



The University of Manchester Research

Direct and indirect effects of CO2 increase on crop yield in West Africa

DOI: 10.1002/joc.5960

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer

Citation for published version (APA):

Sultan, B., Parkes, B., & Gaetani, M. (2019). Direct and indirect effects of CO2 increase on crop yield in West Africa. *International Journal of Climatology*. https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5960

Published in: International Journal of Climatology

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.



International Journal of Climatology



Direct and indirect effects of CO2 increase on crop yield in West Africa

Journal:	International Journal of Climatology
Manuscript ID	JOC-18-0528.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Sultan, Benjamin; Institut de recherche pour le developpement, ESPACE- DEV Parkes, Ben; University of Manchester School of Mechanical Aerospace and Civil Engineering, MACE Gaetani, Marco; Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, LATMOS- IPSL
Keywords:	General circulation model experiments < 1. Tools and methods, Climate < 2. Scale, Rainfall < 3. Physical phenomenon, Monsson < 5. Geographic/climatic zone, Agrometeorology < 6. Application/context
Country Keywords:	Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Senegal, Mali, Niger



1 Direct and indirect effects of CO2 increase on crop yield in West

2 Africa

- 3 Benjamin Sultan (1), Ben Parkes (2) and Marco Gaetani (3)
- 4 (1) ESPACE-DEV, Univ Montpellier, IRD, Univ Guyane, Univ Reunion, Univ Antilles, Univ Avignon, Maison de la Télédétection,
 500 rue Jean-François Breton, F-34093 Montpellier Cedex, France
- 6 (2) MACE Manchester, United Kingdom
- 7 (3) LATMOS/IPSL, CNRS, Sorbonne Université, Université Paris-Saclay, Paris, France
- 8
- 9

10 Abstract

11 Climate change directly threatens food security in West Africa through a negative impact on 12 productivity of the main staple food crops. However, providing consistent future crop yield 13 projections in the region remain challenging because of uncertainty in the response of the regional 14 climate to the CO2 increase and in the response of the cultivated crop to this altered climate with 15 more CO2 in the atmosphere. Here, we analyse a set of idealised climate simulations to investigate 16 the effect of CO2 concentration increase on the West African monsoon and potential impacts on 17 crop yields of maize. On the one hand, simulations with prescribed SST and guadrupled CO2 18 concentration are analysed to study the atmospheric response to direct radiative forcing induced by 19 increasing CO2 concentration, not mediated by ocean heat capacity. On the other hand, simulations 20 with prescribed SST augmented by 4 K are analysed to study the atmospheric response to the global 21 ocean warming expected as a consequence of the increasing CO2 radiative forcing. We show that if 22 CO2 concentration increase has a positive impact on crop yield due to the fertilisation effect, it also 23 has a direct effect on the monsoon which acts to increase (decrease) rainfall in the Eastern (Western) 24 part of the Sahel and increase (decrease) crop yields consequently. Finally, we show that SST 25 warming acts to reduce rainfall and increase local temperatures leading to strong reduction of crop 26 yield. The reduction of crop yield is more important in the Eastern part of the Sahel where the 27 warming is more intense than in the Western part of the Sahel. Overall, positive effects are weaker 28 and more uncertain than the negative effects in the analysed simulations.

29

30

31 1. Introduction

32 Sub-Saharan Africa is particularly vulnerable to climate change which directly threatens food security 33 of the rapidly growing population (IPCC 2014). Here, multiple environmental, political, and socio-34 economic stressors interact to increase the region's susceptibility and limits its economic and 35 institutional capacity to cope with and adapt to climate variability and change (Connolly-Boutin and 36 Smit 2016; Müller et al. 2010; Challinor et al. 2007). Achieving food security in several African 37 countries will depend partly on the effective adaptation of agriculture to climate change, as crop 38 yields of major staple food crops in the Tropics are expected to decrease in a warmer climate 39 (Challinor et al. 2014). However, one of the limits of adaptation planning — such as breeding more 40 resilient crop varieties or promoting more resistant existing varieties and practices (Barnabás et al 41 2008)— is the high uncertainty in regional scenarios of crop production under climate change. 42 Indeed, although there are robust evidences of a decrease of crop production due to the global 43 warming (Challinor et al. 2014; Knox et al. 2012), the spread of crop yield responses remains very 44 large as found by Müller et al. (2010) which showed that projected impacts relative to current African 45 production levels range from -100% to +168%. Most of the uncertainty is led by the difficulty to 46 estimate the twofold effect of CO2 concentration increase, i.e. the response of the regional climate 47 to the CO2 increase and the response of the cultivated crop to this altered climate with more CO2 in 48 the atmosphere (Berg et al. 2013). Here we investigate those two effects of CO2 increase in West 49 Africa where crop yield is projected to decrease under global warming (Roudier et al. 2011) but also 50 where there are large discrepancies in future climate scenarios (Sultan and Gaetani 2016). The 51 variability of the West African climate during the 20th century has been deeply tied to the CO2 52 concentration increase, but the response of the regional atmospheric dynamics is particularly 53 complex and still debated (Gaetani et al. 2017). Indeed, the CO2 concentration increase has a 54 twofold and conflicting effect on the West African monsoon dynamics. Interestingly, whereas the 55 radiative forcing mediated by the Global Ocean warming weakens the monsoonal circulation, the direct radiative forcing at the land surface acts locally to enhance precipitation (Gaetani et al. 2017). 56 57 Specifically, the Tropical Ocean warming heats the troposphere and imposes stability, reducing 58 moisture transport and deep convection over land, ultimately weakening the monsoonal circulations 59 (Held et al. 2005). Over land, CO2 radiative forcing leads to local increased evaporation and vertical 60 instability, resulting in enhanced precipitation (Giannini 2010). Climate variability in West Africa 61 during the 20th century was characterised by large variability, alternating wet periods with droughts 62 (Nicholson et al. 2017). After a devastating drought characterising the 70s and peaking in the mid-80s (Held et al. 2005), West Africa experienced a recovery in summer monsoon precipitation during the 63 64 90s and at the turn of the 21st century (Fontaine et al. 2011). Dry anomalies were caused by the weakening of the monsoonal circulation in West Africa, driven by the warming of the Tropical Ocean 65 66 (Giannini et al. 2003). The concomitant negative phase of the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation 67 (AMO), which reduced the boreal summer northward migration of the intertropical convergence 68 zone (ITCZ) and its associated rain belt, exacerbated the drying trend, resulting in a long lasting 69 drought (Mohino et al. 2011). Conversely, the recent precipitation recovery has been related to the 70 faster warming of the northern hemisphere, which favoured the northern displacement of the ITCZ 71 (Park et al. 2015), and to the local CO2 radiative forcing over land (Dong and Sutton 2016). In this 72 context, how the competing effects of ocean-mediated and local CO2 radiative forcing combine is 73 still unclear, and the likely further future increase in CO2 concentration casts uncertainties on the 74 rainfall projections for the 21st century (Biasutti 2013).

Rising CO2 concentration in the atmosphere has an impact of the cultivated crop through a direct and an indirect effect. The direct effect is the potential of atmospheric CO2 to increase crop water productivity by enhancing photosynthesis and reducing leaf-level transpiration of plants (Tubiello et 78 al. 2007; Leakey 2009; Deryng et al. 2016). Although the amplitude of this effect depends on the 79 region, the scale and the crop, most of the recent modelling studies found significant increases of 80 crop yield in West Africa due to elevated CO2 (Deryng et al., 2016; 2015; Sultan et al. 2014; Muller et 81 al. 2010). It is particularly true for C3 crops such as cotton (Gerardeaux et al. 2013). C4 crops such as 82 maize, sorghum or millet are less sensitive to atmospheric CO2 concentration however there are 83 impacts as a result of stomatal closure and soil moisture conservation (Leakey et al. 2009). The 84 indirect effect is the response of the crop to the altered climate due to atmospheric CO2 85 concentration increase. Most studies find yield losses under future climate scenarios (Sultan and 86 Gaetani 2016; Challinor et al. 2014; Roudier et al. 2011; Knox et al. 2012; Challinor et al. 2007; Kotir 87 2010; Müller et al. 2010), because of the adverse role of higher temperatures which reduce the crop 88 cycle duration and increase evapotranspiration (Schlenker and Lobell 2010; Roudier et al. 2011; Berg 89 et al. 2013; Sultan et al. 2013). Although uncertain, changes in rainfall modulate the spatial 90 distribution of climate change impacts on crop yields (Gaetani and Sultan 2016; Sultan et al. 2014). 91 Indeed, yields losses of millet and sorghum are particularly high in the western Sahel as a result of 92 the combination of warming and decreased precipitation at the beginning of the rainy season (Sultan 93 et al. 2014). In the central Sahel, temperature and precipitation operate in opposite directions— 94 warming causes yield loss whereas increased rainfall at the end of the rainy season is favourable for 95 growing millet and sorghum (Sultan et al. 2014). Thus, direct and indirect effects of rising 96 atmospheric CO2 act in a competing way with benefits of elevated levels of CO2 through increased 97 crop water productivity while resulting warmer mean temperatures are likely to lead to crop yield 98 losses.

99 Here, we use a set of idealised climate simulations of five climate models combined with a crop 100 model to investigate the effect of CO2 concentration increase on the West African monsoon and 101 potential impacts on maize yields. Maize is an important staple crop of West Africa and is grown 102 extensively in Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger and Nigeria. The climate model experimental set-up allows to 103 separate the direct local CO2 radiative forcing on the West African climate from the indirect forcing 104 mediated by global Sea Surface Temperature (SST). The aim of this study is to investigate how these 105 decoupled climate signals propagate through a crop model rather than producing realistic maize 106 simulations. In addition, the crop model experimental set-up allows to evaluate the potential of the 107 CO2 fertilisation effect on the crop water productivity in combination with the impacts of regional 108 climate change in West Africa.

109 In the next section we introduce the experimental set-up and the crop model (GLAM model) used in 110 this study. In section 3, we analyse the simulations by separating (i) the direct effect of CO2 increase 111 on crop and monsoon and (ii) the effect of SST warming on the regional climate and crop 112 productivity. Finally, in section 4, we discuss our conclusions.

113 2. Materials and Methods

114 *2.1 AMIP Simulations*

115 The competition between the SST-mediated and direct CO2 effect on the West African climate is 116 studied by analysing idealised numerical experiments from a set of five climate models selected in 117 the CMIP5 archive (Taylor et al. 2012) (see Table 1 for details on the models). Models are run in 118 atmospheric-only configuration, with observed SST and sea ice prescribed for the period 1979 to the 119 2008. The simulations take into account the observed evolution in the atmospheric composition 120 (including CO2), due to both anthropogenic and natural influences, and the changes in solar forcing, emissions and concentrations of aerosols, and land use. This experimental set-up is used as the 121 122 control simulation (CTL) for two sensitivity experiments run either by prescribing uniform 4K increase 123 in global SST (4K experiment), or by quadrupling the CO2 atmospheric concentration while

124 maintaining the SST unchanged (4xCO2 experiment). The use of such an idealised design is intended 125 to isolate in a straightforward manner the climate responses to, respectively, the direct local CO2 126 radiative forcing and to the global SST increase, which would not be possible in ocean-atmosphere 127 coupled simulations. Indeed, in coupled simulations, direct and SST-mediated effects of CO2 forcing 128 on the climate system are mixed, and the competitive aspects of the CO2 influence on the West 129 African monsoon cannot be disentangled. Specifically, in the 4xCO2 experiment, the Global Ocean is 130 not allowed to warm and store heat, so that the climate system only responds to the local radiative forcing on land surface induced by the quadrupling of the CO2 concentration (Fig.S1-S5 in 131 132 Supplementary Material). Conversely, by fixing CO2 concentration at present-day values and 133 increasing SST, the climate system only responds to the ocean surface warming, with no direct 134 forcing from increasing CO2 concentration (Fig.S6-S10 in Supplementary Material). The experimental 135 setup is described in detail in Taylor et al. (2012). Extreme idealised forcing is imposed in the 136 sensitivity experiments to magnify the response of the climate system to the global SST warming (in 137 4K), and to the local direct CO2 radiative forcing (in 4xCO2), respectively. These conditions are 138 comparable with the situation expected in 2100 in the RCP8.5 emission scenario (Riahi et al. 2011), 139 with the CO2 concentration augmented from 390 ppm in 2011 to more than 1000 ppm (more than 140 +260 %), and more than 3K global SST warming (IPCC 2014). Model selection is based on the 141 experiment availability, thus considering only models for which the three experiments (CTL, 4K and 142 4xCO2) are available. Moreover, the availability of daily data for the variables used to force the GLAM 143 model (see Section 2.2) represents a further constraint, leading to the final selection of the model 144 ensemble. Availability of multiple realisations is also limited (for the baseline experiment, 6 members 145 are respectively available for HadGEM2-A and IPSL-CM5A-LR, and 2 members for MIROC5; for 146 sensitivity experiments, 2 members are available for IPSL-CM5A-LR and IPSL-CM5B-LR, respectively). 147 Therefore, one realisation of each experiment is used for each model, not to bias the results toward 148 models for which more realisations are available. However, the analysis of precipitation and temperature outputs from HadGEM2-A and IPSL-CM5A-LR shows that idealised perturbations in the 149 150 sensitivity experiments are large enough to overcome model internal variability (not shown), and 151 choosing different realisations for baseline and sensitivity experiments would not change the 152 conclusions of the paper. The selected models correctly simulate all the main features of the 153 monsoonal dynamics, although the comparison with observational and reanalysis products shows 154 some biases (see Supplementary Material in Gaetani et al. 2017). Particularly, HadGEM2-A and IPSL-155 CM5B-LR simulate a significant weaker monsoon, while MIROC5 is affected by significant wet biases. 156 Specific analysis of these biases is beyond the scope of the paper. However, biases in model 157 simulation of the West African monsoon are related to the coarse resolution, which limit the model 158 ability in producing intense and organised convective systems (Vellinga et al. 2015), to the poor representation of the global SST teleconnections (Rowell 2013). The differences in grid resolution 159 160 among models are harmonised by using a first-order conservative remapping to regrid all the 161 datasets to a 1° regular grid. Although caution should be used when regridding the coarse resolution 162 of the IPSL models to 1°, we consider this choice an appropriate compromise to conserve climate 163 model information and respond to the crop model needs. Finally, we highlight that the purpose of 164 this study is to analyse the sensitivity of crop yield to idealised conditions representing the 165 competing effects of the CO2 concentration increase, rather than a realistic productivity assessment.

166 2.2 GLAM Simulations

GLAM is the Global Large Area Model for annual crops (Challinor, et al. 2004). GLAM is a processbased model that was developed for use with climate scale data. GLAM requires soil data, a crop parameter set and meteorological inputs. The soil data is derived from the Digital Soil Map of the World and gridded to the meteorological data grid. The planting dates for the crops were derived from the Global Gridded Crop Model Intercomparison project dates for maize (Elliott et al 2015). 172 GLAM runs are performed at 1° regular grid resolution using climate simulations outputs as 173 meteorological inputs. These inputs are maximum daily temperature, minimum daily temperature, 174 downwelling shortwave radiation at the surface and precipitation. The maize parameter set is 175 identical to the one used in Parkes, et al. (2018) and based on the parameter set used in Vermulen et 176 al. (2013). In this study GLAM was run with an idealised crop where the yield gap parameter is set to 177 1 instead of being calibrated to observed crop yields (Challinor, et al. 2015 Parkes, et al. 2015). We 178 are using a maize parameterisation that is idealised in that we are not attempting to replicate 179 observed yields but instead are simulating the theoretical maximum yield value for a crop in those 180 circumstances. This removes the effects of pest/diseases and management techniques. This method 181 was selected to show the meteorological signals consistently across the domain. GLAM uses a 182 triangular profile to determine growth at a given temperature. For these simulations the base, 183 optimum and maximum temperature were set at 8, 34 and 44 C respectively. If the mean daily 184 temperature is above the optimum temperature then reduced growth is expected. A high 185 temperature stress routine is also used and can further reduce yields if temperatures are above 37 C 186 during flowering. The high temperature stress routine is described fully in Challinor et al (2005).

187

188 Carbon dioxide fertilisation in C4 crops is less significant than in C3 crops. However, C4 crops do 189 respond to carbon dioxide fertilisation due to stomatal closure and conservation of soil moisture. The 190 relationship between transpiration efficiency and carbon dioxide fraction for C4 grasses increases to 191 a maximum before levelling off. The increased transpiration efficiency values are based on response 192 ratio of the transpiration efficiency to carbon dioxide for water limited maize in GLAM generated by 193 Julian Ramirez-Villegas (personal communication, 2015). The curve of this relationship was modelled 194 using a negative square term to find the maximum transpiration efficiency. This maximum is at 850 195 ppm CO2 and results in a transpiration efficiency of 11.06 pa (from 6.5 pa). In addition, the maximum 196 transpiration efficiency was increased from 9.0 g/kg to 15.31 g/kg where the fractional increase in 197 transpiration efficiency (pa) is maintained for the increase in maximum transpiration efficiency (kg).

- 198 199
- 200 2.3 The six scenarios

Six scenarios are used in this study to investigate the role of CO2 concentration increase on crop yield
 in West Africa (Table 2):

- 203
- The control scenario (t0c1f1): Here GLAM runs are performed using climate inputs from the most realistic configuration of a set of climate models forced with observed SST and sea ice prescribed for the period 1979 to the 2008 which takes into account anthropogenic and natural influences. It allows to have a realistic climate forcing as a baseline to further sensitivity experiments.
- The scenario with fertilisation effect of CO2 on the crop (t0c1f4): Here GLAM runs are performed using baseline climate but the crop is experiencing four times higher levels of CO2 concentration which increase transpiration efficiency in the GLAM model and thus increase crop yield. When compared to the control scenario, this simulation gives the fertilising effect of CO2 increase on crop yield in the GLAM model for unchanged climate conditions.
- The warmer climate scenario with no effect of CO2 on the crop transpiration (t4c1f1): Here GLAM
 runs are performed using the +4K climate conditions and atmospheric CO2 concentration is
 similar to the control scenario. When compared to the control scenario, this simulation allows to
 point out the impact on crop yield of the climate system response to the global SST warming.
- The warmer climate scenario with effect of CO2 on the crop transpiration (t4c1f4): Here GLAM runs are performed using the same +4K climate conditions as in t4c1f1 but the crop is experiencing four times higher levels of CO2 concentration which increase transpiration

efficiency in the GLAM model. When compared to the control scenario, this simulation gives the
 combined effects of warmer climate and increase of transpiration efficiency on crop yield in the
 GLAM model.

- The direct CO2 effect on the monsoon with no effect of CO2 on the crop transpiration (t0c4f1):
 Here GLAM runs are performed using climate conditions responding to the quadrupling of CO2
 concentration while SST is unchanged, and CO2 concentration remains unchanged compared to
 the control scenario. When compared to the control scenario, this experiment allows to isolate
 the impact on crop yield of the response of the monsoon to the local direct CO2 radiative forcing.
- The direct CO2 effect on the monsoon added to the effect of CO2 on the crop transpiration (t0c4f4): Here GLAM runs are performed using climate conditions responding to quadrupled CO2 concentration and crop is experiencing four times higher levels of CO2 concentration which increase transpiration efficiency in the GLAM model. When compared to the control scenario, this experiment simulates the combined effects of the CO2 increase on the monsoons dynamics and on the transpiration efficiency.
- 239

240 **3. Results**

241 3.1. The control simulation

242 The control simulation reveals important differences in total rainfall and mean temperatures 243 between the five climate models (Table 3). In particular, HadGEM2 simulates the lowest annual 244 precipitation value (461 mm/year) while the MIROC5 model is the wettest (671 mm/year) and the 245 hottest model (29.1C). Even if climate models are forced with observed SST and are thus likely more 246 realistic than coupled model simulations, there are still important biases compared to observations 247 in the control run. Indeed all models are too dry and too hot compared to annual rainfall and mean 248 temperature computed using the reference WFDEI dataset (707 mm/year and 27.1C respectively). As 249 a result of these important differences between climate models, the simulated yield varies strongly 250 from one model to another since yield is highly sensitive to rainfall and temperature variations 251 (Figure 1). In the GLAM crop model, crop yield increases as total rainfall amount during the growing 252 season increases, following an exponential fit, until reaching values where the water constraint is not 253 limiting anymore. Simulated potential crop yield follows a more linear fit with temperature and 254 shows a decrease of crop yield as temperature decreases. As a result, the HadGEM2 model has the 255 lowest mean yield because of its low annual rainfall compared to the four other models.

256 3.2. The direct effect of CO2 increase on crop and monsoon

257 Elevated concentration of CO2 in the GLAM crop model under the control climate (t0c1f4 simulation) 258 has a clear positive effect on crop yield (red bars in Figure 2). The multi-model mean shows an 259 increase of +26.79% of simulated potential crop yield compared to the control simulation (t0c1f1 260 simulation) when aggregating results over whole West Africa. This crop yield increase is found using 261 any of the five climate models although the amplitude of the yield gain varies across the models. The 262 yield increase exceeds 40% using the IPSL CM5A model while it less than 23% using the CNRM CM5 263 model. The CO2 fertilisation effect is linked to the water stress and therefore it can explain why the 264 responses are model dependent.

An increase of atmospheric CO2 concentration has also a direct effect on the monsoon which has in turn an impact on simulated potential crop yields. The *t0c4f1* simulation isolates this effect by removing the fertilisation effect on the crop model. When aggregating results over whole West Africa, the multi-model mean shows a very weak response of crop yields (-0.67%) which mainly result from a high dispersion across the response of individual models (grey bars in Figure 2). Indeed, the monsoon effect can lead to yield gain of about 22% using the HadGEM2 model while it results to a yield loss of more than 15% in the MIROC5 model. This yield response is mainly driven by the rainfall change in the model with elevated levels of CO2 (Figure 3; Table 4). The HadGEM2 model is highly sensitive to atmospheric CO2 increase which produces more rainfall (+19.82%) while the same CO2 increase lead to a reduction of rainfall of about 2% in the MIROC model. In average over West Africa, there is a positive linear relationship between rainfall changes and yield changes between the *t0c4f1* simulation and the control *t0c1f1* simulation (R²=0.98; Figure 3).

277 The combination of the direct effect of CO2 increase on the crop and on the monsoon (t0c4f4 278 simulation) leads to a large increase of simulated crop yields (+26.79%) over West Africa in the multi-279 model mean (Figure 2). It indicates that the fertilisation effect on the crop dominates the yield 280 response rather than the effect of the monsoon. However individual model runs show that the 281 monsoon effect can largely modulate the fertilisation effect (blue bars in Figure 2). The benefits of 282 the fertilisation effect are almost cancelled in the MIROC model (24,04% in t0c1f4 simulation and 283 6,39% in t0c4f4 simulation) which simulates a decrease of rainfall with the CO2 increase. On the 284 opposite, the benefits are doubled in the HadGEM2 model (24,45% in toc1f4 simulation and 49,68% 285 in t0c4f4 simulation) which simulates more rains with the CO2 increase.

286 The spatial patterns of yield change due to CO2 increase show some important regional disparities 287 (Figure 4). Although the yield increase due to the CO2 fertilisation effect (Figure 4a) is widespread 288 over the Soudano-Sahelian zone, it is slightly less important in the North where water stress is too 289 high for being compensated by the CO2 increase. The CO2 fertilisation effect is also reduced in the 290 wettest areas along the Guinean coast and in southern Atlantic coast where on the opposite there is 291 no water stress and thus where the crop cannot benefit from the reduction of transpiration expected 292 by the CO2 atmospheric concentration increase. In Figure 4b, yield change is driven by the effect of 293 CO2 on the monsoon without taking into account the fertilisation effect (t0c4f0 simulation). The 294 spatial pattern opposes the western part of West Africa and to a less extent the Guinean Coast where 295 potential crop yield losses are expected with the Central Sahel where crop yield gains are expected. 296 When averaging across West Sahel and East Sahel boxes (see Figure 4b for the localisation of the 297 boxes), we can see that the direct effect of the monsoon leads to potential crop yield losses in the 298 West Sahel (-5.27%) and to yield increases in East Sahel (+12.07%). It is highly variable across model 299 and the response depends on rainfall change (Table 5). This spatial pattern is very close to the 300 precipitation change due to CO2 increase effect on the monsoon (Figure 4c). Gaetani et al. (2017) 301 shows that the response of the WAM precipitation to the quadrupling of the CO2 concentration is 302 the northward migration of the precipitation belt, driven by the intensification of the meridional 303 energy gradient across West Africa, and resulting in positive (negative) precipitation anomalies in the 304 Sahel (Guinean coast). The positive precipitation anomalies in the Sahel are also modulated along the 305 zonal direction, being stronger to the east than to the west (see Figure 2 in Gaetani et al. 2017). This 306 feature is associated with an anomalous zonal cell triggered by strengthened convection over West 307 Africa, which connects with subsidence over Tropical Atlantic. This results in a quasi-zonal anomaly in 308 the monsoonal flow, which favours moisture convergence in central-eastern Sahel (see Figures 4 and 309 8 in Gaetani et al. 2017). Precipitation patterns in model responses to quadrupled CO2 concentration 310 are then produced by the combination of the circulation response in the zonal and meridional 311 directions, which is in turn driven by the model regional response to the CO2 forcing. When we 312 combine the direct effect of CO2 increase on the crop and on the monsoon (t0c4f1 simulation), yield 313 is increasing almost everywhere in West Africa (Figure 4d) except in Western part of the Sahel where 314 the reduction of rainfall induced by the CO2 increase dominates the yield benefit of the fertilisation 315 effect.

316 3.3. The effect of SST warming

317 A warmer ocean (+4K increased SSTs in the t4c1f1 experiment) leads to particularly detrimental 318 climate conditions for the crop (Figure 5; Table 6). An important warming is simulated in West Africa 319 with annual temperatures changes ranging between 4K and 5K in the coastal areas of the Atlantic 320 Ocean and reaching +6K, up to +7K in the more continental areas (Figure 5a). The multi-model mean 321 shows that the +4K warming of SSTs leads to a +5.54K local growing season warming in average over 322 West Africa (Table 6). A warmer ocean induces a reduction of rainfall all over West Africa (-18.97% in 323 average) except in the North Eastern part of the Sahel (Niger) where rainfall increases. The rainfall 324 deficit is particularly important in South West Sahel in Senegal, Gambia and Guinea-Bissau where a 325 reduction of rainfall greater than 40% is simulated in the t4c1f1 experiment (see also Gaetani et al. 326 2017).

These warm and dry conditions lead to large potential crop yield losses (Figure 6; Table 6) everywhere in West Africa. The multi-model mean shows that a +4K warming of SSTs leads to a reduction of 56% of crop yield in average over West Africa and a shortening of the crop season duration of 9 days. This reduction is only partly (-40.89%) compensated by the fertilisation effect of CO2.

332 It is interesting that even if the rainfall deficit is the greatest in the Western part of the Sahel, yield 333 loss is more pronounced in the Eastern part of the Sahel when averaged simulations over the same 334 West and East boxes shown in Figure 4 (Table 7). The reduction of the potential yield is the most 335 important in the East Sahel (-69.8%) and slightly hampered by CO2 fertilisation effect (-54.7% of crop 336 yield loss). The yield loss is less important in the West Sahel reaching -52.6% without taking into 337 account CO2 effect on crop and -38.6% with the CO2 fertilisation effect. Simulations show that if the 338 monsoon rains are more affected in the Western Sahel (a reduction of 12 days and more than 25% of 339 the rainfall) than in the Eastern Sahel (a reduction of 3 days and about 16% of rainfall), the warming 340 is more important in the East Sahel (+5.9K against 5.4K in the West Sahel). With such levels of 341 warming, temperatures changes drive the yield variability in the crop model as illustrated by Figure 7 342 which depicts a linear relationship between temperatures and yield changes in the simulations. It 343 might explain why even if the monsoon rainfall is less affected in the East Sahel, the impact on crop 344 yield is more important since the warming is more intense.

345 4. Conclusion

346 Rising CO2 concentration in the atmosphere leads to two opposite effects on potential crop yield in 347 West Africa. On one hand, benefits could be expected through an increase of rainfall driven by the 348 direct effect of CO2 radiative forcing on the monsoonal dynamics. Our simulations showed that, 349 without increase of temperature, positive impacts will be more likely in Central and East Sahel where 350 annual rainfall are strongly enhanced by elevated levels of CO2. Indeed, monsoonal precipitation in 351 West Africa responds to increasing CO2 concentration migrating northwards to the Sahel, driven by 352 the strengthened energy meridional gradient associated with the CO2 radiative forcing over land. 353 Enhanced deep convection triggers an anomalous zonal cell which intensifies the westerly moisture 354 flow from the tropical Atlantic, resulting in a wetter response in central-eastern Sahel (Gaetani et al. 355 2017). Yield gains are also expected through the CO2 fertilisation effect which act to reduce crop 356 transpiration in the crop model and thus increase drought resistance. Although the amplitude of the 357 expected benefits of the CO2 fertilisation is certainly crop model dependent and still debated in the 358 literature (Deryng et al. 2016), we found that they are far greater than those expected from the 359 direct effect on the monsoon. In the Central East Sahel for instance, our simulations showed an 360 increase of +43.5% of crop yield with the fertilisation effect against a yield gain of +12.1% due to the 361 rainfall increase. On the other hand, negative impacts are expected from the elevation of 362 temperatures. Detrimental conditions for the crop were obtained by warming up the ocean of +4K 363 leading to drought conditions in the Western part of the Sahel and to an increase mean surface

temperature of more than +5.5K in West Africa with particularly warm conditions in continental
 regions. This warming could lead to yield loss of more than 56% which can only be partly hampered
 by the fertilisation effect (-40.9% of yield loss by taking into account the fertilisation effect).

367 With such competing effects, which are not always additive, providing reliable climate change 368 impacts scenarios on crop yields is challenging. The differences between climate models in the 369 estimation of the effects of direct and SST-mediated effects of CO2 were found to be very large with 370 for instance the HadGEM2 model simulating an increase of +49.7% of the yield through the increase 371 of rainfall (t0c4f4 simulations) and a decrease of -56.1% with the increase of temperatures (t4c1f4). 372 Overall we found that positive effects in the analysed simulations are weaker and more uncertain 373 than the negative effects. Indeed, simulated positive effects on crop yield range from +6.4% using the 374 MIROC5 model to +49.7% in the HadGEM2 model while the negative effects range from -51.7% to -375 62.9% using the same two climate models respectively. We also found that temperatures increase 376 will likely have a more important impacts on crop yield than rainfall changes as shown in previous 377 studies (Schlenker and Lobell 2010; Roudier et al. 2011; Berg et al. 2013; Sultan et al. 2013). We 378 highlight that, by construction, the idealised simulations analysed in this paper do not account for 379 climate feedbacks to the increasing CO2 concentration. In particular, the global SST response to CO2 380 forcing in past and future climate simulations is far from the homogeneous warming prescribed in 381 the 4K experiment, and this may lead to different results for the monsoonal dynamics and crop 382 productivity. For instance, it has been shown that, in the presence of overall global ocean warming, 383 while the warming of the Tropical belt inhibits precipitation in West Africa, the differential warming 384 of the Northern Hemisphere, and in particular of the North Atlantic and Mediterranean, is favourable 385 to rainfall (Giannini et al. 2013; Park et al. 2014; Park et al. 2016). Ocean-atmosphere coupled 386 simulations of future climate in West Africa include all the climate feedbacks, so that the 387 uncertainties in AMIP idealised simulations discussed in this paper are exacerbated, undermining 388 mitigation and adaptation strategies in the region. Whereby in AMIP simulations the responses to an 389 idealised forcing are concordant, though different in amplitude, coupled model simulations for the 390 end of the 21st century range from dry to very wet projections, characterised by spatial 391 inhomogeneity (Monerie et al. 2017). Coupled climate models are generally skilful in simulating the 392 relationship between the regional atmospheric dynamics and the Sahelian rainfall (Biasutti et al. 393 2009), while SST teleconnections are poorly simulated (Rowell 2013), mainly because of the model 394 biases in simulating ocean dynamics (Roehrig et al. 2013). Moreover, coupled climate simulations are 395 generally performed not considering dynamic vegetation and land use, which are instead key 396 ingredients of the monsoonal dynamics (Koster et al. 2004). Fixing model shortcomings and 397 improving model design should be then prioritised in the next CMIP6 exercise (Eyring et al. 2016).

398 Every modelling study has its limitations and we recognize some caveats in our experiments. First of 399 all, we use a limited number of GCMs (only five) within the full list of models participating to the 400 CMIP5 exercise (more than 30). If different results with different or with more models are still 401 possible, Gaetani et al. (2017) showed a general agreement among models in their response to the 402 idealized conditions, which demonstrates the robustness of the mechanisms linking the WAM 403 dynamics to the SST and CO2 idealized forcings, whatever the model physics or performance. 404 Another limitation is the use of only one ensemble member from each GCM which does not ensure 405 that most of the plausible scenarios are captured. However, we are here critically limited by the 406 availability of ensemble members in the CMIP5 archive, which does not allow to perform a full 407 exhaustive analysis of the internal variability within each GCM. Finally, a caution is necessary when 408 interpreting the crop simulation results presented in this study. Crop yields results have to be 409 interpreted as potential crop yield response to two aspects of climate change on the crops grown in 410 West Africa, i.e. the increase in temperatures and the increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide levels, 411 and not as a realistic crop yield prediction for the future. The crop model is simulating potential 412 yields, without calibration. The parameter set is the same as the one used in Parkes et al. (2018), this 413 includes the high temperature stress routine. This routine reduces crop yields as a result of high 414 temperature stress during flowering. The potential yields are much higher than real yields and 415 therefore the magnitude of reductions in yield as a result of high temperature stress is expected to

- 416 be higher than for calibrated crops. This is expected to reduce the yields in the *t4c1f1* and *t4c1f4*
- 417 experiments and may lead to an overestimate of the impact of increased temperatures.

418 Acknowledgements

- 419 M.G. has been supported by the LABEX project, funded by Agence Nationale de la Recherche (French
- 420 National Research Agency, Grant ANR-10-LABX-18-01). The research leading to these results has
- 421 received funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme FP7/2007-2013 under
- 422 grant agreement n° 603864. (HELIX: High-End cLimate Impacts and eXtremes;
- 423 http://www.helixclimate.eu).
- 424

425 References

- Barnabás B, Jäger K and Fehér A 2008 The effect of drought and heat stress on reproductive
 processes in cereals *Plant Cell Environ*. **31** 11–38
- Berg, A., de Noblet-Ducoudre, N., Sultan, B., Lengaigne, M., and Guimberteau, M. (2013). Projections
 of climate change impacts on potential C4 crop productivity over tropical regions. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* 170, 89–102. doi: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2011.12.003
- Biasutti M (2013) Forced Sahel rainfall trends in the CMIP5 archive. J Geophys Res Atmos 118:1613–
 1623. doi:10.1002/jgrd.50206
- 433 Biasutti M, Sobel AH, Camargo SJ (2009) The role of the Sahara low in summertime Sahel rainfall 434 variability and change in the CMIP3 models. J Clim 22:5755–5771. doi:10.1175/2009JCLI2969.1
- Challinor, A. J., Parkes, B., and Ramirez-Villegas, J.: Crop yield response to climate change varies with
 cropping intensity, Global Change Biology, 21, 1679–1688, DOI:10.1111/gcb.12808, 2015.
- Challinor, A. J., Wheeler, T., Craufurd, P., and Slingo, J.: Simulation of the impact of high temperature
 stress on annual crop yields, Agr. Forest Meteorol., 135, 180–189,
 DOI:10.1016/j.agrformet.2005.11.015, 2005
- Challinor, A. J., Watson, J., Lobell, D. B., Howden, S. M., Smith, D. R., and Chhetri, N. (2014). A metaanalysis of crop yield under climate change and adaptation. *Nat. Clim. Change* 4, 287–291. doi:
 10.1038/nclimate2153
- Challinor, A., Wheeler, T., Craufurd, P., Slingo, J., and Grimes, D.: Design and optimisation of a largearea process-based model for annual crops, Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, 124, 99 120,
 DOI:10.1016/j.agrformet.2004.01.002, 2004.
- Challinor, A., Wheeler, T., Garforth, C., Craufurd, P., and Kassam, A. (2007). Assessing the
 vulnerability of food crop systems in Africa to climate change. *Clim. Change* 83, 381–399. doi:
 10.1007/s10584-007-9249-0
- Connolly-Boutin, L. and Smit, B. (2016). Climate change, food security, and livelihoods in sub-Saharan
 Africa. *Regional Environmental Change*, 16: 385-399.
- 451 Deryng, D. (2015). *Climate Change Impacts on Crop Productivity in Global Semi-Arid Areas and* 452 *Selected Semi-Arid Economies*. Small Grant Programme Working Paper, Overseas Development

453 Institute (ODI), London. Available online at: http://prise.odi.org/research/small-grants-programme-

- 454 <u>climate-change-impacts-on-crop-productivity-in-global-semi-arid-areas-and-selected-semi-arid-</u>
- 455 <u>economies/</u>

Deryng, D., Elliott, J., Folberth, C., Müller, C., Pugh, T. A. M., Boote, K. J., et al. (2016). Regional
disparities in the beneficial effects of rising CO₂ concentrations on crop water productivity. *Nat. Clim. Change* 6, 786–790. doi: 10.1038/nclimate2995

- Dong, B., and Sutton, R. (2015). Dominant role of greenhouse-gas forcing in the recovery of Sahel
 rainfall. Nat. Clim. Change 5, 757–760. doi: 10.1038/nclimate2664
- Elliott, J., Müller, C., Deryng, D., Chryssanthacopoulos, J., Boote, K. J., Büchner, M., Foster, I., Glotter,
 M., Heinke, J., Iizumi, T., Izaurralde, R. C., Mueller, N. D., Ray, D. K., Rosenzweig, C., Ruane, A. C., and
 Sheffield, J.: The Global Gridded Crop Model Intercomparison: data and modeling protocols for Phase
 1 (v1.0), Geosci. Model Dev., 8, 261–277, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-8-261-2015, 2015
- 465 Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R. J., and Taylor, K. E.: Overview 466 of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and 467 organization, Geosci. Model Dev., 9, 1937-1958, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016, 2016.
- Fontaine B., P. Roucou, M. Gaetani, R. Marteau, 2011: Recent changes in precipitation, ITCZ
 convection and northern tropical circulation over North Africa (1979-2007). International Journal of
 Climatology, 31, 633-648, doi: 10.1002/joc.2108.
- Gaetani M., C. Flamant, S. Bastin, S. Janicot, C. Lavaysse, F. Hourdin, P. Braconnot, S. Bony, 2017:
 West African Monsoon dynamics and precipitation: the competition between global SST warming
 and CO2 increase in CMIP5 idealized simulations. Climate Dynamics, 48, 1353-1373, doi:
 10.1007/s00382-016-3146-z.
- Gerardeaux, E., Sultan, B., Palai, O., Guiziou, C., Oettli, P., and Naudin, K. (2013). Positive effect of
 climate change on cotton in 2050 by CO₂ enrichment and conservation agriculture in
 Cameroon. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 33, 485–495. doi: 10.1007/s13593-012-0119-4
- Giannini A (2010) Mechanisms of climate change in the Semiarid African Sahel: the local view. J Clim
 23:743–756. doi:10.1175/2009JCLI3123.1
- 480 Giannini A, Saravanan R, Chang P (2003) Oceanic forcing of Sahel rainfall on interannual to 481 interdecadal time scales. Science 302:1027–1030. doi:10.1126/science.1089357
- Giannini, A., S. Salack, T. Lodoun, A. Ali, A. T. Gaye, and O. Ndiaye (2013), A unifying view of climate
 change in the Sahel linking intra-seasonal, interannual and longer time scales, Environ. Res. Lett., 8
 024010.
- Held, I. M., T. L. Delworth, J. Lu, K. L. Findell, and T. R. Knutson (2005), Simulation of Sahel drought in
 the 20th and 21st centuries., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 102, 17891–17896, doi:
 10.1073/pnas.0509057102.
- IPCC (2014). "Climate change 2014: synthesis report," in *Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, eds Core Writing
 Team, R. K. Pachauri, and L. A. Meyer (Geneva: IPCC), 151.
- 491 Knox, J., Hess, T., Daccache, A., and Wheeler, T. (2012). Climate change impacts on crop productivity 492 in Africa and South Asia. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 7:034032. doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/7/3/034032

Koster RD et al (2004) Regions of strong coupling between soil moisture and precipitation. Science305:1138–1140

- Kotir, J. H. (2010). Climate change and variability in Sub-Saharan Africa: a review of current and
 future trends and impacts on agriculture and food security. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.* 13, 587–605. doi:
 10.1007/s10668-010-9278-0
- Leakey, A. D. B. (2009). Rising atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration and the future of C4 crops for food and fuel. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 276, 2333–2343. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2008.1517
- 500 Mohino E, Janicot S, Bader J (2011) Sahel rainfall and decadal to multi-decadal sea surface 501 Temperature variability. Clim Dyn 37:419–440. doi: 10.1007/s00382-010-0867-2.
- 502 Monerie, PA., Sanchez-Gomez, E. & Boé, J. Clim Dyn (2017) 48: 2751. 503 <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3236-y</u>
- 504 Müller, C., Bondeau, A., Popp, A., Waha, K., and Fader, M. (2010). *Climate Change Impacts on* 505 *Agricultural Yields*. Background note to the World Development Report 2010, Potsdam Institute for 506 Climate Impact Research.
- Park, J. et al. (2016) Anthropogenic Mediterranean warming essential driver for present and future
 Sahel rainfall, Nature Climate Change, doi: 10.1038/nclimate3065.
- Park, J.Y., Bader, J., and Matei, D. (2014). Northern-hemispheric differential warming is the key to
 understanding the discrepancies in the projected Sahel rainfall. Nat. Commun. 6, 5985.
 doi:10.1038/ncomms6985
- 512 Parkes, B., Challinor, A., and Nicklin, K.: Crop failure rates in a geoengineered climate: impact of 513 climate change and marine cloud brightening, Environmental Research Letters, 10, 084 003, 2015.
- Parkes, B., Defrance, D., Sultan, B., Ciais, P., and Wang, X. (2018) Projected changes in crop yield
 mean and variability over West Africa in a world 1.5 K warmer than the pre-industrial era. Earth Syst.
 Dynam., 9, 119-134, https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-9-119-2018
- Riahi, K., Rao, S., Krey, V., et al. (2011) RCP 8.5—A Scenario of Comparatively High Greenhouse Gas
 Emissions. Climatic Change, 109, 33-57. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0149-y</u>
- Roehrig R, Bouniol D, Guichard F, Hourdin FD, Redelsperger JL (2013) The present and future of the
 West African monsoon: a process-oriented assessment of CMIP5 simulations along the AMMA
 transect. J Clim 26:6471–6505. doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00505.1
- Roudier, P., Sultan, S., Quirion, P., and Berg, A. (2011). The impact of future climate change on West
 African crop yields: what does the recent literature say? *Glob. Environ. Change* 21, 1073–1083. doi:
 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.04.007
- Rowell DP (2013) Simulating SST teleconnections to Africa: what is the state of the art? J Clim
 26:5397–5418. doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00761.1
- 527 Schlenker, W., and Lobell, D. B. (2010). Robust negative impacts of climate change on African 528 agriculture. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 5, 1–8. doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/5/1/014010
- 529 Sharon E. Nicholson, Chris Funk, Andreas H. Fink, Rainfall over the African continent from the 19th 530 through the 21st century, Global and Planetary Change, 2017, ISSN 0921-8181, 531 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2017.12.014
- 531 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2017.12.014</u>.

Sultan B and Gaetani M (2016). Agriculture in West Africa in the Twenty-first Century: climate change
and impacts scenarios, and potential for adaptation. *Front. Plant Sci.* 7:1262. doi:
10.3389/fpls.2016.01262

Sultan, B., Guan, K., Kouressy, M., Biasutti, M., Piani, C., Hammer, G. L., et al. (2014). Robust features
of future climate change impacts on sorghum yields in West Africa. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 9. doi:
10.1088/1748-9326/9/10/104006

Sultan, B., Roudier, P., Quirion, P., Alhassane, A., Muller, B., Dingkuhn, M., et al. (2013). Assessing
climate change impacts on sorghum and millet yields in the Sudanian and Sahelian savannas of West
Africa. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 8:014040. doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/8/1/014040

Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J., and Meehl, G. A. (2012). An overview of CMIP5 and the experiment design. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* 93, 485–498. doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1

Tubiello, F. N., Soussana, J. F., and Howden, M. (2007). Crop and pasture response to climate change, *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 104, 19686–19690. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0701728104

545 Vellinga, M., M. Roberts, P. L. Vidale, M. S. Mizielinski, M.-E. Demory, R. Schiemann, J. Strachan, and

546 C. Bain (2015), Sahel decadal rainfall variability and the role of model horizontal resolution, Geophys.

547 Res. Lett., 42, doi:10.1002/2015GL066690

548 Vermeulen, Sonja J., Andrew J. Challinor, Philip K. Thornton, Bruce M. Campbell, Nishadi Eriyagama,

549 Joost M. Vervoort, James Kinyangi, Andy Jarvis, Peter Läderach, Julian Ramirez-Villegas, Kathryn J.

550 Nicklin, Ed Hawkins, Daniel R. Smith (2013) Addressing uncertainty in adaptation planning for

551 agriculture, Proc. Natl Acad. Sci, May 2013, 110 (21) 8357-8362; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1219441110

552

- 553
- 554
- 555

556

Per Review Only

Table 1: Models analysed. CMIP5 model information and outputs are available through the Earth

 System Grid Federation archive (<u>http://cmip-pcmdi.llnl.gov/cmip5</u>)

Country	Modelling centre	Model	Resolution
France	Centre National de Recherches	CNRM-CM5	T127 (~1.4°)
	Météorologiques/Centre Européen de		
	Recherche et Formation Avancée en Calcul		
	Scientifique		
United Kingdom	Met Office Hadley Centre	HadGEM2-A	1.25 × 1.875°
France	Institut Pierre Simon Laplace	IPSL-CM5A-LR	1.875° × 3.75°
France	Institut Pierre Simon Laplace	IPSL-CM5B-LR	1.875° × 3.75°
Japan	Atmosphere and Ocean Research Institute	MIROC5	T127 (~1.4°)
	(The University of Tokyo), National Institute		
	for Environmental Studies, and Japan		
	Agency for Marine Earth Science and		
	Technology		

, jor , yof Tok, Jonmental St. , y for Marine Ear, Technology

Table 2: The experiments with GLAM and AMIP runs. In control climate (ctl), SST and CO2 are prescribed at the 1979-2008 observed values (Taylor et al. 2012).

		Sea Surface Temperature in AGCM	CO2 atmospheric concentration in AGCM	CO2 concentration in GLAM crop model	Short description of the scenario
	t0c1f1	ctl	ctl	ctl	The control scenario
Control climate	t0c1f4	ctl	ctl	ctl x4	The scenario of direct effect on CO2 on the crop
Altered climate with +4K warmer SST but control CO2 concentration	t4c1f1	ctl +4K	ctl ctl		The warmer climate scenario with no effect of CO2 on the crop transpiration
	t4c1f4	ctl +4K	ctl	ctl x4	The warmer climate scenario with direct effect of CO2 on the crop transpiration
Altered climate with 4 times higher levels of CO2 concentration but control SST	t0c4f1	ctl	ctl x4	ctl	The direct CO2 effect of the monsoon with no effect of CO2 on the crop transpiration
	t0c4f4	ctl	ctl x4	ctl x4	The direct CO2 effect of the monsoon with no effect of CO2 on the crop transpiration

Table 3: Simulated yield (kg/ha), annual rainfall (mm/year) and mean surface temperature (degC) in West Africa in the *t0c1f1* control simulations. The values are averaged over the domain: Longitude 15W to 20E and latitude 4N to 15N

Climate model	Mean yield (kg/ha)	Total precipitation (mm/year)	Mean temperature (degC)
CNRM CM5	3994,0	650	27,2
HadGEM2	2921,5	461	28,7
IPSL CM5A	3706,6	645	27,6
IPSL CM5B	3342,6	569	27,4
MIROC5	3480,3	671	29,1

	Mean yield	Total precipitation
Climate models	cnange (%)	cnange (%)
CNRM CM5	-0,57	6,59
HadGEM2	21,91	19,82
IPSL CM5A	1,42	5,43
IPSL CM5B	-7,68	1,60
MIROC5	-15,26	-2,08
MMM	-0,67	5,49

Table 4: Yield and annual precipitation change (%) in West Africa (20W-15E ; 4N-15N) in the *t0c4f1*simulations comparing to CTL simulation. MMM is the multi-model mean.

Table 5: Yield and annual precipitation change (%) in West Sahel and East Sahel (see boxes on Figure

 4) in the *t0c4f1* simulations comparing to the control CTL simulation. MMM is the multi-model mean.

Domain	Climate	Total precipitation change (%)	Mean yield
West Sahel	CNRIM CM5	4,29	-6,79
	HadGEM2	16,07	9,21
	IPSL CM5A	6,78	-1,02
	IPSL CM5B	-2,07	-11,94
	MIROC5	-1,81	-14,34
	MMM	4,01	-5,27
East Sahel	CNRM CM5	10,34	8,11
	HadGEM2	33,45	90,31
	IPSL CM5A	13,23	10,09
	IPSL CM5B	12,27	0,86
	MIROC5	1,60	-20,64
	MMM	12,75	12,07

1,60 -20,64 12,75 12,07 **Table 6:** Crop season duration (day), annual precipitation (%), mean temperature (K) and yield change (%) in the *t4c1f1* and *t4c1f4* simulations (only yield differs) in West Africa comparing to the control CTL simulation. MMM is the multi-model mean.

	Growing season	Total	Mean	t4c1f1	t4c1f4
Climate	duration change	precipitation	temperature	Mean yield	Mean yield
models	(day)	change (%)	change (K)	change (%)	change (%)
CNRM CM5	-14,3	-15,3	5,7	-54,7	-43,1
HadGEM2	-2,9	-16,6	6,0	-62,9	-52,6
IPSL CM5A	-12,7	-18,6	5,3	-55,4	-32,3
IPSL CM5B	-10,9	-27,2	5,5	-57,0	-39,9
MIROC5	-3,5	-17,5	5,2	-51,7	-38,6
MMM	-8,9	-19,0	5,5	-56,1	-40,9

Table 7: Crop season duration (day), annual precipitation (%), mean temperature (K) and yield change (%) in the *t4c1f1* and *t4c1f4* simulations (only yield differs) in West and East Sahel comparing to control CTL simulation. MMM is the multi-model mean.

		Growing season	Total	Mean	t4c1f1	t4c1f4
	Climate	duration	precipitation	temperature	Mean yield	Mean yield
Domain	models	change (day)	change (%)	change (K)	change (%)	change (%)
West	CNRM CM5	-15,7	-24,9	5,4	-50,9	-41,6
Sahel	HadGEM2	-6,9	-25,8	5,8	-60,9	-51,5
	IPSL CM5A	-14,2	-18,1	5,2	-50,2	-26,0
	IPSL CM5B	-13,8	-28,1	5,3	-51,8	-35,2
	MIROC5	-9,6	-30,6	5,2	-50,4	-40,6
	MMM	-12,0	-25,5	5,4	-52,6	-38,6
East	CNRM CM5	-10,3	-10,5	6,1	-62,7	-47,8
Sahel	HadGEM2	5,4	-10,4	6,4	-85,9	-78,0
	IPSL CM5A	-10,1	-28,0	5,5	-69,2	-50,8
	IPSL CM5B	-5,6	-39,8	5,9	-81,1	-69,7
	MIROC5	6,1	1,6	5,3	-63,4	-44,0
	MMM	-2,9	-16,3	5,9	-69,8	-54,7

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/joc



Figure 1: Crop yield response to rainfall and temperature variations in the GLAM model. Pixel by pixel difference against the domain average for mean yield and total growing season rainfall (left) and mean temperature (right). Values are then averaged over the 30 years of the control experiment to give more than 400 values expressed in percentage.



Figure 2: Crop yield response to increased C02 concentration. Simulated yield change (%) are shown as differences with the control run in average over West Africa (20W-15E ; 4N-15N) for the t0c4f4, t0c1f4 and t0c4f1 simulations. MMM is the multi-model mean.



Figure 3: Crop yield response to rainfall variations in the t0c4f1 simulation. Simulated yield and rainfall changes (%) are shown as differences with the control run in average over West Africa for the t0c4f1 simulation. MMM is the multi-model mean.



Figure 4: Mean yield and rainfall changes in West Africa in the t0c1f4, t0c4f1 and t0c4f4 simulations. Multimodel mean changes (%) are shown as differences with the control run. Simulated yield change are shown for simulations t0c1f4 (a), t0c4f1 (b) and t0c4f4 (d). Total rainfall change is shown in (c) for the t0c4f1 simulation. A similar map would be obtained for t0c4f4 simulation

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/joc



Figure 5: Mean temperature and rainfall response to a SST warming of +4K. Multi-model mean changes of temperature (a) and rainfall (b) are shown as differences between the t4c1f1 simulation and the control run.



Figure 6: Crop yield response to a SST warming of +4K. Multi-model mean yield changes in West Africa (%) in the t4c1f1 (a) and t4c1f4 (b) simulations.



Figure 7: Crop yield response to temperature variations in the t4c1f1 simulation. Simulated yield (%) and temperature (K) changes are shown as differences with the control run in average over West Sahel (blue dots) and East Sahel (red dots) for the t4c1f1 simulation. MMM is the multi-model mean.

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/joc