

Reviews of Geophysics®

COMMISSIONED
MANUSCRIPT

10.1029/2022RG000796

Key Points:

- Aerosol climate forcing uncertainty is virtually undiminished despite two decades of advances in many aspects of aerosol-climate science
- This review concludes that current and planned aerosol modeling, satellite and ground-based observation programs remain essential
- New, systematic aircraft aerosol-particle and cloud-process measurements are also needed, along with better model-measurement integration

Correspondence to:

R. A. Kahn,
ralph.kahn@nasa.gov

Citation:

Kahn, R. A., Andrews, E., Brock, C. A., Chin, M., Feingold, G., Gettelman, A., et al. (2023). Reducing aerosol forcing uncertainty by combining models with satellite and within-the-atmosphere observations: A three-way street. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 61, e2022RG000796. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022RG000796>

Received 6 JAN 2023
Accepted 26 APR 2023

© 2023. American Geophysical Union.
All Rights Reserved. This article has
been contributed to by U.S. Government
employees and their work is in the public
domain in the USA.

Reducing Aerosol Forcing Uncertainty by Combining Models With Satellite and Within-The-Atmosphere Observations: A Three-Way Street

Ralph A. Kahn¹ , Elisabeth Andrews^{2,3} , Charles A. Brock⁴ , Mian Chin¹ , Graham Feingold⁴ , Andrew Gettelman^{5,6} , Robert C. Levy¹ , Daniel M. Murphy⁴ , Athanasios Nenes^{7,8} , Jeffrey R. Pierce⁹ , Thomas Popp¹⁰, Jens Redemann¹¹ , Andrew M. Sayer^{1,12} , Arlindo M. da Silva¹ , Larisa Sogacheva¹³ , and Philip Stier¹⁴ 

¹Earth Sciences Division, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA, ²Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences (CIRES), University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA, ³Colorado and Global Monitoring Laboratory, NOAA, Boulder, CO, USA, ⁴Chemical Sciences Laboratory, NOAA, Boulder, CO, USA, ⁵National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA, ⁶Now at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, USA, ⁷Laboratory of Atmospheric Processes and Their Impacts, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne, Switzerland, ⁸Center for the Study of Air Quality and Climate Change, Foundation for Research and Technology Hellas (FORTH), Thessaloniki, Greece, ⁹Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA, ¹⁰German Aerospace Center (DLR), German Remote Sensing Data Center (DFD), Oberpfaffenhofen, Germany, ¹¹School of Meteorology, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, USA, ¹²University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA, ¹³Finnish Meteorological Institute, Climate Research Programme, Helsinki, Finland, ¹⁴Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

Abstract Aerosol forcing uncertainty represents the largest climate forcing uncertainty overall. Its magnitude has remained virtually undiminished over the past 20 years despite considerable advances in understanding most of the key contributing elements. Recent work has produced modest increases only in the confidence of the uncertainty estimate itself. This review summarizes the contributions toward reducing the uncertainty in the aerosol forcing of climate made by satellite observations, measurements taken within the atmosphere, as well as modeling and data assimilation. We adopt a more measurement-oriented perspective than most reviews of the subject in assessing the strengths and limitations of each; gaps and possible ways to fill them are considered. Currently planned programs supporting advanced, global-scale satellite and surface-based aerosol, cloud, and precursor gas observations, climate modeling, and intensive field campaigns aimed at characterizing the underlying physical and chemical processes involved, are all essential. But in addition, new efforts are needed: (a) to obtain systematic aircraft in situ measurements capturing the multi-variate probability distribution functions of particle optical, microphysical, and chemical properties (and associated uncertainty estimates), as well as co-variability with meteorology, for the major aerosol air mass types; (b) to conceive, develop, and implement a suborbital (aircraft plus surface-based) program aimed at systematically quantifying the cloud-scale microphysics, cloud optical properties, and cloud-related vertical velocities associated with aerosol-cloud interactions; and (c) to focus much more research on integrating the unique contributions of satellite observations, suborbital measurements, and modeling, to reduce the persistent uncertainty in aerosol climate forcing.

Plain Language Summary Aerosols, such as airborne wildfire smoke, desert dust, volcanic and pollution particles, affect Earth's climate by reflecting (some also absorb) sunlight. These aerosol particles also play key roles in cloud formation and evolution, further affecting the planet's energy balance. The magnitudes of these effects, and even the underlying mechanisms, represent the largest uncertainty in climate modeling. Despite two decades of advances in many aspects of aerosol-climate science, aerosol climate forcing uncertainty is virtually undiminished. Yet, reducing this uncertainty is critical for any effort to attribute, mitigate, or predict climate changes. We adopt a measurement-oriented perspective to assess the strengths and limitations of measurement and modeling programs, and conclude that current and planned efforts need to continue. However, in addition, new efforts are needed: (a) to obtain aircraft in situ measurements that capture systematically aerosol particle properties for the major aerosol air mass types, globally, (b) to conceive, develop, and implement an aircraft and surface-based program aimed at filling gaps in our understanding of the interactions between aerosol particles and clouds, along with (c) much more research focused on integrating

the unique contributions of satellite observations, suborbital measurements, and modeling, to reduce the uncertainty in our understanding of Earth's changing climate.

1. Introduction

The confidence with which Earth's present and possible future climate can be simulated depends upon our ability to represent the factors that heat and cool the system, and the processes that mediate the environmental response. In this context, radiative forcing describes the energy fluxes that drive the climate system. Changes in the radiative forcing of climate are caused primarily by perturbations of atmospheric constituents, mainly greenhouse trace gases (GHGs), airborne particles (aerosol particles), and clouds. By convention, positive forcing produces net surface heating, whereas negative forcing produces cooling. Understanding changes in the radiative forcing of climate is critical for any effort to attribute, mitigate, or predict climate change.

Although GHGs contribute most of the positive radiative forcing, its magnitude is tightly constrained, so uncertainty in the climate forcing by aerosol particles dominates the uncertainty in forcing changes overall (e.g., Forster et al., 2021; Watson-Parris & Smith, 2022). Globally, aerosol forcing is generally negative. As one illustration of the importance of reducing aerosol forcing uncertainty, decreases in aerosol amount in some regions can lead to increased surface heating (Jenkins et al., 2022; Quaas et al., 2022). Thus, understanding the factors driving climate change, and improving our ability to predict climate changes under different future scenarios, requires a reduction in the uncertainty in aerosol climate forcing. This includes both the direct radiative forcing due to light scattering and absorption by airborne particles, as well as indirect effects due to the interactions between aerosol particles and clouds (ACI).

There are fundamental reasons why aerosol radiative forcing (ARF) is more difficult to quantify than forcing from GHGs. First, present-day aerosol forcing is often assessed relative to assumed pre-industrial conditions, which are presumed to be largely unaffected by human influences (e.g., IPCC, 2013). Yet, there are few observational constraints on the pre-industrial aerosol state (e.g., Carslaw et al., 2017). For example, for aerosol amount there is no analog to the ice core data that defines pre-industrial GHG concentrations, and unlike gases, aerosol microphysical properties vary greatly. Further, even for the present day, the distinction between natural and anthropogenic aerosol is often ambiguous. Is wind-blown dust to be considered natural or anthropogenic when it is emitted in regions experiencing desertification due to increased use of water resources, over-grazing and other farming practices, or some combination of larger-scale environmental changes of uncertain natural or anthropogenic origin? The same question applies to smoke aerosol from lightning-ignited wildfires that might be greatly intensified by anthropogenically enhanced warming, drying, or forest management practices. Also, in practical terms, remote-sensing data alone cannot be interpreted precisely enough in most cases even to distinguish natural aerosol from aerosol that are unambiguously anthropogenic when directly sampled (see Section 2 below). These issues with historical data and the attribution of today's emissions contribute to large uncertainty in the difference between aerosol forcing under both pristine and present-day conditions (Carslaw et al., 2013; Hamilton et al., 2018).

Note that the total direct radiative forcing by aerosol includes natural sources, representing the dominant contribution to the global atmospheric aerosol mass load, plus anthropogenic aerosol. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) calls the total quantity the aerosol direct radiative effect, and refers to the anthropogenic component as the aerosol direct forcing. Given the ambiguities from an observational perspective, we use the term “aerosol forcing” to include anthropogenic and natural direct and indirect forcings and adjustments (defined subsequently); we specify direct or indirect where needed.

A second reason why ARF is more difficult to quantify: aerosol particles are vastly more spatially and temporally heterogeneous than GHGs, due to relatively short atmospheric lifetime, sources that are highly non-uniform in space and time, and particle physical and chemical evolution that varies with atmospheric conditions. As such, frequent, global observation of aerosol distribution and key properties must be provided to capture this heterogeneity. Not only is aerosol amount highly variable at different locations and times, aerosol light scattering, light absorption, and cloud nucleating properties vary considerably with source, composition, and particle evolution. As we discuss in Section 2, these factors cannot be determined adequately from remote sensing alone.

Finally, aerosol particles produce relatively large adjustments to forcing compared to GHGs. That is, aerosol particles have secondary climate impacts, such as changing the atmospheric stability profile or altering cloud

radiative properties, lifetime, and precipitation. These semi-direct (ambient heating by light-absorbing particles), indirect (e.g., increased particle concentration causing additional cloud droplet or ice crystal formation), and other effects represent aerosol-induced changes in the atmosphere that can cause changes in surface temperature indirectly. For example, vertical redistribution of aerosol extinction can alter the atmospheric thermodynamic structure, and atmospheric adjustments can even change the sign of black carbon forcing in the upper atmosphere compared to the surface (e.g., Lau et al., 2008; Samset et al., 2013), whereas for major GHGs such as CO₂, adjustments are estimated to represent much smaller fractional contributions (Forster et al., 2021). A combination of measurements and modeling is required to constrain adjusted forcing.

Reducing the magnitude of aerosol forcing uncertainty to a value comparable to that of CO₂ and other long-lived GHGs (estimated at ± 0.35 and ± 0.23 W/m², respectively; IPCC, 2013) will require greater observational constraints than near-future satellite measurements alone are likely to provide. A lower bound on the uncertainty range of just the direct component of the total global-mean all-sky aerosol forcing (i.e., that due to scattering and absorption by airborne particles but not their indirect effects on clouds) is estimated as ± 1.1 W/m² when considering anticipated data from a planned next-generation NASA satellite mission aimed at addressing global climate change issues (1σ ; Thorsen et al., 2021). (This number represents 30% or more of the global all-sky aerosol forcing by most estimates.) Systematically incorporating prior information beyond that available from current or near-future large-scale observations is necessary to reduce uncertainties in the role aerosol particles play in climate forcing. Thorsen et al. (2021) suggest that incorporating additional particle property constraints might approximately halve the direct forcing uncertainty estimate, though the even larger uncertainty associated with the indirect effects of aerosol particles on clouds is more difficult to reduce or even to estimate. Thus, to reduce climate modeling uncertainties, there is a crucial need for better particle optical, microphysical, and chemical property information than can be provided by satellite measurements alone. This persistent uncertainty is reflected in part by the enormously diverse, yet often simplistic, particle property assumptions made in different models (e.g., CCSP, 2009). Such diversity is also true of the aerosol optical model priors (i.e., initial guesses) or climatologies adopted as constraints in leading satellite aerosol retrieval algorithms (e.g., Holzer-Popp et al., 2013; Kahn & Gaitley, 2015; M.-H. Kim et al., 2018; Levy et al., 2007; Remer et al., 2005). Further, the uncertainties in aerosol-cloud interactions must be reduced as well.

Previous reviews of aerosol climate forcing tend to adopt a model-centric perspective, appropriately, as models offer the ability to make climate predictions. Such reviews can provide formal estimates of aerosol forcing and its uncertainties based on current modeling, often also taking account of the limited constraints provided by available measurements (e.g., Bellouin et al., 2020). Here we take a more measurement-focused perspective, reviewing where we stand at present on the contributions measurements can make and their relationships with models, allowing us to also identify gaps that need to be filled.

Figure 1 provides a framework for discussing research activities aimed at reducing uncertainty in aerosol forcing, and also helps organize the material presented in subsequent sections. It illustrates the unique and essential roles played by satellite observations, measurements made within the atmosphere (often termed “suborbital” measurements when taking a perspective that includes global satellite measurements), as well as aerosol and climate modeling, in closing the gap in aerosol forcing uncertainty relative to that of GHGs. The arrows and associated, color-coded annotations in Figure 1 highlight the required *exchange of information* between these three elements. (The common expression “a two-way street” means A affects B, but B also affects A. Here, A affects B and C, B affects A and C, and C affects A and B; hence, a three-way street.) From the synthesis provided by this review, we conclude that satellite measurement and modeling efforts and plans for addressing aerosol climate forcing are relatively mature. However, the uncertainty in aerosol impacts on climate directly, and indirectly through their interactions with clouds, could be significantly reduced through specific enhancements to the suborbital component, along with greater synergy among the three elements. As such, we review the satellite and modeling contributions first (Sections 2 and 3, below), then consider the suborbital element in Section 4, and provide a synthesis in Section 5 and the Conclusions. The view presented here is informed in part by discussions in the AeroCom and AeroSat communities over the past decade (<https://aerocom.met.no> and <https://aero-sat.org>, respectively; last accessed: March 2023), the work of the Systematic Aircraft Measurements to Characterize Aerosol Air Masses (SAM-CAAM) Science Definition Team (Kahn et al., 2017), and the collective insights of the authors of the current paper.




Figure 1. A framework for considering the research activities needed to reduce the persistent aerosol forcing uncertainty. It illustrates the relationships between the measurement and modeling contributions, and the interactions among these elements that we identify as central to this effort (adapted from Kahn, 2012). The arrows and associated, color-coded annotations indicate the contributions each element can make to the other two—a three-way street.

2. Satellite Contributions

Earth-orbiting satellites offer the opportunity to collect frequent, global data, and are well suited to remotely measure quantities that vary on kilometer or even smaller spatial scales, at daily or even shorter timescales.

2.1. Aerosol Amount—Total-Column Optical Depth and 3-D Distribution

For more than 20 years, satellites have demonstrated the ability to provide extensive spatial and frequent temporal coverage of aerosol column amount globally, primarily under clear-sky conditions, and generally reported as the mid-visible aerosol optical depth (AOD). This quantity is widely used as a constraint on climate models or for model evaluation (e.g., Buchard et al., 2017; Gelaro et al., 2017; Gliß et al., 2021; Kinne et al., 2006; Randles et al., 2017; Rubin et al., 2017; Schutgens et al., 2020), though non-negligible differences among AOD retrieval products must yet be addressed (J. Li et al., 2020; Sogacheva et al., 2020). Tables summarizing currently available satellite AOD products are given in Sogacheva et al. (2020) and Kahn and Samset (2022). Space-based lidars provide the altitudes of extended aerosol layers with the precision of tens of meters (e.g., Winker et al., 2009; Yorks et al., 2016), and usually sample well downwind of aerosol sources, where the AOD tends to be low enough for the signal to penetrate the column under cloud-free conditions. Lidar measurements are complemented by near-source aerosol plume height from multi-angle imagery obtained in low-Earth or geostationary orbit (Carr et al., 2022; Kahn et al., 2008; Nelson et al., 2013). Such information can help characterize aerosol vertical extent or source injection height in models (e.g., Val Martin et al., 2018; van Donkelaar et al., 2010). Although coverage by these measurements is currently limited, their precision has demonstrated value in constraining and/or validating models aimed at simulating downwind wildfire smoke and volcanic ash dispersion (e.g., Vernon

et al., 2018; L. Zhu, Val Martin, et al., 2018). A number of satellite-based, passive-imager spectral techniques, at wavelengths ranging from the ultraviolet (UV) to the infrared, offer greater aerosol layer-height coverage, at the cost of additional assumptions that increase uncertainty (e.g., Go et al., 2020; Griffin et al., 2020; Jeong & Hsu, 2008; Kylling et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2021; Lyapustin et al., 2020). Passive-imager techniques, especially in UV channels, have also been effective in constraining aerosol occurrence, and even amount, over cloudy scenes (e.g., Meyer et al., 2015; Sayer et al., 2019; Torres et al., 2012).

Models require the source strength in addition to the injection height to represent aerosol sources. Efforts at using satellite AOD measurements to constrain source strength have applied either inverse modeling to infer source location along with strength from broad-swath-imager AOD maps (e.g., Dubovik et al., 2008), or forward modeling, where a measured smoke-plume AOD snapshot is compared to a model, run in the forward direction and initialized with varying source strengths (Petrenko et al., 2017). These methods work best for high-AOD aerosol plumes with little background or aged aerosol in the scene to complicate interpretation. Other approaches, specifically for wildfires, use the magnitude of the four-micron brightness temperature anomaly, which can be observed from remote sensing, combined with empirically derived, ecosystem-specific emission factors, to estimate smoke source strength (e.g., Ichoku & Ellison, 2014; Wiggins et al., 2020; see review by Andreae, 2019). Next-generation spacecraft deployments promise to greatly increase coverage frequency and diurnal sampling, with instrumentation such as multi-angle, multi-spectral polarimeter imagers and High Spectral Resolution Lidars offering advanced measurement capabilities (e.g., <https://aos.gsfc.nasa.gov>, last accessed, June 2022). Further, recent advances in estimating satellite-retrieved AOD uncertainty, even at the individual pixel level, have increased the utility of the satellite AOD measurements as constraints on aerosol forcing (Sayer et al., 2020; Witek et al., 2018).

The largest remaining uncertainties in the measured global distribution of aerosol amount for climate forcing applications are due to (a) difficulties in retrieving AOD over snow, ice, bright or topographically complex land, and cloud-covered surfaces, (b) accounting in satellite retrieval algorithms for the detailed aerosol light-scattering and light-absorption properties, as well as the hydration state of different aerosol types under ambient conditions that affect retrieved aerosol amount, (c) obtaining adequate spatial coverage for aerosol layer-height observations, and (d) specifying the relative-humidity-dependent Mass Extinction Efficiency (MEE) that is required to translate between AOD derived optically from remote sensing and the dry aerosol mass that is bookkept in climate and air quality models. Nighttime AOD is also poorly sampled by passive sensors including broad-swath imagers at present, and it can be important in accounting for the infrared part of the energy balance, especially in areas where airborne mineral dust is abundant. This is probably a secondary issue in representing global aerosol climate forcing, given the uncertainties under daylight conditions (e.g., Adebiyi & Kok, 2020); however, some space-based thermal IR (Capelle et al., 2018; Vandenbussche et al., 2013) and even visible (J. Wang et al., 2016) remote-sensing techniques hold promise to provide extensive nighttime AOD coverage beyond what is possible with active sensors. As discussed in subsequent sections, appropriate combinations of modeling and suborbital measurements with the satellite observations (Figure 1) appear to be key to addressing the limitations of the space-based AOD data record.

2.2. Satellite Constraints on Aerosol Particle Properties

Satellite observations have up to now been less successful at providing the quantitative particle optical, microphysical, and chemical properties needed to model aerosol forcing. For example, uncertainty in aerosol light-absorption, usually represented by the spectral single-scattering albedo (SSA), is of comparable or possibly greater importance compared to AOD in setting the overall uncertainty in aerosol direct forcing of Earth's energy budget (J. Li et al., 2022; Loeb & Su, 2010; McComiskey et al., 2008; Thorsen et al., 2021). Along with aerosol vertical distribution, SSA is also critical for modeling the semi-direct aerosol effect, that is, the aerosol impact on solar-energy absorption and atmospheric heating, along with the attendant effects on clouds.

The ability to obtain quantitative or even qualitative constraints on properties such as particle size, SSA, and sphericity depends on retrieval conditions as well as instrument characteristics. These variables can be derived from multi-angle, multi-spectral observations when the surface is not too complex and the AOD is sufficiently high—typically exceeding 0.2 to 0.5 at mid-visible wavelengths. This is often challenging, as the global average mid-visible AOD is ~ 0.14 (e.g., Andrews et al., 2017). For example, much of wildfire smoke instantaneous radiative forcing occurs over extended areas downwind, where smoke AOD < 0.1 (Schill et al., 2020). In addition, the

sun-spacecraft observing geometry must provide an adequate range of scattering angles for robust results using this technique (e.g., Fougnie et al., 2020; Kahn & Gaitley, 2015; Kalashnikova et al., 2013).

Temporal compositing of single-view sensor measurements acquired at different times with different viewing angles (Lyapustin et al., 2021) and/or different AOD (e.g., Seidel & Popp, 2012; Wells et al., 2012) can also be used to enhance their information content and obtain tighter AOD or SSA constraints. Polarized, multi-spectral multi-angular measurements improve retrieval sensitivity to the real part of the particle refractive index and to the width of the particle size distribution, as well as broadening the range of conditions under which meaningful particle-type constraints can be obtained (e.g., Dubovik et al., 2011; Hasekamp et al., 2011; Mishchenko & Travis, 1997). Despite this, systematic differences in aerosol absorption derived from different algorithms applied to the same polarimetric sensor still exceed the requirements for adequate constraints on aerosol forcing (Schutgens et al., 2021). Although the deployment of new polarimeters with increased polarimetric accuracy (e.g., Werdell et al., 2019) should reduce these discrepancies to some degree, algorithmic assumptions will still be required (e.g., when layers containing different aerosol types occur in the atmospheric column); as with all new measurements, the quality of the results remains to be demonstrated.

Space-based, two-channel backscatter lidar with polarization sensitivity currently provides a height-resolved classification of six empirically defined aerosol types operationally, using the retrieved depolarization ratio, attenuated backscatter, layer top and base altitudes, and surface type as input (M.-H. Kim et al., 2018). Future spacecraft deployment of High-Spectral-Resolution Lidar (HSRL) instruments promises to refine lidar aerosol-type retrieval by constraining, in addition, the light extinction-to-backscatter ratio (e.g., Burton et al., 2012; Dawson et al., 2017; Hélière et al., 2012; Russell et al., 2014), a key aerosol-type-dependent microphysical property that must be assumed when interpreting backscatter-only observations in terms of aerosol amount. The inclusion of an UV channel in a future space-based lidar instrument for greater particle-type discrimination, especially with depolarization sensitivity, is also possible (Burton et al., 2015; Nicolae et al., 2018; Papagiannopoulos et al., 2018).

Overall, within the AOD and other retrieval caveats discussed above, satellite remote sensing can contribute to constraining direct aerosol forcing by mapping aerosol types qualitatively and identifying differences in particle size and light-absorption. However, to date, constraints from satellites alone on SSA and particle size distribution lack the coverage, the accuracy, as well as the error characterization, required for closing the aerosol forcing uncertainty gap in most environments.

When retrieval conditions are favorable, some general deductions about the mechanisms driving aerosol property evolution have also been gleaned from satellite data, such as near-source in wildfire smoke and volcanic plumes. For example, changes in AOD, and in retrieved effective particle size and light-absorption downwind of major sources, have been used to infer size-selective or size-independent particle deposition, particle hydration or oxidation, secondary aerosol formation, the condensation of volatiles on existing particles, and particle activation processes (Flower & Kahn, 2020a, 2020b; Junghenn Noyes et al., 2020). In addition, having plume-level wind vectors, for example, derived from multi-angle stereo imaging, makes it possible to estimate timescales for the observed transitions, at least near major aerosol sources. Coincident field data, primarily from aircraft making detailed in situ measurements and in some cases from ground observers, have been essential for building confidence in these inferences made from remote-sensing observations (e.g., Junghenn Noyes et al., 2020). At the same time, extensive, qualitative aerosol property mapping from satellites can place the detailed aircraft measurements, acquired, for example, along disjoint transects of a smoke plume, into the larger context of plume-particle evolution. This complementary exchange of information is illustrated in Figure 1 (red and dark green arrows). Further, despite the qualitative nature of satellite-based particle-evolution-process deductions, the satellite data also offer broad spatial coverage that allows for multi-year assessment of the dominant particle evolution processes and associated timescales where data quality is adequate (e.g., Junghenn Noyes et al., 2022).

Several approaches have been taken to using satellite measurements and the associated inferences as validation or constraints on models (Figure 1, blue and light green arrows). In addition to statistical comparisons between aggregated satellite observations and models of particle evolution processes and timescales, by configuring models to simulate specific instrument measurements, more quantitative, direct comparisons between models and observations can be made in some cases. The results can be especially useful as a means of diagnosing model behavior, leading to better constraints on model parameterizations, at least statistically. Such work has been performed mainly on daily snapshots from polar-orbiting instruments. However, as the capabilities of instruments on geostationary (Gupta et al., 2019; Lim et al., 2018; H. Zhang, Kondragunta, et al., 2020) and even more remote

platforms (Marshak et al., 2018) advance, data from these sources promise to increase constraints on aerosol processes by resolving the time-evolution of particle properties over large areas.

2.3. Strengths and Limitations of Space-Based Aerosol-Cloud-Interaction (ACI) Observations

From the satellite perspective, reducing the forcing uncertainties due to the indirect effects of aerosol particles on clouds is yet more challenging, given the subtlety and complexity of the aerosol as well as the cloud processes involved, and the range of spatial and temporal scales on which they operate (e.g., reviews by Bellouin et al., 2020; Quaas et al., 2020; Rosenfeld et al., 2014; Seinfeld et al., 2016; McCoy et al., 2016; Mülmenstädt & Feingold, 2018). Cloud-formation processes require aerosol particles to serve as cloud condensation nuclei (CCN), except under very cold, homogeneous-nucleation conditions. More generally, the CCN size spectrum and concentration, particle hygroscopicity, and SSA are all required to model cloud-droplet formation and ACI. However, the mutual interactions between ACI mean that the challenge is much greater than just measuring CCN, because a host of other cloud microphysical and dynamical processes change (“adjust”), depending in part on CCN properties and concentrations.

A fundamental limit to the contribution satellites can make regarding ACI is that particles smaller than about 0.1 μm in diameter are difficult to characterize with remote sensing; they are very inefficient at scattering light and are essentially indistinguishable from the background atmospheric gas. Yet, such small particles can represent a significant fraction of the activated CCN, particularly under high updraft velocities (e.g., Stier, 2016; Twomey, 1974). Broad-swath, single-view imagers can provide AOD and can constrain its spectral dependence under good retrieval conditions. The extinction Ångström Exponent (ANG), defined as the negative slope of AOD versus wavelength (both in log space) is inversely proportional to particle size, provided a single aerosol mode dominates the atmospheric column. The product of AOD and ANG (derived from AOD retrieved at several wavelengths), designated the aerosol index (AI), yields a metric that weights AOD toward smaller (CCN-like) sizes (Nakajima et al., 2001). As an estimate of CCN, AI is a qualitative indicator at best, in part because particle hygroscopicity is generally unconstrained by remote-sensing measurements but can dominate the relationship between retrieved AOD and particle number, especially for small particles (Cao et al., 2023; Kapustin et al., 2006), and in part because extrapolating the observed part of the aerosol spectrum to smaller sizes engenders additional assumptions. However, AI is often treated as quantitative for lack of other observational constraints.

At the other end of the CCN size distribution, giant CCN, on the order of several microns in diameter, can have an inordinately large effect on precipitation formation in warm clouds, even at concentrations on the order 1/Liter (Feingold et al., 1999), far too low to be retrieved from space-based remote sensing. High concentrations of coarse-mode and giant CCN ($\sim 1\text{--}2$ microns in diameter and larger) can also have a disproportionately large impact on cloud supersaturation and susceptibility to aerosol perturbations (e.g., Ghan et al., 1998; Morales Betancourt & Nenes, 2014). As such, giant CCN characterization must rely primarily on suborbital measurement. Some recent advances in aircraft instrumentation and analysis are improving our ability to characterize giant CCN in situ (e.g., Dadashazar et al., 2017; Gonzalez et al., 2022; Jung et al., 2015). Yet, giant nuclei measurement remains challenging, due to issues such as losses in conventional inlets (e.g., Wilson et al., 2004), sizing uncertainties in wing-mounted probes (e.g., Gonzalez et al., 2022), generally low number concentrations, and the need to know the time-history of relative humidity exposure to relate dry and ambient particle properties.

Particle light-absorption is also challenging to constrain quantitatively with remote sensing (Section 2.2 above). Yet aerosol composition, particularly smoke or dust aerosol having low SSA, can play an important role in driving cloud-mediated radiative forcing. Such particles can heat the atmosphere, reducing the ambient relative humidity and causing cloud-droplet evaporation (the so-called semi-direct effect). Further, by affecting the atmospheric vertical stratification, they can either suppress (e.g., Koren et al., 2004) or possibly enhance convection, depending on the location of the aerosol (Jiang & Feingold, 2006; Koren et al., 2005). Well-defined smoke plumes can apparently also alter mesoscale (S. S. Lee et al., 2014) and large-scale (Williams et al., 2022) circulation patterns.

Satellite-based mapping of aerosol amount over extended regions is obtained from passive measurements of column-integrated AOD. Attempts at correlating AOD directly with CCN concentration measured in situ have yielded only qualitative relationships (e.g., Andreae, 2009; Shen et al., 2019; Shinozuka et al., 2015), and vertical decoupling introduces significant additional uncertainty (Stier, 2016). Of particular relevance for this application,

the CCN that actually participate in the cloud-droplet-formation process are typically just below cloud base, a region inaccessible to passive measurements from space. These CCN can be measured directly only with in situ aircraft instruments or inferred from surface remote sensing, by inverting cloud microphysical measurements (Feingold et al., 1998), although indirect methods offer promise for some situations (e.g., Rosenfeld et al., 2016).

Further complicating the satellite contribution to measuring ACI is the complexity of interpreting remote-sensing observations in the vicinity of clouds (e.g., Marshak et al., 2021). This region, sometimes termed the “twilight zone,” contains a continuum of hydrated aerosol, evaporating cloud droplets, and cloud fragments (Koren et al., 2007). To interpret remote-sensing observations, both “cloud contamination” of the aerosol signal and light-scattering by the cloud must be taken into account. Standard retrieval algorithms assume 1-D radiative transfer whereas these situations are inherently three-dimensional; the 3-D radiative transfer that applies here can produce significantly different AOD retrieval results and aerosol forcing estimates (e.g., Wen et al., 2007; Yang et al., 2022). Furthermore, considering the hygroscopic growth of particles in the vicinity of clouds as a continuum means that the aerosol forcing is driven by the 3-D spatial distribution of humidity in the cloud field (which varies on much smaller scales than the aerosol properties, e.g., Anderson et al., 2003).

Atmospheric dynamics plays an important role in determining the effects of aerosol on clouds, and this too is difficult to constrain from space at the relevant spatial and temporal scales, and with the required accuracy. Water vapor supersaturation, responsible for cloud droplet and ice crystal formation, is generated by expansion cooling that is directly proportional to vertical velocity. The fraction of particles that activate to form cloud droplets is often strongly dependent on updraft velocity, although aerosol number concentration, size distribution, and to a lesser extent composition also affect the result (Ervens et al., 2005; Feingold, 2003; McFiggans et al., 2006). Vertical velocity is more important when cloud supersaturation is low; such “velocity-limited conditions” occur frequently around the globe (Morales Betancourt & Nenes, 2014; Reutter et al., 2009; Sullivan et al., 2016). When low supersaturation occurs under high aerosol (polluted) conditions, drop concentration depends on both CCN concentration and vertical velocity (e.g., Bougiatioti et al., 2020; Foskinis et al., 2022; Georgakaki et al., 2021; Kacarab et al., 2020); however, factors such as aerosol size distribution and chemical composition can also become more important under these conditions (e.g., McFiggans et al., 2006; Rissman et al., 2004). In aerosol-poor environments such as the Arctic, the factor limiting droplet formation is often the number concentration of CCN, and vertical velocity uncertainty becomes less important (e.g., Feingold et al., 2003; McFiggans et al., 2006). Yet, vertical velocity is rarely constrained by measurements contemporaneous with aerosol amount and properties such as particle size distribution and hygroscopicity (e.g., Bougiatioti et al., 2020; Kacarab et al., 2020). Further, despite its high spatial variability globally (order tens of meters), vertical velocity can only be measured at the required accuracy and spatial resolution with limited sampling, using active Doppler lidar or Doppler radar from suborbital platforms (e.g., Guimond et al., 2014; Schroeder et al., 2020). At least until next-generation satellite instruments are developed, updraft velocity measurements relevant to drop and ice formation are unlikely to be possible from spacecraft alone.

The most widely observed ACI process is cloud brightening, which is caused by an increase in CCN concentration generating an increase in cloud droplet number, and all else being equal, a decrease in droplet size (Twomey, 1974). However, this conceptually simple mechanism is also strongly affected by cloud adjustments (e.g., Quaas et al., 2020; Twomey, 1977). Much work has focused on aerosol-related cloud brightening with all other factors, especially cloud liquid water path (LWP), held constant. However, both LWP and cloud fraction have been shown to exhibit non-monotonic responses to aerosol perturbations. Under clean conditions, increases in aerosol tend to increase LWP, whereas under polluted conditions LWP might be reduced (Ackerman et al., 2004; Bretherton et al., 2007; Gryspeerd et al., 2019; S. Wang et al., 2003). Similar results appear to be valid for cloud fraction (e.g., Gryspeerd et al., 2021; Xue et al., 2008). Although some in-cloud processes can be inferred from satellite observations (e.g., Rosenfeld et al., 2016), at least with assumptions that must be carefully assessed (Grosvenor et al., 2018; Y. Zhu, Rosenfeld, & Li, 2018), the spatial and temporal resolution required to observe most ACI processes is beyond present-day satellite-measurement capabilities. Further, the lack of simultaneous, detailed, space-based observations of the multiple factors of import in these processes precludes resolving the key subtleties in these aspects of ACI with satellite data alone.

The processes associated with cloud brightening are relatively fast, for example, on order 10 min for aerosol activation in shallow clouds to approximately 20 hr for LWP and cloud fraction adjustments (Glassmeier et al., 2021). However, aerosol particles can also alter regional-scale circulation patterns on much longer timescales, which in

turn change cloud amount (e.g., Menon et al., 2002). From climate-forcing and even extreme-weather perspectives, these circulation responses are of great importance (Persad et al., 2022; Soden & Chung, 2017; Williams et al., 2022). This is one aspect of ACI where satellite observations play a dominant role, providing frequent, regional-to-global-scale measurements of cloud amount and bulk cloud properties (Figure 1).

In summary, many of the factors that dominate aerosol-cloud-radiation interactions, such as CCN concentration, particle size spectrum and composition, are difficult to measure with space-based remote sensing; this is especially true for efforts to obtain coincident aerosol and related cloud properties. As such, knowledge of these quantities remains limited on a global scale (e.g., Seinfeld et al., 2016), leaving model-simulated aerosol indirect effects inadequately constrained by observations. Except in special circumstances and with stringent assumptions (e.g., Dawson et al., 2020; Pahlow et al., 2006; Rosenfeld et al., 2016), quantitative constraints on nearly all the key variables needed to characterize detailed ACI are beyond the capabilities of existing and currently planned space-based remote-sensing instruments. Nevertheless, satellite observations of well-defined aerosol sources such as ship tracks, industrial point sources of pollution, wildfire smoke and volcanic plumes, represent “natural laboratories” that have proven particularly useful in studying ACI, because the unaffected surroundings provide a control for the confounding factors associated with meteorology, at least to first order (Christensen et al., 2022). Also, the large data sets obtained from space can support fine-scale stratification of meteorological conditions, allowing the aerosol effects on clouds to be isolated statistically in some cases (e.g., Zamora & Kahn, 2020).

Characterizing ACI globally requires knowledge of co-varying aerosol properties and vertical velocity from suborbital platforms, as a function of meteorological variables that can also be monitored over broad regions from space or derived from reanalysis. The suborbital measurements would be targeted at characterizing statistically the key variables at cloud scale for a range of specific cloud types and meteorological conditions, some of which could be retrieved from space-based instruments with enough specificity to map out the appropriate ACI regimes. Steps in this direction have been taken by several field campaigns, including VOCALS (Bretherton et al., 2010; Mechoso et al., 2014), ORACLES (Redemann et al., 2021), and recently ACTIVATE (Sorooshian et al., 2019, 2021). The complexity of ACI and resulting ramification calls for a further, comprehensive program of targeted efforts of this kind, especially with simultaneous radiative flux measurements included, so the indirect effect can be quantified and radiative closure assessed. Specifying such a program is beyond the scope of the current review.

3. Regional-To-Global-Scale Modeling Contributions

Climate modeling is of course essential for calculating direct and indirect aerosol forcing globally, for filling gaps in the observational record, and for making climate forcing and response predictions based on assumed future emissions scenarios. Such models can also play a key role in targeting aircraft in situ measurements to sample specific aerosol and cloud situations, and subsequently, in identifying the aerosol sources and aging histories for aerosol air masses captured by satellite and suborbital observations (Figure 1, purple and yellow arrows, respectively). However, from emissions to aerosol climate forcing, models incorporate large numbers of assumptions and parameterizations of complex physical and chemical processes.

3.1. Model Representation of Aerosol Particle Properties

There are a few fundamental steps models take in simulating the global distribution of aerosol particles, and then calculating aerosol direct radiative forcing (e.g., Kinne et al., 2003). First, aerosol particles and their precursor emissions are usually prescribed from existing data sets, such as for combustion aerosol (e.g., van der Werf et al., 2017), or calculated interactively by the models, typically for sea salt (de Leeuw et al., 2011) and mineral dust (e.g., Pu et al., 2020; Zender et al., 2003) based upon meteorological conditions such as near-surface wind shear and surface properties. The emission inventories specify the initial state of aerosol mass, and might provide some indication of particle composition, size distribution, and aerosol precursor gases (e.g., Hoesly et al., 2018; Randerson et al., 2012). These data, as well as the source locations and vertical distribution of emissions, must be supplied to the model, based on measurements where available (see Section 2), and inferred or assumed elsewhere. Then the atmospheric aerosol concentrations are calculated from simulated atmospheric processes, including chemical and physical transformation, transport, dry deposition, and wet removal. These processes are typically represented as parameterizations of physical mechanisms or as empirical relationships that depend on aerosol physical and chemical properties; they can be coupled interactively to meteorological conditions from

the host general circulation model. Next, the aerosol optical properties, including the wavelength-dependent extinction (scattering + absorption), SSA, and particle single-scattering phase function (or asymmetry factor) are calculated as a function of aerosol mass composition, particle size distribution, particle-type-specific hygroscopic growth, refractive indices, and sometimes particle shape, limited by the extent to which these properties have been measured for the aerosol types involved (see Section 4 below). In bulk aerosol treatments, the microphysical properties are prescribed, although a growing number of modal and sectional aerosol models calculate them explicitly from microphysical schemes (e.g., Bauer et al., 2008; Kokkola et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2007; Mann et al., 2010; Stier et al., 2005). The resulting optical and microphysical properties vary greatly depending on model parameterizations, choice of parameter values, and assumed meteorological conditions. Finally, the direct aerosol radiative effects are derived from the calculated or assumed aerosol optical properties, simulated mass loading, and meteorological conditions, typically using fast, simplified radiative transfer models, though often traceable to more detailed models (e.g., Iacono et al., 2008).

The best-constrained aerosol-related quantity in this process is probably the mid-visible AOD, thanks to the modern-era satellite observations from multiple space-borne platforms (see Section 2 above). This provides a basis for models to adjust their parameterizations and assumptions to better match at least the AOD. Soon after monthly global satellite AOD data products became available, they were used to validate model results (e.g., Gliß et al., 2021; Kinne et al., 2006). More recently, satellite as well as surface-network-based AOD has been used to constrain some models directly. Assimilation of aerosol data has become routine in many operational and research forecasting organizations (e.g., Benedetti et al., 2009; Randles et al., 2017). The International Cooperative for Aerosol Prediction (ICAP) offers a multi-model ensemble that includes major aerosol forecasting activities from around the world, often assimilating satellite-derived AOD as a constraint (Xian et al., 2019).

However, reproducing the global, mid-visible AOD to within the satellite retrieval uncertainty, typically a few tenths under good retrieval conditions, does not resolve the fundamental issues created by the intermediate steps leading up to the AOD calculation. This is clearly demonstrated in AeroCom studies showing that the diversity of model-simulated total AOD is much smaller than the diversities of individual aerosol species and other key quantities such as mass loading, MEE, and lifetime, for which there are far fewer observational constraints (CCSP, 2009; Gliß et al., 2021; Kinne et al., 2006). Apparently, different models match the observed AOD for different reasons. Further, within models, the diversity of all aerosol-forcing-related quantities increases on regional spatial and seasonal/sub-seasonal temporal scales in most cases.

Although mid-visible AOD is by far the most common observable assimilated in these models, assimilation of lidar extinction and/or backscatter profiles as well as multi-wavelength reflectances from passive sensors is being explored (e.g., Benedetti et al., 2009; Sekiyama et al., 2010; J. Zhang et al., 2011; J. Zhang, Spurr, et al., 2020). Generally, in aerosol data assimilation, aerosol optical properties are specified by the host model; measurements are used to adjust only the aerosol constituent mass concentrations. As such, the process is limited by uncertainties in both the measurements and the model parameterizations. Further, the simultaneous adjustment of optical properties, particle size, and mass concentration has not yet received adequate attention, especially given the increasing availability of hyperspectral data (e.g., C. M. Lee et al., 2015).

3.2. Application of Model Aerosol Type to Complement Measurements

Aerosol composition based on source characteristics, transport, removal processes, as well as microphysical and chemical evolution, can be extracted from model simulations and used to complement satellite measurements. Specifically, models can in principle provide priors to aerosol remote-sensing retrieval algorithms, or retrospective refinement to the aerosol-type mixing state as part of the satellite aerosol-retrieval process when the aerosol-type information content of the satellite-observed signals is limited (Figure 1, purple arrow). For example, the model-simulated aerosol species, advected downwind, can be used to weight a loosely constrained range of particle properties derived from the satellite observations; the model-simulated aerosol type depends only on the source-receptor relationship, whereas the specificity of satellite-retrieved aerosol-type constraints varies with retrieval conditions, and is greatly diminished when the AOD is low or when a dominant type is lacking (Section 2 above). The challenge is associating the aerosol properties assumed by the model with the aerosol types derived by the satellite retrieval algorithm. An early effort keyed on ANG and absorbing AOD to connect aerosol properties simulated by an aerosol transport model with the satellite-retrieved aerosol type (S. Li et al., 2015). To make the comparisons, AOD fractions of the modeled aerosol components were ranked, reducing

dependence of the result on absolute AOD values. This application is in its infancy, and the process of associating satellite-constrained aerosol types with aerosol as represented in models requires substantial further investigation.

However, there is also considerable uncertainty in model-simulated particle property detail, arising in part from the lack of such detail in emission inventories used to initialize climate models, and limitations in the representation of particle microphysical and chemical aging processes. Model representation of aerosol properties often fails to capture the complexity found in nature, particularly in bulk models lacking microphysics, and generally, differences among commonly used aerosol representations in models can produce very different aerosol forcing results in model simulations (Nazarenko et al., 2017). Further, it has been shown many times in the literature that large diversity exists in model-simulated aerosol properties and both direct and indirect radiative forcing (e.g., Fiedler et al., 2019; Shindell et al., 2013; Stier et al., 2013). The first comprehensive inter-model comparisons of the main parameters determining the ARF were documented by the AeroCom community, with simulation results from more than a dozen global models (Kinne et al., 2006; Schulz et al., 2006; Textor et al., 2006, 2007). Since then, the diversity among model simulations of aerosol forcing and climate response has persisted, especially at regional scales (e.g., Bian et al., 2017; Gliß et al., 2021; Huneus et al., 2011; D. Kim et al., 2014, 2019; Koch et al., 2009; J.-Y. Lee et al., 2021; Mortier et al., 2020; Pan et al., 2015; Samset et al., 2014; Sand et al., 2017; Tsigaridis et al., 2014) despite the advances in satellite observation and in situ measurement (summarized in Sections 2 and 4, respectively).

For climate modeling applications, aerosol amount is quite well measured by the combination of satellite and ground-based instruments (Section 2.1 above), which also places constraints on aerosol source strength (e.g., Dubovik et al., 2008; Petrenko et al., 2017), transport, and to some extent, removal (e.g., Das et al., 2017; D. Kim et al., 2014, 2019; Reid et al., 2009). However, aerosol-type diversity and the associated uncertainty in aerosol-species-specific physical and optical properties, especially SSA (e.g., Loeb & Su, 2010; McComiskey et al., 2008; Thorsen et al., 2021), continue to play a leading role in simulated aerosol direct forcing uncertainty. The availability of generally good, global AOD data sets from satellite remote sensing (Section 2 above) helps constrain transport and removal processes in models, although uncertainties in other, aerosol-type-specific properties such as SSA and MEE lead to much poorer constraints on mass loading and direct aerosol forcing. For indirect forcing, uncertainty due to limited observational constraints on the processes by which aerosol particles affect different cloud types (Section 2.3 above) combines with particle and cloud property uncertainties (Carslaw et al., 2013). In addition, vertical velocity at cloud-scale cannot be resolved in current climate models, yet, uncertainties in this quantity can make models overly sensitive to aerosol or meteorological conditions, obscuring the underlying sources of modeled indirect forcing uncertainty (Sullivan et al., 2016). In addition, only a few models treat the aerosol effects on ice nucleation for cold clouds (e.g., Gettelman et al., 2012), further contributing to spread due to model diversity. These aerosol-climate-forcing issues in turn make major contributions to the diversity in model climate prediction, and *model diversity represents only a lower bound on model uncertainty, especially when model diversity is reduced as a consequence of model inter-comparison studies rather than based on comparisons with measurements. To obtain estimates of actual model uncertainty requires having appropriate measurements against which to compare.*

3.3. Strengths and Limitations of the Aerosol-Forcing Modeling Process

Within models, the terms associated with aerosol climate forcing can be isolated, ARF is usually defined as the change of net irradiance (in W m^{-2}) at either the tropopause after stratospheric temperature adjustment (e.g., Ramaswamy et al., 2001), or at the top-of-atmosphere, provided stratospheric adjustment has little effect on the ARF (e.g., Schulz et al., 2006). As such, ARF is the combined result of aerosol-radiation interactions (ARI) and ACI (Boucher et al., 2013). ARI represents the change aerosol particles make to the incoming solar radiation reaching Earth's surface through both direct and semi-direct effects. As discussed in Section 2.3, ACI accounts for the impact aerosol particles have on cloud albedo and lifetime when they serve as CCN (or Ice Nuclei, IN), in turn altering radiative fluxes. ARF can produce positive or negative net climate forcing, depending on the aerosol type, meteorological conditions, surface properties, and the spatial distribution of aerosol particles relative to clouds.

To calculate ARI, models must represent the vertically and spectrally resolved aerosol extinction, SSA, and phase function (or asymmetry factor) of airborne particles. As discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 above, these quantities depend on the emissions inventories and meteorology used to initialize the model, the atmospheric transport,

removal, chemical processes used to simulate aerosol mass concentrations and composition, and the underlying aerosol physical and optical properties including particle mixing state, size distribution and shape, hygroscopic growth, and spectral-dependent complex refractive indices. The parameterizations associated with each step in model simulation entail considerable uncertainties. Although most of the required quantities are either inferred from measurements or derived from theory, measurements to constrain the models are grossly limited or unavailable. Extrapolating sparse optical property measurements over much larger spatial and temporal domains is risky, resulting in large uncertainties propagating throughout the multiple stages of radiative forcing calculations (e.g., Stier et al., 2013).

Modeling the ACI component of ARF is even more uncertain than that for ARI, as it involves the liquid and ice cloud formation processes, lifetime, and properties along with aerosol particle microphysical characteristics (Section 2.3 above; comprehensively reviewed by Bellouin et al., 2020). For example, changes in CCN can affect cloud-droplet number; clouds can respond with “adjusted” mass and extent. Similarly, aerosol particles can affect precipitation and latent heat release, although changes in precipitation on regional scales are mediated primarily by energy and water budget considerations (e.g., Dagan & Stier, 2020; Gettelman & Sherwood, 2016; Held & Soden, 2006; O’Gorman et al., 2012). Studies of aerosol impacts on deep convective clouds find that with increased aerosol loading, precipitation and convective updrafts might increase, decrease, or remain relatively unchanged, apparently depending upon other, unidentified factors (Boucher et al., 2013; Tao et al., 2012), results that entail significant model uncertainties (Marinescu et al., 2021). As discussed earlier, quantifying aerosol indirect effects also involves modeling cloud formation, lifetime, and properties, and is highly sensitive to cloud-scale vertical velocities and the above-mentioned aerosol characteristics. Many of the relevant processes operate on spatial scales far smaller than the resolution of global models and are therefore either highly parameterized or simply not included, such as some aerosol effects on convective clouds. Large Eddy Simulations (LES) are valuable research tools, complementary to climate models in that they can resolve many of the smaller-scale processes; however, they still entail assumptions that are often unconstrained by measurements, are impractical to run over large areas or long time periods, and cannot provide estimates of forcing (e.g., Bellouin et al., 2020).

Further, the review of aerosol forcing modeling above addresses only present-day conditions. In most modeling-oriented climate assessments such as the IPCC reports, ARF requires accounting for the difference between present-day and “pre-industrial” conditions, that is, conditions at a time when it is assumed anthropogenic influences were minimal, commonly taken as 1750 or 1850. This of course engenders further uncertainties, as discussed in Section 1.

4. The Role of Aircraft and Ground-Based In Situ and Remote-Sensing Measurements

Existing aircraft and ground-based in situ and remote-sensing aerosol measurements are sometimes described collectively as the suborbital aerosol program-of-record. These data provide the key information that has been applied by both the satellite and modeling communities as constraints on aerosol microphysical properties (e.g., Glib et al., 2021; Reddington et al., 2017) and vertical structure (Watson-Parris et al., 2019). The particle property measurements are used to assign priors and to make other assumptions in many satellite remote-sensing aerosol retrieval algorithms. They also form the basis for the microphysical property assumptions of aerosol source characteristics in most models, and they can contribute to model validation (Figure 1). For climate applications, these suborbital measurements are usually used in a statistical sense due to their significant spatial and/or temporal sampling limitations.

4.1. Surface-Based Observation Network and Aircraft Field Campaign Contributions

Networks of surface-based remote-sensing instruments, such as sun photometers (e.g., the Aerosol Robotic Network, AERONET, Holben et al., 1998; the Marine Aerosol Network, MAN, Smirnov et al., 2011) and aerosol lidars (e.g., the Micro-Pulse Lidar Network, MPLNET, Welton et al., 2001; the European Aerosol Research Lidar Network, EARLINET, Pappalardo et al., 2014), generate a substantial database of aerosol amount, vertical distribution, and some particle property information. In addition, heavily instrumented surface sites, such as the US Department of Energy’s Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) program at their Southern Great Plains site and Mobile Facilities (e.g., Mather & Voyles, 2013; Vogelmann et al., 2012) contribute detailed, local

aerosol, cloud, and radiation measurements. (A table of leading surface-based aerosol measurement networks is given in Kahn et al. (2004).) Direct in situ sampling at ground stations can add physical, optical, and chemical detail to the remotely sensed particle optical properties and can document long-term variability. However, such measurements are acquired only near or at the surface and at only a few sampling sites, mostly concentrated in a few regions of the globe (e.g., The US Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments network, IMPROVE, Malm & Hand, 2007; the Surface Particulate Matter Network, SPARTAN, Snider et al., 2015; the Global Atmospheric Watch (GAW) network, Andrews et al., 2019; Rose et al., 2021; Laj et al., 2020; the European Commission's Aerosol, Clouds, and Trace Gases Research Infrastructure (ACTRIS) (<https://www.actris.eu>; last accessed: March 2023); plus studies of collected data by Burgos et al., 2020; Fanourgakis et al., 2019).

Intensive aircraft field campaigns complement the surface-based measurements, offering much greater flexibility in sampling the atmosphere near and downwind of aerosol sources; this allows for in situ as well as remote-sensing measurement of transported aerosol layers aloft as they evolve, and further, can provide insight into the processes involved in aerosol evolution and aerosol-cloud interaction (e.g., the Atmospheric Tomography Mission, ATom, Brock et al., 2021; the Studies of Emissions and Atmospheric Composition, Clouds and Climate Coupling by Regional Surveys campaign, SEAC⁴RS, Toon et al., 2016; The Green Ocean Amazon Experiment, GOAMAZON, Martin et al., 2017; the Observations of Aerosols above Clouds and their Interactions campaign, ORACLES, Redemann et al., 2021; the Aerosol Cloud Meteorology Interactions over the Western Atlantic Experiment, ACTIVATE, Sorooshian et al., 2021). However, such campaigns can target only selected regions and are usually limited in time, typically lasting only a few weeks or months. Finally, laboratory analysis of collected samples is sometimes required to obtain compositional and some key optical results, but are currently also severely limited in scope (e.g., Di Biagio et al., 2017; McNeill et al., 2020).

4.2. Strengths and Limitations of Aerosol Property Data Available From Suborbital Sources

Aerosol property databases have been developed in the past. A leading example is the Optical Properties of Aerosols and Clouds (OPAC) database (Hess et al., 1998). It provides tabulated, digital, microphysical and optical properties, covering UV, visible, and infrared spectral ranges, for aerosol components as well as mixtures representing various aerosol types, and includes data calculated at a number of relative humidity values. The need for such databases is demonstrated by the widespread use of OPAC optical properties in models, satellite remote sensing retrieval algorithms, and as precomputed packages for use in radiative transfer codes (e.g., Chin et al., 2002; Dee et al., 2011; Gasteiger & Wiegner, 2018; Thomas et al., 2009; Vicent et al., 2020). Indeed, OPAC has over 3,000 citations at the time of writing, according to Google Scholar. However, OPAC has known, significant limitations, due to the lack of representative (or in some cases, any) measurements of the required aerosol properties. These limitations have been documented in the literature (e.g., Alvarado et al., 2016; Colarco et al., 2013; Zieger et al., 2013) and, despite the availability of much better instrumentation than that used decades ago to help construct OPAC, this situation persists today.

As consistently and systematically measured particle chemical, microphysical, and optical properties are currently lacking, it is difficult to critically assess and improve model assumptions. Recent efforts to collect retrospective, in situ aerosol data into a better organized “program-of-record” promise to help refine our sense for the range of particle property values in different places (e.g., Balkanski et al., 2021; Reddington et al., 2017; Schuster & Trepte, 2021). However, past aerosol property measurements were not designed to provide the comprehensive inputs needed for global climate modeling. To be most useful as constraints on modeling aerosol forcing, suborbital measurements of particle microphysical and chemical properties must meet the following four criteria:

- A *statistical sampling* of key variables for major aerosol airmass types is needed. (An aerosol airmass describes the spatial and temporal distribution of aerosol particles having similar properties, based on remote-sensing retrieval of aerosol type or on model simulation from a particular source and evolution.) Aircraft in situ aerosol measurements are not often made with the aim of obtaining the distribution (e.g., the probability distribution function or PDF) of particle property values associated with specific aerosol types. Except at sparse surface-based sampling stations, a limited number of individual measurements of a given aerosol airmass type is the best we currently have in most cases, whereas to establish the PDF of a quantity, a sufficient number of measurements is required so that subsequent measurements reproduce the distribution of values already obtained.
- A *suite of specific physical, chemical, and optical quantities* is needed to adequately characterize an aerosol type for climate applications, and would also be useful for air quality modeling (Table 1). All the required

Table 1

The Suite of Aerosol Properties That Need to Be Measured Systematically, Primarily From Aircraft, and the Purpose of Each, for the Climate-Forcing Application^a

Aerosol properties obtained from in situ measurements^b and integrated analysis

Spectral extinction coefficient	– To constrain and to interpret spectral Aerosol Optical Depth (AOD)
Spectral absorption or single-scattering albedo	– To determine atmospheric spectral light-absorption and heating – To constrain spectral AOD retrievals
Particle hygroscopic growth factor	– To connect particle properties with ambient RH conditions – To model particle activation and aerosol-cloud interactions
Particle size distribution	– To model particle optical properties and loss mechanisms – To model particle activation and aerosol-cloud interactions – As a complement to chemical composition discrimination – Required for deriving aerosol Mass Extinction Efficiency (MEE)
Particle composition	– For source identification – To classify measurements in terms of aerosol types as specified in most models, for example, sea salt, sulfate, mineral dust, black carbon (BC), brown carbon (BrC), especially important for aerosol-cloud-interaction modeling – To support deriving properties of the anthropogenic fraction, as needed to calculate anthropogenic aerosol “climate” forcing (also supports air quality applications)
Spectral single-scattering phase matrix (all possible angles)	– To calculate radiation fields – To constrain multi-angle radiance AOD retrievals – <i>Polarized</i> —to help determine aerosol type, and to constrain remote-sensing observations where polarized data are included
MEE	– To translate between optical remote-sensing measurements and model aerosol mass (Can be derived from integrated analysis of particle size distribution and extinction coefficient, with density deduced from particle compositional constraints or measured directly from samples)
Real refractive index	– To model aerosol optical properties – To constrain AOD retrievals to the level-of-detail required for aerosol forcing

Variables providing meteorological context

Carbon monoxide (CO; also possibly CO ₂ , NO ₂ , O ₃)	– As a tracer for smoke, to help distinguish smoke from urban pollution in some cases – For modeling heterogeneous reactions, secondary aerosol formation
Ambient temperature, pressure, and relative humidity (RH)	– To help interpret ambient measurements – To translate between instrument and ambient conditions
Aircraft 3-D location	– To relate aircraft measurements to model simulations and to any available satellite observations, for source identification and aging history

Variables providing ambient, remote-sensing context

Ambient Spectral single-scattering phase matrix (all possible angles)	– To assess in-aircraft measurements by comparing with ambient conditions – To help calculate radiation fields and constrain remote-sensing AOD retrievals – <i>Polarized</i> —to help determine aerosol type, and to constrain remote-sensing retrievals where polarized data are included
Ambient spectral extinction coefficient	– To constrain remote-sensing spectral AOD retrievals and assess in-aircraft measurements by comparing with ambient conditions
Large particle/cloud probe	– To provide information about dust and other particles larger than the inlet size cut of other instruments – As an independent measure of possible cloud impact on the reliability of other data
Aerosol layer heights	– To determine flight levels for subsequent direct sampling – To correlate with meteorological conditions – As a constraint on trajectory modeling to identify aerosol sources and evolution

Note. This table was originally developed for aircraft aerosol measurements, as these can sample aerosol aloft and can characterize particle property evolution systematically. However, a subset of these measurements acquired from surface-based instruments can contribute as well, especially for the near-surface components that are difficult to sample from airborne platforms. Source: Adapted from Kahn et al., 2017; © American Meteorological Society. Used with permission.

^aThe variables in this table are aimed at characterizing aerosol properties for the major aerosol air mass types in general. Cloud condensation nuclei and Ice Nuclei would be included, especially in the hygroscopic growth factor and size distribution measurements. However, systematic and comprehensive measurements of additional cloud and meteorological variables associated with aerosol-cloud interactions, for the major cloud types and meteorological regimes, globally, as introduced in Section 2.3, would require a different aircraft program, beyond the scope of this review. ^bThese quantities are typically measured inside the aircraft, at low or at least altered RH.

types of measurements have been made in the past, but rarely have they all been made together for the same aerosol airmass and under appropriate ranges of meteorological conditions.

- *Particle property evolution during transport needs to be characterized.* The properties of many aerosol types change significantly as they age. As such, the particle properties of major aerosol types need to be characterized systematically *downwind from the source* (or upwind toward the source) to adequately capture the aging process. Further, *the source, the age, and the associated environmental conditions* need to be recorded for each sample, best done in most cases by aerosol transport modeling (Figure 1, yellow arrow). (The timescales for particle evolution vary. Changes in wildfire smoke particles and secondary aerosol formation typically occur over minutes to hours (e.g., Kleinman et al., 2020; Yokelson et al., 2009), whereas alteration of mineral dust properties can take days (e.g., Denjean et al., 2016) and is unlikely to be fully captured during a single aircraft flight.) Such aircraft measurements can also acquire information characterizing *aerosol variability at spatial scales of a few km or less*, which can be important for representing sub-grid-scale aerosol properties and ACI processes in climate models (Fast et al., 2022; Haywood et al., 1997). With the help of aerosol transport modeling and/or synoptic-scale satellite observations, aerosol sources and transport history can be determined, even when aerosol layers are superposed at different elevations and from different sources, but again, this has not been done for much of the program-of-record.
- *Uncertainty characterization is critical* to assess the resulting uncertainty in derived aerosol forcing. However, estimates of measurement uncertainty are difficult to obtain for many aircraft in situ instruments. This situation can be improved considerably with techniques that were unavailable for most field campaigns until recently. For example, open-path instruments, some existing and some in development, can measure aerosol properties under ambient conditions. Such properties include aerosol scattering and extinction, as well as particle size distribution (Martins, 2016) and light-absorption estimates (Gordon et al., 2015). These measurements facilitate uncertainty estimate calculations for the particle hygroscopicity derived from other, in-aircraft measurements. In addition, the open-path instruments can produce uncertainty estimates (or even corrections) for directly measured inlet efficiency, which is especially important for super-micron particles.

Although many current models are not equipped to apply detailed in situ aerosol property measurements directly due to the simplicity of their parameterizations, such information remains critical for characterizing model error. By systematically collocating measured and modeled aerosol optical properties in space and time, the probability distribution of errors in these parameters can be estimated. Such diagnostics can help refine model parameterizations and better quantify the uncertainties in the derived ARF, especially those associated with simplified assumptions and parameterizations. And as computer capabilities allow climate models to advance, the applicability of information provided by such measurement detail will increase. For example, more sophisticated parameterizations of aerosol-cloud interactions and more subtle particle physical and chemical changes during particle aging could be captured in the simulations.

5. Discussion—Addressing Suborbital Data Limitations

Of the three elements shown in Figure 1, the suborbital measurement component is the least well addressed for the aerosol-climate-forcing application by existing and planned efforts. In this section, we review the more comprehensively defined possibilities for aerosol property measurements first, and touch on those for ACI subsequently.

The current aerosol measurement program-of-record does not meet the criteria summarized in Section 4. This is reflected in the *diversity of assumed aerosol properties* in remote-sensing retrieval algorithms, and the even greater particle property diversity among model assumptions (e.g., CCSP, 2009; Gliß et al., 2021; Myhre et al., 2013). The lack of consensus about aerosol intensive properties provides some indication of what is yet to be achieved with systematic in situ aerosol measurements. *All measurements have uncertainties. However, in situ measurements can provide the most direct way to quantify particle SSA and size distribution, offer by far the best constraints on particle hygroscopicity and the CCN size spectrum, and produce the only available constraints on MEE and actual particle composition.* This is illustrated, for example, by the work of Brock et al. (2021).

As such, a comprehensive database of key in situ measurements targeting the major aerosol air masses would fill this persistent gap in our ability to model the effects of aerosol particles on climate. It would also add value to several decades of existing as well as all future global satellite remote-sensing measurements by providing more robust, complete, and detailed particle microphysical property information than is currently available to use as priors or constraints on remote-sensing retrieval algorithms. For data assimilation, such measurements would

provide a better basis for quantifying errors arising from faulty or uncertain assumptions about aerosol optical properties in the retrieval process and would open the door for the assimilation of aerosol properties beyond AOD. The data would be of value for air quality applications as well, by contributing to the accuracy of aerosol species as represented in air quality models.

One simplifying factor for developing a database addressing current needs is that, *for a given source in a given season, the particle intensive microphysical and optical properties tend to be repeatable*, even as the aerosol amount varies on many spatial and temporal scales. For example, although the amount of dust raised from a particular desert source region can vary diurnally, seasonally, and interannually, the emitted dust microphysical properties generally remain unchanged (e.g., Reid et al., 2008). Similarly, wildfires consuming the same vegetation types in the same ecosystem and season tend to produce smoke particles having similar properties (e.g., Junghenn Noyes et al., 2022; Reid et al., 2005). This means a program aimed at making the suite of key in situ particle intensive property measurements systematically is at least feasible.

Complementary satellite measurements are also needed (Figure 1), frequently, over large spatial scales for regional context, (a) to map the varying extensive properties, that is, aerosol amounts and 3-D spatial distributions of different aerosol types, and (b) to limit as much as possible sampling bias (e.g., Schutgens et al., 2017). *Aerosol type, the classification possible based on particle size, shape, and SSA constraints that can be derived from satellite remote-sensing measurements, is the key to linking the extensive aerosol air masses, mapped out frequently and globally by satellites, with the detailed intensive properties that can only be derived from in situ measurements.* Hence, systematic in situ aircraft measurements will have made a key contribution to reducing aerosol forcing uncertainty once they have adequately characterized the detailed particle microphysical properties for major aerosol sources and their downwind evolution. Further, the in situ measurements can be acquired under non-precipitating cloudy conditions, in some cases even if the aerosol particles are concentrated within a cloud layer, and the observations need not be obtained in synchrony with satellite observations (although doing so at times would be important, e.g., for remote-sensing retrieval validation and assessment of consistency among different measurement approaches).

Aircraft in situ programs aimed at measuring aerosol microphysical or optical properties systematically have been deployed in the past, though with different objectives from the one discussed here (e.g., the Civil Aircraft for Regular Investigation of the Atmosphere Based on an Instrument Container, CARIBIC, Nguyen et al., 2006; the Vertical Profiles of Aerosol Optical Properties over rural Oklahoma program, Andrews et al., 2011; the Vertical Profiles of Aerosol Optical Properties over Central Illinois program, Sheridan et al., 2012). Some recent airborne science projects have also included components aimed at characterizing aerosol properties or processes systematically (Brock et al., 2021; Redemann et al., 2021; Sorooshian et al., 2019, 2021). These efforts offer some guidance as to how such programs might operate. However, the level of effort needed to characterize statistically the required suite of aerosol properties (Table 1), for many aerosol types, has been beyond the scope of past campaigns, which have either focused on one specific region or included only commercial airline pathways, and some quantities such as MEE have not been constrained in most of these experiments.

A possible future aircraft program addressing the needed aerosol microphysical properties for reducing aerosol forcing uncertainty has been outlined previously, showing that the key variables could be measured with a relatively small but dedicated aircraft, and with technologies that existed even in 2014, though there have been some significant improvements in instrumentation since (Kahn et al., 2017). The aircraft would fly two-to-three times per week from an initial base of operations, with fixed flight plans aimed at sampling all the major, climatologically likely aerosol air masses accessible from the base, as identified in advance from model simulations and satellite aerosol-type mapping. Each flight plan would begin with a high-altitude traverse along one of the pre-determined paths, and a simple lidar on board would determine the elevations of the aerosol layers below. The layers would then be sampled, as far up- or downwind as feasible, and the aircraft would return to base.

Once the PDFs of the key variables were acquired for the accessible aerosol air masses, the aircraft would move to a new base of operations, again informed by an analysis of aerosol transport model simulations and aircraft siting considerations. Unlike typical aircraft field campaigns, the data would be processed routinely, probably at a central location, as is common for NASA satellite missions. In addition to helping deployment planning in advance, by identifying important source locations and likely dispersion pathways as sampling targets, aerosol transport models would also be run routinely during deployment, to characterize the sources and aging histories of the aerosol particles sampled during each flight (Figure 1, yellow arrow). As opportunities arose, the aircraft

would overfly ground stations for cross-validation, and could also participate in intensive field campaigns when appropriate. Taking account of typical aircraft maintenance considerations, the availability of basing facilities, and the seasonality of some aerosol sources, we estimate that a deployment of roughly three-to-four years would be required to sample the major aerosol air masses of North America. There is additional uncertainty in this estimate, however, due to limited knowledge about the number of samples required to obtain PDFs for different key variables and for different aerosol types, depending also on the capabilities of the designated aircraft and the robustness of the instrumentation. The successful demonstration of such a program could engender similar programs hosted in other regions around the world, leading to characterization of the major aerosol air mass types, globally.

The requirements for suborbital measurements to comprehensively reduce uncertainties in modeling ACI processes and effects are not as well established as those described above for addressing aerosol properties. A suborbital ACI measurement program could be considerably more complex. Reviews of past modeling and measurement work (e.g., Rosenfeld et al., 2014; Mülmenstädt & Feingold, 2018; Bellouin et al., 2020) and experience from recent aircraft campaigns aimed at characterizing aerosol particles, clouds, and their interactions in specific regions (Behrenfeld et al., 2019; Crosbie et al., 2022; Sorooshian et al., 2019, 2021) provide some indication of what would be involved. Both aerosol and cloud properties would need to be measured for this application, on spatial scales ranging from 10^{-7} to 10^6 m and temporal scales of minutes to hours or more. Sampling would have to encompass major cloud types, and several coordinated aircraft would probably be required to provide a combination of remote-sensing and in situ observations capable of resolving variations both vertically as well as horizontally within and surrounding cloud systems. Variables identifying distinct cloud and meteorological regimes, that could subsequently be mapped with space-based remote sensing, would be required to allow the field results to be extrapolated to global scale and extended time periods. A future study identifying the required variables, likely instruments to make the key measurements, targeting requirements, and observation strategies aimed at reducing ACI modeling uncertainties in general is indicated.

6. Conclusions—A Three-Way Street

The aerosol-related climate forcing uncertainties have not diminished appreciably in more than 20 years, despite substantial progress in other aerosol- and cloud-related measurement and modeling areas. Forcing uncertainty translates directly into climate change attribution and prediction uncertainty.

Unlike most previous reviews of aerosol climate forcing constraints and uncertainties, we take a measurement-oriented perspective. As illustrated in Figure 1, the satellite and suborbital measurement as well as the modeling research communities each have unique and essential contributions to make to the other two to achieve substantial progress in reducing the uncertainty in aerosol climate forcing overall. The application of loose satellite constraints on aerosol type and precursor gas distributions to improve model simulations needs to be explored in broader terms than previously, in part by taking the limited retrieved information content on particle size, shape, and light-absorption where available and linking it to more specific aerosol species, based on source properties projected to the observed locations by aerosol transport modeling. This is an example of a two-way street—the models help refine the satellite-retrieved aerosol type results, especially where the AOD is too low for reliable satellite aerosol-type retrieval or where cloud, complex surface topography or snow cover entirely precludes remote-sensing aerosol measurement; the aggregate of satellite instruments provides the 3-D spatial distribution of aerosol amount and type to constrain and/or validate the models, improving aerosol source initialization, transport, transformation, and deposition, and reducing model bias. Aerosol data assimilation offers another example: for each analysis cycle, the model projects past observations into the future, which in turn provides additional constraints for the assimilation of new data.

As outlined in Section 4 above, for the suborbital component to adequately contribute to modeling and to the interpretation of satellite observations (the third way), a database of systematic, statistically representative in situ measurements needs to be developed, containing the key particle microphysical, optical, and chemical properties and associated uncertainty estimates that cannot be derived from remote-sensing measurements alone. Such in situ measurements are needed to improve assumptions and parameterizations in models as well as observation operators for data assimilation, putting the model-assumed aerosol particle properties on more solid and consistent footing. The detailed aerosol properties will also serve to improve the priors or constraints on satellite retrieval algorithms, adding value to more than two decades of retrospective as well as planned future satellite aerosol observations. Further, such in situ aerosol data, with attention to the co-variability among aerosol and

meteorological variables, would make more precise and *quantitative* connections between the satellite optical constraints on aerosol amount and type and the modeled, species-specific, aerosol mass (e.g., the MEEs), a key requirement for improved data assimilation and model validation. A separate suborbital measurement program is needed to characterize the processes by which ACI interact, reporting detailed cloud properties in the presence of different aerosol amounts and types, under a range of meteorological conditions.

Completing the pattern of relationships, models, constrained by satellite measurements, can help in targeting the systematic in situ measurements to regions where they will matter most. Subsequently, models can help interpret the aerosol source and aging history, as well as cloud regime-type and evolution acquired through satellite and suborbital observations. In addition to its application to climate-related study, this approach would help improve model representation of surface-level particulate matter (PM) concentrations and composition, which is at the heart of air quality monitoring on regional and global scales (e.g., Appel et al., 2008; Hammer et al., 2019; van Donkelaar et al., 2021). Specifically, two leading sources of uncertainty for air quality applications on regional-to-global scales relate to the aerosol vertical distribution and aerosol composition, which are also among the leading uncertainties in aerosol contributions to climate forcing, though the observational requirements for air quality applications are somewhat different, for example, requiring near-surface aerosol chemical toxicity and possibly tighter constraints on particle size. For air quality applications, recent advances in data analysis techniques are likely to make important contributions (e.g., Bellinger et al., 2017).

Clearly, programs supporting advanced, global-scale satellite and surface-based aerosol, precursor gas, and cloud observations, climate modeling, surface networks, and intensive field campaigns aimed at characterizing the underlying physical and chemical processes involved, as currently planned, are all essential. The main parts of the overall picture missing from current programs or those planned for the near future are: (a) a program of long-term, systematic aircraft measurements aimed at creating a climatology of the key aerosol microphysical properties driving aerosol-climate interactions for the major aerosol air mass types, along with their statistical distributions and uncertainties, (b) a suborbital program aimed at filling gaps in aerosol-cloud-interaction-related cloud-scale microphysics, cloud optical properties, and associated dynamics, and (c) the mandate, the support, and the computational resources for the respective communities to work together in detail on the *synthesis* effort—the three-way street (Figure 1). Such efforts would go a long way toward “model-data fusion” (e.g., Gettelman et al., 2022); that is, developing consistent representations of aerosol properties as retrieved from remote sensing, measured in situ, and adopted by models (sometimes referred to in the AeroCom, AeroSat, and ICAP communities as “harmonizing” aerosol types among different platforms and communities). It would help members of the involved research communities agree upon those properties that most affect the aerosol analysis or application in a given place and time, and would greatly improve the feasibility of exchanging aerosol information among and between measurements and models. The cloud-related requirements for constraining aerosol-cloud interactions, such as better characterization of ice-cloud processes, documentation of aerosol effects on cloud condensate and cloud fraction, as well as vertical velocity constraints, especially in convective systems, are also needed. Yet, fully effecting the three-way street seems to be essential for substantially reducing the aerosol direct and indirect forcing uncertainty that persistently dominates climate and also affects air quality prediction uncertainty. The technical capabilities to achieve this are all currently available.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest relevant to this study.

Data Availability Statement

This paper represents a review and analysis of previously published work. As such, the underlying data are made available from the original sources through the cited literature.

Acknowledgments

R. Kahn thanks the AeroCom and AeroSat communities for discussions over years that helped refine many of the ideas presented in this paper, as well as the SAM-CAAM Science Definition Team for demonstrating that a notional payload of technologies available even in 2014 could meet the systematic aerosol in situ measurement requirements and fit within a relatively small aircraft. We also thank Yves Balkanski, Alan Brewer, Richard Ferrare, Bob Yokelson, and John Yorks for helpful notes related to their work, three anonymous reviewers whose notes helped us improve the paper, and Jay Friedlander for artistic support in producing Figure 1. AeroSat was initiated in the ESA Climate Change Initiative (CCI) project Aerosol_cci framework (ESA-ES-RIN Contract no. 4000101545/10/I-AM), which also provides some AeroSat coordination support. R. Kahn is supported in part by NASA's Climate and Radiation Research and Analysis Program under Hal Maring, NASA's Atmospheric Composition Modeling and Analysis Program under Richard Eckman, and the NASA EOS MISR and Terra projects. E. Andrews is supported by NOAA cooperative agreement NA22OAR4320151. The National Center for Atmospheric Research is supported by the National Science Foundation. A. Nenes acknowledges support by the project PyroTRACH (ERC-2016-COG) funded from H2020-EU.1.1.—Excellent Science—European Research Council (ERC), project ID 726165 and from the European Union project FORCES funded from Horizon H2020-EU.3.5.1 (project ID 821205). J.R. Pierce is supported by NASA Grant 80NSSC21K0429. P. Stier acknowledges support from the European Research Council (ERC) project RECAP under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme with grant agreement no. 724602, and the FORCES and NextGEMs project under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research programme with grant agreements 821205 and 101003470, respectively (https://research-and-innovation.ec.europa.eu/funding/funding-opportunities/funding-programmes-and-open-calls/horizon-2020_en).

References

- Ackerman, A. S., Kirkpatrick, M. P., Stevens, D. E., & Toon, O. B. (2004). The impact of humidity above stratiform clouds on indirect aerosol climate forcing. *Nature*, 432(7020), 1014–1017. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03174>
- Adebiyi, A. A., & Kok, J. F. (2020). Climate models miss most of the coarse dust in the atmosphere. *Science Advances*, 6(15), eaaz9507. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaz9507>
- Alvarado, M. J., Lonsdale, C. R., Macintyre, H. L., Bian, H., Chin, M., Ridley, D. A., et al. (2016). Evaluating model parameterizations of submicron aerosol scattering and absorption with in situ data from ARCTAS 2008. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16(14), 9435–9455. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-9435-2016>
- Anderson, T. L., Charlson, R. J., Winker, D. M., Ogren, J. A., & Holmen, K. (2003). Mesoscale variations of tropospheric aerosols. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 60(1), 119–135. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(2003\)060](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(2003)060)
- Andreae, M. O. (2009). Correlation between cloud condensation nuclei concentration and aerosol optical thickness in remote and polluted regions. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 9(2), 543–556. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-9-543-2009>
- Andreae, M. O. (2019). Emission of trace gases and aerosols from biomass burning—An updated assessment. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 19(13), 8523–8546. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-8523-2019>
- Andrews, E., Ogren, J. A., Kinne, S., & Samset, B. (2017). Comparison of AOD, AAOD and column single scattering albedo from AERONET retrievals and in situ profiling measurements. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17(9), 6041–6072. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-6041-2017>
- Andrews, E., Sheridan, P. J., & Ogren, J. A. (2011). Seasonal differences in the vertical profiles of aerosol optical properties over rural Oklahoma. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 11(20), 10661–10676. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-10661-2011>
- Andrews, E., Sheridan, P. J., Ogren, J. A., Hageman, D., Jefferson, A., Wendell, J., et al. (2019). Overview of the NOAA/ESRL federated aerosol network. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 100(1), 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-17-0175.1>
- Appel, K. W., Bhawe, P. V., Gilliland, A. B., Sarwar, G., & Roselle, S. J. (2008). Evaluation of the community multiscale air quality (CMAQ) model version 4.5: Sensitivities impacting model performance; Part II—Particulate matter. *Atmospheric Environment*, 42(24), 6057–6066. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.03.036>
- Balkanski, Y., Mona, L., Andrews, E., Bellouin, N., Carslaw, K., Chin, M., et al. (2021). AeroCom-AeroSat commission on constraining aerosol properties. In *AeroCom-AeroSat virtual meeting, 14 October 2021*.
- Bauer, S. E., Wright, D. L., Koch, D., Lewis, E. R., McGraw, R., Chang, L.-S., et al. (2008). MATRIX 534 (Multiconfiguration aerosol TRacker of mIXing state): An aerosol microphysical module for 535 global atmospheric models. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 8(20), 6003–6035. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-6003-2008>
- Behrenfeld, M. J., Moore, R. H., Hostetler, C. A., Graff, J., Gaube, P., Russell, L. M., et al. (2019). The North Atlantic aerosol and marine ecosystem study (NAAMES): Science Motive and mission overview. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 6, 122. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00122>
- Bellinger, C., Jabbar, M. S. M., Zaiane, O., & Osornio-Vargas, A. (2017). A systematic review of data mining and machine learning for air pollution epidemiology. *BMC Public Health*, 17(907), 907. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4914-3>
- Bellouin, N., Quaas, J., Gryspeerdt, E., Kinne, S., Stier, P., Watson-Parris, D., et al. (2020). Bounding global aerosol radiative forcing of climate change. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 58(1), e2019RG000660. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019RG000660>
- Benedetti, A., Morcrette, J.-J., Boucher, O., Dethof, A., Engelen, R. J., Fisher, M., et al. (2009). Aerosol analysis and forecast in the European centre for medium-range weather forecasts integrated forecast system: 2. Data assimilation. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 114(D13), D13205. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD011115>
- Bian, H., Chin, M., Hauglustaine, D. A., Schulz, M., Myhre, G., Bauer, S. E., et al. (2017). Investigation of global particulate nitrate from the AeroCom phase III experiment. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17(21), 12911–12940. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-12911-2017>
- Boucher, O., Randall, D., Artaxo, P., Bretherton, C., Feingold, G., Forster, P., et al. (2013). Clouds and aerosols. Climate change 2013: The physical science basis. In T. F. Stocker, D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S. K. Allen, J. Boschung, et al. (Eds.), *Contribution of working group I to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bougiatioti, A., Nenes, A., Lin, J. J., Brock, C. A., de Gouw, J., Liao, J., et al. (2020). Drivers of cloud droplet number variability in the summertime with focus on the Southeast United States. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20, 12163–12176. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-12163-2020>
- Bretherton, C. S., Blossey, P. N., & Uchida, J. (2007). Cloud droplet sedimentation, entrainment efficiency, and subtropical stratocumulus albedo. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34(3), L03813. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL027648>
- Bretherton, C. S., Wood, R., George, R. C., Leon, D., Allen, G., & Zhent, X. (2010). Southeast Pacific stratocumulus clouds, precipitation and boundary layer structure sampled along 20 S during VOCALS-Rex. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10(21), 10639–10654. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-10639-2010>
- Brock, C. A., Froyd, K. S., Dollner, M., Williamson, C. J., Schill, G., Murphy, D. M., et al. (2021). Ambient aerosol properties in the remote atmosphere from global-scale in situ measurements. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 21(19), 15023–15063. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-15023-2021>
- Buchard, V., Randles, C. A., Silva, A. M. D., Darmenov, A., Colarco, P. R., Govindaraju, R., et al. (2017). The MERRA-2 aerosol reanalysis, 1980 onward. Part II: Evaluation and case studies. *Journal of Climate*, 30(17), 6851–6872. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0613.1>
- Burgos, M. A., Andrews, E., Titos, G., Benedetti, A., Bian, H., Buchard, V., et al. (2020). A global model-measurement evaluation of particle light scattering coefficients at elevated relative humidity. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20(17), 10231–10258. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-10231-2020>
- Burton, S. P., Ferrare, R. A., Hostetler, C. A., Hair, J. W., Rogers, R. R., Obland, M. D., et al. (2012). Aerosol classification using airborne High Spectral Resolution Lidar measurements—Methodology and examples. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 5(1), 73–98. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-5-73-2012>
- Burton, S. P., Hair, J. W., Kahnert, M., Ferrare, R. A., Hostetler, C. A., Cook, A. L., et al. (2015). Observations of the spectral dependence of linear particle depolarization ratio of aerosols using NASA Langley airborne High Spectral Resolution Lidar. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15(23), 13453–13473. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-13453-2015>
- Cao, Y., Zhu, Y., Wang, M., Rosenfeld, D., Liang, Y., Liu, J., et al. (2023). Emission reductions significantly reduce the hemispheric contrast in cloud droplet number concentration in recent two decades. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 128(2), e2022JD037417. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022JD037417>
- Capelle, V., Chedin, A., Pondrom, M., Crevoisier, C., Armante, R., Crepeau, L., & Scott, N. (2018). Infrared dust aerosol optical depth retrieved daily from IASI and comparison with AERONET over the period 2007–2016. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 206, 15–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.12.008>

- Carr, J. L., Horváth, Á., Wu, D. L., & Friberg, M. D. (2022). Stereo plume height and motion retrievals for the record-setting Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai eruption of 15 January 2022. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49(9), e2022GL098131. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL098131>
- Carlslaw, K. S., Gordon, H., Hamilton, D. S., Johnson, J. S., Regayre, L. A., Yoshioka, M., & Pringle, K. J. (2017). Aerosols in the pre-industrial atmosphere. *Current Climate Change Reports*, 3, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-017-0061-2>
- Carlslaw, K. S., Lee, L. A., Reddington, C. L., Pringle, K. J., Rap, A., Forster, P. M., et al. (2013). Large contribution of natural aerosols to uncertainty in indirect forcing. *Nature*, 503(7474), 67–74. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12674>
- CCSP (U.S. Climate Change Science Program). (2009). Synthesis and assessment product 2.3. In M. Chin, R. A. Kahn, & S. Schwartz (Eds.), (Eds.), *Atmospheric aerosol properties and climate impacts* (p. 116).
- Chin, M., Ginoux, P., Kinne, S., Torres, O., Holben, B. N., Duncan, B. N., et al. (2002). Tropospheric aerosol optical thickness from the GOCART model and comparisons with satellite and sun photometer measurements. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 59(3), 461–483. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(2002\)059<0461:TOAOT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(2002)059<0461:TOAOT>2.0.CO;2)
- Christensen, M., Gettelman, A., Cermak, J., Dagan, G., Diamond, M., Douglas, A., et al. (2022). Opportunistic experiments to constrain aerosol radiative forcing. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 22(1), 641–674. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-641-2022>
- Colarco, P. R., Nowottnick, E. P., Randles, C. A., Yi, B., Yang, P., Kim, K.-M., et al. (2013). Impact of radiatively interactive dust aerosols in the NASA GEOS-5 climate model: Sensitivity to dust particle shape and refractive index. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119(2), 753–786. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JD020046>
- Crosbie, E., Ziemba, L. D., Shook, M. A., Robinson, C. E., Winstead, E. L., Thornhill, K. L., et al. (2022). Measurement report: Closure analysis of aerosol–cloud composition in tropical maritime warm convection. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 22(20), 13269–13302. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-13269-2022>
- Dadashazar, H., Wnag, Z., Crosbie, E., Brunke, M., Zeng, X., Jonsson, H., et al. (2017). Relationships between giant sea salt particles and clouds inferred from aircraft physicochemical data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122(6), 3421–3434. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD026019>
- Dagan, G., & Stier, P. (2020). Constraint on precipitation response to climate change by combination of atmospheric energy and water budgets. *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science*, 3(34), 34. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-020-00137-8>
- Das, S., Harshvardhan, H., Bian, H., Chin, M., Curci, G., Protonotariou, A. P., et al. (2017). Biomass burning aerosol transport and vertical distribution over the South African-Atlantic region. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122(12), 6391–6415. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD026421>
- Dawson, K. W., Ferrare, R. A., Moore, R. H., Clayton, M. D., Thorsen, T. J., & Eloranta, E. W. (2020). Ambient aerosol hygroscopic growth from combined Raman lidar and HSRL. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 125(7), e2019JD031708. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD031708>
- Dawson, K. W., Meskhidze, N., Burton, S. P., Johnson, M. S., Kacenelenbogen, M. S., Hostetler, C. A., & Hu, Y. (2017). Creating Aerosol Types from Chemistry (CATCH): A new algorithm to extend the link between remote sensing and models. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122(22), 12366–12392. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD026913>
- Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., et al. (2011). The ERA-interim reanalysis: Configuration and performance of the data assimilation system. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 137(656), 553–597. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.828>
- de Leeuw, G., Andreas, E. L., Anguelova, M. D., Fairall, C. W., Lewis, E. R., O'Dowd, C., et al. (2011). Production flux of sea spray aerosol. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 49(2), RG2001. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010RG000349>
- Denjean, C., Formenti, P., Desboeufs, K., Desboeufs, K., Chevaillier, S., Triquet, S., et al. (2016). Size distribution and optical properties of African mineral dust after intercontinental transport. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 121(12), 7117–7138. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD024783>
- Di Biagio, C., Formenti, P., Balkanski, Y., Caponi, L., Cazaunau, M., Pangui, E., et al. (2017). Global scale variability of the mineral dust long-wave refractive index: A new dataset of in situ measurements for climate modeling and remote sensing. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17(3), 1901–1929. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-1901-2017>
- Dubovik, O., Herman, M., Holdak, A., Lapyonok, T., Tanre, D., Deuze, J. L., et al. (2011). Statistically optimized inversion algorithm for enhanced retrieval of aerosol properties from spectral multi-angle polarimetric satellite observations. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 4(5), 975–1018. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-4-975-2011>
- Dubovik, O., Lapyonok, T., Kaufman, Y. J., Chin, M., Ginoux, P., Kahn, R. A., & Sinyuk, A. (2008). Retrieving global sources of aerosols from satellites using inverse modeling. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 8(2), 209–250. <https://doi.org/10.5194/ACP-8-209-2008>
- Ervens, B., Feingold, G., & Kreidenweis, S. M. (2005). The influence of water-soluble organic carbon on cloud drop number concentration. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 110(D18), D18211. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JD005634>
- Fanourgakis, G. S., Kanakidou, M., Nenes, A., Bauer, S. E., Bergman, T., Carlsaw, K. S., et al. (2019). Evaluation of global simulations of aerosol particle and cloud condensation nuclei number, with implications for cloud droplet formation. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 19(13), 8591–8617. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-8591-2019>
- Fast, J. D., Bell, D. M., Liu, J., Mei, F., Saliba, G., Shilling, J. E., et al. (2022). Using aircraft measurements to characterize subgrid-scale variability of aerosol properties near the ARM Southern Great Plains site. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 22(17), 11217–11238. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-11217-2022>
- Feingold, G. (2003). Modeling of the first indirect effect: Analysis of measurement requirements. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30(19), 1997. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL017967>
- Feingold, G., Cotton, W. R., Kreidenweis, S. M., & Davis, J. T. (1999). Impact of giant cloud condensation nuclei on drizzle formation in marine stratocumulus: Implications for cloud radiative properties. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 56(24), 4100–4117. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1999\)056<4100:TIOGCC>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1999)056<4100:TIOGCC>2.0.CO;2)
- Feingold, G., Eberhard, W. L., Veron, D. E., & Previdi, M. (2003). First measurements of the Twomey aerosol indirect effect using ground-based remote sensors. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30(6), 1287. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002GL016633>
- Feingold, G., Yang, S., Hardesty, R. M., & Cotton, W. R. (1998). Feasibility of retrieving cloud condensation nucleus properties from Doppler cloud radar, microwave radiometer, and lidar. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 15(5), 1188–1195. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0426\(1998\)015<1188:FCRCDR>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0426(1998)015<1188:FCRCDR>2.0.CO;2)
- Fiedler, S., Kinne, S., Huang, W. T. K., Räisänen, P., O'Donnell, D., Bellouin, N., et al. (2019). Anthropogenic aerosol forcing—Insights from multiple estimates from aerosol-climate models with reduced complexity. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 19(10), 6821–6841. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-6821-2019>
- Flower, V. J. B., & Kahn, R. A. (2020a). The evolution of Iceland volcano emissions, as observed from space. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 125(19), e2019JD031625. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD031625>

- Flower, V. J. B., & Kahn, R. A. (2020b). Interpreting the volcanological processes of Kamchatka, based on multi-sensor satellite observations. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 237, 111585. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2019.111585>
- Forster, P., Storelvmo, T., Armour, K., Collins, W., Dufresne, J.-L., Frame, D., et al. (2021). The Earth's energy budget, climate feedbacks, and climate sensitivity. In V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, et al. (Eds.), *Climate change 2021: The physical science basis. Contribution of working group I to the sixth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change* (pp. 923–1054). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.009>
- Foskinis, R., Nenes, A., Papayannis, A., Georgakaki, P., Kokkalis, P., Eleftheriadis, E., et al. (2022). Towards reliable retrievals of cloud droplet number for non-precipitating planetary boundary layer clouds and their susceptibility to aerosol. *Frontiers in Remote Sensing*, 3, 958207. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frsen.2022.958207>
- Fougnie, B., Chimot, J., Vazques-Navarro, M., Marbach, T., & Bojkov, B. (2020). Aerosol retrieval from space—How does geometry of acquisition impact our ability to characterize aerosol properties. *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, 256, 107304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2020.107304>
- Gasteiger, J., & Wiegner, M. (2018). MOPSMAP v1.0: A versatile tool for the modeling of aerosol optical properties. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11(7), 2739–2762. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-2739-2018>
- Gelaro, R., McCarty, W., Suárez, M. J., Todling, R., Molod, A., Takacs, L., et al. (2017). The modern-era retrospective analysis for research and applications, version 2 (MERRA-2). *Journal of Climate*, 30(14), 5419–5454. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0758.1>
- Georgakaki, P., Bougiatioti, A., Wiedner, J., Mignani, C., Ramelli, F., Kanji, Z. A., et al. (2021). On the drivers of droplet variability in Alpine mixed-phase clouds. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 21(14), 10993–11012. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-10993-2021>
- Gettelman, A., Geer, A. J., Forbes, R. M., Carmichael, G. R., Feingold, G., Posselt, D. J., et al. (2022). The future of Earth system prediction: Advances in model-data fusion. *Science Advances*, 8(14), eabn3488. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abn3488>
- Gettelman, A., Liu, X., Barahona, D., Lohmann, U., & Chen, C. C. (2012). Climate impacts of ice nucleation. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 117(D20), D20201. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JD017950>
- Gettelman, A., & Sherwood, S. C. (2016). Processes responsible for cloud feedback. *Current Climate Change Reports*, 2(4), 179–189. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-016-0052-8>
- Ghan, S., Guzman, G., & Abdul-Razzak, H. (1998). Competition between sea salt and sulfate particles as cloud condensation nuclei. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 55(22), 3340–3347. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1998\)055<3340:CBSSAS>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1998)055<3340:CBSSAS>2.0.CO;2)
- Glassmeier, F., Hoffmann, F., Johnson, J. S., Yamaguchi, T., Carslaw, K. S., & Feingold, G. (2021). Ship-track-based assessments overestimate the cloud-mediated cooling effect of anthropogenic aerosol. *Science*, 371(6528), 485–489. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abd3980>
- Gliß, J., Mortier, A., Schulz, M., Andrews, E., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S. E., et al. (2021). AeroCom phase III multi-model evaluation of the aerosol life cycle and optical properties using ground- and space-based remote sensing as well as surface in situ observations. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 21(1), 87–128. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-87-2021>
- Go, S., Kima, J., Mok, J., Irie, H., Yoon, J., Torres, O., et al. (2020). Ground-based retrievals of aerosol column absorption in the UV spectral region and their implications for GEMS measurements. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 245, 111759. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2020.111759>
- Gonzalez, M. E., Corral, A. F., Crosbie, E., Dadazhazar, H., Diskin, G. S., Edwards, E. L., et al. (2022). Relationships between supermicrometer particle concentrations and cloud water sea salt and dust concentrations: Analysis of MONARC and ACTIVATE data. *Environmental Science: Atmospheres*, 2(4), 738–752. <https://doi.org/10.1039/d2ea00049k>
- Gordon, T. D., Wagner, N. L., Richardson, M. S., Law, D. C., Wolfe, D., Eloranta, E. W., et al. (2015). Design of a novel open-path aerosol extinction cavity ringdown spectrometer. *Aerosol Science & Technology*, 49(9), 717–726. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02786826.2015.1066753>
- Griffin, D., Sioris, C., Chen, J., Dickson, N., Kovachik, A., de Graaf, M., et al. (2020). The 2018 fire season in North America as seen by TROPOMI: Aerosol layer height validation and evaluation of model-derived plume heights. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 13(3), 1427–1445. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-13-1427-2020>
- Grosvenor, D. P., Sourdeval, O., Zuidema, P., Ackerman, A., Alexandrov, M. D., Bennartz, R., et al. (2018). Remote sensing of droplet number concentration in warm clouds: A review of the current state of knowledge and perspectives. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 56(2), 409–453. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2017RG000593>
- Gryspeerdt, E., Goren, T., & Smith, T. W. P. (2021). Observing the timescales of aerosol–cloud interactions in snapshot satellite images. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 21(8), 6093–6109. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-6093-2021>
- Gryspeerdt, E., Goren, T., Sourdeval, O., Quaas, J., Mülmenstädt, J., Dipu, S., et al. (2019). Constraining the aerosol influence on cloud liquid water path. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 19(8), 5331–5347. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-5331-2019>
- Guimond, S. R., Tian, L., Heymsfield, G. M., & Fraiser, S. J. (2014). Wind retrieval algorithms for the IWRAP and HIWRAP airborne Doppler radars with applications to hurricanes. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 31(6), 1189–1214. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-13-00140.1>
- Gupta, P., Levy, R. C., Mattoo, S., Remer, L. A., Holz, R. E., & Heidinger, A. K. (2019). Applying the dark target aerosol algorithm with advanced Himawari imager observations during the KORUS-AQ field campaign. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 12, 6557–6577. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-12-6557-2019>
- Hamilton, D. S., Hantson, S., Scott, C. E., Kaplan, J. O., Pringle, K. J., Nieradzik, L. P., et al. (2018). Reassessment of pre-industrial fire emissions strongly affects anthropogenic aerosol forcing. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 3182. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05592-9>
- Hammer, M. S., van Donkelaar, A., Martin, R. V., Li, C., Lyapustin, A., Sayer, A. M., et al. (2019). Improved global estimates of fine particulate matter concentrations and trends derived from updated satellite retrievals, modeling advances, and additional ground-based monitors. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 54, 7879–7890. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c01764>
- Hasekamp, O. P., Litvinov, P., & Butz, A. (2011). Aerosol properties over the ocean from PARASOL multiangle photopolarimetric measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 116(D14), D14204. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JD015469>
- Haywood, J. M., Ramaswamy, V., & Donner, L. J. (1997). A limited-area-model case study of the effects of sub-grid scale variations in relative humidity and cloud upon the direct radiative forcing of sulfate aerosol. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 24(2), 143–146. <https://doi.org/10.1029/96GL03812>
- Held, I. M., & Soden, B. J. (2006). Robust responses of the hydrological cycle to global warming. *Journal of Climate*, 19(21), 5686–5698. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI3990.1>
- Hélière, A., Gelsthorpe, R., Le Hors, L., & Toulemont, Y. (2012). ATLID, the atmospheric lidar on board the Earthcare Satellite. *Proceedings of SPIE*, 10584, 105842D. <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2309095>
- Hess, M., Koepke, P., & Schulz, I. (1998). Optical properties of aerosols and clouds: The software package OPAC. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 79(5), 831–844. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(1998\)079](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1998)079)

- Hoesly, R. M., Smith, S. J., Feng, L., Klimont, Z., Janssens-Maenhout, G., Bolt, R. M., et al. (2018). Historical (1750–2014) anthropogenic emissions of reactive gases and aerosols from the Community Emissions Data System (CEDS). *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11(1), 369–408. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-369-2018>
- Holben, B. N., Eck, T. F., Slutsker, I., Tanré, D., Buis, J. P., Setzer, A., et al. (1998). AERONET—A federated instrument network and data archive for aerosol characterization. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 66, 1–16. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257\(98\)00031-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257(98)00031-5)
- Holzer-Popp, T., de Leeuw, G., Griesfeller, J., Martynenko, D., Kluser, L., Bevan, S., et al. (2013). Aerosol retrieval experiments in the ESA Aerosol cci project. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 6(8), 1919–1957. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-6-1919-2013>
- Huneeus, N., Schulz, M., Balkanski, Y., Griesfeller, J., Prospero, J. A., Kinne, S., et al. (2011). Global dust model intercomparison in AeroCom Phase I. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 11(15), 7781–7816. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-7781-2011>
- Iacono, M. J., Delamere, J. S., Mlawer, E. J., Shephard, M. W., Clough, S. A., & Collins, W. D. (2008). Radiative forcing by long-lived greenhouse gases: Calculations with the AER radiative transfer models. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 113(D13), D13103. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD009944>
- Ichoku, C., & Ellison, L. (2014). Global top-down smoke-aerosol emissions estimation using satellite fire radiative power measurements. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 14(13), 6643–6667. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-6643-2014>
- IPCC. (2013). Summary for policymakers. In T. F. Stocker, D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S. K. Allen, et al. (Eds.), *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 University Press.
- Jenkins, S., Povey, A., Gettelman, A., Grainger, R., Stier, P., & Allen, M. (2022). Is anthropogenic global warming accelerating? *Journal of Climate*, 35(24), 4273–4290. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-22-0081.1>
- Jeong, M.-J., & Hsu, N. C. (2008). Retrievals of aerosol single-scattering albedo and effective aerosol layer height for biomass-burning smoke: Synergy derived from “A-Train” sensors. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35(24), L24801. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL036279>
- Jiang, H., & Feingold, G. (2006). Effect of aerosol on warm convective clouds: Aerosol-cloud surface flux feedbacks in a new coupled large eddy model. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 111(D1), D01202. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JD006138>
- Jung, E., Albrecht, B. A., Jonsson, H. H., Chen, Y.-C., Seinfeld, J. H., Sorooshian, A., et al. (2015). Precipitation effects of giant cloud condensation nuclei artificially introduced into stratocumulus clouds. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15(10), 5645–5658. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-5645-2015>
- Junghenn Noyes, K. T., Kahn, R. A., Limbacher, J. A., & Li, Z. (2022). Canadian and Alaskan wildfire smoke particle properties, their evolution, and controlling factors, using satellite observations. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 22(15), 10267–10290. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-10267-2022>
- Junghenn Noyes, K. T., Kahn, R. A., Sedlacek, A., Kleinman, L., Limbacher, J., & Li, Z. (2020). Wildfire smoke particle properties and evolution, from space-based multi-angle imaging. *Remote Sensing*, 12(5), 769. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12050769>
- Kacarab, M., Thornhill, K. L., Dobracki, A., Howell, S. G., O'Brien, J. R., Freitag, S., et al. (2020). Biomass burning aerosol as a modulator of droplet number in the southeast Atlantic region. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20(5), 3029–3040. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-3029-2020>
- Kahn, R. A. (2012). Reducing the uncertainties in direct aerosol radiative forcing. *Surveys in Geophysics*, 33(3–4), 701–721. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10712-011-9153-z>
- Kahn, R. A., Berkoff, T., Brock, C., Chen, G., Ferrare, R., Ghan, S., et al. (2017). SAM-CAAM: A concept for acquiring systematic aircraft measurements to characterize aerosol air masses. *Bulletin American Meteorology Society*, 98(10), 2215–2228. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-16-0003.1>
- Kahn, R. A., Chen, Y., Nelson, D. L., Leung, F.-Y., Li, Q., Diner, D. J., & Logan, J. A. (2008). Wildfire smoke injection heights—Two perspectives from space. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35(4), L04809. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GL032165>
- Kahn, R. A., & Gaitley, B. J. (2015). An analysis of global aerosol type as retrieved by MISR. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 120(9), 4248–4281. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023322>
- Kahn, R. A., Ogren, J. A., Ackerman, T. P., Bosenberg, J., Charlson, R. J., Diner, D. J., et al. (2004). Aerosol data sources and their roles within PARAGON. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 85(10), 1511–1522. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-85-10-1511>
- Kahn, R. A., & Samset, B. H. (2022). Ch. 10, Remote sensing measurements of aerosol properties. In K. S. Carslaw (Ed.), *Aerosols and climate* (p. 823). Elsevier Publications ISBN: 978-0-12-819766-0.
- Kalashnikova, O. V., Garay, M. J., Martonchik, J. V., & Diner, D. J. (2013). MISR dark water aerosol retrievals: Operational algorithm sensitivity to particle non-sphericity. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 6(8), 2131–2154. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-6-2131-2013>
- Kapustin, V. N., Clarke, A. D., Shinozuka, Y., Howell, S., Brekhovskikh, V., Nakajima, T., & Higurashi, A. (2006). On the determination of a cloud condensation nuclei from satellite: Challenges and possibilities. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 111(D4), D04202. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JD005527>
- Kim, D., Chin, M., Yu, H., Diehl, T., Tan, Q., Kahn, R. A., et al. (2014). Sources, sinks, and transatlantic transport of North African dust aerosol: A multi-model analysis and comparison with remote sensing data. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 119(10), 6259–6277. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JD021099>
- Kim, D., Chin, M., Yu, H., Pan, X., Bian, H., Tan, Q., et al. (2019). Asia and trans-Pacific dust: A multi-model and multi-remote sensing observation analysis. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 124(23), 13534–13559. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD030822>
- Kim, M.-H., Omar, A. H., Tackett, J. L., Vaughan, M. A., Winker, D. M., Trepte, C. R., et al. (2018). The CALIPSO version 4 automated aerosol classification and lidar ratio selection algorithm. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 11, 6107–6135. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-11-6107-2018>
- Kinne, S., Lohmann, U., Feichter, J., Timmreck, C., Schulz, M., Ghan, S., et al. (2003). Monthly averages of aerosol properties: A global comparison among models, satellite data and AERONET ground data. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 108(D20), 4634. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JD001253>
- Kinne, S., Schulz, M., Textor, C., Guibert, S., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S. E., et al. (2006). An AeroCom initial assessment—Optical properties in aerosol component modules of global models. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 6(7), 1815–1834. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-6-1815-2006>
- Kleinman, L. I., Sedlacek, A. J., III, Adachi, K., Buseck, P. R., Collier, S., Dubey, M. K., et al. (2020). Rapid evolution of aerosol particles and their optical properties downwind of wildfires in the western US. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20(21), 13319–13341. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-13319-2020>
- Koch, D., Schulz, M., Kinne, S., McNaughton, C., Spackman, J. R., Balkanski, Y., et al. (2009). Evaluation of black carbon estimations in global aerosol models. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 9(22), 9001–9026. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-9-9001-2009>

- Kokkola, H. T., Kühn, A., Laakso, T., Bergman, K. E. J., Lehtinen, T., Mielonen, A., et al. (2018). SALSA2.0: The sectional aerosol module of the aerosol–chemistry–climate model ECHAM6.3.0-HAM2.3-MOZ1.0. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11(9), 3833–3863. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-3833-2018>
- Koren, I., Kaufman, Y. J., Remer, L. A., & Martins, J. V. (2004). Measurement of the effect of Amazon smoke on inhibition of cloud formation. *Science*, 303(5662), 1342–1345. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1089424>
- Koren, I., Kaufman, Y. J., Rosenfeld, D., Remer, L. A., & Rudich, Y. (2005). Aerosol invigoration and restructuring of Atlantic convective clouds. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32(14), L14828. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL023187>
- Koren, I., Remer, L. A., Kaufman, Y. J., Rudich, Y., & Martins, J. V. (2007). On the twilight zone between clouds and aerosols. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34(8), L08805. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GL029253>
- Kylling, A., Vandenbussche, S., Capelle, V., Cuesta, J., Klüser, L., Lelli, L., et al. (2018). Comparison of dust layer heights from active and passive satellite sensors. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 11(5), 2911–2936. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-11-2911-2018>
- Laj, P., Bigi, A., Rose, C., Andrews, E., Myhre, C. L., Coen, M. C., et al. (2020). A global analysis of climate-relevant aerosol properties retrieved from the network of Global Atmosphere Watch (GAW) near-surface observatories. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 13(8), 4353–4392. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-13-4353-2020>
- Lau, K. M., Ramanathan, V., Wu, G.-X., Li, Z., Tsay, S. C., Hsu, C. N., et al. (2008). The joint aerosol-monsoon experiment: A new challenge for monsoon climate research. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 89(3), 369–383. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-89-3-369>
- Lee, C. M., Cable, M. L., Hook, S. J., Green, R. O., Ustin, S. L., Mandl, D. J., & Middleton, E. M. (2015). An introduction to the NASA Hyper-spectral InfraRed Imager (HyspIRI) mission and preparatory activities. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 167, 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.06.012>
- Lee, J.-Y., Marotzke, J., Bala, G., Cao, L., Corti, S., Dunne, J. P., et al. (2021). Future global climate: Scenario-based projections and near-term information. In V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, et al. (Eds.), *Climate change 2021: The physical science basis. Contribution of working group I to the sixth assessment report of the intergovernmental Panel on climate change* (pp. 553–672). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.006>
- Lee, S. S., Feingold, G., McComiskey, A., Yamaguchi, T., Koren, I., Martins, J. V., & Yu, H. (2014). Effect of gradients in biomass burning aerosol on shallow cumulus convective circulations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119(16), 9948–9964. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD021819>
- Levy, R. C., Remer, L. A., & Dubovik, O. (2007). Global aerosol optical properties and application to Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer aerosol retrieval over land. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 112(D13), D13210. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JD007815>
- Li, J., Carlson, B. E., Yung, Y. L., Lv, D., Hansen, J. E., Penner, J. E., et al. (2022). Scattering and absorbing aerosols in the climate system. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 3(6), 363–379. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-022-00296-7>
- Li, J., Kahn, R. A., Wei, J., Carlson, B. E., Lacis, A. A., Li, Z., et al. (2020). Synergy of satellite- and ground-based aerosol optical depth measurements using an ensemble Kalman filter approach. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 125(5), e2019JD031884. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD031884>
- Li, S., Kahn, R. A., Chin, M., Garay, M. J., & Liu, Y. (2015). Improving satellite-retrieved aerosol microphysical properties using GOCART data. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 8(3), 1157–1171. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-8-1157-2015>
- Lim, H., Choi, M., Kim, J., Kasai, Y., & Chan, P. W. (2018). AHI/Himawari-8 Yonsei aerosol retrieval (YAER): Algorithm, validation and merged products. *Remote Sensing*, 10(5), 699. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10050699>
- Liu, X., Penner, J. E., Ghan, S. J., & Wang, M. (2007). Inclusion of ice microphysics in the NCAR community atmospheric model version 3 (CAM3). *Journal of Climate*, 20(18), 4526–4547. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli4264.1>
- Loeb, N. G., & Su, W. (2010). Direct aerosol radiative forcing uncertainty based on a radiative perturbation analysis. *Journal of Climate*, 23(19), 5288–5293. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JCLI3543.1>
- Lu, Z., Wang, J., Xu, X., Chen, X., Kondragunta, S., Torres, O., et al. (2021). Hourly mapping of the layer height of thick smoke plumes over the western U.S. in 2020 severe fire season. *Frontiers in Remote Sensing*, 2, 766628. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frsen.2021.766628>
- Lyapustin, A., Go, S., Korkin, S., Wang, Y., Torres, O., Jethva, H., & Marshak, A. (2021). Retrievals of aerosol optical depth and spectral absorption from DSCOVR EPIC. *Frontiers in Remote Sensing*, 2, 645794. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frsen.2021.645794>
- Lyapustin, A., Wang, Y., Korkin, S., Kahn, R. A., & Winker, D. (2020). MAIAC thermal technique for smoke injection height from MODIS. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, 17(5), 730–734. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LGRS.2019.2936332>
- Malm, W. C., & Hand, J. L. (2007). An examination of the physical and optical properties of aerosols collected in the IMPROVE program. *Atmospheric Environment*, 41(16), 3407–3427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2006.12.012>
- Mann, G. W., Carslaw, K. S., Spracklen, D. V., Ridley, D. A., Manktelow, P. T., Chipperfield, M. P., et al. (2010). Description and evaluation of GLOMAP-mode: A modal global aerosol microphysics model for the UKCA composition-climate model. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 3(2), 519–551. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-3-519-2010>
- Marinescu, P. J., van den Heever, S. C., Heikenfeld, M., Barrett, A. I., Barthlott, C., Hoose, C., et al. (2021). Impacts of varying concentrations of cloud condensation nuclei on deep convective cloud updrafts—A multimodel assessment. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 78(4), 1147–1172. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-20-0200.1>
- Marshak, A., Ackerman, A., Da Silva, A., Eck, T., Holben, B. N., Kahn, R. A., et al. (2021). Aerosol properties in cloudy environments from remote sensing observations: Review of current state of knowledge. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 102(11), E2177–E2197. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-20-0225.1>
- Marshak, A., Herman, J., Szabo, A., Blank, K., Carn, S., Cede, A., et al. (2018). Earth observations from DSCOVR/EPIC instrument. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 9, 1829–1850. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-17-0223.1>
- Martin, S. T., Artaxo, P., Machado, L., Manzi, A. O., Souza, R. R. F., Wang, J., et al. (2017). The Green Ocean AMAZON experiment (GOAM-AZON 2014/2015) observes pollution affecting gases, aerosols, clouds, and rainfall of the rain forest. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 98(5), 981–997. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00221.1>
- Martins, J. V. (2016). *Airborne open polar/imaging nephelometer for ice particles in cirrus clouds and aerosols field campaign report*. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, ARM Climate Research Facility. DOE/SC-ARM-15-063.
- Mather, J. H., & Voyles, J. W. (2013). The ARM climate research facility: A review of structure and capabilities. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 94(3), 377–392. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00218.1>
- McComiskey, A., Schwartz, S. E., Schmid, B., Guan, H., Lewis, E. R., Ricchiuzzi, P., & Ogren, J. A. (2008). Direct aerosol forcing: Calculation from observables and sensitivities to inputs. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 113(D9), D09202. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009170>
- McCoy, D. T., Tan, I., Hartmann, D. L., Zelinka, M. D., & Storelvmo, T. (2016). On the relationships among cloud cover, mixed-phase partitioning, and planetary albedo in GCMs. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 8(2), 650–668. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015MS000589>

- McFiggans, G., Artaxo, P., Baltensperger, U., Coe, H., Facchini, M. C., Feingold, G., et al. (2006). The effect of physical and chemical aerosol properties on warm cloud droplet activation. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 6(9), 2593–2649. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-6-2593-2006>
- McNeill, J., Snyder, G., Weagle, C. L., Walsh, B., Bissonnette, P., Stone, E., et al. (2020). Large global variations in measured airborne metal concentrations driven by anthropogenic sources. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 21817. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-78789-y>
- Mechoso, C. R., Wood, R., Weller, R., Bretherton, C. S., Clarke, A. D., Coe, H., et al. (2014). Ocean-cloud-atmosphere-land interactions in the southeastern Pacific: The VOCALS program. *Bulletin American Meteorology Society*, 95(3), 357–375. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00246.1>
- Menon, S., Hansen, J., Nazarenko, L., & Luo, Y. (2002). Climate effects of black carbon aerosols in China and India. *Science*, 297(5590), 2250–2253. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1075159>
- Meyer, K., Platnick, S., & Zhang, Z. (2015). Simultaneously inferring above-cloud absorbing aerosol optical thickness and underlying liquid phase cloud optical and microphysical properties using MODIS. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 120(11), 5524–5547. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023128>
- Mishchenko, M. I., & Travis, L. D. (1997). Satellite retrieval of aerosol properties over the ocean using polarization as well as intensity of reflected sunlight. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 102(D14), 16989–17013. <https://doi.org/10.1029/96JD02425>
- Morales Betancourt, R., & Nenes, A. (2014). Understanding the contributions of aerosol properties and parameterization discrepancies to droplet number variability in a global climate model. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 14(9), 4809–4826. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-4809-2014>
- Mortier, A., Gliss, J., Schulz, M., Aas, W., Andrews, E., Bian, H., et al. (2020). Evaluation of climate model aerosol trends with ground-based observations over the last two decades—An AeroCom and CMIP6 analysis. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20(21), 13355–13378. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-13355-2020>
- Müllerstädt, J., & Feingold, G. (2018). The radiative forcing of aerosol-cloud interactions in liquid clouds: Wrestling and embracing uncertainty. *Current Climate Change Reports*, 4(1), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-018-0089-y>
- Myhre, G., Samset, B. H., Schulz, M., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., Bernsten, T. K., et al. (2013). Radiative forcing of the direct aerosol effect from AeroCom Phase II simulations. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13(4), 1853–1877. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-1853-2013>
- Nakajima, T., Higurashi, A., Kawamoto, K., & Penner, J. E. (2001). A possible correlation between satellite-derived cloud and aerosol microphysical parameters. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 28(7), 1171–1174. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000GL012186>
- Nazarenko, L., Rind, D., Tsigaridis, K., Del Genio, A. D., Kelley, M., & Tausnev, N. (2017). Interactive nature of climate change and aerosol forcing. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122(6), 3457–3480. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD025809>
- Nelson, D. L., Garay, M. J., Kahn, R. A., & Dunst, B. A. (2013). Stereoscopic height and wind retrievals for aerosol plumes with the MISR Interactive Explorer (MINX). *Remote Sensing*, 5(9), 4593–4628. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs5094593>
- Nguyen, H. N., Gudmundsson, A., & Martinsson, B. G. (2006). Design and calibration of a multi-channel aerosol sampler for tropopause region studies from the CARIBIC platform. *Aerosol Science & Technology*, 40(8), 649–655. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02786820600676807>
- Nicolae, D., Vasilescu, J., Talianu, C., Biniotoglou, I., Nicolae, V., Andrei, S., & Antonescu, B. (2018). A neural network aerosol-typing algorithm based on lidar data. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 18(19), 14511–14537. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-14511-2018>
- O’Gorman, P. A., Allan, R. P., Byrne, M. P., & Previdi, M. (2012). Energetic constraints on precipitation under climate change. *Surveys in Geophysics*, 33(3–4), 585–608. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10712-011-9159-6>
- Pahlow, M., Feingold, G., Jefferson, A., Andrews, E., Ogren, J. A., Wang, J., et al. (2006). Comparison between lidar and nephelometer measurements of aerosol hygroscopicity at the Southern Great Plains atmospheric radiation measurement site. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 111(D5), D05S15. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JD005646>
- Pan, X., Chin, M., Gautam, R., Bian, H., Kim, D., Colarco, P. R., et al. (2015). A multi-model evaluation of aerosols over South Asia: Common problems and possible causes. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15(10), 5903–5928. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-5903-2015>
- Papagiannopoulos, N., Mona, L., Amodeo, A., D’Amico, G., Gumà Claramunt, P., Pappalardo, G., et al. (2018). An automatic observation-based aerosol typing method for EARLINET. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 18(21), 15879–15901. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-15879-2018>
- Pappalardo, G., Amodeo, A., Apituley, A., Comeron, A., Freudenthaler, V., Linn, H., et al. (2014). EARLINET: Towards an advanced sustainable European aerosol lidar network. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 7(8), 2389–2409. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-7-2389-2014>
- Persad, G. G., Samset, B. H., Laura, J., & Wilcox, L. J. (2022). Aerosols must be included in climate risk assessments. *Nature*, 611(24), 662–664. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-03763-9>
- Petrenko, M., Kahn, R. A., Chin, M., & Limbacher, J. A. (2017). Refined use of satellite aerosol optical depth snapshots to constrain biomass burning emissions in the GOCART model. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 122(20), 10983–11004. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD026693>
- Pu, B., Ginoux, P., Guo, H., Hsu, C., Kimball, J., Marticorena, B., et al. (2020). Retrieving the global distribution of the threshold of wind erosion from satellite data and implementing it into the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory land-atmosphere model (GFDL AM4.0/LM4.0). *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20(1), 55–81. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-55-2020>
- Quaas, J., Arola, A., Cairns, B., Christensen, M., Deneke, H., Ekman, A. M. L., et al. (2020). Constraining the Twomey effect from satellite observations: Issues and perspectives. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20(23), 15079–15099. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-15079-2020>
- Quaas, J., Hailing, J., Smith, C., Albright, A. L., Aas, W., Bellouin, N., et al. (2022). Robust evidence for reversal of the trend in aerosol effective climate forcing. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 22(18), 12221–12239. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-12221-2022>
- Ramaswamy, V., Boucher, O., Haigh, J., Hauglustaine, D., Haywood, J., Myhre, G., et al. (2001). Ch. 6. Radiative forcing of climate change. In J. T. Houghton (Ed.), *Climate change 2001: The scientific basis* (pp. 349–416). Cambridge University Press.
- Randerson, J. T., Chen, Y., van der Werf, G. R., & Morton, D. C. (2012). Global burned area and biomass burning emissions from small fires. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 117, G04012. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JG002128>
- Randles, C. A., da Silva, A. M., Buchard, V., Colarco, P. R., Darmenov, A., Govindaraju, R., et al. (2017). The MERRA-2 aerosol reanalysis, 1980–onward. Part I: System description and data assimilation evaluation. *Journal of Climate*, 30(17), 6823–6850. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli-d-16-0609.s1>
- Reddington, C. L., Carslaw, K. S., Stier, P., Schutgens, N., Coe, H., Liu, D., et al. (2017). The global aerosol synthesis and science project (GASSP). *Bulletin American Meteorology Society*, 98(9), 1857–1877. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00317.1>
- Redemann, J., Wood, R., Zuidema, P., Doherty, S. J., Luna, B., LeBlanc, S. E., et al. (2021). An overview of the ORACLES (Observations of aerosols above Clouds and their interactionS) project: Aerosol–cloud–radiation interactions in the southeast Atlantic basin. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 21(3), 1507–1563. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-1507-2021>
- Reid, J. S., Hyer, E. J., Prins, E. M., Westphal, D. L., Zhang, J., Wang, J., et al. (2009). Global monitoring and forecasting of biomass-burning smoke: Description of and lessons from the fire locating and modeling of burning emissions (FLAMBE) program. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 2(3), 144–162. <https://doi.org/10.1109/jstars.2009.2027443>

- Reid, J. S., Koppmann, R., Eck, T. F., & Eleuterio, D. P. (2005). A review of biomass burning emissions part II: Intensive physical properties of biomass burning particles. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 5(3), 799–825. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-5-799-2005>
- Reid, J. S., Reid, E. A., Walker, A., Piketh, S., Cliff, S., Al Mandoos, A., et al. (2008). Dynamics of southwest Asian dust particle size characteristics with implications for global dust research. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 113(D14), D14212. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009752>
- Remer, L. A., Kaufman, Y. J., Tanre, D., Mattoo, S., Chu, D. A., Martins, J. V., et al. (2005). The MODIS aerosol algorithm, products, and validation. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 62(4), 947–973. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS3385.1>
- Reutter, P., Su, H., Trentmann, J., Simmel, M., Rose, D., Gunthe, S. S., et al. (2009). Aerosol- and updraft-limited regimes of cloud droplet formation: Influence of particle number, size and hygroscopicity on the activation of cloud condensation nuclei (CCN). *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 9(18), 7067–7080. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-9-7067-2009>
- Rissman, T., Nenes, A., & Seinfeld, J. H. (2004). Chemical amplification (or dampening) of the Twomey effect: Conditions derived from droplet activation theory. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 61(8), 919–930. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(2004\)061<0919:CAODOT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(2004)061<0919:CAODOT>2.0.CO;2)
- Rose, C., Coen, M. C., Andrews, E., Lin, Y., Bossert, I., Myhre, C. L., et al. (2021). Seasonality of the particle number concentration and size distribution: A global analysis retrieved from the network of global atmosphere Watch (GAW) near-surface observatories. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 21(22), 17185–17223. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-17185-2021>
- Rosenfeld, D., Andreae, M. O., Asmi, A., Mian Chin, M., de Leeuw, G., Donovan, D. P., et al. (2014). Global observations of aerosol-cloud-precipitation-climate. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 52(4), 750–808. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013RG000441>
- Rosenfeld, D., Zheng, Y., Hashimshoni, E., Pöhlker, M. L., Jefferson, A., Pöhlker, C., et al. (2016). Satellite retrieval of cloud condensation nuclei concentrations by using clouds as CCN chambers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(21), 5828–5834. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514044113>
- Rubin, J. I., Reid, J. S., Hansen, J. A., Anderson, J. L., Holben, B. N., Xian, P., et al. (2017). Assimilation of AERONET and MODIS AOT observations using variational and ensemble data assimilation methods and its impact on aerosol forecasting skill. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122(9), 4967–4992. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD026067>
- Russell, P. B., Kacenelenbogen, M., Livingston, J. M., Hasekamp, O. P., Burton, S. P., Schuster, G. L., et al. (2014). A multiparameter aerosol classification method and its application to retrievals from spaceborne polarimetry. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119(16), 9838–9863. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JD021411>
- Samset, B. H., Myhre, G., & Schulz, M. (2014). Upward adjustment needed for aerosol radiative forcing uncertainty. *Nature Climate Change*, 4, 230–232. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2170>
- Samset, B. H., Myhre, G., Schulz, M., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., Bernsten, T. K., et al. (2013). Black carbon vertical profiles strongly affect its radiative forcing uncertainty. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13(5), 2423–2434. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-2423-2013>
- Sand, M., Samset, B. H., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., Bellouin, N., Bernsten, T. K., et al. (2017). Aerosols at the poles: An AeroCom phase II multi-model evaluation. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17(19), 12197–12218. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-12197-2017>
- Sayer, A. M., Govaerts, Y., Kolmonen, P., Lipponen, A., Luffarelli, M., Mielonen, T., et al. (2020). A review and framework for the evaluation of pixel-level uncertainty estimates in satellite aerosol remote sensing. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 13(2), 373–404. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-13-373-2020>
- Sayer, A. M., Hsu, N. C., Lee, J., Kim, W. V., Burton, S., Fenn, M. A., et al. (2019). Two decades observing smoke above clouds in the south-eastern Atlantic Ocean: Deep Blue algorithm updates and validation with ORACLES field campaign data. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 12(7), 3595–3627. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-12-3595-2019>
- Schill, G. P., Froyd, K. D., Bian, H., Kupe, A., Williamson, C., Brock, C. A., et al. (2020). Widespread biomass burning smoke throughout the remote troposphere. *Nature Geoscience*, 13(6), 422–427. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-020-0586-1>
- Schroeder, P., Brewer, W. A., Choukulkar, A., Weickmann, A., Zucker, M., Holloway, M. W., & Sandberg, S. (2020). A compact, flexible, and robust micropulsed Doppler lidar. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 37(8), 1387–1402. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-19-0142.1>
- Schulz, M., Textor, C., Kinne, S., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., Bernsten, T., et al. (2006). Radiative forcing by aerosols as derived from the AeroCom present-day and pre-industrial simulations. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 6(12), 5225–5246. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-6-5225-2006>
- Schuster, G. L., & Trepte, C. (2021). Models, in situ, and remote sensing of aerosols (MIRA). Retrieved from https://science.larc.nasa.gov/wpcontent/uploads/sites/147/2021/11/MIRA_newsletter_20211027.pdf
- Schutgens, N., Dubovik, O., Hasekamp, O., Torres, O., Jethva, H., Leonard, P. J. T., et al. (2021). AEROCOM and AEROSAT AOD and SSA study—Part 1: Evaluation and intercomparison of satellite measurements. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 21(9), 6895–6917. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-6895-2021>
- Schutgens, N., Sayer, A. M., Heckel, A., Hsu, N. C., Jethva, H., de Leeuw, G., et al. (2020). An AeroCom–AeroSat study: Intercomparison of satellite AOD datasets for aerosol model evaluation. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20(21), 12431–12457. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-12431-2020>
- Schutgens, N., Tsyro, S., Gruspeerd, E., Goto, D., Weigum, N., Schultz, M., & Stier, P. (2017). On the spatio-temporal representativeness of observations. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17(16), 9761–8780. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-9761-2017>
- Seidel, F., & Popp, C. (2012). Critical surface albedo and its implications to aerosol remote sensing. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 5(7), 1653–1665. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-5-1653-2012>
- Seinfeld, J. H., Bretherton, C. S., Carslaw, K. S., Coe, H., DeMott, P. J., Dunlea, E. J., et al. (2016). Improving our fundamental understanding of the role of aerosol-cloud interactions in the climate system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(21), 5781–5790. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514043113>
- Sekiya, T. T., Tanaka, T. Y., Shimizu, A., & Miyoshi, T. (2010). Data assimilation of CALIPSO aerosol observations. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10(1), 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-39-2010>
- Shen, Y., Virkkula, A., Ding, A., Luoma, K., Keskinen, H., Aalto, P. P., et al. (2019). Estimating cloud condensation nuclei number concentrations using aerosol optical properties: Role of particle number size distribution and parameterization. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 19(24), 15483–15502. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-15483-2019>
- Sheridan, J. P., Andrews, E., Ogren, J. A., Tackett, J. L., & Winker, D. M. (2012). Vertical profiles of aerosol optical properties over Central Illinois and comparison with surface and satellite measurements. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 12(23), 11695–11721. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-11695-2012>
- Shindell, D. T., Lamarque, J.-F., Schulz, M., Flanner, M., Jiao, C., Chin, M., et al. (2013). Radiative forcing in the ACCMIP historical and future climate simulations. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13(6), 2939–2974. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-2939-2013>
- Shinozuka, Y., Clarke, A. D., Nenes, A., Jefferson, A., Wood, R., McNaughton, C. S., et al. (2015). The relationship between cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) concentration and light extinction of dried particles: Indications of underlying aerosol processes and implications for satellite-based CCN estimates. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15(13), 7585–7604. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-7585-2015>

- Smirnov, A., Holben, B. N., Giles, D. M., Slutsker, I., O'Neill, N. T., Eck, T. F., et al. (2011). Maritime aerosol network as a component of AERONET—First results and comparison with global aerosol models and satellite retrievals. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 4(3), 583–597. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-4-583-2011>
- Snider, G., Weagle, C. L., Martin, R. V., van Donkelaar, A., Conrad, K., Zwicker, M., et al. (2015). SPARTAN: A global network to evaluate and enhance satellite-based estimates of ground-level aerosol for global health applications. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 8(1), 505–521. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-8-505-2015>
- Soden, B., & Chung, E.-S. (2017). The large-scale dynamical response of clouds to aerosol forcing. *Journal of Climate*, 30(21), 8783–8794. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0050.1>
- Sogacheva, L., Popp, T., Sayer, A. M., Dubovik, O., Garay, M. J., Heckel, A., et al. (2020). Merging regional and global aerosol optical depth records from major available satellite products. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20(4), 2031–2056. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-2031-2020>
- Sorooshian, A., Anderson, B., Bauer, S. E., Braun, R. A., Cairns, B., Crosbie, E., et al. (2019). Aerosol-cloud-meteorology interaction airborne field investigations: Using lessons learned from the U.S. West coast in the design of ACTIVATE off the U.S. East Coast. *Bulletin American Meteorology Society*, 100(8), 1511–1528. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-18-0100.1>
- Sorooshian, A., Atkinson, J., Ferrare, R., Hair, J., & Ziemba, L. (2021). Taking flight to study clouds and climate. *Eos*, 102. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EO158570>
- Stier, P. (2016). Limitations of passive remote sensing to constrain global cloud condensation nuclei. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16(10), 6595–6607. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-6595-2016>
- Stier, P., Feichter, J., Kinne, S., Kloster, S., Vignati, E., Wilson, J., et al. (2005). The aerosol-climate model ECHAM5-HAM. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 5(4), 1125–1156. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-5-1125-2005>
- Stier, P., Schutgens, N. A. J., Bellouin, N., Bian, H., Boucher, O., Chin, M., et al. (2013). Host model uncertainties in aerosol radiative forcing estimates: Results from the AeroCom prescribed intercomparison study. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13(6), 3245–3270. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-3245-2013>
- Sullivan, S. C., Lee, D., Oreopoulos, L., & Nenes, A. (2016). Role of updraft velocity in temporal variability of global cloud hydrometeor number. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(21), 5791–5796. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514039113>
- Tao, W.-K., Chen, J.-P., Li, Z., Wang, C., & Zhang, C. (2012). Impact of aerosols on convective clouds and precipitation. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 50(2), RG2001. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011RG000369>
- Textor, C., Schulz, M., Guibert, S., Kinne, S., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., et al. (2006). Analysis and quantification of the diversities of aerosol life cycles within AeroCom. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 6(7), 1777–1813. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-6-1777-2006>
- Textor, C., Schulz, M., Guibert, S., Kinne, S., Balkanski, Y., Bauer, S., et al. (2007). The effect of harmonized emissions on aerosol properties in global models—An AeroCom experiment. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 7(17), 4489–4501. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-4489-2007>
- Thomas, G. E., Poulsen, C. A., Sayer, A. M., Marsh, S. H., Dean, S. M., Carboni, E., et al. (2009). The GRAPE aerosol retrieval algorithm. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 2, 679–701. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2-679-2009>
- Thorsen, T. J., Winker, D. M., & Ferrare, R. A. (2021). Uncertainty in observational estimates of the aerosol direct radiative effect and forcing. *Journal of Climate*, 34(1), 195–213. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-1009.1>
- Toon, O. B., Maring, H., Dibb, J., Ferrare, R., Jacob, D. J., Jensen, E. J., et al. (2016). Planning, implementation, and scientific goals of the studies of emissions and atmospheric composition, clouds and climate coupling by regional Surveys (SEAC4RS) field mission. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 121(9), 4967–5009. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD024297>
- Torres, O., Jethva, H., & Bhartia, P. K. (2012). Retrieval of aerosol optical depth above clouds from OMI observations: Sensitivity analysis and case studies. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 69(3), 1037–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JASD-11-0130.1>
- Tsigaridis, K., Daskalakis, N., Kanakidou, M., Adams, P. J., Artaxo, P., Bahadur, R., et al. (2014). The AeroCom evaluation and intercomparison of organic aerosol in global models. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 14(19), 10845–10895. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-10845-2014>
- Twomey, S. (1974). Pollution and the planetary albedo. *Atmospheric Environment*, 8(12), 1251–1256. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-6981\(74\)90004-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-6981(74)90004-3)
- Twomey, S. (1977). The influence of pollution on the short wave albedo of clouds. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 34(7), 1149–1152. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1977\)034](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1977)034)
- Val Martin, M., Kahn, R. A., & Tosca, M. (2018). A global climatology of wildfire smoke injection height derived from space-based multi-angle imaging. *Remote Sensing*, 10, 1609. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10101609>
- van der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Giglio, L., van Leeuwen, T. T., Chen, Y., Rogers, B. M., et al. (2017). Global fire emissions estimates during 1997–2016. *Earth System Science Data*, 9(2), 697–720. <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-9-697-2017>
- Vandenbussche, S., Kochenova, S., Vandaele, A. C., Kumps, N., & De Maziere, M. (2013). Retrieval of desert dust aerosol vertical profiles from IASI measurements in the TIR atmospheric window. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 6(10), 2577–2591. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-6-2577-2013>
- Van Donkelaar, A., Hammer, M., Bindle, L., Brauer, M., Brook, J., Garay, M., et al. (2021). Monthly global estimates of fine particulate matter and their uncertainty. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 55(22), 15287–15300. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c05309>
- Van Donkelaar, A., Martin, R. V., Brauer, M., Kahn, R. A., Levy, R. C., Verduzco, C., & Villeneuve, P. (2010). Global estimates of average ground-level fine particulate matter concentrations from satellite-based aerosol optical depth. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 118(6), 847–855. <https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP.0901623>
- Vernon, C. J., Bolt, R., Canty, T., & Kahn, R. A. (2018). The impact of MISR-derived injection-height initialization on wildfire and volcanic plume dispersion in the HySPLIT model. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 11, 6289–6307. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-11-6289-2018>
- Vicent, J., Verrelst, J., Sabater, N., Alonso, L., Rivera-Caicedo, J. P., Martino, L., et al. (2020). Comparative analysis of atmospheric radiative transfer models using the Atmospheric Look-up table Generator (ALG) toolbox (version 2.0). *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13(4), 1945–1957. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-1945-2020>
- Vogelmann, A., McFarquhar, G. M., Ogren, J. A., Turner, D. D., Comstock, J. M., Feingold, G., et al. (2012). RACORO extended-term, aircraft observations of boundary-layer clouds. *Bulletin American Meteorology Society*, 93(6), 861–878. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00189.1>
- Wang, J., Aegerter, C., Xu, X., & Szykman, J. J. (2016). Potential application of VIIRS Day/Night Band for monitoring nighttime surface PM_{2.5} air quality from space. *Atmospheric Environment*, 124, 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.11.013>
- Wang, S., Wang, Q., & Feingold, G. (2003). Turbulence, condensation, and liquid water transport in numerically simulated nonprecipitating stratocumulus clouds. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 60(2), 262–278. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(2003\)060<0262:TCALWT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(2003)060<0262:TCALWT>2.0.CO;2)
- Watson-Parris, D., Schutgens, N., Reddington, C., Pringle, K. J., Liu, D., Allan, J. D., et al. (2019). In situ constraints on the vertical distribution of global aerosol. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 19(18), 11765–11790. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-11765-2019>
- Watson-Parris, D., & Smith, C. J. (2022). Large uncertainty in future warming due to aerosol forcing. *Nature Climate Change*, 12, 1111–1113. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01516-0>

- Wells, K. C., Martins, J. V., Remer, L. A., Kreidenweis, S. M., & Stephens, G. L. (2012). Critical reflectance derived from MODIS: Application for the retrieval of aerosol absorption over desert regions. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 117(D3), D03202. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016891>
- Welton, E. J., Campbell, J. R., Spinhirne, J. D., & Scott, V. S. (2001). Global monitoring of clouds and aerosols using a network of micro-pulse lidar systems. *Proceedings of SPIE*, 4153, 151–158. <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.417040>
- Wen, G., Marshak, A., Cahalan, R. F., Remer, L., & Kleidman, R. G. (2007). 3D aerosol-cloud radiative interaction observed in collocated MODIS and ASTER images of cumulus cloud fields. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 112(D13), D13204. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JD008267>
- Werdell, P. J., Behrenfeld, M. J., Bontempi, P. S., Boss, E., Caorms, B., Davis, G. T., et al. (2019). The plankton, aerosol, cloud, ocean ecosystem mission: Status, science, advances. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 100(9), 1775–1794. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-18-0056.1>
- Wiggins, E. B., Soja, A. J., Gargulinski, E., Halliday, H. S., Pierce, R. B., Schmidt, C. C., et al. (2020). High temporal resolution satellite observations of fire radiative power reveal link between fire behavior and aerosol and gas emissions. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(23), e2020GL090707. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL090707>
- Williams, A. I. L., Stier, P., Dagan, G., & Watson-Parris, D. (2022). Strong control of effective radiative forcing by the spatial pattern of absorbing aerosol. *Nature Climate Change*, 12(12), 735–742. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01415-4>
- Wilson, J. C., Lafleu, B. G., Hilbert, H., Seebaugh, W. R., Fox, J., Gesler, D. W., et al. (2004). Function and performance of a low turbulence inlet for sampling supermicron particles from aircraft platforms. *Aerosol Science & Technology*, 38(8), 790–802. <https://doi.org/10.1080/027868290500841>
- Winker, D. M., Vaughan, M. A., Omar, A., Hu, Y., Powell, K. A., Liu, Z., et al. (2009). Overview of the CALIPSO mission and CALIOP data processing algorithms. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 26(11), 2310–2323. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JTECHA1281.1>
- Witek, M. L., Garay, M. J., Diner, D. J., Bull, M. A., & Seidel, F. C. (2018). New approach to the retrieval of AOD and its uncertainty from MISR observations over dark water. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 11(1), 429–439. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-11-429-2018>
- Xian, P., Reid, J. S., Hyer, E. J., Sampson, C. R., Rubin, J. I., Ades, M., et al. (2019). Current state of the global operational aerosol multi-model ensemble: An update from the International Cooperative for Aerosol Prediction (ICAP). *The Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 145(Suppl), 176–209. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3497>
- Xue, H., Feingold, G., & Stevens, B. (2008). Aerosol effects on clouds, precipitation, and the organization of shallow cumulus convection. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 65(2), 392–406. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2007JAS2428.1>
- Yang, C. K., Chiu, J. C., Marchak, A., Feingold, G., Varnai, T., Wen, G., et al. (2022). Near-cloud aerosol retrieval using machine learning techniques, and implied direct radiative effects. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49, e2022GL098274. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL098274>
- Yokelson, R., Crounse, J. D., DeCarlo, P. F., Karl, T., Urbanski, S., Atlas, E., et al. (2009). Emissions from biomass burning in the Yucatan. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 9(15), 5785–5812. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-9-5785-2009>
- Yorks, J. E., McGill, M. J., Palm, S. P., Hlavka, D. L., Selmer, P. A., Nowottnick, E. P., et al. (2016). An overview of the CATS level 1 processing algorithms and data products. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(9), 4632–4639. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL068006>
- Zamora, L. M., & Kahn, R. A. (2020). Saharan dust aerosols change deep convective cloud prevalence, possibly by inhibiting marine new particle formation. *Journal of Climate*, 33(21), 9467–9477. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-20-0083.1>
- Zender, C. S., Bian, H., & Newman, D. (2003). Mineral dust entrainment and deposition (DEAD) model: Description and 1990s dust climatology. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 108(D14), 4416. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JD002775>
- Zhang, H., Kondragunta, S., Laszlo, I., & Zhou, M. (2020). Improving GOES Advanced Baseline Imager (ABI) aerosol optical depth (AOD) retrievals using an empirical bias correction algorithm. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 13(11), 5955–5975. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-13-5955-2020>
- Zhang, J., Campbell, J. R., Reid, J. S., Westphal, D. L., Baker, N. L., Campbell, W. F., & Hyer, E. J. (2011). Evaluating the impact of assimilating CALIOP-derived aerosol extinction profiles on a global mass transport model. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38(14), L14801. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL04773>
- Zhang, J., Spurr, R. J. D., Reid, J. S., Xian, P., Colarco, P. R., Campbell, J. R., et al. (2020). Development of an Ozone monitoring instrument (OMI) aerosol index (AI) data assimilation scheme for aerosol modeling over bright surfaces—A step toward direct radiance assimilation in the UV spectrum. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 14(1), 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-27-2021>
- Zhu, L., Val Martin, M., Hecobian, A., Deeter, M. N., Gatti, L. V., Kahn, R. A., & Fischer, E. V. (2018). Development and implementation of a new biomass burning emissions injection height scheme for the GEOS-Chem model. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11(10), 4103–4116. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-4103-2018>
- Zhu, Y., Rosenfeld, D., & Li, Z. (2018). Under what conditions can we trust retrieved cloud drop concentrations in broken marine stratocumulus? *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 123(16), 8754–8767. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2017jd028083>
- Zieger, P., Fierz-Schmidhauser, R., Weingartner, E., & Baltensperger, U. (2013). Effects of relative humidity on aerosol light scattering: Results from different European sites. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13(21), 10609–10631. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-10609-2013>