



Yao-Sheng Chen^{1,2}, Prasanth Prabhakaran^{1,2}, Fabian Hoffmann³, Jan Kazil^{1,2}, Takanobu Yamaguchi^{1,2}, Graham Feingold² ¹CIRES, CU Boulder, ²NOAA CSL, ³LMU

• LWP adjustment to seeding can be characterized with a slope

where

(L: LWP; N: cloud droplet number concentration)

 \circ Examine the magnitude and timescale of k for nocturnal nonprecipitating marine stratocumulus using aerosol seeding

• LES with the System for Atmospheric Modeling (SAM)



Magnitude and timescale of liquid water path adjustment to cloud droplet number concentration for nocturnal non-precipitating marine stratocumulus



Summary

- Based on unseeded (BASE) and seeded runs for an ensemble of 22 MFs:
- k is not very negative 24-h after seeding; k becomes less negative at higher
- δL evolves with a short timescale (~ 5 h) for 8–12 h due to fast feedback between cloud depth (hence L) and $w_{\rm e}$
- Timescale for k mostly dominated by timescale for δL hence also short
- $_{\odot}$ Implication: LWP adjustment over a large area of seeded clouds is unlikely to be very negative even during nighttime, and the adjustment could be relatively fast, although plume spreading in ship tracks and MCB applications may introduce additional timescales

References

• Two manuscripts in preparation: Chen et al. (2024), Hoffmann et al. (2024)

and later on 22-MF composites for BASE and 3 seeding amounts) • *k* not very negative after 24-h: needs to be

around -0.45 by 24-h approach -0.64 with a timescale of 20 h

• *k* less negative for high

N: consistent with Lu and Seinfeld (2005) and Chen et al. (2011); enhancement by increasing N via several mechanisms should saturate at high NBoth *L* evolution and *N* evolution contribute to k

• **Response in ENTR flux** divergence dominates the response in actual **F**: strong initial response, decays over

• *L* budget and *l* budget can be calculated from $L' \propto \zeta_{\rm c} \mathcal{F}, \ l' = \frac{L'}{T} \propto \zeta_{\rm c}^{-1} \mathcal{F}$

Both the responses in entrainment efficiency and buoyancy flux

ENTR and SUBS terms make k more negative; **RAD and SURF make** k more positive • Nevolution could be

• *k* budget between N250–N400 similar to but weaker than between BASE-N165



- L for BASE evolves with a timescale between 10 and **15 h** towards the stage governed by the thermodynamic adjustment timescale (Schubert et al. 1979; Bretherton et al. 2010)
- Decompose L and L' for seeded runs

 $L = L_{\text{BASE}} + \delta L$ $L' = L'_{\text{BASE}} + \delta L'$

- δL evolves with a short timescale (~ 5 h) for 8–12 **h**: consistent with the short timescale in Jones et al. (2014)
- Steep $\delta w_e \delta \zeta_c$ slope: δw_e sensitive to $\delta \zeta_{\rm c}$, meaning fast feedback between cloud depth (hence L) and $w_{\rm e}$, consistent with Jones et al. (2014); also see Zhu et al. (2005); for our simulations, can derive simple equations to link $\delta w_{\rm e}$ and $\delta \zeta_{\rm c}$
- **Timescale for** *k* mostly dominated by timescale for δL , hence also short
- Similar δL evolution and $\delta w_{e} - \delta \zeta_{c}$ relation for different seeding amounts after scaling: δL timescale insensitive to seeding amounts; consistent with linearized MLM in Jones et al. (2014)