

1 **An investigation on causes of the detected surface solar radiation**
2 **brightening in Europe using satellite data**

3 **Linda Schilliger^{1,2}, Anke Tetzlaff¹, Quentin Bourgeois¹, Lucas Ferreira Correa², and Martin**
4 **Wild²**

5 ¹Federal Office for Meteorology and Climatology (MeteoSwiss), Zurich, Switzerland

6 ²Institute for Atmospheric and Climate Science, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

7 **Key Points:**

- 8 • CM SAF Land Flux v1.0 surface solar radiation data agree well with station-based mea-
9 surements over Europe, also at high-altitude locations.
10 • The direct aerosol effect was the main driver of the European brightening from 1983 to
11 2000. Changes in cloudiness rather counteracted it.
12 • After 2000 the brightening in Europe was dominated by the cloud effect, whereas the aerosol
13 effect resulted rather negligible.

Corresponding author: Linda Schilliger, linda.schilliger@meteoswiss.ch

Abstract

Surface solar radiation is fundamental for terrestrial life. It provides warmth to make our planet habitable, drives atmospheric circulation, the hydrological cycle and photosynthesis. Europe has experienced an increase in surface solar radiation, termed "brightening", since the 1980s. This study investigates the causative factors behind this brightening. A novel algorithm from the EU-METSAT satellite application facility on climate monitoring (CM SAF) provides the unique opportunity to simulate surface solar radiation under various atmospheric conditions for clouds (clear-sky or all-sky), aerosol optical depth (time-varying or climatological averages) and water vapor content (with or without its direct influence on surface solar radiation). Through a multiple linear regression approach, the study attributes brightening trends to changes in these atmospheric parameters. Analyzing 61 locations distributed across Europe from 1983 to 2020, aerosols emerge as key driver during 1983-2002, with Southern Europe and high elevations showing subdued effects (0-1%/decade) versus more pronounced impacts in Northern and Eastern Europe (2-6%/decade). Cloud effects exhibit spatial variability, inducing a negative effect on surface solar radiation (-3 to -2%/decade) at most investigated locations in the same period. In the subsequent period 2001-2020, aerosol effects are negligible, while cloud effects dominate the observed brightening (2-5%/decade). This study therefore finds a substantial decrease in the cloud radiative forcing over Europe in the first two decades of the 21st century. Water vapor exerts negligible influence in both sub-periods.

Plain Language Summary

This study explores the recent increase in surface solar radiation in Europe, commonly referred to as "brightening", which began in the mid-1980s. Surface solar radiation is crucial for life on Earth, fostering warmth, shaping wind patterns, and fueling the hydrological cycle and photosynthesis. Utilizing data derived from satellites, we simulated surface solar radiation under different atmospheric conditions regarding clouds, aerosols, and water vapor. This allowed us to separate the individual effects and analyze their contributions to the observed brightening across 61 locations in Europe from 1983 to 2020. We find that the decrease in aerosols was the dominant driver for the brightening during the initial period from 1983 to 2002. Southern Europe and high-elevation areas showed modest aerosol effects, while Northern and Eastern Europe experienced higher values. Cloud effects were predominantly negative (decreasing surface solar radiation) at most locations. However, between 2001 and 2020 the aerosol effect resulted negligible and the brightening was mostly attributed to a decrease in cloudiness during that sub-period. Water vapor was found to have a negligible impact on surface solar radiation trends.

1 Introduction

Solar radiation incident upon Earth's surface, also referred to as surface solar radiation or surface incoming solar radiation (SIS) represents the primary energy source for life on our planet. It governs a multitude of environmental processes. Not only does it provide heat directly to our environments, it also plays a crucial role in the global hydrological cycle by providing energy for evaporation, enabling photosynthesis, supporting plant growth, and inducing pressure gradients that influence atmospheric circulation patterns. Given its fundamental role in creating habitable environments, Earth is greatly sensitive to potential variations in surface solar radiation. This sensitivity extends to solar power generation, as solar power plants are receiving strong interest due to their potential as renewable energy sources (Wild, 2012; Jacobson & Delucchi, 2011; Zou et al., 2019). Due to being of such high importance for numerous essential processes, the analysis of surface solar radiation trends and their causes is crucial. Several studies (e.g., Ohmura, 1989; Stanhill & Moreshet, 1992; Liepert, Fabian, & Grassl, 1994; Gilgen, Wild, & Ohmura, 1998; Gilgen, Roesch, Wild, & Ohmura, 2009; Sanchez-Lorenzo et al., 2015) have found a negative surface solar radiation trend (dimming) over land regions until the mid-1980s, spanning approximately three decades. Studies have found indications of a weakened hydrological cycle (e.g., Liepert, Feichter, Lohmann, & Roeckner, 2004; Liepert & Romanou, 2005) and a reduction of

64 the diurnal surface temperature range (Wild et al., 2007) during this dimming phase. Furthermore,
65 this dimming has masked the global warming to some extent (Murphy et al., 2009; Wild et al.,
66 2007; Wild, 2016). More recent studies have further highlighted the importance of quantifying
67 surface solar radiation trends by finding the shortwave warming to be a larger contributor to the
68 global warming than the long-wave warming (greenhouse effect) (Philipona et al., 2009). From
69 around 1985 up to recent times a positive trend (brightening) has been found at many locations
70 (Wild et al., 2005; Gilgen et al., 2009; Sanchez-Lorenzo et al., 2015). However, the brightening
71 period is not as globally discovered as the dimming period (e.g., no brightening in India, Padma Ku-
72 mari & Goswami, 2010; Wild, 2009). After 2000, the brightening has exhibited reduced inten-
73 sity in some regions, such as China and Japan. In contrast, Europe and the USA have experienced
74 continued brightening, albeit with some indications of stabilization in recent years (Wild et al.,
75 2005, 2021).

76 As the surface solar radiation variability is larger than the variability of the solar output,
77 global dimming and brightening cannot be explained by variations in extraterrestrial solar irra-
78 diance (Foukal et al., 2006), making Earth's atmosphere responsible for them. In dimming times,
79 the atmosphere is more opaque and therefore more solar radiation is reflected back to space and
80 less is let through the atmosphere towards Earth's surface, eventually cooling Earth. Less reflec-
81 tion and more solar radiation coming through the atmosphere heat up Earth's surface during bright-
82 ening times. Changes in atmospheric aerosol concentration or clouds have been suggested as causes
83 of dimming and brightening periods. The majority of studies come to the conclusion that changes
84 in aerosol particle concentration in the atmosphere were the main driver of the recent positive
85 surface solar radiation trends (Wild et al., 2005; Norris & Wild, 2007; Ruckstuhl et al., 2008; Ohvri
86 et al., 2009; Philipona et al., 2009; Zerefos et al., 2009; Folini & Wild, 2011; Nabat et al., 2014;
87 Wild et al., 2021; Julsrud et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2023; Dong et al., 2023). Aerosol optical depth
88 is majorly influenced by anthropogenic emissions, especially sulfur and also black carbon (Streets
89 et al., 2009). Vestreng et al. (2007) reported a 60% decrease in sulfur emissions (one of the most
90 abundant aerosol particles in the atmosphere) between 1990 and 2004 in Europe, supporting the
91 theory of an important aerosol effect on the observed brightening during this period. However,
92 recent analysis of satellite-derived data showed that the same trend is still visible when using a
93 constant aerosol climatology, implying that only changes in cloudiness were responsible for the
94 observed brightening from 1983 to 2010 (Sanchez-Lorenzo et al., 2017), respective from 1983
95 to 2015 (Pfeifroth et al., 2018). Additionally, focusing on the Iberian Peninsula and the period
96 2003 to 2012, Mateos et al. (2014) found a dominant cloud effect on surface solar radiation trends.
97 Ferreira Correa et al. (2023) analyzed the Alpine region, while distinguishing between high and
98 low elevation sites. They found strong evidence that, together with a surface albedo effect, changes
99 in cloud optical depth were the primary effect causing the observed surface solar radiation trends
100 at high elevation stations. At low elevation sites, however, they identified a strong aerosol effect
101 causing the surface solar radiation trends.

102 Despite numerous investigations into this subject, the precise contributions of aerosols and
103 clouds, along with their spatial distribution, remain unclear. This study endeavours to quantify
104 the effects that have contributed to the recent brightening in Europe and to illustrate their geo-
105 graphic distribution utilizing newly generated satellite-derived data from the EUMETSAT Satel-
106 lite Application Facility on Climate Monitoring (CM SAF). With the applied algorithm, it is pos-
107 sible to separate cloud, direct aerosol and water vapour effects by combining different simula-
108 tions. In addition to analyzing the entire temporal span covering the period from 1983 to 2020,
109 we scrutinize two distinct sub-periods: 1983 to 2020 and 2001 to 2020. This is motivated for two
110 reasons: First, major efforts to reduce anthropogenic aerosol emissions took place in the 1980s
111 and 1990s. Therefore, we consider the first sub-period as representative for the decline in anthro-
112 pogenic aerosol particles and the second sub-period for more stable conditions. Second, the two
113 sub-periods can also be dynamically justified, considering the decadal variability in the predom-
114 inance of different atmospheric regimes. The initial sub-period is predominantly characterized
115 by positive phases of the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO), particularly during the 1990s. Posi-
116 tive NAO is generally associated with above-average precipitation and cloudiness. During the
117 second sub-period NAO positive phases occurred less frequently and were less intense. In con-

118 trast, in particular winters around 2010 were dominated by negative phases of NAO, which are
119 generally associated with less precipitation and cloudiness (Weisheimer et al., 2017; Papritz &
120 Grams, 2018; Climate Prediction Center, 2024; National Weather Service - NOAA, 2024). The
121 temporal split is robust and substantiated by supplementary material figures. We tested the sen-
122 sitivity of the choice of the exact year for the split of the two sub-periods and found no substan-
123 tial impact on our results (see Supplementary Material Figures S1 to S6).

124 **2 Data**

125 **2.1 Satellite-Derived Data**

126 This investigation utilized the CM SAF Meteosat Land Flux v1.0 Surface Radiation Bud-
127 get (SRB) dataset (Bourgeois & Duguay-Tetzlaff, 2023), which was derived through the appli-
128 cation of the "GeoSatClim" algorithm developed by MeteoSwiss to raw data sourced from the
129 Meteosat satellite. This dataset encompasses all components of the SRB, including absorbed sur-
130 face solar radiation, albedo, surface downward radiation, surface outgoing radiation, as well as
131 latent and sensible heat fluxes, which were jointly retrieved with similar boundary conditions.
132 Data is available for the period 1983/01/01 to 2020/12/31 with an hourly resolution and a spa-
133 tial resolution of $0.05^\circ \times 0.05^\circ$ longitude and latitude covering the geographic extent of $\pm 75^\circ$ lon-
134 gitude and $\pm 75^\circ$ latitude of the Meteosat disk.

135 The GeoSatClim software incorporates a physical retrieval scheme originally developed
136 by Stoeckli (2017) and subsequently adapted to GeoSatClim by Bourgeois and Duguay-Tetzlaff
137 (2023). With GeoSatClim, the Heliosat approach (Cano et al., 1986; Mueller et al., 2009) is ex-
138 panded to encompass the infrared spectrum with the addition of a cloud optical depth calcula-
139 tion for both visible and infrared channels. These additional features enhance the performance,
140 particularly in regions characterized by snow-covered mountains (Bourgeois & Duguay-Tetzlaff,
141 2023). The GeoSatClim SIS retrieval is entirely based on the new inter-calibrated Meteosat EU-
142 METSAT radiances. Consequently, the decadal stability of the CM SAF Land Flux SIS is con-
143 tingent on the quality of the new Meteosat calibration.

144 The computation of surface solar radiation requires cloud optical parameters, which are
145 retrieved from the satellite, values of the atmospheric gas concentration, information about so-
146 lar and viewing angles, the surface albedo, that is also retrieved by the satellite, and information
147 about the aerosol optical depth (AOD). Time-varying aerosol optical depth information is taken
148 from model-based estimates that include pre-industrial natural aerosol and emission estimates
149 (Fiedler, Kinne, et al., 2019) and information on different emission scenarios (Fiedler, Stevens,
150 et al., 2019). For the natural aerosols the monthly climatology MACv2 was used and the anthro-
151 pogenic aerosol MACv2-SP information was considered for the period 1979 to 2014. The SSP2-
152 45 emission scenario was utilized to model the anthropogenic aerosol optical depth for the pe-
153 riod 2015 to 2020, since this data set was derived already some time ago. In addition to the tropo-
154 spheric aerosols, stratospheric aerosol information from NASA GISS was incorporated (NASA,
155 2016). To generate the published CM SAF Land Flux data daily varying aerosols were used, thus
156 accounting for the aerosol-induced brightening in the operational CM SAF Land Flux SIS data.
157 Additionally, MeteoSwiss has generated SIS data employing an aerosol climatology using the
158 CM SAF algorithm. The constant daily aerosol climatology is derived from the Copernicus At-
159 mosphere Monitoring Service (CAMS) reanalysis produced by the European Centre for Medium-
160 Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) (Inness et al., 2019). The AOD is bilinearly interpolated
161 to the Meteosat grid from a $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ longitude and latitude resolution and temporally inter-
162 polated from 6-hour estimates to match the Meteosat temporal resolution. Moreover, a dataset
163 devoid of direct influence from water vapor concentration on SIS was processed. The primary
164 data utilized in this study comprises outputs generated by GeoSatClim, incorporating various con-
165 figurations pertaining to clouds, aerosol input, and water vapor content. All analyses and sub-
166 sequent conclusions drawn in this study are based exclusively on the examination of these datasets.

167

2.2 Station Data

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

To validate the satellite-derived data, data from the Global Energy Balance Archive (GEBA) (Wild et al., 2017) was employed for all locations beyond Switzerland. While the GEBA station data is not homogenized, datasets from Italy and Spain utilized in this study are derived from individually homogenized sources (Manara et al. (2016) for Italy, Sanchez-Lorenzo et al. (2013) for Spain). Norris and Wild (2007) demonstrated a strong agreement between ISCCP-FD (second generation of the International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project) all-sky flux and GEBA data on interannual timescales, affirming the reliability of GEBA measurements also on extended timescales. The GEBA data spans consistently from 1983/01/01 to 2015/12/31 across all considered locations, thereby restricting the validation of the satellite dataset to this timeframe. GEBA data, provided as monthly means, were processed according to protocols outlined on the WRDC (World Radiation Data Centre) website (http://wrdc.mgo.rssi.ru/wrdc_en_new.htm).

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

For validation within Switzerland, the newly homogenized ground measurements from MeteoSwiss (Swiss Met Net, SMN) were employed. These data provide monthly mean values for the period 1983/01/01 to 2020/12/31. Daily averages were calculated from instantaneous 10-minute measurements, with the aggregation of all daily means within a month yielding the monthly means. The averaging process tolerates 24 missing 10-minute values for the daily means, with a constraint that no more than 14 consecutive missing values are permissible. In the most extreme scenario, this tolerance allows for the calculation of a daily mean even in the presence of a two-hour data gap around noon, which could potentially create a bias. Furthermore, when aggregating the daily to the monthly means, a maximum of 5 daily values can be absent with no more than 3 consecutive gaps tolerated.

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

For this investigation, a selection of 61 stations across Europe, providing continuous data, was chosen to serve as reference points in the validation procedure and for all further analysis. Among these stations 53 are located outside of Switzerland and were chosen as per table 1 in Pfeifroth et al. (2018). They checked the quality of the ground measurement data (GEBA) at these locations and they are relatively equally distributed covering different climate zones. In Switzerland a total of 8 stations was selected, including four low and four higher elevation locations. Very high altitude locations (altitude > 3000 meters) were excluded, as in mountainous (inhomogeneous) terrain area-wide satellite measurements cannot be compared to a point measurement.

197

3 Methodology

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

Satellites are incapable of directly measuring surface solar radiation. Instead, they measure the outgoing radiation at the top of atmosphere across specific spectral bands. This signal is substantially influenced by clouds, enabling the derivation of cloud cover or cloud optical depth from these measurements. Clear-sky surface solar radiation is estimated through physical modelling, which involves radiative transfer simulations using atmospheric water vapor, ozone and aerosols as input parameters. Water vapor and ozone data are sourced exclusively from ERA5 reanalysis data provided by ECMWF. The cloud information, retrieved directly from satellite radiances, is then employed to adjust the modelled clear-sky surface solar radiation to obtain the estimates of all-sky surface solar radiation. CM SAF's satellite algorithm GeoSatClim calculates both all-sky (SIS) and clear-sky (SISCF) surface solar radiation. It also provides the unique opportunity of two options regarding the aerosol input. The surface solar radiation can be simulated using modelled aerosol input with long-term variability, denoted as "CMIP" (since these aerosol data align with those utilized in models participating in CMIP6), or employing a daily aerosol climatology, labelled as "CLIM". Additionally, a dataset excluding the direct effect of water vapor on SIS, labelled as "noWV", can be generated. Combining these options differently allows the separation of cloud, direct aerosol and water vapor effects. This feature is the key that enables conducting the current study. GeoSatClim processes the corresponding datasets for all required combinations of the mentioned options for clouds, aerosol input and water vapor influence. It returns instantaneous values at intervals of 15 or 30 minutes (depending on the satellite generation, MVIRI or SEVIRI respectively) for the specific grid cell corresponding to the input coordinates.

218 These computations span the period 1983/01/01 to 2020/21/31. The specific locations and their
 219 corresponding input coordinates are listed in Appendix A. A total of 61 locations in Europe were
 220 subject to analysis.

221 For this study, a novel multiple linear regression model incorporating clouds, aerosols and
 222 water vapor as predictor variables was developed. The cloud signal was calculated as the ratio
 223 of all-sky radiation to clear-sky radiation, using time-varying aerosols both times as depicted by
 224 Equation 1. The water vapor signal was computed as the ratio of radiation with water vapor in-
 225 fluence to radiation unaffected by water vapor directly using the time-varying aerosol input, as
 226 represented by Equation 2. The aerosol signal was determined as the ratio of all-sky radiation
 227 calculated using time-varying aerosols to all-sky radiation obtained using the aerosol climatol-
 228 ogy. It is described by Equation 3.

$$Clouds_t = \frac{SIS_t}{SISCF_t} \quad (1)$$

$$Water.vapor_t = \frac{SIS_t}{SIS.noWV_t} \quad (2)$$

$$Aerosols_t = \frac{SIS_t}{SIS.CLIM_t} \quad (3)$$

231 For each of the three signals, deseasonalized relative anomalies were computed. This ef-
 232 fectively removes a significant portion of the seasonal variability. In Equations 4 to 7, S, C, A
 233 and W denote the logarithmic forms of the relative deseasonalized anomalies of SIS, Clouds, Aerosols
 234 and Water.vapor, respectively. These variables serve as the primary predictors of the regression
 235 model. The logarithm transformation is essential to compensate for the inherent skewness in the
 236 distribution of the ratios, thereby ensuring a theoretical condition for linear regression.

$$S = \ln\left(\frac{SIS_t}{SIS_0}\right) \quad (4)$$

$$C = \ln\left(\frac{Clouds_t}{Clouds_0}\right) \quad (5)$$

$$A = \ln\left(\frac{Aerosols_t}{Aerosols_0}\right) \quad (6)$$

$$W = \ln\left(\frac{Water.vapor_t}{Water.vapor_0}\right) \quad (7)$$

240 Relative anomalies have the advantage of allowing a better spatial and seasonal intercom-
 241 parison. However, it should be taken into account that during winter satellite-based cloud detec-
 242 tion encounters increased challenges, primarily attributable to the visual similarity between cloud
 243 cover and snow. Any erroneous cloud identification during this season significantly influences
 244 the observed relative brightening due to the lower radiation levels.

245 To account for seasonality, harmonic functions of first (Equations 8 and 9) and second (Equa-
 246 tions 10 and 11) generation were included for the cloud, the aerosol and the water vapor predic-
 247 tor, as well as for the intercept (indicated with $_{int}$).

$$cos1 = \cos\left(\left(\frac{2\pi}{12}\right) \cdot month\right) \quad (8)$$

$$sin1 = \sin\left(\left(\frac{2\pi}{12}\right) \cdot month\right) \quad (9)$$

$$cos2 = \cos\left(\left(\frac{2\pi}{6}\right) \cdot month\right) \quad (10)$$

$$sin2 = \sin\left(\left(\frac{2\pi}{6}\right) \cdot month\right) \quad (11)$$

251
252

Adding an interactional component between clouds and water vapor as another predictor slightly improved the model further.

253
254
255
256
257
258
259

The final model, as represented by Equation 12, incorporates all aforementioned components, including an error term ϵ comprising residuals. This model attributes the identified trend in SIS (Equation 4) to the specific predictors. Individual model runs were performed for all locations. Assessment of the model's goodness of fit involved the calculation of the adjusted R-squared. Across all examined locations, an adjusted R-squared exceeding 95% was attained, with the majority exceeding 97%. These exceptionally high values indicate the model's capability to explain the variability in surface solar radiation.

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(t) = & \theta_{\text{int}} + \theta_{\text{int,cos1}} \cdot \cos 1 + \theta_{\text{int,sin1}} \cdot \sin 1 + \theta_{\text{int,cos2}} \cdot \cos 2 + \theta_{\text{int,sin2}} \cdot \sin 2 + \\
 & C(t) \cdot (\theta_C + \theta_{C,\cos 1} \cdot \cos 1 + \theta_{C,\sin 1} \cdot \sin 1 + \theta_{C,\cos 2} \cdot \cos 2 + \theta_{C,\sin 2} \cdot \sin 2) + \\
 & A(t) \cdot (\theta_A + \theta_{A,\cos 1} \cdot \cos 1 + \theta_{A,\sin 1} \cdot \sin 1 + \theta_{A,\cos 2} \cdot \cos 2 + \theta_{A,\sin 2} \cdot \sin 2) + \\
 & W(t) \cdot (\theta_W + \theta_{W,\cos 1} \cdot \cos 1 + \theta_{W,\sin 1} \cdot \sin 1 + \theta_{W,\cos 2} \cdot \cos 2 + \theta_{W,\sin 2} \cdot \sin 2) + \\
 & WxC(t) \cdot \theta_{WxC} + \epsilon(t)
 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

260
261
262
263
264
265

Linear trends in the main predictors (A, C, W, and their interactional term WxC) and the predictand (S) were computed for each month of the year, denoted as β_x for variable x. To ascertain the contribution of the individual effects (A, C, W, and WxC) in each month of the year, β was multiplied by the best estimate of the regression model denoted by θ , while considering the inclusion of four harmonics for A, C, and W. The example below focuses on the aerosol parameter, yet it is analogous for both the clouds and water vapor parameters.

$$\Lambda_A = \beta_A \cdot (\theta_A + \theta_{A,\cos 1} \cdot \cos 1 + \theta_{A,\sin 1} \cdot \sin 1 + \theta_{A,\cos 2} \cdot \cos 2 + \theta_{A,\sin 2} \cdot \sin 2) \tag{13}$$

266
267

The part in brackets can be summarized to θ_{tot} . Λ_A is the relative trend contribution of A for the respective month for A being in the logarithmic form.

$$\Lambda_A = \beta_A \cdot \theta_{A,\text{tot}} \tag{14}$$

268
269
270

In the framework of the global brightening analysis, the slope is the focus of investigation. Equation 15 shows the respective equation excluding the intercept. β_ϵ represents the trend in the residuals.

$$\beta_S = \beta_A \cdot \theta_{A,\text{tot}} + \beta_C \cdot \theta_{C,\text{tot}} + \beta_W \cdot \theta_{W,\text{tot}} + \beta_{WxC} \cdot \theta_{WxC} + \beta_\epsilon \tag{15}$$

271
272
273
274
275
276

The natural logarithm was introduced for all terms in the regression equation. Its mathematical elimination was necessary, in order to be able to properly interpret the outcome. Equation 15 was multiplied with $dt = t_2 - t_1$ in order to determine the period over which the relative trend is calculated. β_S indicates how large the relative difference (the factorial change) in SIS between t_1 and t_2 is. $dt = t_2 - t_1 = 10$ years represents the relative decadal difference. The equation is presented in its exponential form in Equation 16.

$$\exp(\beta_S \cdot dt) = \exp(\beta_A \cdot \theta_{A,\text{tot}} \cdot dt + \beta_C \cdot \theta_{C,\text{tot}} \cdot dt + \beta_W \cdot \theta_{W,\text{tot}} \cdot dt + \beta_{WxC} \cdot \theta_{WxC} \cdot dt + \beta_\epsilon \cdot dt) \tag{16}$$

277

Equation 16 can be rearranged to Equation 17. The terms become multiplicative.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \exp(\beta_S \cdot dt) = & (\exp(\beta_A \cdot dt))^{\theta_{A,\text{tot}}} \cdot (\exp(\beta_C \cdot dt))^{\theta_{C,\text{tot}}} \cdot (\exp(\beta_W \cdot dt))^{\theta_{W,\text{tot}}} \\
 & \cdot (\exp(\beta_{WxC} \cdot dt))^{\theta_{WxC}} \cdot \exp(\beta_\epsilon \cdot dt)
 \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

278

Equation 18 expresses the relative change in SIS over time dt .

$$\frac{SIS_{t_2}}{SIS_{t_1}} = \exp(\beta_S \cdot dt) \tag{18}$$

279 Equation 19 expresses the relative change in global radiation SIS that was caused by changes
280 in aerosols over time dt . It goes likewise for the other predictors (Equations 20 to 22).

$$\frac{Aerosols_{t2}}{Aerosols_{t1}} = \exp(\beta_A \cdot dt) \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{Clouds_{t2}}{Clouds_{t1}} = \exp(\beta_C \cdot dt) \quad (20)$$

$$\frac{Water.vapor_{t2}}{Water.vapor_{t1}} = \exp(\beta_W \cdot dt) \quad (21)$$

$$\exp\left(\frac{WxC_{t2}}{WxC_{t1}}\right) = \exp(\beta_{WxC} \cdot dt) \quad (22)$$

284 Equation 17 can be expressed in an alternative manner.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{SIS_{t2}}{SIS_{t1}} = & \left(\frac{Aerosols_{t2}}{Aerosols_{t1}}\right)^{\theta_{A,tot}} \cdot \left(\frac{Clouds_{t2}}{Clouds_{t1}}\right)^{\theta_{C,tot}} \cdot \left(\frac{Water.vapor_{t2}}{Water.vapor_{t1}}\right)^{\theta_{W,tot}} \\ & \cdot \left(\exp\left(\frac{WxC_{t2}}{WxC_{t1}}\right)\right)^{\theta_{WxC}} \cdot \left(\frac{\epsilon_{t2}}{\epsilon_{t1}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

285 The resulting factors presented on the right-hand side of Equation 23 represent the rela-
286 tive contributions of the respective parameters for the analyzed month. These factors signify the
287 relative trends in SIS, assuming all other effects exhibited no trend (i.e., if the β 's of all other ef-
288 fects were zero). These components denote factorial changes with a value of 1 indicating no trend
289 in SIS. Values less than 1 suggest that the effect would lead to dimming rather than brightening
290 during that month. The product of all factorial changes yields the relative change in SIS for the
291 corresponding month of the year. These values represent the relative contributions over the time
292 interval $t_2 - t_1 = dt$ years ($dt = 10$ years for relative decadal trend contributions) compared to
293 the initial state in 1983/01/01. This calculation was performed for all months of the year across
294 all 61 locations individually. Additionally, the 95% confidence interval was estimated for the cloud,
295 the aerosol and the water vapor effects. They are based solely on the uncertainty of the estimated
296 coefficients and were calculated for every locations separately using the bootstrap method and
297 subsequently averaged over the respective locations as presented in Figures 6 and 8. To derive
298 a final contribution per effect per location, the 12 monthly contributions were subsequently av-
299 eraged. The intended design sought negative values for negative effects; therefore, 1 was sub-
300 tracted from all values. These 12 values were then weighted by their corresponding climatolog-
301 ical mean SIS (SIS_0), as contributions in summer exert a greater impact on the total effect due
302 to the higher solar elevation and therefore increased radiation during this season. After being weighted
303 by SIS_0 and averaged over the year, a single value was obtained and mapped onto the European
304 map for all locations under consideration.

305 It is important to note that for the calculation of the individual contributions in the two sub-
306 periods (Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3) the estimated coefficients (θ 's) of the full period (1983/01/01
307 to 2020/12/31) were utilized, with only the β 's extracted from the shortened sub-periods. This
308 approach is justified by the understanding that the model's sensitivity to predictors remains con-
309 sistent across various time scales – as it is of physical nature – with interannual estimates being
310 representative of decadal trends. Therefore, the sensitivity of the model does not change for the
311 sub-periods and utilizing estimates over a longer period ensures greater accuracy.

312 4 Results and Discussion

313 4.1 Validation of Satellite Dataset

314 The spatial analysis of the performance of GeoSatClim is shown in Figure 1. At many lo-
315 cations we find only very small trends of the bias compared to ground stations, which is a very

316 good result and proves the stability of the satellite-derived data. At most Central European lo-
 317 cations, GeoSatClim exhibits a slight overestimation of the trend (blue) compared to ground sta-
 318 tions, with the majority of locations showing bias trends below $3 \text{ W/m}^2/\text{dec}$. It demonstrates that
 319 the decadal trends observed from ground stations and satellite-derived data agree remarkably well
 320 well over the British Isles, and particularly in Switzerland, where it yields highly stable values (very
 321 small trends in the bias). In Switzerland, the performance of the satellite-based GeoSatClim re-
 322 trievals remains outstanding, even in high-elevation locations in the Alps. However, GeoSatClim
 323 notably underestimates the trend in surface solar radiation over the Iberian Peninsula, with de-
 324 viations reaching up to $-4 \text{ W/m}^2/\text{dec}$. Similar discrepancies between satellite and station data for
 325 the Iberian Peninsula have been previously observed by Pfeifroth et al. (2018) and Trentmann
 326 and Pfeifroth (2023), albeit for slightly different time periods. Trentmann and Pfeifroth (2023)
 327 concluded that these deviations might stem from erroneous station data.




Figure 1: Bias of trends in surface solar radiation anomalies for GeoSatClim using time-varying aerosols ($\text{W/m}^2/\text{dec}$) compared to station data (GEBA and SMN). Positive/negative trends (blue/red) indicate that the satellite dataset is overpredicting/underpredicting the observed station trends. S = statistically significant trend ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$), NS = statistically not significant trend ($p\text{-value} > 0.05$).

328 The comprehensive findings depicted in Figure 1 reveal significant trends of the bias at nu-
 329 merous locations and a distinct spatial pattern. In stability analysis, the preference typically lies
 330 with non-significant trends. Nonetheless, the presence of significant trends does not necessar-
 331 ily imply poor performance of the algorithm, as significant trends can occur quickly in regres-
 332 sion analysis conducted on time series data with many data points.




Figure 2: Biases (compared to GEBA and SMN data) of monthly surface solar radiation anomalies for GeoSatClim CMIP (W/m^2) averaged over all 61 locations in Europe. Additionally shown is the linear decadal trend of the biases (dashed straight line) in $\text{W/m}^2/\text{dec}$. The values in brackets represent the 95% confidence interval of the estimated trend.

333 Averaging across all locations yields a stability measure of $0.3 \text{ W/m}^2/\text{dec}$ (as shown in Fig-
 334 ure 2), meaning, that on average the satellite-derived data overestimated the trend observed from
 335 ground stations by $0.3 \text{ W/m}^2/\text{dec}$. This is a commendable result indicative of GeoSatClim's re-
 336 liability. However, the spatial distribution observed in Figure 1 needs further consideration. Over-
 337 and underestimation of the brightening (blue and red points, respectively) partially offset each
 338 other across Europe. Nevertheless, the analysis substantiates the stability of GeoSatClim data through-
 339 out Europe. We therefore have confidence in the trend analysis.

340 Figure 3 illustrates the deseasonalized monthly and annual mean surface solar radiation
 341 anomalies, including the linear decadal Mann-Kendall trends (Mann-Kendall test, (Mann, 1945;
 342 Kendall, 1975)), separately averaged over the 53 locations outside of Switzerland and over the
 343 8 locations within Switzerland. For the average of the 53 non-Swiss stations, a mean trend of 2.6
 344 $\text{W/m}^2/\text{dec}$ is found when using GEBA reference data. GeoSatClim, utilizing time-varying aerosols
 345 (CMIP), shows a trend of $3.3 \text{ W/m}^2/\text{dec}$. Hence, GeoSatClim overestimates this trend by $0.7 \text{ W/m}^2/\text{dec}$
 346 (in comparison to the GEBA reference). Conversely, employing the aerosol climatology (CLIM),
 347 GeoSatClim significantly underestimates it by $1.7 \text{ W/m}^2/\text{dec}$. All calculated trends exhibit sta-
 348 tistical significance with very low p-values. The mean absolute bias (MAB) when using time-
 349 varying aerosols is 5 W/m^2 , while it is 5.4 W/m^2 when employing the aerosol climatology.

350 The average of the 8 Swiss locations derived from SMN station data is $2.5 \text{ W/m}^2/\text{dec}$. GeoSat-
 351 Clim calculates a linear trend of $2.4 \text{ W/m}^2/\text{dec}$ when utilizing time-varying aerosols, reaffirm-
 352 ing the exceptional data quality of GeoSatClim in Switzerland. As expected, when employing
 353 an aerosol climatology, the observed trends cannot be reproduced ($0.9 \text{ W/m}^2/\text{dec}$). This under-
 354 scores the critical importance of using time-varying aerosols instead of a constant climatology.
 355 The MAB is 6.1 W/m^2 using the time-varying aerosols and 6.5 W/m^2 using the climatology.




Figure 3: Monthly (thin lines) and annual (bold lines) mean surface solar radiation anomalies (W/m^2) of the 53 locations outside of Switzerland for the period 1983/01/01 to 2015/12/31 and the 8 locations in Switzerland for the period 1983/01/01 to 2020/12/31. Additionally shown are the linear trends (dashed straight lines). CMIP = GeoSatClim using time-varying aerosols (red), CLIM = GeoSatClim using the aerosol climatology (blue), GEBA/SMN = GEBA/SMN stations reference data (black), pval = p-value. The values in brackets show the 95% confidence interval of the estimated trends. Furthermore, the mean absolute biases (MAB) of the deseasonalized anomalies are shown.

356 4.2 Brightening and Contributions

357 4.2.1 Full Period 1983 to 2020

358 Across Europe, a consistent brightening is observed over the period 1983/01/01 to 2020/12/31,
 359 where satellite data are available, with the most pronounced values evident in Eastern and North-
 360 Eastern Europe (see Figure 4). Conversely, the smallest values are detected over the British Isles,
 361 the Iberian Peninsula and the Alpine regions in the southern part of Switzerland. Regarding the
 362 aerosol effect, minimal spatial variability is visible, except for the negligible aerosol effect at the
 363 four high-elevation locations in southern Switzerland and the marginally higher values in East-
 364 ern Europe (up to 3%/dec). However, the majority of locations showed aerosol effects between
 365 1 and 2%/dec. The relatively lower values observed in Southern Europe could potentially be at-
 366 tributed to an enhanced influence of natural aerosol particles such as Saharan dust. Governmen-
 367 tal regulations aimed at reducing emissions would not have affected the natural aerosol particle
 368 load. The nearly absent aerosol effect at higher altitudes is expected, as most sources that emit
 369 aerosol particles are located close to the Earth' surface, resulting in lower aerosol loads at higher
 370 elevations.

371 The cloud effect shows a more intricate spatial pattern. It tends to be slightly negative (dimming-
 372 inducing) in Northern Spain and at certain locations in the British Isles, with values ranging mostly
 373 from 0 to -2%/dec. Conversely it is predominantly positive everywhere else, ranging from 1 to
 374 3%/dec at most locations, with the highest magnitudes observed at higher latitude locations. No-
 375 tably, at high-altitude locations in Switzerland the cloud effect tends to be negligible.

376 The water vapour effect and also the interactional term between clouds and water vapor
 377 resulted negligible at all considered locations. Therefore, these effects are not shown. As both
 378 presented effects, the aerosol and the cloud effect, appear very similar when analyzing the whole
 379 period, we decided to split the period. The two sub-periods are analyzed separately and the find-

380 ings are presented in the following two sections. More detail regarding the sensitivity of the pe-
 381 riod split can be found in Section 1 and in the Supplementary Material Figures S1 to S6.




Figure 4: Relative changes in SIS (brightening) and relative cloud and aerosol effects per decade ($\%/dec$) averaged over all months of the year and weighted according to their climatological mean surface solar radiation over the period 1983/01/01 to 2020/12/31. All data shown in this figure are satellite-derived.

382 4.2.2 Sub-period 1983 to 2002

383 A widespread brightening is found, when analyzing the sub-period 1983 to 2002 (see Fig-
 384 ure 5). Despite also observing a brightening across Europe, notable differences in the aerosol and
 385 cloud effects are evident in this sub-period compared to the full period. The aerosol effect is pos-
 386 itive throughout Europe, predominantly ranging between 2 and 4%/dec, with the highest values
 387 in Eastern Europe, reaching up to 6%/dec. The high-altitude locations (Swiss Alpine locations)
 388 display only negligible aerosol effects, while values over the Iberian Peninsula also remain min-
 389 imal (ranging from 0 to 1%/dec). The cloud effect reveals a distinct pattern. It is negative (dimming-
 390 inducing) across most locations, with values ranging from -3 to -2%/dec for the majority of an-
 391 alyzed locations. At selected locations, the cloud effect reaches magnitudes of -4 to -5%/dec. Pos-
 392 itive values are only found in northern regions (around 2%/dec) and around the Mediterranean
 393 Sea (ranging from 0 to 2%/dec), contributing to a brightening in these areas.

394 The overall aerosol effect remains positive at all locations also for the shortened period,
 395 indicating a widespread brightening attributed to the overall trend in AOD. Chiacchio et al. (2011)
 396 examined AOD trends in Europe for the period 1979 to 2007 estimated by the Goddard Chem-
 397 istry Aerosol Radiation and Transport model (GOCART) and they found decreasing AOD across
 398 the continent, which explains the positive values obtained. Particularly in Eastern Europe, a re-
 399 gion known for its industrial activity, substantial aerosol effects are found. These effects can po-
 400 tentially be attributed to successful implementation of emission regulations or also to the decline
 401 of heavy industry following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 (Ohvri et al., 2009). Apart
 402 from Eastern Europe, the strongest trends are observed in Central/Northern Europe, while the
 403 weakest trends are observed in Southern Europe and at high altitudes (the four southern Swiss
 404 locations). A likely explanation for this pattern are the lower aerosol loads at higher elevations
 405 and the larger surface solar radiation values at lower latitudes, which make relative effects smaller.
 406 This pattern is elucidated in more detail in Section 4.2.1. Regarding the cloud effect, Norris and
 407 Wild (2007) reported a slight increase in cloud cover during the period 1987 to 2002. Further anal-
 408 ysis by Sanchez-Lorenzo et al. (2017) focused on summer cloud cover trends from 1983 to 2009,
 409 revealing a positive trend in cloud cover for the summer months across Central Europe, Eastern
 410 Europe, and most of the British Isles, which supports the findings of the current study. Analyz-
 411 ing the period 1981 to 2005, Ruckstuhl et al. (2010) concluded that cloud optical depth increased
 412 in all seasons, with more pronounced trends in winter. These findings align with this study's pre-

413 dominantly negative cloud effects (causing dimming) for this first sub-period. Additionally, Stjern
 414 et al. (2009) emphasized the role of the cloud effect in North-Eastern and Arctic Europe in driv-
 415 ing the detected brightening. Consistently, the present study also identifies a positive cloud ef-
 416 fect conducive to a brightening in North-Eastern Europe, however alongside an equally promi-
 417 nent positive aerosol effect in these regions.




Figure 5: Relative changes in SIS (brightening) and relative cloud and aerosol effects per decade (%/dec), averaged over all months of the year and weighted according to their climatological mean surface solar radiation over the period 1983/01/01 to 2002/12/31. All data shown in this figure are satellite-derived.

418 Figure 6 shows the seasonality of the contributors to the observed decadal trends in sur-
 419 face solar radiation, averaged across all locations, as well as specifically over the ten most north-
 420 ern and ten most southern locations spanning from 1983/01/01 to 2002/12/31. Values exceed-
 421 ing 1.00 indicate a positive effect on the surface solar radiation trend, thereby inducing a bright-
 422 ening, while values below 1.00 signify that the corresponding effect induced a dimming during
 423 the respective time of the year. For instance, a value of 1.07 refers to an effect responsible for a
 424 brightening of 7 %/dec in the corresponding month of the year, assuming no other effects were
 425 present. The product of all trend contributions equals the satellite surface solar radiation trend
 426 calculated using time-varying aerosols.

427 Even when considering the average over all 61 locations (see the corresponding plot in Fig-
 428 ure 6), seasonality is discernible. The relative brightening is positive throughout the year except
 429 for July and October to December, with its zenith observed in the first half of the year, particu-
 430 larly in January and May (both peaking around 6%/dec), and in August (around 3%/dec). This
 431 result confirms previous analyses by Chiacchio and Wild (2010) and Sanchez-Lorenzo et al. (2017),
 432 who found, based on in situ observations, that the European brightening is most pronounced in
 433 spring and summer. However, while their focus was on absolute brightening, this study delves
 434 into relative brightening. Given the diminished solar elevation in winter, even a modest absolute
 435 brightening in W/m^2 can translate to a substantial relative brightening in %, thus explaining the
 436 January peak in the averaged plot across all locations. The consistently positive aerosol effect
 437 across all months suggests a reduction of AOD in all months of the year. The aerosol effect ex-
 438 hibits slight seasonality, peaking in winter months and maximally increasing surface solar radi-
 439 ation by around 4%/dec. It is known, that in Europe the absolute values of AOD are highest in
 440 summer (Filonchyk et al., 2020; Remer et al., 2008), as in winter there is increased precipitation
 441 washing aerosol particles out of the atmosphere. Consequently, an identical AOD decrease through-
 442 out all months of the year results in the largest relative values in winter, which could explain the
 443 minor visible seasonality of the aerosol effect. However, the AOD is predominated by anthro-
 444 pogenic aerosol particles, subject to stringent emission controls. This also suggests limited vari-
 445 ability, although seasonality could still be apparent due to for example stronger heating in win-
 446 ter. In contrast, the cloud effect demonstrates much stronger seasonality than the aerosol effect.

447 With negligible seasonality in the aerosol effect and negligible contributions from other terms,
 448 the cloud effect drives the seasonal variation of the brightening. Peaks in cloud effect occur in
 449 May (4%/dec) and August (0%/dec), while negative effects in July and later months indicate in-
 450 creased cloud cover and/or cloud optical depth over time during these months. The water vapor
 451 effect and interactional term appear irrelevant.

452 All months considered, the aerosol effect emerges as the predominant driver of the brightening
 453 on average, with the cloud effect contributing most to its seasonality. In several months,
 454 the cloud effect decreased surface solar radiation trends, but still a brightening resulted, as the
 455 cloud-induced dimming was overpowered by the aerosol-induced brightening. The narrow 95%
 456 confidence interval shows the very small uncertainty of the calculated contributions. This uncer-
 457 tainty refers only to the uncertainty in the estimated coefficients (see Section 3 for details). It is
 458 small for the aerosol effect, with slightly larger uncertainty in winter months. For the water vapour
 459 effect it is barely visible at all and for the cloud effect it is so small, that it coincides with the best
 460 estimate and is not visible at all in Figure 6.

461 Examining the additional plots in Figure 6 depicting averages over the ten most northern
 462 and southern locations reveals differences compared to the average over all locations. At more
 463 northern latitudes, the aerosol effect appears slightly stronger and its seasonality is more pronounced.
 464 The cloud effect also exhibits greater seasonal variability, peaking in March, May and most promi-
 465 nently in September. Conversely, southern locations exhibit weaker aerosol effects and less pro-
 466 nounced seasonality. However, this decreased seasonality of the aerosol effect (almost constant
 467 throughout the year) could also be due to the relative nature of the analysis and generally higher
 468 SIS values at lower latitudes. The cloud effect also shows less seasonality, with particularly simi-
 469 lar values throughout spring and summer. A solitary strong cloud peak is visible in February.
 470 The uncertainty of the aerosol effect is larger for the average of the 10 most northern locations,
 471 but again it is rather small.




Figure 6: Monthly contributions to the brightening by effect as per regression model for the period 1983/01/01 to 2002/12/31 including the 95% confidence interval. Mean values of all 61 considered locations, mean of the 10 northern-most locations with latitude $\geq 55^\circ\text{N}$ and mean of the 10 southern-most locations with latitude $\leq 43^\circ\text{N}$ are shown. Additionally shown in colored shading are the 95% confidence intervals of the aerosol, the cloud and the water vapor effects. Satellite SIS trend (thick brown): Decadal trend of the relative surface solar radiation anomalies from GeoSatClim using time-varying aerosols (cMIP).

4.2.3 Sub-period 2001 to 2020

472 The brightening that was observed in the previous sub-period persists in this sub-period
 473 (see Figure 7). At many locations it even intensified. When analyzing the aerosol and cloud ef-
 474 fects, a notable difference from the corresponding plots of the earlier sub-period 1983/01/01 to
 475

476 2002/12/31 (Figure 5) is evident. During this later period, the aerosol effect exhibits minimal to
 477 negligible influence across all locations, ranging from 0 to 1%/dec. In contrast, the cloud effect
 478 demonstrates a more substantial, predominantly positive impact on SIS trends. Particularly pro-
 479 nounced cloud effects are observed in Central and Northern Europe, ranging from 2 to 5%/dec.
 480 The high-altitude locations in the Swiss Alps show only minimal cloud effects around 1%/dec.




Figure 7: Relative changes in SIS (brightening) and relative cloud and aerosol effects per decade (%/dec), averaged over all months of the year and weighted according to their climatological mean surface solar radiation over the period 2001/01/01 to 2020/12/31. All data shown in this figure are satellite-derived.

481 During this second sub-period, the aerosol effect appears to exert only a minimal impact
 482 on the SIS trends, while the cloud effect emerges as a significant driver, exerting a dominant in-
 483 fluence on the observed brightening across Europe. The regulative measures regarding anthro-
 484 pogenic emissions have started to be put in place in the 1980s and this study proves their at least
 485 partial success. As the emission levels were already reduced and the measures in place at the start
 486 of this sub-period analysis (2001/01/01), the decrease in AOD was rather small during the next
 487 20 years, as resulted in the very small aerosol effects visible in Figure 7. Nevertheless, the bright-
 488 ening persisted during this period (ranging from 2 to 6%/dec), predominantly attributable to vari-
 489 ations in cloudiness, as indicated by the pronounced cloud effects in Figure 7. This suggests a
 490 decrease in cloud optical depth and/or in total cloud cover over this period. The latter assertion
 491 finds support in the findings of Hatzianastassiou et al. (2020), who noted decreasing total cloud
 492 cover over Europe from 2001 to 2009. Their analysis, which also examined the individual con-
 493 tributions of total cloud cover and AOD to the observed brightening, concluded on clouds being
 494 the primary driver, with AOD exerting a minor influence (Figure 4 in Hatzianastassiou et al. (2020)).
 495 Similarly, Mateos et al. (2014) observed a dominant cloud effect when analyzing SIS trend con-
 496 tributions over the Iberian Peninsula from 2003 to 2012. Moreover, Ferreira Correa et al. (2023)
 497 noted the growing importance of the cloud radiative effect over the entire brightening period. All
 498 these findings are consistent with the results of the current study.

499 Figure 8 presents the seasonal evolution of the various contributors to the decadal SIS trends
 500 for the second sub-period. Notably, the cloud effect and the brightening exhibit striking similar-
 501 ities, appearing almost identical for certain months in both the northern and southern averaged
 502 plots. At the northern locations much higher winter values of SIS and cloud effect with a strong
 503 peak in January are found. A less pronounced, but very similar seasonality is found at southern
 504 latitudes, showing three smaller peaks in January, May and October. The aerosol effect remains
 505 low and displays minimal seasonality for all locations. No discernible effects are attributed to
 506 water vapor or the interactional term. Although the 95% confidence interval is included in Fig-
 507 ure 8, it is barely visible for any of the effects. This underlines the accuracy of the estimated con-
 508 tributions, especially in this second sub-period.

509 When compared to the corresponding plots of the first sub-period (Figure 6), significant
 510 disparities emerge. Despite strong seasonality in the cloud effect, particularly evident at north-
 511 ern locations, it does not align with the seasonality observed in the sub-period 1983 to 2002. In-
 512 stead, the first two decades of the 21st century are characterized by heightened relative cloud ef-
 513 fects in winter across all locations and negligible to slightly negative cloud effects during the sum-
 514 mer months. A potential reason for the observed discrepancies might be the change in Northern
 515 Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) regime around the change of century (Weisheimer et al., 2017; Pa-
 516 pritz & Grams, 2018; Climate Prediction Center, 2024; National Weather Service - NOAA, 2024).




Figure 8: Monthly contributions to the brightening by effect as per regression model for the period 2001/01/01 to 2020/12/31 including the 95% confidence interval. Mean values of all 61 considered locations, mean of the 10 northern-most locations with latitude $\geq 55^\circ\text{N}$ and mean of the 10 southern-most locations with latitude $\leq 43^\circ\text{N}$ are shown. Additionally shown in colored shading are the 95% confidence intervals of the aerosol, the cloud and the water vapor effects. Satellite SIS trend (thick brown): Decadal trend of the relative surface solar radiation anomalies from GeoSatClim using time-varying aerosols (cMIP).

517 5 Conclusions

518 The aim of this study was to analyze and quantify the factors influencing the observed trends
 519 in surface solar radiation over the period 1983/01/01 to 2020/12/31 across 61 European locations.
 520 Initially, the satellite-derived data generated using the CM SAF GeoSatClim algorithm were val-
 521 idated against ground measurements obtained from GEBA and Swiss Met Net at the 61 locations.
 522 Subsequently, a detailed seasonal-scale analysis was conducted utilizing a multiple linear regres-
 523 sion model to assess the individual contributions of clouds, aerosols, and water vapor to the ob-
 524 served brightening. CM SAF's Land Flux satellite algorithm offers flexibility to compute both
 525 all-sky and clear-sky radiation. Additionally, GeoSatClim provides two distinct options concern-
 526 ing aerosol input: CMIP, representing a simulation incorporating time-varying modelled aerosol
 527 optical depth, and CLIM, which utilizes a daily aerosol climatology with no long-term trend in
 528 aerosol optical depth. Moreover, the algorithm provides the option to eliminate the direct effect
 529 of water vapour on surface solar radiation.

530 The validation process for GeoSatClim utilizing time-varying aerosols revealed a robust
 531 alignment of trends with reference data across Europe, particularly in Switzerland, encompass-
 532 ing even its high-elevation Alpine regions. Generally, GeoSatClim exhibited a slight tendency
 533 to overestimate trends, with an exception observed in Spain, where trends were underestimated.
 534 As discussed in Section 4.1, potential discrepancies in the reference data from Spanish ground
 535 stations may account for this deviation.

536 Over the entire period 1983/01/01 to 2020/12/31 a brightening was found. Delving into
 537 the monthly-scale contributions to surface solar radiation trends yielded insightful findings. Ex-

538 amining this whole period revealed a balanced scenario, with nearly equal impacts stemming from
539 variations in aerosol optical depth and cloudiness. Consequently, the period was split in two and
540 each sub-period was analyzed individually.

541 For the first sub-period 1983/01/01 to 2002/12/31 a strong brightening was found and the
542 aerosol effect emerged as the primary driver across Europe. The aerosol effect was particularly
543 pronounced in Eastern Europe, while registering near-zero influence at high-altitude Alpine
544 locations. This outcome resonates with findings by Chiacchio et al. (2011), who found a decline
545 in aerosol optical depth across Europe between 1979 and 2007, based on results from an Atmo-
546 spheric Chemistry Transport model, likely attributable to effective emission regulations. The in-
547 tensified aerosol effects in Eastern Europe may be further linked to the decline of heavy indus-
548 try following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 (Ohvriil et al., 2009). Given that most
549 aerosol-emitting sources are situated near the Earth's surface, resulting in lower aerosol optical
550 depths at higher elevations, the minimal aerosol effect observed at Alpine locations is understand-
551 able. Clouds overall even increased during this sub-period and consequently exerted a negative
552 impact on surface solar radiation trends at most locations, particularly in Central/Eastern Europe
553 and in the British Isles. The contribution of water vapor remained negligible. As the aerosol ef-
554 fect overcompensated the negative cloud effect at most locations, it resulted in a brightening nonethe-
555 less. The uncertainties of the estimated contributions were small for the aerosol effect with larger
556 uncertainty in winter months. The water vapor and cloud effects exhibited negligible uncertainty.

557 The analysis of the period 2001/01/01 to 2020/12/31 portrayed a substantially different sit-
558 uation. While the brightening persisted, the underlying contributors underwent notable shifts. The
559 direct aerosol effect became rather insignificant, albeit still maintaining a positive influence. This
560 suggests that anthropogenic aerosol emissions had likely reached regulatory thresholds and re-
561 mained relatively stable during this latter sub-period. Variability in cloud cover, however, emerged
562 as the predominant driver of the observed brightening in this sub-period. This study thus also en-
563 abled the detection of a substantial decrease in the cloud radiative forcing over Europe in the first
564 two decades of the 21st century. Further exploration into the reasons of this decrease would com-
565 plement the findings of this study. The water vapor effect was again negligible. Analyzing each
566 month of the year separately revealed different seasonality for both investigated sub-periods. This
567 is mainly attributable to the changed seasonality of the cloud effect, which could be a consequence
568 of the Northern Atlantic Oscillation regime change. The uncertainties of the estimated coefficients
569 were even smaller for this sub-period.

570 There are several limitations which should be kept in mind regarding this study. The spa-
571 tial resolution of the satellite limits the accuracy, particularly in heterogeneous terrain, as it pro-
572 vides averaged values per grid cell. Consequently, very high-altitude locations such as mountain
573 peaks were excluded from this study to mitigate potential inaccuracies. Another source of un-
574 certainty stems from the aerosol optical depth data utilized, which was modelled and, from 2015/01/01
575 onwards, forced according to the socio-economic emission pathway SSP2-45, which is known
576 to underestimate the actual changes (Schwalm et al., 2020). While the statistical regression model
577 employed in this study has demonstrated excellent fidelity in reproducing satellite-observed sur-
578 face solar radiation variability, residual model uncertainty persists. Regarding the interpretations
579 of the findings, it is imperative to acknowledge that the aerosol effect discussed herein is the di-
580 rect aerosol effect, wherein aerosol particles directly scatter and absorb incoming solar radiation.
581 However, there exist additional indirect aerosol effects, whereby an increased number of aerosol
582 particles increase the number of cloud droplets, because the particles act as cloud condensation
583 nuclei. Increasing numbers of cloud droplets enhance the cloud's albedo, which amplifies the cool-
584 ing effect of these clouds (Twomey et al., 1984). Apart from the described first indirect aerosol
585 effect, aerosol particles can further prolong a cloud's lifespan by minimizing precipitation (Albrecht,
586 1989). The two indirect aerosol effects could not be analyzed separately with the available data,
587 as they were encompassed within the cloud effect.

588 In recent years there have been studies conducted, analyzing correlations between long-
589 term surface solar radiation trends and atmospheric circulation (Sanchez-Lorenzo et al., 2008;
590 Chiacchio & Wild, 2010; Parding et al., 2016). There are also studies suggesting aerosol-cloud

591 interactions could depend on the level of pollution (Koren et al., 2008; Rosenfeld et al., 2008).
 592 It could be of high interest to conduct further research in these directions.

593 Appendix A List of Locations

594 Table A1 lists all 61 locations that are analyzed in this study. Additionally to the station
 595 name, the coordinates and the corresponding country are listed.

Table A1: List of 61 analyzed locations

Station	Longitude (°E)	Latitude (°N)	Country
Aberdeen	-2.08	57.17	Great Britain
Aberporth	-4.57	52.13	Great Britain
Ajaccio	8.80	41.92	France
Albacete	-1.86	38.95	Spain
Aldergrove	-6.22	54.65	Great Britain
Basel-Binningen	7.58	47.55	Switzerland
Belsk	20.78	51.83	Poland
Bergen	5.32	60.40	Norway
Bratislava	17.10	48.17	Slovak Republic
Caceres	-6.34	39.47	Spain
Cagliari	9.05	39.25	Italy
Clermont_ferrand	3.17	45.78	France
Clones	-7.23	54.18	Ireland
Col-du-Grand-St-Bern	7.17	45.87	Switzerland
Coruna	-8.38	43.30	Spain
Davos	9.85	46.82	Switzerland
Debilt	5.18	52.10	Netherlands
De_kooy	4.78	52.92	Netherlands
Dijon	5.08	47.27	France
Dublin	-6.25	53.43	Ireland
Dunstaffnage	-5.43	56.47	Great Britain
Eelde	6.58	53.13	Netherlands
Embrun	6.50	44.57	France
Eskdalemuir	-3.20	55.32	Great Britain
Geneve-Cointrin	6.13	46.25	Switzerland
Guetsch-Andermatt	8.62	46.65	Switzerland
Helsinki	24.97	60.32	Finland
Hohenpeissenberg	11.02	47.80	Germany
Hradec_kralove	15.85	50.25	Czech Republic
Jokioinen	23.50	60.82	Finland
Klagenfurt	14.33	46.65	Austria
Lerwick	-1.18	60.13	Great Britain
Logrono	-2.33	42.45	Spain
Maastricht	5.78	50.91	Netherlands
Madrid	-3.68	40.41	Spain
Malin_head	-7.33	55.37	Ireland
Millau	3.02	44.12	France
Montpellier	3.97	43.58	France
Murcia	-0.80	37.79	Spain
Nancy-essey	6.22	48.68	France
Nice	7.20	43.65	France
Odessa	30.63	46.48	Ukraine
Oviedo	-5.87	43.35	Spain

Continued on the next page

Table A1 – Continued from previous page

Station	Longitude (°E)	Latitude (°N)	Country
Palma_mallorca	2.74	39.57	Spain
Payerne	6.94	46.81	Switzerland
Perpignan	2.87	42.73	France
Pisa	10.40	43.68	Italy
Potsdam	13.10	52.38	Germany
Rennes	-1.73	48.07	France
San_sebastian	-2.04	43.31	Spain
Santander	-3.80	43.49	Spain
Stockholm	17.95	59.35	Sweden
Strasbourg	7.63	48.55	France
Toravere	26.47	58.27	Estonia
Valentia	-10.25	51.93	Ireland
Vigna_di_valle	12.21	42.08	Italy
Vlissingen	3.60	51.45	Netherlands
Warszawa	20.98	52.27	Poland
Weissfluhjoch	9.80	46.83	Switzerland
Zakopane	19.97	49.28	Poland
Zuerich-Kloten	8.53	47.48	Switzerland

596 Open Research Section

597 The Surface Radiation Climate Data Record will be available soon under the DOI
 598 10.5676/EUM_SAF_CM/SLF_METEOSAT/V001. The part of the data that was used for this
 599 study is temporarily available at <https://figshare.com/s/50f58aa738aadf53bfa6>
 600 for peer review.

601 Global Energy Balance Archive (GEBA) data is publicly accessible via [http://www.geba](http://www.geba.ethz.ch)
 602 [.ethz.ch](http://www.geba.ethz.ch) (Wild et al. (2017), supplementary data are available at [https://doi.org/10](https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.873078)
 603 [.1594/PANGAEA.873078](https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.873078)).

604 The reference data from the Swiss measurement stations (Swiss Met Net) are freely available upon
 605 request to MeteoSwiss via the contact form: [https://www.meteoswiss.admin.ch/about](https://www.meteoswiss.admin.ch/about-us/contact/contact-form.html)
 606 [-us/contact/contact-form.html](https://www.meteoswiss.admin.ch/about-us/contact/contact-form.html).

607 The CAMS AOD re-analysis data is available under ([https://ads.atmosphere.copernicus](https://ads.atmosphere.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/cams-global-reanalysis-eac4-monthly?tab=form)
 608 [.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/cams-global-reanalysis-eac4-monthly?tab=form](https://ads.atmosphere.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/cams-global-reanalysis-eac4-monthly?tab=form)).

609 The information about the aerosol optical depth is taken from model-based estimates that include
 610 pre-industrial natural aerosol and emission estimates (Fiedler, Kinne, et al., 2019) and informa-
 611 tion on different emission scenarios (Fiedler, Stevens, et al., 2019). For more details see Section
 612 2.1.

613 Acknowledgments

614 This study is supported by MeteoSwiss and we thank them for the raw data supply. We extend
 615 our appreciation to Christoph Frei for his comprehensive statistical support concerning the def-
 616 inition, testing and application of the statistical model. He played a pivotal role in ensuring a ro-
 617 bust analytical framework. We also thank Christian Grams for his valuable inputs regarding at-
 618 mospheric regimes. The Global Energy Balance Archive (GEBA) is co-funded by the Federal
 619 Office of Meteorology and Climatology MeteoSwiss within the framework of GCOS Switzer-
 620 land and we acknowledge Pascale Smith for providing the GEBA data. Furthermore, we acknowl-
 621 edge Jörg Trentmann and Uwe Pfeifroth for the valuable discussions and their inputs.

References

- Albrecht, B. A. (1989). Aerosols, Cloud Microphysics, and Fractional Cloudiness. *Science*, 245(4923), 1227-1230. Retrieved from <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.245.4923.1227> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.245.4923.1227>
- Bourgeois, Q., & Duguay-Tetzlaff, A. (2023). Algorithm Technical Base Document. Meteosat Surface Radiation Budget Edition 1. CM SAFCM SAF (www.cmsaf.eu to be published 11/2023).
- Cano, D., Monget, J.-M., Albuissou, M., Guillard, H., Regas, N., & Wald, L. (1986). A method for the determination of the global solar radiation from meteorological satellite data. *Solar energy*, 37(1), 31–39.
- Chiacchio, M., Ewen, T., Wild, M., Chin, M., & Diehl, T. (2011). Decadal variability of aerosol optical depth in Europe and its relationship to the temporal shift of the North Atlantic Oscillation in the realm of dimming and brightening. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 116(D2). Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2010JD014471> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JD014471>
- Chiacchio, M., & Wild, M. (2010). Influence of NAO and clouds on long-term seasonal variations of surface solar radiation in Europe. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 115(D10). Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2009JD012182> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD012182>
- Climate Prediction Center. (2024). *North Atlantic Oscillation*. Retrieved from <https://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/data/teledoc/nao.shtml>
- Dong, B., Sutton, R. T., & Wilcox, L. J. (2023). Decadal trends in surface solar radiation and cloud cover over the North Atlantic sector during the last four decades: drivers and physical processes. *Climate Dynamics*, 60, 2533 – 2546. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06438-3>
- Ferreira Correia, L., Folini, D., Chtirkova, B., & Wild, M. (2023). Causes for decadal trends in Surface Solar Radiation in the Alpine region. *Authorea Preprints*.
- Fiedler, S., Kinne, S., Huang, W. T. K., Räisänen, P., O'Donnell, D., Bellouin, N., ... Lohmann, U. (2019). Anthropogenic aerosol forcing – insights from multiple estimates from aerosol-climate models with reduced complexity. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 19(10), 6821–6841. Retrieved from <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/19/6821/2019/> doi: <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-6821-2019>
- Fiedler, S., Stevens, B., Gidden, M., Smith, S. J., Riahi, K., & van Vuuren, D. (2019). First forcing estimates from the future CMIP6 scenarios of anthropogenic aerosol optical properties and an associated Twomey effect. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 12(3), 989–1007. Retrieved from <https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/12/989/2019/> doi: <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-989-2019>
- Filonchyk, M., Hurynovich, V., Yan, H., Zhou, L., & Gusev, A. (2020). Climatology of aerosol optical depth over Eastern Europe based on 19 years (2000–2018) MODIS TERRA data. *International Journal of Climatology*, 40(7), 3531-3549. Retrieved from <https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/joc.6412> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6412>
- Folini, D., & Wild, M. (2011). Aerosol emissions and dimming/brightening in Europe: Sensitivity studies with ECHAM5-HAM. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 116(D21). Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2011JD016227> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016227>
- Foukal, P., Fröhlich, C., Spruit, H., & Wigley, T. M. L. (2006). Variations in solar luminosity and their effect on Earth's climate. *Nature*, 443, 161–166. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05072>
- Gilgen, H., Roesch, A., Wild, M., & Ohmura, A. (2009). Decadal changes in shortwave ir-

- 677 radiance at the surface in the period from 1960 to 2000 estimated from Global Energy
 678 Balance Archive Data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 114(D10).
 679 Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2008JD011383)
 680 [abs/10.1029/2008JD011383](https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD011383) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD011383>
- 681 Gilgen, H., Wild, M., & Ohmura, A. (1998). Means and Trends of Shortwave Irradiance at
 682 the Surface Estimated from Global Energy Balance Archive Data. *Journal of Climate*,
 683 11(8), 2042–2061. Retrieved from [https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/](https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/11/8/1520-0442_1998_011_2042_matosi_2.0.co_2.xml)
 684 [journals/clim/11/8/1520-0442_1998_011_2042_matosi_2.0.co_2](https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/11/8/1520-0442_1998_011_2042_matosi_2.0.co_2.xml)
 685 [.xml](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1998)011<2042:MATOSI>2.0.CO;2) doi: 10.1175/1520-0442(1998)011<2042:MATOSI>2.0.CO;2
- 686 Hatzianastassiou, N., Ioannidis, E., Korrás-Carraca, M.-B., Gavrouzou, M., Papadimas,
 687 C. D., Matsoukas, C., ... Vardavas, I. (2020). Global Dimming and Bright-
 688 ening Features during the First Decade of the 21st Century. *Atmosphere*, 11(3).
 689 Retrieved from <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4433/11/3/308> doi:
 690 10.3390/atmos11030308
- 691 Inness, A., Ades, M., Agustí-Panareda, A., Barré, J., Benedictow, A., Blechschmidt,
 692 A.-M., ... Suttie, M. (2019). The CAMS reanalysis of atmospheric composi-
 693 tion. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 19(6), 3515–3556. Retrieved from
 694 <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/19/3515/2019/> doi:
 695 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-3515-2019>
- 696 Jacobson, M. Z., & Delucchi, M. A. (2011). Providing all global energy with wind,
 697 water, and solar power, Part I: Technologies, energy resources, quantities and ar-
 698 eas of infrastructure, and materials. *Energy Policy*, 39(3), 1154–1169. Retrieved
 699 from [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421510008645)
 700 [S0301421510008645](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421510008645) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.11.040>
- 701 Julsrud, I. R., Storelvmo, T., Schulz, M., Moseid, K. O., & Wild, M. (2022). Disentan-
 702 gling Aerosol and Cloud effects on Dimming and Brightening in Observations and
 703 CMIP6. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 127(21), e2021JD035476.
 704 Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2021JD035476)
 705 [abs/10.1029/2021JD035476](https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JD035476) (e2021JD035476 2021JD035476) doi:
 706 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JD035476>
- 707 Kendall, M. G. (1975). Rank correlation methods. 2nd impression. *Charles Griffin and Com-*
 708 *pany Ltd. London and High Wycombe.*
- 709 Koren, I., Vanderlei Martins, J., Remer, L. A., & Afargan, H. (2008). Smoke Invigo-
 710 ration Versus Inhibition of Clouds over the Amazon. *Science*, 321(5891), 946-
 711 949. Retrieved from [https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/](https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1159185)
 712 [science.1159185](https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1159185) doi: 10.1126/science.1159185
- 713 Liepert, B. G., Fabian, P., & Grassl, H. (1994). Solar radiation in Germany-observed trends
 714 and an assessment of their causes. Pt. 1; Regional approach. *Beitraege zur Physik der*
 715 *Atmosphaere;(Germany)*, 67(1).
- 716 Liepert, B. G., Feichter, J., Lohmann, U., & Roeckner, E. (2004). Can aerosols spin down
 717 the water cycle in a warmer and moister world? *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31(6).
 718 Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2003GL019060)
 719 [abs/10.1029/2003GL019060](https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL019060) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL019060>
- 720 Liepert, B. G., & Romanou, A. (2005). Global dimming and brightening and the water cy-
 721 cle.
- 722 Manara, V., Brunetti, M., Celozzi, A., Maugeri, M., Sanchez-Lorenzo, A., & Wild, M.
 723 (2016). Detection of dimming/brightening in Italy from homogenized all-sky
 724 and clear-sky surface solar radiation records and underlying causes (1959-2013).
 725 *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16(17), 11145–11161. Retrieved from
 726 <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/16/11145/2016/> doi:
 727 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-11145-2016>
- 728 Mann, H. B. (1945). Nonparametric tests against trend. *Econometrica*, 13(3), 245–259. Re-
 729 trieved 2023-08-09, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1907187>
- 730 Mateos, D., Sanchez-Lorenzo, A., Antón, M., Cachorro, V. E., Calbó, J., Costa, M. J.,
 731 ... Wild, M. (2014). Quantifying the respective roles of aerosols and clouds in

- 732 the strong brightening since the early 2000s over the Iberian Peninsula. *Journal*
733 *of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119(17), 10,382-10,393. Retrieved from
734 [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2014JD022076)
735 [2014JD022076](https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD022076) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD022076>
- 736 Mueller, R. W., Matsoukas, C., Gratzki, A., Behr, H. D., & Hollmann, R. (2009). The CM-
737 SAF operational scheme for the satellite based retrieval of solar surface irradiance—A
738 LUT based eigenvector hybrid approach. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 113(5),
739 1012–1024.
- 740 Murphy, D. M., Solomon, S., Portmann, R. W., Rosenlof, K. H., Forster, P. M., & Wong,
741 T. (2009). An observationally based energy balance for the Earth since 1950.
742 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 114(D17). Retrieved from
743 [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2009JD012105)
744 [2009JD012105](https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD012105) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD012105>
- 745 Nabat, P., Somot, S., Mallet, M., Sanchez-Lorenzo, A., & Wild, M. (2014). Contribu-
746 tion of anthropogenic sulfate aerosols to the changing Euro-Mediterranean climate
747 since 1980. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41(15), 5605-5611. Retrieved from
748 [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2014GL060798)
749 [2014GL060798](https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL060798) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL060798>
- 750 NASA. (2016). *Forcings in GISS Climate Model*. Retrieved from [https://data.giss](https://data.giss.nasa.gov/modelforce/strataer/)
751 [.nasa.gov/modelforce/strataer/](https://data.giss.nasa.gov/modelforce/strataer/)
- 752 National Weather Service - NOAA. (2024). *Observation of Monthly Mean North Atlantic*
753 *Oscillation*. Retrieved from [https://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/](https://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/precip/CWlink/pna/month_ao_index.shtml)
754 [precip/CWlink/pna/month_ao_index.shtml](https://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/precip/CWlink/pna/month_ao_index.shtml)
- 755 Norris, J. R., & Wild, M. (2007). Trends in aerosol radiative effects over Europe inferred
756 from observed cloud cover, solar “dimming,” and solar “brightening”. *Journal of*
757 *Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 112(D8). Retrieved from [https://agupubs](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2006JD007794)
758 [.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2006JD007794](https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JD007794) doi:
759 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JD007794>
- 760 Ohmura, A. (1989). Secular variation of global radiation in Europe. *IRS’88: Current prob-*
761 *lems in atmospheric radiation*, 298–301.
- 762 Ohvriil, H., Teral, H., Neiman, L., Kannel, M., Uustare, M., Tee, M., ... Laulainen, N.
763 (2009). Global dimming and brightening versus atmospheric column transparency,
764 Europe, 1906–2007. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 114(D10). Re-
765 trieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2008JD010644)
766 [10.1029/2008JD010644](https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD010644) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD010644>
- 767 Padma Kumari, B., & Goswami, B. N. (2010). Seminal role of clouds on solar dimming
768 over the Indian monsoon region. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 37(6). Retrieved from
769 [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2009GL042133)
770 [2009GL042133](https://doi.org/10.1029/2009GL042133) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009GL042133>
- 771 Papritz, L., & Grams, C. M. (2018). Linking Low-Frequency Large-Scale Circulation
772 Patterns to Cold Air Outbreak Formation in the Northeastern North Atlantic. *Geo-*
773 *physical Research Letters*, 45(5), 2542-2553. Retrieved from [https://agupubs](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017GL076921)
774 [.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017GL076921](https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL076921) doi:
775 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL076921>
- 776 Parding, K. M., Liepert, B. G., Hinkelman, L. M., Ackerman, T. P., Dagestad, K., & Olseth,
777 J. A. (2016). Influence of synoptic weather patterns on solar irradiance variabil-
778 ity in northern Europe. *Journal of Climate*, 29(11), 4229 - 4250. Retrieved from
779 [https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/29/11/](https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/29/11/jcli-d-15-0476.1.xml)
780 [jcli-d-15-0476.1.xml](https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0476.1) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0476.1>
- 781 Pfeifroth, U., Sanchez-Lorenzo, A., Manara, V., Trentmann, J., & Hollmann, R. (2018).
782 Trends and variability of surface solar radiation in Europe based on surface- and
783 satellite-based data records. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 123(3),
784 1735-1754. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JD027418)
785 [.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JD027418](https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027418) doi: [https://doi.org/10.1002/](https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027418)
786 [2017JD027418](https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027418)

- 787 Philipona, R., Behrens, K., & Ruckstuhl, C. (2009). How declining aerosols and rising
788 greenhouse gases forced rapid warming in Europe since the 1980s. *Geophysical Re-*
789 *search Letters*, 36(2). Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2008GL036350)
790 [.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2008GL036350](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2008GL036350) doi: [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL036350)
791 [10.1029/2008GL036350](https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL036350)
- 792 Remer, L. A., Kleidman, R. G., Levy, R. C., Kaufman, Y. J., Tanré, D., Mattoo, S., ...
793 Holben, B. N. (2008). Global aerosol climatology from the MODIS satellite sen-
794 sors. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 113(D14). Retrieved from
795 [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2007JD009661)
796 [2007JD009661](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2007JD009661) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009661>
- 797 Rosenfeld, D., Lohmann, U., Raga, G. B., O'Dowd, C. D., Kulmala, M., Fuzzi, S., ... An-
798 dreae, M. O. (2008). Flood or Drought: How Do Aerosols Affect Precipitation?
799 *Science*, 321(5894), 1309-1313. Retrieved from [https://www.science.org/](https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1160606)
800 [doi/abs/10.1126/science.1160606](https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1160606) doi: [10.1126/science.1160606](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1160606)
- 801 Ruckstuhl, C., Norris, J. R., & Philipona, R. (2010). Is there evidence for an aerosol in-
802 direct effect during the recent aerosol optical depth decline in Europe? *Journal of*
803 *Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 115(D4). Retrieved from [https://agupubs](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2009JD012867)
804 [.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2009JD012867](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2009JD012867) doi:
805 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD012867>
- 806 Ruckstuhl, C., Philipona, R., Behrens, K., Collaud Coen, M., Dürr, B., Heimo, A., ...
807 Zelenka, A. (2008). Aerosol and cloud effects on solar brightening and the re-
808 cent rapid warming. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35(12). Retrieved from
809 [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2008GL034228)
810 [2008GL034228](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2008GL034228) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL034228>
- 811 Sanchez-Lorenzo, A., Calbó, J., & Martin-Vide, J. (2008). Spatial and temporal trends in
812 sunshine duration over Western Europe (1938–2004). *Journal of Climate*, 21(22),
813 6089 - 6098. Retrieved from [https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/](https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/21/22/2008jcli2442.1.xml)
814 [journals/clim/21/22/2008jcli2442.1.xml](https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/21/22/2008jcli2442.1.xml) doi: [https://doi.org/10.1175/](https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JCLI2442.1)
815 [2008JCLI2442.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JCLI2442.1)
- 816 Sanchez-Lorenzo, A., Calbó, J., & Wild, M. (2013). Global and diffuse solar ra-
817 diation in Spain: building a homogeneous dataset and assessing their trends.
818 *Global and Planetary Change*, 100, 343-352. Retrieved from [https://www](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921818112002238)
819 [.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921818112002238](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921818112002238)
820 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2012.11.010>
- 821 Sanchez-Lorenzo, A., Enriquez-Alonso, A., Wild, M., Trentmann, J., Vicente-Serrano,
822 S. M., Sanchez-Romero, A., ... Hakuba, M. Z. (2017). Trends in downward
823 surface solar radiation from satellites and ground observations over Europe dur-
824 ing 1983–2010. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 189, 108-117. Retrieved
825 from [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425716304655)
826 [S0034425716304655](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425716304655) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.11.018>
- 827 Sanchez-Lorenzo, A., Wild, M., Brunetti, M., Guijarro, J. A., Hakuba, M. Z., Calbó, J.,
828 ... Bartok, B. (2015). Reassessment and update of long-term trends in downward
829 surface shortwave radiation over Europe (1939–2012). *Journal of Geophysical Re-*
830 *search: Atmospheres*, 120(18), 9555-9569. Retrieved from [https://agupubs](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2015JD023321)
831 [.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2015JD023321](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2015JD023321) doi:
832 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023321>
- 833 Schwalm, C. R., Glendon, S., & Duffy, P. B. (2020). RCP8.5 tracks cumulative CO₂
834 emissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(33), 19656-
835 19657. Retrieved from [https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/](https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.2007117117)
836 [pnas.2007117117](https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.2007117117) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2007117117>
- 837 Stanhill, G., & Moreshet, S. (1992). Global radiation climate changes: The world network.
838 *Climatic Change*, 21(1), 57–75.
- 839 Stjern, C. W., Kristjánsson, J. E., & Hansen, A. W. (2009). Global dimming and global
840 brightening — An analysis of surface radiation and cloud cover data in northern
841 Europe. *International Journal of Climatology*, 29(5), 643-653. Retrieved from

- 842 [https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/](https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/joc.1735)
 843 [joc.1735](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.1735) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.1735>
- 844 Stoeckli, R. (2017). The HelioMont surface solar radiation processing 2017 update. *Scientific Report MeteoSwiss*, 93, 122.
- 845
- 846 Streets, D. G., Yan, F., Chin, M., Diehl, T., Mahowald, N., Schultz, M., ... Yu, C. (2009). Anthropogenic and natural contributions to regional trends in aerosol optical depth, 1980–2006. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 114(D10). Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2008JD011624> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD011624>
- 847
- 848
- 849
- 850
- 851 Trentmann, J., & Pfeifroth, U. (2023). Assessing the quality of gridded Climate Data Records of the Surface Irradiance using global Reference Data Sets. *EGU General Assembly, Vienna, Austria, 24-28 Apr 2023, EGU23-2563*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu23-2563>
- 852
- 853
- 854
- 855 Twomey, S. A., Piepgrass, M., & Wolfe, T. L. (1984). An assessment of the impact of pollution on global cloud albedo. *Tellus B*, 36B(5), 356-366. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1600-0889.1984.tb00254.x> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0889.1984.tb00254.x>
- 856
- 857
- 858
- 859 Vestreng, V., Myhre, G., Fagerli, H., Reis, S., & Tarrasón, L. (2007). Twenty-five years of continuous sulphur dioxide emission reduction in Europe. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 7(13), 3663–3681. Retrieved from <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/7/3663/2007/> doi: <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-3663-2007>
- 860
- 861
- 862
- 863 Weisheimer, A., Schaller, N., O'Reilly, C., MacLeod, D. A., & Palmer, T. (2017). Atmospheric seasonal forecasts of the twentieth century: multi-decadal variability in predictive skill of the winter North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) and their potential value for extreme event attribution. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 143(703), 917-926. Retrieved from <https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/qj.2976> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2976>
- 864
- 865
- 866
- 867
- 868
- 869 Wild, M. (2009). Global dimming and brightening: A review. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 114(D10). Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2008JD011470> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD011470>
- 870
- 871
- 872
- 873 Wild, M. (2012). Enlightening Global Dimming and Brightening. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93(1), 27 - 37. Retrieved from https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/bams/93/1/bams-d-11-00074_1.xml doi: <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00074.1>
- 874
- 875
- 876
- 877 Wild, M. (2016). Decadal changes in radiative fluxes at land and ocean surfaces and their relevance for global warming. *WIREs Climate Change*, 7(1), 91-107. Retrieved from <https://wires.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/wcc.372> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.372>
- 878
- 879
- 880
- 881 Wild, M., Gilgen, H., Roesch, A., Ohmura, A., Long, C. N., Dutton, E. C., ... Tsvetkov, A. (2005). From dimming to brightening: Decadal changes in solar radiation at Earth's surface. *Science*, 308(5723). doi: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1103215>
- 882
- 883
- 884 Wild, M., Ohmura, A., & Makowski, K. (2007). Impact of global dimming and brightening on global warming. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34(4). Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2006GL028031> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL028031>
- 885
- 886
- 887
- 888 Wild, M., Ohmura, A., Schär, C., Müller, G., Folini, D., Schwarz, M., ... Sanchez-Lorenzo, A. (2017). The Global Energy Balance Archive (GEBA) version 2017: A database for worldwide measured surface energy fluxes. *Earth System Science Data*, 9(2), 601–613. Retrieved from <https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/9/601/2017/> doi: <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-9-601-2017>
- 889
- 890
- 891
- 892
- 893 Wild, M., Wacker, S., Yang, S., & Sanchez-Lorenzo, A. (2021). Evidence for Clear-Sky Dimming and Brightening in Central Europe. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48(6), e2020GL092216. Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2020GL092216> (e2020GL092216 2020GL092216)
- 894
- 895
- 896

- 897 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL092216>
- 898 Zerefos, C. S., Eleftheratos, K., Meleti, C., Kazadzis, S., Romanou, A., Ichoku, C., . . . Bais,
899 A. (2009). Solar dimming and brightening over Thessaloniki, Greece, and Beijing,
900 China. *Tellus B: Chemical and Physical Meteorology*, *61*(4), 657-665. Retrieved
901 from <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0889.2009.00425.x> doi:
902 10.1111/j.1600-0889.2009.00425.x
- 903 Zhou, L., Sun, L., Luo, Y., Xia, X., Huang, L., Liao, Z., & Yan, X. (2023). Air pollutant con-
904 centration trends in China: correlations between solar radiation, PM2.5, and O3. *Air*
905 *Quality, Atmosphere and Health*, *16*, 1721 – 1735. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11869-023-01368-3>
- 906
- 907 Zou, L., Wang, L., Li, J., Lu, Y., Gong, W., & Niu, Y. (2019). Global surface solar
908 radiation and photovoltaic power from Coupled Model Intercomparison Project
909 Phase 5 climate models. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *224*, 304-324. Retrieved
910 from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652619309783> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.03.268>
- 911