

Author Responses to Referees' Comments on “**Coupling between surface ozone and leaf area index in a chemical transport model: Strength of feedback and implications for ozone air quality and vegetation health**” by S. S. Zhou et al. (MS No.: acp-2018-351)

Our point-by-point responses are provided below. The referees' comments are *italicized*, our new/modified text is highlighted in **bold**. The revised manuscript with tracked changes is also included in the linked file below for the Editor's easy reference:

https://www.dropbox.com/s/ejy5uu03kafrp6/Zhou_2018_revised_v1.docx?dl=0

Response to Referee #1

Zhou et al. (2018) develop a parameterization for ambient ozone to impact the LAI that is in turn used in the model parameterization for ozone sources and sinks. The main points of this paper is that the sign and strength of the ozone-LAI feedback depends on regional NO_x. Although this paper is timely with respect to the substantial interest in biosphere-atmosphere interactions through atmospheric chemistry, I think this paper needs major revisions. If the authors address these revisions then the paper should be substantive and appropriate for publication in ACP.

We thank the reviewer for the very helpful comments. The paper has been revised substantially to address the reviewer's concerns point by point, and all changes are cited and discussed in the responses below.

What is new about the paper is that the authors isolate the feedback between LAI and ozone. However, I think the authors' choice to isolate this feedback from the rest of the ozone-vegetation interactions needs to be better justified. The authors say that the other ozone-vegetation interactions are uncertain, but the feedback between LAI and ozone is also uncertain.

The reviewer aptly pointed out that all individual pathways behind ozone-vegetation coupling are themselves uncertain. This paper, therefore, does not argue that ozone-LAI interaction is any less uncertain, but attempts to tease out this particular pathway (i.e., via LAI changes without meteorological feedbacks) in a modeling framework that can assess its relative contribution to the full ozone-vegetation coupling. This contributes to an overall goal to identify the dominant pathways to focus on in future research. Our focus on LAI first is motivated by its ubiquitous importance as a key land surface parameter in any atmospheric chemistry models (articulated also in P3 L18). We now make these points more clearly:

P3 L17: “... to transpiration changes. **This complication from meteorological feedbacks could mask the relative importance of individual vegetation variables (e.g., LAI) in contributing to the overall coupling effect, rendering attribution more difficult.**”

P3 L19: “**LAI is a ubiquitously important land surface parameter driving atmospheric chemistry and hydroclimate in many models [e.g., Wong et al., 2018].** Previous modeling studies ...”

P4 L1: “In this study, **we focus on the relationship between ozone and LAI, and assess its relative importance in the overall ozone-vegetation coupling effect.** We use a standalone...”

P4 L9: "... This effort not only allows ozone-vegetation coupling to be considered **dynamically within an atmospheric model without the complication from meteorological changes and feedbacks**, but also..."

We also remove a sentence in the Conclusions and Discussion to avoid overstating the uncertainty of biogeophysical pathways in comparison with the biogeochemical pathways:

~~"... whereby reduced stomatal conductance following ozone damage leads to less transpiration, higher vegetation temperature and thus higher isoprene emission. However, they noted that dynamically changing hydrometeorological variables and processes are not generally tuned for atmospheric chemical measurements, and may introduce large uncertainty in simulating and attributing boundary layer ozone concentrations to various determining factors."~~

The numbers that the authors give for LAI decreases due to ozone are substantial. The ozone damage to stomatal conductance and photosynthesis parameterization developed by Lombardozzi et al. (2012, 2015) is directly constrained from observations, but if the atmospheric chemistry model simulates too much surface ozone then there will be too much ozone damage. How much of the feedback is because there is too much ozone? Further, BVOC emission and ozone dry deposition parameterizations are highly sensitive to changes in LAI. Are the authors confident that these processes actually respond this strongly to LAI?

The majority of the feedback indeed occurs when ozone level goes from zero (no ozone damage at all) to an ambient level. As can be seen from the LAI-to-ozone response curve (Fig. 1), at ambient ozone levels (e.g., > 30 ppbv) LAI responds only tenuously to any more perturbation in ozone level. Therefore, the general high biases in simulated ozone by many atmospheric chemistry models (e.g., Lamarque et al., 2012) relative to observed ambient ozone levels would contribute only little to the total feedback. The shape of the LAI-to-ozone response curve is now discussed more:

P10 L25: "... **Moreover, the month-to-month variations in ozone concentration are typically much smaller than an incidental jump between zero and a prescribed level. As shown by Fig. 1, the strongest response of LAI to ozone happens at low ozone levels, while at and above ambient levels (e.g., > 30 ppb), LAI responses to any ozone variations also become progressively small.** We thus assume that the "steady-state response" for ozone-LAI relationship is reasonably robust to represent **short-term responses of LAI superimposed on the long-term, ozone-induced decline in seasonally varying LAI. ...**"

The sensitivities of BVOC emissions and dry deposition velocities to LAI changes are assessed using the statistical model of Wong et al. [2018], as discussed in P14 L12 – P15 L3. The statistical model is also based on GEOS-Chem parameterizations and simulations. The LAI dependence in these parameterizations is typically well constrained theoretically by canopy biophysics and empirically by flux observations.

The authors often discuss regional hotspots of changes in ozone sources and sinks. But perhaps these regions are most poorly constrained in terms of their natural emissions and dry deposition, nonetheless anthropogenic emissions and ambient chemistry. Although this paper could motivate more observations of ozone sources and sinks in these regional hotspots, perhaps the focus of the discussion should be on more regions where ozone can be constrained from observations.

We agree with the reviewer that the strongest feedback we find occurs where ozone concentrations and fluxes are not well constrained by observations, i.e., in the tropical forests. We now address this in the Conclusions and Discussion:

P20 L20: "... for high-resolution regional air quality simulations. **Along the same line, we find the greatest feedbacks over tropical forests, where ozone concentrations and fluxes are not as well constrained by available in-situ observations as in the midlatitudes. More extensive and long-term measurements of biosphere-atmosphere fluxes in tropical regions are necessary to ascertain the strength of ozone-vegetation feedbacks in these identified hotspots. We also note that ...**"

In the rest of the paper, we also dissect and discuss extensively the feedback pathways in midlatitude high-NO_x regions, especially in North America and Europe, where ozone concentrations and fluxes are better constrained than in the tropics.

For the asynchronous ozone-vegetation coupling, I understand the authors' use as a sanity check. But what are examples of the first and second order feedbacks that the authors describe? Does this asynchronous coupling allow meteorology to respond to changes in LAI? I'm not sure I understand how their method helps them to address their third goal of "[evaluating] if the "quasi-steady state response" assumption behind the ozone-LAI synchronous coupling is reasonable". This may come from my not understanding the problem as described at the end of Section 2. Will the authors please clarify their statement of the problem?

First and second order feedbacks refer to the number of sequential feedback loops, or "cycles", considered in an asynchronous coupling experiment. They have no additional physical meaning other than in the context of modeling experiments, and in our experiments meteorology is never allowed to respond to LAI changes. We now explain it more clearly:

P15 L27: "... The resulting relative changes in monthly LAI at PFT levels due to ozone damage, **which we can call the "first-order" effect**, are then multiplied by the intact potential LAI and fed into GEOS-Chem to simulate ozone concentrations again, **finishing one cycle of coupling. The "new" ozone concentrations** are then fed back to CLM to estimate the "new" steady-state LAI changes, **which we can call the "second-order" effect**. In theory, the feedback cycles should carry on until relative LAI changes and ozone concentrations come into equilibrium with each other. ..."

The asynchronous coupling experiment is designed to decidedly represent a long-term quasi-steady state of dynamic ozone-vegetation coupling. If the simulated responses are similar to those from the synchronous coupling experiment, then we may at least assume that the parameterization used in the latter is a reasonable representation of the a quasi-steady-state response. These points are now discussed in greater detail:

P10 L25: "... **Moreover, the month-to-month variations in ozone concentration are typically much smaller than an incidental jump between zero and a prescribed level. As shown by Fig. 1, the strongest response of LAI to ozone happens at low ozone levels, while at and above ambient levels (e.g., > 30 ppb), LAI responses to any ozone variations also become progressively small.** We thus assume that the "steady-state response" for ozone-LAI relationship is reasonably robust to represent **short-term responses of LAI superimposed on the long-term, ozone-induced decline in seasonally varying LAI.** This assumption is further tested by driving CLM with hourly varying GEOS-Chem ozone fields in **an asynchronous coupling experiment** until LAI reaches a quasi-steady state, which will be discussed in Sect. 5."

P16 L6: "... suggesting that the first-order effect has already encapsulated most of the coupling effect. **The final simulated results for both LAI and ozone concentrations should represent a long-term quasi-steady state of dynamic ozone-vegetation interactions.**"

P16 L18: "... The overall strong resemblance **in the relative LAI changes between the two coupling approaches, at least for regions with sufficiently high LAI, suggests that the simplified parameterization for ozone-LAI coupling on a monthly timescale used in synchronous coupling (Sect. 2.4) is a reasonable idealization of the cumulative long-term steady-state responses** of vegetation to temporally varying ozone levels."

Further, I think the assumptions going into feedback factor analysis needs to be more clearly laid out.

The feedback factor analysis mainly serves as an alternative and arguably novel way to examine ozone feedbacks, analogous to the analysis of climate feedbacks, based on the simulated results from a set of model experiments. The assumptions behind the analysis do not differ from those behind any model experiments we have conducted. We have, however, attempted to explain the feedback factor in clearer wording:

P17 L18: "Here, we conduct a simulation, *[Intact_NoAnth]*, in GEOS-Chem with the same settings as the *[Intact LAI]* case (for synchronous coupling) but with all anthropogenic emissions turned off (Table 3). Therefore, the differences between this case and *[Intact LAI]* necessarily represent the effect of anthropogenic forcing (mostly by fossil fuel combustion) on ozone changes **without any ozone-LAI feedback**, whereas the difference between this case and *[Affected LAI]* represents the "**final**" effect with ozone-LAI coupling and feedback. **In Eq. (11), $\Delta[\text{O}_3]_i$ and $\Delta[\text{O}_3]_f$ are the differences in ozone concentrations between cases, *[Intact LAI]* – *[Intact_NoAnth]* and *[Affected LAI]* – *[Intact_NoAnth]*, respectively.** Thus, **analogous to the interpretation of the climate feedback factor, the ozone feedback factor f** here reflects the strength and sign of feedback effect from ozone-vegetation coupling on ozone concentration itself, and a value of $f < 0$ represents a negative feedback whereby ozone changes are dampened by ozone-vegetation interactions, and $0 < f < 1$ represents a positive feedback whereby ozone changes are amplified by ozone-vegetation interactions."

Specific comments:

I would advise that the authors avoid the term "significant" unless the authors use statistical testing to determine the significance of a change. I would also advise that the authors avoid the term "vegetation-ozone coupling" because as they mention, they are isolating the LAI-ozone coupling.

Where appropriate, "ozone-LAI coupling" is used if we are referring specifically to the results from our model experiments, and "ozone-vegetation coupling" is used if we are referring to ozone-vegetation interactions in general, which can include other factors than LAI alone. We have also trimmed down the use of "significant" in response to the reviewer's concern, e.g., replacing it with "substantial" or "important" in many places where it has no statistical inference. It remains where it does have statistical meaning.

Page 1. In general, there are many jargon terms and ambiguous descriptors in the abstract.

The abstract has now been modified to use less jargons and more discrete terms:

"Tropospheric ozone is **an air pollutant** with substantial harm on vegetation, **and** is also strongly dependent on various vegetation-mediated processes. The interdependence between ozone and vegetation may constitute feedback mechanisms that can alter ozone concentration itself but have not been considered in most studies to date. In this study we examine the importance of **dynamic** coupling between surface ozone and leaf area index (LAI) in shaping ozone air quality and **vegetation**. We first implement an empirical scheme for ozone damage on vegetation in the Community Land Model (CLM), and simulate the steady-state responses of LAI to long-term exposure to a range of prescribed ozone levels (from 0 ppb to 100 ppb). We find that most plant functional types suffer a substantial decline in LAI as ozone level

increases. Based on the CLM-simulated results, we develop and implement in the GEOS-Chem chemical transport model a parameterization that **computes fractional changes in monthly LAI as a function of local mean ozone levels. By forcing LAI** to respond to ozone concentrations on a monthly timescale, the model simulates **ozone-LAI coupling dynamically** via biogeochemical processes including biogenic volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions and dry deposition, **without the complication from meteorological changes**. We find that ozone-induced damage on LAI can lead to **changes in ozone concentrations by –1.8 ppb to +3 ppb in boreal summer**, with a corresponding ozone feedback factor of –0.1 to +0.6 **that represents an overall self-amplifying effect from ozone-LAI coupling. Substantially** higher simulated ozone due to strong positive **feedbacks** is found in most tropical forests, mainly due to the ozone-induced reductions in LAI and dry deposition velocity, whereas reduced isoprene emission plays a lesser role in these low-NO_x environments. In high-NO_x regions such as eastern US, Europe and China, however, the feedback effect is much weaker and even negative in some regions, reflecting the compensating effects of reduced dry deposition and reduced isoprene emission (**which reduces ozone in high-NO_x environments**). In remote, low-LAI regions including most of the Southern Hemisphere, the ozone feedback is generally slightly negative **due to the** reduced transport of NO_x-VOC reaction products that serve as NO_x reservoirs. This study represents the first step to account for dynamic ozone-vegetation coupling in a chemical transport model with **ramifications for a more realistic joint** assessment of ozone air quality and ecosystem health.”

Line 14: From the first sentence to the second, it's not clear that there is an "interdependence" between ozone impacts on vegetation & vegetation impacts on ozone.

The interdependence stems from the first sentence, “Tropospheric ozone is **an air pollutant** with substantial harm on vegetation, **and** is also strongly dependent on various vegetation-mediated processes.”

Line 21: Will the authors use a term other than “correlates” here?

We now use “... that **computes ... as a function of ...**” instead. See the revised abstract above.

Line 21: “dynamically forcing” seems contradictory to me. I think the authors should find another way to describe this.

The wording is now changed. See the revised abstract above.

Lines 24-25: Standing alone in the abstract, “ozone feedback” and especially “ozone feedback factor” are not meaningful to readers. The authors should either define them in the abstract or use plainer language in the abstract.

The wording is now changed. See the revised abstract above.

Page 2. Line 2: I would say “important ramifications for more realistic assessment of ozone air quality and ecosystem stretch” is a stretch

The wording is now changed. See the revised abstract above.

Line 16: Tai et al. (2013) is not in the references.

The reference is now added.

Line 17: “offline-coupled” is a bit ambiguous - can the authors clearly articulate what this means?

The modeling approach differentiates between synchronous and asynchronous coupling. To avoid confusion, we have now removed “offline”.

Lines 22-23: Is this isoprene chemistry current?

We believe the statement concerned captures the broad understanding of isoprene chemistry to date, without having to specify the nuanced pathways that are still constantly updated.

Lines 24-25: This is not exactly right. The authors should revise their description of the chemical loss pathways of ozone

The description is modified accordingly:

P2 L23: “... On the other hand, the major sinks for surface ozone include **in-situ chemical loss mainly via photolysis and the subsequent reaction of singlet oxygen atom O(¹D) with water vapor (H₂O)**, and the dry deposition of ozone onto **vegetated surfaces** [Wang *et al.*, 1998; Wild, 2007]. ...”

Line 25: Dry deposition does not mainly occur through leaf stomatal uptake. In addition, Wang *et al.* (1998) is not an appropriate citation here

For ozone, stomatal uptake is an important component (likely more than half) of the total dry-depositional sink. To be more precise and in response to the reviewer’s concern, we have modified that paragraph substantially:

P2 L23: “... On the other hand, the major sinks for surface ozone include **in-situ chemical loss mainly via photolysis and the subsequent reaction of singlet oxygen atom O(¹D) with water vapor (H₂O)**, and the dry deposition of ozone onto **vegetated surfaces** [Wang *et al.*, 1998; Wild, 2007]. **Leaf stomatal uptake of ozone, in particular, represents 40–60% of the total dry-depositional sink [Fowler *et al.*, 2009]. Vegetation also controls transpiration, which modulates boundary-layer mixing, temperature, water vapor content, and thus the production, dilution and loss of ozone. Therefore, via biogenic VOC emissions, dry deposition and transpiration, vegetation can substantially influence surface ozone concentrations.**”

The two references, Wang *et al.* [1998] and Wild [2007], are cited for their estimates of the global tropospheric ozone budget, of which chemical loss and dry deposition are the two major loss pathways. The references are relocated to reflect this better.

Page 3. Lines 4-5: How are there dynamic changes in PFT distribution following ozone damage?

Ozone damage can influence PFT distribution over time due to the differential abilities of different species to tolerate ozone. We now include this discussion:

P3 L4: “... with the greatest damage (20–25% for GPP, 15–20% for transpiration) happening at northern midlatitudes [Lombardozzi *et al.*, 2015]. **The ozone-induced decrease in transpiration has been shown to enhance regional temperature by up to 3°C and reduce precipitation by up to 2 mm d⁻¹ in summertime central US [Li *et al.*, 2016]. Differential abilities of plant species to tolerate ozone, when integrated over space and time, can also cause the long-term shifts in species richness and ecosystem composition [e.g., Fuhrer *et al.*, 2016].** As vegetation variables such as stomatal resistance, LAI, and plant functional type

(PFT) distribution all play important roles shaping surface ozone, dynamic changes in these variables following ozone damage may thus induce a cascade of feedbacks that ultimately affect ozone itself. ...”

Line 5: Li et al. ERL 2016 does as well

Li et al. [2016] is now discussed and cited. See our modification right above for P3 L4.

Line 15: Lombardozzi et al. (2015) used fixed satellite LAI? It seems strange that LAI would not be coupled into the carbon and water cycles in CLM.

Yes, Lombardozzi et al. (2015) used the “SP” (satellite phenology) mode of CLM with fixed, prescribed monthly LAI with daily interpolation. The lack of LAI evolution there is indeed part of the motivation behind our work.

Lines 13-27: The point of this paragraph is unclear.

The paragraph aims to discuss the importance and challenges of using LAI as a metric for characterizing ozone-vegetation interactions. We now modify the opening sentences to make it clearer:

P3 L19: “**LAI is a ubiquitously important land surface parameter driving atmospheric chemistry and hydroclimate in many models [e.g., Wong et al., 2018].** Previous modeling studies of ozone damage on vegetation usually used **prescribed LAI and other structural variables such as canopy height** derived from satellites and land surveys as fixed parameters in their vegetation simulations [e.g., Sitch et al., 2007; Lombardozzi et al., 2015]. ...”

Page 4. Line 1-4: How do the authors conclude that these changes in meteorology due to ozone damage are more uncertain, or less important, as the feedbacks between LAI and ozone? Why should we have one and not the other in our CTMs? Are the feedbacks between LAI and ozone realistic if we are not accounting for coupling between vegetation, meteorology and ozone?

The gist of this study is to identify the relative importance of individual pathways to guide future research focus. The full response to the reviewer’s concern here is already included in our earlier response to the first concern of the reviewer.

Line 10-11: Please specify the prescribed atmospheric data

Done. P4 L17: “... by prescribed atmospheric data **from Climate Research Unit (CRU)–National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP)** at a resolution of 1.9° latitude by 2.5° longitude. ...”

Page 5. Line 12: The authors should elaborate on the “updates on important canopy processes”

The updates are specified on P4 L19: “... This version not only updates important canopy processes including canopy radiation and upscaling of leaf processes from previous versions, but also improves the stability of the iterative solution in the computation of photosynthesis and stomatal conductance [Sun et al., 2012]. ...”

Line 10: “hydrometeorological variables” is a bit vague

We have now removed that phrase altogether. P5 L15: "... Lombardozzi et al. [2012] showed that modifying photosynthesis and stomatal conductance independently using different ozone impact factors can improve model simulations of vegetation responses to ozone exposure. ..."

Line 18: Sitch et al. (2007) is not really an appropriate reference here

The reference is now removed. Appropriate references are added.

P5 L25: "... CUO is only accumulated when LAI is above a minimum value of 0.5 and ozone flux is larger than a critical threshold of $0.8 \text{ nmol O}_3 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ to account for the compensating ability of plants to detoxify ozone [Lombardozzi et al., 2012; 2015]."

Line 25-26: Table 1 gives no indication of how impacts of ozone vary more generally among three groups rather than 15 because the authors only present the three groups

We agree with the reviewer that the table gives no indication of the within-group variability of plant responses to ozone. A single set of parameters was obtained for each broad plant group by Lombardozzi et al. [2015], who pulled together data for mostly temperate species from across the world and derived such parameterized relationships. The limitations arising from data paucity are discussed in greater detail in the Conclusions and Discussion:

P20 L13: "Uncertainty can arise from the large variability in the ozone sensitivity of different plants, especially for tropical trees and grasses, which are modeled based on relatively insufficient data as compared with temperate ecosystems [Lombardozzi et al., 2013]. **The current Lombardozzi et al. [2015] scheme classifying 15 PFTs into three plant groups is relatively robust in capturing the average plant physiological responses to ozone uptake on a global scale from across many studies, but it treats tropical and temperate plants equivalently as far as ozone sensitivity is concerned, which may lead to possible biases due to an inadequate representation of spatial heterogeneity of plant-ozone ecophysiology. More detailed experimental and field data, especially for tropical and subtropical plants, can potentially help us derive a more region-specific and spatially resolved parameterization that can be particularly useful for high-resolution regional air quality simulations. ...**"

Page 6. Line 15-17: Sure, GEOS-Chem has been extensively used and evaluated, but that doesn't mean that it looks good against observations. Some discussion of the surface ozone bias is needed.

More discussion of the ozone biases is now included.

P6 L22: "... **In general, GEOS-Chem underestimates tropospheric ozone in the tropics but overestimates it in the northern subtropics and southern midlatitudes [Zhang et al., 2010]. For regional surface ozone, the model has small systematic biases overall in the US and China, but has a tendency to overestimate summertime concentrations in the eastern US and certain sites in China [Wang et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2011]. ...**"

Lines 21-30: A more detailed description of soil NO_x, BVOC and dry deposition parameterized mechanisms would be helpful, especially how LAI fits into them. Note that the authors have previously defined r_a as $r_a + r_b$. What do "sublayer resistance" and "bulk surface resistance" mean? Silva et al. (2018) find that the ozone dry deposition scheme in GEOS-Chem is highly sensitive to changes in LAI. This means that any changes in LAI are going to impact ozone deposition velocity, but is this strong dependence constrained by observations?

CLM calculates resistances at the leaf level and then integrates them to the canopy level via canopy scaling. GEOS-Chem uses parameterization at the canopy level throughout, and therefore the exact definitions of resistances are subtly different between GEOS-Chem and CLM. For instance, the sublayer resistance in GEOS-Chem is equivalent to the canopy-integrated leaf-level boundary layer resistance in CLM. To avoid confusion, we now redefine r_a and r_b in Eq. (3) and the description below:

P5 L23: “where $[O_3]$ is the surface ozone concentration (nmol m^{-3}), $k_{O_3} = 1.67$ is the ratio of leaf resistance to ozone to leaf resistance to water, r_s here is the leaf-level stomatal resistance, **r_b is the leaf boundary layer resistance, and r_a is the aerodynamic resistance between the leaf and the reference level, ...**”

We also relabel the corresponding canopy-level resistances in GEOS-Chem with capital letters instead of small letters, and include the original description of what bulk surface resistance means. Moreover, the sensitivities of BVOC emissions and dry deposition velocities to LAI changes are assessed using the statistical model of *Wong et al.* [2018], as discussed in P14 L12 – P15 L3. The LAI dependence in these parameterizations is typically well constrained theoretically by canopy biophysics and empirically by flux observations. We now also reference this paper again here.

P7 L2: “... whereby dry deposition velocity is the inverse of aerodynamic resistance (R_a), sublayer resistance (R_b) and bulk surface resistance (R_c) added in series. The term R_c accounts for a combination of resistances from vegetation (including stomatal resistance), lower canopy and ground, which have specific values for 11 different land types. *Wong et al.* [2018] extensively evaluated the LAI dependence of both MEGAN biogenic emissions and dry deposition in GEOS-Chem. ...”

Lines 31 (page 6) to 6 (page 7): I'm confused about the harmonization. So PFT distribution is not the same for soil NO emission, BVOC emission, and dry deposition parameterizations?

The reviewer is right. Historically, GEOS-Chem has been using different land/plant type classification schemes for different modules, which has been a source of internal inconsistencies. The model is now moving toward harmonizing all land/plant type classifications, but what is important about the *Geddes et al.* [2016] is that it enables users to input any customized land/plant type distribution and have it harmonized across all modules.

Page 7. Line 9: Are the constant ozone levels prescribed for each grid box?

Yes.

Line 14: What does “one-sided exposed LAI” mean? Why do the authors use it?

Across the literature LAI usually means one-sided LAI, but for various purposes CLM distinguishes between one-sided vs. two-sided LAI. Therefore, we specify it here mostly for the reference for CLM users. Exposed LAI accounts for the covering of leaves by snow in winter, but is essentially the same as total LAI in snow-free summer. To avoid confusion (and the paper is mostly concerned with northern summer anyway), “exposed” now only appears once and ELAI is replaced by LAI elsewhere.

Lines 23-31: I find the terms “incremental increase” and “incremental decrease” used in this context ambiguous. It might be helpful to give an example in the supplementary text of what the authors are describing on

We agree with the reviewer that “incremental” is not the best word to describe what we mean. We now rephrase the relevant sentences to make the meaning clearer.

P8 L4: “... but **its decrease per unit ozone increase** becomes smaller at higher ozone concentrations (Fig. 1) because of the progressive closure of stomata as represented by the ozone damage scheme. ... In some places especially in grasslands and semiarid regions, however, γ_{raw} increases with ozone level but **its increase per unit ozone increase** also declines and then levels off at higher ozone concentrations.”

Lines 29- 31 (e.g., similar to their Figure 1).

Page 8. Line 12: This is a factor of five difference. Why is there such a large range?

This represents the variability of responses for a different PFTs across a wide variety of environmental conditions and constraints. Despite the large range, a majority of the γ_{∞} values fall within 0.7 and 1. We now specify the variability in greater detail.

P8 L24: “... We find that for 90% of the grid cells/PFTs, γ_{∞} is between about 0.3 and 1.5; **for 50% of the grid cells/PFTs, γ_{∞} is between about 0.75 and 0.95.** ...”

Line 14: Does this mean that values below 0.3 are set to 0.3 and values above 1.5 are set to 1.5?

Yes.

Page 9. Lines 5-6: It's not clear to me how the authors will use Intact_NoAnth to examine the strength of the ozone feedback.

This is explained in detail in Sect. 6 of the revised manuscript.

Lines 7-8: Why do the authors need three years after spin up? Shouldn't the spin up be used to reach quasi-steady state? Do the authors average across the three years after spin up, or just use the third 2012?

We decidedly hope to exclude interannual variability from our feedback analysis. Changes from 2011 to 2012 conditions may lead to small perturbations in the ozone-vegetation steady state, and thus after spinning up we let the ozone-vegetation coupling to further settle down to 2012 conditions.

Lines 12-19: This is unclear to me. My impression is that the authors do not want to use observationally-derived LAI here because it would already include the impact of historical ozone damage. So, the authors need to derive a potential LAI. Is this the case? Will the authors spell this out a little more clearly? Why are the authors using CLM MODIS LAI here, rather than the LAI used in GEOS-Chem? I have some qualms with “maximum LAI possible if there is no ozone damage in reality” because of the “self-healing” effect.

Yes, this is the case, and the reviewer’s understanding is correct. The meaning is now spelled out more clearly.

P10 L2: “For the [*Intact LAI*] case, we first derive an intact, potential LAI that should represent the maximum LAI possible if there is no ozone damage in reality, which is taken as the baseline case for investigating the effect of ozone-LAI coupling. **This is necessary because the present-day satellite-derived “observed” LAI is supposedly already the outcome of long-term ozone-vegetation interactions, and should not be used as the**

baseline. Instead, the potential LAI is used as the initial condition to drive the GEOS-Chem simulations. ...”

Default MODIS LAI in GEOS-Chem is available at the total, grid-cell level only, not at the PFT level. Therefore, the PFT-level LAI from CLM is used here, which when integrated over all PFTs is indeed very close to the default total LAI used in GEOS-Chem. Moreover, in the current model configuration the self-healing effect, which counteracts only in part the damaging effect, is already incorporated in the steady-state results.

Lines 20-24: Is LAI only changing on a monthly basis? If so, is there a large change in LAI from May 31 to June 1 over northern midlatitude forests? How does this influence ozone? Could this impact the authors' results?

The monthly LAI values are all interpolated to obtain daily LAI values that form a more continuous time series in the model.

Page 10. Line 3: Typo on this line

Corrected.

Line 30: Is this physically constrained by observations? A decrease of up to 2.6 m²/m² seems really high. On a similar note, the authors' Figure S3 shows relative changes in LAI due to ozone are pretty high. Could the ozone impact on LAI be overstated?

Long-term responses of canopy-level and grid cell-level LAI to ozone exposure are not well constrained by observations. There is a possibility that these changes are overstated or understated. That said, the current parameterization uses well-constrained leaf-level statistical information of ozone impacts on photosynthesis and stomatal conductance, and its integrated effect on LAI would be as good or as bad as the current representation of all processes (e.g., allocation) between cellular photosynthesis and leaf growth.

CLM-simulated responses of LAI to ozone damage could also be overestimated due to a combination of high biases in simulated LAI for grasses and crops and their demonstrable strong ozone sensitivity. This is now discussed at greater length:

P12 L9: "... This is likely because of the higher sensitivity of grasses and crops to ozone exposure compared with other plant groups in this ozone damage scheme (see Table 1), and the general overestimation of grass and crop LAI in CLM, which is also documented in other studies [Chen *et al.*, 2015; Williams *et al.*, 2016]. **The over-representation of grasses and crops in these subtropical and tropical regions in the CLM world may in turn lead to possible high biases in the simulated ozone damage on LAI therein.**"

Page 12. Lines 3-5: Can the authors show this in a figure in supplemental?

We decide that the explanation should be more nuanced in the paragraphs that follow, and thus in this paragraph we eliminate the explanation. The more detailed explanation with figures to support is included in the third paragraph of the section and also in the second last paragraph using the statistical method of Wong *et al.* [2018]:

P13 L22: "... In the relatively high-NO_x regions at northern midlatitudes (over North America, Europe and East Asia), ozone enhancement from ozone-LAI coupling is relatively small compared with the subtropical and tropical regions (Fig. 3b). This is mostly due to the compensation between the effects of reduced dry deposition, which increases ozone, and

reduced isoprene emission, which decreases ozone. In Europe and northern China, in particular, ozone-LAI coupling enhances NO_x level due to reduced sequestration by biogenic VOCs (Fig. 6b), which further limits ozone production due to more sequestration of OH by NO_x (shown in Fig. S8) and thus less efficient cycling of HO_x radicals. On the other hand, in the subtropical and tropical regions where isoprene emission is high (Fig. 5a) and NO_x level is relatively low (Fig. 6a), reduced dry deposition (Fig. 4b) and reduced isoprene emission (Fig. 5b) add together to enhance ozone concentrations. **In central North America, which is low-NO_x in general, the small reduction in NO_x levels is consistent with the slight ozone reduction there (Fig. 3b).**”

Page 13. Lines 5-9: This sentence is a bit unclear.

We decide that this sentence indeed carries little interesting new insight or scientific significance. We now remove it and join the two paragraphs together. Doing so also creates a smoother narrative overall.

Page 14. It would be helpful to have the same color scale on Figure 7 and Figure 3b. The Wong et al. (2018) statistical technique needs to be described in further detail in the manuscript. Does this technique only use the changes in LAI due to ozone damage archived from GEOS-Chem, or does it also use archived ozone concentrations, isoprene and deposition?

The color scale of Fig. 7 is now updated. The statistical method of Wong et al. [2018] is designed to assess the local sensitivity of ozone to any LAI changes and attribute the sensitivity to the two dominant pathways of biogenic emissions and dry deposition. The LAI changes can be caused by any factors, e.g., land use change, CO₂ fertilization, etc., and the method is applied here for ozone damage. The description is now modified:

P14 L13: “... using the statistical model developed by Wong et al. [2018], which is a **computationally simple, “offline” assessment tool** to estimate the local sensitivity of ozone to any LAI changes, **whatever the cause of such changes is, and quantify the relative importance of each of the two dominant pathways (dry deposition vs. isoprene emission) in contributing to this sensitivity as a function of an array of variables including mean ozone concentration**, total NO_x emission, wind speed, temperature, etc., for any vegetated locations. ...”

Page 15. Line 12: What are the first and second order feedback effects?

Please see our response to the reviewer’s question about first-order and second-order effect above.

Page 17. Line 23: The authors should cite the specific chapter in the IPCC (2013) report that they are referring to, not the entire report.

The reference is now replaced with another one: [Stephens, 2005].

Line 24: I don’t think it is appropriate to describe the formation of ozone from NO_x and VOCs “anthropogenic forcing of precursor emissions”

We now modify it to: “**anthropogenic precursor emissions**”. This is more direct and unambiguous.

Line 20-26: Does this approach assume that the change in ozone due to the LAI feedback + the change in ozone due to NO_x emissions = change in ozone due to both NO_x emissions + LAI feedback? I think this needs to be stated and the limitations of the approach discussed.

The commutability of the two effects is not a concern for the purpose of quantifying feedback effect. Since LAI changes do not affect anthropogenic NO_x emission, NO_x emission here is always a prescribed factor and baseline, and the feedback effect of ozone-LAI coupling is examined on top of this baseline by finding the differences between turning on and off the coupling.

Page 18. Lines 9-10: I'm not sure I understand the difference between "with and without the parameterized ozone-LAI relationship" and "with synchronous vs. asynchronous ozone-LAI coupling". Is the difference that for the first, only GEOS Chem is used, and for the second GEOS Chem and CLM are used? In general, finding a clearer way of describing the different set-ups would be helpful.

Yes, the reviewer's interpretation is correct. We now change the wording to reflect it better:

P19 L6: "... with and without **parameterized ozone-LAI coupling within GEOS-Chem** (ozone-affected LAI vs. intact, potential LAI), with and without anthropogenic emissions, and with synchronous vs. asynchronous ozone-LAI coupling. ..."

Line 14: What are the authors defining as long-term here?

It is now specified:

P19 L11: "Generally, ozone damage causes a global LAI reduction for most PFTs under long-term ozone exposure **over multiple decades**. Compared with ..."

Line 17: What is the important vegetation structural parameter?

LAI. The sentence now reads: "Only a few studies of ozone-vegetation interactions have considered **this** important vegetation structural parameter in coupled model simulations."

Lines 17-23: I'm a bit confused because the authors say here that the LAI changes are quite different from Sadiq et al. (2017), but then say later on that the "biogeochemical" feedback is similar between the two studies.

Sadiq et al. [2017] considered both biogeochemical and biogeophysical feedbacks. The differences of this study from theirs mainly stem from (decidedly) the exclusion of biogeophysical feedbacks in this study. The biogeochemical part of their study is indeed quite consistent with what we found here.

Page 19. Lines 2-5: This sentence is a bit unclear. To the best of my understanding, the authors are implying that ozone damage influence on sensible vs. latent heat flux partitioning and the resulting model meteorology is wacky and less certain than the influence of ozone damage on LAI. How do the authors justify this?

The sentence concerned is now removed. The fuller response to the reviewer's concern about the exclusion of biogeophysical feedbacks is also included in our responses above.

Lines 24-32: I find this particular discussion confusing. Because LAI evolves on slower timescales, I'm not seeing why it is a problem that LAI is updated to reflect ozone damage on the monthly

timescale. To me, the bigger issue is whether the authors are resolving seasonal transitions in LAI on monthly or daily timescales. How do the authors know that the parameterization of ozone-LAI relationship is based on the decadal timescale?

The ozone-LAI parameterization is based on multidecadal steady-state results from CLM simulations. The seasonal transitions are handled by an imposed seasonality that is also affected by ozone exposure in the long term. We agree with the reviewer that the wording chosen here may not be the clearest. Since we have now included more description and explanation of the timescale issue in Sect. 2.5 and Sect. 5 as well (see our responses and cited texts above), we find it appropriate to remove this part altogether from the Conclusions and Discussion section. The sentence regarding “hysteresis effect” is retained, and added to the end of the last paragraph.

Responses to Referee #2

The main goal of this study is to quantify the impacts of ozone vegetation damage on the atmospheric surface ozone concentrations themselves (ozone air quality). The research team design an intelligent set of systematic global modeling experiments to parse out this particular air quality feedback focused on changes in the LAI only (ignoring meteorology changes). For example, where ozone vegetation damage has been incorporated in coupled chemistry-climate models and Earth system models, (such as NCAR CESM and NASA GISS ModelE2) it is extremely challenging (and maybe impossible) to assess the actual sign and magnitude of this feedback on surface ozone air quality due to the complex bi-directional linkages between the vegetation, meteorology and atmospheric chemistry. The study builds on a recent previous paper: Sadiq, M., Tai, A. P. K., Lombardozzi, D., and Val Martin, M.: Effects of ozone–vegetation coupling on surface ozone air quality via biogeochemical and meteorological feedbacks, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 17, 3055-3066, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-3055-2017>, 2017. The previous paper used sensitivity experiments within a single model framework (CLM-CESM) to examine the underlying driving mechanisms for the ozone-vegetation feed-backs. A previous conclusion was that reduced transpiration leading to increased leaf temperatures (and increased BVOC emissions) is an important mechanism in the NH mid-latitudes leading to a fairly strong positive surface ozone response. The previous work is appropriately discussed in the current paper, and a rationale is provided to focus on the relatively smaller feedbacks through LAI changes only in this work.

The workload represented in this paper is extensive and impressive, including developing an “ozone damage” LAI functional algorithm that is implemented into GEOS-Chem, and multiple synchronous and asynchronous coupling experiments using CLM and GEOS-Chem. The high quality and clarity of the writing and presentation means that it is possible to follow fairly easily the complex experimental design and methodology. The model results are applied to understand the underlying LAI-related biogeochemical mechanisms (dry deposition versus BVOC emissions only here) that drive the ozone-LAI feedback in the current model framework. The major important new findings of the study are that the O₃-LAI feedback can have a different sign on surface ozone AQ depending on region and level of NO_x pollution; and that the positive feedback is particularly strong in tropical regions. The study also introduces and calculates a new metric “ozone feedback factor” that is strongly positive in tropical regions, which is an additional important contribution to the literature.

We thank the reviewer for the comments.

1. A major finding and possibly the most interesting aspect of the study is the high sensitivity positive feedback in the tropics (through the reduced dry deposition). I believe that this result is based on the application of ozone damage parameters (photosynthesis and stomatal conductance) for temperate plants (e.g. Lombardozzi et al., 2011; 2013)? Is this correct? The entire model framework assumes that tropical plants behave like temperate zone plants in response to ozone? The paper needs to emphasize more strongly that there are essentially no ozone sensitivity measurement data for tropical plants, and therefore the implications for the value of the results.

The Lombardozzi *et al.* [2013] parameterization scheme used in this study has indeed incorporated results from several tropical plant studies; but the reviewer is right in that the scheme, by pulling data from all studies and sorting them only into three plant groups, effectively treats tropical and temperate plants in the same way. We now address these points and potential problems that arise more fully in the Conclusions and Discussion:

P20 L13: “Uncertainty can arise from the large variability in the ozone sensitivity of different plants, especially for tropical trees and grasses, which are modeled based on relatively insufficient data as compared with temperate ecosystems [Lombardozzi *et al.*, 2013]. The current Lombardozzi *et al.* [2015] scheme classifying 15 PFTs into three plant groups is relatively robust in capturing the average plant physiological responses to ozone uptake on a global scale from across many studies, **but it treats tropical and temperate plants equivalently as far as ozone sensitivity is concerned, which may lead to possible biases due to an inadequate representation of spatial heterogeneity of plant-ozone ecophysiology. More detailed experimental and field data, especially for tropical and subtropical plants, can potentially help us derive a more region-specific and spatially resolved parameterization** that can be particularly useful for high-resolution regional air quality simulations. **Along the same line, we find the greatest feedbacks over tropical forests, where ozone concentrations and fluxes are not as well constrained by available in-situ observations as in the midlatitudes. More extensive and long-term measurements of biosphere-atmosphere fluxes in tropical regions are necessary to ascertain the strength of ozone-vegetation feedbacks in these identified hotspots. We also note that our parameterization necessarily ignores hysteresis effect, whereby damage done at incidentally high ozone concentrations may not undergo full recovery even when ozone levels drop again.”**

2. The exponential LAI parameterization function for GEOS-Chem. Based on Figure 1, the saturation occurs for relatively low ozone. Between 40 and 100 ppbv there is no dependence of LAI on ozone concentration. This function seems to be physically unrealistic. We would expect the LAI response of a forest or cropland ecosystem growing in ~45 ppbv ambient ozone to be rather different to such in ~90 ppbv ambient ozone?

The relationship between LAI and ozone exposure is poorly constrained by observations, since there have been no long-term monitoring or experimental studies to investigate the responses of LAI to ozone damage at a wide enough range of different ozone levels and for a sufficient diversity of PFTs. Most experimental studies to date only considered ambient vs. elevated ozone without finer gradation of ozone levels, so no continuous functional relationship can be inferred from their results.

The currently simulated relationship between LAI and ozone is consistent with the ozone damage function for photosynthesis and stomatal conductance [Lombardozzi *et al.*, 2013] used in this study, whereby most of the ozone effect on photosynthesis and conductance happens when cumulative ozone uptake (CUO) passes a certain threshold, beyond which the correlations between CUO and damage are weak. The damage function was developed based on the most comprehensive data available to date, which showed that there is substantial variability in plant responses to ozone and often the photosynthetic and stomatal responses are not correlated with CUO. Even within one species across different studies with the same experimental conditions, correlations are not evident. Correlations of photosynthesis or stomatal conductance with CUO are often only evident within a given study that measures the response of the same plant through time, but using the results of individual studies as the basis for universal parameterization may not be a valid representation of global ecosystems, and thus we consider it more robust to use a function based on responses across multiple species.

Moreover, the response of LAI to ozone is the outcome of the integrated effect of ozone damage on photosynthesis and stomatal conductance, and all subsequent processes (e.g.,

allocation, growth/senescence). In the model, what appears to be happening is a self-protective effect, namely, that ozone-induced stomatal closure limits further ozone uptake and damage so that LAI does not decline infinitely as ambient ozone increases further. This is explained in Sect. 2.4, but an empirical basis for such a mechanism is lacking from the literature.

3. *Regarding the LAI function. The paper could be greatly strengthened by showing validation and evaluation of the LAI function against measurement data (or even plant biomass could be used as proxy for some ecosystems where LAI changes are less available).*

We agree with the reviewer that a validation and evaluation with empirical data will strengthen the implications of our study. As mentioned above, however, there have been no experimental studies to investigate the responses of LAI to ozone damage at a graduation of ozone levels that is sufficient for inferring any continuous functional formulation between ozone levels and structural variables such as LAI and biomass. We can alternatively at least compare our simulated reduction in LAI at some prescribed ambient vs. elevated ozone levels with studies that measured or meta-analyzed vegetation changes (in LAI, biomass, yield, etc.) at these ozone levels [e.g., Karnosky *et al.*, 2005; Mills *et al.*, 2007; Dermody *et al.*, 2008; Feng *et al.*, 2008]. The percentage reductions predicted by our parameterization typically fall well within their empirical uncertainty bounds. We now include this comparison in Sect. 2.4:

P9 L9: “... **When we apply some generic ambient ozone level (e.g., 30 ppb) and an elevated (+50%) ozone level to Eq. (8), the percentage changes in LAI as ozone increases from ambient to elevated level range between about –20% and +3% (with the bottom and top 2.5% of grid cells/PFTs trimmed). These modeled LAI changes generally fall within the empirical uncertainty bounds found by previous ozone-elevation experiments for a few species of trees and crops [e.g., Karnosky *et al.*, 2005; Dermody *et al.*, 2008; Feng *et al.*, 2008].**”

4. *The paper assumes that BVOC emissions are essentially positive linear function of LAI. In reality, ozone vegetation damage may influence BVOC emissions in complex ways (even independent of LAI) through changes in biochemistry and plant production, and even lead to increases in BVOC emissions. There is a growing literature in this area that needs to be cited and discussed. The paper needs to emphasize the limitations of the BVOC modeling response and that the BVOC response sign could be different on monthly timescales (positive versus negative).*

The complex interactions between ozone exposure and terpenoid biosynthesis are now discussed in the Conclusions and Discussion:

P20 L28: “... **This study also considers ozone effects on biogenic VOC emissions only via the gradual modification of LAI, but previous studies have suggested that chronic ozone exposure may inhibit isoprene biosynthesis by directly interfering with enzymatic activities [e.g., Calfapietra *et al.*, 2007], and high ozone episodes may even enhance isoprene emission by triggering plant defense mechanisms against oxidative stress [e.g., Fares *et al.*, 2006]. It is necessary to further examine the interactions between ozone and isoprene biosynthesis on different timescales.** Moreover, in this study meteorological conditions are prescribed and looped over for a typical year only, and thus the potential impacts of interannual climate variability on the ozone-LAI relationships are not fully considered. For instance, the occurrence of droughts may either weaken or strengthen the coupling between plants and ozone **by interfering with photosynthetic capacity, stomatal behaviors and biogenic emissions** [e.g., Wang *et al.*, 2017]. **Despite the limitations stated above,** our findings still attest to the existence of strong ozone biogeochemical feedbacks under typical conditions, ...”

5. *The study seems to only consider isoprene? I agree isoprene is by far the most important for ozone, but how do changes in other BVOCs influence the ozone-LAI feedbacks? For example, monoterpenes*

and sesquiterpenes in the tropics? Both CLM and GEOS-Chem do include higher level BVOCs and terpenes.

The reviewer is right in that isoprene, among all BVOCs, is by far the most important for ozone-vegetation interactions. This is indeed the common finding from our other studies using both GEOS-Chem and CESM, both of which consider dynamic BVOC emissions and chemistry in addition to isoprene, e.g., *Sadiq et al.* [2017] and *Wong et al.* [2018]. They typically found that other BVOCs play only a very small role in ozone-vegetation feedbacks.

6. There are some curious features of Figure 3a, the baseline surface ozone distribution, in this GEOS-Chem model. For example, (i) surface ozone in eastern China is about 40-50 ppbv, much lower (about half of the levels) than in Northeastern US (70-80 ppbv). Indian subcontinent has very low ozone whereas Sahara Desert has substantially higher ozone. The highest European values in summer are over the Mediterranean Sea rather than the continental land mass. Do these features agree with current ozone measurement monitoring networks in these regions?

GEOS-Chem reproduces observed ozone concentrations to various extents of success depending on the region. For instance, while it is possible that ozone in eastern China is lower than in the eastern US due to weaker solar radiation reaching the surface in China, the problem of positive biases in simulated surface ozone in the eastern US is also well documented. For other regions where only satellite-derived ozone columns are available for model validation, GEOS-Chem also has varying degrees of success in matching observations. More about GEOS-Chem performance is now included in Sect. 2.3:

P6 L22: “... In general, GEOS-Chem underestimates tropospheric ozone in the tropics but overestimates it in the northern subtropics and southern midlatitudes [Zhang et al., 2010]. For regional surface ozone, the model has small systematic biases overall in the US and China, but has a tendency to overestimate summertime concentrations in the eastern US and certain sites in China [Wang et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2011]. Anthropogenic emissions ...”

7. Related to Figure 3b, the authors offer an explanation for the decreased ozone signals in US crop belt and North China Plain: “Such a reduction is driven by reduced transport of VOCs as well as organic nitrate formed from VOC-NO_x reactions following reduced LAI elsewhere in more vegetated regions”. For sure, their model shows limited to no LAI changes in these regions. However, it is really interesting that these regions are heavily dominated by crop ecosystems where we would expect to see substantial relative changes in LAI due to ozone damage in reality. Are specific crop types represented in the CLM model version? Would the results be different in sign if specific crop types are represented in the model?

The sentence concerned has already been removed in response to the other reviewer’s similar question. Indeed, it is likely that local LAI changes in central North America may still play a role in the negative ozone changes there, as is shown in Fig. 7. See our response above.

Regarding crop types, the CLM land cover we used (and thus in GEOS-Chem) only considers C₃ crops generically without resolving specific crop types. Since the differences in ozone sensitivity among different crop types are typically less than that between crops and other vegetation types, we deem it unlikely that differentiating among different crop types would lead to substantially different results.

8. The difference between the synchronous and asynchronous coupling methods (Figure 3b versus 8b) are massive for the [O₃] changes due to O₃-LAI coupling. At least the sign is the same, but the spatial responses are very different, especially over N America, Europe, Central Asia, Middle East, N Africa and E China. In many of these widespread regions, synchronous shows a strong signal, but asynchronous has no signal. The authors state: “Most of the bigger differences occur in low-LAI

regions which are more prone to idiosyncratic model (CLM) behaviors and numerical outliers especially in the asynchronously coupled cases where such peculiarities are not smoothed out.” The paper needs to offer a more scientific, and more physically mechanistic explanation for these differences (rather than “idiosyncratic model (CLM) behaviors”). What does “smoothed out” mean? How can readers know which is the most realistic response? Please directly link the results to the 3 reasons for doing the asynchronous experiments (Page 15, Lines 10-15).

A more detailed explanation for the discrepancies in low-LAI regions is now included.

P16 L18: “... The overall strong resemblance **in the relative LAI changes between the two coupling approaches, at least for regions with sufficiently high LAI**, suggests that the simplified parameterization for ozone-LAI coupling on a monthly timescale **used in synchronous coupling** (Sect. 2.4) is a reasonable idealization of the cumulative long-term **steady-state** responses of vegetation to temporally varying ozone levels.”

P16 L29: “... Most of the bigger differences occur in low-LAI regions **and over the oceans. The discrepancies likely arise from the tendency toward more unstable model (CLM) behaviors at low LAI and the inclusion of diurnally and daily fluctuating ozone in ozone-LAI coupling in the asynchronous approach (as opposed to using constant ozone levels in parameterizing the ozone-LAI relationship). In the original ozone-vegetation scheme in CLM, cumulative ozone damage only occurs when both LAI and ozone level are above some thresholds. Thus, when LAI is low and ozone fluctuating, ozone-LAI coupling becomes more erratic and loses persistence. Such peculiarities are smoothed out when parameterizing the ozone-LAI relationship by the best-fitting of responses curves and filtering of poorly fitting locations.**”

Minor comments Fig. 7 Title “Attribution”

Corrected.

References:

Dermody, O., Long, S. P., McConnaughay, K., and DeLucia, E. H.: How do elevated CO₂ and O₃ affect the interception and utilization of radiation by a soybean canopy?, *Global Change Biol.*, 14, 556-564, 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01502.x, 2008.

Feng, Z. Z., Kobayashi, K., and Ainsworth, E. A.: Impact of elevated ozone concentration on growth, physiology, and yield of wheat (*triticum aestivum* L.): A meta-analysis, *Global Change Biol.*, 14, 2696-2708, 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01673.x, 2008.

Karnosky, D. F., Pregitzer, K. S., Zak, D. R., Kubiske, M. E., Hendrey, G. R., Weinstein, D., Nosal, M., and Percy, K. E.: Scaling ozone responses of forest trees to the ecosystem level in a changing climate, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 28, 965-981, 2005.

Mills, G., Buse, A., Gimeno, B., Bermejo, V., Holland, M., Emberson, L., and Pleijel, H.: A synthesis of aot₄₀-based response functions and critical levels of ozone for agricultural and horticultural crops, *Atmos. Environ.*, 41, 2630-2643, doi:10.1016/J.Atmosenv.2006.11.016, 2007.

Coupling between surface ozone and leaf area index in a chemical transport model: Strength of feedback and implications for ozone air quality and vegetation health

Shan S. Zhou¹, Amos P. K. Tai^{1,2}, Shihan Sun¹, Mehliyar Sadiq¹, Colette L. Heald³, Jeffrey A. Geddes⁴

5 ¹ Earth System Science Programme and Graduate Division of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Faculty of Science, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha Tin, Hong Kong

² Partner State Key Laboratory of Agrobiotechnology and Institute of Environment, Energy and Sustainability, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha Tin, Hong Kong

10 ³ Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Department of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

⁴ Department of Earth and Environment, Boston University, Boston, USA

Correspondence to: Amos P. K. Tai (amostai@cuhk.edu.hk)

Abstract. Tropospheric ozone is an air pollutant with substantial harm on vegetation, and is also strongly dependent on various vegetation-mediated processes. The interdependence between ozone and vegetation may constitute feedback mechanisms that can alter ozone concentration itself but have not been considered in most studies to date. In this study we examine the importance of dynamic coupling between surface ozone and leaf area index (LAI) in shaping ozone air quality and vegetation. We first implement an empirical scheme for ozone damage on vegetation in the Community Land Model (CLM), and simulate the steady-state responses of LAI to long-term exposure to a range of prescribed ozone levels (from 0 ppb to 100 ppb). We find that most plant functional types suffer a substantial decline in LAI as ozone level increases. Based on the CLM-simulated results, we develop and implement in the GEOS-Chem chemical transport model a parameterization that computes fractional changes in monthly LAI as a function of local mean ozone levels. By forcing LAI to respond to ozone concentrations on a monthly timescale, the model simulates ozone-LAI coupling dynamically via biogeochemical processes including biogenic volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions and dry deposition, without the complication from meteorological changes. We find that ozone-induced damage on LAI can lead to changes in ozone concentrations by -1.8 ppb to +3 ppb in boreal summer, with a corresponding ozone feedback factor of -0.1 to +0.6 that represents an overall self-amplifying effect from ozone-LAI coupling. Substantially higher simulated ozone due to strong positive feedbacks is found in most tropical forests, mainly due to the ozone-induced reductions in LAI and dry deposition velocity, whereas reduced isoprene emission plays a lesser role in these low-NO_x environments. In high-NO_x regions such as eastern US, Europe and China, however, the feedback effect is much weaker and even negative in some regions, reflecting the compensating effects of reduced dry deposition and reduced isoprene emission (which reduces ozone in high-NO_x environments). In remote, low-LAI regions including most of the Southern Hemisphere, the ozone feedback is generally slightly negative, due to the reduced transport of NO_x-VOC reaction

Deleted: significant

Deleted: but

Deleted: biogeochemical

Deleted: foliage

Deleted: density

Deleted: (PFTs)

Deleted: correlates

Deleted: the

Deleted: s

Deleted: to

Deleted: dynamically

Deleted: vegetation

Deleted: synchronously

Deleted: an ozone feedback

Deleted: of

Deleted: northern

Deleted: Significantly

Deleted: ozone-LAI

Deleted: leads to lower

Deleted: the

Deleted: regime

Deleted: , likely

Deleted:

products that serve as NO_x reservoirs. This study represents the first step to account for dynamic ozone-vegetation coupling in a chemical transport model with ramifications for a more realistic joint assessment of ozone air quality and ecosystem health.

Deleted: important

1 Introduction

Tropospheric ozone (O₃) is an important greenhouse gas with an estimated radiative forcing of 0.40±0.20 W m⁻² [IPCC, 2013]. It is also an important air pollutant shown to have harmful effects on both human health and vegetation, including crops [Anenberg et al., 2010; Ainsworth et al., 2012]. Tropospheric ozone is primarily produced from the photochemical oxidation of various precursor species including carbon monoxide (CO), methane (CH₄) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) by hydroxyl radicals (OH) in the presence of nitrogen oxides (NO_x ≡ NO + NO₂). Most of the precursors have large anthropogenic sources from industrial and agricultural activities, and tropospheric ozone concentrations have been increasing since the industrial revolution. The earliest surface ozone observations recorded at L'Observatoire de Montsouris near Paris showed an annual mean ozone concentration of 11 ppb for the 1876-1910 period in Europe [Volz and Kley, 1988]. Ozone concentrations displayed a significant upward trend at northern midlatitudes during 1970s-1980s, and then a flattening or even declining trend depending on the region in the last two decades [Olmans et al., 2013]. As anthropogenic emissions are expected to decrease in many countries due to more stringent regulation [van Vuuren et al., 2011], other factors such as climate, land surface and vegetation changes will likely have increasingly important roles shaping future ozone levels [e.g., Tai et al., 2013; Wong et al., 2017]. In this study, we in particular examine the possible roles of two-way interactions between ozone and vegetation in modulating surface ozone air quality using a coupled land-atmosphere modeling framework.

Deleted: significant

Vegetation can influence both the sources and sinks of tropospheric ozone. Globally, precursors from natural sources play an important role in ozone formation. They include such gases as NO_x, CH₄ and various non-methane VOCs (NMVOCs) emitted by land vegetation and soil microbes. Isoprene (C₅H₈), which is the most abundant biogenic NMVOCs species emitted by vegetation [Guenther et al., 2006], is a major ozone precursor in high-NO_x environments, but can consume ozone by direct ozonolysis or reduce ozone by sequestering NO_x via the formation of isoprene nitrate and peroxyacetyl nitrate (PAN) in low-NO_x environments [Horowitz et al., 2007; Hollaway et al., 2017]. On the other hand, the major sinks for surface ozone include in-situ chemical loss mainly via photolysis and the subsequent reaction of singlet oxygen atom O(¹D) with water vapor (H₂O), and the dry deposition of ozone onto vegetated surfaces [Wang et al., 1998; Wild, 2007]. Leaf stomatal uptake of ozone, in particular, represents 40–60% of the total dry-depositional sink [Fowler et al., 2009]. Vegetation also controls transpiration, which modulates boundary-layer mixing, temperature, water vapor content, and thus the production, dilution, and loss of ozone. Therefore, via biogenic VOC emissions, dry deposition and transpiration, vegetation can substantially influence surface ozone concentrations.

Deleted: n

Deleted: offline-coupled

Deleted: significantly

Deleted: the

Deleted: reactions

Deleted: , hydrogen peroxide (HO₂) and OH [Wild, 2007]

Deleted: vegetation mainly through leaf stomatal uptake

Deleted:]

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: can therefore influence surface ozone via biogenic VOC emissions and dry deposition as well as

Deleted: and chemical

Surface ozone can in turn influence vegetation. The stomatal uptake of ozone has been shown to damage plants and reduce photosynthetic CO₂ assimilation at the leaf level, which may in turn reduce leaf area index (LAI), gross primary productivity (GPP), and crop yield [Karnosky et al., 2007; Ainsworth et al., 2012]. Yue and Unger [2014] developed a terrestrial

ecosystem model to assess the damage of surface ozone on gross primary productivity (GPP) throughout the US, and found that GPP is reduced by 4-8% on average in the eastern US in the growing season due to exposure to year-2005 ozone levels. Another study also found that global GPP and transpiration are reduced by 11% and 2.2%, respectively, under exposure to present-day ozone concentrations, with the greatest damage (20–25% for GPP, 15–20% for transpiration) happening at northern midlatitudes [Lombardozzi *et al.*, 2015]. The ozone-induced decrease in transpiration has been shown to enhance regional temperature by up to 3°C and reduce precipitation by up to 2 mm d⁻¹ in summertime central US [Li *et al.*, 2016]. Differential abilities of plant species to tolerate ozone, when integrated over space and time, can also cause the long-term shifts in species richness and ecosystem composition [e.g., Fuhrer *et al.*, 2016]. As vegetation variables such as stomatal resistance, LAI, and plant functional type (PFT) distribution all play important roles shaping surface ozone, dynamic changes in these variables following ozone damage may thus induce a cascade of feedbacks that ultimately affect ozone itself. The impact of such ozone-vegetation coupling on ozone air quality has only recently been examined by Sadiq *et al.* [2017], who found that by implementing synchronous ozone-vegetation coupling in the Community Earth System Model (CESM), simulated present-day surface ozone concentrations can be higher by 4–6 ppb over North America, Europe and China. Roughly half of such an enhancement is caused by reduced ozone dry deposition following increased stomatal resistance, and the rest mostly arises from reduced transpiration that leads to higher vegetation temperature and thus isoprene emission. They suggested that a major challenge in diagnosing the various feedback pathways is the high uncertainty associated with the temperature and precipitation responses to transpiration changes. This complication from meteorological feedbacks could mask the relative importance of individual vegetation variables (e.g., LAI) in contributing to the overall coupling effect, rendering attribution more difficult.

LAI is a ubiquitously important land surface parameter driving atmospheric chemistry and hydroclimate in many models [e.g., Wong *et al.*, 2018]. Previous modeling studies of ozone damage on vegetation usually used prescribed LAI and other structural variables such as canopy height, derived from satellites and land surveys as fixed parameters in their vegetation simulations [e.g., Sitch *et al.*, 2007; Lombardozzi *et al.*, 2015]. Some studies have considered the long-term decline in growth and LAI following ozone damage on GPP, which further limits GPP itself [Yue and Unger, 2015] and can lead to a biogeochemical feedback effect on air quality due to the importance of LAI in modulating surface ozone and hydrometeorology [Sadiq *et al.*, 2017]. Observation-based, prescribed LAI may be adequate for present-day or short-term simulations of vegetation and climate, but with ozone-vegetation interaction as well as other drivers such as warming and rising CO₂, historical and future foliage properties may be significantly different from those in the present day. Prognostic LAI simulated dynamically by biogeochemical models may therefore be required to enable more realistic simulations especially for multidecadal and century-long historical simulations or future projections under rather different climate scenarios. Furthermore, while ozone concentration generally responds and equilibrates with any changes in the terrestrial boundary conditions over relatively short timescales (hours to weeks), the responses of vegetation to ozone exposure are usually slower and may require months to years to fully take effect due to the cumulative nature of ozone damage [Lombardozzi *et al.*, 2012]. It is essential to examine different timescales of ozone-vegetation coupling, and decide accordingly the most suitable and computationally efficient model coupling approach to adequately capture the interactive effects.

Deleted: .

Deleted: structural variables (e.g.,

Deleted: ,

Deleted:)

In this study, we focus on the relationship between ozone and LAI, and assess its relative importance in the overall ozone-vegetation coupling effect. We use a standalone land surface model (LSM) with active biogeochemical cycles driven by prescribed meteorological inputs and ozone concentrations to examine the long-term evolution of LAI in response to different levels of ozone exposure. Based on the simulated ozone-LAI relationships, we develop a simplified parameterization scheme for synchronous coupling between ozone and LAI on a monthly timescale for computationally efficient use in air quality assessment by a chemical transport model (CTM). We also investigate the effect of asynchronous coupling by performing a series of offline-coupled LSM-CTM model experiments. By comparing simulated ozone concentrations from CTM simulations with vs. without ozone-induced damage on LAI, we quantify the “ozone feedback” that results from ozone-vegetation coupling, and examine the possible pathways contributing to the feedback. This effort not only allows ozone-vegetation coupling to be considered dynamically within an atmospheric model without the complication from meteorological changes and feedbacks, but also renders the incorporation of ozone-induced biogeochemical feedbacks and air quality-ecosystem coevolution more computationally affordable in regional climate and air quality models.

Deleted: w

Deleted: online

Deleted: regional climate or air quality

Deleted: arising

Deleted: hydro

2 Model description and simulations

2.1 Basic description for Community Land Model

In this study, we simulate ozone damage on vegetation using the Community Land Model (CLM) version 4.5, embedded within the Community Earth System Model (CESM) version 1.2.2 forced by prescribed atmospheric data from Climate Research Unit (CRU)–National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) at a resolution of 1.9° latitude by 2.5° longitude. This version not only updates important canopy processes including canopy radiation and upscaling of leaf processes from previous versions, but also improves the stability of the iterative solution in the computation of photosynthesis and stomatal conductance [Sun *et al.*, 2012]. We use the “BGC mode” with active biogeochemistry [Oleson *et al.*, 2013], which dynamically simulates ecosystem structural variables (LAI and canopy height) based on post-photosynthesis carbon allocation. When evaluated against regional observations, this version of CLM typically captures the spatial variability of gross primary production (GPP) and LAI well, albeit with different signs and degrees of region-specific biases including a general overestimation in both variables in humid, highly productive regions [e.g., Wang *et al.*, 2015; Sakalli *et al.*, 2017].

Deleted:

CLM4.5 uses the Ball-Berry stomatal conductance model [Ball *et al.*, 1987] described by Collatz *et al.* [1991] to simulate leaf stomatal conductance (g_s) as

$$g_s = \frac{1}{r_s} = m \frac{A_n}{c_s} h_s P_{\text{atm}} + b \quad (1)$$

where r_s is the leaf stomatal resistance ($\text{s m}^2 \mu\text{mol}^{-1}$), m is a PFT-dependent parameter ($m = 9$ for C_3 plants and $m = 4$ for C_4 plants), A_n is the leaf net photosynthesis rate ($\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$), c_s is the CO_2 partial pressure at the leaf surface (Pa), $h_s = e_s/e_i$ is the leaf surface fractional humidity with e_s being the vapor pressure (Pa) at the leaf surface and e_i being the saturation vapor

pressure (Pa) at leaf temperature, P_{atm} is the atmospheric pressure (Pa), and b is the minimum stomatal conductance ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) ($b = 10000$ for C_3 plants and $b = 40000$ for C_4 plants) when there is no net photosynthesis.

The rate of net photosynthesis, A_n , is computed based on the Farquhar model [Farquhar *et al.*, 1980] for C_3 plants, and the photosynthesis scheme of Collatz *et al.* [1992] for C_4 plants. Overall, A_n ($\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) is represented by

$$A_n = \min(A_c, A_j, A_p) - R_d \quad (2)$$

where A_c is the Rubisco (RuBP carboxylase/oxygenase)-limited photosynthesis rate, A_j is the RuBP-limited photosynthesis rate, A_p is the product-limited photosynthesis rate, and R_d is the dark respiration rate, all in the same unit as A_n . The photosynthesis rate is dependent on intercellular CO_2 concentration (c_i), which is in turn dependent on g_s , c_s , and ambient CO_2 concentration (c_a) through the diffusive flux equations. A_n and g_s are therefore strongly coupled and at every model time step a unique solution for A_n and g_s is found by numerical iterations until c_i converges.

2.2 Scheme for ozone damage on vegetation

In the default configuration, CLM calculates stomatal conductance, which controls both water and carbon fluxes, tightly coupled to photosynthesis as mentioned above. Ozone-mediated impacts on vegetation are not included. Several land models have incorporated ozone damage by directly modifying photosynthesis using an empirical ozone flux-based factor, which in turn affects stomatal conductance [Sitch *et al.*, 2007; Yue and Unger, 2014]. Lombardozzi *et al.* [2012] showed that modifying photosynthesis and stomatal conductance independently using different ozone impact factors can improve model simulations of vegetation responses to ozone exposure. In this study, we implement the ozone damage scheme of Lombardozzi *et al.* [2015], which modifies the initial net photosynthesis rate (A_n) and stomatal conductance (g_s) calculated by the Farquhar-Ball-Berry model (described above) independently using two ozone damage factors, F_p and F_c , which are multiplied to A_n and g_s , respectively. These two factors are calculated from the cumulative uptake of ozone (CUO), which integrates the ozone flux through leaf stomata over the growing season or leaf lifetime:

$$\text{CUO} = 10^{-6} \sum \frac{[\text{O}_3]}{k_{\text{O}_3} r_s + r_b + r_a} \Delta t \quad (3)$$

where $[\text{O}_3]$ is the surface ozone concentration (nmol m^{-3}), $k_{\text{O}_3} = 1.67$ is the ratio of leaf resistance to ozone to leaf resistance to water, r_s here is the leaf-level stomatal resistance, r_b is the leaf boundary layer resistance, and r_a is the aerodynamic resistance between the leaf and the reference level, and $\Delta t = 30$ min is the given model time step. CUO is only accumulated when LAI is above a minimum value of 0.5 and ozone flux is larger than a critical threshold of $0.8 \text{ nmol O}_3 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ to account for the compensating ability of plants to detoxify ozone [Lombardozzi *et al.*, 2012; 2015]. The two ozone damage factors are calculated as a linear function of CUO as:

$$F_p = a_p \times \text{CUO} + b_p \quad (4)$$

$$F_c = a_c \times \text{CUO} + b_c \quad (5)$$

where a_p , b_p , a_c and b_c are empirical slopes and intercepts (Table 1). There are 15 PFTs (Supplement Table S1) plus bare ground in the vegetation composition of CLM4.5 [Oleson *et al.*, 2013], but as Table 1 shows, the experimental effects of ozone differ

Deleted: , especially with respect to hydrometeorological variables

Deleted: and boundary layer

Deleted: surface

Deleted: [Sitch *et al.*, 2007]

Deleted: and ozone flux is larger than a critical threshold of $0.8 \text{ nmol O}_3 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ to account for the compensating ability of plants to detoxify ozone

among three more general plant groups: broadleaf trees, needleleaf trees, and grasses and crops. We therefore lump CLM4.5 PFTs into the three plant groups: “broadleaf” to include all broadleaf tree and broadleaf shrub PFTs, “needleleaf” to include all needleleaf tree and shrub PFTs, and “grasses and crops” to include C₃ and C₄ grasses and C₃ unmanaged rainfed crops.

5
Table 1: Slopes (per mmol m⁻²) and intercepts (unitless) used in Eq. (4) and Eq. (5) to relate cumulative uptake of ozone (CUO) to the ozone damage factors applied to the net photosynthesis rate and stomatal conductance, following Lombardozi et al. [2015]. Values for “average” sensitivity (as opposed to “high” and “low” sensitivity) are used in this study.

10

	Photosynthesis		Conductance	
	Slope, a_p	Intercept, b_p	Slope, a_c	Intercept, b_c
Broadleaf	0	0.8752	0	0.9125
Needleleaf	0	0.839	0.0048	0.7823
Grasses and crops	-0.0009	0.8021	0	0.7511

15
2.3 Description for GEOS-Chem chemical transport model

We use the GEOS-Chem global 3-D chemical transport model version 10-01 (geos-chem.org) with fully coupled O₃-NO_x-hydrocarbon-aerosol chemical mechanism for atmospheric chemistry simulations, driven by assimilated meteorological fields from the Goddard Earth Observing System (GEOS-5) produced by the NASA Global Modeling and Assimilation Office (GMAO), with a horizontal resolution of 2° latitude by 2.5° longitude and 47 vertical layers. GEOS-Chem has been extensively used in ozone simulations and evaluated with in situ and satellite observations in previous studies, both on a global scale [e.g., Liu et al., 2006; Zhang et al., 2010] and a regional scale [e.g., Wang et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2011]. In general, GEOS-Chem underestimates tropospheric ozone in the tropics but overestimates it in the northern subtropics and southern midlatitudes [Zhang et al., 2010]. For regional surface ozone, the model has small systematic biases overall in the US and China, but has a tendency to overestimate summertime concentrations in the eastern US and certain sites in China [Wang et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2011]. Anthropogenic emissions of NO_x, CO, sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and ammonia (NH₃) are from the EDGAR v4.2 (Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research) seasonal global base emission inventory for the years 1970–2008. Anthropogenic VOC emissions are from the RETRO (REanalysis of the TROpospheric chemical composition) monthly global inventory for year 2000. Biomass burning emissions are from the year-specific GFED4 (Global Fire Emissions Dataset) dataset.

Deleted: .

In GEOS-Chem, LAI affects surface ozone mainly through three channels: biogenic VOC emissions, dry deposition, and soil NO_x emission. Biogenic emissions are calculated within GEOS-Chem by the Model of Emissions of Gasses and Aerosols from Nature (MEGAN v2.1) [Guenther et al., 2012]. The emission of a given VOC species is based on a baseline

emission factor modulated by a series of activity factors accounting for variations in light, temperature, leaf age, soil moisture, LAI, and CO₂ inhibition. Dry deposition is computed by the resistance scheme of *Wesely* [1989], whereby dry deposition velocity is the inverse of aerodynamic resistance (R_a), sublayer resistance (R_s) and bulk surface resistance (R_b) added in series. The term R_c accounts for a combination of resistances from vegetation (including stomatal resistance), lower canopy and ground, which have specific values for 11 different land types. *Wong et al. [2018]* extensively evaluated the LAI dependence of both MEGAN biogenic emissions and dry deposition in GEOS-Chem. Soil NO_x emission is based on the scheme of *Hudman et al. [2012]*, and further modulated by a reduction factor to account for within-canopy NO_x deposition [*Jacob and Bakwin, 1991*].

Different modules in GEOS-Chem and CLM4.5 have traditionally used a variety of land type and PFT classification schemes. To harmonize between them, we use the land cover harmonization module recently developed by *Geddes et al. [2016]*, which classifies vegetation into the same 15 PFTs as CLM4.5 (Table S1) in GEOS-Chem. Emission factors and fractional coverages for those PFTs related to biogenic VOC emissions are mapped and regridded at model initialization. The 15 PFTs are also remapped to the 24 biomes [*Steinkamp and Lawrence, 2011*] for the soil NO_x module according to their types and locations, and to the 11 land types used in the dry deposition module. Original monthly mean LAI input in GEOS-Chem derived from the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) satellite instrument at a grid-level resolution of 0.5°×0.5° is replaced by monthly PFT-level LAI from default CLM land surface data of the present day (year 2000), which is in turn derived from the grid-level MODIS LAI using the deaggregation methods of *Lawrence and Chase [2007]*.

2.4 Model experiments to determine ozone-LAI relationship

We implement the ozone damage scheme described above into CLM4.5-BGC and conduct 11 simulations under prescribed constant ozone levels from 0 ppb to 100 ppb with an interval of 10 ppb, where the simulation with 0 ppb ozone is treated as the control case (CTR) without ozone damage on vegetation. All simulations are run with initial conditions for year 2000 (which have themselves been obtained from a spin-up simulation starting from no vegetation for more than 1000 years, driven by prescribed year-2000 meteorology) for a total of 80 years. We find that vegetation structure reaches a steady state with no further temporal trends in the monthly mean values roughly after 20-40 years of simulations depending on the prescribed ozone level and PFT. Monthly mean PFT-level one-sided exposed LAI averaged over the last 15 simulation years is extracted as the steady-state solution to be compared with the control case. Aggregate, grid-level LAI, i.e., the fraction-weighted sum over all PFTs, is also calculated.

To quantify ozone damage on vegetation structure, we define a PFT-level ozone impact factor, γ , to represent the relative change of monthly mean LAI between the case with a given ozone concentration and the control case. The PFT-level γ factors are directly calculated as:

$$\gamma_{\text{raw}} = \frac{\text{LAI}_{\text{O}_3}}{\text{LAI}_{\text{CTR}}} \quad (7)$$

Deleted: r

Deleted: r_c

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

Deleted: r_b

Deleted: r_c

Deleted: (ELAI)

where γ_{raw} is a spatially and monthly varying ozone impact factor dependent on ozone concentration directly from the CLM simulations, $\text{LAI}_{[\text{O}_3]}$ is the simulated steady-state monthly LAI at a given ozone concentration, and LAI_{CTR} is the original monthly LAI in the control case with no ozone damage. We find that monthly γ_{raw} (both PFT-level and grid-level) for a given location generally decreases as ozone concentration increases, but its decrease per unit ozone increase becomes smaller at higher ozone concentrations (Fig. 1) because of the progressive closure of stomata as represented by the ozone damage scheme. When the stomatal conductance is small enough to limit ozone flux below the critical threshold, no additional damage will be caused by ozone. This restrictive effect from attenuated stomatal conductance on ozone flux prevents LAI from declining infinitely. Thus, above a certain high-enough ozone concentration, γ_{raw} generally levels off due to a relatively steady $\text{LAI}_{[\text{O}_3]}$ in the majority of land grid cells worldwide. In some places especially in grasslands and semiarid regions, however, γ_{raw} increases with ozone level but its increase per unit ozone increase also declines and then levels off at higher ozone concentrations.




Figure 1: Relationship between the ozone impact factor, γ , for relative LAI changes in Eq. (7) and surface ozone concentration in summer (JJA), using the grid cell covering Massachusetts as an example. Black circles refer to γ_{raw} directly calculated from CLM simulated results, and the red dashed line refers to γ_{opt} in Eq. (8) that is obtained by best-fitting.

For both kinds of ozone-LAI relationship, we can best-fit an exponential-like function to the values of CLM-simulated γ_{raw} with two optimization parameters to obtain an optimized ozone impact factor, γ_{opt} , for each model grid cell, month and PFT:

$$\gamma_{\text{opt}} = \gamma_{\infty} + (1 - \gamma_{\infty})e^{-k[\text{O}_3]} \quad (8)$$

where one of the parameter to optimize, γ_{∞} , is essentially the “saturated” relative change in LAI at very high ozone concentrations, and k is the exponential decay factor indicating how “quickly” γ evolves with increasing ozone concentration.

We find that for 90% of the grid cells/PFTs, γ_{∞} is between about 0.3 and 1.5; for 50% of the grid cells/PFTs, γ_{∞} is between about 0.75 and 0.95. To exclude outlying conditions where model-simulated LAI is unrealistically too sensitive to ozone

Deleted: E

Deleted: E

Deleted: incremental

Deleted: for the same

Deleted: incremental

Deleted: for the same

(mostly in low-LAI regions at the peripheries of major forests and grasslands), we constrain the optimized γ_{sc} to be between 0.3 and 1.5. We also smooth the fitted values by replacing them with mean values of their surrounding grid cells if the ratio of fitted sum of squares to total sum of squares in that grid cell falls below 0.25 (i.e., if the fitted curve explains less than 25% of the variability of the simulated results). The fitting is done for both PFT-level and grid-level data, and for the vast majority of PFTs and grid cells the fitted to total sum of squares ratio is above 0.25, demonstrating the robustness of Eq. (8) as the fitting and parameterization function to be implemented in GESO-Chem (or any other CTM or climate model). The maps for fitted γ_{sc} and k for different PFTs are shown in Figs. S1-2 in the supplement. The global median values of annually averaged $(\gamma_{sc} - 1) \times 100\%$ for different PFTs range between -19% (for needleleaf evergreen boreal trees) to $+5.0\%$ (for broadleaf deciduous temperate shrubs), and are negative for most PFTs, indicating a general decline of LAI at very high ozone levels. When we apply some generic ambient ozone level (e.g., 30 ppb) and an elevated (+50%) ozone level to Eq. (8), the percentage changes in LAI as ozone increases from ambient to elevated level range between -20% and $+3\%$ (with the bottom and top 2.5% of grid cells/PFTs trimmed). These modeled LAI changes generally fall within the empirical uncertainty bounds found by previous ozone-elevation experiments for a few species of trees and crops [e.g., Karnosky et al., 2005; Dermody et al., 2008; Feng et al., 2008].

Formatted: Font: Italic

2.5 GEOS-Chem experiments with ozone-vegetation coupling

We implement the parameterization equation, Eq. (8) in GEOS-Chem, and conduct three GEOS-Chem experiments (Table 2): 1) [*Intact LAI*], a control case with monthly prescribed intact potential LAI that is unaffected by ozone; 2) [*Affected LAI*], an experimental case with LAI being updated continuously and evolving with ozone concentration; and 3) [*Intact_NoAnth*], a case with intact potential LAI but without anthropogenic emissions, to examine the strength of ozone feedback (see Sect. 6). We run the above three cases first using 2009 to 2012 meteorology as spin-up and then loop over 2012 meteorology for three simulation years to reach a quasi-steady state for ozone air quality representative of current-day conditions. The detailed implementation algorithm for each simulation is discussed below.

Table 2: GEOS-Chem experiments to investigate the effect of synchronous ozone-vegetation coupling.

Name	Description
[<i>Intact LAI</i>]	GEOS-Chem simulation run with monthly intact potential LAI unaffected by ozone
[<i>Affected LAI</i>]	GEOS-Chem simulation run with continuously-updated LAI affected by ozone month by month

[Intact_NoAnth] GEOS-Chem simulation run with monthly intact potential LAI unaffected by ozone and with no anthropogenic emissions of ozone precursors

For the *[Intact LAI]* case, we first derive an intact, potential LAI that should represent the maximum LAI possible if there is no ozone damage in reality, which is taken as the baseline case for investigating the effect of ozone-LAI coupling. This is necessary because the present-day satellite-derived “observed” LAI is supposedly already the outcome of long-term ozone-vegetation interactions, and should not be used as the baseline. Instead, the potential LAI is used as the initial condition to drive the GEOS-Chem simulations. The potential LAI is derived using the current LAI and optimal γ_{opt} factor:

$$LAI_{pot} = \frac{LAI_{MOD}}{\gamma_{opt}} \quad (9)$$

LAI_{MOD} here is the monthly mean PFT-level LAI from default CLM land cover for the present day originally derived from grid-level MODIS LAI. The optimal γ_{opt} is calculated using Eq. (8) from the monthly mean ozone concentrations averaged over year 2005-2008 to represent a present-day norm on which our model experiments are based.

For the *[Affected LAI]* case, PFT-level LAI input of each simulated month is adjusted and evolves dynamically with γ_{opt} based on the ozone concentration of the previous month. Specifically, monthly mean ozone concentration of the previous month is read in the first time step of the current simulation month and used to calculate γ_{opt} for every PFT in each grid cell, which is then multiplied to the intact potential LAI to derive a new ozone-affected LAI (LAI_{O_3}) input for the current simulation month:

$$LAI_{O_3} = \gamma_{opt} LAI_{pot} \quad (10)$$

This manner of implementation essentially enables dynamic coevolution of LAI and ozone month by month, and assumes that LAI responds to fluctuations in ozone levels on a monthly timescale.

Such a monthly to intraseasonal timescale for ozone-LAI coupling may not be long enough for plants to fully respond to large fluctuations of ozone concentration. As described in Sect. 2.4, when ozone is incidentally increased from zero to a prescribed level, LAI typically responds and stabilizes over about two decades. As such, is it justifiable to use the relationship between monthly mean ozone and LAI, which have reached a long-term quasi-steady state in CLM, as the basis for parameterization? We first note that, in reality, observed ozone and LAI have likely been through an extended period of coevolution and are likely coupled in a manner resembling in a quasi-steady state, albeit with seasonal fluctuations and some long-term trends. Moreover, the month-to-month variations in ozone concentration are typically much smaller than an incidental jump between zero and a prescribed level. As shown by Fig. 1, the strongest response of LAI to ozone happens at low ozone levels, while at and above ambient levels (e.g., > 30 ppb), LAI responses to any ozone variations also become progressively small. We thus assume that the “steady-state response” for ozone-LAI relationship is reasonably robust to represent short-term responses of LAI superimposed on the long-term, ozone-induced decline in seasonally varying LAI. This

Deleted: This

Deleted: on a

Deleted: Also

Deleted: month-to-month

Deleted: variations

Deleted: in

Deleted: (

Deleted: the seasonality of the intact


Deleted:)

assumption is further tested by driving CLM with hourly varying GEOS-Chem ozone fields in an asynchronous coupling experiment until LAI reaches a quasi-steady state, which will be discussed in Sect. 5.

All simulations use the same prescribed meteorological fields and PFT fractional coverage. Output variables for boreal summer (June, July and August, or JJA), boreal winter (December, January and February, or DJF), and the whole year are extracted for analysis and comparison; in the rest of this paper we will focus on boreal summer results at quasi-steady state, because this is when high ozone concentrations overlap to the greatest extent with the growing season of the majority of land plants in major populated regions at midlatitudes. Equivalent results for boreal winter and the whole year are included in the supplement and discussed briefly in the main text.

10 3 Impact of ozone exposure on leaf area index

We first calculate 2012 JJA mean total LAI by summing over all PFT-level LAI values weighted by the respective PFT fractional coverage, and compare the grid-level LAI_{O_3} with LAI_{pot} to examine the impacts of synchronous ozone-vegetation coupling on LAI. Figure 2a shows the distribution of summertime ozone-affected LAI with a maximum value of 5.5 in Amazonia. The spatial pattern of intact, potential LAI (*Supplement Fig. S3a*) is very similar to that of affected LAI, but the magnitude is higher almost everywhere globally. The differences between these two sets of summertime LAI ($[Affected\ LAI] - [Intact\ LAI]$) are shown in Fig. 2b (the corresponding percentage changes are shown in Fig. S3b). Due to synchronous ozone-vegetation coupling on a monthly timescale, LAI values generally decline in most of the vegetated regions, and LAI experiences the greatest reduction of up to 2.6 in heavily forested regions including equatorial Asia and southeastern China. There are a few grid cells showing an opposite effect with a slight LAI increase located at the border of vegetated areas, and the possible reasons include “self-healing” effect of vegetation under moderate ozone exposure (e.g., higher water-use efficiency and increased carbon allocation to leaves) to compensate for the photosynthetic damage [*Sadiq et al., 2017*], as well as numerical outliers due to LAI fluctuations in low-LAI regions. Since the LAI increase in those grid cells is relatively small compared with the magnitude of LAI reduction, and almost always occurs in low-LAI or marginal areas between vegetated and non-vegetated regions, the overall impacts of those grid cells are deemed negligible.



Deleted: n

Deleted: ly


Deleted: ed

Figure 2: (a) Simulated leaf area index (LAI) affected by long-term ozone exposure in summer (JJA mean) in GEOS-Chem, and (b) differences between ozone-affected LAI in (a) and intact, potential LAI unaffected by ozone, i.e., $[Affected\ LAI] - [Intact\ LAI]$.

We also plot the PFT-level LAI changes between $[Affected\ LAI]$ and $[Intact\ LAI]$ case (Fig. S4), and find that total LAI changes in different places are mainly caused by the dominant local PFTs: in tropical regions such as Amazonia, part of central Africa (mostly in Gabon and Congo) and equatorial Asia, the LAI changes are mainly ascribed to tropical broadleaf evergreen trees; whereas in high-latitude regions, boreal needleleaf evergreen trees play the dominant role in the LAI changes. We also find a large contribution from C₃ and C₄ grasses and rainfed crops in total LAI reduction in several subtropical and tropical regions such as southeastern China, southern Brazil, part of western Europe, and maritime Southeast Asia. This is likely because of the higher sensitivity of grasses and crops to ozone exposure compared with other plant groups in this ozone damage scheme (see Table 1), and the general overestimation of grass and crop LAI in CLM, which is also documented in other studies [Chen et al., 2015; Williams et al., 2016]. The over-representation of grasses and crops in these subtropical and tropical regions in the CLM world may in turn lead to possible high biases in the simulated ozone damage on LAI therein.

15 4 Impact of synchronous ozone-vegetation coupling on surface ozone

Summertime (JJA) global ozone concentrations and changes due to synchronous ozone-LAI coupling are shown in Fig. 3. Figure 3a shows the JJA mean surface ozone field in the $[Affected\ LAI]$ case, with a global average ozone concentration of 28 ppb and highest value of 75 ppb in central Africa. Figure 3b shows the differences in ozone concentration between the $[Affected\ LAI]$ and $[Intact\ LAI]$ case (see percentage changes in Fig. S5). With LAI being dynamically influenced by ozone in the $[Affected\ LAI]$ case, simulated ozone concentration is generally higher in most vegetated areas such as the tropics, eastern North America, and southern China by up to 3 ppb (~10%), reflecting a significant positive feedback arising from ozone-LAI coupling. The spatial patterns of both the absolute and percentage changes in simulated ozone on the continents generally match that of LAI changes due to ozone exposure (Fig. 2b), whereas ozone concentrations over the oceanic and desert areas also increase, which is likely due to the remote transport of ozone and NO_x reservoir species from high-ozone areas. We also find a slight ozone reduction in north China within 1.8 ppb and in central North America within 0.8 ppb.



Deleted: ; these places experience moderate ozone exposure in summer but relatively little LAI changes. Such a reduction is driven by reduced transport of VOCs as well as organic nitrate formed from VOC-NO_x reactions following reduced LAI elsewhere in more vegetated regions [Hollaway et al., 2017]

Figure 3: (a) Surface ozone concentration with ozone-affected leaf area index (LAI) in boreal summer (JJA mean) from the [Affected LAI] case; and (b) differences in JJA ozone concentration between the [Affected LAI] and [Intact LAI] case (i.e., [Affected LAI] – [Intact LAI]).

5 We further investigate the possible pathways contributing to the above simulated ozone changes. Figure 4a shows the JJA ozone dry deposition velocity (v_d , cm s^{-1}) in the [Affected LAI] case, which mirrors the global LAI distribution, reflecting leaf stomatal uptake of ozone. Its absolute changes compared with the [Intact LAI] case are shown in Fig. 4b (corresponding percentage changes are shown in Fig. S6), which indicates that regions with a large LAI reduction also have a large decline in ozone dry deposition velocity. The spatial pattern of such a decline is broadly consistent with that of the ozone reduction, suggesting that reduced dry deposition due to ozone-induced LAI decline is an important factor for the higher ozone shown in Fig. 3b.




Figure 4: (a) Ozone dry deposition velocity (v_d) in summer (JJA mean) from the [Affected LAI] case; and (b) differences in ozone dry deposition velocity between the [Affected LAI] and [Intact LAI] case (i.e., [Affected LAI] – [Intact LAI]).

15 Global isoprene emission rate ($\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) in summer in the [Affected LAI] case and its differences from the [Intact LAI] case are shown in Fig. 5a and 5b, respectively (percentage changes are shown in Fig. S7). Isoprene, which is one of the most important biogenic VOCs determining ambient ozone, shows a general decline globally, mostly reflecting the strong association between isoprene emission and LAI. Isoprene plays opposite roles in ozone changes depending on the ambient NO_x level. Figure 6 shows the summertime surface NO_x concentration as well as its changes between the [Affected LAI] and [Intact LAI] case. In the relatively high- NO_x regions at northern midlatitudes (over North America, Europe and East Asia), ozone enhancement from ozone-LAI coupling is relatively small compared with the subtropical and tropical regions (Fig. 3b). This is mostly due to the compensation between the effects of reduced dry deposition, which increases ozone, and reduced isoprene emission, which decreases ozone. In Europe and northern China, in particular, ozone-LAI coupling enhances NO_x level due to reduced sequestration by biogenic VOCs (Fig. 6b), which further limits ozone production due to more sequestration of OH by NO_x (shown in Fig. S8) and thus less efficient cycling of HO_x radicals. On the other hand, in the subtropical and tropical regions where isoprene emission is high (Fig. 5a) and NO_x level is relatively low (Fig. 6a), reduced dry deposition

Deleted:

Moved down [2]: Global isoprene emission rate ($\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) in summer in the [Affected LAI] case and its differences from the [Intact LAI] case are shown in Fig. 5a and 5b, respectively (percentage changes are shown in Fig. S7). Isoprene, which is one of the most important biogenic VOCs determining ambient ozone, shows a general decline globally, mostly reflecting the strong association between isoprene emission and LAI.

Moved down [3]:





Figure 5: (a) Isoprene emission rate (E_{isop}) in summer (JJA mean) from the [Affected LAI] case; and (b) differences in isoprene emission rate between the [Affected LAI] and [Intact LAI] case (i.e., [Affected LAI] – [Intact LAI]).

Deleted: Unlike LAI reduction, however, the greatest absolute reduction for isoprene emission occurs in central Africa rather than throughout the entire tropical regions, mainly because of the high baseline isoprene emission in this region, so that a similar perturbation in LAI may induce a particularly large change in isoprene emission.


Moved (insertion) [2]

(Fig. 4b) and reduced isoprene emission (Fig. 5b) add together to enhance ozone concentrations. In central North America, which is low-NO_x in general, the small reduction in NO_x levels is consistent with the slight ozone reduction there (Fig. 3b).

Moved (insertion) [3]



5 **Figure 5:** (a) Isoprene emission rate (E_{isop}) in summer (JJA mean) from the [Affected LAI] case; and (b) differences in isoprene emission rate between the [Affected LAI] and [Intact LAI] case (i.e., [Affected LAI] – [Intact LAI]).



10 **Figure 6:** (a) Surface NO_x concentration in summer (JJA mean) from the [Affected LAI] case; and (b) differences in NO_x concentration between the [Affected LAI] and [Intact LAI] case (i.e., [Affected LAI] – [Intact LAI]).

We further estimate the relative contribution of reduced dry deposition vs. isoprene emission toward the simulated ozone changes under ozone-LAI coupling using the statistical model developed by Wong *et al.* [2018], which is a computationally simple, “offline” assessment tool to estimate the local sensitivity of ozone to any LAI changes, whatever the cause of such changes is, and quantify the relative importance of each of the two dominant pathways (dry deposition vs. isoprene emission) in contributing to this sensitivity as a function of an array of variables including mean ozone concentration, total NO_x emission, wind speed, temperature, etc., for any vegetated locations. According to the statistical model, we find that ozone is substantially enhanced globally when driven only by reduced ozone dry deposition (Fig. 7a), and mildly reduced when driven only by isoprene emission (Fig. 7b). The possible total ozone changes via both pathways combined (Fig. 7c) broadly match the pattern of ozone changes on the continents directly simulated by GEOS-Chem (Fig. 3b). The statistical model suggests that reduced ozone dry deposition plays a more dominant role in the total ozone changes, and reduced biogenic isoprene emission generally causes a decline in ozone that partially offsets the effect of reduced dry deposition especially in

Deleted: designed to be

15 Deleted: attribute this sensitivity to

Deleted: based on

Deleted: simulated

Deleted: significantly

northern midlatitude high-NO_x regions where ozone sensitivity to isoprene emission is stronger than in tropical low-NO_x regions. In general, anthropogenic NO_x emission and baseline LAI are the most important factors determining which of dry deposition vs. biogenic emissions is the dominant pathway accounting for local ozone responses to LAI changes.

5




Figure 7: Attribution of simulated ozone changes to (a) changes in dry deposition only; (b) changes in biogenic isoprene emission only; and (c) changes in both dry deposition and isoprene emission combined, based on the statistical model developed by Wong *et al.* [2018].

10

Equivalent plots of Fig. 3 but for boreal wintertime (DJF) mean and annual mean ozone are shown in Fig. S5. Annual ozone changes due to ozone-LAI coupling are broadly consistent with that for JJA mean, albeit with weaker negative feedbacks and more spatially dispersed positive feedbacks. The wintertime ozone enhancements in the Northern Hemisphere are generally much stronger and more widespread than those in summer, mostly due to the smaller importance of isoprene emission in counteracting the deposition-mediated positive feedbacks.

15

5 Impacts of asynchronous ozone-vegetation coupling on surface ozone

In the above we have presented the effect of synchronous ozone-LAI coupling, whereby ozone and LAI interact dynamically “online” on a monthly timescale according to a simplified parameterization scheme, on ozone air quality. Here we perform an additional series of GEOS-Chem and CLM experiments to determine the effect of ozone-LAI coupling if the coupling is done asynchronously. The results from these experiments, in comparison with those in Sect. 4, allow us to: 1) examine the relative importance of first-order and second-order feedback effects; 2) check if driving CLM with temporally varying ozone fields would yield different results; and 3) evaluate if the “quasi-steady state response” assumption behind the ozone-LAI synchronous coupling is reasonable.


20

We first simulate hourly ozone concentrations using GEOS-Chem under year-2012 conditions, which are then used to drive CLM with the ozone damage scheme (Sect. 2.2) for at least 20 simulation years until a quasi-steady state is reached. The resulting relative changes in monthly LAI at PFT levels due to ozone damage, which we can call the “first-order” effect,

25

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: 1



Deleted:

Deleted:

are then multiplied by the intact potential LAI and fed into GEOS-Chem to simulate ozone concentrations again, finishing one cycle of coupling. The “new” ozone concentrations are then fed back to CLM to estimate the “new” steady-state LAI changes, which we can call the “second-order” effect. In theory, the feedback cycles should carry on until relative LAI changes and ozone concentrations come into equilibrium with each other. In practice, we find that the second-order LAI changes after one cycle of asynchronous coupling are much smaller than the first-order changes and yield only negligible further changes in ozone concentrations, suggesting that the first-order effect has already encapsulated most of the coupling effect. The final simulated results for both LAI and ozone concentrations should represent a long-term quasi-steady state of dynamic ozone-vegetation interactions.

The asynchronous ozone-LAI coupling experiments have the same model configurations as described in Sect. 2.4 and 2.5, except that γ_{raw} in Eq. (7) is now calculated with CLM-simulated LAI driven by hourly ozone fields from the [Intact LAI] case, instead of constant ozone levels. We constrain γ_{raw} to be within the range of 0.3 to 1.6, which covers more than 90% of its values. In the [Affected LAI] case here, we replace γ_{opt} in Eq. (10) with γ_{raw} to obtain LAI_{O₃}, which are then used as boundary conditions for GEOS-Chem simulation.

The differences in LAI between the [Affected LAI] and [Intact LAI] case are shown in Figs. S9 and S10. The mostly negatively relative changes in LAI here for asynchronous coupling are broadly consistent with that shown in Fig. S3 for synchronous coupling, albeit with more frequent occurrences of the sporadic LAI increases in low-LAI regions. This is expected because in the development of parameterization for synchronous ozone-LAI coupling, many of these grid cells are filtered out due to poor fitting by Eq. (8). The overall strong resemblance in the relative LAI changes between the two coupling approaches, at least for regions with sufficiently high LAI, suggests that the simplified parameterization for ozone-LAI coupling on a monthly timescale used in synchronous coupling (Sect. 2.4) is a reasonable idealization of the cumulative long-term steady-state responses of vegetation to temporally varying ozone levels.

Figure 8 shows the JJA mean surface ozone in the [Affected LAI] case and the changes from the [Intact LAI] case due to asynchronous ozone-LAI coupling. Simulated ozone concentrations are in the same range as that for synchronous coupling with a global average of 28 ppb and highest value of 79 ppb in central Africa. The absolute (Fig. 8b) and relative (Fig. S11) differences in ozone concentrations between the [Affected LAI] and [Intact LAI] case are broadly consistently with that for synchronous ozone-LAI coupling (Fig. 3b and Fig. S5), but are generally more localized. Similar to the synchronously coupled case, simulated ozone concentrations are higher especially in the tropics, eastern North America, Europe, and southern China by up to 3 ppb, indicating a strong positive feedback due to ozone-LAI interactions. The same figures as Figs. 4-6 but for asynchronous coupling are included in the supplement (Figs. S12-S16), also showing show broadly consistent patterns. Most of the bigger differences occur in low-LAI regions and over the oceans. The discrepancies likely arise from the tendency toward more unstable model (CLM) behaviors at low LAI and the inclusion of diurnally and daily fluctuating ozone in ozone-LAI coupling in the asynchronous approach (as opposed to using constant ozone levels in parameterizing the ozone-LAI relationship). In the original ozone-vegetation scheme in CLM, cumulative ozone damage only occurs when both LAI and ozone level are above some thresholds. Thus, when LAI is low and ozone fluctuating, ozone-LAI coupling becomes more

Deleted: ,

Deleted: hourly

Deleted: which

Deleted: finishing one cycle.

Deleted: between

Deleted: in

Deleted: both


Deleted: approaches

Deleted: , computationally efficient

Deleted: steady-state

Deleted: .

erratic and loses persistence. Such peculiarities are smoothed out when parameterizing the ozone-LAI relationship by the best-fitting of responses curves and filtering of poorly fitting locations.



5 **Figure 8:** (a) Surface ozone concentration with ozone-affected leaf area index (LAI) in summer (JJA mean) from the *[Affected LAI]* case for asynchronous ozone-LAI coupling; and (b) differences in JJA ozone concentration between the *[Affected LAI]* and *[Intact LAI]* case (i.e., $[Affected\ LAI] - [Intact\ LAI]$).

6 Ozone feedback factor

10 Climate feedback factor has been widely used in climate studies to indicate how the initial, “direct” surface temperature change driven by a given radiative forcing can be dampened or amplified by internal feedback mechanisms in the climate system [e.g., Stephens, 2005]. Here we analogously develop the concept of ozone feedback factor, f , which can be used to indicate how an initial ozone change ($\Delta[O_3]_i$) driven by anthropogenic precursor emissions (mostly NO_x and VOCs) can be amplified or dampened by various processes within the earth system (e.g., ozone-vegetation coupling) to arrive at a final ozone change ($\Delta[O_3]_f$):

$$\Delta[O_3]_f = \frac{\Delta[O_3]_i}{1-f} \quad (11)$$

Here, we conduct a simulation, *[Intact_NoAnth]*, in GEOS-Chem with the same settings as the *[Intact LAI]* case (for synchronous coupling) but with all anthropogenic emissions turned off (Table 3). Therefore, the differences between this case and *[Intact LAI]* necessarily represent the effect of anthropogenic forcing (mostly by fossil fuel combustion) on ozone changes without any ozone-LAI feedback, whereas the difference between this case and *[Affected LAI]* represents the “final” effect with ozone-LAI coupling and feedback. In Eq. (11), $\Delta[O_3]_i$ and $\Delta[O_3]_f$ are the differences in ozone concentrations between cases, $[Intact\ LAI] - [Intact_NoAnth]$ and $[Affected\ LAI] - [Intact_NoAnth]$, respectively. Thus, analogous to the interpretation of the climate feedback factor, the ozone feedback factor f here reflects the strength and sign of feedback effect from ozone-vegetation coupling on ozone concentration itself, and a value of $f < 0$ represents a negative feedback whereby ozone changes are dampened by ozone-vegetation interactions, and $0 < f < 1$ represents a positive feedback whereby ozone changes are amplified by ozone-vegetation interactions.

Deleted: which are more prone to idiosyncratic model (CLM) behaviors and numerical outliers especially in the asynchronously coupled cases where such peculiarities are not smoothed out.

Deleted: [IPCC, 2013].

Deleted: forcing of

Deleted: surface

Deleted: coupling

Deleted: effect

Deleted: that

Deleted: (synchronous)

Deleted: That is, i

The summertime f factor for ozone-LAI coupling based on GEOS-Chem simulations is shown in Fig. 9, where the red areas indicate a positive feedback on ozone concentration after incorporating ozone-LAI coupling and blue areas indicate a negative feedback. We find a significant positive feedback signal in central Africa and the Amazon, which experience a relatively large reduction in ozone dry deposition and isoprene emission due to ozone-LAI coupling (Fig. 4b and Fig. 5b). The strong positive feedback over these tropical forest regions is mostly caused by the combined effects of reduced dry deposition and (to a lesser extent) reduced isoprene emission in a low- NO_x environment, which act in the same direction to increase surface ozone. The negative feedback in many remote regions with low or no LAI, e.g., central North America and most of the Southern Hemisphere, is mostly a result of reduced transport of NO_x reservoir species formed from reactions of NO_x and biogenic VOCs. In contrast, in high-population, high- NO_x regions including the eastern US, Europe and eastern China, the relatively weak positive feedback and even negative feedback (in North China) mostly reflect the compensating effects of reduced isoprene emission (which reduces ozone in high- NO_x regime) and reduced dry deposition (which enhances ozone).




Figure 9: Ozone feedback factor distribution in summer due to ozone-LAI coupling.

Generally, ozone feedback factor of $f > 0$ (positive feedback) occurs in most heavily vegetated areas with low NO_x levels. Distinct ozone positive feedbacks in the tropics indicate a substantial effect from ozone-LAI coupling, which can have important ramifications for future ozone projections. In major populated regions at northern midlatitudes, the relatively weak feedback effect is not a result of the insignificance of every individual pathway, but rather reflects compensating effect between several important pathways.

7 Conclusions and discussion

In this study, we develop a parameterized function for an ozone impact factor on LAI by conducting various land surface-biogeochemical model simulations using CLM with an empirical scheme of ozone damage on vegetation to represent the impact of long-term ozone exposure on monthly mean LAI. We then conduct various sets of atmospheric chemical transport simulations using GEOS-Chem driven by present-day meteorological conditions and PFT fractional coverage under various configurations: with and without parameterized ozone-LAI coupling within GEOS-Chem (ozone-affected LAI vs. intact,

Deleted: region

Deleted: also

Deleted: (to a lesser extent)

Deleted: significant

Deleted: the parameterized ozone-LAI relationship

potential LAI), with and without anthropogenic emissions, and with synchronous vs. asynchronous ozone-LAI coupling. Such configurations allow us to investigate the impacts of ozone-LAI coupling on simulated ozone air quality and vegetation health, as well as the sign and strength of vegetation-mediated ozone feedback, which can either dampen or amplify the effect of anthropogenic emissions on tropospheric ozone levels.

5 Generally, ozone damage causes a global LAI reduction for most PFTs under long-term ozone exposure over multiple decades. Compared with the hypothetical intact LAI that is unaffected by ozone, the reduction in PFT-weighted LAI can be as high as 2.6 (percentage reduction up to 50%) in high-LAI regions. Only a few studies of ozone-vegetation interactions have considered this important vegetation structural parameter in coupled model simulations [e.g., *Yue and Unger, 2014; Sadiq et al., 2017*]. The magnitude of simulated LAI changes in this study is quite different from that of *Sadiq et al. [2017]*, who used
10 the same ozone damage scheme from *Lombardozi et al. [2015]* but in a fully coupled land-atmosphere model (CLM4CN-CAM4-Chem) where meteorological variables are also modified dynamically by both stomatal and LAI changes. They found a relatively irregular pattern of summertime LAI changes and the magnitude is generally small (within 5%), likely due to more favorable meteorological conditions triggered by stomatal changes that partly counteract ozone-induced photosynthetic damage (e.g., more convective precipitation and enhanced soil moisture in certain places where surface temperature increases).

15 Incorporating the ozone-induced damage on LAI in the GEOS-Chem chemical transport model, we find an ozone feedback of -1.8 ppb to $+3$ ppb globally, and a corresponding ozone feedback factor of about -0.1 to $+0.6$. The strongest positive feedback from ozone-LAI coupling is found in tropical forests, where dry deposition plays the dominant role modulating the feedback. *Sadiq et al. [2017]* called this kind of feedback “biogeochemical” because it is effected directly through plant ecophysiological responses and allocation to structural parts. *Sadiq et al. [2017]* also considered
20 “biogeophysical” or “meteorological” feedback, whereby ozone-induced damage on plants causes a cascade of meteorological changes that ultimately affect ozone itself. In their study, the total ozone feedback is up to $+4-6$ ppb, and based on sensitivity simulations they attributed roughly half of that to biogeochemical feedback, which is consistent in both magnitude and sign with this study despite the use of different chemical transport models, although in their study stomatal changes (not considered in this study) play a larger role in the biogeochemical feedback than LAI changes. The remaining positive feedback in their
25 study mostly arises from biogeophysical feedback, whereby reduced stomatal conductance following ozone damage leads to less transpiration, higher vegetation temperature and thus higher isoprene emission.

As our ozone-LAI coupling approach is embedded within a chemical transport model driven by prescribed meteorology, the feedback effects on surface ozone in this study is purely biogeochemical, and decidedly do not include the complication arising from meteorological changes. The feedbacks are attributable to different pathways in different regions.
30 In tropical regions such as maritime Southeast Asia, Amazonia and central Africa, the strong summertime positive ozone feedback is mainly due to the ozone-induced LAI reduction and the subsequent decrease in ozone dry deposition. Reduced isoprene emission further enhances the feedback in these low- NO_x environments but is relatively minor due to the relatively lower sensitivity of ozone to isoprene emission in these regions. In contrast, in high- NO_x regions such as the eastern US, Europe and eastern China, reduced isoprene emission decreases ozone, and this counteracts with the positive feedback from

Deleted: However, they noted that dynamically changing hydrometeorological variables and processes are not generally tuned for atmospheric chemical measurements, and may introduce large uncertainty in simulating and attributing boundary-layer ozone concentrations to various determining factors.

dry deposition, yielding relatively small or even negative feedback effects there. Over the oceans in the Northern Hemisphere, surface ozone concentration also increases in response to reduced LAI on the continents, mainly because of continental outflow. Over most of the Southern Hemisphere, there is a weak negative feedback, which is likely driven by reduced intercontinental transport of organic nitrate (as a reservoir of NO_x) formed from NO_x-VOC reactions.

5 Uncertainty can arise from the large variability in the ozone sensitivity of different plants, especially for tropical trees and grasses, which are modeled based on relatively insufficient data as compared with temperature ecosystems [Lombardozzi et al., 2013]. The current Lombardozzi et al. [2015] scheme classifying 15 PFTs into three plant groups is relatively robust in capturing the average plant physiological responses to ozone uptake on a global scale from across many studies, but it treats tropical and temperate plants equivalently as far as ozone sensitivity is concerned, which may lead to possible biases due to an inadequate representation of spatial heterogeneity of plant-ozone ecophysiology. More detailed experimental and field data, especially for tropical and subtropical plants, can potentially help us derive a more region-specific and spatially resolved parameterization that can be particularly useful for high-resolution regional air quality simulations. Along the same line, we find the greatest feedbacks over tropical forests, where ozone concentrations and fluxes are not as well constrained by available in-situ observations as in the midlatitudes. More extensive and long-term measurements of biosphere-atmosphere fluxes in tropical regions are necessary to ascertain the strength of ozone-vegetation feedbacks in these identified hotspots. We also note that our parameterization necessarily ignores hysteresis effect, whereby damage done at incidentally high ozone concentrations may not undergo full recovery even when ozone levels drop again.

10 This study focuses exclusively on ozone-LAI coupling, but the interaction between ozone and stomatal conductance has also been shown to substantially modulate ozone-vegetation feedbacks [Sadiq et al., 2017]. Ozone-stomata coupling using the same modeling framework certainly warrants further investigation. This study also considers ozone effects on biogenic VOC emissions only via the gradual modification of LAI, but previous studies have suggested that chronic ozone exposure may inhibit isoprene biosynthesis by directly interfering with enzymatic activities [e.g., Calfapietra et al., 2007], and high ozone episodes may even enhance isoprene emission by triggering plant defense mechanisms against oxidative stress [e.g., Fares et al., 2006]. It is necessary to further examine the interactions between ozone and isoprene biosynthesis on different timescales. Moreover, in this study meteorological conditions are prescribed and looped over for a typical year only, and thus the potential impacts of interannual climate variability on the ozone-LAI relationships are not fully considered. For instance, the occurrence of droughts may either weaken or strengthen the coupling between plants and ozone by interfering with photosynthetic capacity, stomatal behaviors and biogenic emissions [e.g., Wang et al., 2017]. Despite the limitations stated above, our findings still attest to the existence of strong ozone biogeochemical feedbacks under typical conditions, and highlight the importance of incorporating ozone-vegetation coupling into regional to global air quality and ecosystem health assessment so that more realistic future projections can be made.

Deleted:

Deleted: Although t

Deleted: more

Deleted: precise

Deleted: for different PFTs

Deleted: †

Another possible caveat comes from the timescale of plant responses to ozone. Forcing LAI input in GEOS-Chem simulations to be continuously modified by the ozone impact factor γ at the beginning of every month necessarily assumes ozone-LAI coupling to occur on a monthly to intraseasonal timescale, but the parameterization of ozone-LAI relationship is based on the long-term (typically decadal) quasi-steady state. As discussed in Sect. 2.5 and Sect. 5, we deem this “steady-state response” assumption a reasonable idealization for ozone-LAI coupling even on shorter timescales, which is further buttressed by the resemblance of its simulated responses to the asynchronously coupled experiments where LAI and temporally varying ozone always equilibrate with each other.

Moved down [4]: We note, however, that our parameterization necessarily ignores hysteresis effect, whereby damage done at incidentally high ozone concentrations may not undergo full recovery even when ozone levels drop again.

Deleted: significantly

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: and

Moved (insertion) [4]

Deleted: We note, however, that our parameterization necessarily ignores hysteresis effect, whereby damage done at incidentally high ozone concentrations may not undergo full recovery even when ozone levels drop again.O

Deleted: ozone

Data availability

Most of the data produced by this study and presented in the manuscript are deposited in the publicly available institutional repository, accessible via this link: <http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/sci/essc/tgabi/data.html>. Request for raw data or the complete set of data, or any questions regarding the data, can be directed to the principal investigator, Amos P. K. Tai (amostai@cuhk.edu.hk).

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Early Career Scheme (Project #: 24300614) of the Research Grants Council of Hong Kong given to the principal investigator, Amos P. K. Tai. We also thank the Information Technology Services Centre (ITSC) at The Chinese University of Hong Kong for their devotion in providing the necessary computational services for this work. Colette L. Heald acknowledges the support from the National Science Foundation (ATM-1564495) for the development of land cover harmonization used in this work.

References

- Ainsworth, E. A., C. R. Yendrek, S. Stith, W. J. Collins, and L. D. Emberson: The effects of tropospheric ozone on net primary productivity and Implications for climate change, *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.*, 63(1), 637–661, doi:10.1146/annurev-arplant-042110-103829, 2012.
- Anenberg, S. C., L. W. Horowitz, D. Q. Tong, and J. J. West: An estimate of the global burden of anthropogenic ozone and fine particulate matter on premature human mortality using atmospheric modeling, *Environ. Health Perspect.*, 118(9), 1189–1195, doi:10.1289/ehp.0901220, 2010.
- Ball, J. T., I. E. Woodrow, and J. A. Berry: A model predicting stomatal conductance and its contribution to the control of photosynthesis under different environmental conditions, in *Progress in Photosynthesis Research*, pp. 221–224, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1987.
- Bey, I., D. J. Jacob, R. M. Yantosca, J. A. Logan, B. D. Field, A. M. Fiore, Q. Li, H. Y. Liu, L. J. Mickley, and M. G. Schultz: Global modeling of tropospheric chemistry with assimilated meteorology: Model description and evaluation, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 106(D19), 23073–23095, doi:10.1029/2001JD000807, 2001.
- Calfapietra, C., A. E. Wiberley, T. G. Falbel, A. R. Linskey, G. S. Mugnozza, D. F. Karnosky, F. Loreto, and T. D. Sharkey: Isoprene synthase expression and protein levels are reduced under elevated O_3 but not under elevated CO_2 (FACE) in field-grown aspen trees, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 30, 654–661, doi:10.1111/J.1365-3040.2007.01646.X, 2007.
- Chen, M., T. J. Griffis, J. Baker, J. D. Wood, and K. Xiao: Simulating crop phenology in the Community Land Model and its impact on energy and carbon fluxes, *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences*, 120(2), 310–325, doi:10.1002/2014JG002780, 2015.

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: ¶

Collatz, G., M. Ribas-Carbo, and J. Berry: Coupled photosynthesis-stomatal conductance model for leaves of C₄ plants, *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, 19(5), 519, doi:10.1071/PP9920519, 1992.

Collatz, G. J., J. T. Ball, C. Grivet, and J. A. Berry: Physiological and environmental regulation of stomatal conductance, photosynthesis and transpiration: a model that includes a laminar boundary layer, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 54(2-4), 107-136, doi:10.1016/0168-1923(91)90002-8, 1991.

5 [Dermody, O., S. P. Long, K. McConnaughay, and E. H. DeLucia: How do elevated CO₂ and O₃ affect the interception and utilization of radiation by a soybean canopy? *Global Change Biol.*, 14, 556-564, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01502.x, 2008.](#)

10 [Fares, S., C. Barta, F. Brilli, M. Centritto, L. Ederli, F. Ferranti, S. Pasqualini, L. Reale, D. Tricoli, and F. Loreto: Impact of high ozone on isoprene emission, photosynthesis and histology of developing *Populus alba* leaves directly or indirectly exposed to the pollutant. *Physiol. Plantarum*, 128, 456-465, doi:10.1111/J.1399-3054.2006.00750.X, 2006.](#)

[Farquhar, G. D., S. von Caemmerer, and J. A. Berry: A biochemical model of photosynthetic CO₂ assimilation in leaves of C₃ species., *Planta*, 149\(1\), 78-90, doi:10.1007/BF00386231, 1980.](#)

15 [Feng, Z. Z., K. Kobayashi, and E. A. Ainsworth: Impact of elevated ozone concentration on growth, physiology, and yield of wheat \(*triticum aestivum* L.\): A meta-analysis. *Global Change Biol.*, 14, 2696-2708, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01673.x, 2008.](#)

[Fowler, D., K. Pilegaard, M. A. Sutton, P. Ambus, M. Raivonen, J. Duyzer, D. Simpson, H. Fagerli, S. Fuzzi, J. K. Schjoerring, C. Granier, A. Nefel, I. S. A. Isaksen, P. Laj, M. Maione, P. S. Monks, J. Burkhardt, U. Daemngen, J. Neiryneck, E. Personne, R. Wichink-Kruit, K. Butterbach-Bahl, C. Flechard, J. P. Tuovinen, M. Coyle, G. Gerosa, B. Loubet, N. Altimir, L. Gruenhage, C. Ammann, S. Cieslik, E. Paoletti, T. N. Mikkelsen, H. Ro-Poulsen, P. Cellier, J. N. Cape, L. Horvath, F. Loreto, U. Niinemets, P. I. Palmer, J. Rinne, P. Misztal, E. Nemitz, D. Nilsson, S. Pryor, M. W. Gallagher, T. Vesala, U. Skiba, N. Brueggemann, S. Zechmeister-Boltenstern, J. Williams, C. O'Dowd, M. C. Facchini, G. de Leeuw, A. Flossman, N. Chaumerliac, and J. W. Erisman: Atmospheric composition change: Ecosystems-atmosphere interactions, *Atmos. Environ.*, 43, 5193-5267, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2009.07.068, 2009.](#)

20 [Fuhrer, J., M. V. Martin, G. Mills, C. L. Heald, H. Harmens, F. Hayes, K. Sharps, J. Bender, and M. R. Ashmore: Current and future ozone risks to global terrestrial biodiversity and ecosystem processes. *Ecol. Evol.*, 6, 8785-8799, doi:10.1002/ece3.2568, 2016.](#)

25 [Geddes, J. A., C. L. Heald, S. J. Silva, and R. V. Martin: Land cover change impacts on atmospheric chemistry: Simulating projected large-scale tree mortality in the United States, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16\(4\), 2323-2340, doi:10.5194/acp-16-2323-2016, 2016.](#)

30 [Guenther, A., T. Karl, P. Harley, C. Wiedinmyer, P. I. Palmer, and C. Geron: Estimates of global terrestrial isoprene emissions using MEGAN \(Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature\), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6\(11\), 3181-3210, doi:10.5194/acp-6-3181-2006, 2006.](#)

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

- Guenther, A. B., X. Jiang, C. L. Heald, T. Sakulyanontvittaya, T. Duhl, L. K. Emmons, and X. Wang: The model of emissions of gases and aerosols from nature version 2.1 (MEGAN2.1): An extended and updated framework for modeling biogenic emissions, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 5(6), 1471–1492, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-1471-2012, 2012.
- Hollaway, M. J., S. R. Arnold, W. J. Collins, G. Folberth, and A. Rap: Sensitivity of midnineteenth century tropospheric ozone to atmospheric chemistry-vegetation interactions, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 122(4), 2452–2473, doi:10.1002/2016JD025462, 2017.
- Horowitz, L. W., A. M. Fiore, G. P. Milly, R. C. Cohen, A. Perring, P. J. Wooldridge, P. G. Hess, L. K. Emmons, and J. F. Lamarque: Observational constraints on the chemistry of isoprene nitrates over the eastern United States, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 112(12), doi:10.1029/2006JD007747, 2007.
- 10 Hudman, R. C., N. E. Moore, A. K. Mebust, R. V. Martin, A. R. Russell, L. C. Valin, and R. C. Cohen: Steps towards a mechanistic model of global soil nitric oxide emissions: Implementation and space based-constraints, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12(16), 7779–7795, doi:10.5194/acp-12-7779-2012, 2012.
- IPCC: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Cambridge Univ. Press. Cambridge, United Kingdom New York, USA*, 1535 pp, doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324, 2013.
- Jacob, D. J., and P. S. Bakwin: Cycling of NO_x in tropical forest canopies, in *Microbial production and consumption of greenhouse gases: methane, nitrogen oxides, and halomethanes*, pp. 237–253, 1991.
- Karnosky, D. F., K. S. Pregitzer, D. R. Zak, M. E. Kubiske, G. R. Hendrey, D. Weinstein, M. Nosal, and K. E. Percy: Scaling ozone responses of forest trees to the ecosystem level in a changing climate, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 28, 965-981, 2005.
- 20 Karnosky, D. F., J. M. Skelly, K. E. Percy, and A. H. Chappelka: Perspectives regarding 50 years of research on effects of tropospheric ozone air pollution on US forests, *Environ. Pollut.*, 147(3), 489–506, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2006.08.043, 2007.
- Lawrence, P. J., and T. N. Chase: Representing a new MODIS consistent land surface in the Community Land Model (CLM 3.0), *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences*, 112(1), doi:10.1029/2006JG000168, 2007.
- Li, J. L., A. Mahalov, and P. Hyde: Simulating the impacts of chronic ozone exposure on plant conductance and photosynthesis, and on the regional hydroclimate using WRF/Chem, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 11, 114017, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/11/114017, 2016.
- 25 and on the regional hydroclimate using WRF/Chem, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 11, 114017, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/11/114017, 2016.
- Liu, X. et al.: First directly retrieved global distribution of tropospheric column ozone from GOME: Comparison with the GEOS-CHEM model, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 111, D02308, doi:10.1029/2005JD006564, 2006.
- Lombardozzi, D., S. Levis, G. Bonan, and J. P. Sparks: Predicting photosynthesis and transpiration responses to ozone: Decoupling modeled photosynthesis and stomatal conductance, *Biogeosciences*, 9(8), 3113–3130, doi:10.5194/bg-9-3113-2012, 2012.
- 30 Lombardozzi, D., J. P. Sparks, and G. Bonan: Integrating O₃ influences on terrestrial processes: photosynthetic and stomatal response data available for regional and global modeling, *Biogeosciences*, 10(11), 6815–6831, doi:10.5194/bg-10-6815-2013, 2013.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

- Lombardozi, D., S. Levis, G. Bonan, P. G. Hess, and J. P. Sparks: The influence of chronic ozone exposure on global carbon and water cycles, *J. Clim.*, 28(1), 292–305, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00223.1, 2015.
- Oleson, K. W. et al.: Technical Description of version 4.5 of the Community Land Model (CLM), *NCAR Tech. Note NCAR/TN-503+STR*, 420 pp, doi:10.5065/D6RR1W7M, 2013.
- 5 Oltmans, S. J. et al.: Recent tropospheric ozone changes - A pattern dominated by slow or no growth, *Atmos. Environ.*, 67, 331–351, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.10.057, 2013.
- Sadiq, M., A. P. K. Tai, D. Lombardozi, and M. Val Martin: Effects of ozone-vegetation coupling on surface ozone air quality via biogeochemical and meteorological feedbacks, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17(4), 3055–3066, doi:10.5194/acp-17-3055-2017, 2017.
- 10 Sakalli, A., A. Cescatti, A. Dosio, and M. U. Gücel: Impacts of 2°C global warming on primary production and soil carbon storage capacity at pan-European level, *Clim. Services*, 7, 64–77. doi:10.1016/j.cliser.2017.03.006, 2017.
- Sitch, S., P. M. Cox, W. J. Collins, and C. Huntingford: Indirect radiative forcing of climate change through ozone effects on the land-carbon sink, *Nature*, 448(7155), 791–794, doi:10.1038/nature06059, 2007.
- Steinkamp, J., and M. G. Lawrence: Improvement and evaluation of simulated global biogenic soil NO emissions in an AC-GCM, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11(12), 6063–6082, doi:10.5194/acp-11-6063-2011, 2011.
- 15 Stephens, G. L.: Cloud feedbacks in the climate system: A critical review. *J. Climate*, 18, 237-273. doi:10.1175/Jcli-3243.1.2005.
- Sun, Y., L. Gu, and R. E. Dickinson: A numerical issue in calculating the coupled carbon and water fluxes in a climate model, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 117(22), 1–16, doi:10.1029/2012JD018059, 2012.
- 20 Tai, A. P. K., L. J. Mickley, C. L. Heald, and S. Wu: Effect of CO₂ inhibition on biogenic isoprene emission: implications for air quality under 2000 to 2050 changes in climate, vegetation and land use. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 3479-3483. doi:10.1002/grl.50650. 2013.
- Volz, A., and D. Kley: Evaluation of the Montsouris series of ozone measurements made in the nineteenth century, *Nature*, 332(6161), 240–242, 1988.
- 25 Wang, H., D. J. Jacob, P. Le Sager, D. G. Streets, R. J. Park, A. B. Gilliland, and A. van Donkelaar: Surface ozone background in the United States: Canadian and Mexican pollution influences, *Atmos. Environ.*, 43(6), 1310–1319, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.11.036, 2009.
- Wang, Y., J. A. Logan, and D. J. Jacob: Global simulation of tropospheric O₃-NO_x-hydrocarbon chemistry: 2. Model evaluation and global ozone budget, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 103(D9), 10727–10755, doi:10.1029/98JD00157, 1998.
- 30 Wang, Y., Y. Zhang, J. Hao, and M. Luo: Seasonal and spatial variability of surface ozone over China: Contributions from background and domestic pollution, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11(7), 3511–3525, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3511-2011, 2011.
- Wang, Y.-Y., Z.-H. Xie, B.-H. Jia, and Y. Yu: Improving simulation of the terrestrial carbon cycle of China in version 4.5 of the Community Land Model using a revised V_{cmax} scheme, *Atmos. Ocean. Sci. Lett.*, 8(2), 88–94, doi:10.3878/AOSL20140090, 2015.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Field Code Changed

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: (Asian) Chinese (Taiwan), (Other)

- Wang, Y., Y. Xie, W. Dong, Y. Ming, J. Wang, and L. Shen: Adverse effects of increasing drought on air quality via natural processes, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 12827-12843, doi:10.5194/acp-17-12827-2017, 2017.
- Wesely, M. L.: Parameterization of surface resistances to gaseous dry deposition in regional-scale numerical models, *Atmos. Environ.*, 23(6), 1293–1304, doi:10.1016/0004-6981(89)90153-4, 1989.
- 5 Wild, O.: Modelling the global tropospheric ozone budget: exploring the variability in current models, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 2643–2660, doi:10.5194/acpd-7-1995-2007, 2007.
- Williams, I. N., Y. Lu, L. M. Kueppers, W. J. Riley, S. C. Biraud, J. E. Bagley, and M. S. Torn: Land-atmosphere coupling and climate prediction over the U.S. Southern Great Plains, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 121, 12,125-12,144, doi:10.1002/2016JD025223, 2016.
- 10 Wong, A. Y. H., A. P. K. Tai, and Y.-Y. Ip: Attribution and statistical parameterization of the sensitivity of surface ozone to changes in leaf area index based on a chemical transport model, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 123, 1883-1898, doi:10.1002/2017JD027311, 2018.
- Yue, X., and N. Unger: Ozone vegetation damage effects on gross primary productivity in the United States, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14(17), 9137–9153, doi:10.5194/acp-14-9137-2014, 2014.
- 15 Yue, X., and N. Unger: The Yale Interactive terrestrial Biosphere model version 1.0: Description, evaluation and implementation into NASA GISS ModelE2, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 8(8), 2399–2417, doi:10.5194/gmd-8-2399-2015, 2015.
- Zhang, L., D. J. Jacob, X. Liu, J. A. Logan, K. Chance, A. Eldering, and B. R. Bojkov: Intercomparison methods for satellite measurements of atmospheric composition: Application to tropospheric ozone from TES and OMI, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10(10), 4725–4739, doi:10.5194/acp-10-4725-2010, 2010.
- 20 Zhang, L., D. J. Jacob, N. V. Downey, D. A. Wood, D. Blewitt, C. C. Carouge, A. van Donkelaar, D. B. A. Jones, L. T. Murray, and Y. X. Wang: Improved estimate of the policy-relevant background ozone in the United States using the GEOS-Chem global model with 1/2 degrees x 2/3 degrees horizontal resolution over North America, *Atmos. Environ.*, 45, 6769-6776, doi:10.1016/J.Atmosenv.2011.07.054, 2011.

Moved (insertion) [1]

Deleted: ¶

Moved up [1]: Wang, Y., Y. Xie, W. Dong, Y. Ming, J. Wang, and L. Shen: Adverse effects of increasing drought on air quality via natural processes, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 12827-12843, doi:10.5194/acp-17-12827-2017, 2017.¶

Formatted: Font: Italic