

Evaluation of climate simulations produced with the Brazilian Global Atmospheric Model version 1.2

Article

Accepted Version

Coelho, C. A. S., de Souza, D. C., Kubota, P. Y., Coelho, S. M. S. C., Menezes, L., Guimarães, B. S., Figueroa, S. N., Bonatti, J. P., Cavalcanti, I. F. A., Sampaio, G., Klingaman, N. P. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2927-9303> and Baker, J. C. A. (2020) Evaluation of climate simulations produced with the Brazilian Global Atmospheric Model version 1.2. *Climate Dynamics*. ISSN 0930-7575 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-020-05508-8> Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/93653/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00382-020-05508-8>

Publisher: Springer

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1
2 **Evaluation of climate simulations**
3 **produced with the Brazilian Global Atmospheric Model version 1.2**
4

5 Caio. A. S. Coelho, Dayana C. de Souza, Paulo Y. Kubota, Simone M. S. C. Coelho,
6 Layrson Menezes, Bruno S. Guimarães, Silvio N. Figueroa, José P. Bonatti,
7 Iracema F. A. Cavalcanti, Gilvan Sampaio

8 *Centro de Previsão de Tempo e Estudos Climáticos (CPTEC), Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais*
9 *(INPE), Rodovia Presidente Dutra, Km 40, SP-RJ, Cachoeira Paulista, SP 12630-000, Brazil*

10 Nicholas P. Klingaman

11 *National Centre for Atmospheric Science–Climate and Department of Meteorology,*
12 *University of Reading, Earley Gate, P.O. Box 243, Reading, Berkshire RG6 6BB, UK*
13

14 Jessica C. A. Baker

15 *School of Earth and Environment, Institute for Climate and Atmospheric Science,*
16 *University of Leeds, Leeds, UK*

17
18
19
20
21 Corresponding author: Caio A. S. Coelho, e-mail: caio.coelho@inpe.br,

22 Phone number: +55 12 31868670, Fax number: +55 12 31012835
23
24

25 Revised version to Climate Dynamics: 27 July 2020
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Abstract**

35 This paper presents an evaluation of climate simulations produced by the Brazilian Global Atmospheric
36 Model version 1.2 (BAM-1.2) of the Center for Weather Forecast and Climate Studies (CPTEC). The
37 model was run over the 1975-2017 period at two spatial resolutions, corresponding to ~180 and ~100 km,
38 both with 42 vertical levels, following most of the Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP)
39 protocol. In this protocol, observed sea surface temperatures (SSTs) are used as boundary conditions for
40 the atmospheric model. Four ensemble members were run for each of the two resolutions. A series of
41 diagnostics was computed for assessing the model's ability to represent the top of the atmosphere (TOA)
42 radiation, atmospheric temperature, circulation and precipitation climatological features. The
43 representation of precipitation interannual variability, El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) precipitation
44 teleconnections, the Madden and Julian Oscillation (MJO) and daily precipitation characteristics was also
45 assessed. The model at both resolutions reproduced many observed temperature, atmospheric circulation
46 and precipitation climatological features, despite several identified biases. The model atmosphere was
47 found to be more transparent than the observations, leading to misrepresentation of cloud-radiation
48 interactions. The net cloud radiative forcing, which produces a cooling effect on the global mean climate
49 at the TOA, was well represented by the model. This was found to be due to the compensation between
50 both weaker longwave cloud radiative forcing (LWCRF) and shortwave cloud radiative forcing (SWCRF)
51 in the model compared to the observations. The model capability to represent inter-annual precipitation
52 variability at both resolutions was found to be linked to the adequate representation of ENSO
53 teleconnections. However, the model produced weaker than observed convective activity associated with
54 the MJO. Light daily precipitation over the southeast of South America and other climatologically similar
55 regions was diagnosed to be overestimated, and heavy daily precipitation underestimated by the model.
56 Increasing spatial resolution helped to slightly reduce some of the diagnosed biases. The performed
57 evaluation identified model aspects that need to be improved. These include the representation of polar
58 continental surface and sea ice albedo, stratospheric ozone, low marine clouds, and daily precipitation
59 features, which were found to be larger and last longer than the observed features.

60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73

74 1. Introduction

75 The strategy for evaluating simulations produced by climate models developed as part of the Atmospheric
76 Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP, Gates et al., 1998) provides a framework for model diagnosis,
77 validation and intercomparison (Toh et al., 2018). AMIP-type simulations are routinely performed in
78 global climate prediction and weather forecast centers (e.g., Muzita et al., 2012; Kodama et al. 2015)
79 during the model development process to evaluate atmospheric global circulation models' (AGCMs)
80 performance and identify errors to facilitate future improvements. AMIP has a standard experimental
81 protocol, enabling the scientific community to evaluate these models systematically, with a simple design:
82 an AGCM is constrained by realistic (observed) SSTs and sea ice conditions and run over a
83 climatological (historical) period (usually for the past 30 years), with a comprehensive set of variables
84 archived for diagnostic research. This experimental design enables the scientific investigation to focus on
85 the AGCM without the added complexity of ocean-atmosphere feedbacks in the climate system.

86 Since 1995, the Centre for Weather Forecast and Climate Studies (CPTEC) of the National Institute for
87 Space Research (INPE) in Brazil has performed climate research using an AGCM originally obtained
88 from the Center for Ocean-Land-Atmosphere Studies (COLA) in the USA. Cavalcanti et al. (2002) and
89 Marengo et al. (2003) evaluated and documented the performance of the first AMIP-type climate
90 simulation performed with CPTEC/COLA AGCM. Over the years, this model has been further developed
91 and adapted for Brazilian climate conditions by CPTEC/INPE scientists and collaborators for use in both
92 diagnostics research and routine (operational) predictions, being renamed to CPTEC AGCM. Coelho et
93 al. (2012) reported the ability of CPTEC AGCM in predicting drought events in the Amazon. Coelho et
94 al. (2013) documented the performance of CPTEC AGCM probabilistic seasonal precipitation forecasts
95 produced for Brazil over a period of 10 years. Although the last CPTEC AGCM version was able to
96 simulate the climatological atmospheric circulation features, unacceptable systematic errors at high
97 latitudes (spurious precipitation) were found in short (10 days) and long (30 years) integrations. To
98 overcome these errors, a new CPTEC global model has been developed, called the Brazilian Global
99 Atmospheric Model (BAM). This model evolved recently from the first version 1.0 (BAM-1.0, Figueroa
100 et al. 2016) to the current version 1.2 (BAM-1.2), which is evaluated in this paper when run for
101 performing climate AMIP-type simulations. Cavalcanti and Raia (2017) and Cavalcanti et al. (2020)
102 investigated the ability of a predecessor BAM version with simplified and fast physical parameterizations
103 (known as BAM version 0.0, BAM-0.0) in simulating the lifecycle of the South American monsoon
104 system and climate variability over South America, respectively. Guimarães et al. (2020) defined a
105 configuration and performed the first assessment of BAM-1.2 for sub-seasonal predictions, which is the
106 same version currently used at CPTEC for global operational numerical weather prediction. However, the
107 performance of BAM-1.2 climate simulations is yet to be documented.

108 This study aims to evaluate the performance of the CPTEC model (BAM-1.2) when producing AMIP-
109 type climate simulations (see section 2 for additional information about the performed simulations). The
110 atmospheric features produced with BAM-1.2 AMIP-type simulations at two spatial resolutions,
111 corresponding to around 180 and 100 km, both with 42 vertical levels, are compared. The paper addresses
112 the following questions: How well does BAM-1.2 represent the top of the atmosphere (TOA) radiation,
113 temperature, atmospheric circulation and precipitation climatological features? What are BAM-1.2 biases
114 for the features listed above? How well does BAM-1.2 represent precipitation interannual variability, El
115 Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) precipitation teleconnections, the Madden and Julian Oscillation
116 (MJO) and daily precipitation characteristics? What is the impact of increasing spatial resolution in all of
117 the above?

118 The manuscript is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the model (BAM-1.2), the experimental
119 design and observational reference datasets used for model evaluation. Section 3 presents the assessment
120 of how BAM-1.2 represents the global annual mean TOA radiation and vertical zonal mean temperature
121 profile. Sections 4 and 5 describe how BAM-1.2 simulates the climatological seasonal mean atmospheric
122 circulation and precipitation features, respectively. Section 6 assesses how BAM-1.2 represents ENSO
123 precipitation teleconnections and precipitation interannual variability on the seasonal time scale. Section 7

124 describes how BAM-1.2 simulates the MJO and daily precipitation characteristics. Section 8 provides a
125 summary and concludes the manuscript.

126 **2. The Brazilian global atmospheric model version 1.2 (BAM-1.2), experimental design and** 127 **observational references**

128 **2.1 Model description**

129 The study uses the Brazilian global atmospheric model version 1.2 (BAM-1.2), which is CPTEC's
130 spectral model developed for numerical weather forecasting, climate simulations and predictions. BAM-
131 1.2 provides several physical parameterizations options that can be selected depending on computational
132 efficiency requirements (e.g., single-moment and double-moment microphysics schemes). Prior to
133 performing the climate simulations evaluated here, a series of sensitivity tests was performed to define an
134 optimal model configuration for an adequate representation of the main global climatological features.
135 For deep convection, a modified version of the Grell-Dévényi (2002) and the revised version of the
136 simplified Arakawa-Shubert (Han and Pan. 2011) parameterization schemes were tested. For the
137 planetary boundary layer (PBL), the modified Mellor-Yamada dry diffusion scheme, which is based on
138 Mellor-Yamada (1982), and the Bretherton-Park moist diffusion scheme (Bretherton and Park, 2009)
139 were tested. For short-wave (SW) and long-wave (LW) radiation, the Rapid Radiative Transfer Model for
140 General Circulation Models (RRTMG, Iacono et al. 2008) scheme, the long-wave radiation scheme
141 (Chou et al. 2001, CLIRAD-LW), and the short-wave radiation scheme developed by Chou and Suarez
142 (1999) (CLIRAD-SW), the latter modified by Tarasova and Fomin (2000), were tested. After performing
143 these tests, the chosen model configuration to be used in this study is similar to the configuration
144 described in Guimarães et al. (2020). The BAM-1.2 physical processes components used for performing
145 the simulations here evaluated are indicated in Table 1: microphysics from Morrison et al. (2005, 2009);
146 the IBIS-CPTEC surface model (Kubota, 2012); the long-wave radiation scheme developed by Chou et
147 al. (2001) (CLIRAD-LW); the short-wave radiation scheme developed by Chou and Suarez (1999)
148 (CLIRAD-SW), modified by Tarasova and Fomin (2000); the Bretherton-Park moist diffusion scheme
149 (Bretherton and Park, 2009) for the planetary boundary layer (PBL), which is referred to as moist-PBL;
150 and the revised version of the simplified Arakawa-Shubert deep convection scheme (Han and Pan. 2011).

151 The moist-PLB used here in BAM-1.2 includes the thermal plume scheme for the convective boundary
152 layer developed by Rio and Hourdin (2008), and the following adjustments with respect to Bretherton and
153 Park (2009): (1) interactive calculation between stratiform cloudiness and the vertical diffusion
154 coefficient, and (2) improved saturation vapour pressure calculation (Souza et al. 2019). The simplified
155 Arakawa-Shubert deep convection scheme implemented in BAM-1.2 has the following adjustments with
156 respect to Han and Pan (2011): (1) momentum calculation including pressure gradient generated by
157 convective cells, (2) entrainment parameters calibration, (3) cloud fraction calculation based on
158 probability distribution functions (pdfs), and (4) optical properties calculations based on liquid water and
159 ice predictive variables.

160 The two BAM-1.2 horizontal resolutions used in this study are triangular quadratic truncation at 126
161 waves (TQ126, corresponding to a grid of approximately 1.0° in latitude and longitude) and at 62 waves
162 (TQ62, corresponding to a grid of approximately 1.8° in latitude and longitude), both with 42 (L42)

163 sigma vertical levels (32 in the troposphere and 10 in the stratosphere) and a model top at 2hPa. The
164 coarser resolution (TQ62) was chosen because it was used in previous BAM studies (Cavalcanti and Raia,
165 2017 and Cavalcanti et al. 2020) and it was computationally efficient. The other resolution (TQ126) was
166 chosen because it allows almost doubling the spatial refinement of the simulations, therefore providing
167 more detailed information, potentially leading to improved representation of some regional climate
168 features. Aerosol optical depth in the first 2 km of the atmosphere is specified as 0.22 and 0.14 over the
169 continents and oceans, respectively, as estimated by Yu et al. (2006). Carbon dioxide (CO₂) concentration
170 was kept constant at 370 parts per million (ppm) in all simulations because this is the standard
171 configuration in BAM-1.2. This procedure differs from the current AMIP protocol in which CO₂
172 concentration is prescribed with the global annual mean values during the simulation period. As we do
173 not follow exactly the current AMIP protocol, our simulations are called AMIP-type rather than AMIP.
174 Ozone was initialized with seasonally varying mean climatological values, for the four seasons of the
175 year, compiled by the National Meteorological Center (NMC) Development Division Staff (1988).

176 **2.2 Experimental design and observational reference datasets**

177 Two sets of 4-member ensemble AMIP-type climate simulations for the period from 1975 to 2017 were
178 performed with BAM-1.2, one set for each of the two model resolutions (TQ126L42 and TQ62L42)
179 investigated in this study. ERA-40 reanalysis (Uppala et al. 2005) atmospheric initial conditions for the 1st
180 January, 1st April, 1st July and 1st October 1975 were used to initialize the model and produce the 4-
181 member ensemble for each model resolution. The atmospheric variables needed to initialize the model are
182 zonal and meridional wind, specific humidity and virtual temperature in 23 vertical levels between 1000
183 and 1 hPa, and surface pressure. The horizontal ERA-40 resolution chosen for initialization of all above
184 listed variables was 1.125° in latitude and longitude, which was interpolated to the model spectral
185 resolution (TQ126L42, ~100 km, and TQ62L42, ~180 km). Following the AMIP protocol, monthly
186 observed SSTs and sea ice conditions from Taylor et al. (2000) at 1° in latitude and longitude were
187 prescribed as boundary conditions for the model. The first six years of simulations (from 1975 to 1980)
188 were discarded; most of the assessment presented concentrates in the 30-year (1981-2010) climatological
189 period. ERA-40 reanalysis was used as initial conditions because these data were readily available and
190 already interpolated at the two investigated model resolutions. However, the use of another reanalysis
191 dataset for generating initial conditions would not be expected to produce major changes in the
192 climatological features analyzed here, particularly because this study investigates long climate
193 simulations forced with observed sea surface temperatures. The role of boundary conditions (sea surface
194 temperature) dominates the role of initial conditions in such simulations. The TOA radiation and the daily
195 precipitation characteristics assessments were based on the 2001-2016 and 1998-2017 periods,
196 respectively, due to the reference satellite data availability.

197 The following observational references were used for model evaluation. ERA-5 reanalysis (Hersbach et
198 al., 2018, 2019) was used for the atmospheric circulation and temperature assessment. The International
199 Satellite Cloud Climatology Project (ISCCP) dataset (Schiffer and Rossow 1983) was used for cloud
200 amount evaluation. The Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) dataset (Loeb et al.,
201 2018) was used for TOA radiation assessment. The Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP)

202 dataset (Adler et al. 2003) was used for precipitation evaluation. GPCP was chosen because this dataset is
203 composed of surface observations and satellite precipitation estimates, as opposed to the ERA-5
204 reanalysis precipitation dataset that is composed of model-produced precipitation values, as the latter are
205 known to be less representative of real-world observations. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric
206 Administration (NOAA) Southern Oscillation Index (SOI) was used for evaluating ENSO precipitation
207 teleconnections. The NOAA Outgoing Longwave Radiation (OLR) dataset (Liebman and Smith 1996)
208 and (ERA-5) reanalysis 850 and 200 hPa zonal winds (Hersbach et al., 2018, 2019) datasets were used for
209 assessing MJO activity. For the daily precipitation analysis, the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission
210 (TRMM) dataset was used (3B42 product, version 7A, Kummerow et al., 1998; Huffman et al., 2007,
211 2010). Table 2 summarizes the observational reference datasets and variables used in this study.

212 **3. Global annual mean climatological top of the atmosphere radiation features and vertical zonal** 213 **mean temperature profile**

214 An adequate representation of atmospheric radiation in climate models is fundamental for successful
215 climate simulations. This section starts by assessing how well BAM-1.2 represents the global annual
216 mean climatological TOA radiation under clear sky and cloudy conditions, which is important for
217 investigating how well the model simulates cloud-radiation interactions. Next, this section assesses model
218 fidelity for the vertical profile of zonal-mean annual mean climatological temperatures.

219 Figure 1 shows in panel a) the global climatological (2001-2016) annual mean TOA outgoing longwave
220 radiation (OLR) under clear sky conditions derived from satellite (CERES), and in panels b) and c) the
221 corresponding OLR under clear sky conditions simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km) and BAM
222 TQ126L42 (~100 km). The model climatological mean spatial patterns (panels b and c) resemble the
223 observed pattern (panel a), with model global mean values of 267.33 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and of
224 269.45 W.m^2 for BAM TQ126L42 close to the reference (CERES) value of 266.11 W.m^2 . Panel d) shows
225 the zonal means of the maps of panels a) for CERES (black line), b) BAM TQ62L42 (blue line), and c)
226 BAM TQ126L42 (red line), which further illustrates the close match between CERES and BAM. Panel d)
227 also reveals the small biases of 1.23 W.m^2 and 3.37 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and BAM TQ126L42,
228 respectively (see also supplementary Figure S1 panels a to d for the bias and root mean squared error
229 (RMSE) spatial patterns). The model is able to detect the reduced OLR values around the equator
230 associated with the large atmospheric water vapor concentration in the Intertropical Convergence Zone
231 (ITCZ) region, which absorbs more OLR than the drier high-latitude atmosphere. The model is also able
232 to produce two maximum OLR values around 25°S and 25°N near the subtropical high-pressure systems
233 and desert regions. As temperatures over these high pressure systems and desert regions are higher than
234 over extratropical regions, OLR also tends to be higher in these regions than over extratropical regions.

235 Panels e) to h) of Figure 1 show similar figures to panels a) to d), but for the global climatological annual
236 mean TOA outgoing shortwave radiation (OSR) under clear sky conditions. While OLR can identify the
237 amount of energy absorbed by the atmosphere and re-emitted at its own temperature at the top of the
238 atmosphere, OSR can identify the amount of energy reflected back to space at the TOA. Comparing
239 panels f) and g) with panel e) shows that OSR under clear sky conditions is generally well represented by
240 the model, except in polar regions where OSR is underestimated due to polar continental surface and sea
241 ice albedo misrepresentation. This feature is also noticeable in panel h), which illustrates that the largest

242 mismatches between CERES and BAM zonal mean OSR occur over polar regions, leading to a negative
243 bias of -4.08 W.m^2 in both BAM TQ62L42 and BAM TQ126L42. The model simulated global mean
244 OSR values were 49.72 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and 49.71 W.m^2 for BAM TQ126L42 while the
245 reference (CERES) value was 53.78 W.m^2 (see also supplementary Figure S1 panels e to h for the bias
246 and RMSE spatial patterns).

247 Panels i) to p) of Figure 1 show similar figures to panels a) to h), but for global climatological annual
248 mean TOA OLR (panels i to l) and OSR (panels m to p) under cloudy conditions. The comparison of
249 panels j) and k) with panel i) for OLR and of panels n) and o) with panel m) for OSR reveals that the
250 model climatological mean spatial patterns resemble CERES patterns, but with clear biases (see also
251 supplementary Figure S1 panels i to p for the bias and RMSE spatial patterns). The model overestimates
252 global mean cloudy sky OLR, with values of 255.12 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and 258.05 W.m^2 for
253 BAM TQ126L42, while the reference (CERES) value was 240.28 W.m^2 . This OLR overestimation is also
254 illustrated in panel l), which shows the zonal mean values with a mean bias of 14.86 W.m^2 for BAM
255 TQ62L42 and 17.80 W.m^2 for BAM TQ126L42. Note that both simulated and CERES values of OLR
256 under cloudy conditions are smaller than the clear sky OLR values reported in the previous paragraph.
257 Such a reduction in OLR is due to the fact that clouds in the atmosphere absorb longwave radiation
258 emitted by the surface and lower atmospheric layers, and emit longwave radiation at lower temperatures
259 to the TOA. The model underestimates global mean OSR values under cloudy conditions, with values of
260 82.11 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and 80.02 W.m^2 for BAM TQ126L42, while the reference (CERES)
261 value was 99.12 W.m^2 . This OSR underestimation feature is also illustrated in panel p), which shows the
262 zonal mean values with a mean negative bias of -17.08 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and -19.15 W.m^2 for
263 BAM TQ126L42. Note also that both simulated and CERES cloudy-sky OSR values are larger than clear-
264 sky OSR values reported in the previous paragraph. Such an increase in OSR is due to the fact that clouds
265 in the atmosphere reflect shortwave radiation at the top of the atmosphere much more than the
266 atmosphere under clear sky conditions. Overall, the model in both spatial resolutions is able to detect the
267 maximum and minimum values of OLR and OSR at the TOA but overestimates OLR (due to having an
268 atmosphere unable to absorb enough longwave radiation) and underestimates OSR (due to having an
269 atmosphere unable to reflect enough shortwave radiation). In other words, the model atmosphere is more
270 transparent than the observations, leading to misrepresentation of cloud radiation interactions. Note that
271 the largest differences between both simulated and observed OLR and OSC are noticed over regions
272 where stratocumulus clouds are usually observed (over the oceans to the west of the continents). This is a
273 problem previously identified in other models (e.g., Brient et al., 2019 and references therein) and will be
274 further diagnosed when discussing Figure 2. The model OLR overestimation over the Amazon and
275 Indonesia regions is related to underestimation of convective clouds, a feature also noticed in BAM
276 version 0.0 (Cavalcanti et al. 2020).

277 Panel a) of Figure 2 shows the global climatological (2001-2016) annual mean TOA longwave cloud
278 radiative forcing (LWCRF) derived from satellite (CERES), and panels b) and c) show the corresponding
279 LWCRF simulated by BAM TQ62L42 ($\sim 180 \text{ km}$) and BAM TQ126L42 ($\sim 100 \text{ km}$). The LWCRF is
280 defined as the difference between OLR under clear sky (first row in Figure 1) and OLR under cloudy
281 (third row in Figure 1) conditions. The LWCRF assesses the impact of clouds on longwave radiation at
282 the TOA. The observed LWCRF (panel a) is positive; it represents the atmospheric warming effect from
283 clouds that absorb longwave radiation. The model (panels b and c) underestimates global mean LWCRF
284 by more than a factor of two, with values of 12.11 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and 11.40 W.m^2 for BAM
285 TQ126L42 compared with the reference (CERES) value of 25.84 W.m^2 (see also supplementary Figure
286 S2 panels a to d for the bias and RMSE spatial patterns). Such an underestimation in LWCRF is further
287 illustrated in the zonal means shown in panel d) and is due to the model atmosphere having reduced
288 capability to absorb longwave radiation than the real world atmosphere, as discussed in the previous
289 paragraph. Misrepresentation of cloud radiation interactions in the model led to the mean LWCRF bias of
290 -13.63 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and of -14.43 W.m^2 for BAM TQ126L42, indicating that LWCRF is
291 weaker in the model than observed.

292 Panel e) in Figure 2 shows the global climatological annual mean TOA shortwave cloud radiative forcing
293 (SWCRF) derived from satellite (CERES), and in panels b) and c) the corresponding SWCRF simulated
294 by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km) and BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km). The SWCRF is defined as the difference
295 between OSR under clear sky (second row in Figure 1) and OSR under cloudy (fourth row in Figure 1)
296 conditions. The SWCRF assesses the impact of clouds on shortwave radiation at the TOA. The global
297 mean SWCRF is negative; it represents the atmospheric cooling effect from cloud-reflected shortwave
298 radiation. The model (panels f and g) overestimates the observed (panel e) SWCRF. Global mean
299 SWCRF values were -32.39 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and -30.31 W.m^2 for BAM TQ126L42, while the
300 reference (CERES) value was -45.34 W.m^2 (see also supplementary Figure S2 panels e to h for the bias
301 and RMSE spatial patterns). Such an overestimation in SWCRF is further illustrated in the zonal means
302 shown in panel h); it is due to the model atmosphere being too transparent to shortwave radiation, as
303 discussed earlier. Misrepresentation of cloud radiation interactions in the model led to the mean SWCRF
304 bias of 13.00 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and of 15.07 W.m^2 for BAM TQ126L42, indicating that SWCRF
305 is weaker in the model than observed.

306 Panel i) in Figure 2 shows the global climatological annual mean TOA net cloud radiative forcing
307 (NETCRF) derived from satellite (CERES), and in panels j) and k) the corresponding NETCRF simulated
308 by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km) and BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km). The NETCRF is defined as the sum of
309 LWCRF (first row in Figure 2) and SWCRF (second row in Figure 2). The NETCRF assesses the net
310 impact of clouds on both longwave and shortwave radiation at the TOA. The global mean NETCRF is
311 negative, representing the net cooling effect from clouds. The NETCRF is reasonably well represented by
312 the model (panels j and k) when compared to the CERES (panel i), even though some biases are apparent.
313 The global mean NETCRF values were -20.18 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and -18.91 W.m^2 for BAM
314 TQ126L42 while the reference (CERES) value was -19.51 W.m^2 . This leads to NETCRF biases of -0.63
315 W.m^2 for BAM TQ62L42 and 0.64 W.m^2 for BAM TQ126L42 (pane l), which are much smaller
316 compared to LWCRF (panel d) and SWCRF (panel h) biases. These small biases in NETCRF are due to
317 the compensation between the weaker LWCRF and SWCRF discussed in the previous two paragraphs.
318 Panel l) also illustrates larger negative NETCRF biases over polar regions compared to other regions.

319 Panel m) of Figure 2 shows the global climatological annual mean low cloud fraction from ISCCP. To
320 illustrate the misrepresentation of cloud-radiation interactions in BAM, panels n) and o) of Figure 2 show
321 NETCRF biases for BAM TQ62L42 and BAM TQ126L42, respectively, computed as the difference
322 between the simulated NETCRF maps of panels j) and k) and the CERES NETCRF map of panel i). The
323 largest positive NETCRF biases are found over oceanic regions near the western coast of North and South
324 America, Africa and Oceania. These oceanic regions are characterized by low cloud (Brient et al. 2019).
325 The comparison of panels n) and o) with panel m) shows a remarkable coincidence of regions with large
326 positive NETCRF biases and high fraction of low clouds over ocean regions near the western coasts. This
327 suggests that much of the identified NETCRF biases are likely related to misrepresentation of low marine
328 clouds in the model. Panel p) shows the NETCRF bias difference between BAM TQ126L42 and BAM
329 TQ62L42 (i.e., the difference between the map shown in panel o and the map shown in panel n). The
330 positive values in the tropics shown in panel p) indicate regions where the higher resolution model
331 version (panel o) has smaller biases than the lower resolution (panel n). These final three panels of Figure
332 2 reveal that increasing the model spatial resolution reduces the negative NETCRF bias identified over
333 the eastern tropical Indian Ocean, the Maritime Continent, and the South Pacific and South Atlantic
334 Convergence Zones.

335 Figure 3 shows in panel a) the vertical climatological (1981-2010) annual zonal mean temperature
336 profiles (isolines) from 1000 to 10 hPa (in $^{\circ}\text{C}$) derived from ERA-5 reanalysis, and in panels b) and c) the
337 corresponding profiles simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km) and BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km). The
338 model (panels b and c) represents well the observed (panel a) zonal mean temperature vertical structure,
339 including meridional and vertical temperature gradients, as well as the temperature minima near the
340 equator around 100 hPa. The shading in panels b and c highlights warm biases at around 100 hPa near the
341 Equator, due mainly to ultra-violet (UV) radiation absorption by ozone in the low stratosphere, which is

342 overestimated in the model (not shown). As the model atmosphere is too transparent to longwave
343 radiation, this allows more energy to be absorbed by stratospheric ozone and warm the high-level
344 atmosphere (around 100 hPa). However, at the top of the stratosphere ozone is underestimated by the
345 model (not shown), leading to cold biases likely due to the model top atmosphere being unable to absorb
346 enough longwave radiation emitted by lower atmospheric and cloud layers. These two panels also reveal
347 cold biases in the equatorial mid-troposphere, likely due to misrepresentation of low and middle clouds,
348 which reduces long wave radiation absorption. Panel d) shows the vertical profile of the zonal mean
349 temperature bias difference between BAM TQ126L42 (panel c) and BAM TQ62L42 (panel b), which
350 reveals that increasing spatial resolution increases temperature biases near the top model levels.

351 **4. Atmospheric circulation seasonal climatological features**

352 Another important aspect of climate model simulations is to investigate how well models represent
353 atmospheric circulation. This section assesses how well BAM-1.2 simulates atmospheric circulation
354 climatological features on the seasonal scale.

355 Figure 4 shows low level (850 hPa) circulation climatological (1981-2010) means for austral summer
356 (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row)
357 derived from ERA-5 (first column), simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, second column), and BAM
358 TQ126L42 (~100 km, third column). The model (second and third columns) adequately represents the
359 observed lower level climatological circulation features (first column). The comparison of these figure
360 panels shows that the sub-tropical westerlies in the Southern Hemisphere oceans are accordingly
361 represented by the model. The sub-tropical westerlies observed over the Northern Hemisphere Pacific and
362 Atlantic Oceans are also well represented by the model. Equatorial easterly trades are adequately
363 represented by the model, but are stronger than observed, particularly over the Pacific Ocean. The semi-
364 permanent anticyclones over the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Oceans are also well placed by the model. In
365 addition, the model is able to locate the semi-permanent anticyclones over the South Atlantic toward the
366 South American continent during the austral winter and toward the central south Atlantic during the
367 austral summer, as observed. The low level easterlies over the Indian peninsula is also adequately
368 represented during the austral winter, closely resembling the observations. The fourth column of Figure 4
369 shows the zonal-mean zonal wind from the panels in the first 3 columns. Although the model (blue line
370 for BAM TQ62L42 and red line for BAM TQ126L42) reproduces the observed (black line for ERA-5)
371 westerly maxima in mid-latitudes and easterly maxima in the tropics, the intensity of these features are
372 generally stronger in the model when compared to the observations. See also supplementary Figure S3 for
373 the low-level (850 hPa) circulation biases.

374 Figure 5 shows upper level (200 hPa) circulation climatological (1981-2010) means for austral summer
375 (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row)
376 derived from ERA-5 (first column), simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, second column), and by
377 BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, third column). The model (panels in the second and third columns)
378 adequately represents the observed (panels in the first column) upper-level climatological circulation
379 features, including the sub-tropical and polar westerly jets, the anti-cyclone over Bolivia (known as the
380 Bolivian high) during the austral summer (first row) and the associated trough over northeast Brazil and
381 the tropical south Atlantic. During the austral spring (SON, fourth row), however, the model fails to
382 reproduce the initial formation of the Bolivian high and associated trough over northeast Brazil. The
383 anticyclonic circulations over Indonesia and South Africa during austral summer (DJF), as well as the
384 Tibetan and Mexican highs, other typical anticyclonic boreal summer (JJA) circulation features, are well
385 represented by the model.

386 The fourth column of Figure 5 shows the zonal-mean zonal wind from the panels in the first 3 columns.
387 Although the model (blue line for BAM TQ62L42 and red line for BAM TQ126L42) reproduces the
388 observed jets (black line for ERA-5), including the stronger subtropical jets in the winter hemispheres
389 than the summer hemispheres, there are also some model biases. During DJF (panel d) in the northern
390 hemisphere, the simulated subtropical jet is weaker than observed at both resolutions, while the southern

391 hemisphere polar jet is stronger than observed for BAM TQ126L42 but better matches the observations in
392 BAM TQ62L42. During MAM (panel h), the northern hemisphere simulated subtropical jet is slightly
393 weaker than observed and the southern hemisphere simulated polar jet is stronger than observed at both
394 resolutions. Meanwhile, the southern hemisphere subtropical jet is slightly weaker than observed for
395 BAM TQ126L42 and matches the observations closely in BAM TQ62L42. During JJA (panel l), the
396 northern hemisphere model simulated subtropical jet is weaker than observed and the southern
397 hemisphere polar jet is stronger than observed at both resolutions, while the southern hemisphere
398 subtropical jet is slightly weaker than observed for BAM TQ62L42 and matches the observations closely
399 in BAM TQ126L42. During SON (panel p) the northern hemisphere simulated subtropical jet is slightly
400 stronger and displaced northwards when compared to the observations at both resolutions. The southern
401 hemisphere subtropical jet is slightly weaker than observed in BAM TQ62L42 and resembles the
402 observations in BAM TQ126L42, while the southern hemisphere polar jet is slightly stronger than
403 observed for BAM TQ126L42 and matches the observations in BAM TQ62L42. Overall the mean biases
404 shown in the bottom right of the fourth column panels in Figure 5 are similar, suggesting little impact
405 from changing the model horizontal resolution. See also supplementary Figure S4 for the upper level (200
406 hPa) circulation biases.

407 Figure 6 shows the vertical profile of climatological (1981-2010) seasonal-mean, zonal-mean zonal wind
408 for austral summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring
409 (SON, fourth row) derived from ERA-5 reanalysis (first column), simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180
410 km, second column), and simulated by BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, third column). The comparison of the
411 simulated profiles (second and third column) with the observed profile (first column) reveals that the
412 model adequately simulates the main features of the zonal mean wind. This includes the maximum
413 westerlies around 200 hPa (the subtropical jets) in both hemispheres, the high-latitude polar jets above
414 200 hPa in the winter hemispheres, and the equatorial easterlies above 100 hPa. The shading in the second
415 and third column panels illustrate that the model tends to simulate stronger than observed westerly winds
416 around 45°S and 45°N through most of the troposphere at both resolutions. In other words, around these
417 latitudes the model overestimates the subtropical westerly jets, and in some seasons (e.g. JJA and SON)
418 the northern hemisphere jets are displaced poleward. These central shaded panels also reveal that the
419 equatorial easterlies above 100 hPa are stronger in the model when compared to the observations. The
420 zonal mean bias difference between BAM TQ126L42 (third column) and BAM TQ62L42 (second
421 column) shown in the fourth column highlights that during JJA and DJF the westerly subtropical jets
422 between 400 and 100 hPa are intensified when increasing the model resolution. These fourth column
423 panels also reveal that increasing the model resolution strengthens the equatorial easterlies above 100 hPa
424 and the westerly high-latitude polar jets above 200 hPa in the southern hemisphere in JJA and SON. The
425 stronger equatorial easterlies are also noticeable over a large portion of the equatorial region in JJA and
426 SON when increasing resolution from TQ62L42 to TQ126L42.

427 **5. Precipitation seasonal climatological features**

428 Precipitation is a variable of great relevance for the activities of a number of societal sectors (e.g.
429 agriculture, energy production and tourism). Therefore, it is essential to assess how well climate models
430 represent this variable. This section presents an assessment of seasonal precipitation climatological
431 features simulated by BAM-1.2.

432 Figure 7 shows the climatological (1981-2010) mean accumulated precipitation for austral summer (DJF,
433 first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row) derived
434 from GPCP (first column), simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, second column), and BAM
435 TQ126L42 (~100 km, third column). Despite some biases discussed below and illustrated in Figure 8, the
436 model simulated climatological mean spatial patterns (second and third columns) resemble the observed
437 patterns (first column) for the most relevant features, including: low precipitation over the semi-
438 permanent sub-tropical high pressure systems in the Pacific and Atlantic oceans, high precipitation over
439 the South Pacific, South Atlantic and South Indian ocean convergence zones, as well as around the
440 equator over the ITCZ. The zonal mean accumulated precipitation shown in the fourth column for GPCP

441 (black line), BAM TQ62L42 (blue line) and BAM TQ126L42 (red line) illustrates that the model, despite
442 some biases, is able to simulate the primary and secondary precipitation maxima around the Equator and
443 in the mid-latitudes, the latter associated with the storm tracks, due to its capability to represent
444 precipitation from the ITCZ and baroclinic weather systems and associated fronts. The global mean
445 accumulated precipitation is larger in the model simulations than observed (see numbers on the bottom
446 left of the first four column panels). The latter numbers reveal that the model run at higher resolution
447 (BAM TQ126L42) has much larger biases than the model run at lower resolution (BAM TQ62L42). The
448 zonal means shown in the fourth column illustrate that much of these biases in BAM TQ126L42 are due
449 to the precipitation overestimation around the equator. Two possible reasons why the higher resolution
450 model version (BAM TQ126L42) has larger precipitation biases than the lower resolution model version
451 (BAM TQ62L42) are: 1) The used time step for running the higher resolution model version (600 s) is
452 half of the time step used for the lower resolution (1200 s). The deep convection scheme is called at each
453 time step, while the shortwave radiation scheme is called every hour and the long wave radiation scheme
454 is called every three hours. This implies that the convection scheme is called more often in the higher
455 resolution model version without the radiative warming/cooling contribution, because of having a shorter
456 time step than the lower resolution model version, which can lead to an imbalance between diabatic
457 heating by convection and radiative cooling. This imbalance can directly affect atmospheric
458 thermodynamics and instability, leading to precipitation impacts. 2) The higher-resolution model version
459 is better able to resolve sub-grid processes at the expense of allowing more intense horizontal gradients
460 and waves interactions across scales. This may generate intense convective precipitation systems, which
461 interact with the atmosphere and again can directly impact atmospheric thermodynamics and instability.

462 Figure 8 shows the accumulated precipitation mean bias over 1981-2010 for austral summer (DJF, first
463 row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row), for BAM
464 TQ62L42 (~180 km, first column) and BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, second column). This figure confirms
465 the previous finding that the identified excess precipitation biases are concentrated around the equator,
466 where the positive biases are largest. Large positive biases are found predominantly over the Indian
467 Ocean and western equatorial Pacific in both investigated model resolutions (first and second columns).
468 Along the South Pacific convergence zone biases are positive. Along the South Atlantic convergence
469 zone, and the southwestern South Atlantic, biases are predominantly negative. The model also shows
470 negative biases over the Maritime Continent and eastern Indian Ocean, particularly in DJF, JJA and SON.
471 See also supplementary Figure S5 for the precipitation RMSE. The panels on the third column of Figure
472 8 show the mean bias differences between the higher resolution BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, second
473 column) version and the lower resolution BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, first column) version. These panels
474 (third column) illustrate that increasing spatial resolution reduces precipitation biases over the central and
475 eastern Indian Ocean in DJF and MAM, and over most South America and the South Pacific convergence
476 zone in MAM, JJA and SON. However, over other equatorial regions, including northern South America,
477 the eastern equatorial Pacific and the western Indian Ocean, increasing spatial resolution increases
478 precipitation biases. Therefore, depending on the region the impact of increasing spatial resolution is
479 positive (i.e., decreases the bias) or negative (i.e., increases the bias).
480

481 Figure 9 shows the standard deviation of accumulated precipitation over the 1981-2010 period for austral
482 summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth
483 row), derived from GPCP (first column), and simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, second column)
484 and by BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, third column). At both spatial resolutions (second and third columns)
485 the model produces a pattern similar to the observations (first column). Higher variability is observed
486 over the equatorial region and over the South Atlantic and South Pacific convergence zones, and lower
487 variability over the ocean regions where semi-permanent sub-tropical high-pressure systems are located.
488 However, over the regions of higher precipitation variability, the model tends to overestimate the
489 observed variability, particularly over the South Pacific convergence zone (see also supplementary Figure
490 S6 for precipitation standard deviation biases).

491

492

493 **6. El Niño Southern Oscillation precipitation teleconnections and interannual precipitation**
494 **variability on the seasonal time scale**

495 El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) precipitation teleconnections manifest through changes in the
496 equatorial Walker circulation and the propagation of Rossby waves excited by anomalous equatorial heat
497 sources (deep convective activity) associated with SST anomalies in the equatorial Pacific (Wallace and
498 Gutzler, 1981; Karoly, 1989). The Southern Oscillation Index (SOI) is a well known atmospheric index
499 used for diagnosing the sea level pressure seesaw between Tahiti (in the central Pacific) and Darwin (in
500 northern Australia) established during the two phases of ENSO (El Niño and La Niña; Philander, 1985).
501 The SOI is defined as the standardized sea level pressure difference between Tahiti and Darwin. During
502 El Niño events (when equatorial Pacific SSTs are anomalously warm) sea level pressure tends to be lower
503 in the central Pacific and higher in northern Australia, leading to negative SOI values. During La Niña
504 events (when equatorial Pacific SSTs are anomalously cool) sea level pressure tends to be higher in the
505 central Pacific and lower in northern Australia, leading to positive SOI values. These sea level pressure
506 conditions in the equatorial region are associated with changes in the Walker circulation, with anomalous
507 ascent and development of deep convection and precipitation over the regions of lower sea level pressure,
508 and subsidence and absence of clouds and precipitation over the regions where sea level pressure is
509 higher (Philander, 1990). Analysing the relationship between SOI and global precipitation in this section
510 allows identifying so-called ENSO precipitation teleconnections, which are typical conditions associated
511 with El Niño and La Niña events in the equatorial Pacific.

512 Figure 10 shows the correlation between the SOI and precipitation anomalies over the 1981-2010 period
513 for austral summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring
514 (SON, fourth row), derived from observations (NOAA SOI and GPCP, first column) and simulated by
515 BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, second column) and by BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, third column). The
516 positive correlations in the observed patterns (first column) reveal consistency between El Niño (negative
517 SOI) and precipitation deficits over the Maritime Continent, northern Australia and northeast Brazil. The
518 negative correlations shown in the observed patterns (first column) reveal consistency between El Niño
519 and excess precipitation over the equatorial Pacific and southeastern South America. During La Niña
520 (positive SOI) these correlations translate into opposite precipitation conditions over these regions. In
521 other words, La Niña is usually consistent with precipitation excess over the Maritime Continent,
522 northern Australia and northeast Brazil, and precipitation deficit over the equatorial Pacific and
523 southeastern South America. Although individual El Niño and La Niña events may produce differences in
524 the sign, location and magnitude of precipitation anomalies, these are examples of precipitation patterns
525 typically manifested through well-documented global ENSO teleconnections (Ropelewski and Halpert,
526 1987, 1989). The panels on the second and third columns show that ENSO precipitation teleconnections
527 are adequately represented by the model at both spatial resolutions, as most of the correlations described
528 above resemble those in observations (first column). Increasing the spatial resolution from BAM
529 TQ62L42 to BAM TQ126L42 slightly improves the representation of ENSO-precipitation
530 teleconnections. This is illustrated by the slight increase in pattern correlation values between the
531 simulated patterns (second and third columns) and the observed pattern (first column) shown in the
532 bottom left of each figure panel. Although most tropical teleconnection features are reasonably well
533 represented by the model, there are still missing or weak features requiring better representation in the
534 model, such as the negative correlations over the Great Horn of Africa in DJF, and the positive
535 correlations over southern Africa in MAM.

536 Another important aspect to be evaluated in climate models is how well they represent the year-to-year
537 (inter-annual) precipitation variability. Figure 11 shows the correlation between observed precipitation
538 anomalies (GPCP) and simulated precipitation anomalies by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, first column) and
539 BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, second column), over the 1981-2010 period for austral summer (DJF, first
540 row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row). This analysis
541 measures the strength of linear association between the simulated and observed seasonal precipitation
542 anomalies. The mean biases for each season are removed when computing anomalies (i.e. when

543 subtracting the model simulated seasonal precipitation for each of the 30 seasons analyzed from the
544 model seasonal climatological 30-year mean) prior to computing the correlation. In other words, this
545 correlation analysis measures how well the model simulates seasonal precipitation anomalies compared to
546 the observed seasonal precipitation anomalies, which, if the model turns out to be well-calibrated, should
547 both oscillate in the same direction (i.e. at each grid point positive anomalies simulated when positive
548 anomalies are observed and negative anomalies simulated when negative anomalies are observed). These
549 figures show that the model simulated precipitation anomalies have a strong linear association (indicated
550 by large positive correlation values) over tropical regions, mainly due to the model's ability to represent
551 ENSO teleconnections as illustrated in Figure 10. Note that the tropical regions over the Pacific, South
552 America and the Maritime Continent, where correlations are large and positive in Figure 11, coincide
553 with the regions in Figure 10 where ENSO teleconnections manifest. Increasing spatial resolution from
554 BAM TQ62L42 to BAM TQ126L42 does not substantially change the tropical mean and global mean
555 correlations shown at the bottom left of the figure panels in the first and second columns of Figure 11.
556 Looking at the difference between the correlation maps for the higher and lower resolution model
557 versions, one can have an idea about where the increase in resolution can help improve the representation
558 of this year-to-year (interannual) precipitation variability. We have tested if these correlation differences
559 are statistically significant at the 10% level, using a bootstrap resampling procedure with replacement.
560 For performing this test, the correlation maps for both model resolutions were recomputed 1000 times,
561 and checked if the 90% confidence intervals of these 1000 correlation samples for each model resolution
562 overlapped or not. Non-overlapping grid-points are showed in colors in Figure 11 (third column),
563 indicating regions where the differences in correlations are statistically significant at the 10% level. The
564 positive correlation differences between BAM TQ126L42 (second column) and BAM TQ62L42 (first
565 column) shown in yellow, orange and red in the third column are limited to small regions illustrating that
566 the increase in spatial resolution has little impact in improving the representation of precipitation inter-
567 annual variability.

568 **7. Madden and Julian Oscillation and daily precipitation climatological characteristics**

569 The previous sections presented an assessment of BAM for reproducing annual and seasonal mean
570 climatological features. In this section, we use higher frequency (daily) data to first assess the model's
571 ability to simulate the climatological features (i.e. the typical patterns during the phases) of an intra-
572 seasonal phenomenon (the MJO) based on daily OLR and daily 200 hPa and 850 hPa zonal wind. The
573 MJO is characterized by the eastward equatorial propagation of tropical convection from the Indian
574 Ocean towards the Pacific, taking about 40 to 50 days to complete a full cycle around the world (Madden
575 and Julian, 1972). Next we assess model representation of daily precipitation climatological
576 characteristics, including frequency, persistence, intermittency, size and orientation of rainfall features
577 over southeastern South America.

578 Figure 12 shows the MJO life cycle composite represented by the mean anomalies of OLR (shading) and
579 the zonal wind at 200 hPa (contours) using all days during November to April 1981-2010 when the MJO
580 was in phases 1 to 8 (as defined by Wheeler and Hendon, 2004), derived from observations (NOAA OLR
581 and ERA-5 200 hPa zonal wind, first column) and simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (second column) and
582 BAM TQ126L42 (third column). MJO phases for both observations and model simulations were
583 computed using the diagnostics package described in Waliser et al. (2009). This diagnostics package
584 performs combined empirical orthogonal function analyses for determining the MJO phases by
585 combining zonal winds (at 850hPa and 200hPa) with OLR averaged between 15°S and 15°N. The model
586 (second and third panels) reasonably represents the observed (first panel) MJO propagation from the
587 tropical Indian Ocean towards the western equatorial Pacific. The phenomenon is depicted by negative
588 OLR anomalies (representing anomalous convective activity) moving east from phases 2 to 8 from the
589 tropical Indian Ocean towards the western equatorial Pacific. However, the model at both spatial
590 resolutions (second and third panels) simulates weaker anomalous convection than observed (first panel).
591 In order to be able to visualize the spatial structure of anomalous convection in BAM, in Figure 12 the
592 colour scale for the model simulations is different from the colour scale for the observations. This
593 optimised data visualization was also used in Figure 12 of Kodama et al. (2015) and in Figure 5 of Liu et
594 al. (2017) when examining similar MJO features in other models. Increasing resolution improves the
595 amplitude of anomalous convection associated with the MJO, but the simulated convection remains

596 weaker than observed. BAM TQ62L42 (second column) also shows a faster eastward propagation of the
597 anomalous convection from the Indian Ocean to the western equatorial Pacific from phase 4 to 5 than
598 observed (first column). Increasing spatial resolution from BAM TQ62L42 (second column) to (BAM
599 TQ126L42, third column) reduces this phase speed bias and also strengthens the anomalous convection,
600 which was too weak in BAM TQ62L42, leading to an improved representation of the MJO life cycle.
601 However, increasing spatial resolution reversed the anomalous convection signal over Brazil in phases 3,
602 4 and 7 of the MJO. The upper level (200 hPa) zonal winds are adequately represented in the model
603 (second and third panels) when compared to the observations (first panel) through the MJO phases,
604 consistently showing easterly wind anomalies to the east of the maximum equatorial negative OLR
605 anomaly and westerly wind anomalies to the west of this maximum. This accordingly represents the
606 upper level circulation divergence associated with the deep MJO convective activity eastward
607 propagation. The model is also able to represent the upper-level convergence with easterly wind
608 anomalies to the east and westerly wind anomalies to the west of the maximum equatorial positive OLR
609 anomaly, where a lack of convection and subsidence prevail.

610
611 To analyze daily precipitation features, and following Klingaman et al. (2017) and Martin et al. (2017),
612 Figure 13 (panels a to d) shows joint (two-dimensional, 2-D) probability density functions (colors) of
613 binned values of daily precipitation at the same grid point on consecutive days, and one dimensional (1-
614 D) probability density function (dashed line) of daily precipitation, aggregated over all grid points within
615 southeast South America (15-40°S, 60-35°W) for the period 1998-2017, derived from TRMM (first
616 column) and simulated by BAM (second right column). To compare TRMM with BAM, TRMM
617 precipitation was interpolated to the same horizontal resolutions as BAM (TQ62, ~180 km, first row, and
618 TQ126, ~100 km, second row). This region of South America, which includes large portions of Brazil
619 and Paraguay, northeast Argentina and Uruguay was selected because of its economic importance in
620 terms of food and energy production; it also has a large population heavily affected by daily precipitation
621 events. Besides, this is one of the world's most active regions in terms of mesoscale convective activity
622 (Velasco and Fritsch, 1987).

623 High probability values along the diagonal in panels a) to d) of Figure 13 suggest persistent precipitation
624 rates on consecutive days at the same grid point. The comparison of panels b) and d) with panels a) and
625 c), respectively, reveals that the model simulated daily precipitation is more persistent than observed by
626 TRMM, particularly for low to moderate rain rates (< 20 mm/day). The 1-D probability density function
627 (dashed lines) of daily precipitation in panels b) and d), when compared to those shown in panels a) and
628 c), show that the model overestimates light precipitation (< 20 mm/day) and underestimates heavy
629 precipitation (> 20 mm/day). This comparison also reveals that increasing spatial resolution from BAM
630 TQ62L42 (~180 km) to BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km) produces slightly more frequent heavy precipitation,
631 events, but still not as many events as observed by TRMM at the same resolution. High probabilities in
632 the lower right and upper left corners of panels a) to d) suggest intermittent precipitation at a grid point.
633 In other words, high probabilities in the lower right corner indicate that days of moderate or heavy
634 precipitation are frequently followed by days of light or no precipitation, while high probabilities in the
635 upper left indicate that light or no precipitation is frequently followed by moderate or heavy precipitation.
636 Panels b) and d) show that the model simulated precipitation is similarly intermittent to the observations
637 (panels a) and c) up to 60 mm/day, but for heavier than 60 mm/day the model becomes less intermittent
638 (more persistent) than TRMM. This is related to the underestimation of heavy precipitation in the model
639 when compared to the observations, as discussed above.

640 As described in Klingaman et al. (2017) and Martin et al. (2017), Figure 13 (panels e to h) shows
641 instantaneous (lag-0) correlations computed over non-overlapping 7 x 7 grid point sub-regions within the
642 southeast South America region (15-40°S, 60-35°W). Within each sub-region, the daily gridded
643 precipitation (1998-2017) time series at each point is correlated against the time series at the central grid
644 point (0,0). The plots shown in panels e) to h) are correlations averaged over the sub-regions. These four
645 panels show this diagnostic for TRMM (first column) and for the mean of all four BAM ensemble
646 members (second column). For the lower spatial resolution (~180 km; panels e) and f) these figures
647 contain the mean of four 7 x 7 grid point sub-regions within the southeast South America region. For the
648 higher spatial resolution (~100 km; panels g) and h) these figures contain the mean of nine 7 x 7 grid point

649 sub-regions within the southeast South America region. These four panels illustrate the typical size and
650 orientation of daily precipitation features as observed by TRMM and simulated by BAM. Panels f) and h)
651 show that precipitation features in BAM are oriented preferentially in the southeast to northwest direction
652 as in TRMM (panels e and g). These panels also reveal that precipitation features in BAM are larger than
653 those in TRMM. Increasing spatial resolution from BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km) to BAM TQ126L42 (~100
654 km) reduces this size bias, but BAM precipitation features (panel h) are still slightly larger than those in
655 TRMM (panel g), and the orientation is again consistent with TRMM.

656 In order to provide a global assessment supplementary Figures S7 and S8 show results of the same
657 analysis performed for southeastern South America (Figure 13) to other five same-sized (25 degrees in
658 longitude by 25 degrees in latitude) and climatologically similar regions (Southern Australia [45-20°S,
659 110-135°E], Southern Africa [35-10°S, 15-40°E], Eastern Asia [20-45°N, 105-130°E], Southern Europe
660 [20-45°N, 5°W-20°E] and Southeast North America [20-45°N, 100-75°W]). Consistent results with those
661 described above for Figure 13 were found for all these regions, suggesting systematic biases in the model
662 representation of daily precipitation features.
663

664 **8. Summary and conclusions**

665 This study evaluated the performance of CPTEC model (BAM-1.2) when producing AMIP-type climate
666 simulations at two spatial resolutions corresponding to around 180 and 100 km, both with 42 vertical
667 levels. Such simulations performed under observed boundary conditions (i.e. using observed SSTs when
668 running the model) provided a valuable framework for addressing the questions raised in the introductory
669 section, and also helped to identify area for model improvement. The main findings and conclusions are
670 summarized below.

671 At both spatial resolutions, BAM-1.2 reproduced well the observed vertical profile of the zonal annual
672 mean temperature, the seasonal mean atmospheric circulation and main climatological features of
673 precipitation, although some biases were identified, particularly in top of the atmosphere radiation. Both
674 OLR and OSR climatological features under clear sky conditions were adequately represented, indicating
675 that radiation interactions with atmospheric gases were well represented. The OSR assessment under clear
676 sky conditions also revealed that polar continental surface and sea ice albedo are misrepresented. Under
677 cloudy conditions, the model at both spatial resolutions overestimated OLR and underestimated OSR.
678 These deficiencies were attributed to a simulated atmosphere that was too transparent to longwave and
679 shortwave radiation under cloudy conditions, which led to a misrepresentation of cloud-radiation
680 interactions. Both LWCRF and SWCRF were found to be weaker in the model than in the observations.
681 This led to a weaker TOA warming effect in the global mean climate, due to the model having a less
682 absorptive atmosphere, and a weaker TOA cooling effect due to the model atmosphere being less
683 reflective. Nevertheless, the net cloud radiative forcing, which produces the TOA cooling effect in the
684 global mean climate, was well represented by the model at both spatial resolutions, with small global
685 mean biases. This was achieved by a compensation between both weaker LWCRF and SWCRF in the
686 model, leading to an adequate representation of atmospheric circulation and precipitation conditions. The
687 net cloud radiative forcing assessment also revealed that low marine clouds are misrepresented in the
688 model.

689 El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) precipitation teleconnections were also found to be well
690 represented by the model, including the typical patterns during El Niño (La Niña) events of excess
691 (deficit) precipitation over the equatorial Pacific and southeast South America and deficient (excess)
692 precipitation over the Maritime Continent, northern Australia and northern South America. Increasing the
693 spatial resolution slightly improved the representation of ENSO precipitation teleconnections. The
694 representation of inter-annual precipitation variability in the model at both spatial resolutions was linked
695 to the ability of the model to represent ENSO atmospheric teleconnections.

696 Despite some biases in the phase speed propagation, the eastward propagation of the MJO life cycle was
697 adequately simulated by the model. However, the model produced weaker than observed associated

698 tropical convective activity (a common feature among climate models), which propagates from the Indian
699 Ocean to the western Pacific during MJO events. Increasing spatial resolution helped to reduce the phase
700 speed bias and also strengthen the MJO convective activity, leading to an improved representation of the
701 life cycle, although simulated convection was still found to be much weaker than observed.

702 The analysis of daily simulated precipitation over the southeast of South America region revealed that the
703 model tends to overestimate light precipitation and underestimate heavy precipitation. Increasing spatial
704 resolution produced slightly heavier precipitation, but still not as much as observed. Daily precipitation
705 features were found to be larger and last longer in the model simulations than in the observations.
706 Increasing spatial resolution helped to reduce precipitation feature sizes, diminishing the size bias, but the
707 simulated precipitation features at higher resolution were still found to be slightly larger than observed.
708 The dominant spatial orientation of model simulated precipitation features at both spatial resolutions was
709 southeast to northwest, as in observations. Repeating this analysis to other five same-sized and
710 climatologically similar regions to southeastern South America, over Southern Australia, Southern Africa,
711 Eastern Asia, Southern Europe and Southeast North America revealed consistent results to all these
712 regions, suggesting systematic biases in the model representation of daily precipitation features.

713 Overall, BAM-1.2 simulated adequately most climate aspects here evaluated, despite the identified biases.
714 The performed evaluation identified model aspects that need to be improved. These include the
715 representation of polar continental surface and sea ice albedo, stratospheric ozone, low marine clouds, and
716 daily precipitation features. Improving cloud representation in the model is likely the key aspect needed
717 for addressing the identified transparency bias and associated cloud radiation interactions
718 misrepresentation. Tackling all of the above mentioned aspects in future model versions is expected to
719 produce an improved representation of the global climatological features discussed here.

720 *Acknowledgements*

721 We thank two anonymous reviewers for providing valuable comments and suggestions that contributed to
722 improving the quality of this manuscript. We thank Bárbara Yamada for the technical support in
723 obtaining part of the observational datasets used in this study. This research was partially supported by
724 the Climate Science for Services Partnership Brazil project (CSSP-Brazil) funded by the Newton Fund.
725 CASC thanks Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), process
726 305206/2019-2, and Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP), process
727 2015/50687-8 (CLIMAX Project) for the support received. DCS was supported by CNPq (process
728 167804/2018-9). BSG was supported by CNPq and Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de
729 Nível Superior (CAPES). NPK was supported by an Independent Research Fellowship from the UK
730 Natural Environment Research Council (NE/L010976/1) and by the National Centre for Atmospheric
731 Science ACREW project.

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739 **References**

- 740 Adler RF, Huffman GJ, Chang A, Ferraro R, Xie P, Janowiak J, Rudolf B, Schneider U, Curtis S, Bolvin
741 D, Gruber A, Susskind J, Arkin P (2003) The Version 2 Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP)
742 Monthly Precipitation Analysis (1979-Present). *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 4, 1147-1167.
- 743 Bretherton CS, Park S (2009) A new moist turbulence parameterization in the Community Atmosphere
744 Model. *Journal of Climate*. **22**: 3422-48.
- 745 Brient F, Roehrig R, Voldoire A (2019) Evaluating marine stratocumulus clouds in the CNRM-CM6-1
746 model using short-term hindcasts. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11, 127–148.
747 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001461>
- 748 Cavalcanti IFA, Raia A (2017) Lifecycle of South American Monsoon System simulated by
749 CPTEC/INPE AGCM. *International Journal of Climatology*, 37(51), 878–896.
750 <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5044>.
- 751 Cavalcanti IFA, Marengo JA, Satyamurty P, Trosnikov I, Bonatti J, Nobre CA, D'Almeida C, Sampaio G,
752 Castro CAC, Camargo H, Sanches MB (2002) Global climatological features in a simulation using
753 CPTEC/COLA AGCM. *J. Clim.* 15: 2965–2988.
- 754 Cavalcanti IFA, Silveira VP, Figueroa SN, Kubota PY, Bonatti JP, Souza DC (2020) Climate variability
755 over South America-regional and large scale features simulated by the Brazilian Atmospheric Model
756 (BAM-v0). *International Journal of Climatology*. 40, 5, 2845-2869. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6370>
- 757 Chou MD, Suarez MJ, Liang XZ, Yan MM, Cote C (2001) A thermal infrared radiation parameterization
758 for atmospheric studies. NASA/TM-2001-104606, Vol. 19.
- 759 Chou MD, Suarez, MJ (1999) A solar radiation parameterization (CLIRAD-SW) for atmospheric studies.
760 NASA/TM-1999-104606, M. J. Suarez, Ed., Series on Global Modeling and Data Assimilation. **15**, 40
761 pp.
- 762 Coelho CAS (2013) Comparative skill assessment of consensus and physically based tercile probability
763 seasonal precipitation forecasts for Brazil. *Meteorological Applications*, 20, 236-245.
- 764 Coelho CAS, Costa SMS, Freitas SR, Ito ER, Luz G, Santos AF, Nobre CA, Marengo JA, Pezza AB
765 (2012) Climate diagnostics of three major drought events in the Amazon and illustrations of their seasonal
766 precipitation predictions. *Meteorol. Appl.* 19: 237–255.
- 767 Figueroa SN, Bonatti JP, Kubota PY, Grell GA, Morrison H, Barros SRM, Fernandez JPR, Ramirez E,
768 Siqueira L, Luzia G, Silva J, Silva JR, Pendaharkar J, Capistrano VB, Alvim DS, Enoré DP, Diniz FLR,
769 Satyamurti P, Cavalcanti IFA, Nobre P, Barbosa HMJ, Mendes CL, Panetta J (2016) The Brazilian global
770 atmospheric model (BAM): performance for tropical rainfall forecasting and sensitivity to convective
771 scheme and horizontal resolution. *Weather Forecast.* 31: 1547–1572.
- 772 Gates WL, Boyle J, Covey C, Dease C, Doutriaux C, Drach R, Fiorino M, Gleckler P, Hnilo J, Marlais S,
773 Phillips T, Potter G, Santer B, Sperber K, Taylor K, Williams D (1998) An Overview of the Results of
774 the Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP I). *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **73**, 1962-1970.
- 775 Grell G, Devenyi D (2002) A generalized approach to parameterizing convection combining ensemble
776 and data assimilation techniques. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 29, doi:[10.1029/2002GL015311](https://doi.org/10.1029/2002GL015311).
- 777
- 778 Guimarães B S, Coelho CAS, Woolnough SJ, Kubota PY, Bastarz CF, Bonatti JP, Figueroa SN, de Souza
779 DC (2020) Configuration and hindcast quality assessment of a Brazilian global sub-seasonal prediction
780 system. *QJRMS*, 146, Issue 728, Part A, 1067-1084. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3725>.

781

782 Han J, Pan HL (2011) Revision of convection and vertical diffusion schemes in the NCEP global forecast
783 system. *Weather and Forecasting*, **26**: 520-33.

784 Hersbach H, de Rosnay P, Bell B, Schepers D, Simmons A, Soci C, Abdalla S, Balmaseda MA, Balsamo
785 G, Bechtold P, Berrisford P, Bidlot J, de Boissésion E, Bonavita M, Browne P, Buizza R, Dahlgren P, Dee
786 D, Dragani R, Diamantakis M, Flemming J, Forbes R, Geer A, Haiden T, Hólm E, Haimberger L, Hogan
787 R, Horányi A, Janisková M, Laloyaux P, Lopez P, Muñoz-Sabater J, Peubey C, Radu R, Richardson D,
788 Thépaut J-N, Vitart F, Yang X, Zsótér E, Zuo H (2018) Operational global reanalysis: progress, future
789 directions and synergies with NWP. ERA Report Series, 27. <https://www.ecmwf.int/node/18765>

790 Hersbach H, Bell W, Berrisford P, Horányi A, Muñoz-Sabater J, Nicolas J, Radu R, Schepers D,
791 Simmons A, Soci C, Dee D (2019) Global reanalysis: goodbye ERA-Interim, hello ERA5. ECMWF
792 Newsletter 159, 17-24. DOI 10.21957/vf291hehd7

793 Huffman GJ, Adler RF, Bolvin DT, Gu G, Nelkin EJ, Bowman KP, Hong Y, Stocker EF, Wolff DB
794 (2007) The TRMM multi-satellite precipitation analysis: quasi-global, multiyear, combined-sensor
795 precipitation estimates at fine scale. *J. Hydrometeorol.*, **8**, 38–55.

796 Huffman GJ, Adler RF, Bolvin DT, Nelkin EJ (2010) The TRMM multi-satellite precipitation analysis
797 (TMPA), in: *Satellite rainfall applications for surface hydrology*, edited by: Hossain, F. and
798 Gebremichael, M., 3–22, Springer Verlag.

799 Iacono M, Delamere J, Mlawer E, Shephard M, Clough S, Collins W (2008) Radiative forcing by long-
800 lived greenhouse gases: Calculations with the AER radiative transfer models. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **113**,
801 D13103, doi:[10.1029/2008JD009944](https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD009944).

802

803 Karoly DJ (1989) Southern Hemisphere circulation features associated with El Niño–Southern Oscillation
804 events. *J. Climate*, **2**, 1239–1252

805 Klingaman NP, Martin GM, Moise A (2017): ASoP (v1.0): a set of methods for analyzing scales of
806 precipitation in general circulation models. *Geosci. Model Dev.*, **10**, 57–83.

807 Kodama C, Yamada Y, Noda AT, Kikuchi K, Kajikawa Y, Nasuno T, Tomita T, Yamaura T, Takahashi
808 TG, Hara M, Kawatani Y, Satoh M, Sugi M (2015) A 20-year climatology of a NICAM AMIP-type
809 simulation. *J. Meteor. Soc. Japan*, **93**, 393-424, doi:10.2151/jmsj.2015-024.

810 Kubota PY (2012) Variability of storage energy in the soil-canopy system and its impact on the definition
811 of precipitation standard in South America (in Portuguese with abstract in English). Ph. D. thesis,
812 Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE), São José dos Campos, Brazil.

813 Kummerow C, Barnes W, Kozu T, Shiue J, Simpson J (1998) The Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission
814 (TRMM) sensor package, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol.*, **15**, 809–817.

815 Liebmann B, Smith CA (1996) Description of a Complete (Interpolated) Outgoing Longwave Radiation
816 Dataset. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, **77**, 1275-1277.

817 Liu, X., Wu, T., Yang, S. and co-authors (2017) MJO prediction using the sub-seasonal to seasonal
818 forecast model of Beijing Climate Center. *Clim Dyn* **48**, 3283–3307. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3264-7)
819 [3264-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3264-7)

820 Loeb NG, and co-authors (2018) Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) Energy
821 Balanced and Filled (EBAF) Top-of-Atmosphere (TOA) Edition-4.0 Data Product, *Journal of Climate*,
822 **31**(2), 895-918.

- 823 Madden RA, Julian PR (1972) Description of global-scale circulation cells in the Tropics with a 40–50
824 day period. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 29, 1109–1123.
- 825 Marengo JA, Cavalcanti IFA, Satyamurty P, Trosnikov I, Nobre CA, Bonatti JP, Camargo H, Sampaio G,
826 Sanches MB, Manzi AO, Castro CAC, D'Almeida C, Pezzi LP, Candido L. (2003) Assessment of
827 regional seasonal rainfall predictability using the CPTEC/COLA atmospheric GCM. *Clim. Dyn.* 21: 459–
828 475.
- 829 Martin GM, Klingaman NP, Moise AF (2017) Connecting spatial and temporal scales of tropical
830 precipitation in observations and the MetUM-GA6. *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 10, 105–126.
- 831 Mellor GL, Yamada T (1982) Development of a turbulence closure model for geophysical fluid problems.
832 *Rev. Geophys. Space Phys.* **20**: 851–875
- 833 Mizuta R, Yoshimura H, Murakami H, Matsueda M, Endo H, Ose T, Kamiguchi K, Hosaka M, M
834 Sugi, Yukimoto S, Kusunoki S, Kitoh A (2012) Climate Simulations Using MRI-AGCM3.2 with 20-km
835 Grid, *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II*, 2012, Volume 90A, Pages 233-
836 258, Released June 07, 2012, Online ISSN 2186-9057, Print ISSN 0026-
837 1165, <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2012-A12>
- 838 Morrison G, Curry JA, Khvorostyanov VI (2005) A new double-moment microphysics parameterization
839 for application in cloud and climate models. Part I: Description. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **62**, 1665–1677,
840 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS3446.1>.
- 841 Morrison H, Thompson G, Tatarskii V (2009) Impact of cloud microphysics on the development of
842 trailing stratiform precipitation in a simulated squall line: Comparison of one-and two-moment schemes.
843 *Monthly weather review.* **137**: 991-1007.
- 844 NMC Development Division Staff (1988) Research version of the medium range forecast model. NMC
845 Documentation Series 1,339 pp. [Available from the Development Division, NCEP, Washington, DC
846 20233.]
847
848 Philander, SGH (1985) El Niño and La Niña. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 42, 2652-2662.
- 849 Philander, SGH (1990) El Niño, La Niña, and the southern oscillation. Princeton University, Princeton,
850 New Jersey. Academic Press, Inc, 291pp
- 851 Rio C, Houdin F (2008) A Thermal Plume Model for the Convective Boundary Layer: Representation of
852 Cumulus Clouds. *Journal of The Atmospheric Sciences.* 65: 407-425.
- 853 Ropelewski CF, Halpert MS (1987) Global and regional scale precipitation patterns associated with the El
854 Nino/ Southern Oscillation. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 115, 1606-1626.
- 855 Ropelewski CF, Halpert MS (1989) Precipitation patterns associated with the high index phase of the
856 Southern Oscillation. *J. Climate*, 2, 268-284.
- 857 Schiffer RA, Rossow WB (1983) The International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project (ISCCP): The
858 first project of the World Climate Research Programme. *Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc.*, **64**, 779-784.
- 859 Souza DC, Kubota PY, Figueroa SN, Gutierrez EMAR, Coelho CAS (2019) Impacto da resolução
860 horizontal na simulação dos jatos de baixos níveis na América do Sul usando o modelo global do CPTEC.
861 *Estudos Interdisciplinares nas Ciências Exatas e da Terra e Engenharias* 4. E82ed.: Atena Editora, 205-
862 217. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22533/at.ed.22519110919>
- 863 Tarasova TA, Fomin BA (2000) Solar radiation absorption due to water vapor: Advanced broadband
864 parameterizations. *Journal of Applied Meteorology.* **39**: 1947-1951.

- 865 Taylor KE, Williamson D, Zwiers F (2000) “The sea surface temperature and sea ice concentration
866 boundary conditions for AMIP II simulations” PCMDI Report 60, Program for Climate Model Diagnosis
867 and Intercomparison, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, 25 pp
- 868 Toh YY, Turner AG, Johnson SJ , Holloway CE (2018). Maritime Continent seasonal climate biases in
869 AMIP experiments of the CMIP5 multimodel ensemble *Clim Dyn* (2018) Volume 50, Issue 3–4, 777–
870 800. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-017-3641-x>
- 871 Uppala SM and Coauthors (2005) The ERA-40 Re-Analysis. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 131, 2961–
872 3012.
- 873 Velasco, I, Fritsch JM (1987) Mesoscale convective com-plexes in the Americas.*J. Geophys. Res.*, 92,
874 9591–9613.
- 875 Yu H, Kaufman YJ, Chin M, Feingold G, Remer LA, Anderson TL, Balkanski Y, Bellouin N, Boucher
876 O, Christopher S, DeCola P, Kahn R, Koch D, Loeb N, Reddy MS, Schulz M, Takemura T, Zhou M
877 (2006) A review of measurement-based assessments of the aerosol direct radiative effect and forcing.
878 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 6: 613–666.
- 879 Waliser D, Sperber K, Hendon H, Kim D, Maloney E, Wheeler M, Weickmann K, Zhang C, Donner L,
880 Gottschalck J, Higgins W, Kang I-S, Legler D, Moncrieff N, Schubert S, Stern W, Vitart F, Wang B,
881 Wang W, Woolnough S (2009): MJO Simulation Diagnostics. *J. Climate*, 22, 3006-3030.
- 882 Wallace JM, Gutzler DS (1981) Teleconections in the geopotential height field during the Northern
883 Hemisphere winter. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 109, 785-812.
- 884 Wheeler MC, Hendon HH (2004) An all-season real-time multivariate MJO index: Development of an
885 index for monitoring and prediction. *Mon . Wea . Rev.*, 132, 1917–1932.
- 886

1 Table 1: Physical processes components of the Brazilian global atmospheric model version 1.2 (BAM-1.2) used
 2 for performing the AMIP-type climate simulations to be evaluated in this study.

BAM-1.2 physical processes components

Microphysics	Morrison et al. (2005, 2009)
Land Surface	IBIS-CPTEC (Kubota, 2012)
Long-wave radiation	CLIRAD-LW (Chou et al., 2001)
Short-wave radiation	CLIRAD-SW (Chou and Soares, 1999, modified by Tarasova and Fomin, 2000)
Planetary boundary layer	Moist diffusion scheme (Bretherton and Park, 2009)
Deep convection	Revised simplified Arakawa-Shubert (Han and Pan, 2011)
Aerosol optical depth	Yu et al. (2006)
Thermal plume for convective boundary layer	Rio and Hourdin (2008)

3


4

5 Table 2: Summary of observational reference datasets and variables used in this study


Reference dataset	Variables	Reference
ERA-5 reanalysis	Atmospheric circulation Temperature 850 and 200 hPa zonal winds	(Hersbach et al., 2018, 2019)
The International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project (ISCCP)	Cloud amount	(Schiffer and Rossow 1983)
The Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES)	TOA radiation	(Loeb et al., 2018)
The Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP)	Precipitation	(Adler et al., 2003)
The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Southern Oscillation Index (SOI)	Southern Oscillation Index (SOI) Outgoing Longwave Radiation (OLR)	https://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/data/indices/soi (Liebman and Smith 1996)
Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM), 3B42 product, version 7A.	Daily precipitation	(Kummerow et al., 1998; Huffman et al., 2007, 2010)

6

7



1 Figure 1: Global climatological (2001-2016) annual mean top of the atmosphere outgoing longwave
2 radiation (OLR) under clear sky conditions a) derived from satellite (CERES, Loeb et al., 2018), b)
3 simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km), c) simulated by BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km), and d) zonal
4 means of values shown in the maps of panels a), b) and c) for CERES (black line), BAM TQ62L42 (blue
5 line), BAM TQ126L42 (red line). BAM results shown in this figure correspond to the ensemble mean of
6 the performed 4-member simulations. Panels e) to h) are similar to panels a) to d) but for global
7 climatological annual mean top of the atmosphere outgoing shortwave radiation (OSR) under clear sky
8 conditions. Panels i) to l) are similar to panels a) to d) but for global climatological annual mean top of
9 the atmosphere outgoing longwave radiation (OLR) under cloudy conditions. Panels m) to p) are similar
10 to panels a) to d) but for global climatological annual mean top of the atmosphere outgoing shortwave
11 radiation (OSR) under cloudy conditions. The values shown at the bottom left hand corner of each map
12 displayed in this figure are the global means (i.e. the mean of all values shown in the map). The values
13 shown in the panels on the fourth column figures are the mean biases for BAM TQ62L42 (in blue) and
14 BAM TQ126L42 (in red). Units in all panels are $W.m^{-2}$.



1 Figure 2: Global climatological (2001-2016) annual mean top of the atmosphere longwave cloud radiative
 2 forcing (LWCRF) a) derived from satellite (CERES, Loeb et al., 2018), b) simulated by BAM TQ62L42
 3 (~180 km), c) simulated by BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km), and d) zonal means of values shown in the maps
 4 of panels a), b) and c) for CERES (black line), BAM TQ62L42 (blue line), BAM TQ126L42 (red line).
 5 BAM results shown in this figure correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-member
 6 simulations. Panels e) to h) are similar to panels a) to d) but for global climatological annual mean top of
 7 the atmosphere shortwave cloud radiative forcing (SWCRF). Panels i) to l) are similar to panels a) to d)
 8 but for global climatological annual mean top of the atmosphere net cloud radiative forcing (NETCRF).
 9 Panel m) is the global climatological (1984-2008) annual mean low cloud fraction from ISCCP (Schiffer
 10 and Rossow 1983). Panels n) and o) are NETCRF biases for BAM TQ62L42 and BAM TQ126L42,
 11 respectively. Panel p) is the NETCRF bias difference between BAM TQ126L42 and BAM TQ62L42.
 12 The values shown at the bottom left hand corner of maps displayed in this figure are the global means (i.e.
 13 the mean of all values shown in the map). The values shown in the panels on the fourth column figures
 14 are the mean biases for BAM TQ62L42 (in blue) and BAM TQ126L42 (in red). Units in all panels are
 15 $W.m^{-2}$, except for cloud fraction in panel m) which is expressed in percentage.


16

17

18


19

20




1 Figure 3: Vertical climatological (1981-2010) annual zonal mean temperature profile (isolines) from 1000
 2 to 10 hPa (in °C) a) derived from ERA-5 reanalysis (Hersbach et al., 2018, 2019), b) simulated by BAM
 3 TQ62L42 (~180 km), and c) simulated by BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km). BAM results shown in this figure
 4 correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-member simulations. Shading in panels b) and c) are
 5 temperature biases computed as differences between panels b) and c) vertical temperature zonal mean
 6 profiles and panel a) vertical temperature zonal mean profile. Panel d) is the vertical profile of the zonal
 7 mean temperature bias difference between BAM TQ126L42 (panel c) and BAM TQ62L42 (panel b).


8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15



1 Figure 4: Low level (850 hPa) circulation climatological (1981-2010) mean represented by streamlines
 2 with magnitude in $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (colors) for austral summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter
 3 (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row) derived from ERA-5 (Hersbach et al., 2018, 2019, first
 4 column), simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, second column), and simulated by BAM TQ126L42
 5 (~100 km, third column). The fourth column contains the zonal mean of the zonal mean wind component
 6 (black line for ERA-5, blue line for BAM TQ62L42 and red line for BAM TQ126L42) used for
 7 producing the panels in the first 3 columns. The values shown in the bottom right of the panels on the
 8 fourth column figures are the mean biases for BAM TQ62L42 (in blue) and BAM TQ126L42 (in red) in
 9 $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. BAM results shown in this figure correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-member
 10 simulations.



1 Figure 5: Upper level (200 hPa) circulation climatological (1981-2010) mean represented by streamlines
 2 with magnitude in $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (colors) for austral summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter
 3 (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row) derived from ERA-5 (Hersbach et al., 2018, 2019, first
 4 column), simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, second column), and simulated by BAM TQ126L42
 5 (~100 km, third column). The fourth column contains the zonal mean of the zonal mean wind component
 6 (black line for ERA-5, blue line for BAM TQ62L42 and red line for BAM TQ126L42) used for
 7 producing the panels in the first 3 columns. The values shown in the bottom right of the panels on the
 8 fourth column figures are the mean biases for BAM TQ62L42 (in blue) and BAM TQ126L42 (in red) in
 9 $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. BAM results shown in this figure correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-member
 10 simulations.




1 Figure 6: Vertical climatological (1981-2010) seasonal zonal mean profile of the zonal wind component
 2 (isolines) from 1000 to 10 hPa (in $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) for austral summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second
 3 row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row) derived from ERA-5 reanalysis (Hersbach et
 4 al., 2018, 2019, first column), simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, second column), and simulated by
 5 BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, third column). BAM results shown in this figure correspond to the ensemble
 6 mean of the performed 4-member simulations. Shading in the second and third column panels are zonal
 7 mean biases computed as differences between the second and third column panels vertical zonal mean
 8 profiles and the vertical zonal mean profile of the first column. The panels on the fourth column are the
 9 vertical profiles of the zonal mean bias difference between BAM TQ126L42 (third column) and BAM
 10 TQ62L42 (second column).

11

12


13



1 Figure 7: Accumulated precipitation climatological (1981-2010) mean (in mm) for austral summer (DJF,
2 first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row) derived
3 from GPCP (Adler et al. 2003, first column), simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, second column),
4 and simulated by BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, third column). The values shown in the bottom left of the
5 first three column figures are the global mean accumulated precipitation (in mm) for the maps shown in
6 each panel. The fourth column contains the zonal mean accumulated precipitation (black line for GPCP,
7 blue line for BAM TQ62L42 and red line for BAM TQ126L42) used for producing the panels in the first
8 three columns. The values shown in the bottom right of the panels on the fourth column figures are the mean
9 biases (in mm) for BAM TQ62L42 (in blue) and BAM TQ126L42 (in red). BAM results shown in this
10 figure correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-member simulations.


11

12



1 Figure 8: Accumulated precipitation mean bias (in mm) over the 1981-2010 period for austral summer
 2 (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row), for
 3 BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, first column) and BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, second column). Biases were
 4 computed as the difference between the model simulated climatological mean for BAM TQ62L42
 5 (second column in Figure 7) and for BAM TQ126L42 (third column in Figure 7) and the corresponding
 6 GPCP climatological mean (Adler et al. 2003, first column in Figure 7). The panels on the third column
 7 are the mean bias differences between BAM TQ126L42 (second column) and BAM TQ62L42 (first
 8 column).

9
 10
 11




1 Figure 9: Accumulated precipitation standard deviation (in mm) over the 1981-2010 period for austral
 2 summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth
 3 row), derived from GPCP (Adler et al., 2003, first column), and simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km,
 4 second column) and by BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, third column). BAM standard deviations were
 5 computed using all four individual ensemble members (not the ensemble mean) for each investigated
 6 model spatial resolution in order avoid filtering out through the ensemble mean the model simulated
 7 precipitation inter-annual variability.

8


9

10



1 Figure 10: Correlation between the Southern Oscillation Index (SOI) and precipitation anomalies over the
 2 1981-2010 period for austral summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third
 3 row) and spring (SON, fourth row), derived from observations (NOAA SOI and GPCP, first column) and
 4 simulated by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, second column) and by BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, third
 5 column). The values shown in the bottom left panels are the pattern correlations with the observed pattern
 6 (first column). BAM results shown in this figure correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-
 7 member simulations.

8
 9




1 Figure 11: Correlation between observed precipitation anomalies (GPCP, Adler et al., 2003) and
 2 simulated precipitation anomalies by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, first column) and BAM TQ126L42
 3 (~100 km, second column), over the 1981-2010 period for austral summer (DJF, first row), autumn
 4 (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row). Correlation values above 0.36
 5 are statistically significant and different from zero using the Student's t-test at the 10% level. The values
 6 shown in the bottom left panels of the maps in the first and second columns are the mean of the
 7 correlation values shown in the maps computed over the tropics (T, global mean between 30°S and 30°N)
 8 and over the entire globe (G, global mean between 90°S and 90°N). The maps shown in the fourth
 9 column are the correlation differences between BAM TQ126L42 (second column) and BAM TQ62L42 (first
 10 column). Only statistically significant differences at the 10% level determined through a bootstrap
 11 resampling procedure with replacement computed with 1000 samples are shown. BAM results shown in
 12 this figure correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-member simulations.

13

14

1



2 Figure 12: MJO life cycle composite represented by the mean of OLR (shading) and the zonal wind
3 component at 200 hPa (contours) anomalies of all days during the November to April 1981-2010 period
4 when the MJO was in phases (PH) 1 to 8 (as defined by Wheeler and Hendon, 2004) derived from
5 observations (NOAA OLR and ERA-5 200 hPa zonal wind, first column) and simulated by BAM
6 TQ62L42 (second column) and BAM TQ126L42 (third column). MJO phases for both observations and
7 model simulations were computed using the diagnostics package described in Waliser et al. (2009). BAM
8 composites for each of the 8 phases were first computed for each ensemble member separately and next
9 the mean of these composites were computed and are shown here in the panels of the second and third
10 columns. Note that the OLR color scales for the observations and BAM simulations are different as
11 indicated in the color bars.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21


22

23


24

25


a. 2D PDF (colors) for TRMM at T62





b. 2D PDF (colors) for BAM at T62




c. 2D PDF (colors) for TRMM at T126




d. 2D PDF (colors) for BAM at T126




e. 7×7 regions for TRMM T62




f. 7×7 regions for BAM T62



g. 7×7 regions for TRMM T126



h. 7×7 regions for BAM T126



0.050.150.250.350.450.550.650.750.850.95
Correlation with (0,0) - mean over all sub-regions

1

2 Figure 13: Joint (two-dimensional, 2-D) probability density function (colors, in logarithmic scale) of
3 binned values (bin intervals are shown in the horizontal and left vertical axes) of daily precipitation at the
4 same grid point on consecutive days, and one dimensional (1-D) probability density function (dashed
5 line) of daily precipitation using the right-hand side axis, aggregated over all grid points within the
6 southeast South America (15-40°S, 60-35°W) for the period 1998-2017, a) derived from TRMM
7 (Kummerow et al., 1998; Huffman et al., 2007, 2010) interpolated to T62 spatial resolution (~180 km), b)
8 simulated by all four BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km) ensemble members, c) derived from TRMM interpolated
9 to T126 spatial resolution (~100 km), and d) simulated by all four BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km) ensemble
10 members. Mean instantaneous (lag-0) correlations of daily gridded precipitation 1998-2017 time series at
11 all grid points within a 7 x 7 grid point sub-region within the southeast South America region (15-40°S,
12 60-35°W), against the precipitation time series at the central grid point (0,0) of each 7 x 7 grid point sub-
13 region, averaged over all possible non-overlapping 7 x 7 grid point sub-regions within the southeast South
14 America region, e) derived from TRMM interpolated to T62 spatial resolution (~180 km), f) simulated
15 by BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km), g) derived from TRMM interpolated to T126 spatial resolution (~100
16 km), and h) simulated by BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km). The values for BAM in panels f) and h) are
17 averages of the mean instantaneous correlation values obtained for the four individual ensemble
18 members. The printed values and filled blocks in panels e) to h) show the same data. See Klingaman et al.
19 (2017) and Martin et al. (2017) for further information on how these figures are produced.

20

21

This online resource contains supplementary figures for the paper: Evaluation of climate simulations produced with the Brazilian Global Atmospheric Model version 1.2

Journal: Climate Dynamics

Autors: Caio. A. S. Coelho¹, Dayana C. de Souza¹, Paulo Y. Kubota¹, Simone M. S. C. Coelho¹, Layrson Menezes¹, Bruno S. Guimarães¹, Silvio N. Figueroa¹, José P. Bonatti¹, Iracema F. A. Cavalcanti¹, Gilvan Sampaio¹, Nicholas P. Klingaman², and Jessica C. A. Baker³

¹*Centro de Previsão de Tempo e Estudos Climáticos (CPTEC), Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE), Rodovia Presidente Dutra, Km 40, SP-RJ, Cachoeira Paulista, SP 12630-000, Brazil*

²*National Centre for Atmospheric Science–Climate and Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Earley Gate, P.O. Box 243, Reading, Berkshire RG6 6BB, UK*

³*School of Earth and Environment, Institute for Climate and Atmospheric Science, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK*

Corresponding e-mail address: caio.coelho@inpe.br




Figure S1: Global annual mean bias (first two columns) and root mean squared error (RMSE, last two columns) in $W.m^2$, for BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, first and third columns), for BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, second and fourth columns), computed with respect to satellite data (CERES, Loeb et al., 2018) over the 2001-2016 period, for: top of the atmosphere outgoing longwave radiation (OLR) under clear sky conditions (first row), top of the atmosphere outgoing shortwave radiation (OSR) under clear sky conditions (second row), top of the atmosphere OLR under cloudy conditions (third row), and top of the atmosphere OSR under cloudy conditions (fourth row). BAM results shown in this figure correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-member simulations.




Figure S2 Global annual mean bias (first two columns) and root mean squared error (RMSE, last two columns) in $W.m^2$, for BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, first and third columns), for BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, second and fourth columns), computed with respect to satellite data (CERES, Loeb et al., 2018) over the 2001-2016 period, for: top of the atmosphere longwave cloud radiative forcing (LWCRF, first row), and top of the atmosphere shortwave cloud radiative forcing (SWCRF, second row). BAM results shown in this figure correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-member simulations.




Figure S3: Low level (850 hPa) circulation mean bias represented by streamlines with magnitude in $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (colors) for austral summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row), for BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, first column), and BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, second column), computed with respect to ERA-5 (Hersbach et al., 2018, 2019) over the 2001-2016 period. BAM results shown in this figure correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-member simulations.




Figure S4: Upper level (200 hPa) circulation mean bias represented by streamlines with magnitude in $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (colors) for austral summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row), for BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, first column), and BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, second column), computed with respect to ERA-5 (Hersbach et al., 2018, 2019) over the 2001-2016 period. BAM results shown in this figure correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-member simulations.




Figure S5: Accumulated precipitation RMSE (in mm) for austral summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row), for BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, first column), and BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, second column), computed with respect to GPCP (Adler et al. 2003) over the 1981-2010 period. BAM results shown in this figure correspond to the ensemble mean of the performed 4-member simulations.




Figure S6: Accumulated precipitation standard deviation bias (in mm) for austral summer (DJF, first row), autumn (MAM, second row), winter (JJA, third row) and spring (SON, fourth row), for BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km, first column) and BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km, second column), computed with respect to GPCP (Adler et al., 2003) over the 1981-2010 period. BAM standard deviations were computed using all four individual ensemble members (not the ensemble mean) for each investigated model spatial resolution in order avoid filtering out through the ensemble mean the model simulated precipitation inter-annual variability.




Figure S7: Joint (two-dimensional, 2-D) probability density function (colors, in logarithmic scale) of binned values (bin intervals are shown in the horizontal and left vertical axes) of daily precipitation at the same grid point on consecutive days, and one dimensional (1-D) probability density function (dashed line) of daily precipitation using the right-hand side axis, aggregated over all grid points during the 1998-2017 period, for 5 regions (rows): Southern Australia (*S. Aus.*) [45-20°S, 110-135°E], Southern Africa (*S. Afr.*) [35-10°S, 15-40°E], Eastern Asia (*E. Asia*) [20-45°N, 105-130°E], Southern Europe (*S. Eur.*) [20-45°N, 5°W-20°E] and Southeast North America (*SE N. Am.*) [20-45°N, 100-75°W]. The first column shows plots derived from TRMM (Kummerow et al., 1998; Huffman et al., 2007, 2010) interpolated to T62 spatial resolution (~180 km), the second column for all four BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km) ensemble members, the third column for TRMM interpolated to T126 spatial resolution (~100 km), and the fourth column for all four BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km) ensemble members. See Klingaman et al. (2017) and Martin et al. (2017) for further information on how these figures are produced.




Figure S8: Mean instantaneous (lag-0) correlations of daily gridded precipitation 1998-2017 time series at all grid points within a 7 x 7 grid point sub-region within 5 regions (rows), Southern Australia (*S. Aus.*) [45-20°S, 110-135°E], Southern Africa (*S. Afr.*) [35-10°S, 15-40°E], Eastern Asia (*E. Asia*) [20-45°N, 105-130°E], Southern Europe (*S. Eur.*) [20-45°N, 5°W-20°E] and Southeast North America (*SE N. Am.*) [20-45°N, 100-75°W], against the precipitation time series at the central grid point (0,0) of each 7 x 7 grid point sub-region, averaged over all possible non-overlapping 7 x 7 grid point sub-regions within the five investigated regions. The first column shows plots derived from TRMM interpolated to T62 spatial resolution (~180 km), the second column for BAM TQ62L42 (~180 km), the third column for TRMM interpolated to T126 spatial resolution (~100 km), and the fourth column for BAM TQ126L42 (~100 km). The values for BAM (second and fourth columns) are averages of the mean instantaneous correlation values for the four individual ensemble members. The printed values and filled blocks in panels show the

same data. See Klingaman et al. (2017) and Martin et al. (2017) for further information on how these figures are produced.