

Cloud Microphysics in Global Cloud Resolving Models

Tatsuya Seiki¹, Woosub Roh², Masaki Satoh²

1: Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology

Yokohama Institute for Earth Sciences

2: The University of Tokyo, Atmosphere and Ocean Research

Institute

Corresponding Author: Masaki Satoh (satoh@aori.u-tokyo.ac.jp)

This article is submitted for

“Earth’s Climate and Weather: Dominant Variability and Disastrous Extremes”

AGU Geophysical Monograph Series

accepted July 11, 2021

Key words

- Global cloud resolving models
- Cloud microphysics
- Climate
- Climate change
- Weather forecasting
- Cloud radiative forcing
- Model evaluation
- Satellite simulators
- Satellite observations
- Ground observations

Abstract

Global cloud resolving models (GCRMs) are a new type of general circulation model that explicitly calculates the growth of cloud systems with fine spatial resolutions and more than 10 GCRMs have been developed at present. This chapter of the monograph reviews cloud microphysics schemes used in GCRMs with introductions to the recent progress and researches with GCRMs. Especially, research progress using a pioneer of GCRMs, Nonhydrostatic ICosahedral Atmospheric Model (NICAM), is focused. Since GCRMs deal with climatology and meteorology, it is a challenging issue to establish cloud microphysics schemes for GCRMs. A brief history of the development of cloud microphysics schemes and cloud-radiation coupling in NICAM is described. In addition, current progress in analytical techniques using satellite simulators is described. The combined use of multi-optical sensors enables us to constrain uncertain processes in cloud microphysics without artificial tuning. As a result, cloud microphysics schemes used in the NICAM naturally represent cloud systems, and hence, the radiative budget is well balanced with little optimization. Finally, a new satellite and a ground validation campaign are introduced for future work.

1. Introduction

This chapter of the monograph reviews cloud microphysics schemes used in global cloud resolving models (GCRMs) with introductions to the recent progress and researches with GCRMs. Section 1 briefly introduces the background and design of GCRMs. Cloud microphysics schemes in GCRMs are reviewed in Section 2 and model evaluation using optical sensors are reviewed in Section 3. Especially, research progress using a pioneer of GCRMs, Nonhydrostatic ICosahedral Atmospheric Model (NICAM), is focused. Finally, Section 4 summarizes this chapter. Acronyms of numerical models, satellites, and optical instruments are described in Table 1.

1.1 Global cloud resolving models

Climatology and meteorology have separated spatiotemporal scales and hence have been individually investigated in separate research communities (see Figure 1). However, ongoing climate change increases social risks such as record breaking intense precipitation, intense tropical cyclones, and extensive flood damage. Recent extreme events have been intensively analyzed around the world and have been edited as a special issue for “Explaining Extreme Events from a Climate Perspective” for the Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society every year starting in 2011 (e.g., Herring et al., 2019). To meet social demands, the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) has promoted research on “weather and climate extremes” as one of the current grand challenges (<https://www.wcrp-climate.org/grand-challenges/grand-challenges-overview>). The two research communities have started to work together to tackle this issue across spatiotemporal scales.

For the next decade, the WCRP has newly proposed lighthouse activities (<https://www.wcrp-climate.org/wcrp-ip-la>), in which a “digital twin of Earth” is to be utilized for modeling earth systems more realistically (e.g. Bauer et al., 2021). Recent advances in parallel computing have

enabled us to achieve global atmospheric simulations with finer horizontal resolution (e.g., Wedi, 2014; Satoh et al., 2017; Schär et al., 2020). Thus, motivation and research infrastructure are now prepared for global cloud resolving simulations that fill the scale gap between climate research and weather forecasting.

In the UK, for example, the UPSCALE (UK on PRACE: weather-resolving Simulations of Climate for globAL Environmental risk) project was organized for global weather prediction using a general circulation model (GCM) with a horizontal resolution of up to 25 km (Mizielinski et al., 2014). In Europe, multi-high-resolution GCMs have been used for predicting regional climate as the PProcess-based climate sIMulation: AdVances in high-resolution modelling and European climate Risk Assessment (PRIMAVERA) project (<https://www.primavera-h2020.eu/>). In the Pan-Pacific region, the International laboratory for High-resolution Earth System Prediction (iHESP) project has started to examine intense cyclones for decadal prediction by using a 25-km atmosphere and 10-km ocean-coupled GCM (Zhang et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2020). Finally, the High Resolution Model Intercomparison Project (HighResMIP) was coordinated as a part of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) for examining the capability of capturing mesoscale phenomena using GCMs only by increasing the horizontal resolution up to 25 km (Haarsma et al., 2016; Roberts et al., 2018). However, in HighResMIP, most participants are conventional GCMs, which do not predict precipitating hydrometeors (e.g., rain, snow, graupel, and hail) [cloud microphysics in CMIP6 models are described in the ES-DOC Explorer (<https://explore.es-doc.org/>)] and rely on parameterizations for representing convective clouds, although some GCMs have recently incorporated explicit calculations for rain and snow [ARPEGE-Climat (Roehrig et al., 2020), CAM (Morrison and Gettelman, 2008; Song et al., 2012; Gettelman and Morrison, 2015), ECHAM/ICON-A (Posselt and Lohmann, 2008; Sant et al., 2015),

IFS (Forbes et al., 2011), MIROC (Michibata et al., 2019), and UM-Global Atmosphere (Boutle et al., 2014; Walters et al., 2019)]. Explicit (grid-scale) representations of convective clouds are necessary for seamlessly simulating the interaction between a mesoscale convective system and its environmental state at finer resolutions (e.g., Miyakawa et al., 2012; Takasuka et al. 2015). Climate models without convective parameterizations can successfully better represent some aspects of climate states than those with convective parameterizations by increasing horizontal resolution even if the climate models cannot fully resolve convective clouds (e.g., Senf et al., 2020; Stevens et al., 2020; Vergara-Temprado et al., 2020; Wedi et al., 2020).

In the era of global simulations with horizontal resolutions of a few kilometers, nonhydrostatic dynamical cores (e.g., Saito et al., 2007) are required for resolving convection in an environmental state (e.g., Kato and Saito, 1995; Weisman et al., 1997; Yang et al., 2017). In addition, cloud microphysics for precipitating hydrometeors should be explicitly calculated as is done in mesoscale models. Global atmospheric models that explicitly calculate the growth of cloud systems are a new type of GCM and are now called global cloud resolving models (Satoh et al., 2019). In particular, explicit representation of smaller clouds is a great advantage of GCRMs compared to conventional GCMs even if the cloud microphysics in GCMs become sophisticated (details are described in Section 3.2). Global cloud resolving models are now practically available for various research fields in many countries thanks to prevailing massive parallel computers and advanced network environments. For example, Nakano et al. (2017) demonstrated that forecasts of tropical cyclones generally improve by using three GCRMs with the horizontal resolution of less than 10 km. In contrast to operational global numerical weather prediction models (e.g., Kalnay et al., 1990; Zhang et al., 2019), GCRMs are not restricted by operating time and hence can be used for challenging issues in terms of spatiotemporal resolution and complexity of physics.

Currently, the first international intercomparison project for GCRMs, the initiative DYnamics of the Atmospheric general circulation Modeled On Non-hydrostatic Domains (DYAMOND), has been organized (Stevens et al., 2019) and GCRMs are becoming established (See Figure 2). Table 2 summarizes the GCRMs that have been developed at present. Note that multimodel framework (MMF) is another approach to modeling convective cloud systems in GCMs (e.g., Tao et al., 2009).

1.2. A baseline for spatial resolutions

Cloud microphysics schemes for GCRMs are designed to work with horizontal resolutions from 1 to 15 km based on 15 years of experience with global high-resolution simulations using the NICAM. Similarly, a common cloud microphysics scheme is used in a unified system for weather-to-seasonal prediction developed in the United States of America that uses a horizontal resolution of 13 km for medium-range weather prediction and a horizontal resolution of 3 km for global cloud resolving simulations [The geophysical fluid dynamics laboratory (GFDL) System for High-resolution prediction on Earth-to-Local Domains (SHiELD), Harris et al., 2020]. In addition, IFS has been well evaluated with a horizontal resolution of 9 km, and its results are comparable to IFS with a horizontal resolution of 1.4 km in many aspects (Wedi et al., 2020). Thus, IFS with a horizontal resolution of 9 km works for research purpose in terms of practical use, although Wedi et al. (2020) emphasized the advantages of using a 1 km resolution for resolving deep convection by IFS.

As a pioneer of GCRMs, the NICAM was developed in the early 2000s (Tomita et al., 2001; Satoh, 2002; Satoh, 2003; Tomita and Satoh, 2004) and has been improved over the past twenty years (Satoh et al., 2008a; Satoh et al., 2014; Kodama et al., 2021). NICAM developers first conducted cloud resolving simulations with horizontal resolutions of up to 3.5 km on an Aqua-

Planet (Tomita et al., 2005) and then achieved cloud resolving simulations with realistic land-ocean distributions (Miura et al., 2007a; 2007b). Miyamoto et al. (2013) finally attained the world's first global simulations with a subkilometer horizontal resolution (Figure 3) on the K computer with 20,480 nodes (163,840 cores).

Global statistics of convective cores from subkilometer simulations have shown that the number of convective cores does not converge, even at a 870 m resolution (Miyamoto et al., 2013; Kajikawa et al., 2016). Sueki et al. (2019) further investigated the resolved size of convective cores over the tropics and found similar results at a horizontal resolution of 50 m. In general, convective cores were found to become resolved at a horizontal resolution of 1/6 of their sizes (Miyamoto et al., 2013; Miyamoto et al., 2015; Kajikawa et al., 2016) and to become fully resolved at horizontal resolutions of 1/40 to 1/20 of their sizes (Sueki et al., 2019).

On the other hand, it has been found that individual convective cores are not necessarily resolved for capturing large-scale convective systems that last longer than the daily scale (cf. Figure 1) or some aspects of climate states as mentioned above. For example, in practice, a NICAM with a horizontal resolution of 14 km is widely used for Madden-Julian oscillation (MJO), tropical cyclones, and extratropical cyclones. A NICAM with a horizontal resolution of 14 km successfully shows the top-performing skill score of the MJO prediction (Miyakawa et al., 2014). Similarly, a NICAM with a horizontal resolution of 14 km successfully reproduces tropical cyclones (e.g., Oouchi et al., 2009; Taniguchi et al., 2010; Yanase et al., 2010; Nakano et al., 2015), as was done using a NICAM with finer horizontal resolutions (e.g., Fudeyasu et al., 2008; Yamada et al., 2016; Nakano et al., 2017). In particular, the eyewall structure has been clearly captured for intense tropical cyclones (Yamada et al., 2010; Yamada and Satoh, 2013; Yamada et al., 2017), although

the detailed wind structure of tropical cyclones was not sufficiently resolved even at a horizontal resolution of 7 km (Miyamoto et al., 2014 and see also Figure 3).

We conclude that a horizontal resolution of 14 km, which roughly captures meso-beta-scale (20 - 200 km) cloud systems according to Sueki et al. (2019), is a baseline for global cloud (system) resolving simulations without cumulus parameterizations provided by the NICAM. In terms of the response of clouds to global warming, the response of clouds smaller than 40 to 100 km is found to be very different from the response of larger clouds (Noda et al., 2014; Noda et al., 2016). In terms of the radiative budget, the global mean values almost converged at a horizontal resolution of 3.5 km and did not significantly differ at horizontal resolutions equal to or finer than 14 km (Kajikawa et al., 2016), whereas global simulations with horizontal resolutions of 28 km or 56 km suffer from nonnegligible radiation biases (Seiki et al., 2015b; Kodama et al., 2021). The radiative budget (cloud amount) is found to be affected by the numerical settings of physical processes rather than horizontal resolution (Seiki et al., 2014; 2015a; Roh et al., 2017; Kodama et al., 2021), as was shown in other GCMs (e.g., Meehl et al., 2019). Therefore, we efficiently optimize a cloud microphysics scheme at a horizontal resolution of 14 km in a strategic way and then fine-tune cloud microphysics at finer objective horizontal resolutions because of their high computational cost.

1.3. How to evaluate cloud microphysics

Explicit coupling between radiation and cloud microphysics enables us to evaluate cloud microphysics through cloud radiative forcing (e.g., Hashino et al., 2016). Moreover, the use of a consistent assumption between the radiative transfer model and cloud microphysics represents cloud radiative forcing depending on the particle shape and growth stage of cloud systems (Seiki

et al., 2014; 2015a; Thompson et al., 2016; Matsui et al., 2018). In addition, the coupling reduces the freedom of tunable model parameters. This substantially reduces efforts for model optimization and hence provides model developers an insight into the improvements in model performance (e.g., Kodama et al., 2021).

Satellite simulators push forward the idea of cloud-radiation coupling for the purpose of model evaluation, data assimilation, and observing system simulation experiments (e.g., Masunaga et al., 2010). Satellite simulators compile forward radiative transfer models that use model results as an atmospheric environment to match remote sensing (Figure 4). Thanks to satellite simulators, various types of cloud systems and their dominant cloud microphysics can be evaluated from various aspects by using multisensor analyses. Model evaluations using satellite simulators are reviewed in Section 3 in greater detail.

1.4. Benefits to optimizing Cloud Radiative Forcing

Cloud radiative forcing (CRF) is considered the most important parameter to optimize in the performance of cloud microphysics in GCRMs, whereas initialization and reproducibility of specific events are important for mesoscale models. Climate states are realized in the semiequilibrium condition of the energy balance; it is difficult to understand the causal relationship in the balanced state (e.g., Stevens and Feingold, 2009; Morrison et al., 2012). Therefore, one may design a cloud microphysics scheme that represents correct physical mechanisms with few tuning parameters and then optimize the CRF. Uncertainties in CRF significantly affect climate projection through various pathways of cloud feedback (e.g., Meehl et al., 2020; Sherwood et al., 2020). In terms of practical use for long-term simulations, CRF should be optimized because climate drift is inevitable because of energy imbalance (e.g., Stockdale, 1997).

One can strategically evaluate cloud microphysics schemes by using in situ observations or remote sensing whose objective is a specific type of cloud (details are described in Section 2). Cloud radiative forcing differs by cloud type (e.g., Hartmann et al., 1992): distributions of cloud types are climatologically determined by region and season (Rossow and Schiffer, 1999). In general, longwave CRF is dominated by high clouds; shortwave CRF is dominated by high thick clouds and low clouds; both longwave and shortwave CRF are effective over the intertropical convergence zone. In particular, cirrus generally has a strong long CRF even with a small optical thickness (Liou, 1986; Ackermann et al., 1988; Fu and Liou, 1993; Jensen et al., 1994) and extensively covers the upper troposphere (e.g., Liou, 1986; Rossow and Schiffer, 1999; Sassen et al., 2008; Haladay and Stephens, 2009; Hagihara et al., 2010) and hence has a strong influence on a broad range of atmospheric layers. In addition, low-level clouds are commonly biased as “too few and too bright” among GCMs (Nam et al., 2012) and have been a major source of uncertainties in climate sensitivity (e.g., Bony and Dufresne, 2005; Zhang et al., 2013; Andrews et al., 2015). In particular, a negative bias in low-level clouds strongly increases the downward shortwave radiative flux to the sea surface and consequently affects atmospheric circulation through ocean feedback (e.g., Kang et al., 2009; Trenbirth and Fasullo, 2010; Kay et al., 2016; Hyder et al., 2018). On the other hand, in the Arctic region, supercooled liquid water in low-level clouds strongly contributes to the longwave CRF to enhance sea ice (land surface ice) melting (e.g., Curry et al., 1993; Shupe et al., 2004; Francis et al., 2005; Bennartz et al., 2013; Kapsh et al., 2013; 2016). Recently, these strong impacts of CRF from various cloud types on climate states have been used for making a scale to measure the reliability of climate projections as “emergent constraints on future climate change” (e.g., Hall et al., 2019). Current progress in understanding climate sensitivity and cloud feedback is comprehensively reviewed in Sherwood et al. (2020).

Improvements in cloud radiative forcing evidently have positive feedback to improvements in model performances through cloud radiation interactions (e.g., Tao et al., 1996). For instance, satellite observations indicate that cirrus clouds generally support invigoration of convective clouds over the tropics through longwave CRF (Masunaga and Bony, 2018; Masunaga and Mapes, 2020). More specifically, the longwave component of the CRF has strong impacts on the structure and track of tropical cyclones (Fovell et al., 2010; Bu et al., 2014; 2017) and the onset of MJO (Takasuka et al., 2018). Thus, a cloud microphysics scheme, which is evaluated in terms of CRF, is expected to also work for case studies (e.g., Arakane et al., 2014; Sato et al., 2015; Yamada et al., 2016), regional weather prediction (e.g., Miyoshi et al., 2016; Nasuno et al., 2017; Harris et al., 2020), and regional climate research (e.g., Adachi et al., 2017; 2019; Adachi and Tomita, 2020).

1.5. Global and regional simulations

The hybrid use of a GCRM for global and regional simulations accelerates the evaluation of cloud microphysics using in situ measurements (see Figure 5 and details are described in Section 2). The use of in situ measurements [e.g., the Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM)] will greatly contribute to improvements in GCRMs, as was done for GCMs (e.g., Randall et al., 2016). However, it is not efficient to perform global high-resolution simulations for comparison to in situ observations. Therefore, the NICAM employs two types of regional settings that are easily switched with a namelist in the running configuration. One is a stretched grid system on a global domain [so-called stretched NICAM (Tomita, 2008a; Uchida et al., 2016; Shibuya et al. 2016), see Figure 5b]. The other picks up one diamond panel of the icosahedron and uses the panel as the regional domain [so-called diamond NICAM (Uchida et al., 2017), see Figure 5c]. Both grid systems share icosahedral grid data, numerical operators, and physical packages with the original global settings. In addition, the single-column model has also been prepared (Seiki and Roh, 2020).

This kind of regional setting is also used in other GCRMs [ICON (Zängl et al., 2014; Stevens et al., 2020), FV3 (Harris et al., 2019; 2020); MPAS (Skamarock, 2012; 2018); and UM (Davies et al., 2005)].

In addition, portable usage of cloud microphysics among GCRMs, mesoscale models, and LES models will complement the evaluation of cloud microphysics and will develop the application of cloud microphysics. Cloud microphysics schemes in the NICAM are shared with SCALE (Nishizawa et al., 2015; Sato et al., 2015), which works as a mesoscale model and a large eddy simulation model. SCALE is highly optimized for massive parallel supercomputers with codesign by researchers in computational science and computer science (<https://scale.riken.jp/>) and hence can be used for ultrafine atmospheric simulations with a grid resolution of finer than 10 m (Sato et al., 2018) and for experimental applications such as prediction of the electric field by solving the Poisson equation (Sato et al., 2019). In addition, one can examine the performance of the cloud microphysics schemes in the NICAM in comparison to more complex schemes such as a spectral bin cloud microphysics scheme or a Lagrangian particle model by using SCALE (e.g., Sato et al., 2015; 2018). This common usage of cloud microphysics is also found between ICON and COSMO and between MPAS and WRF. In addition, one can use common packages for cloud modeling to obtain widely used cloud microphysics schemes [e.g., Kinematic Driver (Shipway and Hill, 2012); and libcloudph++ (Arabas et al., 2015; Jaruga and Pawlowska, 2018)].

2. Cloud microphysics in the NICAM

A brief history of the development of cloud microphysics schemes and related processes is described in this section. The NICAM has various options for bulk cloud microphysics schemes that assume particle size distribution (PSD) as specific analytic functions. Single-moment bulk

cloud microphysics schemes (SMBs) predict the total mass concentration, and double-moment bulk cloud microphysics schemes (DMBs) predict the total number concentration in addition to the total mass concentration to represent the time evolution of PSDs of hydrometeors. Spectral bin cloud microphysics schemes have not yet worked for global simulations with the NICAM because of the difficulty of tuning with their expensive computational cost. Single-moment bulk cloud microphysics schemes are widely used for GCRMs because of their simplicity and cheaper computational cost. Table 3 summarizes the cloud microphysics schemes used in the DYAMOND GCRMs. Most cloud microphysics in the DYAMOND GCRMs have not yet been comprehensively evaluated for global simulations and some GCRMs have individually started to analyze elemental variables such as surface precipitation (e.g., Arnold et al., 2020; Dueben et al., 2020; Hohenegger et al. 2020). Therefore, performances of cloud microphysics in GCRMs other than NICAM have not yet been sufficiently documented. Hereafter we focus on cloud microphysics in NICAM.

Thermodynamics in cloud microphysics schemes are modified to match the NICAM. In particular, the total air density and the moist internal energy are exactly conserved in common procedures such as diagnosis of the saturated vapor pressure (see Satoh 2003 and Satoh et al., 2008a, for details). Gravitational sedimentation is commonly solved using a semi-Lagrangian scheme, which is conservative and positive definite (Xiao et al. 2003).

2.1. Single-moment bulk cloud microphysics scheme with five water categories

The NICAM team began realistical global cloud resolving simulations with a SMB with five water categories proposed by Grabowski (1998) (hereafter G98). This scheme predicts the specific water content of vapor, cloud water and rain (q_v , q_c , and q_r , respectively) and diagnoses the

specific water content of cloud ice and snow (q_i and q_s , respectively) by using temperature. The concept of G98 is to represent different latent heat between the ice phase and liquid phase (e.g., latent heat of vaporization $L_v = 2.50\text{e6 J kg}^{-1}$ and latent heat of sublimation $L_s = 2.83\text{e6 J kg}^{-1}$ at atmospheric temperature $T_a = 273 \text{ K}$) and different terminal velocities between rain and snow (typically 3 to 7 m s^{-1} for rain and at most 1 m s^{-1} for snow in G98), although G98 cannot deal with melting and freezing due to the diagnosis. The diagnosis of ice categories is also used in other SMBs for weather prediction (e.g., Lopez, 2002; Khairoutdinov and Randall, 2003). As G98 is simple, there are only four tunable processes: auto-conversion and accretion of cloud water, auto-conversion and accretion of cloud ice, terminal velocity of rain, and terminal velocity of snow. Therefore, radiative fluxes of G98 were optimized by modifying the terminal velocity of snow (Iga et al., 2007) with the assumed effective radii of cloud ice and snow as 40 μm .

These five category types of cloud microphysics do not separate dense ice (graupel and hail) and light ice (snow) and hence do not capture differences in dominant growth processes between convective precipitation systems (riming and accretion) and stratiform precipitation systems (aggregation). In addition, the diagnosis of cloud ice and snow results in the absence of the melting layer (freezing layer). These characteristics are apparently observed in the vertical structure of radar echo by reference to satellite observations (Sato et al., 2008b; Masunaga et al., 2008). Nevertheless, G98 sufficiently worked to capture deep convective systems over the tropics, such as tropical cyclones (e.g., Fudeyasu et al., 2008; Oouchi et al., 2009; Taniguchi et al., 2010; Yanase et al., 2010) and MJO (e.g., Miura et al., 2007; Nasuno et al., 2009; Taniguchi et al., 2010; Miyakawa et al., 2012).

2.2. Single-moment bulk cloud microphysics scheme with six water categories

The NICAM contains a SMB with six water categories referred to as NSW6 (NICAM single-moment bulk cloud microphysics with six water categories). This scheme predicts the specific water content of vapor, cloud water, rain, cloud ice, snow, and graupel (q_v , q_c , q_r , q_i , q_s , and q_g , respectively). Tomita (2008b) simplified a six-category type based on Lin et al. (1983) and Rutledge and Hobbs (1984) by omitting hail production and replacing the interaction between cloud water and cloud ice with a saturation adjustment to reduce the computational cost. These simplifications allow NSW6 to be similar to G98 except for microphysical processes involving graupel. Kodama et al. (2012) optimized the longwave CRF by modifying the timescale of the auto-conversion of cloud ice to snow. The 2012 version of the NICAM (NICAM.12), which was generally used for published works from 2012 to 2019 [e.g., an atmospheric model intercomparison project (AMIP) type experiment (Kodama et al., 2015)], was established based on this version of NSW6. The reproducibility and forecasting skills for tropical cyclones, MJO, and boreal-summer intra-seasonal oscillation improved by using NSW6 (e.g., Miyakawa et al., 2014; Miyakawa and Kikuchi, 2018; Nakano et al., 2015; 2017; Nakano and Kikuchi, 2019; Kikuchi et al., 2017).

Major revision of microphysical processes involving rain, snow, and graupel in NSW6 was accomplished by Roh and Satoh (2014) using the stretched NICAM by reference to TRMM satellite observations. The objectives of the revisions were to capture the vertical structure of convective systems over the tropics and to separately capture different types of cloud systems. Specifically, a rescaled bimodal shape of snow particle size distribution and variable bulk snow density were assumed following Field et al. (2005) and Thompson et al. (2008); excessive graupel was suppressed by switching off accretion of snow and cloud ice by graupel following Lang et al. (2007) and by changing the intercept parameter of the graupel particle size distribution following

Gilmore et al. (2004); and a variable formulation of the intercept parameter of the rain particle size distribution was incorporated to represent stratiform rain systems following Zhang et al. (2008). In addition, the saturation adjustment for cloud ice was replaced with vapor deposition and sublimation to solve well-known issues (e.g., Gettelman et al., 2010). These modifications significantly increased cloud ice and snow globally, and decreased graupel in the mid-latitudes. As a result, vertical profiles of ice water content from this version of NSW6 more closely approximated the satellite observations compared with those from NSW6 in NICAM.12 (Figure 6a-6c).

Finally, the cloud radiative forcing was successfully improved by explicitly coupling cloud microphysics and radiative transfer using the coupling procedure provided by Seiki et al. (2014) [Kodama et al., (2021); details are described in Section 2.4]. The 2016 version of the NICAM (NICAM.16), which has been used for published works after 2020 [e.g., production for HighResMIP (Kodama et al., 2021)], was established based on this version of NSW6.

The next version of NSW6 is now under development. Global simulations with NSW6 were found to suffer from the underestimation bias in low-level mixed-phase clouds in the midlatitudes to polar regions (Kodama et al., 2015; Hashino et al., 2016; Roh et al., 2020). Recently, Seiki and Roh (2020) improved the bias by replacing rain-production terms with the auto-conversion and accretion parameterizations by Khairoutdinov and Kogan (2000), an ice nucleation term with heterogeneous ice nucleation by Phillips et al. (2007), and suppressing vapor deposition and riming with reasonable thresholds. These modifications successfully prolonged the lifetime of mixed-phase low-level clouds by sustaining supercooled liquid water. A similar approach was used to improve low-level mixed-phase clouds by Furtado and Field (2017) with UM and Engdahl et al.

(2020) with AROME. The improvements were made using a single-column model, and hence, the new settings are now tested for long-term global simulations.

2.3. Double-moment bulk cloud microphysics scheme with six water categories

The NICAM contains a DMB with six water categories referred to as NDW6 (NICAM double-moment bulk cloud microphysics with six water categories). This scheme predicts the specific water content of vapor, cloud water, rain, cloud ice, snow, and graupel (qv , qc , qr , qi , qs , and qg , respectively) and the number concentration of each hydrometeor category (nc , nr , ni , ns , and ng , respectively). Seiki and Nakajima (2014) developed NDW6 based on Seifert and Beheng (2001; 2006) and Seifert (2008) (hereafter SB) with minor modifications (e.g., saturation adjustment of cloud water is replaced with condensation/evaporation). The SB scheme was evaluated in terms of surface precipitation but not for CRF (e.g., Seifert et al., 2006). As a result, large biases in outgoing longwave radiation at the top of the atmosphere (OLR) were found in global simulations with NDW6 (Figure 7a). This version of NDW6 is referred to as NDW6-SN14.

Seiki et al. (2014) elaborated ice modeling of NDW6 to improve the OLR biases originating from cirrus clouds: the heterogeneous ice nucleation scheme was replaced with the scheme based on Phillips et al. (2007), who referred to experimental data from field campaign observations by Demott et al. (2003); nonsphericity was incorporated into ice cloud microphysics assuming power-law relationships between the projected area and the particle mass and between the maximum dimension and the particle mass based on Mitchell (1996); and nonsphericity was incorporated into CRF based on Fu (1996) and Fu et al. (1998) (details are described in Section 2.4). These improvements were examined using a stretched NICAM by reference to in situ sonde observations. These modifications significantly improved the OLR biases in global simulations (Figure 7b). This version of NDW6 is referred to as NDW6-S14.

Seiki et al. (2015b) incorporated homogeneous ice nucleation into NDW6 based on Ren and McKenzie (2005) and Kärcher et al. (2006) to alleviate the underestimation bias in ni found by Seiki et al. (2014). In addition, the lower limit of the sticking efficiency was incorporated into ice aggregation because of a lack of experimental evidence at atmospheric temperatures colder than 253 K (Pruppacher and Klett, 1997). Uncertainties in the sticking efficiency were also discussed in Li et al. (2010). The impacts of the former change on OLR, which caused a significant decrease in OLR, were cancelled by the latter change, and thus, OLR did not significantly change in this latest version of NDW6 (Figure 7c). This version of NDW6 is referred to as NDW6-S15 and is implemented in NICAM.16. Ice water content from NDW6-S15 (NDW6 in NICAM.16) is a little bit underestimated, especially just above the freezing level (Figure 6a, 6d). Ice cloud microphysics in winter snowfall systems, in which interaction between cloud ice and snow dominated, are well represented by NDW6-S15 (Kondo et al., 2021), and hence, hydrometeor interactions between rain and graupel might be problematic. The bias in IWC and higher OLR over the tropics indicate that NDW6-S15 underestimate high-density ice (graupel) originated by convection.

The remaining biases in OLR were found to originate from the spatial resolution of the NICAM (Seiki et al., 2015b). Specifically, negative biases in OLR over the subtropical regions originated from insufficient vertical resolution for capturing thin cirrus layers, and positive biases in OLR over the tropics originated from insufficient horizontal resolution for capturing convective organization. Both biases clearly diminish as vertical layers increase (Figure 7d) and horizontal resolution increases (Figure 7e). Therefore, NDW6 does not need extensive tuning in terms of CRF. In the current status of the NICAM (e.g., Stevens et al., 2019), 78 vertical layers with a layer thickness of approximately 400 m in the free troposphere are used as a standard setting based on Seiki et al. (2015b).

2.4. Coupling procedure between cloud microphysics and radiative transfer

Cloud radiative forcing significantly differs based on the assumption of single-scattering properties (SSPs). For example, the nonsphericity of ice particles had an impact on outgoing solar radiation at the top of the atmosphere (OSR) by more than 100 W m^{-2} in a cirrus case [Seiki et al. (2014) and see Figure 8], and an invalid assumption of effective radii as a globally fixed value, which was used in NICAM.12, caused nonnegligible biases in both OLR and OSR [10 to 20 W m^{-2} from the tropics to mid-latitudes (Seiki et al., 2015a; Kodama et al., 2021), and see Figure 9]. These biases in CRF are comparable to or greater than the biases originating from uncertainties in cloud microphysics. Thus, it is better to optimize cloud microphysics after explicitly coupling cloud microphysics and radiative transfer. Importance of cloud-radiation coupling for numerical weather prediction was discussed also using other models (e.g., Thompson et al., 2016; Matsui et al., 2018).

Cloud microphysics is coupled with radiative transfer through SSPs of hydrometeors. The single-scattering properties strongly depend on the ratio of particle size to wavelength (e.g., Hansen and Travis, 1974); hence, SSPs are generally prepared as a look-up table of effective radii at each wavelength band in radiative transfer models. In the NICAM, radiative transfer is calculated with a broadband model mstrnX (Sekiguchi and Nakajima, 2008), which requires the extinction coefficient per unit volume of hydrometeor particles, scattering coefficients per unit volume of the hydrometeor particles, and moments of the phase function (asymmetry factor and truncation factor) used for the delta two-stream approximation (Nakajima et al., 2000). Thus, input data to the coupling procedure are the volume of the hydrometeors and effective radii derived from cloud microphysics.

In the latest version of the NICAM [NICAM.16 (Kodama et al., 2021)], nonsphericity is newly assumed for the SSP of ice hydrometeors because nonsphericity has been found to have a strong impact on both shortwave radiation (e.g., Pollack and Cuzzi, 1980; Takano and Liou, 1989, 1995; Stephens et al., 1990; Macke, 1993; Yang and Liou, 1995; MacFarquhar et al., 1999; Fu, 2007) and longwave radiation (e.g., Ackerman and Stephens, 1987; Mitchell and Arnott, 1994; Mitchell et al., 1996). A nonspherical database provided by Fu (1996) and Fu et al. (1998) was compiled for the wavelength bands used in mstrnX, and then the SSP look-up table was prepared in the range of effective radii from 1 μm to 1 mm (Seiki et al., 2014). One may choose another nonspherical SSP database that has options to choose specific shapes, such as Yang et al. (2013) [e.g., NU-WRF (Matsui et al., 2018); MIROC (Tatabe et al., 2019)]. Seiki et al. (2014) found that the dependence of the asymmetry factor on the effective radii, which vary by particle shape, is key to determining the cloud albedo of cirrus, as shown in Figure 8.

The definition of the effective radii of nonspherical ice particles is another issue for nonspherical modeling because the “effective” size is not obvious for irregular shapes in contrast to a sphere. Therefore, the concept of “effective distance”, which is defined by the ratio of the volume to the projected area, was proposed by Mitchell and Arnott (1994). The concept was confirmed by Fu (1998) by reference to light scattering calculated using the finite difference time domain method. Following equations (3.11) in Fu (1996) or (2.5) in Fu et al. (1998), the effective radii of ice hydrometeors re are defined as follows:

$re_j \equiv \frac{3}{4\rho_{ice}} \frac{\rho_a q_j}{\int_0^\infty A_j(x) f_j(x) dx}, (j = i, s, g)$	(1)
--	-------

where ρ_a is the air density, $\rho_{ice} = 916.7 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ is the ice density, A is the projected area, x is the particle mass, and f is the particle mass distribution.

Equation (1) is analytically integrated with the power-law relationship between A and x for each hydrometeor category ($A = \gamma x^\sigma$). In NDW6, particle models compiled by Mitchell (1996) are used: hexagonal columns for cloud ice, assemblages of planar polycrystals in cirrus clouds for snow, and lump graupel for graupel (Seiki et al., 2014). In NSW6, sponge-like spherical ice is assumed for cloud ice and graupel, and two-dimensional fractal shapes (e.g., $A \propto D^2$ and $x \propto D^2$) are assumed for snow (Roh and Satoh, 2014; Kodama et al., 2021). Thus, the effective radii of snow are assumed to be constant ($r_{\text{es}} = 125 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$). The cloud radiative forcing of NSW6 significantly decreases with this assumption for the effective radii (see NSW6, NSW6-Mie, and NSW6-Mie-ReFIX in Figure 9).

2.5. Impact of precipitating hydrometeors on the radiation budget

The impacts of precipitating hydrometeors on CRF can be examined by means of the new look-up table. CMIP3 and CMIP5 GCMs commonly have large biases in CRF over the ITCZ region (Li et al., 2013). Past studies suggested that these biases originated from the lack of CRF by precipitating hydrometeors in conventional GCMs (e.g., Waliser et al., 2011; Li et al., 2014; 2016). Chen et al. (2018) analyzed the role of precipitating hydrometeors by using an off-line radiation model with NICAM results and found that the layering structure of snow underlying cloud ice had impacts on OLR over the tropics and storm-track regions up to 2 W m^{-2} . Similarly, snow has strong impacts on OSR up to 3 W m^{-2} in the summer hemisphere.

The degree of the possible biases related to precipitating hydrometeors could differ by model (Matsui et al., 2018; Michibata et al. 2019), but it is evident that the systematic effect of precipitating hydrometeors on radiation is nonnegligible in terms of climate projection. Recently, precipitating hydrometeors have been found to have important indirect effects on aerosol-cloud

interactions (so-called buffering effects) with MIROC (Michibata and Suzuki, 2020; Michibata et al., 2020).

2.6. Differences between SMBs and DMBs

Representation of changing number concentrations is essential for representing realistic cloud growth. Figure 10 shows the typical cloud microphysical processes used in SMBs and DMBs. It is clearly seen that most processes change the number concentrations in addition to the mass concentration. SMBs generally deal with this issue by assuming PSD functions (qj and nj relationship) based on observations. Thus, the performance of SMBs relies on the diagnosis technique of PSDs.

The complexity and dependence of cloud microphysical processes inevitably differ between DMBs and SMBs regardless of the diagnosis technique of PSDs. For example, condensation increases only qr , but evaporation decreases both qr and nr (e.g., Morrison and Grabowski, 2008). In addition, larger liquid droplets are more likely to freeze [heterogeneous and homogeneous freezing of supercooled liquid water (e.g., Bigg 1953; Fukuta and Schaller, 1982; Khvorostyanov and Curry, 2009)], but smaller ice crystals more easily melt away. This kind of asymmetry between a pair of growth and decay processes (see the pairs of arrows in Figure 10) induces hysteresis, and hence, cannot be represented by SMBs. As a result, SMBs necessarily simplify these processes and modify the balance among the hydrometeor interactions. The ratio of the tendency between the mass concentration and the number concentration $[(\partial qj/\partial t)/(\partial nj/\partial t)]$ differs by process, and hence, these inconsistencies in the tendency result in bias in the mean particle mass $\bar{x}_j = (\rho_a qj/nj)$ or mean particle diameter \bar{D}_j when using SMBs.

Biases in the mean particle mass (diameter) feedback to the performance of cloud microphysics schemes through the dependence of particle-growth equations (e.g., Igel et al., 2015;

Seiki et al., 2015; Seiki and Roh, 2020). The dependences of cloud-related processes on bulk cloud microphysical parameters are summarized in Table 4. For example, in collisional processes, the collisional cross section is proportional to the square of the particle diameter. In addition, in evaporation (sublimation) and condensation (deposition), vapor flux onto the particles is proportional to their surface area (square of the particle diameter). Moreover, terminal velocity, which is contained in many microphysical processes, is mostly determined by the particle diameter (Bohm, 1989; 1992; Mitchell, 1996). In terms of CRF, the extinction efficiency is represented as a function of the size parameter, and the extinction cross-section is proportional to the square of the particle radii as mentioned in Section 2.4. Thus, strong feedbacks of x_j (or D_j) to cloud microphysics and CRF imply that cloud microphysics can potentially be evaluated by monitoring x_j (or D_j) from observations. Specifically, optical sensors, which are sensitive to various moments of particle radii, are powerful tools to define the growth mode of clouds. Evaluation of cloud microphysics in the NICAM using satellite observations is described in Section 3.

3. Model evaluation using optical sensors

3.1 Sensitivity of optical sensors

There are two kinds of optical sensors to observe clouds and precipitating hydrometeors. Passive sensors can observe the radiance from clouds and precipitation and have more spatial coverage than active sensors. Active sensors have a transmitter and a receiver and can detect the vertical profiles of clouds and precipitation, but they have a smaller swath than passive sensors. Thus, the combined use of the two types of optical sensors can complementarily reveal the nature of cloud systems in detail. In addition, satellite sensors have different characteristics depending on

the wavelength of the sensor. The major satellites used for model evaluation are summarized in Table 5.

Visible (Vis) channels can observe optically thick clouds, and the observations are limited during daytime. Visible channels have been widely used for estimating warm-cloud optical properties [e.g., optical thickness and effective radius (Nakajima and King, 1990)]. The infrared (IR) channels, especially from 10 to 13 μm wavelength, are sensitive to cloud-top temperature and can detect even very thin cirrus clouds. Infrared channels have also been utilized for detecting cloud optical properties (e.g., Iwabuchi et al., 2016; 2018). The combined use of VIS and IR channels has been used for categorizing cloud systems using the cloud optical thickness and cloud-top temperature [e.g., the International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project cloud category proposed by Rossow and Schiffer (1999)].

Passive microwaves are sensitive to precipitating hydrometeors. Low frequency microwaves (<20 GHz) are used to capture the emissions from the path-integrated water content of rain over the ocean. On the other hand, high-frequency microwaves (>80 GHz) are used for capturing scattering signals of large ice particles such as snow and graupel over land and ocean. These various frequencies of microwave observations enable us to obtain integrated column information about precipitating hydrometeors, particularly in deep convective systems.

Active microwave observations referred to as radar are now available at 94 GHz/3.2 mm (so-called cloud radar) and at 13.6 GHz/2.2 cm and 35.5 GHz/8.5 mm (so-called precipitation radar). In addition, lidar with wavelengths of 532 and 1064 nm is available. In general, the backscattering coefficient rapidly decreases at size parameters ($2\pi r/\lambda$) smaller than 1 according to Mie theory, and hence, the detectable particle size differs by the frequency/wavelength. In addition, too strong backscattering results in strong attenuation of return signals. The Cloud Profiler Radar (CPR) on

CloudSat can clearly detect vertical profiles of nonprecipitating and light-precipitating clouds and slightly detect intense precipitating clouds due to attenuation (Stephens et al. 2008). CALIOP on CALIPSO can detect optical thin cirrus and the thermodynamic phase of clouds using the depolarization ratio (Winker et al., 2009). The precipitation radar on TRMM and GPM core satellites can detect the vertical profiles of precipitating clouds but cannot detect nonprecipitating clouds (Hou et al., 2014). Even when using GPM satellite observations, it is difficult to accurately capture extreme precipitation systems such as hail storms due to strong attenuation, multiple scattering, and spatial inhomogeneity (e.g., Mroz et al., 2018). Thus, the combined use of lidar, cloud radar, and precipitation radar enables us to integrate an understanding of cloud organization from shallow clouds to deep convective clouds.

Consistency in the assumption of cloud microphysics between a model and a satellite retrieval algorithm is an important issue. For example, so-called Z - R and k - Z relationships, which implicitly assume a PSD, are used in the retrieval of precipitation flux using PR (Iguchi et al., 2009). However, the assumptions are generally not used in cloud microphysics schemes. In contrast, some cloud microphysics schemes (e.g., Milbrandt and Yau, 2005; Seifert, 2008) have more degrees of freedom to represent PSDs than these retrieval algorithms. In addition, satellite products inherently suffer from contamination: a product consists of a major portion of an objective physical parameter and a minor portion of other physical parameters. For example, in the past, it was difficult to separate cloud water paths from liquid water paths in the retrieval of microwaves (Elsaesser et al., 2017). It is still difficult to retrieve snowfall over sea ice or land ice using microwaves. Thus, we need to understand the characteristics of optical sensors in comparing model results to satellite observations.

Satellite simulators solve the issue by directly comparing emulated satellite signals from model results to level 1 satellite data (see Figure 4). This comparison method enables us to share microphysical assumptions between a model and satellite simulators. On the other hand, it is difficult to interpret radiance-based comparisons to find biases in cloud microphysics schemes. Current progress in analytical techniques using satellite simulators is described in the following sections. Note that the accuracy of emulated satellite signals depends on the forward radiative transfer calculation method used in a satellite simulator and hence it needs to be examined, especially in data assimilation (e.g., Okamoto, 2017; Okamoto et al., 2019). At present, various satellite simulators (optical sensor simulators) have been developed [e.g., COSP (Bodas-Salcedo et al., 2011; Swales et al., 2018), CRTM (Chen et al., 2008; Ding et al., 2011), ECSIM (Voor et al., 2007; Reverdy et al., 2015), Joint-Simulator (Hashino et al., 2013; Satoh et al., 2016), POLARRIS (Matsui et al., 2019), RTTOV (Saunders et al., 2018), SDSU (Masunaga et al. 2010), and Goddard-SDSU (Matsui et al., 2013; 2014)].

3.2 Evaluation of the size distribution of cloud systems

The horizontal resolution of GCRMs that is comparable to satellite observations is a milestone for the evaluation of cloud representation. For example, infrared channels on a geostationary satellite MTSAT, which were frequently used for capturing cirrus clouds (e.g., Inoue, 1987; Mapes and Houze, 1993), had a footprint size of approximately 4 km. Thus, cloud size can be newly evaluated by the advent of GCRMs, whereas cloud fraction is derived from macrophysics in conventional GCMs (e.g., Watanabe et al., 2009; Park et al., 2014). Horizontal inhomogeneity in cloud distribution develops as the cloud regime changes (Kawai and Teixeira, 2010; 2012), and hence, explicit representation of cloud systems is the unique approach of GCRMs. One can use

GCRMs' cloud distribution to evaluate sub-grid inhomogeneity assumed in conventional GCMs (e.g., Watanabe et al., 2009; Hotta et al., 2020).

The split-window technique, which uses brightness temperature of 11 μm and 12 μm , is generally applied to classify high clouds (e.g., Inoue, 1987; Liou, 2002). In addition, OLR or IWP can also be applicable to classifying relatively thick high clouds over the subtropics to tropics (e.g., Inoue and Ackerman, 2002; Inoue et al., 2006; 2008; 2010). The size distribution of high clouds derived from MTSAT was well reproduced by the NICAM with a horizontal resolution of 3.5 km (Inoue et al., 2008), and smaller clouds are likely to be underestimated as the horizontal resolution decreases to 7 km or 14 km (Inoue et al., 2008; Noda et al., 2014). Recently, CloudSat and CALPSO satellite observations have also been available for estimating cloud sizes with the categorization of cloud types (e.g., Seiki et al., 2019)

A new issue arises from the NICAM simulations: formation processes of smaller high clouds, which are not well represented in GCRMs or conventional GCMs. Even small clouds make a large contribution to the total CRF over the tropics due to their large population. This is true for the response of high clouds to global warming (Noda et al., 2014; 2016). Simulated results from the NICAM indicated that the response of high clouds with cloud radii smaller than 50 km to global warming significantly differs from the response with cloud radii larger than 100 km (Noda et al., 2014; 2016). In particular, the robustness of the fixed anvil temperature (FAT) hypothesis (Hartmann and Larson, 2002; Zelinka and Hartmann, 2010) is found to depend on cloud sizes (Noda et al., 2016). Figure 11 shows an example of the different responses of high clouds to global warming by cloud size. The OLR change under global warming attributes to a change in emissivity, a change in cloud top temperature, and a change in clear sky radiation. A reduction in the emissivity is found to be dominant in the response of smaller thin cirrus whereas an increase

in the cloud top temperature is dominant in the response of larger clouds as was established by conventional GCMs with the FAT hypothesis. Moreover, Noda et al. (2019) argued that convective self-aggregation (e.g., Wing et al., 2017) does not sufficiently work to reduce CRF over the tropics from cloud-size analysis using global high-resolution simulations. Note that cirrus clouds contain very small-scale structures, such as uncinus and streak structures (e.g., Heymsfield, 1975), which can be captured by using large eddy simulation models (e.g., Sölch and Kärcher, 2011). Thus, the response of smaller cirrus formations to climate change is an underdeveloped issue.

3.3 Evaluation of vertical structure of cloud systems

The vertical structures of precipitating cloud systems from NICAM simulations have been evaluated using active sensors: TRMM-PR, CloudSat-CPR, and CALIPSO-CALIOP. In particular, TRMM-PR has a footprint of 5 km, and hence, rain microphysics is directly evaluated without assuming subgrid variability. TRMM-PR enables us to evaluate the difference in the vertical structure of precipitation flux between convective cloud systems and stratiform cloud systems (Takayabu, 2002; Satoh et al., 2008b). Here, the physical parameter “precipitation flux” has inconsistency in the terminal velocities of precipitating hydrometeors between the NICAM and TRMM algorithms. Therefore, the evaluation of models using retrieved products is not an apple-to-apple comparison. After Satoh et al. (2008b), we generally used satellite simulators to evaluate the vertical structures of cloud systems.

The contoured frequency by altitude diagram (CFAD), which illustrates the probability density function of the radar reflectivity at each vertical level, is frequently used for evaluating the vertical structure of cloud systems (e.g., Marchand et al., 2009; Matsui et al., 2016). Atmospheric temperature is also used as the vertical axis of the CFAD to capture differences in the freezing

level and the tropopause level by latitude. The shape of the CFAD is sensitive to cloud microphysics or assumptions of particle shapes (e.g., Masunaga et al., 2008; Satoh et al., 2010; Hashino et al., 2013). In addition to the CFAD, a cloud-top beta-temperature radar-conditioned diagram was also proposed by Hashino et al. (2013) to analyze the relationship between ice water content and ice effective radii. The sensitivity of cloud microphysics to the CFAD was clearly observed within only 7 days from NICAM simulations (e.g., Satoh et al., 2010; Roh and Satoh, 2014; Roh et al., 2017). Therefore, we did not require longer simulations (e.g., seasonal to annual simulations) to evaluate cloud microphysics schemes using satellite observations.

Nakajima et al. (2010) proposed a contoured frequency by using the optical depth diagram (CFODD), which uses the cloud optical depth from the cloud top (COD) as the vertical axis, by using Aqua and CloudSat satellite observations. This alternative diagram successfully captures the transition of the droplet growth mode from condensational growth to collisional growth by means of the characteristics that the COD is directly related to the liquid water path and effective radius (Suzuki et al., 2010; 2011). Auto-conversion and accretion in warm clouds have been globally evaluated by using the CFODD (Suzuki et al., 2013; 2015). Kuba et al. (2015) analyzed the detectable cloud microphysics in the CFODD using a spectral bin cloud microphysics scheme.

In terms of the evaluation of cloud microphysics schemes in the NICAM, Kuba et al. (2020) found that the CFODD is sensitive to the shape parameters assumed in the PSD function from the comparison between NDW6 and a spectral bin cloud microphysics scheme. The contoured frequency by optical depth diagram can also be utilized for the evaluation of vertical structures of cirrus clouds by combining CloudSat and CALIPSO satellite observations (Seiki et al., 2015b). One can easily analyze the CFODD for cirrus clouds by using the EarthCARE Research Product

Monitor (https://www.eorc.jaxa.jp/EARTHCARE/research_product/ecare_monitor.html)
provided by the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency.

3.4 Evaluation of cloud organization

Masunaga et al. (2005) proposed an analytical method to categorize cloud systems using cloud-top temperature and radar echo top height from TRMM satellite observations (see Figure 12a). The categorized cloud systems were found to be closely related to large scale circulation (Masunaga and Kummerow, 2006). Thus, the cloud-top and rain-top diagrams can be used for the evaluation of cloud organization in GCRMs (e.g., Masunaga et al., 2008). Recently, Roh and Satoh (2018) proposed a method to extend the observable coverage by using the polarization-corrected brightness temperature at 89 GHz (PCT89) instead of radar echo to detect the rain-top height.

Matsui et al. (2009) further established a method to systematically evaluate the cloud microphysics scheme [Triple-Sensor Three-Step Evaluation Framework (T3EF)]: comparisons of 1) the cloud-top and rain-top diagram from IR radiance and radar echo, 2) CFAD from radar echo, and 3) cumulative probability distribution of PCT85 from a high-frequency microwave imager. T3EF clearly revealed problematic processes in a cloud microphysics scheme (Li et al., 2010). NSW6 was successfully revised by using T3EF (Roh and Satoh, 2014; Roh et al., 2017, and see Figure 12).

3.5 Evaluation of hydrometeor classes

Global observations of the depolarization ratio from CALIOP enable us to discriminate the thermodynamic phase of hydrometeors and the shape of ice particles (Hu et al., 2009; 2010; Yoshida et al., 2010; Saito et al., 2016). Recently, the GCM-Oriented CALIPSO Cloud Product

(CALIPSO-GOCCP) was released for easy comparison between models and CALIPSO satellite observations (Chepfer et al., 2010). One can evaluate the frequency of occurrence of liquid and ice clouds to evaluate the freezing process in cloud microphysics schemes using GOCCP (Cesana and Chepfer, 2012). The GCM results were more consistently evaluated by satellite observations with the aid of a satellite simulator (Cesana and Chepfer, 2013; Cesana et al., 2015). Note that hydrometeor classification using CALIOP is limited to nonprecipitating particles near the cloud top due to the limitation of attenuation (e.g., Hagihara et al., 2014).

Roh et al. (2020) developed a single parameterization to diagnose the depolarization ratio from the backscattering coefficient and then evaluated NSW6 and NDW6 using the hydrometeor discrimination method proposed by Yoshida et al. (2010) (see Figure 13). NSW6 underestimated mixed-phase low-level clouds over the Southern Ocean due to poor representation of supercooled liquid water, whereas NDW6 reproduced mixed-phase low-level clouds well. The bias in NSW6 was successfully alleviated by Seiki and Roh (2020), as described in Section 2.2.

Large particles can be evaluated using cloud radar and precipitation radar. Kikuchi et al. (2017) proposed a hydrometeor classification method using only CPR radar echo and atmospheric temperature based on the CloudsSat-CALIPSO combined dataset. Recently, hydrometeor classification using GPM-DPR satellite observations has been developed. Snow, rain, and mixed-phase clouds are categorized by using Ku-band radar echo and the dual-frequency ratio (Liao and Meneghini, 2011; 2016; Liao et al., 2020). In addition, the hail detection method was newly proposed by Seiki (2021). Future work should evaluate the microphysics of precipitating hydrometeors using CPR and DPR.

3.6 Challenging issues in satellite simulators

A challenging new satellite project is now underway: The Earth Clouds, Aerosol and Radiation Explorer (EarthCARE, Illingworth et al. 2015) satellite, which is a joint mission by the European Space and Japanese Aerospace Exploration Agencies. The EarthCARE satellite has multiple passive and active sensors (Figure 14): Cloud Profiling Radar (CPR), ATmospheric LIDar (ATLID), Multi Spectral Imager (MSI), and Broad Band Radiometer (BBR). The CPR on EarthCARE has a Doppler capability to provide information on the terminal velocity of rain and ice and convective motions. Multiple sensors have synergy to understand the interaction between clouds and aerosols and to provide new insights into cloud microphysics related to vertical motion for evaluating GCRMs. It is confirmed that the EarthCARE satellite will be launched in 2023.

Global cloud resolving models can be used for the observing system simulation experiments (OSSE) to evaluate retrieval algorithms for optical sensors at the planning stage of new satellite projects. A NICAM with a Joint-Simulator was used to create the EarthCARE-like radiances to estimate the accuracy of the retrieved Doppler velocity. In particular, OSSE using the NICAM were helpful to investigate the noise of Doppler velocity of CPR depending on the instrument setting (pulse repetition frequency) before the launch (Hagihara et al., 2021).

There are ongoing challenging issues in the development of satellite simulators. First, satellite simulators will be utilized to estimate a range of uncertainties from the observations, as was done by Hagihara et al. (2021). Second, the sensitivity of the nonspherical assumption to cloud representation is also a challenging issue. Several satellite simulators consider the nonspherical shapes of ice from a database using the discrete dipole approximation (DDA) and T-matrix (e.g., Hashino et al. 2013; Matsui et al. 2019). In addition, the application of depolarization provides insight into nonspherical modeling (Matsui et al., 2019). Finally, the 3D radiation of clouds is a long-standing issue (e.g., Benner and Evans 2001; Okata et al. 2017), whereas radiative transfer is

generally calculated in the vertical dimension. Three-dimensional scattering from cloud sides will be nonnegligible when the horizontal resolution of GCRMs increases to finer than 1 km (global LES). Monte Carlo simulations or other 3D techniques will be introduced into satellite simulators.

3.7 Ground validation for satellites and models

The ULTra-sIte for Measuring Atmosphere of Tokyo metropolitan Environment (ULTIMATE) project has started to validate satellite observations and cloud microphysics schemes in numerical models by using intensive ground observation data in Japan. The ULTIMATE project obtained several active sensors to detect the vertical distributions of clouds and precipitation. For example, polarimetric Doppler radars were set to derive information about the size distributions, hydrometeor types, and terminal velocity of hydrometeors. In addition, several weather radars (c-band polarimetric radars, x-band phased array polarimetric radar, and w-band cloud radar) work in cooperation around the Tokyo metropolitan area (Figure 15). Wind profiler network and data acquisition system (WINDAS, Ishihara et al. 2006) data are also available to observe the vertical profiles of wind. To utilize these ground radar networks, the POLArimetric Radar Retrieval and Instrument Simulator (POLARRIS, Matsui et al. 2019) is newly introduced into the Joint-Simulator. The synergy of intensive ground, remote-sensing observations and satellite data will contribute to the understanding of microphysical processes and improvements of microphysics in GCRMs.

4. Summary

This chapter reviewed the cloud microphysics in GCRMs and the way to improve cloud microphysics. From the twenty-year history of NICAM development, we recognized that the combined use of multi-optical sensors enables us to constrain uncertain processes in cloud

microphysics without artificial tuning. As a result, cloud microphysics schemes used in the NICAM naturally represent cloud systems, and hence, the radiative budget is well balanced with little optimization. On the other hand, some cloud systems have not yet been evaluated because of the diversity of cloud systems in Earth and the limited sensitivity of spaceborne optical sensors. The evaluation method using satellite simulators is underdeveloped, and new satellites will be continuously planned and launched. In addition, intensive ground observation systems and satellite observations are complementary to each other. Thus, a new frontier for cloud microphysics development is still spreading toward the future.

Acknowledgments

The CloudSat and CERES satellite products were obtained from the NASA Langley Research Center Atmospheric Science Data Center. Authors were supported by the Integrated Research Program for Advancing Climate Models (TOUGOU) Grant (JPMXD0717935457) and “Program for Promoting Researches on the Supercomputer Fugaku” (Large Ensemble Atmospheric and Environmental Prediction for Disaster Prevention and Mitigation) (JPMXP1020351142), which are promoted by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Japan. Authors were supported by the EarthCARE Program, Earth Observation Research Center of JAXA, and Program for Promoting Technological Development of Transportation (Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism of Japan), and Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research B (20H01967) for Ultra Site for Measuring Atmosphere of Tokyo Metropolitan Environment and Collaboration Studies with High-Resolution Atmospheric Models (ULTIMATE).

Reference

- Ackerman, S. A., & Stephens, G. L. (1987). The Absorption of Solar Radiation by Cloud Droplets: An Application of Anomalous Diffraction Theory. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 44(12), 1574–1588. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1987\)044<1574:TAOSRB>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1987)044<1574:TAOSRB>2.0.CO;2)
- Ackerman, T. P., Liou, K.-N., Valero, F. P. J., & Pfister, L. (1988). Heating Rates in Tropical Anvils. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 45(10), 1606–1623. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1988\)045<1606:HRITA>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1988)045<1606:HRITA>2.0.CO;2)
- Adachi, S. A., Nishizawa, S., Yoshida, R., Yamaura, T., Ando, K., Yashiro, H., Kajikawa, Y., & Tomita, H. (2017). Contributions of changes in climatology and perturbation and the resulting nonlinearity to regional climate change. *Nature Communications*, 8(1), 2224. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02360-z>
- Adachi, S. A., Nishizawa, S., Ando, K., Yamaura, T., Yoshida, R., Yashiro, H., Kajikawa, Y., & Tomita, H. (2019). An evaluation method for uncertainties in regional climate projections. *Atmospheric Science Letters*, 20(1), e877. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asl.877>
- Adachi, S. A., & Tomita, H. (2020). Methodology of the Constraint Condition in Dynamical Downscaling for Regional Climate Evaluation: A Review. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 125(11), e2019JD032166. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD032166>
- Andrews, T., Gregory, J. M., & Webb, M. J. (2015). The Dependence of Radiative Forcing and Feedback on Evolving Patterns of Surface Temperature Change in Climate Models. *Journal of Climate*, 28(4), 1630–1648. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00545.1>
- Arabas, S., Jaruga, A., Pawlowska, H., & Grabowski, W. W. (2015). libcloudph++ 1.0: A single-moment bulk, double-moment bulk, and particle-based warm-rain microphysics library in

C++. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 8(6), 1677–1707. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-8-1677-2015>

Arakane, S., Satoh, M., & Yanase, W. (2014). Excitation of Deep Convection to the North of Tropical Storm Bebinca (2006). *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 92(2), 141–161. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2014-201>

Arnold, N. P., Putman, W. M., & Freitas, S. R. (2020). Impact of Resolution and Parameterized Convection on the Diurnal Cycle of Precipitation in a Global Nonhydrostatic Model. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 98(6), 1279–1304. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2020-066>

Austin, R. T., & Stephens, G. L. (2001). Retrieval of stratus cloud microphysical parameters using millimeter-wave radar and visible optical depth in preparation for CloudSat: 1. Algorithm formulation. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 106(D22), 28233–28242. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JD000293>

Austin, R. T., Heymsfield, A. J., & Stephens, G. L. (2009). Retrieval of ice cloud microphysical parameters using the CloudSat millimeter-wave radar and temperature. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 114(D8). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD010049>

Bauer, P., Stevens, B., & Hazeleger, W. (2021). A digital twin of Earth for the green transition. *Nature Climate Change*, 11(2), 80–83. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-00986-y>

Bennartz, R., Shupe, M. D., Turner, D. D., Walden, V. P., Steffen, K., Cox, C. J., Kulie, M. S., Miller, N. B., & Pettersen, C. (2013). July 2012 Greenland melt extent enhanced by low-level liquid clouds. *Nature*, 496(7443), 83–86. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12002>

- 823 Benner, T. C., & Evans, K. F. (2001). Three-dimensional solar radiative transfer in small tropical
 824 cumulus fields derived from high-resolution imagery. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
 825 *Atmospheres*, 106(D14), 14975–14984. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JD900158>
- 826 Bigg, E. K. (1953). The formation of atmospheric ice crystals by the freezing of droplets. *Quarterly*
 827 *Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 79(342), 510–519.
 828 <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49707934207>
- 829 Bodas-Salcedo, A., Webb, M. J., Bony, S., Chepfer, H., Dufresne, J.-L., Klein, S. A., Zhang, Y.,
 830 Marchand, R., Haynes, J. M., Pincus, R., & John, V. O. (2011). COSP: Satellite simulation
 831 software for model assessment. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 92(8),
 832 1023–1043. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2011BAMS2856.1>
- 833 Böhm, H. P. (1989). A General Equation for the Terminal Fall Speed of Solid Hydrometeors.
 834 *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 46(15), 2419–2427. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1989\)046<2419:AGEFTT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1989)046<2419:AGEFTT>2.0.CO;2)
- 835 Böhm, J. P. (1992). A general hydrodynamic theory for mixed-phase microphysics. Part I: Drag
 836 and fall speed of hydrometeors. *Atmospheric Research*, 27(4), 253–274.
 837 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-8095\(92\)90035-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-8095(92)90035-9)
- 838 Bony, S., & Dufresne, J.-L. (2005). Marine boundary layer clouds at the heart of tropical cloud
 839 feedback uncertainties in climate models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32(20).
 840 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL023851>
- 841 Boutle, I. A., Eyre, J. E. J., & Lock, A. P. (2014). Seamless Stratocumulus Simulation across the
 842 Turbulent Gray Zone. *Monthly Weather Review*, 142(4), 1655–1668.
 843 <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-13-00229.1>

- 845 Bu, Y. P., Fovell, R. G., & Corbosiero, K. L. (2014). Influence of Cloud–Radiative Forcing on
 846 Tropical Cyclone Structure. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 71(5), 1644–1662.
 847 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-13-0265.1>
- 848 Bu, Y. P., Fovell, R. G., & Corbosiero, K. L. (2017). The Influences of Boundary Layer Mixing
 849 and Cloud-Radiative Forcing on Tropical Cyclone Size. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*,
 850 74(4), 1273–1292. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-16-0231.1>
- 851 Bubnová, R., Hello, G., Bénard, P., & Geleyn, J.-F. (1995). Integration of the Fully Elastic
 852 Equations Cast in the Hydrostatic Pressure Terrain-Following Coordinate in the Framework
 853 of the ARPEGE/Aladin NWP System. *Monthly Weather Review*, 123(2), 515–535.
 854 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1995\)123<0515:IOTFEE>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1995)123<0515:IOTFEE>2.0.CO;2)
- 855 Cesana, G., & Chepfer, H. (2012). How well do climate models simulate cloud vertical structure?
 856 A comparison between CALIPSO-GOCCP satellite observations and CMIP5 models.
 857 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39(20). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL053153>
- 858 Cesana, Grégory, & Chepfer, H. (2013). Evaluation of the cloud thermodynamic phase in a climate
 859 model using CALIPSO-GOCCP. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118(14),
 860 7922–7937. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50376>
- 861 Cesana, G., Waliser, D. E., Jiang, X., & Li, J.-L. F. (2015). Multimodel evaluation of cloud phase
 862 transition using satellite and reanalysis data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*,
 863 120(15), 7871–7892. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD022932>
- 864 Chang, P., Zhang, S., Danabasoglu, G., Yeager, S. G., Fu, H., Wang, H., Castruccio, F. S., Chen,
 865 Y., Edwards, J., Fu, D., Jia, Y., Laurindo, L. C., Liu, X., Rosenbloom, N., Small, R. J., Xu,
 866 G., Zeng, Y., Zhang, Q., Bacmeister, J., ... Wu, L. (2020). An Unprecedented Set of High-
 867 Resolution Earth System Simulations for Understanding Multiscale Interactions in Climate

Variability and Change. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 12(12),
e2020MS002298. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020MS002298>

Chen, Y., Weng, F., Han, Y., & Liu, Q. (2008). Validation of the Community Radiative Transfer
Model by using CloudSat data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 113(D8).
<https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009561>

Chen, Y.-W., Seiki, T., Kodama, C., Satoh, M., & Noda, A. T. (2018). Impact of Precipitating Ice
Hydrometeors on Longwave Radiative Effect Estimated by a Global Cloud-System
Resolving Model. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 10(2), 284–296.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/2017MS001180>

Chepfer, H., Bony, S., Winker, D., Cesana, G., Dufresne, J. L., Minnis, P., Stubenrauch, C. J., &
Zeng, S. (2010). The GCM-Oriented CALIPSO Cloud Product (CALIPSO-GOCCP). *Journal
of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 115(D4). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD012251>

Curry, J. A., Schramm, J. L., & Ebert, E. E. (1993). Impact of clouds on the surface radiation
balance of the Arctic Ocean. *Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics*, 51(3), 197–217.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01030494>

Davies, T., Cullen, M. J. P., Malcolm, A. J., Mawson, M. H., Staniforth, A., White, A. A., & Wood,
N. (2005). A new dynamical core for the Met Office’s global and regional modelling of the
atmosphere. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 131(608), 1759–1782.
<https://doi.org/10.1256/qj.04.101>

DeMott, P. J., Cziczo, D. J., Prenni, A. J., Murphy, D. M., Kreidenweis, S. M., Thomson, D. S.,
Borys, R., & Rogers, D. C. (2003). Measurements of the concentration and composition of
nuclei for cirrus formation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100(25),
14655–14660. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2532677100>

- 891 Ding, S., Yang, P., Weng, F., Liu, Q., Han, Y., van Delst, P., Li, J., & Baum, B. (2011). Validation
892 of the community radiative transfer model. *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and*
893 *Radiative Transfer*, 112(6), 1050–1064. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2010.11.009>
- 894 Dueben, P. D., Wedi, N., Saarinen, S., & Zeman, C. (2020). Global Simulations of the Atmosphere
895 at 1.45 km Grid-Spacing with the Integrated Forecasting System. *Journal of the*
896 *Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 98(3), 551–572. [https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2020-](https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2020-016)
897 [016](https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2020-016)
- 898 Elsaesser, G. S., O'Dell, C. W., Lebsock, M. D., Bennartz, R., Greenwald, T. J., & Wentz, F. J.
899 (2017). The Multisensor Advanced Climatology of Liquid Water Path (MAC-LWP). *Journal*
900 *of Climate*, 30(24), 10193–10210. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0902.1>
- 901 Engdahl, B. J. K., Thompson, G., & Bengtsson, L. (2020). Improving the representation of
902 supercooled liquid water in the HARMONIE-AROME weather forecast model. *Tellus A:*
903 *Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography*, 72(1), 1–18.
904 <https://doi.org/10.1080/16000870.2019.1697603>
- 905 Field, P. R., Hogan, R. J., Brown, P. R. A., Illingworth, A. J., Choulaton, T. W., & Cotton, R. J.
906 (2005). Parametrization of ice-particle size distributions for mid-latitude stratiform cloud.
907 *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 131(609), 1997–2017.
908 <https://doi.org/10.1256/qj.04.134>
- 909 Forbes, R., Tompkins, A. M., & Untch, A. (2011). *A new prognostic bulk microphysics scheme*
910 *for the IFS*. ECMWF. <https://doi.org/10.21957/bf6vjvxk>
- 911 Fovell, R. G., Corbosiero, K. L., Seifert, A., & Liou, K.-N. (2010). Impact of cloud-radiative
912 processes on hurricane track. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 37(7).
913 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL042691>

- Francis, J. A., Hunter, E., Key, J. R., & Wang, X. (2005). Clues to variability in Arctic minimum sea ice extent. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32(21). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL024376>
- Fu, Q. (2007). A New Parameterization of an Asymmetry Factor of Cirrus Clouds for Climate Models. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 64(11), 4140–4150. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2007JAS2289.1>
- Fu, Q., & Liou, K. N. (1993). Parameterization of the Radiative Properties of Cirrus Clouds. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 50(13), 2008–2025. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1993\)050<2008:POTRPO>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1993)050<2008:POTRPO>2.0.CO;2)
- Fu, Q., Yang, P., & Sun, W. B. (1998). An Accurate Parameterization of the Infrared Radiative Properties of Cirrus Clouds for Climate Models. *Journal of Climate*, 11(9), 2223–2237. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(1998\)011<2223:AAPOTI>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1998)011<2223:AAPOTI>2.0.CO;2)
- Fudeyasu, H., Wang, Y., Satoh, M., Nasuno, T., Miura, H., & Yanase, W. (2008). Global cloud-system-resolving model NICAM successfully simulated the lifecycles of two real tropical cyclones. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35(22). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL036003>
- Fukuta, N., & Schaller, R. C. (1982). Ice Nucleation by Aerosol Particles. Theory of Condensation-Freezing Nucleation. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 39(3), 648–655. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1982\)039<0648:INBAPT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1982)039<0648:INBAPT>2.0.CO;2)
- Furtado, K., & Field, P. (2017). The Role of Ice Microphysics Parametrizations in Determining the Prevalence of Supercooled Liquid Water in High-Resolution Simulations of a Southern Ocean Midlatitude Cyclone. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 74(6), 2001–2021. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-16-0165.1>
- Gettelman, A., Liu, X., Ghan, S. J., Morrison, H., Park, S., Conley, A. J., Klein, S. A., Boyle, J., Mitchell, D. L., & Li, J.-L. F. (2010). Global simulations of ice nucleation and ice

- supersaturation with an improved cloud scheme in the Community Atmosphere Model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 115(D18). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD013797>
- Gettelman, A., & Morrison, H. (2015). Advanced Two-Moment Bulk Microphysics for Global Models. Part I: Off-Line Tests and Comparison with Other Schemes. *Journal of Climate*, 28(3), 1268–1287. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00102.1>
- Gilmore, M. S., Straka, J. M., & Rasmussen, E. N. (2004). Precipitation Uncertainty Due to Variations in Precipitation Particle Parameters within a Simple Microphysics Scheme. *Monthly Weather Review*, 132(11), 2610–2627. <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR2810.1>
- Grabowski, W. W. (1998). Toward Cloud Resolving Modeling of Large-Scale Tropical Circulations: A Simple Cloud Microphysics Parameterization. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 55(21), 3283–3298. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1998\)055<3283:TCRMOL>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1998)055<3283:TCRMOL>2.0.CO;2)
- Haarsma, R. J., Roberts, M. J., Vidale, P. L., Senior, C. A., Bellucci, A., Bao, Q., Chang, P., Corti, S., Fučkar, N. S., Guemas, V., von Hardenberg, J., Hazeleger, W., Kodama, C., Koenigk, T., Leung, L. R., Lu, J., Luo, J.-J., Mao, J., Mizielinski, M. S., ... von Storch, J.-S. (2016). High Resolution Model Intercomparison Project (HighResMIP v1.0) for CMIP6. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9(11), 4185–4208. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-4185-2016>
- Hagihara, Yuichiro, Okamoto, H., & Yoshida, R. (2010). Development of a combined CloudSat-CALIPSO cloud mask to show global cloud distribution. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 115(D4). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD012344>

- 958 Hagihara, Yuichiro, Okamoto, H., & Luo, Z. J. (2014). Joint analysis of cloud top heights from
 959 CloudSat and CALIPSO: New insights into cloud top microphysics. *Journal of Geophysical*
 960 *Research: Atmospheres*, 119(7), 4087–4106. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JD020919>
- 961 Hagihara, Y., Ohno, Y., Horie, H., Roh, W., Satoh, M., Kubota, T., & Oki, R. (2021). Assessments
 962 of Doppler Velocity Errors of EarthCARE Cloud Profiling Radar Using Global Cloud System
 963 Resolving Simulations: Effects of Doppler Broadening and Folding. *IEEE Transactions on*
 964 *Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2021.3060828>
- 965 Haladay, T., & Stephens, G. (2009). Characteristics of tropical thin cirrus clouds deduced from
 966 joint CloudSat and CALIPSO observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*,
 967 114(D8). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD010675>
- 968 Hall, A., Cox, P., Huntingford, C., & Klein, S. (2019). Progressing emergent constraints on future
 969 climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, 9(4), 269–278. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0436-6)
 970 [0436-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0436-6)
- 971 Hansen, J. E., & Travis, L. D. (1974). Light scattering in planetary atmospheres. *Space Science*
 972 *Reviews*, 16(4), 527–610. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00168069>
- 973 Harris, L. M., Rees, S. L., Morin, M., Zhou, L., & Stern, W. F. (2019). Explicit Prediction of
 974 Continental Convection in a Skillful Variable-Resolution Global Model. *Journal of Advances*
 975 *in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11(6), 1847–1869. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001542>
- 976 Harris, L., Zhou, L., Lin, S.-J., Chen, J.-H., Chen, X., Gao, K., Morin, M., Rees, S., Sun, Y., Tong,
 977 M., Xiang, B., Bender, M., Benson, R., Cheng, K.-Y., Clark, S., Elbert, O. D., Hazelton, A.,
 978 Huff, J. J., Kaltenbaugh, A., ... Stern, W. (2020). GFDL SHIELD: A Unified System for
 979 Weather-to-Seasonal Prediction. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 12(10),
 980 e2020MS002223. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020MS002223>

- 981 Hartmann, D. L., Ockert-Bell, M. E., & Michelsen, M. L. (1992). The Effect of Cloud Type on
982 Earth's Energy Balance: Global Analysis. *Journal of Climate*, 5(11), 1281–1304.
983 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(1992\)005<1281:TEOCTO>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1992)005<1281:TEOCTO>2.0.CO;2)
- 984 Hartmann, D. L., & Larson, K. (2002). An important constraint on tropical cloud—Climate
985 feedback. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29(20), 12-1-12–14.
986 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002GL015835>
- 987 Hashino, T., Satoh, M., Hagihara, Y., Kubota, T., Matsui, T., Nasuno, T., & Okamoto, H. (2013).
988 Evaluating cloud microphysics from NICAM against CloudSat and CALIPSO. *Journal of*
989 *Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118(13), 7273–7292.
990 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50564>
- 991 Hashino, T., Satoh, M., Hagihara, Y., Kato, S., Kubota, T., Matsui, T., Nasuno, T., Okamoto, H.,
992 & Sekiguchi, M. (2016). Evaluating Arctic cloud radiative effects simulated by NICAM with
993 A-train. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 121(12), 7041–7063.
994 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD024775>
- 995 Herring, S. C., Christidis, N., Hoell, A., Hoerling, M. P., & Stott, P. A. (2019). Explaining Extreme
996 Events of 2017 from a Climate Perspective. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*,
997 100(1), S1–S117. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-ExplainingExtremeEvents2017.1>
- 998 Heymsfield, A. (1975). Cirrus Uncinus Generating Cells and the Evolution of Cirriform Clouds.
999 Part II: The Structure and Circulations of the Cirrus Uncinus Generating Head. *Journal of the*
1000 *Atmospheric Sciences*, 32(4), 809–819. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1975)032<0809:CUGCAT>2.0.CO;2)
1001 [0469\(1975\)032<0809:CUGCAT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1975)032<0809:CUGCAT>2.0.CO;2)
- 1002 Hohenegger, C., Kornblueh, L., Klocke, D., Becker, T., Cioni, G., Engels, J. F., Schulzweida, U.,
1003 & Stevens, B. (2020). Climate Statistics in Global Simulations of the Atmosphere, from 80

- 1004 to 2.5 km Grid Spacing. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 98(1), 73–
 1005 91. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2020-005>
- 1006 Hotta, H., Suzuki, K., Goto, D., & Lebsock, M. (2020). Climate Impact of Cloud Water
 1007 Inhomogeneity through Microphysical Processes in a Global Climate Model. *Journal of*
 1008 *Climate*, 33(12), 5195–5212. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0772.1>
- 1009 Hou, A. Y., Kakar, R. K., Neeck, S., Azarbarzin, A. A., Kummerow, C. D., Kojima, M., Oki, R.,
 1010 Nakamura, K., & Iguchi, T. (2014). The Global Precipitation Measurement Mission. *Bulletin*
 1011 *of the American Meteorological Society*, 95(5), 701–722. [https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-](https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00164.1)
 1012 [13-00164.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00164.1)
- 1013 Hu, Y., Winker, D., Vaughan, M., Lin, B., Omar, A., Trepte, C., Flittner, D., Yang, P., Nasiri, S.
 1014 L., Baum, B., Holz, R., Sun, W., Liu, Z., Wang, Z., Young, S., Stamnes, K., Huang, J., &
 1015 Kuehn, R. (2009). CALIPSO/CALIOP Cloud Phase Discrimination Algorithm. *Journal of*
 1016 *Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 26(11), 2293–2309.
 1017 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JTECHA1280.1>
- 1018 Hu, Y., Rodier, S., Xu, K., Sun, W., Huang, J., Lin, B., Zhai, P., & Josset, D. (2010). Occurrence,
 1019 liquid water content, and fraction of supercooled water clouds from combined
 1020 CALIOP/IIR/MODIS measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*,
 1021 115(D4). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD012384>
- 1022 Hyder, P., Edwards, J. M., Allan, R. P., Hewitt, H. T., Bracegirdle, T. J., Gregory, J. M., Wood,
 1023 R. A., Meijers, A. J. S., Mulcahy, J., Field, P., Furtado, K., Bodas-Salcedo, A., Williams, K.
 1024 D., Copsey, D., Josey, S. A., Liu, C., Roberts, C. D., Sanchez, C., Ridley, J., ... Belcher, S.
 1025 E. (2018). Critical Southern Ocean climate model biases traced to atmospheric model cloud
 1026 errors. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 3625. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05634-2>

- 1027 Iga, S., Tomita, H., Tsushima, Y., & Satoh, M. (2007). Climatology of a nonhydrostatic global
1028 model with explicit cloud processes. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34(22).
1029 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GL031048>
- 1030 Igel, A. L., Igel, M. R., & Heever, S. C. van den. (2015). Make It a Double? Sobering Results from
1031 Simulations Using Single-Moment Microphysics Schemes. *Journal of the Atmospheric*
1032 *Sciences*, 72(2), 910–925. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-14-0107.1>
- 1033 Iguchi, T., Kozu, T., Kwiatkowski, J., Meneghini, R., Awaka, J., & Okamoto, K. (2009).
1034 Uncertainties in the Rain Profiling Algorithm for the TRMM Precipitation Radar. *Journal of*
1035 *the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 87A, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.87A.1>
- 1036 Illingworth, A. J., Barker, H. W., Beljaars, A., Ceccaldi, M., Chepfer, H., Clerbaux, N., Cole, J.,
1037 Delanoë, J., Domenech, C., Donovan, D. P., Fukuda, S., Hirakata, M., Hogan, R. J.,
1038 Huenerbein, A., Kollias, P., Kubota, T., Nakajima, T., Nakajima, T. Y., Nishizawa, T., ...
1039 Zadelhoff, G.-J. van. (2015). The EarthCARE Satellite: The Next Step Forward in Global
1040 Measurements of Clouds, Aerosols, Precipitation, and Radiation. *Bulletin of the American*
1041 *Meteorological Society*, 96(8), 1311–1332. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00227.1>
- 1042 Inoue, Tomotsugu, Ueda, H., & Inoue, T. (2006). Cloud Properties over the Bay of Bengal Derived
1043 from NOAA-9 Split Window Data and the TRMM PR Product. *Sola*, 2, 41–44.
1044 <https://doi.org/10.2151/sola.2006-011>
- 1045 Inoue, Toshiro. (1987). A cloud type classification with NOAA 7 split-window measurements.
1046 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 92(D4), 3991–4000.
1047 <https://doi.org/10.1029/JD092iD04p03991>
- 1048 Inoue, Toshiro, & Ackerman, S. A. (2002). Radiative Effects of Various Cloud Types as Classified
1049 by the Split Window Technique over the Eastern Sub-tropical Pacific Derived from

- 1050 Collocated ERBE and AVHRR Data. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II,*
 1051 80(6), 1383–1394. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.80.1383>
- 1052 Inoue, Toshiro, Satoh, M., Miura, H., & Mapes, B. (2008). Characteristics of Cloud Size of Deep
 1053 Convection Simulated by a Global Cloud Resolving Model over the Western Tropical Pacific.
 1054 *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II, 86A,* 1–15.
 1055 <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.86A.1>
- 1056 Inoue, Toshiro, Satoh, M., Hagihara, Y., Miura, H., & Schmetz, J. (2010). Comparison of high-
 1057 level clouds represented in a global cloud system-resolving model with CALIPSO/CloudSat
 1058 and geostationary satellite observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres,*
 1059 115(D4). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD012371>
- 1060 Ishihara, M., Kato, Y., Abo, T., Kobayashi, K., & Izumikawa, Y. (2006). Characteristics and
 1061 Performance of the Operational Wind Profiler Network of the Japan Meteorological Agency.
 1062 *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II, 84(6),* 1085–1096.
 1063 <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.84.1085>
- 1064 Iwabuchi, H., Saito, M., Tokoro, Y., Putri, N. S., & Sekiguchi, M. (2016). Retrieval of radiative
 1065 and microphysical properties of clouds from multispectral infrared measurements. *Progress*
 1066 *in Earth and Planetary Science*, 3(1), 32. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-016-0108-3>
- 1067 Iwabuchi, H., Putri, N. S., Saito, M., Tokoro, Y., Sekiguchi, M., Yang, P., & Baum, B. A. (2018).
 1068 Cloud Property Retrieval from Multiband Infrared Measurements by Himawari-8. *Journal of*
 1069 *the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II, 96B,* 27–42. [https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2018-](https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2018-001)
 1070 [001](https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2018-001)

- 1071 Jaruga, A., & Pawlowska, H. (2018). libcloudph++ 2.0: Aqueous-phase chemistry extension of the
 1072 particle-based cloud microphysics scheme. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11(9), 3623–
 1073 3645. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-3623-2018>
- 1074 Jensen, E. J., Kinne, S., & Toon, O. B. (1994). Tropical cirrus cloud radiative forcing: Sensitivity
 1075 studies. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 21(18), 2023–2026.
 1076 <https://doi.org/10.1029/94GL01358>
- 1077 Kajikawa, Y., Miyamoto, Y., Yoshida, R., Yamaura, T., Yashiro, H., & Tomita, H. (2016).
 1078 Resolution dependence of deep convections in a global simulation from over 10-kilometer to
 1079 sub-kilometer grid spacing. *Progress in Earth and Planetary Science*, 3(1), 16.
 1080 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-016-0094-5>
- 1081 Kalnay, E., Kanamitsu, M., & Baker, W. E. (1990). Global Numerical Weather Prediction at the
 1082 National Meteorological Center. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 71(10),
 1083 1410–1428. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(1990\)071<1410:GNWPAT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1990)071<1410:GNWPAT>2.0.CO;2)
- 1084 Kang, S. M., Frierson, D. M. W., & Held, I. M. (2009). The Tropical Response to Extratropical
 1085 Thermal Forcing in an Idealized GCM: The Importance of Radiative Feedbacks and
 1086 Convective Parameterization. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 66(9), 2812–2827.
 1087 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JAS2924.1>
- 1088 Kapsch, M.-L., Graversen, R. G., & Tjernström, M. (2013). Springtime atmospheric energy
 1089 transport and the control of Arctic summer sea-ice extent. *Nature Climate Change*, 3(8), 744–
 1090 748. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1884>
- 1091 Kapsch, M.-L., Graversen, R. G., Tjernström, M., & Bintanja, R. (2016). The Effect of
 1092 Downwelling Longwave and Shortwave Radiation on Arctic Summer Sea Ice. *Journal of*
 1093 *Climate*, 29(3), 1143–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0238.1>

- 1094 Kärcher, B., Hendricks, J., & Lohmann, U. (2006). Physically based parameterization of cirrus
1095 cloud formation for use in global atmospheric models. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
1096 *Atmospheres*, 111(D1). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JD006219>
- 1097 Kato, T., & Saito, K. (1995). Hydrostatic and Non-Hydrostatic Simulations of Moist Convection.
1098 *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 73(1), 59–77.
1099 https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj1965.73.1_59
- 1100 Kawai, H., & Teixeira, J. (2010). Probability Density Functions of Liquid Water Path and Cloud
1101 Amount of Marine Boundary Layer Clouds: Geographical and Seasonal Variations and
1102 Controlling Meteorological Factors. *Journal of Climate*, 23(8), 2079–2092.
1103 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JCLI3070.1>
- 1104 Kawai, H., & Teixeira, J. (2012). Probability Density Functions of Liquid Water Path and Total
1105 Water Content of Marine Boundary Layer Clouds: Implications for Cloud Parameterization.
1106 *Journal of Climate*, 25(6), 2162–2177. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00117.1>
- 1107 Kay, J. E., Wall, C., Yettella, V., Medeiros, B., Hannay, C., Caldwell, P., & Bitz, C. (2016). Global
1108 Climate Impacts of Fixing the Southern Ocean Shortwave Radiation Bias in the Community
1109 Earth System Model (CESM). *Journal of Climate*, 29(12), 4617–4636.
1110 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0358.1>
- 1111 Khairoutdinov, M., & Kogan, Y. (2000). A New Cloud Physics Parameterization in a Large-Eddy
1112 Simulation Model of Marine Stratocumulus. *Monthly Weather Review*, 128(1), 229–243.
1113 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(2000\)128<0229:ANCPPI>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2000)128<0229:ANCPPI>2.0.CO;2)
- 1114 Khairoutdinov, M. F., & Randall, D. A. (2003). Cloud Resolving Modeling of the ARM Summer
1115 1997 IOP: Model Formulation, Results, Uncertainties, and Sensitivities. *Journal of the*

- 1116 *Atmospheric Sciences*, 60(4), 607–625. <https://doi.org/10.1175/1520->
 1117 [0469\(2003\)060<0607:CRMOTA>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(2003)060<0607:CRMOTA>2.0.CO;2)
- 1118 Khvorostyanov, V. I., & Curry, J. A. (2009). Critical humidities of homogeneous and
 1119 heterogeneous ice nucleation: Inferences from extended classical nucleation theory. *Journal*
 1120 *of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 114(D4). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD011197>
- 1121 Kikuchi, K., Kodama, C., Nasuno, T., Nakano, M., Miura, H., Satoh, M., Noda, A. T., & Yamada,
 1122 Y. (2017). Tropical intraseasonal oscillation simulated in an AMIP-type experiment by
 1123 NICAM. *Climate Dynamics*, 48(7), 2507–2528. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3219-z>
- 1124 Kikuchi, M., Okamoto, H., Sato, K., Suzuki, K., Cesana, G., Hagihara, Y., Takahashi, N.,
 1125 Hayasaka, T., & Oki, R. (2017). Development of Algorithm for Discriminating Hydrometeor
 1126 Particle Types With a Synergistic Use of CloudSat and CALIPSO. *Journal of Geophysical*
 1127 *Research: Atmospheres*, 122(20), 11,022–11,044. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027113>
- 1128 Kodama, C., Noda, A. T., & Satoh, M. (2012). An assessment of the cloud signals simulated by
 1129 NICAM using ISCCP, CALIPSO, and CloudSat satellite simulators. *Journal of Geophysical*
 1130 *Research: Atmospheres*, 117(D12). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD017317>
- 1131 Kodama, Chihiro, Yamada, Y., Noda, A. T., Kikuchi, K., Kajikawa, Y., Nasuno, T., Tomita, T.,
 1132 Yamaura, T., Takahashi, H. G., Hara, M., Kawatani, Y., Satoh, M., & Sugi, M. (2015). A 20-
 1133 Year Climatology of a NICAM AMIP-Type Simulation. *Journal of the Meteorological*
 1134 *Society of Japan*. Ser. II, 93(4), 393–424. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2015-024>
- 1135 Kodama, Chihiro, Ohno, T., Seiki, T., Yashiro, H., Noda, A. T., Nakano, M., Yamada, Y., Roh,
 1136 W., Satoh, M., Nitta, T., Goto, D., Miura, H., Nasuno, T., Miyakawa, T., Chen, Y.-W., &
 1137 Sugi, M. (2021). The Nonhydrostatic ICosahedral Atmospheric Model for CMIP6
 1138 HighResMIP simulations (NICAM16-S): Experimental design, model description, and

- 1139 impacts of model updates. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 14(2), 795–820.
1140 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-795-2021>
- 1141 Kondo, M., Sato, Y., Inatsu, M., & Katsuyama, Y. (2021). Evaluation of cloud microphysical
1142 schemes for winter snowfall events in Hokkaido: A case study of snowfall by winter
1143 monsoon. *Sola, adypub*. <https://doi.org/10.2151/sola.2021-012>
- 1144 Kuba, N., Suzuki, K., Hashino, T., Seiki, T., & Satoh, M. (2015). Numerical Experiments to
1145 Analyze Cloud Microphysical Processes Depicted in Vertical Profiles of Radar Reflectivity
1146 of Warm Clouds. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 72(12), 4509–4528.
1147 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-15-0053.1>
- 1148 Kuba, N., Seiki, T., Suzuki, K., Roh, W., & Satoh, M. (2020). Evaluation of Rain Microphysics
1149 Using a Radar Simulator and Numerical Models: Comparison of Two-Moment Bulk and
1150 Spectral Bin Cloud Microphysics Schemes. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*,
1151 12(3), e2019MS001891. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001891>
- 1152 Lang, S., Tao, W.-K., Simpson, J., Cifelli, R., Rutledge, S., Olson, W., & Halverson, J. (2007).
1153 Improving Simulations of Convective Systems from TRMM LBA: Easterly and Westerly
1154 Regimes. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 64(4), 1141–1164.
1155 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS3879.1>
- 1156 Li, J.-L. F., Waliser, D. E., Stephens, G., Lee, S., L’Ecuyer, T., Kato, S., Loeb, N., & Ma, H.-Y.
1157 (2013). Characterizing and understanding radiation budget biases in CMIP3/CMIP5 GCMs,
1158 contemporary GCM, and reanalysis. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*,
1159 118(15), 8166–8184. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50378>
- 1160 Li, J.-L. F., Forbes, R. M., Waliser, D. E., Stephens, G., & Lee, S. (2014). Characterizing the
1161 radiative impacts of precipitating snow in the ECMWF Integrated Forecast System global

1162 model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119(16), 9626–9637.
 1163 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD021450>

1164 Li, J.-L. F., Lee, W.-L., Waliser, D., Wang, Y.-H., Yu, J.-Y., Jiang, X., L’Ecuyer, T., Chen, Y.-C.,
 1165 Kubar, T., Fetzer, E., & Mahakur, M. (2016). Considering the radiative effects of snow on
 1166 tropical Pacific Ocean radiative heating profiles in contemporary GCMs using A-Train
 1167 observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 121(4), 1621–1636.
 1168 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023587>

1169 Li, X., Tao, W.-K., Matsui, T., Liu, C., & Masunaga, H. (2010). Improving a spectral bin
 1170 microphysical scheme using TRMM satellite observations. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal*
 1171 *Meteorological Society*, 136(647), 382–399. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.569>

1172 Liao, Liang, & Meneghini, R. (2011). A Study on the Feasibility of Dual-Wavelength Radar for
 1173 Identification of Hydrometeor Phases. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*,
 1174 50(2), 449–456. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JAMC2499.1>

1175 Liao, L., & Meneghini, R. (2016). A Dual-Wavelength Radar Technique to Detect Hydrometeor
 1176 Phases. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 54(12), 7292–7298.
 1177 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2016.2599022>

1178 Liao, Liang, Meneghini, R., Tokay, A., & Kim, H. (2020). Assessment of Ku- and Ka-band Dual-
 1179 frequency Radar for Snow Retrieval. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*,
 1180 98(6), 1129–1146. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2020-057>

1181 Lin, S.-J. (2004). A “Vertically Lagrangian” Finite-Volume Dynamical Core for Global Models.
 1182 *Monthly Weather Review*, 132(10), 2293–2307. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2004)132<2293:AVLFDC>2.0.CO;2)
 1183 [0493\(2004\)132<2293:AVLFDC>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2004)132<2293:AVLFDC>2.0.CO;2)

- 1184 Lin, S.-J., & Rood, R. B. (1997). An explicit flux-form semi-lagrangian shallow-water model on
1185 the sphere. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 123(544), 2477–2498.
1186 <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49712354416>
- 1187 Lin, Y.-L., Farley, R. D., & Orville, H. D. (1983). Bulk Parameterization of the Snow Field in a
1188 Cloud Model. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 22(6), 1065–1092.
1189 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450\(1983\)022<1065:BPOTSF>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(1983)022<1065:BPOTSF>2.0.CO;2)
- 1190 Liou, K. N. (2002). *An Introduction to Atmospheric Radiation*. Elsevier.
- 1191 Liou, K.-N. (1986). Influence of Cirrus Clouds on Weather and Climate Processes: A Global
1192 Perspective. *Monthly Weather Review*, 114(6), 1167–1199. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1986)114<1167:IOCCOW>2.0.CO;2)
1193 [0493\(1986\)114<1167:IOCCOW>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1986)114<1167:IOCCOW>2.0.CO;2)
- 1194 Locatelli, J. D., & Hobbs, P. V. (1974). Fall speeds and masses of solid precipitation particles.
1195 *Journal of Geophysical Research (1896-1977)*, 79(15), 2185–2197.
1196 <https://doi.org/10.1029/JC079i015p02185>
- 1197 Lopez, P. (2002). Implementation and validation of a new prognostic large-scale cloud and
1198 precipitation scheme for climate and data-assimilation purposes. *Quarterly Journal of the*
1199 *Royal Meteorological Society*, 128(579), 229–257.
1200 <https://doi.org/10.1256/00359000260498879>
- 1201 Macke, A. (1993). Scattering of light by polyhedral ice crystals. *Applied Optics*, 32(15), 2780–
1202 2788. <https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.32.002780>
- 1203 Malardel, S., Wedi, N., Deconinck, W., Diamantakis, M., Kuehnlein, C., Mozdzyński, G.,
1204 Hamrud, M., & Smolarkiewicz, P. (2016). *A new grid for the IFS*. ECMWF.
1205 <https://doi.org/10.21957/zwdu9u5i>

- 1206 Mapes, B. E., & Houze, R. A. (1993). Cloud Clusters and Superclusters over the Oceanic Warm
 1207 Pool. *Monthly Weather Review*, 121(5), 1398–1416. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1993)121<1398:CCASOT>2.0.CO;2)
 1208 [0493\(1993\)121<1398:CCASOT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1993)121<1398:CCASOT>2.0.CO;2)
- 1209 Marchand, R., Haynes, J., Mace, G. G., Ackerman, T., & Stephens, G. (2009). A comparison of
 1210 simulated cloud radar output from the multiscale modeling framework global climate model
 1211 with CloudSat cloud radar observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*,
 1212 114(D8). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD009790>
- 1213 Masunaga, Hirohiko, L’Ecuyer, T. S., & Kummerow, C. D. (2005). Variability in the
 1214 Characteristics of Precipitation Systems in the Tropical Pacific. Part I: Spatial Structure.
 1215 *Journal of Climate*, 18(6), 823–840. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-3304.1>
- 1216 Masunaga, Hirohiko, & Kummerow, C. D. (2006). Observations of tropical precipitating clouds
 1217 ranging from shallow to deep convective systems. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 33(16).
 1218 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL026547>
- 1219 Masunaga, H., Satoh, M., & Miura, H. (2008). A joint satellite and global cloud-resolving model
 1220 analysis of a Madden-Julian Oscillation event: Model diagnosis. *Journal of Geophysical*
 1221 *Research: Atmospheres*, 113(D17). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD009986>
- 1222 Masunaga, Hirohiko, Matsui, T., Tao, W., Hou, A. Y., Kummerow, C. D., Nakajima, T., Bauer,
 1223 P., Olson, W. S., Sekiguchi, M., & Nakajima, T. Y. (2010). Satellite Data Simulator Unit: A
 1224 Multisensor, Multispectral Satellite Simulator Package. *Bulletin of the American*
 1225 *Meteorological Society*, 91(12), 1625–1632. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010BAMS2809.1>
- 1226 Masunaga, Hirohiko, & Bony, S. (2018). Radiative Invigoration of Tropical Convection by
 1227 Preceding Cirrus Clouds. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 75(4), 1327–1342.
 1228 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-17-0355.1>

- 1229 Masunaga, Hirohiko, & Mapes, B. E. (2020). A Mechanism for the Maintenance of Sharp Tropical
 1230 Margins. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 77(4), 1181–1197.
 1231 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-19-0154.1>
- 1232 Matsui, Toshihisa, Zeng, X., Tao, W.-K., Masunaga, H., Olson, W. S., & Lang, S. (2009).
 1233 Evaluation of Long-Term Cloud-Resolving Model Simulations Using Satellite Radiance
 1234 Observations and Multifrequency Satellite Simulators. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic*
 1235 *Technology*, 26(7), 1261–1274. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JTECHA1168.1>
- 1236 Matsui, Toshihisa, Iguchi, T., Li, X., Han, M., Tao, W.-K., Petersen, W., L’Ecuyer, T., Meneghini,
 1237 R., Olson, W., Kummerow, C. D., Hou, A. Y., Schwaller, M. R., Stocker, E. F., &
 1238 Kwiatkowski, J. (2013). GPM Satellite Simulator over Ground Validation Sites. *Bulletin of*
 1239 *the American Meteorological Society*, 94(11), 1653–1660. [https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-](https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00160.1)
 1240 [12-00160.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00160.1)
- 1241 Matsui, T., Santanello, J., Shi, J. J., Tao, W.-K., Wu, D., Peters-Lidard, C., Kemp, E., Chin, M.,
 1242 Starr, D., Sekiguchi, M., & Aires, F. (2014). Introducing multisensor satellite radiance-based
 1243 evaluation for regional Earth System modeling. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
 1244 *Atmospheres*, 119(13), 8450–8475. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JD021424>
- 1245 Matsui, Toshi, Chern, J.-D., Tao, W.-K., Lang, S., Satoh, M., Hashino, T., & Kubota, T. (2016).
 1246 On the Land–Ocean Contrast of Tropical Convection and Microphysics Statistics Derived
 1247 from TRMM Satellite Signals and Global Storm-Resolving Models. *Journal of*
 1248 *Hydrometeorology*, 17(5), 1425–1445. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-15-0111.1>
- 1249 Matsui, Toshi, Dolan, B., Rutledge, S. A., Tao, W.-K., Iguchi, T., Barnum, J., & Lang, S. E. (2019).
 1250 POLARRIS: A POLArimetric Radar Retrieval and Instrument Simulator. *Journal of*

- 1251 *Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 124(8), 4634–4657.
 1252 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JD028317>
- 1253 Matsui, Toshi, Zhang, S. Q., Lang, S. E., Tao, W.-K., Ichoku, C., & Peters-Lidard, C. D. (2020).
 1254 Impact of radiation frequency, precipitation radiative forcing, and radiation column
 1255 aggregation on convection-permitting West African monsoon simulations. *Climate*
 1256 *Dynamics*, 55(1), 193–213. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-018-4187-2>
- 1257 McFarquhar, G. M., Heymsfield, A. J., Macke, A., Iaquinta, J., & Aulenbach, S. M. (1999). Use
 1258 of observed ice crystal sizes and shapes to calculate mean-scattering properties and
 1259 multispectral radiances: CEPEX April 4, 1993, case study. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
 1260 *Atmospheres*, 104(D24), 31763–31779. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JD900802>
- 1261 Meehl, G. A., Yang, D., Arblaster, J. M., Bates, S. C., Rosenbloom, N., Neale, R., Bacmeister, J.,
 1262 Lauritzen, P. H., Bryan, F., Small, J., Truesdale, J., Hannay, C., Shields, C., Strand, W. G.,
 1263 Dennis, J., & Danabasoglu, G. (2019). Effects of Model Resolution, Physics, and Coupling
 1264 on Southern Hemisphere Storm Tracks in CESM1.3. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 46(21),
 1265 12408–12416. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL084057>
- 1266 Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Eyring, V., Flato, G., Lamarque, J.-F., Stouffer, R. J., Taylor, K. E.,
 1267 & Schlund, M. (2020). Context for interpreting equilibrium climate sensitivity and transient
 1268 climate response from the CMIP6 Earth system models. *Science Advances*, 6(26), eaba1981.
 1269 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aba1981>
- 1270 Michibata, T., Suzuki, K., Sekiguchi, M., & Takemura, T. (2019). Prognostic Precipitation in the
 1271 MIROC6-SPRINTARS GCM: Description and Evaluation Against Satellite Observations.
 1272 *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11(3), 839–860.
 1273 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001596>

- 1274 Michibata, T., & Suzuki, K. (2020). Reconciling Compensating Errors Between Precipitation
1275 Constraints and the Energy Budget in a Climate Model. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
1276 47(12), e2020GL088340. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL088340>
- 1277 Michibata, T., Suzuki, K., & Takemura, T. (2020). Snow-induced buffering in aerosol–cloud
1278 interactions. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 20(22), 13771–13780.
1279 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-13771-2020>
- 1280 Milbrandt, J. A., & Yau, M. K. (2005). A Multimoment Bulk Microphysics Parameterization. Part
1281 II: A Proposed Three-Moment Closure and Scheme Description. *Journal of the Atmospheric*
1282 *Sciences*, 62(9), 3065–3081. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS3535.1>
- 1283 Mitchell, D. L. (1996). Use of Mass- and Area-Dimensional Power Laws for Determining
1284 Precipitation Particle Terminal Velocities. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 53(12),
1285 1710–1723. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1996\)053<1710:UOMAAD>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1996)053<1710:UOMAAD>2.0.CO;2)
- 1286 Mitchell, D. L., & Arnott, W. P. (1994). A Model Predicting the Evolution of Ice Particle Size
1287 Spectra and Radiative Properties of Cirrus Clouds. Part II: Dependence of Absorption and
1288 Extinction on Ice Crystal Morphology. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 51(6), 817–832.
1289 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1994\)051<0817:AMPTEO>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1994)051<0817:AMPTEO>2.0.CO;2)
- 1290 Miura, H., Satoh, M., Nasuno, T., Noda, A. T., & Oouchi, K. (2007). A Madden-Julian Oscillation
1291 Event Realistically Simulated by a Global Cloud-Resolving Model. *Science*, 318(5857),
1292 1763–1765. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1148443>
- 1293 Miura, H., Satoh, M., Tomita, H., Noda, A. T., Nasuno, T., & Iga, S. (2007). A short-duration
1294 global cloud-resolving simulation with a realistic land and sea distribution. *Geophysical*
1295 *Research Letters*, 34(2). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL027448>

- 1296 Miyakawa, T., Takayabu, Y. N., Nasuno, T., Miura, H., Satoh, M., & Moncrieff, M. W. (2012).
 1297 Convective Momentum Transport by Rainbands within a Madden–Julian Oscillation in a
 1298 Global Nonhydrostatic Model with Explicit Deep Convective Processes. Part I: Methodology
 1299 and General Results. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 69(4), 1317–1338.
 1300 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-11-024.1>
- 1301 Miyakawa, T., Satoh, M., Miura, H., Tomita, H., Yashiro, H., Noda, A. T., Yamada, Y., Kodama,
 1302 C., Kimoto, M., & Yoneyama, K. (2014). Madden–Julian Oscillation prediction skill of a
 1303 new-generation global model demonstrated using a supercomputer. *Nature Communications*,
 1304 5(1), 3769. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms4769>
- 1305 Miyakawa, T., & Kikuchi, K. (2018). CINDY2011/DYNAMO Madden-Julian oscillation
 1306 successfully reproduced in global cloud/cloud-system resolving simulations despite weak
 1307 tropical wavelet power. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 11664. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-29931-4)
 1308 [29931-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-29931-4)
- 1309 Miyamoto, Y., Satoh, M., Tomita, H., Oouchi, K., Yamada, Y., Kodama, C., & Kinter, J. (2014).
 1310 Gradient Wind Balance in Tropical Cyclones in High-Resolution Global Experiments.
 1311 *Monthly Weather Review*, 142(5), 1908–1926. <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-13-00115.1>
- 1312 Miyamoto, Y., Yoshida, R., Yamaura, T., Yashiro, H., Tomita, H., & Kajikawa, Y. (2015). Does
 1313 convection vary in different cloud disturbances? *Atmospheric Science Letters*, 16(3), 305–
 1314 309. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asl2.558>
- 1315 Miyoshi, T., Lien, G., Satoh, S., Ushio, T., Bessho, K., Tomita, H., Nishizawa, S., Yoshida, R.,
 1316 Adachi, S. A., Liao, J., Geroft, B., Ishikawa, Y., Kunii, M., Ruiz, J., Maejima, Y., Otsuka, S.,
 1317 Otsuka, M., Okamoto, K., & Seko, H. (2016). “Big Data Assimilation” Toward Post-

- 1318 Petascale Severe Weather Prediction: An Overview and Progress. *Proceedings of the IEEE*,
 1319 *104*(11), 2155–2179. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2016.2602560>
- 1320 Mizieliński, M. S., Roberts, M. J., Vidale, P. L., Schiemann, R., Demory, M.-E., Strachan, J.,
 1321 Edwards, T., Stephens, A., Lawrence, B. N., Pritchard, M., Chiu, P., Iwi, A., Churchill, J.,
 1322 del Cano Novales, C., Kettleborough, J., Roseblade, W., Selwood, P., Foster, M., Glover, M.,
 1323 & Malcolm, A. (2014). High-resolution global climate modelling: The UPSCALE project, a
 1324 large-simulation campaign. *Geoscientific Model Development*, *7*(4), 1629–1640.
 1325 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-7-1629-2014>
- 1326 Morrison, H., & Gettelman, A. (2008). A New Two-Moment Bulk Stratiform Cloud Microphysics
 1327 Scheme in the Community Atmosphere Model, Version 3 (CAM3). Part I: Description and
 1328 Numerical Tests. *Journal of Climate*, *21*(15), 3642–3659.
 1329 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JCLI2105.1>
- 1330 Morrison, H., & Grabowski, W. W. (2008). Modeling Supersaturation and Subgrid-Scale Mixing
 1331 with Two-Moment Bulk Warm Microphysics. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, *65*(3),
 1332 792–812. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2007JAS2374.1>
- 1333 Morrison, H., de Boer, G., Feingold, G., Harrington, J., Shupe, M. D., & Sulia, K. (2012).
 1334 Resilience of persistent Arctic mixed-phase clouds. *Nature Geoscience*, *5*(1), 11–17.
 1335 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1332>
- 1336 Mroz, K., Battaglia, A., Lang, T. J., Tanelli, S., & Sacco, G. F. (2018). Global Precipitation
 1337 Measuring Dual-Frequency Precipitation Radar Observations of Hailstorm Vertical
 1338 Structure: Current Capabilities and Drawbacks. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and*
 1339 *Climatology*, *57*(9), 2161–2178. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-18-0020.1>

- 1340 Nakajima, T., & King, M. D. (1990). Determination of the Optical Thickness and Effective Particle
 1341 Radius of Clouds from Reflected Solar Radiation Measurements. Part I: Theory. *Journal of*
 1342 *the Atmospheric Sciences*, 47(15), 1878–1893. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1990)047<1878:DOTOTA>2.0.CO;2)
 1343 [0469\(1990\)047<1878:DOTOTA>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1990)047<1878:DOTOTA>2.0.CO;2)
- 1344 Nakajima, T., Tsukamoto, M., Tsushima, Y., Numaguti, A., & Kimura, T. (2000). Modeling of
 1345 the radiative process in an atmospheric general circulation model. *Applied Optics*, 39(27),
 1346 4869–4878. <https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.39.004869>
- 1347 Nakajima, T. Y., Suzuki, K., & Stephens, G. L. (2010). Droplet Growth in Warm Water Clouds
 1348 Observed by the A-Train. Part II: A Multisensor View. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*,
 1349 67(6), 1897–1907. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JAS3276.1>
- 1350 Nakano, Masuo, Sawada, M., Nasuno, T., & Satoh, M. (2015). Intraseasonal variability and
 1351 tropical cyclogenesis in the western North Pacific simulated by a global nonhydrostatic
 1352 atmospheric model. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42(2), 565–571.
 1353 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL062479>
- 1354 Nakano, Masuo, Wada, A., Sawada, M., Yoshimura, H., Onishi, R., Kawahara, S., Sasaki, W.,
 1355 Nasuno, T., Yamaguchi, M., Iriguchi, T., Sugi, M., & Takeuchi, Y. (2017). Global 7 km mesh
 1356 nonhydrostatic Model Intercomparison Project for improving TYphoon forecast (TYMIP-
 1357 G7): Experimental design and preliminary results. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10(3),
 1358 1363–1381. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-1363-2017>
- 1359 Nakano, M., & Kikuchi, K. (2019). Seasonality of Intraseasonal Variability in Global Climate
 1360 Models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 46(8), 4441–4449.
 1361 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL082443>

- 1362 Nam, C., Bony, S., Dufresne, J.-L., & Chepfer, H. (2012). The ‘too few, too bright’ tropical low-
 1363 cloud problem in CMIP5 models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39(21).
 1364 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL053421>
- 1365 Nasuno, T., Miura, H., Satoh, M., Noda, A. T., & Oouchi, K. (2009). Multi-scale Organization of
 1366 Convection in a Global Numerical Simulation of the December 2006 MJO Event Using
 1367 Explicit Moist Processes. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 87(2), 335–
 1368 345. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.87.335>
- 1369 Nasuno, T., Kikuchi, K., Nakano, M., Yamada, Y., Ikeda, M., & Taniguchi, H. (2017). Evaluation
 1370 of the Near Real-Time Forecasts Using a Global Nonhydrostatic Model during the
 1371 CINDY2011/DYNAMO. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 95(6), 345–
 1372 368. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2017-022>
- 1373 Nishizawa, S., Yashiro, H., Sato, Y., Miyamoto, Y., & Tomita, H. (2015). Influence of grid aspect
 1374 ratio on planetary boundary layer turbulence in large-eddy simulations. *Geoscientific Model*
 1375 *Development*, 8(10), 3393–3419. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-8-3393-2015>
- 1376 Noda, A. T., Satoh, M., Yamada, Y., Kodama, C., & Seiki, T. (2014). Responses of Tropical and
 1377 Subtropical High-Cloud Statistics to Global Warming. *Journal of Climate*, 27(20), 7753–
 1378 7768. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00179.1>
- 1379 Noda, A. T., Seiki, T., Satoh, M., & Yamada, Y. (2016). High cloud size dependency in the
 1380 applicability of the fixed anvil temperature hypothesis using global nonhydrostatic
 1381 simulations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(5), 2307–2314.
 1382 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL067742>
- 1383 Noda, Akira T., Kodama, C., Yamada, Y., Satoh, M., Ogura, T., & Ohno, T. (2019). Responses of
 1384 Clouds and Large-Scale Circulation to Global Warming Evaluated From Multidecadal

- 1385 Simulations Using a Global Nonhydrostatic Model. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth*
 1386 *Systems*, 11(9), 2980–2995. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001658>
- 1387 Okamoto, K. (2017). Evaluation of IR radiance simulation for all-sky assimilation of Himawari-
 1388 8/AHI in a mesoscale NWP system. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*,
 1389 143(704), 1517–1527. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3022>
- 1390 Okamoto, K., Sawada, Y., & Kunii, M. (2019). Comparison of assimilating all-sky and clear-sky
 1391 infrared radiances from Himawari-8 in a mesoscale system. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal*
 1392 *Meteorological Society*, 145(719), 745–766. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3463>
- 1393 Okata, M., Nakajima, T., Suzuki, K., Inoue, T., Nakajima, T. Y., & Okamoto, H. (2017). A study
 1394 on radiative transfer effects in 3-D cloudy atmosphere using satellite data. *Journal of*
 1395 *Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122(1), 443–468.
 1396 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD025441>
- 1397 Onishi, R., Sugiyama, D., & Matsuda, K. (2019). Super-Resolution Simulation for Real-Time
 1398 Prediction of Urban Micrometeorology. *Sola*, 15, 178–182.
 1399 <https://doi.org/10.2151/sola.2019-032>
- 1400 Oouchi, K., Noda, A. T., Satoh, M., Miura, H., Tomita, H., Nasuno, T., & Iga, S. (2009). A
 1401 Simulated Preconditioning of Typhoon Genesis Controlled by a Boreal Summer Madden-
 1402 Julian Oscillation Event in a Global Cloud-system-resolving Model. *Sola*, 5, 65–68.
 1403 <https://doi.org/10.2151/sola.2009-017>
- 1404 Park, S., Bretherton, C. S., & Rasch, P. J. (2014). Integrating Cloud Processes in the Community
 1405 Atmosphere Model, Version 5. *Journal of Climate*, 27(18), 6821–6856.
 1406 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00087.1>

- 1407 Phillips, V. T. J., Donner, L. J., & Garner, S. T. (2007). Nucleation Processes in Deep Convection
1408 Simulated by a Cloud-System-Resolving Model with Double-Moment Bulk Microphysics.
1409 *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 64(3), 738–761. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS3869.1>
- 1410 Pollack, J. B., & Cuzzi, J. N. (1980). Scattering by Nonspherical Particles of Size Comparable to
1411 a Wavelength: A New Semi-Empirical Theory and Its Application to Tropospheric Aerosols.
1412 *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 37(4), 868–881. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1980\)037<0868:SBNPOS>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1980)037<0868:SBNPOS>2.0.CO;2)
- 1413
- 1414 Posselt, R., & Lohmann, U. (2008). Introduction of prognostic rain in ECHAM5: Design and
1415 single column model simulations. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 8(11), 2949–2963.
1416 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-2949-2008>
- 1417 Pruppacher, H. R., & Klett, J. D. (2010). *Microphysics of Clouds and Precipitation* (2nd ed.).
1418 Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-306-48100-0>
- 1419 Putman, W. M., & Lin, S.-J. (2007). Finite-volume transport on various cubed-sphere grids.
1420 *Journal of Computational Physics*, 227(1), 55–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2007.07.022>
- 1421 Putman, W. M., & Suarez, M. (2011). Cloud-system resolving simulations with the NASA
1422 Goddard Earth Observing System global atmospheric model (GEOS-5). *Geophysical*
1423 *Research Letters*, 38(16). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL048438>
- 1424 Randall, D. A., Genio, A. D. D., Donner, L. J., Collins, W. D., & Klein, S. A. (2016). The Impact
1425 of ARM on Climate Modeling. *Meteorological Monographs*, 57(1), 26.1-26.16.
1426 <https://doi.org/10.1175/AMSMONOGRAPHHS-D-15-0050.1>
- 1427 Ren, C., & Mackenzie, A. R. (2005). Cirrus parametrization and the role of ice nuclei. *Quarterly*
1428 *Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 131(608), 1585–1605.
1429 <https://doi.org/10.1256/qj.04.126>

- 1430 Reverdy, M., Chepfer, H., Donovan, D., Noel, V., Cesana, G., Hoareau, C., Chiriaco, M., & Bastin,
 1431 S. (2015). An EarthCARE/ATLID simulator to evaluate cloud description in climate models.
 1432 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 120(21), 11,090-11,113.
 1433 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023919>
- 1434 Roberts, M. J., Vidale, P. L., Senior, C., Hewitt, H. T., Bates, C., Berthou, S., Chang, P.,
 1435 Christensen, H. M., Danilov, S., Demory, M.-E., Griffies, S. M., Haarsma, R., Jung, T.,
 1436 Martin, G., Minobe, S., Ringler, T., Satoh, M., Schiemann, R., Scoccimarro, E., ... Wehner,
 1437 M. F. (2018). The Benefits of Global High Resolution for Climate Simulation: Process
 1438 Understanding and the Enabling of Stakeholder Decisions at the Regional Scale. *Bulletin of*
 1439 *the American Meteorological Society*, 99(11), 2341–2359. [https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-](https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00320.1)
 1440 [15-00320.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00320.1)
- 1441 Roehrig, R., Beau, I., Saint-Martin, D., Alias, A., Decharme, B., Guérémy, J.-F., Voldoire, A.,
 1442 Abdel-Lathif, A. Y., Bazile, E., Belamari, S., Blein, S., Bouniol, D., Bouteloup, Y., Cattiaux,
 1443 J., Chauvin, F., Chevallier, M., Colin, J., Douville, H., Marquet, P., ... Sénési, S. (2020). The
 1444 CNRM Global Atmosphere Model ARPEGE-Climat 6.3: Description and Evaluation.
 1445 *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 12(7), e2020MS002075.
 1446 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020MS002075>
- 1447 Roh, W., & Satoh, M. (2014). Evaluation of Precipitating Hydrometeor Parameterizations in a
 1448 Single-Moment Bulk Microphysics Scheme for Deep Convective Systems over the Tropical
 1449 Central Pacific. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 71(7), 2654–2673.
 1450 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-13-0252.1>

- 1451 Roh, W., Satoh, M., & Nasuno, T. (2017). Improvement of a Cloud Microphysics Scheme for a
 1452 Global Nonhydrostatic Model Using TRMM and a Satellite Simulator. *Journal of the*
 1453 *Atmospheric Sciences*, 74(1), 167–184. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-16-0027.1>
- 1454 Roh, W., & Satoh, M. (2018). Extension of a Multisensor Satellite Radiance-Based Evaluation for
 1455 Cloud System Resolving Models. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*,
 1456 96(1), 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2018-002>
- 1457 Roh, W., Satoh, M., Hashino, T., Okamoto, H., & Seiki, T. (2020). Evaluations of the
 1458 Thermodynamic Phases of Clouds in a Cloud-System-Resolving Model Using CALIPSO and
 1459 a Satellite Simulator over the Southern Ocean. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 77(11),
 1460 3781–3801. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-19-0273.1>
- 1461 Rossow, W. B., & Schiffer, R. A. (1999). Advances in Understanding Clouds from ISCCP.
 1462 *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 80(11), 2261–2288.
 1463 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(1999\)080<2261:AIUCFI>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1999)080<2261:AIUCFI>2.0.CO;2)
- 1464 Rutledge, S. A., & Hobbs, P. V. (1984). The Mesoscale and Microscale Structure and Organization
 1465 of Clouds and Precipitation in Midlatitude Cyclones. XII: A Diagnostic Modeling Study of
 1466 Precipitation Development in Narrow Cold-Frontal Rainbands. *Journal of the Atmospheric*
 1467 *Sciences*, 41(20), 2949–2972. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1984)041<2949:TMAMSA>2.0.CO;2)
 1468 [0469\(1984\)041<2949:TMAMSA>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1984)041<2949:TMAMSA>2.0.CO;2)
- 1469 Saito, K., Ishida, J., Aranami, K., Hara, T., Segawa, T., Narita, M., & Honda, Y. (2007).
 1470 Nonhydrostatic Atmospheric Models and Operational Development at JMA. *Journal of the*
 1471 *Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 85B, 271–304. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.85B.271>
- 1472 Saito, M., Iwabuchi, H., Yang, P., Tang, G., King, M. D., & Sekiguchi, M. (2017). Ice particle
 1473 morphology and microphysical properties of cirrus clouds inferred from combined CALIOP-

1474 IIR measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122(8), 4440–4462.
 1475 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD026080>

1476 Sant, V., Posselt, R., & Lohmann, U. (2015). Prognostic precipitation with three liquid water
 1477 classes in the ECHAM5–HAM GCM. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15(15), 8717–
 1478 8738. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-8717-2015>

1479 Sasaki, W., Onishi, R., Fuchigami, H., Goto, K., Nishikawa, S., Ishikawa, Y., & Takahashi, K.
 1480 (2016). MJO simulation in a cloud-system-resolving global ocean-atmosphere coupled
 1481 model. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(17), 9352–9360.
 1482 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL070550>

1483 Sassen, K., Wang, Z., & Liu, D. (2008). Global distribution of cirrus clouds from CloudSat/Cloud-
 1484 Aerosol Lidar and Infrared Pathfinder Satellite Observations (CALIPSO) measurements.
 1485 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 113(D8).
 1486 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD009972>

1487 Sato, Y., Nishizawa, S., Yashiro, H., Miyamoto, Y., Kajikawa, Y., & Tomita, H. (2015). Impacts
 1488 of cloud microphysics on trade wind cumulus: Which cloud microphysics processes
 1489 contribute to the diversity in a large eddy simulation? *Progress in Earth and Planetary*
 1490 *Science*, 2(1), 23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-015-0053-6>

1491 Sato, Y., Shima, S., & Tomita, H. (2018). Numerical Convergence of Shallow Convection Cloud
 1492 Field Simulations: Comparison Between Double-Moment Eulerian and Particle-Based
 1493 Lagrangian Microphysics Coupled to the Same Dynamical Core. *Journal of Advances in*
 1494 *Modeling Earth Systems*, 10(7), 1495–1512. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001285>

- 1495 Sato, Y., Miyamoto, Y., & Tomita, H. (2019). Large dependency of charge distribution in a tropical
1496 cyclone inner core upon aerosol number concentration. *Progress in Earth and Planetary*
1497 *Science*, 6(1), 62. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-019-0309-7>
- 1498 Satoh, M. (2002). Conservative Scheme for the Compressible Nonhydrostatic Models with the
1499 Horizontally Explicit and Vertically Implicit Time Integration Scheme. *Monthly Weather*
1500 *Review*, 130(5), 1227–1245. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2002)130<1227:CSFTCN>2.0.CO;2)
1501 [0493\(2002\)130<1227:CSFTCN>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2002)130<1227:CSFTCN>2.0.CO;2)
- 1502 Satoh, M. (2003). Conservative Scheme for a Compressible Nonhydrostatic Model with Moist
1503 Processes. *Monthly Weather Review*, 131(6), 1033–1050. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2003)131<1033:CSFACN>2.0.CO;2)
1504 [0493\(2003\)131<1033:CSFACN>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2003)131<1033:CSFACN>2.0.CO;2)
- 1505 Satoh, M., Matsuno, T., Tomita, H., Miura, H., Nasuno, T., & Iga, S. (2008a). Nonhydrostatic
1506 icosahedral atmospheric model (NICAM) for global cloud resolving simulations. *Journal of*
1507 *Computational Physics*, 227(7), 3486–3514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2007.02.006>
- 1508 Satoh, M., Nasuno, T., Miura, H., Tomita, H., Iga, S., & Takayabu, Y. (2008b). Precipitation
1509 Statistics Comparison Between Global Cloud Resolving Simulation with NICAM and
1510 TRMM PR Data. In K. Hamilton & W. Ohfuchi (Eds.), *High Resolution Numerical Modelling*
1511 *of the Atmosphere and Ocean* (pp. 99–112). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-49791-4_6)
1512 [49791-4_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-49791-4_6)
- 1513 Satoh, M., Inoue, T., & Miura, H. (2010). Evaluations of cloud properties of global and local cloud
1514 system resolving models using CALIPSO and CloudSat simulators. *Journal of Geophysical*
1515 *Research: Atmospheres*, 115(D4). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD012247>
- 1516 Satoh, M., Tomita, H., Yashiro, H., Miura, H., Kodama, C., Seiki, T., Noda, A. T., Yamada, Y.,
1517 Goto, D., Sawada, M., Miyoshi, T., Niwa, Y., Hara, M., Ohno, T., Iga, S., Arakawa, T., Inoue,

- 1518 T., & Kubokawa, H. (2014). The Non-hydrostatic Icosahedral Atmospheric Model:
 1519 Description and development. *Progress in Earth and Planetary Science*, 1(1), 18.
 1520 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-014-0018-1>
- 1521 Satoh, M., Roh, W., and Hashino, T. (2016). Evaluations of clouds and precipitations in NICAM
 1522 using the joint simulator for satellite sensors. CGER'S SUPERCOMPUTER MONOGRAPH
 1523 REPORT Vol.22. <http://www.cger.nies.go.jp/publications/report/i127/i127.pdf>.
- 1524 Satoh, M., Tomita, H., Yashiro, H., Kajikawa, Y., Miyamoto, Y., Yamaura, T., Miyakawa, T.,
 1525 Nakano, M., Kodama, C., Noda, A. T., Nasuno, T., Yamada, Y., & Fukutomi, Y. (2017).
 1526 Outcomes and challenges of global high-resolution non-hydrostatic atmospheric simulations
 1527 using the K computer. *Progress in Earth and Planetary Science*, 4(1), 13.
 1528 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-017-0127-8>
- 1529 Satoh, M., Noda, A. T., Seiki, T., Chen, Y.-W., Kodama, C., Yamada, Y., Kuba, N., & Sato, Y.
 1530 (2018). Toward reduction of the uncertainties in climate sensitivity due to cloud processes
 1531 using a global non-hydrostatic atmospheric model. *Progress in Earth and Planetary Science*,
 1532 5(1), 67. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-018-0226-1>
- 1533 Satoh, M., Stevens, B., Judt, F., Khairoutdinov, M., Lin, S.-J., Putman, W. M., & Düben, P. (2019).
 1534 Global Cloud-Resolving Models. *Current Climate Change Reports*, 5(3), 172–184.
 1535 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-019-00131-0>
- 1536 Saunders, R., Hocking, J., Turner, E., Rayer, P., Rundle, D., Brunel, P., Vidot, J., Roquet, P.,
 1537 Matricardi, M., Geer, A., Bormann, N., & Lupu, C. (2018). An update on the RTTOV fast
 1538 radiative transfer model (currently at version 12). *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11(7),
 1539 2717–2737. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-2717-2018>

- 1540 Schär, C., Fuhrer, O., Arteaga, A., Ban, N., Charpillot, C., Girolamo, S. D., Hentgen, L., Hoefler,
1541 T., Lapillonne, X., Leutwyler, D., Osterried, K., Panosetti, D., Rüdisühli, S., Schlemmer, L.,
1542 Schulthess, T. C., Sprenger, M., Ubbiali, S., & Wernli, H. (2020). Kilometer-Scale Climate
1543 Models: Prospects and Challenges. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 101(5),
1544 E567–E587. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-18-0167.1>
- 1545 Seifert, A. (2008). On the Parameterization of Evaporation of Raindrops as Simulated by a One-
1546 Dimensional Rainshaft Model. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 65(11), 3608–3619.
1547 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JAS2586.1>
- 1548 Seifert, A., & Beheng, K. D. (2001). A double-moment parameterization for simulating
1549 autoconversion, accretion and selfcollection. *Atmospheric Research*, 59–60, 265–281.
1550 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-8095\(01\)00126-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-8095(01)00126-0)
- 1551 Seifert, A., & Beheng, K. D. (2006). A two-moment cloud microphysics parameterization for
1552 mixed-phase clouds. Part 1: Model description. *Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics*, 92(1),
1553 45–66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00703-005-0112-4>
- 1554 Seifert, A., Khain, A., Pokrovsky, A., & Beheng, K. D. (2006). A comparison of spectral bin and
1555 two-moment bulk mixed-phase cloud microphysics. *Atmospheric Research*, 80(1), 46–66.
1556 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2005.06.009>
- 1557 Seiki, T. (2021). Near-Global Three-Dimensional Hail Signals Detected by Using GPM-DPR
1558 Observations. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II, adypub.*
1559 <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2021-018>
- 1560 Seiki, T., & Nakajima, T. (2014). Aerosol Effects of the Condensation Process on a Convective
1561 Cloud Simulation. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 71(2), 833–853.
1562 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-12-0195.1>

- 1563 Seiki, T., Kodama, C., Noda, A. T., & Satoh, M. (2015a). Improvement in Global Cloud-System-
 1564 Resolving Simulations by Using a Double-Moment Bulk Cloud Microphysics Scheme.
 1565 *Journal of Climate*, 28(6), 2405–2419. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00241.1>
- 1566 Seiki, T., Kodama, C., Satoh, M., Hashino, T., Hagihara, Y., & Okamoto, H. (2015b). Vertical
 1567 grid spacing necessary for simulating tropical cirrus clouds with a high-resolution
 1568 atmospheric general circulation model. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42(10), 4150–4157.
 1569 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064282>
- 1570 Seiki, T., Kodama, C., Satoh, M., Hagihara, Y., & Okamoto, H. (2019). Characteristics of Ice
 1571 Clouds Over Mountain Regions Detected by CALIPSO and CloudSat Satellite Observations.
 1572 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 124(20), 10858–10877.
 1573 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD030519>
- 1574 Seiki, T., & Roh, W. (2020). Improvements in Supercooled Liquid Water Simulations of Low-
 1575 Level Mixed-Phase Clouds over the Southern Ocean Using a Single-Column Model. *Journal*
 1576 *of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 77(11), 3803–3819. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-19-0266.1>
- 1577 Seiki, T., Satoh, M., Tomita, H., & Nakajima, T. (2014). Simultaneous evaluation of ice cloud
 1578 microphysics and nonsphericity of the cloud optical properties using hydrometeor video
 1579 sonde and radiometer sonde in situ observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
 1580 *Atmospheres*, 119(11), 6681–6701. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JD021086>
- 1581 Sekiguchi, M., & Nakajima, T. (2008). A k-distribution-based radiation code and its computational
 1582 optimization for an atmospheric general circulation model. *Journal of Quantitative*
 1583 *Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, 109(17), 2779–2793.
 1584 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2008.07.013>

- 1585 Senf, F., Voigt, A., Clerbaux, N., Hünnerbein, A., & Deneke, H. (2020). Increasing Resolution and
1586 Resolving Convection Improve the Simulation of Cloud-Radiative Effects Over the North
1587 Atlantic. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 125(19), e2020JD032667.
1588 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JD032667>
- 1589 Sherwood, S. C., Webb, M. J., Annan, J. D., Armour, K. C., Forster, P. M., Hargreaves, J. C.,
1590 Hegerl, G., Klein, S. A., Marvel, K. D., Rohling, E. J., Watanabe, M., Andrews, T.,
1591 Braconnot, P., Bretherton, C. S., Foster, G. L., Hausfather, Z., Heydt, A. S. von der, Knutti,
1592 R., Mauritsen, T., Zelinka, M. D. (2020). An Assessment of Earth's Climate Sensitivity Using
1593 Multiple Lines of Evidence. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 58(4), e2019RG000678.
1594 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019RG000678>
- 1595 Shibuya, R., Miura, H., & Sato, K. (2016). A Grid Transformation Method for a Quasi-Uniform,
1596 Circular Fine Region Using the Spring Dynamics. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of*
1597 *Japan. Ser. II*, 94(5), 443–452. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2016-022>
- 1598 Shipway, B. J., & Hill, A. A. (2012). Diagnosis of systematic differences between multiple
1599 parametrizations of warm rain microphysics using a kinematic framework. *Quarterly Journal*
1600 *of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 138(669), 2196–2211. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.1913>
- 1601 Shupe, M. D., & Intrieri, J. M. (2004). Cloud Radiative Forcing of the Arctic Surface: The
1602 Influence of Cloud Properties, Surface Albedo, and Solar Zenith Angle. *Journal of Climate*,
1603 17(3), 616–628. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(2004\)017<0616:CRFOTA>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(2004)017<0616:CRFOTA>2.0.CO;2)
- 1604 Skamarock, W. C., Klemp, J. B., Duda, M. G., Fowler, L. D., Park, S.-H., & Ringler, T. D. (2012).
1605 A Multiscale Nonhydrostatic Atmospheric Model Using Centroidal Voronoi Tessellations and
1606 C-Grid Staggering. *Monthly Weather Review*, 140(9), 3090–3105.
1607 <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-11-00215.1>

- 1608 Skamarock, W. C., Duda, M. G., Ha, S., & Park, S.-H. (2018). Limited-Area Atmospheric
1609 Modeling Using an Unstructured Mesh. *Monthly Weather Review*, 146(10), 3445–3460.
1610 <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-18-0155.1>
- 1611 Sölch, I., & Kärcher, B. (2011). Process-oriented large-eddy simulations of a midlatitude cirrus
1612 cloud system based on observations. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*,
1613 137(655), 374–393. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.764>
- 1614 Song, X., Zhang, G. J., & Li, J.-L. F. (2012). Evaluation of Microphysics Parameterization for
1615 Convective Clouds in the NCAR Community Atmosphere Model CAM5. *Journal of Climate*,
1616 25(24), 8568–8590. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00563.1>
- 1617 Stephens, G. L., Tsay, S.-C., Stackhouse, P. W., & Flatau, P. J. (1990). The Relevance of the
1618 Microphysical and Radiative Properties of Cirrus Clouds to Climate and Climatic Feedback.
1619 *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 47(14), 1742–1754. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1990\)047<1742:TROTMA>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1990)047<1742:TROTMA>2.0.CO;2)
- 1620
- 1621 Stephens, G. L., Vane, D. G., Tanelli, S., Im, E., Durden, S., Rokey, M., Reinke, D., Partain, P.,
1622 Mace, G. G., Austin, R., L’Ecuyer, T., Haynes, J., Lebsock, M., Suzuki, K., Waliser, D., Wu,
1623 D., Kay, J., Gettelman, A., Wang, Z., & Marchand, R. (2008). CloudSat mission: Performance
1624 and early science after the first year of operation. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
1625 *Atmospheres*, 113(D8). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD009982>
- 1626 Stevens, B., & Feingold, G. (2009). Untangling aerosol effects on clouds and precipitation in a
1627 buffered system. *Nature*, 461(7264), 607–613. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08281>
- 1628 Stevens, B., Satoh, M., Auger, L., Biercamp, J., Bretherton, C. S., Chen, X., Düben, P., Judt, F.,
1629 Khairoutdinov, M., Klocke, D., Kodama, C., Kornbluh, L., Lin, S.-J., Neumann, P., Putman,
1630 W. M., Röber, N., Shibuya, R., Vanniere, B., Vidale, P. L., ... Zhou, L. (2019). DYAMOND:

- 1631 The DYnamics of the Atmospheric general circulation Modeled On Non-hydrostatic
 1632 Domains. *Progress in Earth and Planetary Science*, 6(1), 61. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-019-0304-z)
 1633 [019-0304-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-019-0304-z)
- 1634 Stevens, B., Acquistapace, C., Hansen, A., Heinze, R., Klinger, C., Klocke, D., Rybka, H.,
 1635 Schubotz, W., Windmiller, J., Adamidis, P., Arka, I., Barlakas, V., Biercamp, J., Brueck, M.,
 1636 Brune, S., Buehler, S. A., Burkhardt, U., Cioni, G., Costa-Surós, M., ... Zängl, G. (2020).
 1637 The Added Value of Large-eddy and Storm-resolving Models for Simulating Clouds and
 1638 Precipitation. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 98(2), 395–435.
 1639 <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2020-021>
- 1640 Stockdale, T. N. (1997). Coupled Ocean–Atmosphere Forecasts in the Presence of Climate Drift.
 1641 *Monthly Weather Review*, 125(5), 809–818. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1997)125<0809:COAFIT>2.0.CO;2)
 1642 [0493\(1997\)125<0809:COAFIT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1997)125<0809:COAFIT>2.0.CO;2)
- 1643 Sueki, K., Yamaura, T., Yashiro, H., Nishizawa, S., Yoshida, R., Kajikawa, Y., & Tomita, H.
 1644 (2019). Convergence of Convective Updraft Ensembles With Respect to the Grid Spacing of
 1645 Atmospheric Models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 46(24), 14817–14825.
 1646 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL084491>
- 1647 Suzuki, K., Nakajima, T. Y., & Stephens, G. L. (2010). Particle Growth and Drop Collection
 1648 Efficiency of Warm Clouds as Inferred from Joint CloudSat and MODIS Observations.
 1649 *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 67(9), 3019–3032.
 1650 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JAS3463.1>
- 1651 Suzuki, K., Stephens, G. L., Heever, S. C. van den, & Nakajima, T. Y. (2011). Diagnosis of the
 1652 Warm Rain Process in Cloud-Resolving Models Using Joint CloudSat and MODIS

- 1653 Observations. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 68(11), 2655–2670.
 1654 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-10-05026.1>
- 1655 Suzuki, K., Golaz, J.-C., & Stephens, G. L. (2013). Evaluating cloud tuning in a climate model
 1656 with satellite observations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40(16), 4464–4468.
 1657 <https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.50874>
- 1658 Suzuki, K., Stephens, G., Bodas-Salcedo, A., Wang, M., Golaz, J.-C., Yokohata, T., & Koshiro,
 1659 T. (2015). Evaluation of the Warm Rain Formation Process in Global Models with Satellite
 1660 Observations. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 72(10), 3996–4014.
 1661 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-14-0265.1>
- 1662 Swales, D. J., Pincus, R., & Bodas-Salcedo, A. (2018). The Cloud Feedback Model
 1663 Intercomparison Project Observational Simulator Package: Version 2. *Geoscientific Model
 1664 Development*, 11(1), 77–81. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-77-2018>
- 1665 Takahashi, K., Peng, X., Onishi, R., Ohdaira, M., Goto, K., Fuchigami, H., & Sugimura, T. (2008).
 1666 Impact of Coupled Nonhydrostatic Atmosphere-Ocean-Land Model with High Resolution. In
 1667 K. Hamilton & W. Ohfuchi (Eds.), *High Resolution Numerical Modelling of the Atmosphere
 1668 and Ocean* (pp. 261–273). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-49791-4_15
- 1669 Takano, Y., & Liou, K.-N. (1989). Solar Radiative Transfer in Cirrus Clouds. Part I: Single-
 1670 Scattering and Optical Properties of Hexagonal Ice Crystals. *Journal of the Atmospheric
 1671 Sciences*, 46(1), 3–19. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1989\)046<0003:SRTICC>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1989)046<0003:SRTICC>2.0.CO;2)
- 1672 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1989\)046<0003:SRTICC>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1989)046<0003:SRTICC>2.0.CO;2)
- 1673 Takano, Y., & Liou, K. N. (1995). Radiative Transfer in Cirrus Clouds. Part III: Light Scattering
 1674 by Irregular Ice Crystals. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 52(7), 818–837.
 1675 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1995\)052<0818:RTICCP>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1995)052<0818:RTICCP>2.0.CO;2)

- 1676 Takasuka, D., Miyakawa, T., Satoh, M., & Miura, H. (2015). Topographical Effects on Internally
1677 Produced MJO-Like Disturbances in an Aqua-Planet Version of NICAM. *Sola*, 11, 170–176.
1678 <https://doi.org/10.2151/sola.2015-038>
- 1679 Takasuka, D., Satoh, M., Miyakawa, T., & Miura, H. (2018). Initiation Processes of the Tropical
1680 Intraseasonal Variability Simulated in an Aqua-Planet Experiment: What is the Intrinsic
1681 Mechanism for MJO Onset? *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 10(4), 1047–
1682 1073. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017MS001243>
- 1683 Takayabu, Y. N. (2002). Spectral representation of rain profiles and diurnal variations observed
1684 with TRMM PR over the equatorial area. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29(12), 25-1-25–4.
1685 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001GL014113>
- 1686 Taniguchi, H., Yanase, W., & Satoh, M. (2010). Ensemble Simulation of Cyclone Nargis by a
1687 Global Cloud-System-Resolving Model—Modulation of Cyclogenesis by the Madden-Julian
1688 Oscillation. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 88(3), 571–591.
1689 <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2010-317>
- 1690 Tao, W.-K., Lang, S., Simpson, J., Sui, C.-H., Ferrier, B., & Chou, M.-D. (1996). Mechanisms of
1691 Cloud-Radiation Interaction in the Tropics and Midlatitudes. *Journal of the Atmospheric*
1692 *Sciences*, 53(18), 2624–2651. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1996\)053<2624:MOCRII>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1996)053<2624:MOCRII>2.0.CO;2)
- 1693
1694 Tao, W.-K., Chern, J.-D., Atlas, R., Randall, D., Khairoutdinov, M., Li, J.-L., Waliser, D. E., Hou,
1695 A., Lin, X., Peters-Lidard, C., Lau, W., Jiang, J., & Simpson, J. (2009). A Multiscale
1696 Modeling System: Developments, Applications, and Critical Issues. *Bulletin of the American*
1697 *Meteorological Society*, 90(4), 515–534. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008BAMS2542.1>

- 1698 Tatebe, H., Ogura, T., Nitta, T., Komuro, Y., Ogochi, K., Takemura, T., Sudo, K., Sekiguchi, M.,
1699 Abe, M., Saito, F., Chikira, M., Watanabe, S., Mori, M., Hirota, N., Kawatani, Y., Mochizuki,
1700 T., Yoshimura, K., Takata, K., O'ishi, R., ... Kimoto, M. (2019). Description and basic
1701 evaluation of simulated mean state, internal variability, and climate sensitivity in MIROC6.
1702 *Geoscientific Model Development*, 12(7), 2727–2765. [https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-2727-](https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-2727-2019)
1703 [2019](https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-2727-2019)
- 1704 Thompson, G., Field, P. R., Rasmussen, R. M., & Hall, W. D. (2008). Explicit Forecasts of Winter
1705 Precipitation Using an Improved Bulk Microphysics Scheme. Part II: Implementation of a
1706 New Snow Parameterization. *Monthly Weather Review*, 136(12), 5095–5115.
1707 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008MWR2387.1>
- 1708 Thompson, G., Tewari, M., Ikeda, K., Tessendorf, S., Weeks, C., Otkin, J., & Kong, F. (2016).
1709 Explicitly-coupled cloud physics and radiation parameterizations and subsequent evaluation
1710 in WRF high-resolution convective forecasts. *Atmospheric Research*, 168, 92–104.
1711 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2015.09.005>
- 1712 Tomita, H. (2008a). A Stretched Icosahedral Grid by a New Grid Transformation. *Journal of the*
1713 *Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 86A, 107–119.
1714 <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.86A.107>
- 1715 Tomita, H. (2008b). New Microphysical Schemes with Five and Six Categories by Diagnostic
1716 Generation of Cloud Ice. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 86A, 121–
1717 142. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.86A.121>
- 1718 Tomita, H., Tsugawa, M., Satoh, M., & Goto, K. (2001). Shallow Water Model on a Modified
1719 Icosahedral Geodesic Grid by Using Spring Dynamics. *Journal of Computational Physics*,
1720 174(2), 579–613. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jcph.2001.6897>

- 1721 Tomita, H., & Satoh, M. (2004). A new dynamical framework of nonhydrostatic global model
1722 using the icosahedral grid. *Fluid Dynamics Research*, 34(6), 357.
1723 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fluiddyn.2004.03.003>
- 1724 Tomita, H., Miura, H., Iga, S., Nasuno, T., & Satoh, M. (2005). A global cloud-resolving
1725 simulation: Preliminary results from an aqua planet experiment. *Geophysical Research*
1726 *Letters*, 32(8). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL022459>
- 1727 Trenberth, K. E., & Fasullo, J. T. (2010). Simulation of Present-Day and Twenty-First-Century
1728 Energy Budgets of the Southern Oceans. *Journal of Climate*, 23(2), 440–454.
1729 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JCLI3152.1>
- 1730 Uchida, J., Mori, M., Nakamura, H., Satoh, M., Suzuki, K., & Nakajima, T. (2016). Error and
1731 Energy Budget Analysis of a Nonhydrostatic Stretched-Grid Global Atmospheric Model.
1732 *Monthly Weather Review*, 144(4), 1423–1447. <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-15-0271.1>
- 1733 Uchida, J., Mori, M., Hara, M., Satoh, M., Goto, D., Kataoka, T., Suzuki, K., & Nakajima, T.
1734 (2017). Impact of Lateral Boundary Errors on the Simulation of Clouds with a Nonhydrostatic
1735 Regional Climate Model. *Monthly Weather Review*, 145(12), 5059–5082.
1736 <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-17-0158.1>
- 1737 Vergara-Temprado, J., Ban, N., Panosetti, D., Schlemmer, L., & Schär, C. (2020). Climate Models
1738 Permit Convection at Much Coarser Resolutions Than Previously Considered. *Journal of*
1739 *Climate*, 33(5), 1915–1933. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0286.1>
- 1740 Voldoire, A., Decharme, B., Pianezze, J., Lebeaupin Brossier, C., Sevault, F., Seyfried, L.,
1741 Garnier, V., Bielli, S., Valcke, S., Alias, A., Accensi, M., Ardhuin, F., Bouin, M.-N., Ducrocq,
1742 V., Faroux, S., Giordani, H., Léger, F., Marsaleix, P., Rainaud, R., ... Riette, S. (2017).
1743 SURFEX v8.0 interface with OASIS3-MCT to couple atmosphere with hydrology, ocean,

1744 waves and sea-ice models, from coastal to global scales. *Geoscientific Model Development*,
 1745 10(11), 4207–4227. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-4207-2017>

1746 Voors, R., Donovan, D., Acarreta, J., Eisinger, M., Franco, R., Lajas, D., Moyano, R., Pirondini,
 1747 F., Ramos, J., & Wehr, T. (2007). ECSIM: The simulator framework for EarthCARE.
 1748 *Sensors, Systems, and Next-Generation Satellites XI*, 6744, 67441Y.
 1749 <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.737738>

1750 Waliser, D. E., Li, J.-L. F., L’Ecuyer, T. S., & Chen, W.-T. (2011). The impact of precipitating ice
 1751 and snow on the radiation balance in global climate models. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
 1752 38(6). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL046478>

1753 Walters, D., Baran, A. J., Boutle, I., Brooks, M., Earnshaw, P., Edwards, J., Furtado, K., Hill, P.,
 1754 Lock, A., Manners, J., Morcrette, C., Mulcahy, J., Sanchez, C., Smith, C., Stratton, R.,
 1755 Tennant, W., Tomassini, L., Van Weverberg, K., Vosper, S., ... Zerroukat, M. (2019). The
 1756 Met Office Unified Model Global Atmosphere 7.0/7.1 and JULES Global Land 7.0
 1757 configurations. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 12(5), 1909–1963.
 1758 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-1909-2019>

1759 Watanabe, M., Emori, S., Satoh, M., & Miura, H. (2009). A PDF-based hybrid prognostic cloud
 1760 scheme for general circulation models. *Climate Dynamics*, 33(6), 795–816.
 1761 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-008-0489-0>

1762 Wedi, N. P. (2014). Increasing horizontal resolution in numerical weather prediction and climate
 1763 simulations: Illusion or panacea? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A:*
 1764 *Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 372(2018), 20130289.
 1765 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2013.0289>

- 1766 Wedi, N. P., Polichtchouk, I., Dueben, P., Anantharaj, V. G., Bauer, P., Boussetta, S., Browne, P.,
1767 Deconinck, W., Gaudin, W., Hadade, I., Hatfield, S., Iffrig, O., Lopez, P., Maciel, P., Mueller,
1768 A., Saarinen, S., Sandu, I., Quintino, T., & Vitart, F. (2020). A Baseline for Global Weather
1769 and Climate Simulations at 1 km Resolution. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*,
1770 12(11), e2020MS002192. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020MS002192>
- 1771 Weisman, M. L., Skamarock, W. C., & Klemp, J. B. (1997). The Resolution Dependence of
1772 Explicitly Modeled Convective Systems. *Monthly Weather Review*, 125(4), 527–548.
1773 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1997\)125<0527:TRDOEM>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1997)125<0527:TRDOEM>2.0.CO;2)
- 1774 Wilson, D. R., & Ballard, S. P. (1999). A microphysically based precipitation scheme for the UK
1775 meteorological office unified model. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*,
1776 125(557), 1607–1636. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49712555707>
- 1777 Wing, A. A., Emanuel, K., Holloway, C. E., & Muller, C. (2017). Convective Self-Aggregation in
1778 Numerical Simulations: A Review. *Surveys in Geophysics*, 38(6), 1173–1197.
1779 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10712-017-9408-4>
- 1780 Winker, D. M., Vaughan, M. A., Omar, A., Hu, Y., Powell, K. A., Liu, Z., Hunt, W. H., & Young,
1781 S. A. (2009). Overview of the CALIPSO Mission and CALIOP Data Processing Algorithms.
1782 *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 26(11), 2310–2323.
1783 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JTECHA1281.1>
- 1784 Wood, N., Staniforth, A., White, A., Allen, T., Diamantakis, M., Gross, M., Melvin, T., Smith, C.,
1785 Vosper, S., Zerroukat, M., & Thuburn, J. (2014). An inherently mass-conserving semi-
1786 implicit semi-Lagrangian discretization of the deep-atmosphere global non-hydrostatic
1787 equations. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 140(682), 1505–1520.
1788 <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2235>

- 1789 Xiao, F., Okazaki, T., & Satoh, M. (2003). An Accurate Semi-Lagrangian Scheme for Raindrop
1790 Sedimentation. *Monthly Weather Review*, 131(5), 974–983. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(2003\)131<0974:AASSFR>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2003)131<0974:AASSFR>2.0.CO;2)
1791
- 1792 Yamada, H., Nasuno, T., Yanase, W., & Satoh, M. (2016). Role of the Vertical Structure of a
1793 Simulated Tropical Cyclone in Its Motion: A Case Study of Typhoon Fengshen (2008). *Sola*,
1794 12, 203–208. <https://doi.org/10.2151/sola.2016-041>
- 1795 Yamada, Y., Oouchi, K., Satoh, M., Tomita, H., & Yanase, W. (2010). Projection of changes in
1796 tropical cyclone activity and cloud height due to greenhouse warming: Global cloud-system-
1797 resolving approach. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 37(7).
1798 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL042518>
- 1799 Yamada, Y., & Satoh, M. (2013). Response of Ice and Liquid Water Paths of Tropical Cyclones
1800 to Global Warming Simulated by a Global Nonhydrostatic Model with Explicit Cloud
1801 Microphysics. *Journal of Climate*, 26(24), 9931–9945. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-13-00182.1>
1802
- 1803 Yamada, Y., Satoh, M., Sugi, M., Kodama, C., Noda, A. T., Nakano, M., & Nasuno, T. (2017).
1804 Response of Tropical Cyclone Activity and Structure to Global Warming in a High-
1805 Resolution Global Nonhydrostatic Model. *Journal of Climate*, 30(23), 9703–9724.
1806 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0068.1>
- 1807 Yanase, W., Taniguchi, H., & Satoh, M. (2010). The Genesis of Tropical Cyclone Nargis (2008):
1808 Environmental Modulation and Numerical Predictability. *Journal of the Meteorological*
1809 *Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 88(3), 497–519. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2010-314>

- 1810 Yang, P., & Liou, K. N. (1995). Light scattering by hexagonal ice crystals: Comparison of finite-
1811 difference time domain and geometric optics models. *JOSA A*, 12(1), 162–176.
1812 <https://doi.org/10.1364/JOSAA.12.000162>
- 1813 Yang, P., Bi, L., Baum, B. A., Liou, K.-N., Kattawar, G. W., Mishchenko, M. I., & Cole, B. (2013).
1814 Spectrally Consistent Scattering, Absorption, and Polarization Properties of Atmospheric Ice
1815 Crystals at Wavelengths from 0.2 to 100 μm . *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 70(1),
1816 330–347. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-12-039.1>
- 1817 Yang, Q., Leung, L. R., Lu, J., Lin, Y.-L., Hagos, S., Sakaguchi, K., & Gao, Y. (2017). Exploring
1818 the effects of a nonhydrostatic dynamical core in high-resolution aquaplanet simulations.
1819 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122(6), 3245–3265.
1820 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD025287>
- 1821 Yoshida, R., Okamoto, H., Hagihara, Y., & Ishimoto, H. (2010). Global analysis of cloud phase
1822 and ice crystal orientation from Cloud-Aerosol Lidar and Infrared Pathfinder Satellite
1823 Observation (CALIPSO) data using attenuated backscattering and depolarization ratio.
1824 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 115(D4).
1825 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD012334>
- 1826 Yoshimura, H. (2012). Development of a nonhydrostatic global spectral atmospheric model using
1827 double Fourier series. CAS/JSC WGNE Research Activities in Atmospheric and Ocean
1828 Modeling, 42, 3.05–3.06.
- 1829 Zängl, G., Reinert, D., Rípodas, P., & Baldauf, M. (2015). The ICON (ICOsahedral Non-
1830 hydrostatic) modelling framework of DWD and MPI-M: Description of the non-hydrostatic
1831 dynamical core. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 141(687), 563–579.
1832 <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2378>

- 1833 Zhang, F., Sun, Y. Q., Magnusson, L., Buizza, R., Lin, S.-J., Chen, J.-H., & Emanuel, K. (2019).
1834 What Is the Predictability Limit of Midlatitude Weather? *Journal of the Atmospheric*
1835 *Sciences*, 76(4), 1077–1091. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-18-0269.1>
- 1836 Zhang, G., Xue, M., Cao, Q., & Dawson, D. (2008). Diagnosing the Intercept Parameter for
1837 Exponential Raindrop Size Distribution Based on Video Disdrometer Observations: Model
1838 Development. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 47(11), 2983–2992.
1839 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JAMC1876.1>
- 1840 Zhang, M., Bretherton, C. S., Blossey, P. N., Austin, P. H., Bacmeister, J. T., Bony, S., Brient, F.,
1841 Cheedela, S. K., Cheng, A., Genio, A. D. D., Roode, S. R. D., Endo, S., Franklin, C. N.,
1842 Golaz, J.-C., Hannay, C., Heus, T., Isotta, F. A., Dufresne, J.-L., Kang, I.-S., ... Zhao, M.
1843 (2013). CGILS: Results from the first phase of an international project to understand the
1844 physical mechanisms of low cloud feedbacks in single column models. *Journal of Advances*
1845 *in Modeling Earth Systems*, 5(4), 826–842. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013MS000246>
- 1846 Zhang, S., Fu, H., Wu, L., Li, Y., Wang, H., Zeng, Y., Duan, X., Wan, W., Wang, L., Zhuang, Y.,
1847 Meng, H., Xu, K., Xu, P., Gan, L., Liu, Z., Wu, S., Chen, Y., Yu, H., Shi, S., ... Guo, Y.
1848 (2020). Optimizing high-resolution Community Earth System Model on a heterogeneous
1849 many-core supercomputing platform. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13(10), 4809–4829.
1850 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-4809-2020>
- 1851 Zhang, Y., Li, J., Yu, R., Zhang, S., Liu, Z., Huang, J., & Zhou, Y. (2019). A Layer-Averaged
1852 Nonhydrostatic Dynamical Framework on an Unstructured Mesh for Global and Regional
1853 Atmospheric Modeling: Model Description, Baseline Evaluation, and Sensitivity
1854 Exploration. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11(6), 1685–1714.
1855 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001539>

- Zhang, Y., Li, J., Yu, R., Liu, Z., Zhou, Y., Li, X., & Huang, X. (2020). A Multiscale Dynamical Model in a Dry-Mass Coordinate for Weather and Climate Modeling: Moist Dynamics and Its Coupling to Physics. *Monthly Weather Review*, 148(7), 2671–2699. <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-19-0305.1>
- Zhou, L., Lin, S.-J., Chen, J.-H., Harris, L. M., Chen, X., & Rees, S. L. (2019). Toward Convective-Scale Prediction within the Next Generation Global Prediction System. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 100(7), 1225–1243. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-17-0246.1>

Figure Captions and Tables

Figure 1. Typical spatiotemporal scales of some examples of weather and climate phenomena. The numerical weather prediction model (NWP), general circulation model (GCM), and global cloud resolving model (GCRM) cover different but partially overlapping scales.

Figure 2. Cloud images calculated by the GCRMs in the DYAMOND project and from the geostationary satellite Himawari-8 (After Fig. 2 in Stevens et al., 2019). From left to right: IFS with a horizontal resolution of 4 km, 9 km, and NICAM (top row); ARPEGE-NH, Himawari-8, and ICON (second row); FV3, GEOS5, and UM (third row); and SAM and MPAS (bottom row).

Figure 3. Cloud images calculated by the NICAM with horizontal resolutions of 14 km, 3.5 km and 0.87 km (after Kajikawa et al., 2016). Zoom images of a tropical cyclone are shown in the right column.

Figure 4. A schematic image of the comparison between models and satellites using satellite simulators. From Masunaga et al. (2010), © American Meteorological Society. Used with permission.

Figure 5. Sample images of (a) the default NICAM with the global quasi-uniform icosahedral grid system, (b) stretched NICAM, and (c) diamond NICAM (after Uchida et al., 2017, © American Meteorological Society. Used with permission.).

Figure 6. Comparison of the vertical profiles of annual mean ice water content (IWC) [mg m⁻³] from (a) CloudSat satellite observations [2B-CWC-RO product (Austin and Stephens 2001; Austin et al., 2009)], (b) NSW6 in NICAM.12, (c) NSW6 in NICAM.16, and NDW6 in NICAM.16. The solid lines represent 273-K isotherms. The global simulation data with horizontal resolution of 14 km and 38 vertical layers were provided by courtesy of C. Kodama and A. T. Noda.

Figure 7. Comparison of outgoing longwave radiation at the top of the atmosphere (OLR) from CERES satellite observations (solid lines with points) and NICAM simulations with various versions of NDW6 (solid lines) (after Satoh et al., 2018).

Figure 8. The vertical profiles of (a) downward shortwave radiation and (b) upward shortwave radiation (after Seiki et al., 2014). Thick lines indicate observations by radiometer sonde, thin solid lines indicate NICAM simulations using NDW6 with spherical SSPs, and thin dashed lines indicate NICAM simulations using NDW6 with nonspherical SSPs. The dashed rectangles indicate the location of a cirrus layer.

1903

1904 Figure 9. Comparison of (a) OLR and (b) outgoing shortwave radiation at the top of the
 1905 atmosphere (OSR) from CERES satellite observations (solid lines) and NICAM.16 simulations
 1906 with various settings of cloud and radiation coupling. NSW6 uses full coupling between cloud and
 1907 radiation (dashed lines), NSW6-Mie assumes variable effective radii but spherical SSPs (long
 1908 dashed short dashed lines), and NSW6-Mie-ReFIX assumes constant effective radii and spherical
 1909 SSPs (dotted lines). The global simulation data were provided by courtesy of C. Kodama.

1910

1911 Figure 10. Cloud microphysical processes and cloud interaction among water classes (after
 1912 Satoh et al., 2018). Solid lines indicate the processes that change the number and mass
 1913 concentration of hydrometeors, while dashed lines indicate the processes that change only the mass
 1914 concentration of hydrometeors. Hom/het indicates homogeneous/heterogeneous, respectively.

1915

1916 Figure 11. Breakdown of OLR change under global warming simulated by the NICAM (after
 1917 Noda et al., 2016). An OLR change ΔF is attributed to a change in emissivity $\Delta \varepsilon$, a change in
 1918 cloud-top temperature ΔT_{CT} , and a change in clear sky radiation ΔF^{CLR} . The breakdown was
 1919 calculated by cloud size. Sum shows the summation of the contributions and the difference
 1920 between ΔF and Sum indicates the error of the analysis.

1921

1922

1923 Figure 12. The cloud-top and rain-top diagram using Ku-band radar echo and infrared
 1924 brightness temperature from (a) satellite observations, (c) NSW6 in NICAM.12, and (e) NSW6 in
 1925 NICAM.16. CFAD using Ku-band radar echo from (b) satellite observations, (d) NSW6 in

1926 NICAM.12, and (f) NSW6 in NICAM.16. Here, simulated results were processed by a Joint-
1927 Simulator. From Roh et al. (2017), © American Meteorological Society. Used with permission.

1928

1929 Figure 13. Joint probability density function of the depolarization ratio δ and the ratio of
1930 attenuated backscattering coefficients for successive layers x from (a) satellite observations, (b)
1931 NSW6 in NICAM.16, and (c) NDW6. Low-level clouds behind a frontal cloud system were
1932 sampled over the Southern Ocean. Signals of supercooled liquid water are highlighted by circles.
1933 From Roh et al. (2020), © American Meteorological Society. Used with permission.

1934

1935 Figure 14. Observation geometry of the EarthCARE satellite (from
1936 <https://directory.eoportal.org/web/eoportal/satellite-missions/e/earthcare>).

1937

1938 Figure 15. Overview of the ground observations used in the ULTIMATE project around the
1939 Tokyo metropolitan area.

1940

1941 Table 1. List of acronyms of models, satellites, and instruments.

1942

1943 Table 2. List of GCRMs. Short names and references to the model-frameworks and recent
1944 settings are summarized.

1945

1946 Table 3. GCRMs and cloud microphysics used for the DYAMOND project. The subscripts v ,
1947 c , r , i , s , and g indicate vapor, cloud water, rain, cloud ice, snow, and graupel categories,
1948 respectively.

1949

1950 Table 4. Dependences of cloud-related processes on bulk cloud microphysical parameters.

1951

1952 Table 5. Optical sensors and corresponding sensitive physical parameters.

1 Table 1. List of acronyms of models, satellites, and instruments.

Acronym	Long name
AMSR-E	Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer-EOS
AROME	Applications of Research to Operations at Mesoscale
ARPEGE-NH	Action de Recherche Petite Echelle Grande Echelle-NonHydrostatic version
CALIPSO/CALIOP	Cloud-Aerosol Lidar and Infrared Pathfinder Satellite Observations/Cloud-Aerosol Lidar with Orthogonal Polarization
CAM	Community Atmosphere Model
COSP	The cloud feedback model intercomparison project Observation Simulator Package
CPR	Cloud Profiling Radar
CRTM	Community Radiative Transfer Model
DFSM	Double Fourier Series Model
EarthCARE	Earth Clouds, Aerosols and Radiation Explorer
ECHAM	European Centre Hamburg model
ECSIM	EarthCARE Simulator
FV3	Finite-Volume Cubed-Sphere Dynamical Core
GCOM-C/SGLI	Global Change Observation Mission-Climate/ Second-generation Global Imager
GEOS	Goddard Earth Observing System
GOES	Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite
GPM/DPR/GMI	Global Precipitation Measurement mission/Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar/GPM Microwave Imager
GRIST	Global-to-Regional Integrated forecast SysTem
ICON	ICOsahedral Non-hydrostatic atmospheric model
IFS	Integrated Forecasting System
MIROC	Model for Interdisciplinary Research on Climate
MODIS	Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer
MSSG	Multi-Scale Simulator for the Geoenvironment
MPAS	Model for Prediction Across Scales
MTSAT	Multi-functional Transport Satellite
NICAM	Nonhydrostatic ICosahedral Atmospheric Model
NOAA/AVHRR	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration /Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer
POLARRIS	POLArimetric Radar Retrieval and Instrument Simulator
RTTOV	Radiative Transfer for the TIROS Operational Vertical Sounder
SAM	System for Atmospheric Modeling
SCALE	Scalable Computing for Advanced Library and Environment
SDSU	Satellite Data Simulator Unit
TRMM/PR/VIRS/TMI	Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission/Precipitation Radar/ Visible Infrared Scanner/ TRMM Microwave Imager
UM	Unified Model
WRF	Weather Research and Forecasting Model

Table 2. List of GCRMs. Short names and references to the model-frameworks and recent settings are summarized.

Model name	References
ARPEGE-NH	Bubnová et al. (1995) Voldoire et al. (2017)
DFSM	Yoshimura (2012)
FV3	Lin and Rood (1997) Lin (2004), Zhou et al. (2019)
GEOS5	Putman and Lin (2007), Putman and Suarez (2011), Arnold et al. (2020)
GRIST	Zhang et al. (2019; 2020)
ICON	Zängl et al. (2014), Hohenegger et al. (2020)
IFS	Malardel et al. (2016), Dueben et al. (2020), Wedi et al. (2020)
MSSG	Takahashi et al. (2008), Sasaki et al. (2016), Ohnishi et al. (2019)
MPAS	Skamarock et al. (2012)
NICAM	Satoh et al. (2014), Kodama et al. (2021)
SAM	Khairoutdinov and Randall (2003), Satoh et al. (2019)
UM	Wood et al. (2014), Walters et al. (2019)

Table 3. GCRMs and cloud microphysics used for the DYAMOND project. The subscripts v, c, r, i, s, and g indicate vapor, cloud water, rain, cloud ice, snow, and graupel categories, respectively.

Model name	Cloud microphysics schemes
ARPAGE-NH	SMB with five categories (v, c, r, i, and s) Roehrig et al. (2020)
FV3	SMB with six categories (v, c, r, i, s, and g) Lin et al. (1983), Zhou et al. (2019)
GEOS	SMB with six categories (v, c, r, i, s, and g) Lin et al. (1983), Zhou et al. (2019)
ICON	SMB with six categories (v, c, r, i, s, and g) Lin et al. (1983), Baldauf et al. (2011)
IFS	SMB with five categories (v, c, r, i, and s) Forbes et al. (2011)
MPAS	Hybrid of SMB and DMB with six categories [v, c, r, i, s, and g (the number concentrations of rain and cloud ice are predicted with prescribed aerosols)] Thompson et al. (2008) modified for WRF 3.8.1.
NICAM	SMB with six categories (v, c, r, i, s, and g) Lin et al. (1983), Tomita (2008b), Roh and Satoh (2014)
SAM	SMB with six categories [v, c, r, i, s, and g (ice categories are diagnosed)] Khairoutdinov and Randall (2003)
UM	SMB with four categories [v, c, r, and i (cloud number concentration is diagnosed with climatological distribution of aerosols)] Wilson and Ballard (1999), Boutle et al. (2014), Walters et al. (2019)

10

11 Table 4. Dependences of cloud-related processes on bulk cloud microphysical parameters.

Processes	Dependences	References	Assumptions
Auto-conversion ($c \rightarrow r$)	$\rho \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial t} \propto (\rho q_c)^2 \bar{D}_c^{-6}$	Seifert and Beheng (2001)	Long's kernel (Long, 1974) is used for the collection efficiency.
Auto-conversion ($i \rightarrow s$)	$\rho \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial t} \propto \rho q_i n_i \bar{D}_i^{-4}$	Seiki et al. (2015)	Cloud ice is assumed to be spherical and sufficiently small to satisfy Stoke's law. $v_{t,i} \propto D^2$
Riming ($c \rightarrow j$) ($j = i, s, g$)	$\rho \frac{\partial q_j}{\partial t} \propto \rho q_c n_j \bar{D}_j^{-2+d}$	Seiki and Roh (2020)	Power law is assumed between v_t and D as follows: $v_t \propto D^d$ with d typically ranging from 0.1 to 0.5 (e.g., Locatelli and Hobbs, 1974).
Condensation Evaporation Vapor Deposition Sublimation Melting	$\rho \frac{\partial q_j}{\partial t} \propto n_j \bar{D}_j$	Igel et al. (2015) Seiki and Roh (2020)	Spherical shape is assumed for ice particles.
Immersion freezing	$\rho \frac{\partial q_r}{\partial t} \propto \rho q_r \bar{D}_r^{-3}$	Bigg (1953)	The equation is derived from experiment.
Cloud optical thickness τ_c	$\tau_c \propto n_c \bar{D}_c^{-2}$	Liou (2002)	Extinction efficiency is assumed to be approximately constant (2) for most particles.
Visible cloud albedo R_c	$R_c = \frac{\sqrt{3}(1-g)\tau_c}{2 + \sqrt{3}(1-g)\tau_c}$	Liou (2002) Fu (2007)	Two-stream approximation is used with the asymmetry factor g typically ranging from 0.75 to 0.9 (e.g., Fu, 2007)
Infrared emissivity of cirrus ε_{IR}	$\varepsilon_{IR} = 1 - \exp(-0.79\tau_c)$	Fu and Liou (1993)	The function is derived by fitting to results from a numerical model with experimental data.

12

13 Table 5. Optical sensors and corresponding sensitive physical parameters.

Optical sensors	Satellites/instruments	Physical parameters
Visible/near-infrared imager (0.3 to 4 μm)	Geostationary meteorological satellites (e.g., GOES, Himawari, Meteosat), NOAA/AVHRR, Aqua, Terra/MODIS, GCOM-C/SGLI, TRMM-VIRS	Cloud optical thickness, Cloud-top effective radius
Infrared imager (8 to 12 μm)		Cloud-top temperature, Ice cloud optical thickness Ice cloud-top effective radius
Microwave imager (10 to 20 GHz)	Aqua/AMSR-E, GCOM-W/AMSR2, TRMM/TMI, GPM/GMI	Liquid water path, Precipitation flux,
Microwave imager (80 to 90 GHz)		Ice water path
Lidar (532 nm, 1064 nm)	CALIPSO/CALIOP	Thermodynamic phase, Ice shape, Optical thickness
Cloud radar (94 GHz)	CloudSat/CPR	Ice water content, Liquid water content
Precipitation radar (13.6 GHz, 35.5 GHz)	TRMM/PR, GPM/DPR	Precipitation flux, Hydrometeor class

14

15

1 Figures and Tables





Figure 1. Typical spatiotemporal scales of some examples of weather and climate phenomena. The numerical weather prediction model (NWP), general circulation model (GCM), and global cloud resolving model (GCRM) cover different but partially overlapping scales.



6

7 Figure 2. Cloud images calculated by the GCRMs in the DYAMOND project and from the
8 geostationary satellite Himawari-8 (After Fig. 2 in Stevens et al., 2019). From left to right: IFS
9 with a horizontal resolution of 4 km, 9 km, and NICAM (top row); ARPEGE-NH, Himawari-8,
10 and ICON (second row); FV3, GEOS5, and UM (third row); and SAM and MPAS (bottom row).




Figure 3. Cloud images calculated by the NICAM with horizontal resolutions of 14 km, 3.5 km and 0.87 km (after Kajikawa et al., 2016). Zoom images of a tropical cyclone are shown in the right column.




Figure 4. A schematic image of the comparison between models and satellites using satellite simulators. From Masunaga et al. (2010), © American Meteorological Society. Used with permission.




Figure 5. Sample images of (a) the default NICAM with the global quasi-uniform icosahedral grid system, (b) stretched NICAM, and (c) diamond NICAM (after Uchida et al., 2017, © American Meteorological Society. Used with permission.).




Figure 6. Comparison of the vertical profiles of annual mean ice water content (IWC) [mg m⁻³] from (a) CloudSat satellite observations [2B-CWC-RO product (Austin and Stephens 2001; Austin et al., 2009)], (b) NSW6 in NICAM.12, (c) NSW6 in NICAM.16, and NDW6 in NICAM.16. The solid lines represent 273-K isotherms. The global simulation data with horizontal resolution of 14 km and 38 vertical layers were provided by courtesy of C. Kodama and A. T. Noda.




Figure 7. Comparison of outgoing longwave radiation at the top of the atmosphere (OLR) from CERES satellite observations (solid lines with points) and NICAM simulations with various versions of NDW6 (solid lines) (after Satoh et al., 2018).




Figure 8. The vertical profiles of (a) downward shortwave radiation and (b) upward shortwave radiation (after Seiki et al., 2014). Thick lines indicate observations by radiometer sonde, thin solid lines indicate NICAM simulations using NDW6 with spherical SSPs, and thin dashed lines indicate NICAM simulations using NDW6 with nonspherical SSPs. The dashed rectangles indicate the location of a cirrus layer.




Figure 9. Comparison of (a) OLR and (b) outgoing shortwave radiation at the top of the atmosphere (OSR) from CERES satellite observations (solid lines) and NICAM.16 simulations with various settings of cloud and radiation coupling. NSW6 uses full coupling between cloud and radiation (dashed lines), NSW6-Mie assumes variable effective radii but spherical SSPs (long dashed short dashed lines), and NSW6-Mie-ReFIX assumes constant effective radii and spherical SSPs (dotted lines). The global simulation data were provided by courtesy of C. Kodama.




Figure 10. Cloud microphysical processes and cloud interaction among water classes (after Satoh et al., 2018). Solid lines indicate the processes that change the number and mass concentration of hydrometeors, while dashed lines indicate the processes that change only the mass concentration of hydrometeors. Hom/het indicates homogeneous/heterogeneous, respectively.





Figure 11. Breakdown of OLR change under global warming simulated by the NICAM (after Noda et al., 2016). An OLR change ΔF is attributed to a change in emissivity $\Delta \epsilon$, a change in cloud-top temperature ΔT_{CT} , and a change in clear sky radiation ΔF^{CLR} . The breakdown was calculated by cloud size. Sum shows the summation of the contributions and the difference between ΔF and Sum indicates the error of the analysis.

129



130

131 Figure 12. The cloud-top and rain-top diagram using Ku-band radar echo and infrared brightness
 132 temperature from (a) satellite observations, (c) NSW6 in NICAM.12, and (e) NSW6 in NICAM.16.
 133 CFAD using Ku-band radar echo from (b) satellite observations, (d) NSW6 in NICAM.12, and (f)
 134 NSW6 in NICAM.16. Here, simulated results were processed by a Joint-Simulator. From Roh et
 135 al. (2017), © American Meteorological Society. Used with permission.





Figure 13. Joint probability density function of the depolarization ratio δ and the ratio of attenuated backscattering coefficients for successive layers x from (a) satellite observations, (b) NSW6 in NICAM.16, and (c) NDW6. Low-level clouds behind a frontal cloud system were sampled over the Southern Ocean. Signals of supercooled liquid water are highlighted by circles. From Roh et al. (2020), © American Meteorological Society. Used with permission.

145



146

147 Figure 14. Observation geometry of the EarthCARE satellite (from
 148 <https://directory.eoportal.org/web/eoportal/satellite-missions/e/earthcare>).
 149
 150

151




Figure. 15. Overview of the ground observations used in the ULTIMATE project around the Tokyo metropolitan area.