka, T. A. Myers, D. T. McCoy, S. Po-Chedley, P. M. Caldwell, P. Ceppi, S. A. Klein, K. E. Taylor, Causes of Higher Climate Sensitivity in CMIP6 Models. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 47 \(1\), e2019GL085782 \(2020\).](#)
 J. Weber, J. A. King, N. L. Abraham, D. P. Grosvenor, C. J. Smith, Y. M. Shin, P. Lawrence, S. Roe, D. J. Beerling, M. Val Martin. Chemistry-albedo feedbacks offset up to a third of forestation’s CO₂ removal benefits. *Science*. 383 (6685), 860-864 (2024).
[R. E. Dickinson, A. Henderson-Sellers. Modelling tropical deforestation: A study of GCM land-surface parametrizations. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* 114, 439-462 \(1988\).](#)
 B. A. Albrecht, Aerosols. cloud microphysics and fractional cloudiness. *Science*. 245 (4923), 1227–1230 (1989).
[C. S. Lesk, J. S. Mankin, More concentrated precipitation decreases terrestrial water storage. *Nature*. 653, 425–432 \(2026\).](#)
 G. Duveiller, J. Hooker, A. Cescatti, The mark of vegetation change on Earth’s surface energy balance. ~~Nature~~ *Nat. Commun.* 9(4), 679 (2018).

设置了格式: 下标

R. Alkama, A. Cescatti, Biophysical climate impacts of recent changes in global forest cover. *Science*. 351_(6273), 600–604 (2016).

H. Luo, J. Quaas, Y. Han, Diurnally asymmetric cloud cover trends amplify greenhouse warming. *Sci. Adv.* 10, eado5179_(2024a).

H. Luo, J. Quaas, Y. Han, Decreased cloud cover partially offsets the cooling effects of surface albedo change due to deforestation. *Nat. Commun.* 15, 7345 (2024b).

T. Dror, G. Feingold, Amazon forest loss: An all-sky biophysical top-of-atmosphere cooling feedback. *Science*. 392 (6796), 429–432 (2026).

H. Liu, I. Koren, O. Altaratz, M. D. Chekroun, Opposing trends of cloud coverage over land and ocean under global warming. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 23 (11), 6559–6569 (2023).

S. Cao, L. Chen, D. Shankman, C. Wang, X. Wang, H. Zhang, Excessive reliance on afforestation in China's arid and semi-arid regions: Lessons in ecological restoration. *Earth-Sci. Rev.* 104 (4), 240–245 (2011).

~~T. Nomokonova, K. Ebell, U. Löhnert, M. Maturilli, C. Ritter, The influence of water vapor anomalies on clouds and their radiative effect at Ny Ålesund. *ATMOS-CHEM PHYS.* 20(8), 5157–5173 (2020).~~

D. L. Hartmann, M. E. Ockert-Bell, M. L. Michelsen, The Effect of Cloud Type on Earth's Energy Balance: Global Analysis. *J. Clim.* 5 (11), 1281–1304 (1992).

R. B. Stull, An introduction to boundary layer meteorology. Springer Science & Business Media. (2012).

R. Wood, Stratocumulus clouds. *Mon. Weather Rev.* 140 (8), 2373–2423 (2012).

[S. I. Seneviratne, T. Corti, E. L. Davin, M. Hirschi, E. B. Jaeger, I. Lehner, B. Orlowsky, A. J. Teuling, Investigating soil moisture–climate interactions in a changing climate: A review. *Earth-Sci. Rev.* 99 \(3-4\), 125-161 \(2010\).](#)

G. Tselioudis, J. Remillard, C. Jakob, W. B. Rossow, Contraction of the World's Storm-Cloud Zones the Primary Contributor to the 21st Century Increase in the Earth's Sunlight Absorption. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 52,(11), e2025GL114882 (2025).

[S. Luyssaert, G. Marie, A. Valade, Y.-Y. Chen, S. Njakou Djomo, J. Ryder, J. Otto, K. Naudts, A. S. Lansø, J. Ghattas, M. J. McGrath, Trade-offs in using European forests to meet climate objectives. *Nature.* 562, 259–262 \(2018\).](#)

C. Chen, L. Wang, R. B. Myneni, D. Li, Attribution of Land-Use/Land-Cover Change Induced Surface Temperature Anomaly: How Accurate Is the First-Order Taylor Series Expansion?. *JGR Biogeosciences.* 125(9), e2020JG005787 (2020).

[J. A. Santanello Jr., P. A. Dirmeyer, C. R. Ferguson, K. L. Findell, A. B. Tawfik, A. Berg, M. Ek, P. Gentile, B. P. Guillod, C. van Heerwaarden, J. Roundy, V. Wulfmeyer, Land–atmosphere interactions: The LoCo perspective. *BULL AM METEOROL SOC.* 99 \(6\), 1253-1272 \(2018\).](#)

G. Danabasoglu, J. F. Lamarque, J. Bacmeister, D. A. Bailey, A. K. DuVivier, J. Edwards, L. K. Emmons, J. Fasullo, R. Garcia, A. Gettelman, C. Hannay, M. M. Holland, W. G. Large, P. H. Lauritzen, D. M. Lawrence, J. T. M. Lenaerts, K. Lindsay, W. H. Lipscomb, M. J. Mills, R. Neale, K. W. Oleson, B. Otto-Bliesner, A. S. Phillips, W. Sacks, S. Tilmes, L. van Kampenhout, M. Vertenstein, A. Bertini, J. Dennis, C. Deser, C. Fischer, B. Fox-Kemper, J. E. Kay, D. Kinnison, P. J. Kushner, V. E. Larson, M. C. Long, S. Mickelson, J. K. Moore, E. Nienhouse, L. Polvani, P. J.

1700 Rasch, W. G. Strand, The Community Earth System Model Version 2 (CESM2). J.
 1701 Adv. Model. Earth Syst. 12(2), e2019MS001916 (2020).
 1702 J. T. Fasullo. Evaluating simulated climate patterns from the CMIP archives using satellite
 1703 and reanalysis datasets using the Climate Model Assessment Tool (CMATv1).
 1704 Geosci. Model Dev. 13, 3627–3642 (2020).
 1705 J. Zhu, B. L. Otto-Bliesner, E. C. Brady, A. Gettelman, J. T. Bacmeister, R. B. Neale, C. J.
 1706 Poulsen, J. K. Shaw, Z. S. McGraw, J. E. Kay. LGM Paleoclimate Constraints
 1707 Inform Cloud Parameterizations and Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity in CESM2. J.
 1708 Adv. Model. Earth Syst. 14(4), e2021MS002776 (2022).
 1709 [A. Gettelman, C. Hannay, J. T. Bacmeister, R. B. Neale, A. G. Pendergrass, G.](#)
 1710 [Danabasoglu, J.-F. Lamarque, J. T. Fasullo, D. A. Bailey, D. M. Lawrence, M. J.](#)
 1711 [Mills. High climate sensitivity in the Community Earth System Model Version 2](#)
 1712 [\(CESM2\). Geophys. Res. Lett. 46 \(14\), 8329–8337 \(2019\).](#)
 1713 S. J. Lin, R. B. Rood, An explicit Flux-Form Semi-Lagrangian shallow water model on the
 1714 sphere. Quarterly J. R. Meteorol. Soc. 123 (544), 2477–2498 (1997).
 1715 H. Morrison, A. Gettelman, A new two-moment bulk stratiform cloud microphysics
 1716 scheme in the NCAR community atmosphere model (CAM3), Part I: Description
 1717 and numerical tests. J. Clim, 21, 3642–3659 (2008).
 1718 A. Gettelman, H. Morrison, Advanced two-moment bulk microphysics for global models.
 1719 Part I: Off-line tests and comparison with other schemes. J. Clim. 28 (3), 1268–
 1720 1287 (2015).
 1721 V. E. Larson, CLUBB-SILHS: A parameterization of subgrid variability in the atmosphere.
 1722 2017.

C. S. Bretherton, D. L. Hartmann, Large-scale Controls on Cloudiness. In Clouds in the Perturbed Climate System: Their Relationship to Energy Balance, Atmospheric Dynamics, and Precipitation, J. Heintzenberg, R. J. Charlson, Eds. (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2009).

N. Devaraju, Nathalie de Noblet-Ducoudré, Benjamin Quesada, G. Bala, Quantifying the relative importance of direct and indirect biophysical effects of deforestation on surface temperature and teleconnections. *J. Clim.* 31(10), 3811-3829 (2018).

Y. Sui, M. Wei, B. Liu, Biophysical Impacts of Global Deforestation on Near-Surface Air Temperature in China: Results from Land Use Model Intercomparison Project Simulations. *Adv. Atmos. Sci.*, 42, 1141-1155 (2025).

K. J. Meissner, A. J. Weaver, H. D. Matthews, P. M. Cox, The role of land surface dynamics in glacial inception: a study with the UVic Earth System Model. *Climate Dynamics*. 21, 515–537 (2003).

V. Arora, Montenegro, Small temperature benefits provided by realistic afforestation efforts. *Nature-Nat. Geosci.* 4, 514–518 (2011).

S. C. Swenson, D. Lawrence, A new fractional snow-covered area parameterization for the Community Land Model and its effect on the surface energy balance. *J. GEOPHYS Geophys. ResES-AtmosTMOs*. 117, D21107 (2012).

D. M. Lawrence, R. A. Fisher, C. D. Koven, K. W. Oleson, S. C. Swenson, G. Bonan, N. Collier, B. Ghimire, L. van Kampenhout, D. Kennedy, E. Kluzek, P. J. Lawrence, F. Li, H. Li, D. Lombardozzi, W. J. Riley, W. J. Sacks, M. Shi, M. Vertenstein, W. R. Wieder, C. Xu, A. A. Ali, A. M. Badger, G. Bisht, M. van den Broeke, M. A. Brunke, S. P. Burns, J. Buzan, M. Clark, A. Craig, K. Dahlin, B. Drewniak, J. B.

Fisher, M. Flanner, A. M. Fox, P. Gentine, F. Hoffman, G. Keppel-Aleks, R. Knox,
S. Kumar, J. Lenaerts, L. R. Leung, W.H. Lipscomb, Y. Lu, A. Pandey, J. D.
Pelletier, J. Perket, J. T. Randerson, D. M. Ricciuto, B. M. Sanderson, A. Slater, Z.
M. Subin, J. Tang, R.Q. Thomas, M. Val Martin, X. Zeng, The Community Land
Model Version 5: Description of New Features, Benchmarking, and Impact of
Forcing Uncertainty. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* 11_(12), 4245–4287 (2019).

[D. L. Lombardozzi, Y. Lu, P. J. Lawrence, D. M. Lawrence, S. Swenson, K. W. Oleson,](#)
[W. R. Wieder, E. A. Ainsworth, Simulating Agriculture in the Community Land](#)
[Model Version 5. *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci.* 125 \(8\), e2019JG005529 \(2020\).](#)

G. C. Hurtt, L. Chini, R. Sahajpal, S. Frolking, B. L. Boudirsky, K. Calvin, J. C. Doelman,
J. Fisk, S. Fujimori, K. Klein Goldewijk, T. Hasegawa, P. Havlik, A. Heinemann,
F. Humpenöder, J. Jungclaus, J. O. Kaplan, J. Kennedy, T. Krisztin, D. Lawrence,
P. Lawrence, L. Ma, O. Mertz, J. Pongratz, A. Popp, B. Poulter, K. Riahi, E.
Shevliakova, E. Stehfest, P. Thornton, F. N. Tubiello, D. P. van Vuuren, X. Zhang,
Harmonization of global land use change and management for the period 850–2100
(LUH2) for CMIP6. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 13, 5425–5464 (2020).

T. Chen, C. Guestrin, XGBoost: a scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the*
22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data
Mining, San Francisco, California, USA. 785-794 (2016).

P. Falloon, A. Challinor, S. Dessai, L. Hoang, J. Johnson, A.-K. Kochler, Ensembles and
uncertainty in climate change impacts. *Front. Environ. Sci.* 2, 33 (2014).

- W. Zhang, Z. Xu, W. Guo, The Impacts of Land-Use and Land-Cover Change on Tropospheric Temperatures at Global and Regional Scales. *Earth Interact.* 20 (7), 1–23 (2016).
- G. Abramowitz, N. Herger, E. Gutmann, D. Hammerling, R. Knutti, M. Leduc, R. Lorenz, R. Pincus, G. A. Schmidt, ESD Reviews: Model dependence in multi-model climate ensembles: weighting, sub-selection and out-of-sample testing. *Earth Syst. Dynam.* 10 (1), 91–105 (2019).
- R. Knutti, R. Furrer, C. Tebaldi, J. Cermak, and G. A. Meehl, Challenges in combining projections from multiple climate models. *J. Clim.* 23 (10), 2739–2758 (2010).
- F. von Trentini, E. E. Aalbers, E. M. Fischer, and R. Ludwig, Comparing interannual variability in three regional single-model initial-condition large ensembles (SMILEs) over Europe. *Earth Syst. Dynam.* 11 (4), 1013–1031 (2020).
- J. Snoek, H. Larochelle, R. P. Adams, Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms. *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.* ~~Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems~~ 25, 2960–2968 (2012).
- Y. Wei, S. Liu, D. N. Huntzinger, A. M. Michalak, N. Viovy, W. M. Post, C. R. Schwalm, K. Schaefer, A. R. Jacobson, C. Lu, H. Tian, D. M. Ricciuto, R. B. Cook, J. Mao, and X. Shi, The North American Carbon Program Multi-scale Synthesis and Terrestrial Model Intercomparison Project—Part 2: Environmental driver data, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 7, 2875–2893 (2014).
- Y. Ren, J. Qiu, Z. Zeng, X. Liu, S. Sitch, K. Pilegaard, T. Yang, S. Wang, W. Yuan, A. K. Jain, Earlier spring greening in Northern Hemisphere terrestrial biomes enhanced net ecosystem productivity in summer. *Commun Earth Environ.* 5, 122 (2024).

1790 S. M. Lundberg, G. Erion, H. Chen, A. DeGrave, J. M. Prutkin, B. Nair, R. Katz, J.
 1791 Himmelfarb, N. Bansal, S. -I. Lee, From local explanations to global understanding
 1792 with explainable AI for trees. *Nat. Mach. Intell.* 2, 56–67 (2020).
 1793 J. Muñoz-Sabater, E. Dutra, C. Agustí-Panareda, G. Albergel, G. Arduini, S. Balsamo, M.
 1794 Boussetta, S. Choulga, H. Harrigan, H. Hersbach, D. Martens, M. Miralles, N. Piles,
 1795 E. Rodríguez-Fernández, C. Zsoter, J. Buontempo, J.-N. Thépaut, ERA5-Land: A
 1796 state-of-the-art global reanalysis dataset for land applications. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data.*
 1797 13 (9), 4349-4383 (2021).
 1798 C. L. Parr, M. te Beest, N. Stevens, Conflation of reforestation with restoration is
 1799 widespread. *Science.* 383_(6684),_698-701 [\(2024\)](#).
 1800 FAO FRA. Forest Resources Assessment 2015: Terms and Definitions. FAO Rep. 36,
 1801 (2012).
 1802 ~~J. Weber, J. A. King, N. L. Abraham, D. P. Grosvenor, C. J. Smith, Y. M. Shin, P. Lawrence,~~
 1803 ~~S. Roe, D. J. Beerling, M. Val Martin, Chemistry albedo feedbacks offset up to a~~
 1804 ~~third of forestation's CO₂ removal benefits. *Science*, 2024, 383(6685), 860–864~~
 1805 ~~(2024)~~
 1806 K. Wang, D. Zhao, Y. Zhu, X. Gao, S. Deng, Z. Chen, S. Wang, Y. Cui, Albedo-dominated
 1807 biogeophysical warming effects induced by vegetation restoration on the Loess
 1808 Plateau, China. *Ecol. Indic.* 154,_110690_(2023).
 1809 J. W. Veldman, G. E. Overbeck, D. Negreiros, G. Mahy, S. Le Stradic, G. W. Fernandes,
 1810 G. Durigan, E. Buisson, F. E. Putz, W. J. Bond, Tyranny of trees in grassy biomes.
 1811 *Science.* 347_(6221),_484-485_(2015a).

1812 J. W. Veldman, G. E. Overbeck, D. Negreiros, G. Mahy, S. Le Stradic, G. W. Fernandes,
1813 G. Durigan, E. Buisson, F. E. Putz, W. J. Bond, Where Tree Planting and Forest
1814 Expansion are Bad for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. *BioScience*. 65_(10),
1815 1011-1018,(2015b).

1816 M. L. Flora, C. K. Potvin, A. McGovern, & S. Handler, A Machine Learning Explainability
1817 Tutorial for Atmospheric Sciences. *Artif. Intell. Earth Syst*~~Artificial Intelligence~~
1818 ~~for the Earth Systems~~. 3 (1), e230018 (2024).

1819 S. Roe, C. Streck, R. Beach, J. Busch, M. Chapman, V. Daioglou, A. Deppermann, J.
1820 Doelman, J. Emmet-Booth, J. Engelmann, O. Fricko, C. Frischmann, J. Funk, G.
1821 Grassi, B. Griscom, P. Havlik, S. Hanssen, F. Humpenöder, D. Landholm, G.
1822 Lomax, J. Lehmann, L. Mesnildrey, G.-J. Nabuurs, A. Popp, C. Rivard, J.
1823 Sanderman, B. Sohngen, P. Smith, E. Stehfest, D. Woolf, D. Lawrence, Land-
1824 based measures to mitigate climate change: Potential and feasibility by country,
1825 *Glob. Change Biol.* 27 (23), 6025–6058 (2021).