

Intercomparison of atmospheric carbonyl sulfide (TransCom-COS; Part Two): Evaluation of optimized fluxes using ground-based and aircraft observations

Jin Ma¹, Marine Rемаud², Philippe Peylin², Prabir Patra⁴, Yosuke Niwa^{5,6},
Christian Rodenbeck⁷, Mike Cartwright^{8,9}, Jeremy J. Harrison^{8,9}, Martyn P.
Chipperfield^{10,11}, Richard J. Pope^{10,11}, Christopher Wilson^{10,11}, Sauveur
Belviso², Stephen A. Montzka¹², Isaac Vimont¹², Fred Moore¹², Elliot L.
Atlas¹³, Efrat Schwartz¹⁴, Maarten C. Krol^{1,3}

¹Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

²Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, IPSL, Gif-sur-Yvette,

France

³Meteorology and Air Quality, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands

⁴Research Institute for Global Change, JAMSTEC, Yokohama 236-0001, Japan

⁵National Institute for Environmental Studies, Tsukuba, Japan

⁶Meteorological Research Institute, Japan Meteorological Agency, Tsukuba, Japan

⁷Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany

⁸School of Physics and Astronomy, Space Park Leicester, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK

⁹National Centre for Earth Observation, Space Park Leicester, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK

¹⁰School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

¹¹National Centre for Earth Observation, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

¹²Global Monitoring Laboratory, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, Boulder, USA

¹³Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, University of Miami, Miami, Florida, USA

¹⁴Earth and Planetary Sciences, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel

Key Points:

- Simulations in seven models propagating optimized COS fluxes derived from two inversions agree with independent observations.
- Simulated and observed COS drawdowns are captured in boundary layer over the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans due to plant uptake over lands.
- Weak vertical mixing models using fluxes optimized from the fast-mixing TM5 model overestimate the COS seasonal amplitude at high latitudes.

Corresponding author: Jin Ma, j.ma@uu.nl

31 **Abstract**

32 We present a comparison of atmospheric transport models that simulate carbonyl
 33 sulfide (COS). This is part II of the ongoing Atmospheric Transport Model (ATM) Inter-
 34 comparison Project (TransCom-COS). Differently from part I, we focus on seven model
 35 intercomparison by transporting two recent COS inversions of NOAA surface data within
 36 TM5-4DVAR and LMDz models. The main goals of TransCom-COS part II are (a) to
 37 compare the COS simulations using the two sets of optimized fluxes with simulations that
 38 use a control scenario (part I) and (b) to evaluate the simulated tropospheric COS abun-
 39 dance with aircraft-based observations from various sources. The output of the seven trans-
 40 port models are grouped in terms of their vertical mixing strength: strong and weak mix-
 41 ing. The results indicate that all transport models capture the meridional distribution
 42 of COS at the surface well. Model simulations generally match the aircraft campaigns
 43 HIPPO and ATom. Comparisons to HIPPO and ATom demonstrate a gap between ob-
 44 served and modelled COS over the Pacific Ocean at 0–40°N, indicating a potential miss-
 45 ing source in the free troposphere. The effects of seasonal continental COS uptake by
 46 the biosphere, observed on HIPPO and ATom over oceans, is well reproduced by the sim-
 47 ulations. We found that the strength of the vertical mixing within the column as rep-
 48 resented in the various atmospheric transport models explains much of the model to model
 49 differences. We also found that weak-mixing models transporting the optimized flux de-
 50 rived from the strong-mixing TM5 model show a too strong seasonal cycle at high lat-
 51 itudes.

52 **1 Introduction**

53 Carbonyl sulfide (COS) is a stable sulfur-containing trace gas in the Earth’s atmo-
 54 sphere, contributing to the stratosphere sulfur aerosol formation during volcanic quies-
 55 cent periods (Crutzen, 1976; Turco et al., 1980; Notholt et al., 2003; Brühl et al., 2012).
 56 COS is a long-lived trace gas with an average mole fraction about 500 pmol mol⁻¹ (Montzka
 57 et al., 2007). The largest sink of COS is uptake by the terrestrial ecosystems and there-
 58 fore COS can potentially be used as a proxy for Gross Primary Productivity (GPP) (Montzka
 59 et al., 2007; Campbell et al., 2008; Wohlfahrt et al., 2012; Launois et al., 2015; Whelan
 60 et al., 2018; Remaud et al., 2022).

61 COS is emitted directly to the atmosphere through multiple sources globally, e.g.
 62 anthropogenic emissions (Campbell et al., 2015; Zumkehr et al., 2018), oceanic emissions
 63 (Kettle et al., 2002; Lennartz et al., 2017, 2019) and biomass burning (Notholt et al., 2003;
 64 Stinecipher et al., 2019). COS is absorbed by plants through stomata, like CO₂, but with-
 65 out a respiration flux (Montzka et al., 2007; Protoschill-Krebs et al., 1996; Stimler et al.,
 66 2012; Wohlfahrt et al., 2012; Sun et al., 2022). Although the biosphere is generally a sink
 67 of COS, soils can also become a source and emit COS to the atmosphere over wetlands
 68 and over agricultural areas in summer (Whelan et al., 2013, 2016). Some plants also emit
 69 COS under specific conditions (Belviso, Abadie, et al., 2022). In the stratosphere, COS
 70 undergoes photolysis under high levels of ultra-violet radiation above the ozone layer.
 71 The magnitude, spatial and temporal variability of COS sources and sinks remain to some
 72 extent uncertain (Whelan et al., 2018). The chemical sink of COS by OH removal and
 73 photolysis is about 140 GgS a⁻¹ (Ma et al., 2021). Recently, HPMTF was identified as
 74 potential COS precursor from DMS oxidation (Veres et al., 2020; Novak et al., 2021),
 75 but there remains large uncertainty in the contribution to COS production due to the
 76 sensitivity to multiphase cloud chemistry (Jernigan et al., 2022). COS in the atmosphere
 77 shows relatively small inter-annual variability, implying that the sources and sinks are
 78 almost balanced in terms of the global budget (Montzka et al., 2007). Recent studies,
 79 however, indicate that the COS mole fractions show a declining trend from 2015 to 2020
 80 (Hannigan et al., 2022; Belviso, Remaud, et al., 2022; Serio et al., 2023).

81 Recent atmospheric inversion studies on COS using in situ measurements demon-
 82 strate that the global budget of COS can be closed by optimizing the sources and sinks
 83 of COS. Two inverse modelling studies have been conducted, one based on the TM5-4DVAR
 84 system (Ma et al., 2021) and the other on the LMDz model (Remaud et al., 2022). These
 85 two inversion studies agree on underestimated sources (or overestimated sinks) in trop-
 86 ical regions, consistent with earlier modeling studies (Suntharalingam et al., 2008; Berry
 87 et al., 2013). Also, both inversions reproduced independent data from the HIAPER Pole-
 88 To-Pole Observations (HIPPO) campaigns to some extent, but pointed out the impor-
 89 tance of atmospheric transport to infer the surface fluxes and the need for further anal-
 90 ysis of the impact of transport uncertainties on the COS budget. In a first paper (Part
 91 I, Remaud et al. (2023)), a COS intercomparison was carried out based on a set of ref-
 92 erence surface fluxes for all processes (i.e. non-optimized fluxes); the results pointed out
 93 some shortcomings in the COS global budget that need to be resolved. In this Part II,
 94 we extend the analysis by evaluating model simulations that use two versions of the op-
 95 timized COS fluxes with available independent data, mostly obtained from aircraft plat-
 96 forms.

97 We used a similar approach as in Part I, based on a protocol defined to compare
 98 different transport models with the same set of fluxes, and usually referred as a "TransCom"
 99 inter-comparison exercise. Several "TransCom" protocols were used in the past; they have
 100 been very useful to investigate the diversion of atmospheric transport models through
 101 rigorous inter-comparisons. For example, an earlier TransCom-CH₄ study investigated
 102 the roles of surface emissions, transport and chemical loss in simulating the global methane
 103 distribution (Patra et al., 2011). A previous TransCom Age of Air study (TransCom-
 104 AoA) study using six global models highlighted that the inter-model differences are still
 105 significant and require further investigation (Krol et al., 2018). Differences may be caused
 106 by resolved transport (advection, use of reanalysis data, nudging) or parameterised trans-
 107 port (convection, boundary layer mixing, and resolution) (Bisht et al., 2021). In the ac-
 108 companying Part I paper, Remaud et al. (2023) showed that the differences in the ver-
 109 tical mixing implemented in the various participating atmospheric transport models (ATMs)
 110 were largely responsible for the inter-model differences. In this study, we will further clas-
 111 sify the vertical transport in models as either strong-mixing or weak-mixing and will eval-
 112 uate their performance using various atmospheric measurements. The motivation of this
 113 study is three-fold:

- 114 1. Comparison of the surface fluxes from the TM5-4DVAR and LMDz inverse mod-
 115 elling systems.
- 116 2. Evaluation transport of the model results against various COS measurement data:
 117 ground-based and aircraft COS observation, some of which were used to derive
 118 the optimized fluxes.
- 119 3. Quantification of the impact of the transport uncertainties on the simulation of
 120 COS mixing ratios using the optimized COS fluxes.

121 The paper is organised as follows: first we introduce the participating models, mea-
 122 surements and inter-model comparison protocol in Sect. 2. The results are presented in
 123 Sect. 3.1.2, validations against aircraft observations in Sect. 3.2 and Sect. 3.3. Finally,
 124 the improvements and limitations are discussed in Sect. 4 and conclusions with recom-
 125 mendations are presented in Sect. 5.

126 **2 Transport model, COS fluxes & measurements and protocol**

127 **2.1 Participating models and output**

128 We used seven atmospheric transport models: TM5, TM3, TOMCAT, LMDz, MIROC4,
 129 NICAM5 and NICAM6. The main features of each transport model, i.e. the horizon-

130 tal and vertical resolution, meteorological drivers, and sub-grid scale physical parame-
 131 terizations are given in Appendix Table A1. All models used meteorological fields from
 132 weather forecast analysis (e.g. ERA5) either by interpolating or by nudging towards fields
 133 of horizontal winds and temperature (e.g. LMDz). The participating models are not en-
 134 tirely independent. TM5 and TM3 are in the same family since they share similar physics
 135 and numerical schemes, but TM3 operates on a coarser resolution compared to TM5.
 136 TOMCAT is an offline 3D chemistry transport model, parameterized with the bound-
 137 ary layer scheme of Louis (1979) and Prather advection scheme (Prather, 1986). MIROC4,
 138 NICAM5, NICAM6 use the same JRA-5 meteorological driver fields. MIROC4 has been
 139 further modified since Arakawa and Schubert (1974). Specifically, there is a new thresh-
 140 old on the closure based on relative humidity (Patra et al., 2018). NICAM5 and NICAM6
 141 applied updated physical schemes for convection (Chikira & Sugiyama, 2010), bound-
 142 ary layer mixing (the Mellor-Yamada scheme (Nakanishi & Niino, 2004)), and advection
 143 (Niwa et al., 2011). LMDz uses a mass flux scheme for vertical mixing representing the
 144 thermals for shallow convection and the Emanuel (1991) scheme for deep convection. The
 145 similarities and differences amongst the seven ATMs are expected to influence the model-
 146 to-model spread and their performance in simulating the spatial and temporal distribu-
 147 tions of the COS mole fractions. To effectively evaluate the model-to-model differences,
 148 the models are organized in two groups based on their convective schemes and their zonal
 149 mean deviation from the multi-model average that is presented in Figs. S1 and S2 in Sup-
 150 porting Information (SI). One group exhibits relative fast vertical mixing (strong mix-
 151 ing: TM5, TM3, TOMCAT). The other group exhibits slower convective mixing (weak
 152 mixing: MIROC4, NICAM5, NICAM6 and LMDz). We focus our analysis on the com-
 153 parison between the strong mixing (SM) and weak mixing (WM) model groups. Note
 154 that the fluxes were optimized with one model from the SM group (TM5), and one model
 155 from the WM group (LMDz).

Table 1: Description of the two atmospheric inverse systems that produced the optimized COS surface fluxes, TM5-OPT and LMDz-OPT. η denotes hybrid sigma-pressure coordinates.

Inverse Model	TM5-4DVAR	LMDz
Tracers	COS, CS ₂ and DMS	COS and CO ₂
Hori. Res	6×4	3.75×1.875
Vert. Res	25 η	39 η
Prior sources	Anthropogenic (Zumkehr et al., 2018) Ocean (Kettle et al., 2002; Suntharalingam et al., 2008) Biomass Burning (Ma et al., 2021)	Anthropogenic (Zumkehr et al., 2018) Ocean (Lennartz et al., 2017, 2021) Biomass Burning (Stinecipher et al., 2019)
Prior sinks	– SiB4 biosphere flux (Kooijmans et al., 2021) OH oxidation Stratosphere photolysis	CO ₂ flux ORCHIDEE biosphere flux (Maignan et al., 2021) OH oxidation –
Data assimilation	COS measurements at 14 NOAA surface stations –	COS measurements at 15 NOAA surface stations CO ₂ NOAA surface network
Period	2010-2018	2008-2019
Reference	Ma et al. (2021)	Remaud et al. (2022)

156 2.2 Prescribed COS flux components

157 Details about the TM5 and LMDz inversions are given in Table 1. TM5-4DVAR
 158 optimized a so-called "unknown" source to close the global budget of COS, and LMDz
 159 used an analytical inversion technique to optimize anthropogenic, oceanic, and biomass
 160 burning sources and ecosystem uptake using NOAA surface measurements. Ma et al. (2021)
 161 optimized the unknown emissions at the grid scale using an error correlation length ap-
 162 proach to limit the degrees of freedom. In contrast, Remaud et al. (2022) divided the
 163 globe into big regions. The optimized fluxes generated by TM5-4DVAR and LMDz were

Table 2: Prescribed COS optimized surface fluxes used as model input. Mean magnitudes of different types of fluxes are given for the period 2010–2018. Note that the fluxes are mapped to a fine resolution on $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ as transport input for all models. The flux unit is GgS a^{-1} , and the deviation in parenthesis is the ratio of net flux over source in %.

Period	Net flux	Source	Sink	Net flux	Source	Sink
	OPT-TM5			OPT-LMDz		
2010	42.6 (5.0)	849.2	-806.6	15.1 (2.0)	751.3	-736.2
2011	9.0 (1.1)	836.4	-827.4	11.1 (1.5)	746.5	-735.4
2012	67.8 (7.7)	882.8	-814.9	14.9 (2.0)	762.1	-747.2
2013	-13.8 (-1.7)	818.9	-832.7	-6.8 (-0.9)	747.8	-754.6
2014	62.1 (7.1)	875.9	-813.8	12.1 (1.6)	753.0	-740.9
2015	23.2 (2.8)	826.1	-802.9	36.6 (4.8)	757.1	-720.5
2016	65.3 (7.5)	865.0	-799.7	-26.8 (-3.7)	716.4	-743.2
2017	-46.2 (-5.9)	787.9	-834.1	-7.3 (-1.0)	718.6	-725.8
2018	-18.7 (-2.3)	804.0	-822.6	-8.1 (-1.1)	707.9	-715.9
Average	21.3 (2.5)	838.5	-817.2	4.5 (0.6)	740.1	-735.5




Figure 1: Averaged (2010–2018) optimized surface fluxes that are used as model input: TM5 (left) and LMDz (right). The surface fluxes are augmented with vertically integrated troposphere chemistry (for both models) and stratospheric removal (only for TM5).




Figure 2: Surface fluxes OPT-TM5 (a) and OPT-LMDz (b). The fluxes are multi-year and longitudinal averaged over the years 2010–2018. The x-axis represents month and y-axis latitude. The difference between the fluxes is presented in Fig. S3.

164 first interpolated to a common resolution of $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$, assuring mass conservation. These
 165 COS fluxes are presented in Table 2 and are provided as a lower boundary condition to
 166 each ATM on a monthly temporal resolution. The ATMs then simulated the atmospheric
 167 COS concentration (3D) following the transport of COS surface fluxes. For a compar-
 168 ison to the results with the optimized fluxes, we also present results from the control sce-
 169 nario described in part I (Remaud et al., 2023). Relying on the linearity of the atmo-
 170 spheric transport, each flux of the control scenario was transported separately by all par-
 171 ticipating models, after which the contributions were added.

172 Figure 1 shows the multi-annual mean of the two optimized fluxes, indicating mainly
 173 the anthropogenic sources as hot spots and the main sinks over regions dominated by
 174 vegetation, e.g. large parts of Northern Hemisphere, the Amazon, and parts of Indone-
 175 sia and Africa. We also notice that the fluxes obtained with TM5 show larger spatial gra-
 176 dients compared to those obtained with LMDz in coherence with the fact that TM5 and
 177 LMDz are fast and slow vertical mixing models, respectively (see Sect. 2.1). As shown
 178 in Fig. 2, the OPT-TM5 fluxes on the left-hand panel show a larger seasonal cycle com-
 179 pared to the OPT-LMDz fluxes over higher latitudes. Note also that the horizontal res-
 180 olution of OPT-TM5 fluxes is coarser, since optimization was performed on $6^\circ \times 4^\circ$ res-
 181 olution, whereas optimization in LMDz was performed on $3.75^\circ \times 1.875^\circ$ resolution. The
 182 corresponding difference of the two optimized fluxes is shown in Fig. S3. In general, the
 183 optimized fluxes agree on (prescribed) anthropogenic hot spot emissions and (optimized)
 184 uptake patterns. As will be shown, both fluxes lead to a much better agreement to the
 185 available observations compared to the control scenario (Remaud et al., 2023), as a re-
 186 sult of the optimization process during which NOAA surface observations were assim-
 187 ilated.

188 Since atmospheric chemistry was not taken into account, the optimized fluxes were
 189 adapted to include the chemical loss as an extra sink to the global budgets of COS. The
 190 stratospheric and tropospheric sinks (-144 GgS a^{-1} in total) of TM5 were projected on
 191 the surface and added to the fluxes from Ma et al. (2021) to obtain a balanced atmo-
 192 spheric COS budget. The LMDz optimization did not account for (small) stratospheric
 193 loss and only the tropospheric loss by OH oxidation (-100 GgS a^{-1}) was projected on
 194 the surface. The average annual budget of the OPT-TM5 fluxes is 21.3 GgS a^{-1} , which
 195 represents a deviation from the net total source of about 2.5%. The corresponding LMDz
 196 fluxes (Remaud et al., 2022) have an annual budget of 4.5 GgS a^{-1} , which represent a
 197 deviation from the net total source of 0.6%. On the top of these mean budgets both in-
 198 versions show year to year budget variations.

199 2.3 Measurements and data sampling

200 2.3.1 Surface measurements

201 We compare results to the NOAA Global Monitoring Laboratory COS measure-
 202 ments, which were used in the two inversions (Table 1) during 2010–2018 & 2019 at 14
 203 sites. Further information is given in Appendix Table B1. The COS observations have
 204 been collected as pair flasks one to five times a month since 2000 and have then been anal-
 205 ysed with gas chromatography and mass spectrometer detection. The COS measurements
 206 have been kept for this study only if the difference between the pair flasks was less than
 207 $6.3 \text{ pmol mol}^{-1}$. These data are an extension of the measurements first published in Montzka
 208 et al. (2007). In addition, we used measurements from the French sampling site Gif-sur-
 209 Yvette (GIF) (48.71°N , 2.15°E), located about 20 km to the south west of Paris, where
 210 hourly COS measurements have been collected about 7 m above ground level since Au-
 211 gust 2014 (Belviso et al., 2020, 2023). The NOAA stations are shown in Fig. 3 as red
 212 crosses. We also compare model results to observations from the NOAA Global Green-
 213 house Gas Reference Network (GGGRN) Aircraft Program (Sweeney et al., 2015), which
 214 primarily provides vertical profiles (Fig. 3, top-left corner). Note that the LMDz inver-

238 Greenland, and returned to California across central North America. The HIPPO and
 239 ATom aircraft flight tracks are shown in Fig. 3 as colored dots. In the following anal-
 240 ysis in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, the HIPPO and ATom data were averaged vertically be-
 241 low 2 km to represent the boundary layer, and between 2–8 km to represent the free tro-
 242 sphere.

243 To further evaluate the impact of transport on the vertical distribution of COS,
 244 we compared model results to 2010–2011 NOAA aircraft platform observations located
 245 at 13 sites over North America, listed in Appendix Table B1. The upper altitude that
 246 was typically reached was 8 km. This NOAA aircraft platform data set was already eval-
 247 uated in other studies (Ma et al., 2021; Hu et al., 2021; Remaud et al., 2022, 2023). Note
 248 that TOMCAT did not provide the requested model output for the HIPPO, ATom and
 249 the NOAA aircraft platforms. As a result, the strong mixing models are represented by
 250 TM5 and TM3 in the comparison to HIPPO, ATom and NOAA aircraft observations.

251 2.4 Post-processing of the simulations and measurements

252 In this analysis we focus on the annual mean and the mean seasonal cycle. To this
 253 end, the surface data were processed using the CCGVU curve fitting procedure devel-
 254 oped by the (Carbon Cycle Group of the Earth System Research Laboratory (CCG/ESRL)
 255 at NOAA, USA (Thoning et al., 1989). The CCGVU procedure is fully described and
 256 freely available at <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/mb1/crvfit/crvfit.html>.
 257 The procedure estimates a smooth function by fitting the time series to a first-order poly-
 258 nomial equation for the growth rate combined with a two-harmonic function for the an-
 259 nual cycle. The seasonal cycle and annual gradient were extracted from the smooth func-
 260 tion. In addition, outliers were discarded if their values exceed 3 times the standard de-
 261 viation of the residual time series.

262 To directly compare model simulations and observations, the models were processed
 263 by removing the impact of the yearly budget deviations from Table 2 and the addition
 264 of 485 pmol mol⁻¹, which is representative for the global mean COS mole fraction in 2000–
 265 2020 (Montzka et al., 2007; Serio et al., 2023). The multi-year positive trend of the two
 266 optimized fluxes that was removed amounted to 4.6 and 1.0 pmol mol⁻¹ a⁻¹, respectively,
 267 by assuming that the budget deviation is homogeneously distributed over the whole at-
 268 mosphere. In this way, the simulated COS abundance were set to the reference of the
 269 NOAA surface network. A detailed example of this adjustment procedure at each sta-
 270 tion is provided in Figs. S4, S5, S6 in SI S1.

271 2.5 Evaluation metrics

272 In this paper, root mean square error (RMSE), error weighted squared error (EWSE)
 273 and Pearson correlation coefficient are used to quantify the performance of the model
 274 (groups). RMSE and EWSE are defined as:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (m_i - o_i)^2}{N}}, \quad (1)$$

$$EWSE = \frac{1}{N} \sum \frac{(m_i - o_i)^2}{\sigma_i^2}, \quad (2)$$

275 where m_i is the modelled sample, o_i is the measured sample, N is the number of
 276 samples, and σ_i is the measurement error. σ_i represents the variation in the measure-
 277 ments over time or space, and is from either inter-annual or intra-period variability. If
 278 the monthly mean is analysed, then σ_i is referred to intra-period variability within a given
 279 month). The unit of RMSE is pmol mol⁻¹, and EWSE is unitless. Note that RMSE and

280 EWSE are defined for a single model transporting one flux. To calculate the RMSE of
 281 model groups, the quadratic mean was taken. To calculate the EWSE of model groups,
 282 the arithmetic mean was taken. To calculate the statistics of the mean seasonal cycle,
 283 the time series were first processed by the CCGVU software to remove the trend and out-
 284 liers, after which the RMSE and EWSE were calculated for each model.

285 The Pearson correlation coefficient is defined as:

$$\rho_{m,o} = \frac{Cov(m,o)}{\sigma_m \sigma_o}, \quad (3)$$

286 where ρ is Pearson correlation coefficient, Cov is the covariance of modelled and
 287 observed samples, and σ_m and σ_o are the standard deviation of modelled and observed
 288 samples over certain average (e.g. averaged in latitudinal bins), respectively. The cal-
 289 culation of Pearson correlation coefficient is performed using the Python module Scipy
 290 version 1.7.3.

291 3 Results

292 3.1 Impact of different transport models: using optimized flux scenar- 293 ios

294 3.1.1 Comparison with the NOAA surface network

295 We first compare the model simulations to the NOAA surface network in Febru-
 296 ary and August in Fig. 4. This figure can be compared to Fig. 3 in Remaud et al. (2023).
 297 To highlight the model differences, the models are grouped into SM and WM models,
 298 and the single model results are presented in Fig. S7. The general feature is that all the
 299 models with both fluxes capture the meridional gradient relatively well, but overestimate
 300 the mole fraction at the GIF station. In the Northern Hemisphere (NH), the prominent
 301 drawdown over North America observed at HFM and LEF in August is well reproduced
 302 by the models. This suggests that the optimized fluxes are representative of the net sur-
 303 face flux over North America. An exception is GIF, a French observational site which
 304 was, unlike the NOAA surface data, not assimilated to derive both optimized fluxes. Likely,
 305 the (coarse) grid cell in which GIF is sampled in the models has a high positive flux value
 306 that leads to too high mole fractions (Belviso, Remaud, et al., 2022). This is due to a
 307 misplacement of the hot-spot in the Zumkehr et al. (2018) inventory, recently confirmed
 308 by studies of Belviso et al. (2020); Remaud et al. (2022); Belviso et al. (2023) showed
 309 that the COS emissions have been overestimated in France. However, the large model
 310 spread at GIF results from a combination of the vicinity of the anthropogenic source and
 311 the different model resolutions (X. Lin et al., 2018). In the Southern Hemisphere (SH)
 312 the NOAA observations show a rather flat distribution, and the optimized fluxes repro-
 313 duce this feature as well. At stations in the SH, the OPT-TM5 flux leads to a higher COS
 314 abundance than the OPT-LMDz flux, but at stations in the NH, the difference is more
 315 scattered, possibly caused by large regional differences in the flux distributions. Most
 316 deviations are at high latitudes when WM models propagate the OPT-TM5 flux (pur-
 317 ple). This issue will be discussed later in Sect. 4.

318 The multi-year averaged seasonal cycles are compared to observations in Fig. 5 (dif-
 319 ferences are plotted in Fig. S8). The seasonal cycles show generally good agreement amongst
 320 model simulations and NOAA observations in the SH and at oceanic stations, specifi-
 321 cally at the stations SPO, PSA, CGO, and SMO. These stations are mainly influenced
 322 by the optimized ocean fluxes, and have a relatively small seasonal cycle. In the NH, the
 323 continental seasonality shows larger seasonal amplitudes with the OPT-TM5 fluxes, com-
 324 pared to the simulations with the OPT-LMDz fluxes given the model spread. The ob-
 325 served seasonal cycle seems generally closer to the simulations using the OPT-LMDz fluxes,




Figure 4: Comparison of the meridional variations of the COS abundance simulated by the WM and SM model groups using the optimized surface fluxes with the surface observations only (black) in February and August. The error bars represent the variation among the WM and SM models, and the grey bar represents the RMSE of the measurements at each station. For visualisation, the locations of KUM, NWR, and SUM are shifted by -2°N , -2°N , 2°N , respectively. The WM and SM groups are slightly shifted horizontally to avoid overlap.

326 which is likely caused by the large seasonality in the OPT-TM5 flux. Inspecting the per-
 327 formance of the WM and SM model groups, large differences are observed at PSA, SUM
 328 and ALT, i.e. stations in the two polar regions. In general, WM models using the OPT-
 329 TM5 fluxes overestimate the seasonal cycle. This is explained by the fact that the fluxes
 330 were optimised by the strong mixing TM5, resulting in large seasonal cycle in the op-
 331 timized flux. Propagation of these fluxes in WM models hence leads to overestimated
 332 seasonal cycles, specifically at higher latitudes where mixing and fluxes change strongly
 333 with the season.

334 To assess the performance of the model groups in simulating the seasonal cycle, the
 335 statistics of the model groups transporting the optimized fluxes are presented in Table 3.
 336 As reference, we also show the results of the control simulation that were presented in
 337 Remaud et al. (2023). Five stations (PSA, THD, HFM, BRW, and ALT) are presented
 338 showing high RMSE values in Fig. 5. In general, the seasonal cycles are well reproduced
 339 by the optimized fluxes (correlation in between 0.85 to 1.0), and using the optimized fluxes
 340 leads to large improvements compared to the control scenario. One exception is THD,
 341 where the performance of the control scenario was already good. At PSA, the errors be-
 342 tween observations and model group simulations are largest in local summer (see Fig. 5,
 343 and WM models show larger RMSE values compared to SM models. At PSA, BRW and
 344 ALT, we again notice that using the OPT-TM5 fluxes in WM models leads to large RMSE
 345 and EWSE values.




Figure 5: Mean seasonal cycle of the COS abundance simulated by the WM and SM model groups using the optimized fluxes. The COS mole fractions are decomposed with the standard software CCGVU to remove the inter-annual and synoptic variability. The seasonal cycle is averaged over the years 2010–2018. The black line represents the observed COS seasonal cycle with the standard deviation. The stations are ordered from SH to NH. The errors of the SM group are shown as shading, and those of the WM group are shown as error-bars. These errors represent the model spread.

Table 3: Statistics of the simulation of the seasonal cycle at selected NOAA stations. Results for the optimized fluxes and the control flux are reported as mean seasonal RMSE (pmol mol^{-1}), mean seasonal EWSE (in parentheses), and Pearson correlation. The data corresponds to Fig. 5. Details on calculation of RMSE and EWSE are given in Sect. 2.5.

station	flux	model group	RMSE(EWSE)	corr
PSA	Ctl	SM	27.2 (7.7)	0.88
		WM	49.9 (14.3)	0.84
	OPT-TM5	SM	8.8 (2.3)	0.93
		WM	21.6 (6.0)	0.91
	OPT-LMDZ	SM	6.6 (1.7)	0.93
		WM	12.3 (3.4)	0.91
THD	Ctl	SM	13.9 (0.9)	0.93
		WM	13.2 (0.9)	0.93
	OPT-TM5	SM	13.6 (1.0)	0.88
		WM	14.9 (1.1)	0.86
	OPT-LMDZ	SM	14.1 (1.0)	0.90
		WM	15.4 (1.1)	0.85
HFM	Ctl	SM	26.1 (3.0)	0.91
		WM	18.3 (2.2)	0.93
	OPT-TM5	SM	6.9 (0.6)	0.98
		WM	9.0 (1.0)	0.99
	OPT-LMDZ	SM	19.5 (2.2)	0.99
		WM	14.7 (1.6)	1.00
BRW	Ctl	SM	32.6 (4.0)	0.48
		WM	44.8 (5.3)	0.35
	OPT-TM5	SM	9.1 (1.1)	0.97
		WM	20.8 (2.5)	0.94
	OPT-LMDZ	SM	10.4 (1.3)	0.95
		WM	4.3 (0.5)	0.99
ALT	Ctl	SM	33.6 (3.7)	0.42
		WM	37.3 (4.0)	0.39
	OPT-TM5	SM	11.7 (1.3)	0.96
		WM	22.7 (2.7)	0.94
	OPT-LMDZ	SM	11.7 (1.3)	0.95
		WM	9.9 (1.0)	0.95

346

3.1.2 Mid-troposphere seasonal variations

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

The ongoing surface observations discussed in the previous section were used to optimize the fluxes. In this section, independent data from the ongoing aircraft measurements (mostly over North America (NA)) are used to evaluate the fluxes and models. These data were not assimilated in the inversions, so they can provide insights in the quality of the optimized fluxes using a model ensemble (Ma et al., 2021; Remaud et al., 2022). The vertical gradient in the NOAA aircraft observations (averaged over 2010–2011), grouped by season over NA and Alaska, is presented in Fig. 6, similar to the gradients shown in Fig. 6 of Montzka et al. (2007) for a different set of years and sites. Results from the individual models are presented in Fig. S9 in SI S3.

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

In general, the vertical gradients are well reproduced by the models propagating the optimized fluxes. This is in stark contrast with the control flux scenario. This mismatch was attributed to an overestimated oceanic source at high latitudes and an underestimated biosphere sink at high latitudes (Remaud et al., 2023). The good agreement between the observations and the models reflects that, at high latitudes, the optimized fluxes have more biosphere uptake and less ocean emissions compared to the control fluxes. Over NA during DJF, the observed vertical gradient is about $-15 \text{ pmol mol}^{-1}$, similar to the mean of the WM and SM models. Note, however, that the model spread can reach $100 \text{ pmol mol}^{-1}$ in JJA, pointing to differences in vertical mixing, also within the SM and WM groups. Over the course of the year, the vertical gradient in the observations grows, which is to some extent reproduced by the models with a slight exception for the autumn (SON) over NA where the models still have a too low gradient. As expected, the vertical gradient is more prominent for the WM models.




Figure 6: Seasonal mean observed and simulated COS vertical gradient between 1 and 4 km averaged for NOAA aircraft observations. The data are grouped into the North American continent (left panel) and Alaska (right panel). The monthly COS gradients are calculated by averaging the differences in COS abundances between 1 km and 4 km over all the vertical profiles. The grey shading represents the spread in the observations averaged in 3 months.

369

3.2 Evaluation with HIPPO aircraft data

370

371

372

We use a subset of the HIPPO results from the multi-seasonal aircraft campaigns to evaluate the optimized fluxes as they have not been used in the data assimilation process. HIPPO campaigns 1–2 are not used because model simulations start from 2010,




Figure 7: COS meridional gradient of HIPPO flights 3–5 and model simulations. The model groups and observations are separated in observations below 2 km and into the free troposphere (2–8 km), and averaged in 20° latitude bins. The gray shading represents $1\text{-}\sigma$ in the binned HIPPO data.




Figure 8: COS Vertical gradient of HIPPO measurements against model groups over the oceans. The data are averaged over layers of 1.25 km.

373 while the HIPPO 1–2 data were collected in 2009. Two aspects are considered in the eval-
 374 uation: (1) the meridional gradient and (2) the vertical distribution of the COS abun-
 375 dance. Figure 7 shows the meridional distributions over the Pacific Ocean. We averaged
 376 the observations over 20° latitude bins and in the vertical in two bins: the boundary layer
 377 (below 2 km), and the free troposphere (2–8 km).

378 The prominent feature of simulations compared with HIPPO is that the two fluxes
 379 underestimate the observations, specifically over tropical regions in the free troposphere.
 380 This bias may be due to our simple model correction procedure (SI S1) or unresolved
 381 sources. In the lowest 2 km, the simulations capture the meridional variations well, while
 382 there is an larger gap between HIPPO and simulations in the free troposphere, most promi-
 383 nent in the latitude range 0–40°N. This is more significant during the HIPPO4 campaign
 384 across the east Pacific Ocean, which will be further discussed in Sect. 4. The results for
 385 the individual models are discussed in SI S4.

386 The model performance is quantified in Table 4. We calculate how well the mod-
 387 els reproduce the latitudinal gradients by correlating modeled and observed mole frac-
 388 tion against latitude. Models using the optimized fluxes show significantly improved cor-
 389 relation with HIPPO measurements for all three campaigns, with a significantly reduced
 390 RMSE. Correlations are in the range 0.78–0.93, 0.82–0.95, and 0.92–0.99 for HIPPO3,
 391 HIPPO4, and HIPPO5, respectively. For the RMSE, HIPPO3, HIPPO4, and HIPPO5
 392 show deviations of 15–27 pmol mol⁻¹, 18–30 pmol mol⁻¹, and 18–41 pmol mol⁻¹, re-
 393 spectively. One outlier is the WM model group using the OPT-TM5 fluxes, showing a
 394 RMSE of 41 pmol mol⁻¹, again due to incompatibility of the flux and vertical mixing
 395 at high northern latitudes as shown in Fig. 7. Results for the individual models are pre-
 396 sented in Fig. S10, and results for the control scenario are shown in Fig. S17 in SI S5.

397 To further compare to HIPPO observations, the data are separated over continents
 398 and the Pacific Ocean and mean vertical profiles were calculated. Figure 8 shows the ver-
 399 tical profiles of HIPPO and the simulations. Results of the individual models are shown
 400 in Fig. S11 in SI S4. Consistent with Fig. 7, the simulations are generally lower than the
 401 HIPPO observations, and simulations using the OPT-TM5 fluxes are closer to HIPPO
 402 compared to simulations using the OPT-LMDz fluxes. Although the simulations are lower
 403 than HIPPO measurements, they generally stay within 1- σ of the HIPPO measurements.

404 3.3 Evaluation with ATom aircraft data

405 In this section, we use ATom aircraft data to evaluate the model simulations. The
 406 ATom data were collected in four different campaigns, across mainly the Atlantic and
 407 Pacific oceans. We evaluate the fluxes and model group performance separately over the
 408 Atlantic and Pacific oceans and also assess the impact of nearby continents.

409 Figure 9 shows the COS meridional gradient over the Atlantic Ocean (results of
 410 the individual models are shown in Fig. S12). In the lowest 2 km over the Atlantic Ocean,
 411 the meridional gradients observed by ATom are reasonably well reproduced by the mod-
 412 els. ATom2 observed a drawdown of COS over the Atlantic in the SH, mostly above 2
 413 km. These observations are probably impacted by uptake of the Amazon forest. The mod-
 414 els reproduce this feature well. ATom3 (Sept–Oct 2017) also observed a drawdown of COS
 415 over the Atlantic in the NH during late boreal summer, likely caused by the uptake of
 416 the NH biosphere. ATom4 shows a COS enhancement in the low latitude NH, mostly
 417 below 2 km, which is not well reproduced by the models. In general, however, both fluxes
 418 simulate the observed meridional gradients well. Due to the less strong seasonal varia-
 419 tions, the gradients calculated with the OPT-LMDz fluxes are somewhat flatter com-
 420 pared to the simulations with OPT-TM5 fluxes. Again, for ATom3, there is a strong dif-
 421 ference between the WM model group and the SM model group at high latitudes below
 422 2 km. WM models transporting the OPT-TM5 flux show the largest COS drawdown.

Table 4: Statistics between model groups transporting fluxes (optimized and control fluxes) and HIPPO data along latitude as shown in Fig. 7. RMSE and Pearson correlation are reported. The HIPPO observations are aggregated in the layer below 2 km (BL) and free troposphere (FT, 2–8 km).

campaign	flux	model group	altitude	correlation	std(ppt)	
HIPPO#3	CTL	SM	BL	0.18	25.8	
			FT	0.48	28.1	
		WM	BL	0.15	24.9	
			FT	0.43	30.5	
		OPT-TM5	SM	BL	0.78	15.1
				FT	0.85	15.6
	WM		BL	0.80	15.1	
	OPT-LMDZ	SM	BL	0.93	26.4	
			FT	0.93	24.8	
		WM	BL	0.86	26.5	
	FT	0.86	27.0			
	HIPPO#4	CTL	SM	BL	0.06	57.6
FT				0.52	47.7	
WM			BL	0.01	62.6	
			FT	0.52	47.6	
OPT-TM5			SM	BL	0.82	18.9
				FT	0.89	21.3
		WM	BL	0.95	18.4	
OPT-LMDZ		SM	BL	0.82	24.5	
			FT	0.94	29.1	
		WM	BL	0.92	24	
FT		0.95	30.4			
HIPPO#5		CTL	SM	BL	-0.72	70.8
	FT			-0.56	53.2	
	WM		BL	-0.77	79.2	
			FT	-0.60	52.9	
	OPT-TM5		SM	BL	0.93	24.6
				FT	0.95	18.5
		WM	BL	0.95	41.4	
	OPT-LMDZ	SM	BL	0.96	19.3	
			FT	0.94	18.5	
		WM	BL	0.99	24.3	
	FT	0.92	18.2			




Figure 9: Meridional gradient of ATom flights 1–4 and over the Atlantic Ocean. The model groups and observations are separated into observations below 2 km and in the free troposphere between 2–8 km, and averaged in each 20° latitudinal bin. The gray shading represents the standard deviation of ATom data for each flight and vertical region.




Figure 10: Same as Fig. 9 but over the Pacific Ocean.




Figure 11: The vertical ATom profiles averaged over 1.25 km thick layers and the different model groups over the Pacific Ocean.




Figure 12: Same as Fig. 11, but over the Atlantic Ocean.

Figure 10 compares the COS meridional gradients over the Pacific Ocean (results for individual models are presented in Fig. S13). Generally, all ATom flights are again well simulated by the models. In contrast to the Atlantic, ATom2 does not show a strong drawdown over the SH Pacific, a feature that is well reproduced by the models. ATom3 shows a strong drawdown below 2 km towards high latitudes over the Pacific, and this drawdown is not observed in the free troposphere. Here, models underestimate the COS mole fractions observed by ATom3 in the free troposphere.

The performance of the model groups is evaluated against ATom in Table 5, separated into the Atlantic and Pacific regions. The performance of the models using the control scenario fluxes is also included. We calculate how well the models reproduce the latitudinal gradients by correlating modeled and observed mole fraction against latitude. The results using the optimized fluxes generally reach a high correlation and much lower RMSE, showing improvements over the control scenario. In addition, the correlation of the optimized cases are usually close to 1.0, but there are exceptions, especially in free troposphere. For instance, for ATom1 over the Atlantic, WM models with both fluxes show correlations of 0.32 and 0.57, drastically lower than 0.99 and 0.95 in the boundary layer. For ATom3 over the Pacific, WM models show correlations of -0.4 and 0.28 , while correlations of 0.99 are seen in the boundary layer. These low and sometimes negative correlations are mostly caused by the small variations of the COS mole fractions averaged as latitudinal bins (20°). The lower simulated COS in the NH free troposphere during ATom3 will be further discussed in Sect. 4. Overall, there is no model group or flux showing clearly better statistics than the others. The ATom results using the control scenario is shown in Figs. S18 and S19 and further described in SI S5.

The vertical distribution of the model simulations is compared to ATom data in Figs. 11 and 12 (results for individual models are presented in Figs. S14 and S15 from SI S4). In the lower troposphere, below 8 km, ATom data and model simulations are in good agreement and model-to-model spread is rather small. In the upper troposphere above 8 km, the model-data comparison shows good performance for ATom flights 1–3. ATom4, however, shows a drastic decline of the COS abundance over the Atlantic, and all models fail to capture this decrease. An analysis of the COS vertical distribution over 30° latitudinal bins indicates that this COS decline mainly occurs over high latitudes in both hemispheres, as shown in Fig. S16 in SI S4. This decline is likely associated with the influence of the stratosphere, which has lower COS abundance (Brühl et al., 2012; Glatthor et al., 2017). Since the models do not simulate stratospheric COS removal, this feature is not present in the simulations. For ATom4, around 2 km, the models do not capture the enhanced COS over the Pacific that was observed during April–May 2018.

4 Discussion

In this section, we discuss the main findings and potential improvements of this model intercomparison.

First of all, we find that models with optimized COS fluxes capture the available observations in the atmosphere generally quite well, both in the boundary layer and in the free troposphere. This agreement with observations is in sharp contrast with the control scenario, discussed in the accompanying paper (Remaud et al., 2023), and shows that the flux optimization process generally leads to better comparison to observations, including with measurements that were not used in the optimization process. The optimized fluxes of TM5-4DVAR and LMDz are generally in good agreement, with a slightly stronger seasonal cycle in the OPT-TM5 fluxes. This can be explained by the fact that TM5 is in the group of the "strongly-mixing" models, which implies that larger flux adjustments are required to obtain agreement with the assimilated NOAA surface measurements.

Table 5: Statistics of model groups using different fluxes (CTL, OPT-TM5, OPT-LMDZ). RMSE (pmol mol^{-1}) and Pearson correlation are reported for the different ATom campaigns. The ATom observations are aggregated in the layer below 2 km (BL) and the free troposphere (FT, 2–8 km).

flux	model group	altitude	campaign	correlation	std (ppt)	campaign	correlation	RMSE (ppt)	
CTL	SM	BL		-0.08	72.1		0.91	82.5	
		FT		0.34	74.8		0.95	87.3	
	WM	BL		-0.07	71.7		0.9	84.1	
		FT		0.38	73.5		0.96	87.1	
	OPT-TM5	SM	BL	ATom#1 Atlantic	0.98	11.5	ATom#1 Pacific	0.96	4.5
			FT		0.16	17.4		0.86	11.7
WM		BL	0.99		9.4	0.95		4.7	
		FT	0.32		16.1	0.79		13.8	
SM		BL	0.96		13.6	1		14.4	
		FT	0.48		21.5	0.92		23.7	
OPT-LMDZ	BL	0.95	13.9	0.99	16.2				
	FT	0.57	19.2	0.94	22.9				
CTL	SM	BL		0.88	61.8		-0.23	61.5	
		FT		0.87	70.6		0.02	68.8	
	WM	BL		0.92	58.3		-0.06	57.6	
		FT		0.86	74		0.1	71.3	
	OPT-TM5	SM	BL	ATom#2 Atlantic	0.86	5.8	ATom#2 Pacific	0.73	8.7
			FT		0.97	6.2		0.63	7.5
WM		BL	0.85		4.8	0.78		11.9	
		FT	0.94		10.6	0.56		11.2	
SM		BL	0.89		17.9	0.86		16.6	
		FT	0.99		17.9	0.9		16.6	
OPT-LMDZ	BL	0.46	18	0.89	17				
	FT	0.96	19.6	0.8	18.2				
CTL	SM	BL		-0.88	59.8		-0.92	73.9	
		FT		-0.79	66.3		0.89	73.3	
	WM	BL		-0.91	59.8		-0.94	75.6	
		FT		-0.82	67.9		0.86	73.2	
	OPT-TM5	SM	BL	ATom#3 Atlantic	0.95	8	ATom#3 Pacific	0.98	6.5
			FT		0.97	6.6		-0.37	13.4
WM		BL	0.97		13.6	0.99		15.5	
		FT	0.96		9.1	-0.4		16.4	
SM		BL	0.94		11.6	0.99		7.1	
		FT	0.79		11.8	0.87		16	
OPT-LMDZ	BL	0.97	8.1	0.99	8.6				
	FT	0.81	13.2	0.28	17.3				
CTL	SM	BL		0.64	61.8		0.91	61.3	
		FT		0.79	65		0.84	62.8	
	WM	BL		0.57	59.6		0.91	60.1	
		FT		0.69	64.6		0.87	62	
	OPT-TM5	SM	BL	ATom#4 Atlantic	0.78	18	ATom#4 Pacific	0.9	13.2
			FT		0.71	16.7		0.91	10.9
WM		BL	0.77		17.2	0.93		13.6	
		FT	0.62		17.3	0.96		10.2	
SM		BL	0.57		29.3	0.93		19.5	
		FT	0.51		23.2	0.9		18.4	
OPT-LMDZ	BL	0.59	26.2	0.97	16.5				
	FT	0.35	22.8	0.95	16.6				

473 The net source of the OPT-TM5 fluxes (838.5 GgS a^{-1}) is 13.3% higher than that
 474 of OPT-LMDz (740.1 GgS a^{-1}), see Table 1. Also, it is worth noting that the TM5-4DVAR
 475 inversion assimilated COS measurements from 14 NOAA surface stations, while the LMDz
 476 inversion assimilated COS and CO_2 from 15 NOAA surface stations adding WIS. Inter-
 477 estingly, a similar budget difference of CO_2 inversion was also found based on the com-
 478 parison of GEOS-Chem and TM5-4DVAR (Schuh et al., 2019, 2022). Later, Schuh and
 479 Jacobson (2022) analysed the systematic large-scale patterns in column integrated CO_2
 480 concentration (XCO_2) differences associated with transport of the two models, and found
 481 that the XCO_2 differences were primarily caused by differences in the parameterization
 482 of convective mixing.

483 Near the surface, the strength of the vertical mixing observed in the NOAA air-
 484 craft data, is controlled by the sub-grid scale parameterization. Specifically, TM3, TOM-
 485 CAT, and TM5 as strong-mixing models use a similar boundary layer scheme (Louis, 1979)
 486 and ECMWF-based convective fluxes (Krol et al., 2018). The weak-mixing models share
 487 a similar Mellor-Yamada boundary layer scheme (Mellor & Yamada, 1974, 1982; Nakan-
 488 ishi & Niino, 2004). The station-based vertical gradients are compared to the NOAA air-
 489 craft platform in Fig. S9 in SI S3. Over Alaska, the SM models agree better with the ob-
 490 served vertical gradients. WM models generally simulated too large vertical COS ver-
 491 tical gradients during JJA and SON, and this effect is reinforced by using the OPT-TM5
 492 fluxes. Note, however, that the model spread is large. The smaller vertical gradients for
 493 strong-mixing models can be explained by the faster vertical mixing in the boundary layer,
 494 as pointed out in a SF_6 validation study by Peters et al. (2004).

495 In the free troposphere, the models using optimized fluxes show a significantly im-
 496 proved match to HIPPO and ATom data compared to simulations using the control flux
 497 scenario, see also SI S5. One point of discussion is the underestimation of the modeled
 498 COS, mostly in the free troposphere over the NH and tropics (HIPPO4, HIPPO5, see
 499 Fig. 7, ATom1 and ATom4 Atlantic, see Fig. 9, ATom3 and ATom4 Pacific, see Fig. 10).
 500 These underestimates mostly occur in the NH summer. We speculate that the mismatches
 501 are caused by missing sources in the free troposphere. Recent findings on oxidation path-
 502 ways of DMS revealed a new stable intermediate, hydroperoxy-methyl-thioformate (HPMTF).
 503 HPMTF can potentially be oxidized to produce COS in the troposphere (Wu et al., 2015;
 504 Veres et al., 2020; Fung et al., 2022). However, taking into account the large solubility
 505 of HPMTF strongly reduces the conversion of DMS to COS, even below the yield of 0.7%
 506 (Barnes et al., 1994) that is currently used in COS emission inventories (Ma et al., 2021;
 507 Jernigan et al., 2022). Possibilities of in-cloud production of COS from dissolved HPMTF
 508 are still rather speculative, but cannot be excluded. Another possible candidate for the
 509 COS underestimates in the free troposphere could be unaccounted COS or CS_2 emis-
 510 sions from Asia. Further investigation on this possibility is required.

511 There are several shortcomings in this work. First of all, the COS chemistry in the
 512 troposphere and stratosphere was not explicitly included in the models, but projected
 513 to the surface to keep the modelling protocol relatively simple and the COS budget closed.
 514 However, in reality COS is depleted in the stratosphere, and entrainment of stratospheric
 515 air may result in lower COS mole fractions, as observed in ATom4 over the Atlantic (Fig. 10).
 516 A more realistic approach would be to treat the COS chemistry as a 3-dimensional loss
 517 field. Another limitation of this work is that the ATMs started from a zero COS initial
 518 state, which made direct comparisons against COS measurements challenging. We solved
 519 this by correcting the models for budget imbalances (Table 2) and adding $485 \text{ pmol mol}^{-1}$.
 520 This adjusts the model simulations to the NOAA surface network as reference, yet the
 521 procedure is based on the assumption that the COS abundance does not change over time
 522 in the troposphere. The issue is alleviated by applying the standard CCGVU software
 523 to filter out inter-annual and synoptic signals. Thus comparing the modeled seasonal cy-
 524 cles to observed cycles is likely reliable. However, this correction procedure may partially
 525 explain the offsets between the models with HIPPO and ATom observations.

526 Finally, it would be instructive to compare the results also to the Fourier-transform
 527 infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) network (Wang et al., 2016; Hannigan et al., 2022) and
 528 satellite observations, i.e. MIPAS (Glatthor et al., 2017; Ma et al., 2021; Remaud et al.,
 529 2022), TES (Kuai et al., 2014, 2015; Ma et al., 2021) and ACE-FTS observations (Yousefi
 530 et al., 2019; Kloss et al., 2019). However, applying the averaging kernel without decay-
 531 ing profiles in the stratosphere hampers a straightforward evaluation of the current model
 532 results.

533 5 Conclusions and Recommendations

534 In this paper, we presented results of the inter-model comparison TransCom-COS.
 535 In this Part II we focused on the optimized COS fluxes that are propagated in seven ATMs
 536 starting from the same initial state. We grouped the model results based on two sets of
 537 optimized fluxes (OPT-TM5 and OPT-LMDz), and on the strength of the vertical mixing
 538 in the models. Specifically, we identified weak mixing models (WM, including LMDz)
 539 and strong mixing models (SM, including TM5). Main findings are:

- 540 1. COS fluxes optimized with the TM5-4DVAR and LMDz inversion systems are in
 541 good agreement in terms of spatial distribution, global budgets and temporal vari-
 542 ability. However, TM5-optimized fluxes show a larger seasonal cycle compared to
 543 the LMDz fluxes, likely caused by the different strength of the vertical mixing.
- 544 2. The comparison across model simulations and NOAA surface data shows good agree-
 545 ment in annual mean meridional gradients. Seasonal cycles at stations show more
 546 discrepancies, mainly at high latitude measurement stations. Specifically, WM mod-
 547 els that used the OPT-TM5 fluxes simulated too large seasonal cycles at high-latitudes.
- 548 3. The comparison across model simulations to NOAA vertical observations over North
 549 America shows that all models (using optimized fluxes) simulate reliable COS draw-
 550 downs. Over the North American continent, all the models captured the observed
 551 COS vertical gradient well. Over Alaska, WM models tend to overestimate the
 552 observed vertical gradients.
- 553 4. Model simulations are generally consistent with HIPPO and ATom observations,
 554 and capture observed COS drawdown effects caused by uptake of COS by the bio-
 555 sphere from the NH continent over the Pacific and from the Amazon over the At-
 556 lantic Ocean.
- 557 5. Consistent with findings reported in Ma et al. (2021), simulations tend to under-
 558 estimate COS in the free troposphere in the tropics and in the NH. This could point
 559 to a missing chemical COS source.

560 This paper clearly shows that the current optimized fluxes are well able to repro-
 561 duce the main features of the observed global distribution of COS and its seasonal cy-
 562 cle. To further improve and refine our knowledge on the COS budget we present the fol-
 563 lowing recommendations for future research.

- 564 1. More elaborate data assimilation and model evaluation methods are necessary. These
 565 methods should make use of FTIR and satellite data to further constrain the sources
 566 and sinks of COS. Recent studies have used MIPAS satellite data to constrain GPP
 567 over the Amazon region (Stinecipher et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2023). Hannigan et
 568 al. (2022) recently presented the extensive COS FTIR Network linked to the De-
 569 tection of Atmospheric Composition Change (NDACC) network, which enables
 570 a more comprehensive model evaluation and offers possibilities for data assimi-
 571 lation in the future.
- 572 2. In general, COS inversion studies are still limited by a lack of COS observations,
 573 and more measurement data are needed. Specific focus should be on direct mea-

- 574 surements on large scale ecosystems, such as the Amazon rain forest, and data-
 575 void regions like Asia.
- 576 3. The underestimated COS mole fractions in the free troposphere require an expla-
 577 nation. Enhanced COS production from DMS oxidation can be a candidate, i.e.
 578 through the HPMTF intermediate, but this requires further study.
- 579 4. The TransCom-COS protocol can be further improved by providing ATMs with
 580 a standard initial state and 3D fields of COS related chemistry, e.g. tropospheric
 581 oxidation and stratospheric photolysis.

582 Appendix A TransCom-COS participant Model descriptions

Table A1: Summary information (transport model, meteorology, vertical resolution, horizontal resolution, and physical schemes) of the TransCom models in this study. η denotes hybrid sigma-pressure coordinates, and z^* denotes terrain-following vertical coordinates based on the geometric height.

Transport model	Meteorology	Horizontal resolutions (latitude \times longitude degree)	Vertical resolutions	Reference	Convection scheme	PBL mixing scheme	Advection scheme
LMDz	Nudging towards horizontal winds from ERA-5	1.875 \times 3.75	39 η	Remaud et al. (2018)	Emanuel (1991); Rochetin et al. (2014)	Small scale turbulence: Mellor and Yamada (1974)	Van Leer (1997); Hourdin and Armengaud (1999)
TM5	Meteo-and surface fields from ERAInterim	2 \times 2	25 η	Krol et al. (2005)	Convective mass fluxes from ERAInterim	Near surface mixing: Louis (1979); Free troposphere mixing: Holtslag and Moeng (1991)	Slopes advection scheme: Russell and Lerner (1981)
TM3	Meteo-and surface fields from NCEP	4 \times 5	19 η	Heimann (2003)	Tiedtke (1989)	Louis (1979)	Slopes advection scheme: Russell and Lerner (1981)
TOMCAT	Forced with the surface pressure, vorticity, divergence from ERAInterim	2.8 \times 2.8	60 η (surface to 60 km)	Chipperfield (2006)	Convective mass fluxes from ERAInterim	Louis (1979)	Prather (1986)
MIROC4	Nudging towards horizontal winds and temperature from JRA-55	T42 spectral truncation (2.8 \times 2.8)	67 η	Patra et al. (2018)	Arakawa and Schubert (1974), with updates	Mellor and Yamada (1982)	S.-J. Lin and Rood (1996)
NICAM5	Nudging towards horizontal winds from JRA-55	223 km (icosahedral grid)	40z*	Niwa et al. (2017)	Chikira and Sugiyama (2010)	MYNN (Mellor and Yamada (1974); Nakanishi and Niino (2004))	(Miura, 2007) & Niwa et al. (2011)
NICAM6	Nudging towards horizontal winds from JRA-55	112 km (icosahedral grid)	40z*	Niwa et al. (2017)	Chikira and Sugiyama (2010)	Level 2 scheme MYNN (Mellor and Yamada (1974); Nakanishi and Niino (2004))	(Miura, 2007) & Niwa et al. (2011)

583 Appendix B TransCom-COS observational platform descriptions

584 Appendix C Open Research/ Data Availability statement

585 The COS mole fraction time series at station GIF from 2014 to 2019 are provided
 586 by Sauveur Belviso and can be downloaded from [https://sharebox.lscce.ipsl.fr/
 587 index.php/s/Yxbj6dZsrc6ns0Z?path=%2FGIF-observations](https://sharebox.lscce.ipsl.fr/index.php/s/Yxbj6dZsrc6ns0Z?path=%2FGIF-observations) (last access: 22 August
 588 2022). The COS mole fraction time series at station WIS are provided by Dan Yakir.
 589 COS measurements from GIF and WIS sites are calibrated on the same scale as the NOAA
 590 observations. The LMDz model is available from [http://svn.lmd.jussieu.fr/LMDz/
 591 LMDz6/](http://svn.lmd.jussieu.fr/LMDz/LMDz6/) under the CeCILL v2 free software license. The source codes of NICAM-TM are
 592 included in the package of the parent model NICAM, which can be obtained upon re-
 593 quest under the general terms and conditions (<http://nicam.jp/hiki/?Research+Collaborations>).
 594 The source code of MIROC4-ACTM is archived at [https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo
 595 .7274240](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7274240). TM5 model is available at: <https://sourceforge.net/projects/tm5/>. The
 596 version used for this study is also archived at: <https://zenodo.org/record/7525670#>

Table B1: Information of observational platforms: NOAA surface network, NOAA aircraft, HIPPO and ATOm. Only the stations and time period used in this work are listed.

Observation	Code	Location	Year	Latitude	Longitude	Ground elevation (m a.s.l.)
NOAA surface stations	CGO	Cape Grim, Australia	2010-2018 & 2019	40.4S	144.6W	164
	SMO	American Samoa	2010-2018 & 2019	14.2S	170.6W	77
	MLO	Mauna Loa, United States	2010-2018 & 2019	19.5N	155.6W	3397
	KUM	Cape Kumukahi, United States	2010-2018 & 2019	19.5N	154.8W	3
	NWR	Niwot Ridge, United States	2010-2018 & 2019	40.0N	105.5W	3475
	LEF	Wisconsin, United States	2010-2018 & 2019	45.9N	90.3W	868
	HFM	Harvard Forest, United States	2010-2018 & 2019	42.5N	72.2W	340
	BRW	Barrow, United States	2010-2018 & 2019	71.3N	155.6W	8
	ALT	Alert, Canada	2010-2018 & 2019	82.5N	62.3W	195
	THD	Trinidad Head, United States	2010-2018 & 2019	41.0N	124.1W	120
	MHD	Mace Head, Ireland	2010-2018 & 2019	53.3N	9.9W	18
	PSA	Palmer Station, Antarctica, United States	2010-2018 & 2019	64.8S	64.1W	10
	SPO	South Pole, Antarctica, United States	2010-2018 & 2019	90.0S	24.8W	2810
	SUM	Summit, Greenland	2010-2018 & 2019	72.6N	38.4W	3200
	NOAA Aircraft	ACG	Alaska Coast Guard	2010-2011	57.7N	152.5W
BNE		Beaver Crossing, Nebraska	2010-2011	40.8N	97.2W	466
CAR		Briggsdale, Colorado	2010-2011	40.6N	104.3W	1488
CMA		Offshore Cape May, New Jersey	2010-2011	38.8N	74.3W	0
ESP		Estevan Point, British Columbia	2010-2011	49.4N	126.5W	7
ETL		East Trout Lake, Saskatchewan	2010-2011	54.4N	104.9W	493
HIL		Homer, Illinois	2010-2011	40.1N	87.9W	202
LEF		Park Falls, Wisconsin	2010-2011	45.9N	90.3W	472
NHA		Offshore Portsmouth, New Hampshire (Isles of Shoals)	2010-2011	43.0N	70.6W	0
PEA		Poker Flat, Alaska	2010-2011	64.9N	148.8W	210
TGC		Offshore Corpus Christi, Texas	2010-2011	27.7N	96.9W	0
THD		Trinidad Head, California	2010-2011	41.1N	124.2W	107
WBI	West Branch, Iowa	2010-2011	41.7N	91.4W	242	
HIPPO	Flight 3-5	across North American Continent and Pacific Ocean	2010-2011			
ATom	Flight 1-4	across Pacific, Atlantic and South Ocean	2016-2018			

.Y-DZLezMlyJ. TOMCAT is a UK community model. It is available to UK (or NERC-funded) researchers who normally access the model on common facilities (e.g. Archer or JASMIN) or who are helped to install it on their local machines. As it is a complex research tool, new users will need help to use the model optimally. We do not have the resources to release and support the model in an open way. Any potential user interested in the model should contact Martyn Chipperfield. The model updates described in this paper are included in the standard model library. The SiB4 code used to simulate the biosphere fluxes is available online at https://gitlab.com/kdhaynes/sib4_corral (last access, 01/01/2023). The source codes of ORCHIDEE used to simulate the COS biosphere fluxes is available from <https://doi.org/10.14768/06dcc7f1-28c2-4ebb-8616-deb0831ffd90> (doi), with explanations here: https://forge.ipsl.jussieu.fr/orchidee/wiki/GroupActivities/CodeAvailabilityPublication/ORCHIDEE_COS_JGR. The model outputs of optimized fluxes are available at: https://zenodo.org/record/7632737#.Y_4GCOyZNMm.

Acknowledgments

This study was partly funded by the CO2 Human Emissions (CHE) project, which received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 776186. P.K.P. and Y.N. are partially supported by the Environmental Research and Technology Development Fund (JPMEERF21S20800) of the Environmental Restoration and Conservation Agency provided by the Ministry of Environment of Japan. Y.N. is also supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant JP22H05006. The simulations of NICAM-TM were performed by using the supercomputer system of NIES (SX-Aurora Tsubasa). M.P.C. and C.W. are supported by the NERC National Centre for Earth Observation CPEO project. The work at Leeds was supported by the NCEO CPEO project (NE/X006328/1). We thank Wuhu Feng (NCAS Leeds) for help with the TOMCAT model. Dan Yakir facilitated the collection of flask samples at WIS. Measurements from NOAA’s ongoing surface and aircraft missions and also NOAA’s measurements during the HIPPO and ATOm campaigns were also done by the assistance of C. Siso, B. Miller, K. McKain, C. Sweeney, S. Wolter, J. Higgs, E. Moglia, M. Crotwell,

625 D. Neff, and A. Karion. We thank SURF (<http://www.surf.nl>) for the TM5 model com-
626 putational support in using the National Supercomputer Snellius. J.M. and M.C.K have
627 been supported by the European Research Council (ERC) COS-OCS project with grant
628 agreement No. 742798 (<http://cos-ocs.eu>).

References

- 629
- 630 Arakawa, A., & Schubert, W. H. (1974). Interaction of a cumulus cloud ensemble
631 with the large-scale environment, part i. *Journal of the atmospheric sciences*,
632 *31*(3), 674–701.
- 633 Barnes, I., Becker, K. H., & Patroescu, I. (1994). The tropospheric oxidation of
634 DMS: A new source of OCS. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *21*(22), 2389–
635 2392. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/
636 10.1029/94GL02499](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/94GL02499)
- 637 Belviso, S., Abadie, C., Montagne, D., Hadjar, D., Tropée, D., Vialettes, L., ... oth-
638 ers (2022). Carbonyl sulfide (cos) emissions in two agroecosystems in central
639 france. *Plos one*, *17*(12), e0278584.
- 640 Belviso, S., Lebegue, B., Ramonet, M., Kazan, V., Pison, I., Berchet, A., ... Ciaï,
641 P. (2020). A top-down approach of sources and non-photosynthetic sinks of
642 carbonyl sulfide from atmospheric measurements over multiple years in the
643 paris region (france). *PloS one*, *15*(2), e0228419.
- 644 Belviso, S., Pison, I., Petit, J.-E., Berchet, A., Remaud, M., Simon, L., ... others
645 (2023). The z-2018 emissions inventory of cos in europe: A semiquantitative
646 multi-data-streams evaluation. *Atmospheric Environment*, 119689.
- 647 Belviso, S., Remaud, M., Abadie, C., Maignan, F., Ramonet, M., & Peylin, P.
648 (2022). Ongoing decline in the atmospheric cos seasonal cycle amplitude
649 over western europe: Implications for surface fluxes. *Atmosphere*, *13*(5), 812.
- 650 Berry, J., Wolf, A., Campbell, J. E., Baker, I., Blake, N., Blake, D., ... others
651 (2013). A coupled model of the global cycles of carbonyl sulfide and co₂: A
652 possible new window on the carbon cycle. *Journal of Geophysical Research:
653 Biogeosciences*, *118*(2), 842–852.
- 654 Bisht, J. S., Machida, T., Chandra, N., Tsuboi, K., Patra, P. K., Umezawa, T., ...
655 others (2021). Seasonal variations of sf₆, co₂, ch₄, and n₂o in the ut/l_s region
656 due to emissions, transport, and chemistry. *Journal of Geophysical Research:
657 Atmospheres*, *126*(4), e2020JD033541.
- 658 Brühl, C., Lelieveld, J., Crutzen, P. J., & Tost, H. (2012). The role of car-
659 bonyl sulphide as a source of stratospheric sulphate aerosol and its impact
660 on climate. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *12*(3), 1239–1253. Re-
661 trieved from [https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/12/1239/2012/
662 10.5194/acp-12-1239-2012](https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/12/1239/2012/) doi:
10.5194/acp-12-1239-2012
- 663 Campbell, Carmichael, G. R., Chai, T., Mena-Carrasco, M., Tang, Y., Blake, D., ...
664 others (2008). Photosynthetic control of atmospheric carbonyl sulfide during
665 the growing season. *Science*, *322*(5904), 1085–1088.
- 666 Campbell, Whelan, M., Seibt, U., Smith, S. J., Berry, J., & Hilton, T. W. (2015).
667 Atmospheric carbonyl sulfide sources from anthropogenic activity: Implications
668 for carbon cycle constraints. *Geophysical research letters*, *42*(8), 3004–3010.
- 669 Chikira, M., & Sugiyama, M. (2010). A cumulus parameterization with state-
670 dependent entrainment rate. part i: Description and sensitivity to temperature
671 and humidity profiles. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, *67*(7), 2171–2193.
- 672 Chipperfield, M. (2006). New version of the tomcat/slimcat off-line chemical trans-
673 port model: Intercomparison of stratospheric tracer experiments. *Quarterly
674 Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society: A journal of the atmospheric
675 sciences, applied meteorology and physical oceanography*, *132*(617), 1179–1203.
- 676 Crutzen, P. J. (1976). The possible importance of CSO for the sulfate layer
677 of the stratosphere. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *3*(2), 73–76. doi:
678 10.1029/GL003i002p00073
- 679 Emanuel, K. A. (1991). A scheme for representing cumulus convection in large-scale
680 models. *Journal of the atmospheric sciences*, *48*(21), 2313–2329.
- 681 Fung, K. M., Heald, C. L., Kroll, J. H., Wang, S., Jo, D. S., Gettelman, A., ... oth-
682 ers (2022). Exploring dimethyl sulfide (dms) oxidation and implications for

- 683 global aerosol radiative forcing. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 22(2),
684 1549–1573.
- 685 Glatthor, N., Höpfner, M., Leyser, A., Stiller, G. P., von Clarmann, T., Grabowski,
686 U., ... others (2017). Global carbonyl sulfide (ocs) measured by mipas/envisat
687 during 2002–2012. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17(4), 2631–2652.
- 688 Hannigan, J. W., Ortega, I., Shams, S. B., Blumenstock, T., Campbell, J. E., Con-
689 way, S., ... others (2022). Global atmospheric ocs trend analysis from
690 22 ndacc stations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 127(4),
691 e2021JD035764.
- 692 Heimann, M. (2003). The global atmospheric tracer model tm3: model description
693 and user's manual; release 3.8 a.
- 694 Holtzlag, A., & Moeng, C.-H. (1991). Eddy diffusivity and countergradient transport
695 in the convective atmospheric boundary layer. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sci-
696 ences*, 48(14), 1690–1698.
- 697 Hourdin, F., & Armengaud, A. (1999). The use of finite-volume methods for at-
698 mospheric advection of trace species. part i: Test of various formulations in a
699 general circulation model. *Monthly weather review*, 127(5), 822–837.
- 700 Hu, L., Montzka, S. A., Kaushik, A., Andrews, A. E., Sweeney, C., Miller, J., ...
701 others (2021). Cos-derived gpp relationships with temperature and light help
702 explain high-latitude atmospheric co₂ seasonal cycle amplification. *Proceedings
703 of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(33).
- 704 Jernigan, C. M., Fite, C. H., Vereecken, L., Berkelhammer, M. B., Rollins, A. W.,
705 Rickly, P. S., ... Bertram, T. H. (2022). Efficient production of carbonyl sul-
706 fide in the low-nox oxidation of dimethyl sulfide. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
707 49(3), e2021GL096838.
- 708 Kettle, A., Kuhn, U., von Hobe, M. v., Kesselmeier, J., & Andreae, M. (2002).
709 Global budget of atmospheric carbonyl sulfide: Temporal and spatial varia-
710 tions of the dominant sources and sinks. *Journal of Geophysical Research:
711 Atmospheres*, 107(D22), ACH-25.
- 712 Kloss, C., von Hobe, M., Höpfner, M., Walker, K. A., Riese, M., Ungermann, J., ...
713 Bodeker, G. E. (2019). Sampling bias adjustment for sparsely sampled satellite
714 measurements applied to ace-fts carbonyl sulfide observations. *Atmospheric
715 measurement techniques*, 12(4), 2129–2138.
- 716 Kooijmans, L. M., Cho, A., Ma, J., Kaushik, A., Haynes, K. D., Baker, I., ... oth-
717 ers (2021). Evaluation of carbonyl sulfide biosphere exchange in the simple
718 biosphere model (sib4). *Biogeosciences*, 18(24), 6547–6565.
- 719 Krol, M., De Bruine, M., Killaars, L., Ouwersloot, H., Pozzer, A., Yin, Y., ... others
720 (2018). Age of air as a diagnostic for transport timescales in global models.
721 *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11(8), 3109–3130.
- 722 Krol, M., Houweling, S., Bregman, B., van den Broek, M., Segers, A., van
723 Velthoven, P., ... Bergamaschi, P. (2005, feb). The two-way nested global
724 chemistry-transport zoom model TM5: algorithm and applications. *At-
725 mospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 5(2), 417–432. Retrieved from [http://
726 www.atmos-chem-phys.net/5/417/2005/](http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/5/417/2005/) doi: 10.5194/acp-5-417-2005
- 727 Kuai, L., Worden, J., Kulawik, S., Montzka, S., & Liu, J. (2014). Characteriza-
728 tion of aura tes carbonyl sulfide retrievals over ocean. *Atmospheric Measure-
729 ment Techniques*, 7(1), 163–172.
- 730 Kuai, L., Worden, J. R., Campbell, J. E., Kulawik, S. S., Li, K.-F., Lee, M., ... oth-
731 ers (2015). Estimate of carbonyl sulfide tropical oceanic surface fluxes using
732 aura tropospheric emission spectrometer observations. *Journal of Geophysical
733 Research: Atmospheres*, 120(20), 11–012.
- 734 Launois, T., Peylin, P., Belviso, S., & Poulter, B. (2015). A new model of
735 the global biogeochemical cycle of carbonyl sulfide - Part 2: Use of car-
736 bonyl sulfide to constrain gross primary productivity in current vegetation
737 models. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15(16), 9285–9312. Re-

- 738 trieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/145657370.pdf> doi:
739 10.5194/acp-15-9285-2015
- 740 Lennartz, S. T., Gauss, M., von Hobe, M., & Marandino, C. A. (2021). Monthly re-
741 solved modelled oceanic emissions of carbonyl sulphide and carbon disulphide
742 for the period 2000–2019. *Earth System Science Data*, *13*(5), 2095–2110.
- 743 Lennartz, S. T., Marandino, C. A., Von Hobe, M., Cortes, P., Quack, B., Simo, R.,
744 ... others (2017). Direct oceanic emissions unlikely to account for the missing
745 source of atmospheric carbonyl sulfide. *Atmospheric chemistry and physics*,
746 *17*(1), 385–402.
- 747 Lennartz, S. T., von Hobe, M., Booge, D., Bittig, H. C., Fischer, T., Gonçalves-
748 Araujo, R., ... others (2019). The influence of dissolved organic matter on the
749 marine production of carbonyl sulfide (ocs) and carbon disulfide (cs 2) in the
750 peruvian upwelling. *Ocean science*, *15*(4), 1071–1090.
- 751 Lin, S.-J., & Rood, R. B. (1996). Multidimensional flux-form semi-lagrangian trans-
752 port schemes. *Monthly Weather Review*, *124*(9), 2046–2070.
- 753 Lin, X., Ciais, P., Bousquet, P., Ramonet, M., Yin, Y., Balkanski, Y., ... others
754 (2018). Simulating ch 4 and co 2 over south and east asia using the zoomed
755 chemistry transport model lmdz-inca. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*,
756 *18*(13), 9475–9497.
- 757 Louis, J.-F. (1979). A parametric model of vertical eddy fluxes in the atmosphere.
758 *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, *17*(2), 187–202.
- 759 Ma, J., Kooijmans, L. M., Cho, A., Montzka, S. A., Glatthor, N., Worden, J. R., ...
760 Krol, M. C. (2021). Inverse modelling of carbonyl sulfide: implementation,
761 evaluation and implications for the global budget. *Atmospheric Chemistry and*
762 *Physics*, *21*(5), 3507–3529.
- 763 Ma, J., Kooijmans, L. M., Montzka, S. A., Glatthor, N., Röckmann, T., & Krol,
764 M. C. (2023). Combined assimilation of noaa surface and mipas satellite obser-
765 vations to constrain the global budget of carbonyl sulfide. *To be submitted*.
- 766 Maignan, F., Abadie, C., Remaud, M., Kooijmans, L. M., Kohonen, K.-M., Com-
767 mane, R., ... others (2021). Carbonyl sulfide: comparing a mechanistic
768 representation of the vegetation uptake in a land surface model and the leaf
769 relative uptake approach. *Biogeosciences*, *18*(9), 2917–2955.
- 770 Mellor, G. L., & Yamada, T. (1974). A hierarchy of turbulence closure models for
771 planetary boundary layers. *Journal of the atmospheric sciences*, *31*(7), 1791–
772 1806.
- 773 Mellor, G. L., & Yamada, T. (1982). Development of a turbulence closure model for
774 geophysical fluid problems. *Reviews of Geophysics*, *20*(4), 851–875.
- 775 Miura, H. (2007). An upwind-biased conservative advection scheme for spherical
776 hexagonal–pentagonal grids. *Monthly weather review*, *135*(12), 4038–4044.
- 777 Montzka, S., Calvert, P., Hall, B., Elkins, J., Conway, T., Tans, P., & Sweeney, C.
778 (2007). On the global distribution, seasonality, and budget of atmospheric
779 carbonyl sulfide (cos) and some similarities to co2. *Journal of Geophysical*
780 *Research: Atmospheres*, *112*(D9).
- 781 Nakanishi, M., & Niino, H. (2004). An improved mellor–yamada level-3 model with
782 condensation physics: Its design and verification. *Boundary-layer meteorology*,
783 *112*(1), 1–31.
- 784 Niwa, Y., Tomita, H., Satoh, M., & Imasu, R. (2011). A three-dimensional icosahed-
785 ral grid advection scheme preserving monotonicity and consistency with
786 continuity for atmospheric tracer transport. *Journal of the Meteorological*
787 *Society of Japan. Ser. II*, *89*(3), 255–268.
- 788 Niwa, Y., Tomita, H., Satoh, M., Imasu, R., Sawa, Y., Tsuboi, K., ... others (2017).
789 A 4d-var inversion system based on the icosahedral grid model (nicam-tm 4d-
790 var v1. 0)–part 1: Offline forward and adjoint transport models. *Geoscientific*
791 *Model Development*, *10*(3), 1157–1174.
- 792 Notholt, J., Kuang, Z., Rinsland, C., Toon, G., Rex, M., Jones, N., ... others

- 793 (2003). Enhanced upper tropical tropospheric cos: Impact on the stratospheric
794 aerosol layer. *Science*, *300*(5617), 307–310.
- 795 Novak, G. A., Fite, C. H., Holmes, C. D., Veres, P. R., Neuman, J. A., Faloon, I.,
796 ... others (2021). Rapid cloud removal of dimethyl sulfide oxidation products
797 limits so₂ and cloud condensation nuclei production in the marine atmosphere.
798 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *118*(42), e2110472118.
- 799 Patra, P. K., Houweling, S., Krol, M., Bousquet, P., Belikov, D., Bergmann, D., ...
800 others (2011). Transcom model simulations of ch₄ and related species: linking
801 transport, surface flux and chemical loss with ch₄ variability in the tropo-
802 sphere and lower stratosphere. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *11*(24),
803 12813–12837.
- 804 Patra, P. K., Takigawa, M., Watanabe, S., Chandra, N., Ishijima, K., & Yamashita,
805 Y. (2018). Improved chemical tracer simulation by miroc4.0-based atmo-
806 spheric chemistry-transport model (miroc4-actm). *Sola*, *14*, 91–96.
- 807 Peters, W., Krol, M., Dlugokencky, E., Dentener, F., Bergamaschi, P., Dutton, G.,
808 ... Tans, P. (2004). Toward regional-scale modeling using the two-way nested
809 global model tm5: Characterization of transport using sf₆. *Journal of Geo-
810 physical Research: Atmospheres*, *109*(D19).
- 811 Prather, M. J. (1986). Numerical advection by conservation of second-order mo-
812 ments. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *91*(D6), 6671–6681.
- 813 Protoschill-Krebs, G., Wilhelm, C., & Kesselmeier, J. (1996). Consumption of car-
814 bonyl sulphide (cos) by higher plant carbonic anhydrase (ca). *Atmospheric En-
815 vironment*, *30*(18), 3151–3156.
- 816 Remaud, M., Chevallier, F., Cozic, A., Lin, X., & Bousquet, P. (2018). On the im-
817 pact of recent developments of the lmdz atmospheric general circulation model
818 on the simulation of co₂ transport. *Geoscientific Model Development*, *11*(11),
819 4489–4513.
- 820 Remaud, M., Chevallier, F., Maignan, F., Belviso, S., Berchet, A., Parouffe, A.,
821 ... Peylin, P. (2022). Plant gross primary production, plant respiration
822 and carbonyl sulfide emissions over the globe inferred by atmospheric inverse
823 modelling. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *22*(4), 2525–2552.
- 824 Remaud, M., Ma, J., Krol, M., Abadie, C., Cartwright, M. P., Patra, P., ... others
825 (2023). Intercomparison of atmospheric carbonyl sulfide (transcom-cos; part
826 one): Evaluating the impact of transport and emissions on tropospheric vari-
827 ability using ground-based and aircraft data. *Journal of Geophysical Research:
828 Atmospheres*, e2022JD037817.
- 829 Rochetin, N., Grandpeix, J.-Y., Rio, C., & Couvreur, F. (2014). Deep convection
830 triggering by boundary layer thermals. part ii: Stochastic triggering param-
831 eterization for the lmdz gcm. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, *71*(2),
832 515–538.
- 833 Russell, G. L., & Lerner, J. A. (1981). A new finite-differencing scheme for the
834 tracer transport equation. *Journal of Applied Meteorology (1962-1982)*, 1483–
835 1498.
- 836 Schuh, A. E., Byrne, B., Jacobson, A. R., Crowell, S. M., Deng, F., Baker, D. F., ...
837 Weir, B. (2022). On the role of atmospheric model transport uncertainty in
838 estimating the chinese land carbon sink. *Nature*, *603*(7901), E13–E14.
- 839 Schuh, A. E., & Jacobson, A. R. (2022). Uncertainty in parameterized convection
840 remains a key obstacle for estimating surface fluxes of carbon dioxide. *Atmo-
841 spheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions*, 1–18.
- 842 Schuh, A. E., Jacobson, A. R., Basu, S., Weir, B., Baker, D., Bowman, K., ... oth-
843 ers (2019). Quantifying the impact of atmospheric transport uncertainty on
844 co₂ surface flux estimates. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *33*(4), 484–500.
- 845 Serio, C., Montzka, S., Masiello, G., & Carbone, V. (2023). Trend and multi-
846 frequency analysis through empirical mode decomposition: An application to a
847 twenty-year record of atmospheric carbonyl sulfide measurements. *Journal of*

- 848 *Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 128(3), e2022JD038207.
- 849 Stimler, K., Berry, J. A., & Yakir, D. (2012). Effects of carbonyl sulfide and carbonic anhydrase on stomatal conductance. *Plant Physiology*, 158(1), 524–530.
- 850
- 851 Stinecipher, J. R., Cameron-Smith, P., Kuai, L., Glatthor, N., Höpfner, M., Baker, I., ... others (2022). Remotely sensed carbonyl sulfide constrains model estimates of amazon primary productivity. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49(9), e2021GL096802.
- 852
- 853
- 854
- 855 Stinecipher, J. R., Cameron-Smith, P. J., Blake, N. J., Kuai, L., Lejeune, B., Mahieu, E., ... Campbell, J. E. (2019). Biomass Burning Unlikely to Account for Missing Source of Carbonyl Sulfide. *Geophysical Research Letters*. doi: 10.1029/2019GL085567
- 856
- 857
- 858
- 859 Sun, W., Berry, J. A., Yakir, D., & Seibt, U. (2022). Leaf relative uptake of carbonyl sulfide to co2 seen through the lens of stomatal conductance–photosynthesis coupling. *New Phytologist*.
- 860
- 861
- 862 Suntharalingam, P., Kettle, A. J., Montzka, S. M., & Jacob, D. J. (2008, oct). Global 3-D model analysis of the seasonal cycle of atmospheric carbonyl sulfide: Implications for terrestrial vegetation uptake. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35(19), L19801. Retrieved from <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2008GL034332> doi: 10.1029/2008GL034332
- 863
- 864
- 865
- 866
- 867 Sweeney, C., Karion, A., Wolter, S., Newberger, T., Guenther, D., Higgs, J. A., ... others (2015). Seasonal climatology of co2 across north america from aircraft measurements in the noaa/esrl global greenhouse gas reference network. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 120(10), 5155–5190.
- 868
- 869
- 870
- 871 Thompson, C. R., Wofsy, S. C., Prather, M. J., Newman, P. A., Hanisco, T. F., Ryerson, T. B., ... others (2022). The nasa atmospheric tomography (atom) mission: imaging the chemistry of the global atmosphere. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 103(3), E761–E790.
- 872
- 873
- 874
- 875 Thoning, K. W., Tans, P. P., & Komhyr, W. D. (1989). Atmospheric carbon dioxide at mauna loa observatory: 2. analysis of the noaa gmcc data, 1974–1985. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 94(D6), 8549–8565.
- 876
- 877
- 878 Tiedtke, M. (1989). A comprehensive mass flux scheme for cumulus parameterization in large-scale models. *Monthly weather review*, 117(8), 1779–1800.
- 879
- 880 Turco, R., Whitten, R., Toon, O., Pollack, J., & Hamill, P. (1980). Ocs, stratospheric aerosols and climate. *Nature*, 283(5744), 283–285.
- 881
- 882 Van Leer, B. (1997). Towards the ultimate conservative difference scheme. *Journal of computational physics*, 135(2), 229–248.
- 883
- 884 Veres, P. R., Neuman, J. A., Bertram, T. H., Assaf, E., Wolfe, G. M., Williamson, C. J., ... others (2020). Global airborne sampling reveals a previously unobserved dimethyl sulfide oxidation mechanism in the marine atmosphere. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(9), 4505–4510.
- 885
- 886
- 887
- 888 Wang, Y., Deutscher, N. M., Palm, M., Warneke, T., Notholt, J., Baker, I., ... others (2016). Towards understanding the variability in biospheric co 2 fluxes: using ftir spectrometry and a chemical transport model to investigate the sources and sinks of carbonyl sulfide and its link to co 2. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16(4), 2123–2138.
- 889
- 890
- 891
- 892
- 893 Whelan, M. E., Hilton, T. W., Berry, J. A., Berkelhammer, M., Desai, A. R., & Campbell, J. E. (2016). Carbonyl sulfide exchange in soils for better estimates of ecosystem carbon uptake. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16(6), 3711–3726.
- 894
- 895
- 896
- 897 Whelan, M. E., Lennartz, S. T., Gimeno, T. E., Wehr, R., Wohlfahrt, G., Wang, Y., ... Elliott Campbell, J. (2018). Reviews and syntheses: Carbonyl sulfide as a multi-scale tracer for carbon and water cycles. *Biogeosciences*, 15(12), 3625–3657. Retrieved from <http://oro.open.ac.uk/56080/> doi: 10.5194/bg-15-3625-2018
- 898
- 899
- 900
- 901
- 902 Whelan, M. E., Min, D. H., & Rhew, R. C. (2013, jul). Salt marsh vegetation as a

- 903 carbonyl sulfide (COS) source to the atmosphere. *Atmospheric Environment*,
904 73, 131–137. Retrieved from [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S135223101300160X)
905 [article/pii/S135223101300160X](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S135223101300160X) doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.02.048
- 906 Wofsy. (2011, may). HIAPER Pole-to-Pole Observations (HIPPO): Fine-grained,
907 global-scale measurements of climatically important atmospheric gases
908 and aerosols. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Math-*
909 *ematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 369(1943), 2073–2086. doi:
910 10.1098/rsta.2010.0313
- 911 Wofsy, S., Afshar, S., Allen, H., Apel, E., Asher, E., Barletta, B., ... others (2018).
912 Atom: Merged atmospheric chemistry, trace gases, and aerosols, ornl daac, oak
913 ridge, tennessee, usa.
- 914 Wofsy, S., Afshar, S., Allen, H., Apel, E., Asher, E., Barletta, B., ... Vieznor,
915 N. (2021). *Atom: Merged atmospheric chemistry, trace gases, and*
916 *aerosols, version 2*. ORNL Distributed Active Archive Center. Retrieved
917 from https://daac.ornl.gov/cgi-bin/dsviewer.pl?ds_id=1925 doi:
918 10.3334/ORNLDAAAC/1925
- 919 Wohlfahrt, G., Brilli, F., Hörtnagl, L., Xu, X., Bingemer, H., Hansel, A., & Loreto,
920 F. (2012). Carbonyl sulfide (cos) as a tracer for canopy photosynthesis, tran-
921 spiration and stomatal conductance: potential and limitations. *Plant, Cell &*
922 *Environment*, 35(4), 657–667.
- 923 Wu, R., Wang, S., & Wang, L. (2015). New mechanism for the atmospheric oxida-
924 tion of dimethyl sulfide. the importance of intramolecular hydrogen shift in a
925 ch₃sch₂oo radical. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 119(1), 112–117.
- 926 Yousefi, M., Bernath, P. F., Boone, C. D., & Toon, G. C. (2019). Global mea-
927 surements of atmospheric carbonyl sulfide (ocs), oc34s and o13cs. *Journal of*
928 *Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, 238, 106554.
- 929 Zumkehr, A., Hilton, T. W., Whelan, M., Smith, S., Kuai, L., Worden, J., &
930 Campbell, J. E. (2018, jun). Global gridded anthropogenic emissions in-
931 ventory of carbonyl sulfide. *Atmospheric Environment*, 183, 11–19. Re-
932 trieved from [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1352231018302255)
933 [S1352231018302255](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1352231018302255) doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2018.03.063