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Abstract

Atmospheric aerosols have important impacts on air quality and the Earth-atmospheric energy balance. However, as computing power is limited, Earth system models generally use coarse spatial grids and parameterize finer-scale atmospheric processes. These parameterizations and the simulation of atmospheric aerosols are often sensitive to model horizontal resolutions. Understanding the sensitivities is necessary for the development of Earth system models at higher resolutions with the deployment of more powerful supercomputers. Using the Energy Exascale Earth System Model (E3SM) version 1, this study investigates the impact of horizontal grid spacing on the simulated aerosol mass budget, aerosol-cloud interactions, and the effective radiative forcing of anthropogenic aerosols ($\text{ERF}_{\text{aer}}$) over the contiguous United States. We examine the resolution sensitivity by comparing the nudged simulation results for 2016 from the low-resolution model (LR) and the regional refinement model (RRM).

As expected, the simulated emissions of natural dust, sea salt, and marine organic matter are substantially higher in the RRM than in the LR. In addition, RRM simulates stronger aqueous-phase production of sulfate through the enhanced oxidation of sulfur dioxide by hydrogen peroxide due to increased cloud liquid water content. In contrast, the gas-phase chemical production of sulfate is slightly suppressed. The RRM resolves more large-scale precipitation and produces less convective precipitation than the LR, leading to increased (decreased) aerosol wet scavenging by large-scale (convective) precipitation.

Regarding aerosol effects on clouds, RRM produces larger temporal variabilities of large-scale liquid cloud fractions than LR, resulting in increased microphysical cloud processing of aerosols (more interstitial aerosols are converted to cloud-borne aerosols via aerosol activation) in RRM. Water vapor condensation is also enhanced in RRM compared to LR. Consequently, the RRM simulation produces more cloud droplets, a larger cloud droplet radius, a higher liquid water path, and a larger cloud optical depth than the LR simulation. A comparison of the present-day and pre-industrial simulations indicates
that, for this contiguous United States domain, the higher resolution increases ERF$_{aer}$ at the top of the model by about 12%, which is mainly attributed to the strengthened indirect effect associated with aerosol-cloud interactions.
Atmospheric aerosols have played essential roles in the deterioration of air quality in recent decades, especially in rapidly developing countries (Li et al., 2019; Lim et al., 2020; Xiao et al., 2021). Besides directly degrading atmospheric visibility and with substantial impacts on human health (Apte et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2019), aerosols are also involved in the formation of other major atmospheric pollutants, such as ozone and nitrogen oxides (Perring et al., 2013; Pusede et al., 2015). In addition, atmospheric aerosols from natural and anthropogenic sources considerably affect the radiation balance of the Earth system. The present-day (PD) (the year 2014) anthropogenic aerosol effective radiative forcing (ERF\textsubscript{aer}) relative to the pre-industrial (PI) period (the year 1850) is estimated to range from -0.63 to -1.37 W m\textsuperscript{-2} according to 17 Earth system models (ESMs) participating the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) (Smith et al., 2020). Aerosols can modulate the earth-atmospheric energy balance via several pathways. Firstly, they directly scatter and absorb shortwave and longwave radiation. Secondly, they are involved in cloud formation by acting as cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) and ice nuclei, thus influencing cloud radiative forcing. Thirdly, light-absorbing aerosols depositing on snow and ice surface can change the snow and ice melting by absorbing more solar radiation, leading to changes in surface albedo and energy budgets (Qian et al., 2015). Aerosols can also indirectly affect the global energy budget by influencing the ocean biogeochemistry and terrestrial ecosystems (Hamilton et al., 2022; Jickells et al., 2005; Mahowald et al., 2017).

Accurate simulation of atmospheric aerosols in ESMs is challenging due to complex physical and chemical processes (e.g., emissions, nucleation, coagulation, condensation, dry deposition, wet scavenging and resuspension, droplet activation, gas- and aqueous-phase chemistry, and radiation) and our incomplete understanding of these processes. Substantial parameterizations are designed to represent the aerosol lifecycle and its interactions with clouds and radiation in the Energy Exascale Earth System Model (E3SM) (Burrows et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2020) — a state-of-the-science ESM sponsored by the
United States (US) Department of Energy (DOE) for scientific and energy mission applications (Golaz et al., 2022; Golaz et al., 2019). However, these parameterizations are primarily developed and evaluated at ESM scales, and their performance at higher resolution is generally unclear. As the computing power continues to increase, future ESMs are expected to run at much higher resolutions (Caldwell et al., 2021; Dueben et al., 2020; Heinzeller et al., 2016). Therefore, it is crucial to understand the fidelity of these aerosol parameterizations and how the simulated aerosol lifecycle and aerosol effects on cloud and radiation will change as model resolution increases. These efforts are critical for parameter tuning and model development at high resolutions (Caldwell et al., 2019; Ma et al., 2014; Ma et al., 2015).

Caldwell et al. (2019) and Feng et al. (2022) investigated the impacts of model horizontal resolutions on some aspects of the aerosol lifecycle in E3SM. However, both studies were based on simulations with global uniform resolutions, which will be computationally expensive when the model resolution increases further to convection-permitting. To reduce the computational cost and maintain high-resolution features, variable-resolution techniques with high-resolution grids in the region of interest transitioning to low-resolution meshes in others have been widely applied in ESMs (Harris et al., 2016; Schwartz, 2019; Zarzycki et al., 2014). Tang et al. (2019) developed a regional refinement model (RRM) configuration for E3SM version 1 (E3SMv1) with high-resolution meshes (~25 km) over the contiguous US (CONUS) and low-resolution meshes (~100 km) in other areas. They found that RRM highly resembles the uniform high-resolution simulation in the refined region, indicating that RRM can be an effective and computationally efficient configuration for high-resolution model development.

This study investigates the impact of horizontal grid spacing on aerosol mass budget, aerosol-cloud interactions, and ERF<sub>aer</sub> over the CONUS in 2016 using the RRM configuration. We compare E3SMv1 simulations with a global uniform grid spacing of ~100 km (hereafter referred to as the low-resolution (LR) simulations) to the RRM simulations using the same configuration as Tang et al. (2019) with higher resolution (~25 km) meshes over CONUS. Our findings provide insights into aerosol parameterization development and their dependence on model horizontal resolution. The paper is organized as follows.
Section 2 describes the E3SMv1 model and the simulation configurations. Section 3 discusses the impacts of increasing resolution on 1) the natural aerosol sources, 2) the aerosol wet scavenging, 3) the aerosol chemical production, 4) the aerosol-cloud interactions, and 5) ERF_aer, where apparent discrepancies are found between the LR and RRM simulations. Finally, the study is summarized in Section 4.

2 Model setup

2.1 E3SMv1 model description

Aerosol processes are primarily represented in the E3SM Atmosphere Model version 1 (EAMv1) (Rasch et al., 2019), which uses the High-Order Methods Modeling Environment (HOMME) Spectral Element dynamical core (Dennis et al., 2012). The dynamical core and the physics parametrizations are computed on cubed-sphere grids with data stored at Gauss-Lobatto-Legendre (GLL) nodes. The EAMv1 standard low-resolution configuration has 30 spectral elements per cube face (ne30) and 4 GLL nodes per spectral element (np4), corresponding to a horizontal grid spacing of ~100 km. The model has 72 vertical layers with a vertical resolution of ~20 m near the surface and a vertical resolution higher than 200 m below 1.5 km, and the model top reaches up to ~60 km (~0.1 hPa). The model uses an updated version of the Zhang and McFarlane (1995) (ZM) deep convection scheme with a modified dilute plume calculation (Neale et al., 2008), the Cloud Layers Unified By Binormals (CLUBB) scheme for turbulence, shallow convection, and stratiform clouds (Bogenschutz et al., 2013; Golaz et al., 2002; Larson et al., 2002; Xie et al., 2018), the version 2 of the Morrison and Gettelman (2008) (MG2) 2-moment cloud microphysics scheme with a classical-nucleation-theory-based ice nucleation parameterization (Hoese et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2014), the revised version of the four-mode version of the Modal Aerosol Module (MAM4) (Liu et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2020), and the Rapid Radiative Transfer Model for GCMs (RRTMG) (GCM: general circulation model) (Iacono et al., 2008; Mlawer et al., 1997).
MAM4 considers seven aerosol species: mineral dust, sea salt, marine organic matter (MOM), black carbon (BC), primary organic matter (POM), secondary organic aerosol (SOA), and sulfate (SO$_4$) (Wang et al., 2020). Dust emission is parameterized as a function of surface wind speed, soil erodibility, and a friction velocity threshold following the scheme of Zender et al. (2003) in the land component of E3SMv1. The emissions of sea salt and MOM are estimated from sea spray fluxes, which are parameterized as a function of surface wind speed and sea surface temperature (Burrows et al., 2022). Emissions of other aerosol species and precursor gases are prescribed using CMIP6 emission datasets (Hoesly et al., 2018; Van Marle et al., 2017). The physical properties (including the size distribution, density, and hygroscopicity) of the seven aerosol species are summarized in Burrows et al. (2022).

MAM4 represents aerosol particles in four modes with distinct size properties: Aitken mode, accumulation mode, coarse mode, and primary carbon mode (Burrows et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2020). The primary carbon mode is specified for freshly emitted BC, POM, and MOM, the aging of which is treated explicitly — a feature different from the three-mode version of MAM (MAM3) (Liu et al., 2012). The Aitken mode consists of sea salt, MOM, SOA, and SO$_4$, while all seven species can exist in accumulation and coarse modes. MAM4 assumes that aerosol species are internally mixed within each mode but externally mixed across different modes. Aerosol particles in each mode can suspend in the air (i.e., interstitial aerosols) or exist in cloud droplets (i.e., cloud-borne aerosols). The evolution of aerosol particles involves many physical and chemical processes, such as emissions, nucleation, coagulation, condensation, activation, dry deposition, wet scavenging, resuspension, and gas-phase and aqueous chemistry. More details of these processes and their interactions with radiation and cloud microphysics are described in Liu et al. (2012), Liu et al. (2016), Wang et al. (2020), and Zhang et al. (2022a).

EAMv1 has been evaluated against observations and other ESMs in Xie et al. (2018), Rasch et al. (2019), and Golaz et al. (2019). The simulation of aerosol properties and ERF$_{aer}$ have been evaluated in Wang et al. (2020), Burrows et al. (2022), Feng et al. (2022), and Zhang et al. (2022a). Our investigation
focuses on comparing LR and RRM simulations, and the known model biases are not expected to affect the overall model sensitivity to the resolution change.

2.2 E3SMv1 LR and RRM simulations

In addition to the standard LR E3SMv1 simulation with a globally uniform resolution of ~100 km for EAMv1 and the land component, we conduct an RRM simulation following the configuration of Tang et al. (2019) with a relatively high-resolution mesh (~25 km) over the CONUS for the atmospheric and land components (Figure 1). The simulation period is from October 1, 2015, to January 1, 2017, with the first three months as model spin-up. We use the “FC5AV1C-04P2” compset in E3SMv1 for our study. FC5AV1C-04P2 comprises the coupling of an active atmospheric component — EAMv1, an active land component (version 4.5 of the Community Land Model — CLM4.5) (Oleson et al., 2013), a simplified active sea ice component, and a data ocean model with prescribed historical sea surface temperature and sea ice fractions (Hurrell et al., 2008).

The atmospheric and land initial conditions in the LR simulation are derived from an earlier E3SMv1 simulation, which has reached equilibrium. The RRM initial conditions are regridded from those of the LR simulation to exclude the potential impact of distinct initial conditions on the simulation results. Anthropogenic and biomass-burning emissions of BC, POM, and SO\textsubscript{4} and precursor gas sulfur dioxide (SO\textsubscript{2}) are from the CMIP6 emission inventory (Feng et al., 2020; Hoesly et al., 2018). Notably, we use the emission data in 2014 instead of in 2016 due to the data availability of CMIP6. Dimethyl sulfide (DMS) emissions in 1850, 2000, and 2100 are estimated from a coupled model simulation with a detailed representation of DMS formation in the seawater (Wang et al., 2018). We obtain the DMS emissions in 2014 through linear interpolation of the emissions in 1850, 2000, and 2100. The 3-D SOA production rates (implemented similarly to emissions) are derived from the simulation from Shrivastava et al. (2015). Besides the PD LR and RRM simulations, we run two corresponding simulations with PI aerosol emissions to calculate ERF\textsubscript{aer}. The PI simulation configurations are the same as the corresponding PD
simulations except that emissions of BC, POM, SO$_4$, SO$_2$, DMS, and SOA (production) in 1850 are used in the PI simulations.

We apply nudging globally in the LR and RRM simulations, which differs from Tang et al. (2019), which used nudging only on the low-resolution meshes but not the high-resolution grids in CONUS. We follow the nudging strategy from Zhang et al. (2014) and Sun et al. (2019), which demonstrated that a simulation with constraint horizontal winds could reproduce the evolution characteristics of the observed weather events and the model’s long-term climatology. In addition, it has been corroborated that nudged simulations with a relatively short simulation period (e.g., one year) can reproduce the annual mean changes in aerosol burdens and optical depths caused by anthropogenic aerosols in the E3SM Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP) simulations (Zhang et al., 2022a). The short nudged simulations also have a similar estimate of ERF$_{aer}$ as the AMIP-type free-running simulations (Zhang et al., 2022a). Moreover, by constraining the large-scale circulation, nudging helps to suppress the noises caused by the chaotic response to model changes and facilitates the comparison between the LR and RRM simulations. Similarly, nudging is also used to estimate ERF$_{aer}$, as recommended by previous studies (Kooperman et al., 2012; Sun et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2014). In short, nudging helps increase the signal-to-noise ratio and identify the impact caused by regional refinement more quickly. In our simulations, the horizontal winds are nudged toward the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts Reanalysis v5 (ERA5) (Hersbach et al., 2020) with a relaxation time of 6 hours (Zhang et al., 2022b). To avoid the errors caused by vertical interpolation-extrapolation from ERA5 to E3SM vertical levels, we don’t apply nudging for model levels below 950 hPa and above 10 hPa.

Several parameters differ between the E3SMv1 standard LR and CONUS RRM default configurations. For example, the time step for most physical processes and the coupling between physics and dynamics is 30 minutes in the LR configuration. In comparison, CONUS RRM uses a time step of 15 minutes. Many physical processes are sensitive to the time step and parameter setting (Wan et al., 2015; Wan et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2013). Our sensitivity tests show substantial differences in the aerosol mass...
and energy budgets even outside of the refined region when the respective default configurations are used in the LR and RRM simulations, which is mainly attributed to their distinct physical time steps (not shown). Therefore, it would be better to keep the tuning parameters and time step the same between the LR and RRM simulations to isolate the regional refinement effect (horizontal resolution sensitivity), as recommended by earlier studies (Caldwell et al., 2021; Ma et al., 2015). Therefore, for the LR simulation, we use the time step of 15 minutes and the parameter setting from the default CONUS RRM configuration. With such changes, LR shares the same configuration as RRM, except for regional refinement around CONUS (Figure 1). As expected, the results are very close between the LR and RRM simulations in the low-resolution (~100 km) areas (not shown), facilitating our subsequent investigation of the impacts of regional refinement on the aerosol mass budget and the aerosol forcing over CONUS.
3 Results and Discussions

We focus our analysis on the refined region, as outlined by the red box in Figure 1b (hereafter referred to as the RRM region), and the annual mean simulation results in 2016 unless stated otherwise.
The LR and RRM simulation results have been regridded to 1° × 1° to facilitate their comparison unless otherwise indicated.

### 3.1 Aerosol natural sources

Table 1 summarizes the annual mean sources and burdens of the seven aerosol species in the RRM region from the LR and RRM simulations. We find the largest relative differences in the sources and mass burden of the natural wind-driven aerosols between the RRM and LR simulations. With higher horizontal resolution, the RRM simulation produces more dust (154%), sea salt (13%), and MOM (10%) emissions than LR. The dust emission enhancement by RRM is concentrated in several inland regions with high dust emissions, especially in the Mohave and Sonoran deserts (referred to as Region 1) and the northern North American Prairie (referred to as Region 2) (Figures 2a and 2b). In comparison, the increases in sea salt and MOM emissions mainly occur around the coastal lines (Figures 2c-2f). That dust emissions increase with finer model resolutions has been identified in earlier studies (Caldwell et al., 2019; Feng et al., 2022; Ridley et al., 2013), which attributed the increase to more frequent occurrences of strong winds in high-resolution simulations. Dust emissions are nonlinearly correlated with surface winds and are particularly sensitive to strong winds (Zender et al., 2003). We find larger (7.8%) annual mean surface wind speeds and more frequent strong winds in Region 1 in the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation (Figures 3a and 3c), which can explain the dust emission increase in Region 1 under regional refinement (Figure 2b). However, in Region 2, the annual mean surface wind speeds differ slightly (1.6%) between the RRM and LR simulations. Besides, the probability density functions (PDFs) of wind speed in Region 2 are similar between the two simulations (Figures 3a and 3d), indicating that surface winds alone cannot explain the dust emission enhancement in the RRM simulation. In addition to surface winds, soil moisture can also influence dust emissions by improving the friction velocity threshold (Namikas and Sherman, 1997; Zender et al., 2003). Therefore, high soil moisture may inhibit saltation and thus reduce dust emissions. We find lower (-7.1%) volumetric soil water content in the surface layer in Region 2 in
the RRM simulation than in the LR simulation (Figure 3b), which is consistent with the dust emission increase in the region by RRM (Figure 2b). The reduced surface soil water content in Region 2 is likely related to less precipitation (-3.0%) in the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation (Figure 4c).

### Table 1. Total annual mean sources and burden in the RRM region for the seven aerosol species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>RRM / Tg yr(^{-1})</th>
<th>LR / Tg yr(^{-1})</th>
<th>Relative diff(^{%})</th>
<th>Burden</th>
<th>RRM / Tg</th>
<th>LR / Tg</th>
<th>Relative diff / %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dust</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.0910</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea salt</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0875</td>
<td>0.0782</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOM</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00114</td>
<td>0.00104</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0.00446</td>
<td>0.00446</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.0287</td>
<td>0.0286</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.0859</td>
<td>0.0857</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO(_{4})^2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0216</td>
<td>0.0215</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1}\)Relative diff = \((RRM/LR - 1) \times 100\%\).

\(^{2}\)SO\(_{4}\) is represented in the mass of sulfur (Tg S \(^{-1}\) for sources and TgS for burden). Besides direct anthropogenic emissions of SO\(_{4}\), other SO\(_{4}\) sources include gas-aerosol exchange, aqueous-phase production (aqueous-phase chemistry and cloud water uptake), and new particle formation.

As mentioned above, sea salt and MOM emissions are related to surface wind speed and sea surface temperature (Burrows et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2012). We attribute the increased sea salt and MOM emissions in the RRM simulation to enhanced surface wind speeds at the finer model resolution, as shown in Figure 3a. In addition, since sea salt and MOM are only emitted over the ocean, the distinct land-ocean boundaries may also partially contribute to the discrepancies in sea salt and MOM emissions between the RRM and LR simulations.
Figure 2. Left column: spatial distributions of annual mean sources of (a) dust, (c) sea salt, and (e) MOM from the LR simulation. Right column: the same as the left column but for the absolute differences between the RRM and LR simulations. The green and black boxes in (b) highlight two subregions with substantial changes in dust emissions when applying regional refinement. Region 1 is around the Mohave and Sonoran deserts, and Region 2 is in the northern North American Prairie.
Figure 3. Spatial distributions of the relative differences in annual mean (a) 10-m wind speed ($U_{10}$) and (b) surface-layer volumetric soil water content ($H_{2O}SOI$) between the RRM and LR simulations. The green and black boxes in (a) and (b) are the same as those in Figure 2b. (c, d) Probability density functions (PDFs) of $U_{10}$ in (c) Region 1 and (d) Region 2. The black lines are for the LR simulation, while the red lines are for the RRM simulation. $U_{10}$ on native model grids with an output frequency of 15 minutes is used to derive the corresponding PDF.

3.2 Aerosol wet scavenging by convective vs. large-scale precipitation

In the RRM region, wet scavenging is the primary sink for most aerosol species except for dust and sea salt, the sinks of which are dominated by dry deposition. To understand the impact of RRM on aerosol wet scavenging, it is necessary first to investigate how precipitation differs between the LR and RRM simulations.

Figure 4 evaluates the LR and RRM simulated precipitation against the observational Stage IV data. Stage IV is a radar-based precipitation product with rain-gauge bias adjustment and has a native resolution of 4 km (Lin and Mitchell, 2005). We regrid the Stage IV data to $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ for comparison with our simulation results. Both simulations can capture the observed east-west precipitation gradient in the US east of the Rocky Mountains. The spatial correlation coefficient between the LR simulation and Stage
IV is 0.52, similar to that between RRM and Stage IV. Moreover, most observed precipitation events in the central-eastern US (red box in Figure 4d) are well simulated by the LR and RRM simulations according to the Hovmöller diagrams of meridionally averaged daily precipitation rates in Figure 5, which is attributed to the appropriate nudging strategy applied to the simulations. However, apparent dry biases are found near the coastal areas of the southern US in the LR simulation (Figure 4e). By producing more precipitation than the LR simulation around the US coastal areas, RRM can reduce the dry bias in the southern coastal regions. However, its precipitation is still much lower than observed (Figure 4f). Minor dry biases are also found in the northern Great Plains in both simulations. The model dry biases in the southern and northern Great Plains may be due to the limitation of E3SM in predicting extreme precipitation events, such as mesoscale convective systems (Feng et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021), which is the dominant precipitation contributor in the Great Plains (Li et al., 2021). A noticeable improvement of the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation is the production of more frequent heavy precipitation (> 7.6 mm h\(^{-1}\)), which is mainly attributed to the intensification of large-scale precipitation (Figure 6), consistent with the results from Caldwell et al. (2019). More frequent heavy precipitation can partially alleviate the “too frequent, too weak” problem in low-resolution E3SM simulations (Caldwell et al., 2019). However, our result contradicts Tang et al. (2019), which found more light precipitation but less heavy precipitation as model horizontal resolution increases. It may be because Tang et al. (2019) didn’t apply nudging to their low-resolution and RRM simulations, and precipitation varied much between the two simulations.
Figure 4. (a-c) Spatial distributions of annual mean total precipitation rates (large-scale and convective) for the (a) LR and (b) RRM simulations and (c) their differences (RRM-LR). The green and black boxes in (c) are the same as those in Figure 2b. (d-f) Spatial distributions of annual mean precipitation from Stage IV and the precipitation bias of the LR and RRM simulations against Stage IV. The regional mean biases of the LR and RRM simulations are 0.004 mm h⁻¹ and 0.010 mm h⁻¹ compared to Stage IV with a regional mean precipitation of 0.107 mm h⁻¹. It is noteworthy that the data quality of Stage IV is poor over the open ocean and the western US due to limited radar coverage. The Hovmöller diagram in Figure 5 is based on the red box in (d).
Figure 5. Hovmöller diagrams of meridionally averaged daily precipitation rates in the red box of Figure 4d for (a) Stage IV, (b) the LR simulation, and (c) the RRM simulation in 2016. The centered pattern correlation coefficient between LR and Stage IV is 0.28, the same as that between RRM and Stage IV. The root-mean-square errors of LR and RRM are 5.3 mm day$^{-1}$ and 5.5 mm day$^{-1}$, respectively, against Stage IV.
Figure 6. Probability density functions (PDFs) of (a) convective and (b) large-scale precipitation rates in the RRM region for the LR (black lines) and RRM (red lines) simulations. Precipitation on native grids with an output frequency of 15 minutes is used to calculate the corresponding PDF.

In addition to affecting total precipitation rates, the model resolution notably changes the partitioning between large-scale precipitation (that is computed by the MG2 cloud microphysics parameterization) and deep convective precipitation (that is computed by the ZM deep convection parametrization). As model resolution increases, more precipitation can be resolved, which leads to an increase in large-scale precipitation and a decrease in convective precipitation (Figures 7a and 7b) (Tang et al., 2019).

In E3SMv1, aerosol wet removal by large-scale and convective precipitation is comprised of in-cloud scavenging, which involves the activation of interstitial aerosol particles (IAPs) and the subsequent
removal of cloud-borne aerosol by precipitation, and below-cloud scavenging accounting for the removal
of IAPs by precipitation via impaction and Brownian diffusion (Liu et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013). In-
cloud scavenging is the dominant process for all aerosol species in the RRM region (not shown).

EAMv1 uses two different parameterizations to treat aerosol wet scavenging by large-scale clouds
and deep convective clouds. Here, “large-scale clouds” refer to clouds represented by the CLUBB and
MG2 parameterizations, and “deep convective clouds” refer to clouds represented by the ZM deep
convection parameterization. In large-scale clouds, aerosol activation is parameterized as a function of
subgrid vertical velocity ($W_{sub}$), aerosol properties, and environmental conditions (Abdul-Razzak and
Ghan, 2000). The first-order loss rates of aerosol are computed by multiplying a solubility factor by the
first-order loss rate of cloud water, which is computed as a function of cloud fraction, cloud water, and
precipitation production rate profiles (Barth et al., 2000; Rasch et al., 2000). In deep convective clouds,
the cloud-borne aerosol mixing ratios are computed by multiplying interstitial aerosol mixing ratios by
the prescribed convective-cloud activation fractions, which depend on aerosol modes and species to
represent the hygroscopicity (Liu et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013). The solubility factor is a tunable
parameter, and the model uses different solubility factors for large-scale and deep convective clouds (Liu
et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013).

Therefore, the change in the partitioning between large-scale and deep convective precipitation
should make a difference in aerosol wet removal. Taking SO$_4$ as an example, Figures 7c and 7d show a
significant increase in in-cloud scavenging of SO$_4$ by large-scale precipitation but a noticeable decrease
by deep convective precipitation in the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation. The changing
patterns of in-cloud scavenging by large-scale and deep convective precipitation are consistent with the
changes in the corresponding type of precipitation rates. Figure 8 summarizes the relative differences in
regional mean large-scale and deep convective in-cloud scavenging of different aerosol species in the
RRM region between the RRM and LR simulations. Due to the increase in large-scale precipitation (28%)
and the decrease in deep convective precipitation (-16%) in the RRM region, the large-scale in-cloud scavenging increases and the deep convective in-cloud scavenging reduces for all aerosol species but dust in the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation. Dust exhibits a different response because dust emission is 154% higher in the RRM simulation than in the LR simulation. With the significant increase of dust emission and loading in the atmosphere in the RRM simulation, the wet removal of dust by both large-scale and deep convective clouds are higher than that in the LR simulation, even though the deep convective precipitation rate is lower.

Figure 7. (a, b) Spatial distributions of the relative differences in annual mean (a) large-scale and (b) convective precipitation between the RRM and LR simulations. (c-d) same as (a) and (b) but for in-cloud scavenging of SO$_4$ by (c) large-scale and (d) convective precipitation.
Figure 8. Relative differences in annual regional mean large-scale and convective precipitation and in-cloud scavenging of different aerosol species by large-scale and convective precipitation between the RRM and LR simulations. “Pcp” refers to precipitation, and “SS” denotes sea salt.

### 3.3 Aerosol chemical production

As expected, anthropogenic aerosol emissions (e.g., BC, POM, and SOA) prescribed by offline emission inventories are almost the same between the RRM and LR simulations. However, the SO$_4$ source in the RRM simulation is 2.8% higher (Table 1). MAM4 considers four source terms for sulfate aerosol. Two primary sources of SO$_4$ are gas-aerosol exchange and aqueous-phase production (Figure S1), which contribute to 31% and 63%, respectively, in the RRM region. The other two minor source
terms are (1) direct emission of sulfate aerosol and (2) new particle formation (NPF) (Figure S1), accounting for about 5% and 1% of the total source. Figures 9a and 9c show the spatial distributions of SO$_4^-$ production via the two major pathways from the LR simulation, generally consistent with the distributions of precursor gases (sulfuric acid gas vapor (H$_2$SO$_4$) and SO$_2$ in Figures S2a and S2b) with one peak in the northeastern US and another peak around southwestern Texas. The RRM simulation generally produces more SO$_4^-$ via aqueous-phase production (6.2% on average over the RRM region) but less via gas-aerosol exchange (-3.0%) than the LR simulation (Figures 9b and 9d). Figures 9e-9f show that increasing resolution leads to significantly lower (-13.3%) NPF of SO$_4^-$.

SO$_4^-$ production via gas-aerosol exchange and NPF positively correlates with the H$_2$SO$_4$ concentration (Liu et al., 2012). We find a lower (-5.5%) H$_2$SO$_4$ concentration in the RRM than in the LR (Figure S3a), which can explain the reduction of SO$_2$ production via gas-aerosol exchange and NPF (Figure S1). The source of H$_2$SO$_4$ is the oxidation of gas-phase SO$_2$ by hydroxyl radical (OH) (Figure S1). In our E3SMv1 configuration, OH concentrations are prescribed, and the reaction rate constants of SO$_2$ and OH are similar between the RRM and LR simulations (not shown). Therefore, the H$_2$SO$_4$ production is dominated by the gas-phase SO$_2$ concentration, which shows a reduction (-2.3%) in the RRM compared to the LR (Figure S3b). The sources of gas-phase SO$_2$ include direct emissions and the oxidation of DMS by OH and nitrate radical (NO$_3$) (Figure S1). DMS and SO$_2$ emissions are read from emission inventories, and the reaction rate constants of DMS + OH and DMS + NO$_3$ are close between the RRM and LR simulations. Therefore, the gas-phase SO$_2$ source is similar between the two simulations, and we need to understand the sinks of gas-phase SO$_2$ to explain the general reduction of gas-phase SO$_2$ concentrations in the RRM simulation.
We find that dry and wet deposition cannot explain the general reduction of gas-phase SO$_2$ concentrations in the RRM compared to the LR (not shown). Another major sink of gas-phase SO$_2$ is the oxidation of SO$_2$ by hydrogen peroxide (H$_2$O$_2$) and ozone (O$_3$) to form SO$_4$ via aqueous-phase chemistry (Figures 10c, 10e, and S1). Another process to produce SO$_4$ in the aqueous-phase chemistry module of E3SMv1 is the cloud water uptake of H$_2$SO$_4$ (Figures 10a and S1). All three pathways are related to large-scale cloud liquid water content (LWC) (LWC at 700 hPa shown in Figure S2c). The RRM simulation generally produces a larger LWC than the LR simulation (700 hPa shown as an example in Figure S3c). Therefore, the cloud water uptake of H$_2$SO$_4$ is enhanced in the RRM simulation (Figures 10b and S1).
The aqueous-phase oxidation of SO$_2$ by H$_2$O$_2$ and O$_3$ would also be expected to increase with higher LWC in the RRM simulation. However, we find a slight reduction (-1.2%) in SO$_4$ production via the O$_3$ pathway (Figure 10f). In contrast, the H$_2$O$_2$ pathway is enhanced by 17.0% in the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation (Figure 10d).

The H$_2$O$_2$ and O$_3$ pathways differ in two aspects. First, the O$_3$ concentrations are prescribed, while the H$_2$O$_2$ concentrations are prognostic in our E3SMv1 configuration (Figures S1 and S2e). Second, the O$_3$ pathway is highly sensitive to the pH of the cloud water (proton (H$^+$) concentrations at 700 hPa shown in Figure S2d), while the H$_2$O$_2$ pathway is hardly affected by pH (Seinfeld and Pandis, 2016). We find that the gas-phase H$_2$O$_2$ concentrations are generally slightly higher in the RRM than the LR (Figure S3e), even though the improved H$_2$O$_2$ pathway should consume more H$_2$O$_2$ under regional refinement. The budget analysis (not shown) indicates that the reduction of the gas-phase H$_2$O$_2$ wet removal in the RRM simulation contributes to the slightly enhanced H$_2$O$_2$ concentrations (Figures S1, S2f, and S3f). The reduced wet removal is related to decreased net rain production (mainly convective) used in the wet deposition parameterization of gas species (not shown). Notably, the oxidation of SO$_2$ by H$_2$O$_2$ releases H$^+$ into cloud water (Figure S1). With increased H$_2$O$_2$ concentrations, we expect higher H$^+$ concentrations ([H$^+$]) in large-scale clouds in the RRM simulation than in the LR simulation, as shown in Figure S3d. Slightly higher [H$^+$] (lower pH) would suppress the aqueous-phase oxidation of SO$_2$ by O$_3$ significantly (Seinfeld and Pandis, 2016). These results explain why the O$_3$ pathway is suppressed slightly even though LWC increases in the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation.

In short (Figure S1), higher LWC leads to more SO$_4$ production via cloud water uptake and the aqueous-phase oxidation of SO$_2$ by H$_2$O$_2$. However, the oxidation of SO$_2$ by O$_3$ is slightly suppressed due to the combination of larger LWC and lower pH. Finally, the total aqueous-phase SO$_4$ production is enhanced in the RRM, which consumes more SO$_2$ and leads to lower gas-phase SO$_2$ concentrations compared to the LR.
Figure 10. Left column: spatial distributions of annual mean SO$_4$ aqueous-phase productions through (a) cloud water uptake, (c) the H$_2$O$_2$ oxidation pathway, and (e) the O$_3$ oxidation pathway in the LR simulation. Right column: the same as the left column but for the relative differences between the RRM and LR simulations. It is noteworthy that the aqueous-phase production occurs in large-scale clouds.

3.4 Aerosol-cloud interactions

Aerosol activation in large-scale clouds is parameterized consistently with droplet nucleation. In EAMv1, most IAPs exist in accumulation and Aitken modes (Figures S4a and S4b). We find the aerosol activation in the RRM is, on average, enhanced by 13.7% (accumulation mode) and 5.8% (Aitken mode) compared to the LR (Figures 11a and 11b). Aerosol activation in large-scale clouds primarily occurs in two pathways. One is related to cloud expansion (i.e., increase in cloud fraction, which leads to aerosol activation) and shrinkage (i.e., decrease in cloud fraction, which leads to aerosol resuspension) in the
The same grid box (hereafter referred to as the cloud-intermittency pathway) between model timesteps. The other refers to the activation of IAPs that are brought to the cloud base by updrafts (hereafter referred to as the updraft pathway) (Liu et al., 2012). We find that the cloud-intermittency pathway contributes to almost all the aerosol activation enhancement in Aitken mode but only about half of the enhancement in accumulation mode under regional refinement (not shown). The updraft pathway accounts for the other half of the enhancement in accumulation mode. The contrast RRM impacts on the updraft pathway between the accumulation and Aitken modes may be related to the distinct vertical profiles of IAPs from the two modes (Figure S4c). The cloud-intermittency pathway is parameterized as a function of $W_{\text{sub}}$, aerosol properties, and the change of large-scale liquid cloud fractions between two consecutive time steps ($\Delta L\text{CLOUD}$) (Abdul-Razzak and Ghan, 2000; Zhang et al., 2022a). Positive $\Delta L\text{CLOUD}$ corresponds to cloud expansion, and negative $\Delta L\text{CLOUD}$ denotes cloud shrinkage. We do not find any noticeable differences in $W_{\text{sub}}$ and aerosol properties between the RRM and LR simulations. However, $|\Delta L\text{CLOUD}|$ is considerably larger in the RRM, which indicates larger L$\text{CLOUD}$ temporal variability (Figure 11c), resulting in increased microphysical cloud processing of aerosols and more aerosol activation via the cloud-intermittency pathway. The larger L$\text{CLOUD}$ temporal variability is consistent with the larger relative humidity (RH) temporal variability in the RRM than in the LR (Figure 11d) (Golaz et al., 2002).
Figure 11. (a, b) Spatial distributions of the relative differences in the annual mean vertical-integrated IAP activation fluxes in large-scale clouds for (a) accumulation and (b) Aitken modes between the RRM and LR simulations. (c) Vertical profiles of the annual regional mean absolute temporal variabilities of large-scale liquid cloud fractions \(|ΔCLOUD|\). \(|ΔCLOUD| = |CLOUD_{t_2} - CLOUD_{t_1}|\); \(t_2\) and \(t_1\) indicate two consecutive model time steps. The red line indicates the RRM simulation and the black line for the LR simulation. (d) the same as (c) but for relative humidity (RH).

Enhanced aerosol activation results in higher droplet number concentrations \((N_d)\) in the RRM compared to the LR (Figure 12a). Moreover, the CLUBB vertical-integrated cloud liquid water tendency \((RCMTEND)\), which is dominated by water vapor condensation, is generally remarkably larger in the RRM simulation (Figure 12b), which leads to higher large-scale cloud liquid water path (LWP) and LWC (Figures 12c and S3c). Larger RCMTEND may also contribute to larger droplets at the cloud top in the RRM simulation (\(R_e\) in Figure 12d; \(R_e\) — grid-cell mean droplet effective radius at the top of liquid water clouds), even though \(N_d\) increases. With higher LWP and larger \(R_e\), cloud optical depth (COD) is also higher (Figure 12e).
3.5 Anthropogenic aerosol effective radiative forcing

With considerable impacts on cloud properties, the regional refinement should also influence ERF\textsubscript{aer}.

We use the Ghan (2013) method to decompose ERF\textsubscript{aer} into direct, indirect, and surface albedo effects. Figure 13 shows a stronger (more negative) anthropogenic aerosol shortwave indirect effect (-0.52 W m\textsuperscript{-2}) and enhanced longwave indirect effect (0.21 W m\textsuperscript{-2}) at the top of the model (TOM) in the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation. The net (shortwave + longwave) indirect effect is 0.31 W m\textsuperscript{-2} more negative in the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation, which is about a 12%
enhancement. The total ERF\textsubscript{aer} at TOM is 0.27 W m\textsuperscript{-2} more negative in the RRM simulation, about a 12% enhancement compared to the LR simulation. We also find that the RRM simulation produces a 10% enhancement of ERF\textsubscript{aer} at the surface (Figure S6).

Figure 13. (a) Spatial distribution of annual mean ERF\textsubscript{aer} at the top of the model (TOM) from the LR simulation. (c, e, g) Same as (a) but for ERF\textsubscript{aer} attributed to (c) aerosol indirect effect (longwave + shortwave), (e) aerosol longwave indirect effect, and (g) aerosol shortwave indirect effect. The right column is the same as the left but for the absolute differences between the RRM and LR simulations.
To understand the enhancement of $\text{ERF}_{\text{aer}}$ in the RRM experiment, we compare the production efficiencies of $N_d$, $R_e$, LWP, and COD due to anthropogenic aerosols between the RRM and LR simulations (Figure 14). In Figure 14, the relative changes of $N_d$, LWP, and COD per relative change of CCN at 0.1% supersaturation ($\text{CCN}_{0.1\%}$) between the PD and PI simulations are generally larger in the RRM simulation, consistent with our earlier analysis of the enhanced aerosol activation in RRM. Because cloud properties are more sensitive to anthropogenic aerosols in the RRM, the RRM configuration produces stronger anthropogenic-aerosol-cloud interactions and $\text{ERF}_{\text{aer}}$ (Figure 13).

This result differs from Ma et al. (2015), which demonstrated that higher model resolutions would weaken the aerosol indirect effect. Ma et al. (2015) identified the increased droplet nucleation in simulations with higher resolutions, leading to a stronger first aerosol indirect effect, which is consistent with this study. However, their LWP response to anthropogenic aerosols weakens (lower LWP) as resolution increases, leading to reduced second aerosol indirect effect, in contrast to the larger LWP production efficiencies in our RRM simulation (Figure 14b). The discrepancies may be caused by different parameterizations of water vapor condensation to form cloud liquid water. The water vapor condensation is parameterized in CLUBB on the basis of joint PDFs of vertical velocity, temperature, and moisture in our simulations (Golaz et al., 2002), while it was calculated in CAM5 in Ma et al. (2015) using a saturation equilibrium adjustment approach (Park et al., 2014). The water vapor condensation parameterization affects not only LWP but also the subsequent aqueous-phase chemistry calculation discussed in Section 3.3. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate the sensitivity of water vapor condensation to model resolutions when different parametrizations are used, as their resolution sensitivity can be very different.

Our finding regarding the stronger aerosol indirect effect as resolution increases is also different from Caldwell et al. (2019), which found that the aerosol indirect effect changed only slightly from the low-resolution to high-resolution simulations. This discrepancy might be attributed to the fact that the model timesteps used in low- and high-resolution model simulations are very different in Caldwell et al.
but are kept the same in this study. Since model timestep can affect model aerosol and clouds, aerosol indirect effects can be affected.

Figure 14. Spatial distributions of the relative differences in (a) \( \frac{\text{lnCOD}}{\text{lnCCN}_{0.1\%}} \), (b) \( \frac{\text{lnLWP}}{\text{lnCCN}_{0.1\%}} \), (c) \( \frac{\text{lnR}_e}{\text{lnCCN}_{0.1\%}} \), and (d) \( \frac{\text{lnN}_f}{\text{lnCCN}_{0.1\%}} \) between the RRM and LR simulations. Here, \( \text{ln} x \) denotes the relative change of \( x \) between the PD and PI simulations, i.e., \( \text{ln} x = \frac{P_{\text{DD}-P_{\text{PI}}}}{P_{\text{PI}}} \). Therefore, \( \frac{\text{ln} x}{\text{lnCCN}_{0.1\%}} \) reflects the production efficiency of \( x \) by anthropogenic aerosols.

4 Conclusions

We investigate the impact of increasing model horizontal resolution on the aerosol mass budget and ERF over the CONUS in 2016 by comparing E3SMv1 LR and RRM simulations (Tables 1 and 2). The RRM simulation produces more dust, sea salt, and MOM emissions than the LR simulation due to larger surface wind speeds, more frequent strong surface winds, or drier soil. Besides influencing the natural aerosol sources, RRM also affects SO\(_4\) production from gas-aerosol exchange, aqueous-phase chemistry, and NPF (Table 2). The reduced SO\(_4\) production from gas-aerosol exchange and NPF by RRM is due to decreased gas-phase SO\(_2\) and H\(_2\)SO\(_4\) concentrations in the RRM simulation. Enhanced aqueous-phase SO\(_4\) production consumes more SO\(_2\) under regional refinement, leading to lower gas-phase SO\(_2\).
concentrations. The improved aqueous-phase SO$_4$ production is attributed to more cloud water uptake of H$_2$SO$_4$ and more oxidation of SO$_2$ by H$_2$O$_2$ in large-scale clouds with higher LWC in the RRM simulation. In contrast, the oxidation of SO$_2$ by O$_3$ is slightly suppressed due to the lower pH of large-scale clouds in the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation, which is a consequence of slightly increased gas-phase H$_2$O$_2$ concentrations releasing more H$^+$ through the oxidation of SO$_2$ by H$_2$O$_2$.

Table 2. Comparison of aerosol-relevant properties in the RRM region between the LR and RRM simulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>RRM</th>
<th>LR</th>
<th>Relative diff$^*$ / %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation / mm day$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convective</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO$_4$ in-cloud scavenging / TgS yr$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale precipitation</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convective precipitation</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas-aerosol exchange</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO$_4$ production / TgS yr$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale precipitation</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convective precipitation</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqueous-phase production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPF</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>0.0210</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerosol activation / $10^5$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitken mode</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation mode</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_d$ / $10^{10}$ m$^{-2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_e$ / $\mu$m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWP / g m$^{-2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM ERF$_{net}$ / W m$^{-2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect shortwave</td>
<td>-3.27</td>
<td>-2.74</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect longwave</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (indirect + direct + albedo)</td>
<td>-2.66</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^*$Relative diff = (RRM/LR - 1) $\times$ 100%.

Increasing model horizontal resolution affects the partitioning between large-scale and convective precipitation (Table 2). With more resolved large-scale precipitation and less parameterized deep
convective precipitation, in-cloud scavenging of aerosols by large-scale (deep convective) precipitation generally increases (decreases) in the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation.

RRM enhances the activation of IAPs in large-scale clouds due to the larger temporal variability of L C O U D in the RRM simulation compared to the LR simulation (Table 2). Enhanced aerosol activation leads to more cloud droplets. In addition, RRM enhances water vapor condensation, resulting in larger L W P and R s , which leads to larger COD. Since aerosol activation is stronger in the RRM simulation, cloud droplets, L W P, and COD are more sensitive to anthropogenic aerosols. Consequently, the anthropogenic aerosol indirect effect and E R F a e r in the RRM are stronger than in the LR simulation (Table 2).

Although the study is limited to comparing the E3SMv1 LR (~100 km) and CONUS RRM (~25 km) simulations, the methodology shown in the study is helpful for future studies to investigate the potential impacts of model resolutions on the simulation results, as RRM is significantly less expensive computationally compared to the global high-resolution model. And some findings from this study may also apply to E3SM simulations at higher resolutions or even convection-permitting scales, such as the enhancement in natural aerosol emissions due to stronger winds, the partitioning between large-scale and convective precipitation and associated wet scavenging, and improved IAP activation in large-scale clouds. However, we must also emphasize that the aerosol mass budget and E R F a e r are sensitive to model configurations and regional characteristics such as aerosol properties, land use and land cover, and climate. Aerosol and clouds in other regions can be very different. Furthermore, some resolution sensitivities may differ as model resolution advances to convection-permitting and subgrid-scale processes becomes more significant.
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