

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Celebrating the Anniversary of Three Key Events in Climate **Change Science**

Citation for published version:

Santer, BD, Bonfils, CJW, Fu, Q, Fyfe, JC, Hegerl, G, Mears, C, Painter, JF, Po-Chedley, S, Wentz, FJ, Zelinka, MD & Zou, C-Z 2019, 'Celebrating the Anniversary of Three Key Events in Climate Change Science', Nature Climate Change. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0424-x

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

10.1038/s41558-019-0424-x

Link: Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

Document Version: Peer reviewed version

Published In: Nature Climate Change

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



1	Celebrating the Anniversary of Three Key Events in		
2	Climate Change Science		
3	Benjamin D. Santer ¹ , C.J.W. Bonfils ¹ , Qiang Fu ² , John C. Fyfe ³ , Gabriele C. Hegerl ⁴ ,		
4	Carl Mears ⁵ , Jeffrey F. Painter ¹ , Stephen Po-Chedley ¹ , Frank J. Wentz ⁵ ,		
5	Mark D. Zelinka ¹ & Cheng-Zhi Zou ⁶		
6	¹ Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), Lawrence Livermore Na-		
7	tional Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94550, USA.		
8	² Dept. of Atmospheric Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA.		
9	³ Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis, Environment and Climate Change Canada,		
10	Victoria, British Columbia, V8W 2Y2, Canada.		
11	⁴ School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3FE, UK.		
12	⁵ Remote Sensing Systems, Santa Rosa, CA 95401, USA.		
13	⁶ Center for Satellite Applications and Research, NOAA/NESDIS, College Park, MD 20740, USA.		
14	Corresponding author's email: santer1@llnl.gov		
15	Submitted to Nature Climate Change		
16	Date: January 1, 2019		
	1		

¹⁷ Climate science celebrates three 40th anniversaries in 2019: release of the Charney
¹⁸ report, publication of a key paper on anthropogenic signal detection, and the start of
¹⁹ satellite temperature measurements. This confluence of scientific understanding and
²⁰ data led to the identification of a human fingerprint in atmospheric temperature.

We discuss below the events commemorated by these anniversaries. Our focus is on understanding how the scientific advances arising from these events aided efforts to identify human influences on the thermal structure of the atmosphere.

24 The Charney report

In 1979, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences published the findings of an "Ad Hoc 25 Study Group on Carbon Dioxide and Climate". This is frequently referred to as the Char-26 ney report¹. The authors did not have many of the scientific advantages available today: 27 international climate science assessments based on thousands of relevant peer-reviewed sci-28 entific papers 2,3,4 , four decades of satellite measurements of global climate change⁵, land 29 and ocean surface temperature datasets spanning more than 120 years⁶, estimates of natu-30 ral climate variability^{7,8}, and sophisticated three-dimensional numerical models of Earth's 31 climate system. Nevertheless, the report's principal findings have aged remarkably well. 32 Consider conclusions regarding the equilibrium climate sensitivity (ECS): "We estimate 33 the most probable global warming for a doubling of CO_2 to be near $3^{\circ}C$ with a probable 34 error of +/- $1.5^{\circ}C$ ". These values are in accord with current understanding⁹ and are now 35

³⁶ supported by multiple lines of evidence that were unavailable in 1979. Examples include
 ³⁷ observed patterns of surface warming, greenhouse gas and temperature changes on Ice Age
 ³⁸ timescales, and results from multi-model ensembles of externally forced simulations^{3,4,9}.

There is also better process-level understanding of the feedbacks contributing to ECS 39 uncertainties^{10,11,12}. Charney *et al.* understood that the factor of three spread in ECS was 40 mainly due to uncertainties in the net effect of high and low cloud feedbacks¹³. Reliable 41 assessment of cloud feedbacks required "comprehensive numerical modeling of the general 42 circulations of the atmosphere and the oceans together with validation by comparison of 43 the observed with the model-produced cloud types and amounts." This conclusion foreshad-44 owed rigorous evaluation of model cloud properties with satellite data¹⁴. Such comparisons 45 ultimately led to the elucidation of robust cloud responses to greenhouse warming¹⁵, and 46 to the 2013 conclusion of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that "the 47 sign of the net radiative feedback due to all cloud types is... likely positive"¹⁰. 48

The ocean's role in climate change featured prominently in the Charney report. The authors noted that ocean heat uptake would delay the emergence of a human-caused warming signal from the background noise of natural variability¹⁶. This delay, they wrote, meant that humanity "…*may not be given a warning until the CO*₂ *loading is such that an appreciable climate change is inevitable*". The finding that "*On time scales of decades… the coupling between the mixed layer and the upper thermocline must be considered*" provided impetus for the development of atmosphere-ocean General Circulation Models (GCMs).

The authors also knew that scientific uncertainties did not negate the reality and serious-56 ness of human-caused climate change: "We have examined with care all known negative 57 feedback mechanisms, such as increase in low or middle cloud amount, and have con-58 cluded that the oversimplifications and inaccuracies in the models are not likely to have 59 vitiated the principal conclusion that there will be appreciable warming." Although the 60 GCMs available in 1979 were not yet sufficiently reliable for predicting regional changes, 61 Charney et al. cautioned that the "associated regional climate changes so important to the 62 assessment of socioeconomic consequences may well be significant". 63

In retrospect, the Charney report seems like the scientific equivalent of the handwriting on the wall. Forty years ago, its authors issued a clear warning of the potentially significant socioeconomic consequences of human-caused warming. Their warning was accurate, and remains more relevant than ever.

68 Hasselmann's optimal detection paper

The second scientific anniversary marks the publication of a paper by Klaus Hasselmann entitled: "*On the signal-to-noise problem in atmospheric response studies*"¹⁷. This is now widely regarded as the first serious effort to provide a sound statistical framework for identifying a human-caused warming signal.

In the 1970s, there was recognition that GCM simulations yielded both "signal" and "noise" when forced by changes in atmospheric CO_2 or other external factors¹⁸. The sig⁷⁵ nal was the climate response to the altered external factor. The noise arose from natural ⁷⁶ internal climate variability. Noise estimates were obtained from observations or by running ⁷⁷ an atmospheric GCM coupled to a simple model of the upper ocean. In the presence of ⁷⁸ intrinsic noise, statistical methods were required to identify areas of the world where first ⁷⁹ detection of a human-caused warming signal might occur.

One key insight in Hasselmann's 1979 paper was that analysts should look at the sta-80 tistical significance of global geographical patterns of climate change. Previous work had 81 assessed the significance of the local climate response to a particular external forcing at 82 thousands of individual model grid-points. Climate information at these individual loca-83 tions was correlated in space and in time, hampering assessment of overall significance. 84 Hasselmann noted that "...it is necessary to regard the signal and noise fields as multi-85 dimensional vector quantities... and the significance analysis should accordingly be car-86 ried out with respect to this multi-variate statistical field, rather than in terms of individual 87 gridpoint statistics". Instead of looking for the needle in a tiny corner of a large haystack 88 (and then proceeding to search the next tiny corner), Hasselmann advocated for a more 89 efficient strategy – searching the entire haystack simultaneously. 90

The paper pointed out that theory, observations, and models provide considerable information about signal and noise properties. For example, changes in solar irradiance, volcanic aerosols, and greenhouse gases produce signals with different patterns, amplitudes, and frequencies^{2,3,4,8,19}. These unique signal characteristics ("fingerprints") can be used to ⁹⁵ distinguish climate signals from climate noise.

Hasselmann's paper was a statistical roadmap for hundreds of subsequent climate change
detection and attribution ("D&A") studies. These investigations identified anthropogenic
fingerprints in a wide range of independently monitored observational datasets^{2,3,4}. D&A
research provided strong scientific support for the conclusion reached by the IPCC in 2013: *"it is extremely likely that human influence has been the dominant cause of the observed*warming since the mid-20th century"⁴.

102 Forty years of satellite temperature data

In November 1978, Microwave Sounding Units (MSUs) on NOAA polar-orbiting satellites began monitoring the microwave emissions from oxygen molecules. These emissions are proportional to the temperature of broad atmospheric layers⁵. A successor to MSU, the Advanced Microwave Sounding Unit (AMSU), was deployed in 1998. Estimates of global changes in atmospheric temperature can be obtained from MSU and AMSU measurements.

Over their 40-year history, MSU and AMSU data have been essential ingredients in hundreds of research investigations. These datasets allowed scientists to study the size, significance, and causes of global trends and variability in Earth's atmospheric temperature and circulation, to quantify the tropospheric cooling after major volcanic eruptions, to evaluate climate model performance, and to assess the consistency between observed surface and tropospheric temperature changes^{2,3,4,20}.

Satellite atmospheric temperature data were also a useful test-bed for Hasselmann's 114 signal detection strategy. They had continuous, near-global coverage⁵. Data products 115 were available from multiple research groups, allowing uncertainties in temperature re-116 trievals to be quantified. Signal detection studies with MSU and AMSU revealed that 117 human fingerprints were identifiable in the warming of the troposphere and cooling of the 118 lower stratosphere⁸, confirming model projections made over 50 years ago²¹. Tropospheric 119 warming is largely due to increases in atmospheric CO_2 from fossil fuel use^{2,3,4,8,20}, while 120 lower stratospheric cooling over the 40-year satellite record²² is mainly attributable to an-121 thropogenic depletion of stratospheric ozone²³. 122

While enabling significant scientific advances, MSU and AMSU temperature data have 123 also been at the center of scientific and political imbroglios. Some controversies were re-124 lated to differences between surface warming inferred from thermometers and tropospheric 125 warming estimated from satellites. Claims that these warming rate differences cast doubt 126 on the reliability of the surface data have not been substantiated 20,24 . Other disputes focused 127 on how to adjust for non-climatic artifacts arising from orbital decay and drift, instrument 128 calibration drift, and the transition between MSU and AMSU instruments^{5,20}. More re-129 cently, claims of no significant warming since 1998 have been based on artfully selected 130 subsets of satellite temperature data. Such claims are erroneous and do not call into ques-131 tion the reality of long-term tropospheric warming 25 . 132

A confluence of scientific understanding

The zeitgeist of 1979 was favorable for anthropogenic signal detection. From the Charney report, which relied on basic theory and early climate model simulations, there was clear recognition that fossil fuel burning would yield an appreciable global warming signal¹. Klaus Hasselmann's paper¹⁷ outlined a rational approach for detecting this signal. Satelliteborne microwave sounders began to monitor atmospheric temperature, providing global patterns of multi-decadal climate change and natural internal variability – information required for successful application of Hasselmann's signal detection method.

Because of this confluence in scientific understanding, we can now answer the follow-141 ing question: when did a human-caused tropospheric warming signal first emerge from the 142 background noise of natural climate variability? We addressed this question by applying 143 a fingerprint method related to Hasselmann's approach (see online Methods). An anthro-144 pogenic fingerprint of tropospheric warming is identifiable with high statistical confidence 145 in all currently available satellite datasets (Figure 1). In two out of three datasets, finger-146 print detection at a 5-sigma threshold – the gold standard for discoveries in particle physics 147 - occurs no later than 2005, only 27 years after the 1979 start of the satellite measurements. 148 Humanity cannot afford to ignore such clear signals. 149

References

151	1.	Charney, J. G. et al. Carbon dioxide and climate: A scientific assessment. Available
152		from Climate Research Board, National Research Council (1979).
153	2.	Mitchell, J. F. B. & Karoly, D. J. Detection of climate change and attribution of
154		causes. In J. T. Houghton, Y. Ding, D. J. Griggs, M. Noguer, P. J. van der Linden,
155		X. Dai, K. Maskell, and C. A. Johnson, editors, Climate Change 2001: The Scien-
156		tific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the
157		Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, pages 695–738. Cambridge University
158		Press (2001).
159	3.	Hegerl, G. C. et al. Understanding and Attributing Climate Change. In S. Solomon,
160		D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H. L.
161		Miller, editors, Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of
162		Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Inter-governmental Panel
163		on Climate Change, pages 663–745. Cambridge University Press (2007).
164	4.	Bindoff, N. L. et al. Detection and Attribution of Climate Change: from Global
165		to Regional. In T. F. Stocker, D. Qin, GK. Plattner, M. Tignor, S. K. Allen, J.
166		Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, and P. M. Midgley, editors, Climate Change
167		2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth
168		Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, pages 867-
169		952. Cambridge University Press, (2013).

- ¹⁷⁰ 5. Mears, C. & Wentz, F. J. J. Clim. **30**, 7695–7718 (2017).
- 6. Morice, C. P., Kennedy, J. J., Rayner, N. A. & Jones, P. D. *J. Geophys. Res.* **117**, (2012).
- ¹⁷³ 7. Fyfe, J. C. *et al.*. *Nat. Comm.* **8**, (2017).
- 8. Santer, B. D. *et al. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **110**, 17235–17240 (2013).
- 9. Knutti, R., Rugenstein, M. A. A., & Hegerl, G. C. *Nat. Geosci.* **10**, 727-736 (2017).
- 176 10. IPCC. Summary for Policymakers. In T. F. Stocker, D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tig-
- nor, S. K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, and P. M. Midgley, editors,
 Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group
 I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
 Cambridge University Press (2013).
- 181 11. Ceppi, P., Brient, F., Zelinka, M. D., & Hartmann, D. L. WIREs Clim. Change 8,
 (2017).
- 12. Caldwell, P. M., Zelinka, M. D., Taylor, K. E., & Marvel, K. J. Clim. 29, 513–524
 (2016).
- 13. Klein, S. A., Hall, A., Norris, J. R., & Pincus, R. Surv. Geophys. 38, 1307–1329
 (2017).
- 14. Klein, S. A., Zhang, Y., Zelinka, M. D., Pincus, R., Boyle, J., & Gleckler, P. J. J.
 Geophys. Res. 118, 1329–1342 (2013).

- 15. Zelinka, M. D., Randall, D. A., Webb, M. J., & Klein, S. A. *Nat. Clim. Change* 7,
 674–678 (2017).
- ¹⁹¹ 16. Barnett, T. P. *et al. Science* **309**, 284–287 (2005).
- 192 17. Hasselmann, K.. On the signal-to-noise problem in atmospheric response studies. In
 Meteorology over the Tropical Oceans, pages 251–259. Roy. Met. Soc., London,
 194 1979.
- 195 18. Chervin, R. M., Washington, W. M., & Schneider, S. H. J. Atmos. Sci. 33, 413–423
 196 (1976).
- ¹⁹⁷ 19. North, G. R., Kim, K. Y., Shen, S. S. P., & Hardin, J. W. J. Clim. 8, 401-408 (1995).
- 20. Karl, T. R., Hassol, S. J., Miller, C. D., & Murray, W. L., eds. Temperature trends
 in the lower atmosphere: Steps for understanding and reconciling differences. A Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global
 Change Research. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 164 pages
 (2006).
- ²⁰³ 21. Manabe, S. & Wetherald, R. T. J. Atmos. Sci. 24, 241–259 (1967).
- 204 22. Zou, C.-Z. & Qian, H. J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech. 33, 1967–1984 (2016).
- 205 23. Solomon, S. et al. J. Geophys. Res. 122, 8940–8950 (2017).
- ²⁰⁶ 24. Fu, Q., Johanson, C. M., Warren, S. G., & Seidel, D. J. *Nature* **429**, 55–58 (2004).

207 25. Santer, B. D. et al. Sci. Reports 7, (2017).



Figure 1: Signal-to-noise ratios (S/N) used for identifying a model-predicted anthropogenic fingerprint in satellite measurements of annual-mean tropospheric temperature. The MSU and AMSU measurements are from three different research groups: Remote Sensing Systems (RSS), the Center for Satellite Applications and Research (STAR), and the University of Alabama at Huntsville (UAH). The grey and black horizontal lines are the 3σ and 5σ thresholds that we use for estimating the signal detection time. By 2002, all three satellite datasets yield S/N ratios exceeding the 3σ threshold. By 2016, an anthropogenic signal is consistently detected at the 5σ threshold. Further details of the model and satellite data and the fingerprint method are provided in the online Methods.

208 Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the World Climate Research Programme's Working Group on Coupled 209 Modelling, which is responsible for CMIP, and we thank the climate modeling groups 210 for producing and making available their model output. For CMIP, the U.S. Department 211 of Energy's Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) pro-212 vides coordinating support and led development of software infrastructure in partnership 213 with the Global Organization for Earth System Science Portals. The authors thank Susan 214 Solomon (M.I.T.) and Ken Denman, Norm McFarlane, and Knut von Salzen (Canadian 215 Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis) for helpful comments. Funding: Work at 216 LLNL was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy under contract 217 DE-AC52-07NA27344 through the Regional and Global Model Analysis Program (B.D.S., 218 J.F.P., S.P.-C., and M.Z.) and the Early Career Research Program Award SCW1295 (C.B.). 219 Support was also provided by NASA Grant NNH12CF05C (F.J.W. and C.M.), and NOAA 220 Grant NA18OAR4310423 (Q.F). Author contributions: B.D.S. conceived the study and 221 performed statistical analyses. J.F.P. calculated synthetic satellite temperatures from model 222 simulation output. C.M., F.J.W., and C.-Z.Z. provided satellite temperature data. All au-223 thors contributed to the writing and revision of the manuscript. Competing interests: 224 None. Data and materials availability: All primary satellite and model temperature 225 datasets used here are publicly available. Derived products (synthetic satellite temperatures 226 calculated from model simulations) are provided at: https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/research/DandA/. 227 Disclaimer: The views, opinions, and findings contained in this report are those of the au-228

- thors and should not be construed as a position, policy, or decision of the U.S. Government,
- the U.S. Department of Energy, or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

231 Online Methods

232 1 Satellite atmospheric temperature data

In calculating the signal detection times shown in Figure 1, we used satellite estimates of 233 atmospheric temperature produced by Remote Sensing Systems^{5,26}, the Center for Satellite 234 Applications and Research^{27,28}, and the University of Alabama at Huntsville^{29,30}. We refer 235 to these groups subsequently as RSS, STAR, and UAH (respectively). All three groups 236 provide satellite measurements of the temperatures of the mid- to upper troposphere (TMT) 237 and the lower stratosphere (TLS). Our focus here is on estimating the detection time for an 238 anthropogenic fingerprint in satellite TMT data. TLS is required for correcting TMT for 239 the influence it receives from stratospheric cooling 24 (see Section 3). 240

Satellite datasets are in the form of monthly means on $2.5^{\circ} \times 2.5^{\circ}$ latitude/longitude grids. At the time this analysis was performed, temperature data were available for the 468-month period from January 1979 to December 2017. We used the most recent dataset versions from each group: 4.0 (RSS), 4.0 (STAR), and 6.0 (UAH).

We note that studies of the size, patterns, and causes of atmospheric temperature changes have also relied on information from radiosondes^{20,31,32,33,34}. Non-climatic factors, such as refinements over time in radiosonde instrumentation and thermal shielding, hamper the identification of true climate changes^{20,35}. Additionally, radiosonde data have much sparser coverage than satellite data, particularly in the Southern Hemisphere. The spatially complete coverage of MSU and AMSU offers advantages for obtaining reliable estimates of ²⁵¹ hemispheric- and global-scale temperature trends and patterns of temperature change.

252 2 Details of model output

We used model output from phase 5 of CMIP, the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project³⁶. 253 The simulations analyzed here were contributed by 19 different research groups (see Sup-254 plementary Table S1). Our focus was on three different types of numerical experiment: 255 1) simulations with estimated historical changes in human and natural external forcings; 256 2) simulations with 21st century changes in greenhouse gases and anthropogenic aerosols 257 prescribed according to the Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5 (RCP8.5), with ra-258 diative forcing of approximately 8.5 W/m² in 2100, eventually stabilizing at roughly 12 259 W/m^2 ; and 3) pre-industrial control runs with no changes in external influences on climate. 260 Details of these simulations are provided in Supplementary Tables S2 and S3. 261

Most CMIP5 historical simulations end in December 2005. RCP8.5 simulations were typically initiated from conditions of the climate system at the end of the historical run. To avoid truncating comparisons between modeled and observed atmospheric temperature trends in December 2005, we spliced together synthetic satellite temperatures from the historical simulations and the RCP8.5 runs. Splicing allows us to compare actual and synthetic temperature changes over the full 39-year length of the satellite record. We use the acronym "HIST+8.5" to identify these spliced simulations.

3 Method used for correcting TMT data

Trends in TMT estimated from microwave sounders receive a substantial contribution from the cooling of the lower stratosphere^{24,37,38,39}. In Fu et al. $(2004)^{24}$, a regression-based method was developed for removing the bulk of this stratospheric cooling component of TMT. This method has been validated with both observed and model atmospheric temperature data^{37,40,41}. Here, we refer to the corrected version of TMT as TMT_{cr}. The main text discusses corrected TMT only, and does not use the subscript *cr* to identify corrected TMT.

For calculating tropical averages of TMT_{cr} , Fu et al. $(2005)^{38}$ used:

$$TMT_{cr} = a_{24}TMT + (1 - a_{24})TLS$$
 (1)

where $a_{24} = 1.1$. For the global domain considered here, lower stratospheric cooling makes a larger contribution to TMT trends, so a_{24} is larger^{24,39}. In Fu et al (2004)²⁴ and Johanson and Fu (2006)³⁹, $a_{24} \approx 1.15$ was applied directly to near-global averages of TMT and TLS. Since we are performing corrections on local (grid-point) data, we used $a_{24} = 1.1$ between 30° N and 30° S, and $a_{24} = 1.2$ poleward of 30° . This is approximately equivalent to use of the $a_{24} = 1.15$ for globally-averaged data.

283 4 Calculation of synthetic satellite temperatures

We use a local weighting function method developed at RSS to calculate synthetic satellite temperatures from model output⁴². At each model grid-point, simulated temperature profiles were convolved with local weighting functions. The weights depend on the grid-point surface pressure, the surface type (land or ocean), and the selected layer-average temperature (TLS or TMT).

289 5 Fingerprint method

Detection methods generally require an estimate of the true but unknown climate-change signal in response to an individual forcing or set of forcings^{16,17,43,44,45,46}. This is often referred to as the fingerprint F(x).

²⁹³ We define F(x) as follows. Let S(i, j, x, t) represent annual-mean synthetic MSU tem-²⁹⁴ perature data at grid-point x and year t from the i^{th} realization of the j^{th} model's HIST+8.5 ²⁹⁵ simulation, where:

296

 $i = 1, \dots, N_r(j)$ (the number of realizations for the j^{th} model).

 $j = 1, \dots, N_m$ (the number of models used in fingerprint estimation).

 $x = 1, \dots, N_x$ (the total number of grid-points).

$$t = 1, \dots, N_t$$
 (the time in years).

301

Here, N_r ranges from 1 to 5 realizations and $N_m = 37$ models. After transforming synthetic MSU temperature data from each model's native grid to a common $10^\circ \times 10^\circ$ latitude/longitude grid, $N_x = 576$ grid-points for corrected TMT. N_t is 39 years. We note that because the RSS TMT data do not have coverage poleward of 82.5°, the latitudinal extent ³⁰⁶ of the regridded data is from 80°N to 80°S. This is the minimum common coverage in the ³⁰⁷ three satellite datasets.

The multi-model average atmospheric temperature change, $\overline{\overline{S}}(x,t)$, was calculated by first averaging over an individual model's HIST+8.5 realizations (where multiple realizations were available), and then averaging over models. The double overbar denotes these two averaging steps. Anomalies were then defined at each grid-point x and year t with respect to the local climatological annual mean. The fingerprint F(x) is the first Empirical Orthogonal Function (EOF) of the anomalies of $\overline{\overline{S}}(x,t)$. F(x) was estimated over 1979 to 2017, the same time period used for determining observed TMT changes.

³¹⁵ We seek to determine whether the pattern similarity between the time-varying observa-³¹⁶ tions and F(x) shows a statistically significant increase over time. To address this question, ³¹⁷ we require control run estimates of internally generated variability in which we know *a pri-*³¹⁸ *ori* that there is no expression of the fingerprint (except by chance).

We obtain these variability estimates from control runs performed with multiple models. Because the length of the 36 control runs analyzed here varies by a factor of up to 4, models with longer control integrations could have a disproportionately large impact on our noise estimates. To guard against this possibility, the noise estimates rely on the last 200 years of each model's pre-industrial control run, yielding 7,200 years of concatenated control run data. Use of the last 200 years reduces the contribution of any initial residual drift to noise estimates. Synthetic TMT data from individual model control runs are regridded to the same $10^{\circ} \times$ 10° target grid used for fingerprint estimation. After regridding, anomalies are defined relative to the local climatological annual means calculated over the full length of each control run. Since control run drift can bias S/N estimates, its removal is advisable. Here, we assume that drift behavior can be well-approximated by a least-squares linear trend, and drift is removed at each grid-point. Drift removal is performed over the last 200 control run years (since only the last 200 years are concatenated).

Observed annual-mean TMT data are first transformed to the $10^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}$ latitude/longitude grid used for the model HIST+8.5 simulations and control runs, and are then expressed as anomalies relative to climatological annual means over 1979 to 2017. The observed temperature data are projected onto F(x), the time-invariant fingerprint:

$$Z_o(t) = \sum_{x=1}^{N_x} O(x,t) F(x) \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, 39$$
(2)

where O(x, t) denotes the observed annual-mean TMT data. This projection is equivalent to a spatially uncentered covariance between the patterns O(x, t) and F(x) at year t. The signal time series $Z_o(t)$ provides information on the fingerprint strength in the observations. If observed patterns of temperature change are becoming increasingly similar to F(x), $Z_o(t)$ should increase over time. A recent publication⁴⁷ provides figures showing both F(x) and the observed patterns of annual-mean trends in TMT (see Figure S5A and Figures ³⁴³ 2A,C, and E in Santer *et al.*, 2018).

Hasselmann's 1979 paper discusses the rotation of F(x) in a direction that maximizes the signal strength relative to the control run noise¹⁷. Optimization of F(x) generally leads to enhanced detectability of the signal^{48,49}. In all cases we considered, we achieved detection of an externally-forced fingerprint in satellite TMT data without any optimization of F(x). We therefore show only non-optimized results in our Figure 1.

Finally, we note that all model and observational temperature data used in the fingerprint analysis are appropriately area-weighted. Weighting involves multiplication by the square root of the cosine of the grid node's latitude⁵⁰.

352 6 Estimating detection time

³⁵³ We assess the significance of changes in $Z_o(t)$ by comparing trends in $Z_o(t)$ with a null dis-³⁵⁴ tribution of trends. To generate this null distribution, we require a case in which O(x, t) is ³⁵⁵ replaced by a record in which we know *a priori* that there is no expression of the fingerprint, ³⁵⁶ except by chance. Here, we replace O(x, t) by the concatenated noise data set C(x, t), after ³⁵⁷ first regridding and removing residual drift from C(x, t) (as described above). The noise ³⁵⁸ time series $N_c(t)$ is the projection of C(x, t) onto the fingerprint:

$$N_c(t) = \sum_{x=1}^{N_x} C(x,t) F(x) \quad t = 1, \dots, 7200$$
(3)

Our detection time T_d is based on the signal-to-noise ratio, S/N. As in our previous 359 work⁴⁷, we calculate S/N ratios by fitting least-squares linear trends of increasing length 360 L years to $Z_o(t)$, and then comparing these with the standard deviation of the distribution 361 of non-overlapping L-length trends in $N_c(t)$. Thus the numerator of the S/N ratio mea-362 sures the trend in the pattern agreement between the model-predicted "human influence" 363 fingerprint and observations; the denominator measures the trend in agreement between 364 the fingerprint and patterns of natural climate variability. Detection occurs after L_d years, 365 when the S/N ratio first exceeds some stipulated signal detection threshold, and then re-366 mains continuously above that threshold for all values of $L > L_d$. For example, $L_d = 10$ 367 would signify that $T_d = 1988 - i.e.$, that detection of a human-caused tropospheric warming 368 fingerprint occurred in 1988, 10 years after the start of the satellite temperature record. 369

We estimated T_d with both 3σ and 5σ signal detection thresholds. A 3σ threshold 370 was used by Hansen et al. (1988) for detection of an anthropogenic signal in surface 371 temperature⁵¹. A more stringent 5σ threshold is often employed as the gold standard for 372 scientific discovery in particle physics^{*} For detection at a 3σ threshold, there is a chance 373 of roughly one in 741 that the "match" between the model-predicted anthropogenic finger-374 print and the observed patterns of tropospheric temperature change could actually be due 375 to natural internal variability (as represented by the 36 models analyzed here). With a 5σ 376 detection threshold, this probability decreases to roughly one in 3.5 million[†]. 377

^{*}For example, in detecting the existence of the Higgs boson. See, e.g., https://understandinguncertainty. org/explaining-5-sigma-higgs-how-well-did-they-do.

[†]These are so-called complementary cumulative probabilities – see, e.g., https: //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/

³⁷⁸ We make three assumptions in order to calculate T_d . First, we assume that our knowl-³⁷⁹ edge of observed tropospheric temperature change is derived from the latest MSU and ³⁸⁰ AMSU dataset versions produced by RSS, UAH, and STAR. Second, we assume that large ³⁸¹ ensembles of forced and unforced simulations performed with state-of-the-art climate mod-³⁸² els provide the best current estimates of a human fingerprint and natural internal climate ³⁸³ variability⁴⁷. Third, we assume that although the strength of the fingerprint in the observa-³⁸⁴ tions changes over time, the fingerprint pattern itself is relatively stable⁴⁷.

At the 3σ threshold, $T_d = 1998$ for RSS and STAR and 2002 for UAH (Figure 1). This means that L_d is 20 years for RSS and STAR and 24 years for UAH. With a more stringent 5σ threshold the detection time is longer: $T_d = 2003$ for STAR, 2005 for RSS, and 2016 for UAH, yielding L_d values of 25, 27, and 38 years, respectively. The UAH results are noteworthy. Even though UAH tropospheric temperature data have consistently shown less warming than other datasets^{24,52,53,54}, UAH still yields confident 5σ detection of an anthropogenic fingerprint.

³⁹² Finally, we note that detection times for an anthropogenic signal in surface temperature ³⁹³ are available elsewhere^{43,44,45,51} and have been the topic of recent discussion[‡].

Standard_normal_table#Cumulative. Probabilities are based on a one-tailed test. A one-tailed test is appropriate here, since we seek to determine whether natural variability could yield <u>larger</u> time-increasing similarity with the fingerprint pattern than the similarity we obtained by comparing the fingerprint with satellite data.

[‡]Another scientific anniversary received considerable attention in 2018 – the 30th anniversary of the publication of of a seminal paper by Jim Hansen and his colleagues at the NASA/Goddard Institute for Space Studies⁵¹. Some of the recent reporting on the 1988 Hansen et al. paper focused on the paper's prediction that "the global greenhouse warming should rise above the level of natural climate variability within the next several years". This prediction was for global-mean changes in surface temperature. It relied on a comparison of observed changes with multiple estimates of natural variability.

394 References for Online Methods

- ³⁹⁵ 26. Mears, C. & Wentz, F. J. J. Clim. **29**, 3629–3646 (2016).
- ³⁹⁶ 27. Zou, C.-Z. Zou & Wang, W. J. Geophys. Res. 116, (2011).
- ³⁹⁷ 28. Zou, C.-Z., Goldberg, M. D., & Hao, X. Sci. Adv. 4, (2018).
- 29. Christy, J. R., Norris, W. B., Spencer, R. W., & Hnilo, J. J. J. Geophys. Res. 112,
 (2007).
- 30. Spencer, R. W., Christy, J. R., & Braswell, W. D. Asia-Pac. J. Atmos. Sci. 53,
 121–130 (2017).
- 402 31. Thorne, P. W. et al. Geophys. Res. Lett. 29 (2002).
- 32. Thorne, P.W., Lanzante, J. R., Peterson, T. C., Seidel, D. J., & Shine, K. P. Wiley *Inter. Rev.* 2, 66–88 (2011).
- 405 33. Lott, F. C. et al. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. 118, 2609–2619 (2013).
- 406 34. Seidel, D. J. et al. J. Geophys. Res. 121, 664–681 (2016).
- ⁴⁰⁷ 35. Sherwood, S. C., Lanzante, J. R., & Meyer, C. L. *Science* **309**,155–1559 (2005).
- 36. Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J., & Meehl, G. A. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.* 93, 485–498
 (2012).
- 410 37. Fu, Q. & Johanson, C. M. J. Clim. 17, 4636–4640 (2004).

- 411 38. Fu, Q. & Johanson, C. M. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **32** (2005).
- ⁴¹² 39. Johanson, C. M. & Fu, Q. J. Clim. **19**, 4234–4242 (2006).
- 413 40. Gillett, N. P., Santer, B. D., & Weaver, A. J. *Nature* **432** (2004).
- 41. Kiehl, J.T., Caron, J., & Hack, J. J. J. Clim. 18, 2533–2539 (2005).
- 415 42. Santer, B. D. *et al. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **110**, 26–33 (2013).
- 416 43. Hegerl, G. C. *et al. J. Clim.* **9**, 2281–2306 (1996).
- 44. Tett, S. F. B., Stott, P. A., Allen, M. R., Ingram, W. J., & Mitchell, J. F. B. *Nature*399, 569–572 (1999).
- 419 45. Stott, P. A. *et al. Science* **290**, 2133–2137 (2000).
- 46. Gillett, N. P., Zwiers, F. W., Weaver, A. J., & Stott, P. A. Nature 422, 292-294 (2003).
- 421 47. Santer, B. D. *et al.*. *Science* **361** (2018).
- 422 48. Allen, M. R. & Tett, S. F. B. *Cli. Dyn.* **15**, 419–434 (1999).
- 423 49. Santer, B. D. *et al. Science* **300**, 1280–1284 (2003).
- ⁴²⁴ 50. van den Dool, H.M., Saha, S., & Johansson, Å. J. Clim. **13**, 1421–1435 (2000).
- ⁴²⁵ 51. Hansen, J. *et al. J. Geophys. Res.* **93**, 9341–9364 (1988).
- ⁴²⁶ 52. Wentz, F. J. & Schabel, M. *Nature* **394**, 661–664 (1998).
- ⁴²⁷ 53. Mears, C. A. & Wentz, F. J. *Science* **309**, 1548–1551 (2005).

⁴²⁸ 54. Po-Chedley, S., Thorsen, T. J., & Fu, Q. J. Clim. **28**, 2274–2290 (2015).