

2017

Detection and attribution methodologies overview (APPENDIX C)

Thomas Knutson

NOAA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Lab, Tom.Knutson@noaa.gov

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdeptcommercepub>

Knutson, Thomas, "Detection and attribution methodologies overview (APPENDIX C)" (2017). *Publications, Agencies and Staff of the U.S. Department of Commerce*. 575.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdeptcommercepub/575>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the U.S. Department of Commerce at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications, Agencies and Staff of the U.S. Department of Commerce by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Detection and attribution methodologies overview (APPENDIX C)

Thomas Knutson, NOAA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Lab

Citation: In: *Climate Science Special Report: A Sustained Assessment Activity of the U.S. Global Change Research Program* [Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, D.J. Dokken, B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock (eds.)]. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA (2017), pp. 652-663.

Comments: U.S. Government work

Abstract

In this appendix, we present a brief overview of the methodologies and methodological issues for detection and attribution of climate change. Attributing an observed change or an event partly to a causal factor (such as anthropogenic climate forcing) normally requires that the change first be detectable (Hegerl et al. 2010). A *detectable* observed change is one which is determined to be highly unlikely to occur (less than about a 10% chance) due to internal variability alone, without necessarily being ascribed to a causal factor. An *attributable* change refers to a change in which the relative contribution of causal factors has been evaluated along with an assignment of statistical confidence (e.g., Bindoff et al. 2013; Hegerl et al. 2010).

As outlined in Bindoff et al. (2013), the conceptual framework for most detection and attribution studies consists of four elements: 1) relevant observations; 2) the estimated time history of relevant climate forcings (such as greenhouse gas concentrations or volcanic activity); 3) a modeled estimate of the impact of the climate forcings on the climate variables of interest; and 4) an estimate of the internal (unforced) variability of the climate variables of interest—that is, the changes that can occur due to natural unforced variations of the ocean, atmosphere, land, cryosphere, and other elements of the climate system in the absence of external forcings. The four elements above can be used together with a detection and attribution framework to assess possible causes of observed changes.

1 **Appendix C. Detection and Attribution Methodologies Overview**

2 **C.1 Introduction and Conceptual Framework**

3 In this appendix, we present a brief overview of the methodologies and methodological issues for
4 detection and attribution of climate change. Attributing an observed change or an event partly to
5 a causal factor (such as anthropogenic climate forcing) normally requires that the change first be
6 detectable (Hegerl et al. 2010). A *detectable* observed change is one which is determined to be
7 highly unlikely to occur (less than about a 10% chance) due to internal variability alone, without
8 necessarily being ascribed to a causal factor. An *attributable* change refers to a change in which
9 the relative contribution of causal factors has been evaluated along with an assignment of
10 statistical confidence (e.g., Bindoff et al. 2013; Hegerl et al. 2010).

11 As outlined in Bindoff et al. (2013), the conceptual framework for most detection and attribution
12 studies consists of four elements: 1) relevant observations; 2) the estimated time history of
13 relevant climate forcings (such as greenhouse gas concentrations or volcanic activity); 3) a
14 modeled estimate of the impact of the climate forcings on the climate variables of interest; and 4)
15 an estimate of the internal (unforced) variability of the climate variables of interest—that is, the
16 changes that can occur due to natural unforced variations of the ocean, atmosphere, land,
17 cryosphere, and other elements of the climate system in the absence of external forcings. The
18 four elements above can be used together with a detection and attribution framework to assess
19 possible causes of observed changes.

20 **C.2 Fingerprint-Based Methods**

21 A key methodological approach for detection and attribution is the regression-based
22 “fingerprint” method (e.g., Hasselmann 1997; Allen and Stott 2003; Hegerl et al. 2007; Hegerl
23 and Zwiers 2011; Bindoff et al. 2013), where observed changes are regressed onto a model-
24 generated response pattern to a particular forcing (or set of forcings), and regression scaling
25 factors are obtained. When a scaling factor for a forcing pattern is determined to be significantly
26 different from zero, a detectable change has been identified. If the uncertainty bars on the scaling
27 factor encompass unity, the observed change is consistent with the modeled response, and the
28 observed change can be attributed, at least in part, to the associated forcing agent, according to this
29 methodology. Zwiers et al. (2011) showed how detection and attribution methods could be
30 applied to the problem of changes in daily temperature extremes at the regional scale by using a
31 generalized extreme value (GEV) approach. In their approach, a time-evolving pattern of GEV
32 location parameters (i.e., “fingerprint”) from models is fit to the observed extremes as a means of
33 detecting and attributing changes in the extremes to certain forcing sets (for example,
34 anthropogenic forcings).

35 A recent development in detection/attribution methodology (Ribes et al. 2017) uses hypothesis
36 testing and an additive decomposition approach rather than linear regression of patterns. The new

1 approach makes use of the magnitudes of responses from the models rather than using the model
2 patterns and deriving the scaling factors (magnitudes of responses) from regression. The new
3 method, in a first application, gives very similar attributable anthropogenic warming estimates to
4 the earlier methods as reported in Bindoff et al. (2013) and shown in Figure 3.2. Some further
5 methodological developments for performing optimal fingerprint detection and attribution
6 studies are proposed in Hannart (2016), who, for example, focuses on the possible use of raw
7 data in analyses without the use of dimensional reductions, such as projecting the data onto a
8 limited number of basis functions, such as spherical harmonics, before analysis.

9 **C.3 Non-Fingerprint Based Methods**

10 A simpler detection/attribution/consistency calculation, which does not involve regression and
11 pattern scaling, compares observed and simulated time series to assess whether observations are
12 consistent with natural variability simulations or with simulations forced by both natural and
13 anthropogenic forcing agents (Knutson et al. 2013; van Oldenborgh et al. 2013). Cases where
14 observations are inconsistent with model simulations using natural forcing only (a detectable
15 change), while also being consistent with models that incorporate both anthropogenic and natural
16 forcings, are interpreted as having an attributable anthropogenic contribution, subject to caveats
17 regarding uncertainties in observations, climate forcings, modeled responses, and simulated
18 internal climate variability. This simpler method is useful for assessing trends over smaller
19 regions such as sub-regions of the United States (see the example given in Figure 6.5 for regional
20 surface temperature trends).

21 Delsole et al. (2011) introduced a method of identifying internal (unforced) variability in climate
22 data by decomposing variables by timescale, using a measure of their predictability. They found
23 that while such internal variability could contribute to surface temperature trends of 30-years'
24 duration or less, and could be responsible for the accelerated global warming during 1977–2008
25 compared to earlier decades, the strong (approximately 0.8°C, or 1.4°F) warming trend seen in
26 observations over the past century was not explainable by such internal variability. Constructed
27 circulation analogs (van den Dool et al. 2003; Deser et al. 2016) is a method used to identify the
28 part of observed surface temperature changes that is due to atmospheric circulation changes
29 alone.

30 The timescale by which climate change signals will become detectable in various regions is a
31 question of interest in detection and attribution studies, and methods of estimating this have been
32 developed and applied (e.g., Mahlstein et al. 2011; Deser et al. 2012b). These studies illustrate
33 how natural variability can obscure forced climate signals for decades, particularly for smaller
34 (less than continental) space scales.

35 Other examples of detection and attribution methods include the use of multiple linear regression
36 with energy balance models (e.g., Canty et al. 2013) and Granger causality tests (e.g., Stern and
37 Kaufmann 2014). These are typically attempting to relate forcing time series, such as the

1 historical record of atmospheric CO₂ since 1860, to a climate response measure, such as global
2 mean temperature or ocean heat content, but without using a full coupled climate model to
3 explicitly estimate the response of the climate system to forcing (or the spatial pattern of the
4 response to forcing). Granger causality, for example, explores the lead–lag relationships between
5 different variables to infer causal relationships between them, and attempts to control for any
6 influence of a third variable that may be linked to the other two variables in question.

7 **C.4. Multistep Attribution and Attribution without Detection**

8 A growing number of climate change and extreme event attribution studies use a *multistep*
9 *attribution* approach (Hegerl et al. 2010), based on attribution of a change in climate conditions
10 that are closely related to the variable or event of interest. In the multistep approach, an observed
11 change in the variable of interest is attributed to a change in climate or other environmental
12 conditions, and then the changes in the climate or environmental conditions are separately
13 attributed to an external forcing, such as anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases. As an
14 example, some attribution statements for phenomena such as droughts or hurricane activity—
15 where there are not necessarily detectable trends in occurrence of the phenomenon itself—are
16 based on models and on detected changes in related variables such as surface temperature, as
17 well as an understanding of the relevant physical processes linking surface temperatures to
18 hurricanes or drought. For example, some studies of the recent California drought (e.g., Mao et
19 al. 2015; Williams et al. 2015) attribute a fraction of the event to anthropogenic warming or to
20 long-term warming based on modeling or statistical analysis, although without claiming that
21 there was a detectable change in the drought frequency or magnitude.

22 The multistep approach and model simulations are both methods that, in principle, can allow for
23 attribution of a climate change or a change in the likelihood of occurrence of an event to a causal
24 factor without necessarily detecting a significant change in the occurrence rate of the
25 phenomenon or event itself (though in some cases, there may also be a detectable change in the
26 variable of interest). For example, Murakami et al. (2015) used model simulations to conclude
27 that the very active hurricane season observed near Hawai‘i in 2014 was at least partially
28 attributable to anthropogenic influence; they also show that there is no clear long-term detectable
29 trend in historical hurricane occurrence near Hawai‘i in available observations. If an attribution
30 statement is made where there is not a detectable change in the phenomenon itself (for example,
31 hurricane frequency or drought frequency) then this statement is an example of *attribution*
32 *without detection*. Such an attribution without detection can be distinguished from a conventional
33 single-step attribution (for example, global mean surface temperature) where in the latter case
34 there is a detectable change in the variable of interest (or the scaling factor for a forcing pattern is
35 significantly different from zero in observations) and attribution of the changes in that variable to
36 specific external forcing agents. Regardless of whether a single-step or multistep attribution
37 approach is used, or whether there is a detectable change in the variable of interest, attribution

1 statements with relatively higher levels of confidence are underpinned by a thorough
2 understanding of the physical processes involved.

3 There are reasons why attribution without detection statements can be appropriate, despite the
4 lower confidence typically associated with such statements as compared to attribution statements
5 that are supported by detection of a change in the phenomenon itself. For example, an event of
6 interest may be so rare that a trend analysis for similar events is not practical. Including
7 attribution without detection events in the analysis of climate change impacts reduces the
8 chances of a false negative, that is, incorrectly concluding that climate change had no influence
9 on a given extreme events (Anderegg et al. 2014) in a case where it did have an influence.
10 However, avoiding this type of error through attribution without detection comes at the risk of
11 increasing the rate of false positives, where one incorrectly concludes that anthropogenic climate
12 change had a certain type of influence on an extreme event when in fact it did not have such an
13 influence (see Box 3.1).

14 **C.5 Extreme Event Attribution Methodologies**

15 Since the release of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report
16 (IPCC AR5) and the Third National Climate Assessment (NCA3; Melillo et al. 2014), there have
17 been further advances in the science of detection and attribution of climate change. An emerging
18 area in the science of detection and attribution is the attribution of extreme weather and climate
19 events (NAS 2016; Stott 2016; Easterling et al. 2016). According to Hulme (2014), there are four
20 general types of attribution methods that are applied in practice: physical reasoning, statistical
21 analysis of time series, fraction of attributable risk (FAR) estimation, and the philosophical
22 argument that there are no longer any purely natural weather events. As discussed in a recent
23 National Academy of Sciences report (NAS 2016), possible anthropogenic influence on an
24 extreme event can be assessed using a risk-based approach, which examines whether the odds of
25 occurrence of a type of extreme event have changed, or through an ingredients-based or
26 conditional attribution approach.

27 In the risk-based approach (Stott et al. 2004; Hulme 2014; NAS 2016), one typically uses a
28 model to estimate the probability (p) of occurrence of a weather or climate event within two
29 climate states: one state with anthropogenic influence (where the probability is p_1) and the other
30 state without anthropogenic influence (where the probability is p_0). Then the ratio (p_1/p_0)
31 describes how much more or less likely the event is in the modeled climate with anthropogenic
32 influence compared to a modeled hypothetical climate without anthropogenic influences.
33 Another common metric used with this approach is the fraction of attributable risk (FAR),
34 defined as $FAR = 1 - (p_0/p_1)$. Further refinements on such an approach using causal theory are
35 discussed in Hannart et al. (2016b).

36 In the conditional or ingredients-based approach (Trenberth et al. 2015; Shepherd 2016; Horton
37 et al. 2016; NAS 2016), an investigator may look for changes in occurrence of atmospheric

1 circulation and weather patterns relevant to the extreme event, or at the impact of certain
2 environmental changes (for example, greater atmospheric moisture) on the character of an
3 extreme event. Conditional or ingredients-based attribution can be applied to extreme events or
4 to climate changes in general. An example of the ingredients-based approach and more
5 discussion of this type of attribution method is given in Box C.2.

6 Hannart et al. (2016b) have discussed how causal theory can also be applied to attribution studies
7 in order to distinguish between necessary and sufficient causation. Hannart et al. (2016a) further
8 propose methodologies to use data assimilation systems, which are now used operationally to
9 update short-term numerical weather prediction models, for detection and attribution. They
10 envision how such systems could be used in the future to implement near-real time systematic
11 causal attribution of weather and climate-related events.

12 ----- **START BOX C.1 HERE** -----

13 **Box C.1. On the Use of Significance Levels and Significance Tests in Attribution Studies**

14 In detection/attribution studies, a detectable observed change is one which is determined to be
15 highly unlikely to occur (less than about a 10% chance) due to internal variability alone. Some
16 frequently asked questions concern the use of such a high statistical threshold (significance level)
17 in attribution studies. In this box, we respond to several such questions received in the public
18 review period.

- 19 - Why is such a high degree of confidence (for example, statistical significance at p level
20 of 0.05) typically required before concluding that an attributable anthropogenic
21 component to a climate change or event has been detected? For example, could
22 attribution studies be reframed to ask whether there is a 5% or more chance that
23 anthropogenic climate change contributed to the event?

24 This question is partly related to the issue of risk avoidance. For example, if there is a particular
25 climate change outcome that we wish to avoid (for example, global warming of 3°C, or 10°C, or
26 a runaway greenhouse) then one can use the upper ranges of confidence intervals of climate
27 model projections as guidance, based on available science, for avoiding such outcomes.
28 Detection/attribution studies typically deal with smaller changes than climate projections over
29 the next century or more. For detection/attribution studies, researchers are confronting models
30 with historical data to explore whether or not observed climate change signals are emerging from
31 the background of natural variability. Typically the emergent signal is just a small fraction of
32 what is predicted by the models for the coming century under continued strong greenhouse gas
33 emission scenarios. Detecting that a change has emerged from natural variability is not the same
34 as approaching a threshold to be avoided, unless the goal is to ensure no detectable
35 anthropogenic influence on climate. Consequently, use of a relative strong confidence level (or
36 p -value of 0.05) for determining climate change detection seems justified for the particular case
37 of climate change detection, since one can also separately use risk-avoidance strategies or

1 probability criteria to avoid reaching certain defined thresholds (for example, a 2°C global
2 warming threshold).

3 A related question concerns ascribing blame for causing an extreme event. For example, if a
4 damaging hurricane or typhoon strikes an area and causes much damage, affected residents may
5 ask whether human-caused climate change was at least partially to blame for the event. In this
6 case, climate scientists sometimes use the “Fraction of Attributable Risk” framework, where they
7 examine whether the odds of some threshold event occurring have been increased due to
8 anthropogenic climate change. This is typically a model-based calculation, where the probability
9 distribution related to the event in question is modeled under preindustrial and present-day
10 climate conditions, and the occurrence rates are compared for the two modeled distributions.
11 Note that such an analysis can be done with or without the detection of a climate change signal
12 for the occurrence of the event in question. In general, cases where there has been a detection
13 and attribution of changes in the event in question to human causes, then the attribution of
14 increased risk to anthropogenic forcing will be relatively more confident.

15 The question of whether it is more appropriate to use approaches that incorporate a high burden
16 of statistical evidence before concluding that anthropogenic forcings contributed significantly (as
17 in traditional detection/attribution studies) versus using models to estimate anthropogenic
18 contributions when there may not even be a detectable signal present in the observations (as in
19 some Fraction of Attributable Risk studies) may depend on what type of error or scenario one
20 most wants to avoid. In the former case, one is attempting to avoid the error of concluding that
21 anthropogenic forcing has contributed to some observed climate change, when in fact, it later
22 turns out that anthropogenic forcing has not contributed to the change. In the second case, one is
23 attempting to avoid the “error” of concluding that anthropogenic forcing has not contributed
24 significantly to an observed climate change or event when (as it later comes to be known)
25 anthropogenic forcing had evidently contributed to the change, just not at a level that was
26 detectable at the time compared to natural variability.

27 - What is the tradeoff between false positives and false negatives in attribution statistical
28 testing, and how is it decided which type of error one should focus on avoiding?

29 As discussed above, there are different types of errors or scenarios that we would ideally like to
30 avoid. However, the decision of what type of analysis to do may involve a tradeoff where one
31 decides that it is more important to avoid either falsely concluding that anthropogenic forcing
32 *has* contributed, or to avoid falsely concluding that anthropogenic forcing had *not* made a
33 detectable contribution to the event. Since there is no correct answer that can apply in all cases, it
34 would be helpful if, in requesting scientific assessments, policymakers provide some guidance
35 about which type of error or scenario they would most desire be avoided in the analyses and
36 assessments in question.

- 1 - Since substantial anthropogenic climate change (increased surface temperatures,
2 increased atmospheric water vapor, etc.) has already occurred, aren't all extreme events
3 affected to some degree by anthropogenic climate change?

4 Climate scientists are aware from modeling experiments that very tiny changes to initial
5 conditions in model simulations lead to very different realizations of internal climate variability
6 “noise” in the model simulations. Comparing large samples of this random background noise
7 from models against observed changes is one way to test whether the observed changes are
8 statistically distinguishable from internal climate variability. In any case, this experience also
9 teaches us that any anthropogenic influence on climate, no matter how tiny, has some effect on
10 the future trajectory of climate variability, and thus could affect the timing and occurrence of
11 extreme events. More meaningful questions are: 1) Has anthropogenic forcing produced a
12 statistically significant change in the probability of occurrence of some class of extreme event?
13 2) Can we determine with confidence the net sign of influence of anthropogenic climate change
14 on the frequency, intensity, etc., of a type of extreme event? 3) Can climate scientists quantify
15 (with credible confidence intervals) the effect of climate change on the occurrence frequency, the
16 intensity, or some other aspect of an observed extreme event?

17 ----- **END BOX C.1 HERE** -----

18 ----- **START BOX C.2 HERE** -----

19 **Box C.2 Illustration of Ingredients-based Event Attribution: The Case of Hurricane Sandy**

20 To illustrate some aspects of the conditional or ingredients-based attribution approach, the case
21 of Hurricane Sandy can be considered. If one considers Hurricane Sandy's surge event, there is
22 strong evidence that sea level rise, at least partly anthropogenic in origin (see Ch. 12: Sea Level
23 Rise), made Sandy's surge event worse, all other factors being equal (Reed et al. 2015). The
24 related question of whether anthropogenic climate change increased the risk of an event like
25 Sandy involves not just the sea level ingredient to surge risk but also whether the frequency
26 and/or intensity of Sandy-like storms has increased or decreased as a result of anthropogenic
27 climate change. This latter question is more difficult and is briefly reviewed here.

28 A conditional or ingredients-based attribution approach, as applied to a hurricane event such as
29 Sandy, may assume that the weather patterns in which the storm was embedded—and the storm
30 itself—could have occurred in a preindustrial climate, and the event is re-simulated while
31 changing only some aspects of the large-scale environment (for example, sea surface
32 temperatures, atmospheric temperatures, and moisture) by an estimated anthropogenic climate
33 change signal. Such an approach thus explores whether anthropogenic climate change to date has
34 altered the odds of occurrence or intensity of a Hurricane Sandy-like event. Modeling studies
35 show, as expected, that the anomalously warm sea surface temperatures off the U.S. East Coast
36 during Sandy led to a substantially more intense simulated storm than under present-day
37 climatological conditions (Magnusson et al. 2014). However, these anomalous sea surface

1 temperatures and other environmental changes are a mixture of anthropogenic and natural
2 influences, and so it is not generally possible to infer the anthropogenic component from such
3 experiments. Another study (Lackmann 2015) modeled the influence of just the anthropogenic
4 changes to the thermodynamic environment (including sea surface temperatures, atmospheric
5 temperatures, and moisture perturbations) and concluded that anthropogenic climate change to
6 date had caused Hurricane Sandy to be about 5 hPa more intense, but that this modeled change
7 was not statistically significant at the 95% confidence level. A third study used a statistical–
8 dynamical model to compare simulated New York City-area tropical cyclones in pre–
9 anthropogenic and anthropogenic time periods (Reed et al. 2015). It concluded that there have
10 been anthropogenically induced increases in the types of tropical cyclones that cause extreme
11 surge events in the region, apart from the effects of sea level rise, such as increased radius of
12 maximum winds in the anthropogenic era. However, the statistical–dynamical model used in the
13 study simulates an unusually large increase in global tropical cyclone activity in 21st century
14 projections (Emanuel 2013) compared to other tropical cyclone modeling studies using
15 dynamical models—a number of which simulate future decreases in late 21st century tropical
16 storm frequency in the Atlantic basin (e.g., Christensen et al. 2013). This range of uncertainty
17 among various model simulations of Atlantic tropical cyclone activity changes under climate
18 change imply that there is low confidence in determining the net impact to date of anthropogenic
19 climate change on the risk of Sandy-like events, though anthropogenic sea level rise, all other
20 things equal, has increased the surge risk.

21 In summary, while there is agreement that sea level rise alone has caused greater storm surge risk
22 in the New York City area, there is low confidence on whether a number of other important
23 determinants of storm surge climate risk, such as the frequency, size, or intensity of Sandy-like
24 storms in the New York region, have increased or decreased due to anthropogenic warming to
25 date.

26 ----- **END BOX C.2 HERE** -----

27

1 **REFERENCES**

- 2 Allen, M.R. and P.A. Stott, 2003: Estimating signal amplitudes in optimal fingerprinting, Part I:
3 Theory. *Climate Dynamics*, **21**, 477-491. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00382-003-0313-9>
- 4 Anderegg, W.R.L., E.S. Callaway, M.T. Boykoff, G. Yohe, and T.y.L. Root, 2014: Awareness of
5 both type 1 and 2 errors in climate science and assessment. *Bulletin of the American*
6 *Meteorological Society*, **95**, 1445-1451. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00115.1>
- 7 Bindoff, N.L., P.A. Stott, K.M. AchutaRao, M.R. Allen, N. Gillett, D. Gutzler, K. Hansingo, G.
8 Hegerl, Y. Hu, S. Jain, I.I. Mokhov, J. Overland, J. Perlwitz, R. Sebbari, and X. Zhang, 2013:
9 Detection and attribution of climate change: From global to regional. *Climate Change 2013:*
10 *The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report*
11 *of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M.
12 Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, and P.M. Midgley, Eds.
13 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 867–
14 952. <http://www.climatechange2013.org/report/full-report/>
- 15 Canty, T., N.R. Mascioli, M.D. Smarte, and R.J. Salawitch, 2013: An empirical model of global
16 climate – Part 1: A critical evaluation of volcanic cooling. *Atmospheric Chemistry and*
17 *Physics*, **13**, 3997-4031. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-3997-2013>
- 18 Christensen, J.H., K. Krishna Kumar, E. Aldrian, S.-I. An, I.F.A. Cavalcanti, M. de Castro, W.
19 Dong, P. Goswami, A. Hall, J.K. Kanyanga, A. Kitoh, J. Kossin, N.-C. Lau, J. Renwick, D.B.
20 Stephenson, S.-P. Xie, and T. Zhou, 2013: Climate phenomena and their relevance for future
21 regional climate change. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of*
22 *Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate*
23 *Change*. Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A.
24 Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, and P.M. Midgley, Eds. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,
25 United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1217–1308.
26 <http://www.climatechange2013.org/report/full-report/>
- 27 DelSole, T., M.K. Tippett, and J. Shukla, 2011: A significant component of unforced
28 multidecadal variability in the recent acceleration of global warming. *Journal of Climate*, **24**,
29 909-926. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/2010jcli3659.1>
- 30 Deser, C., R. Knutti, S. Solomon, and A.S. Phillips, 2012: Communication of the role of natural
31 variability in future North American climate. *Nature Climate Change*, **2**, 775-779.
32 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1562>
- 33 Deser, C., L. Terray, and A.S. Phillips, 2016: Forced and internal components of winter air
34 temperature trends over North America during the past 50 years: Mechanisms and

- 1 implications. *Journal of Climate*, **29**, 2237-2258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15->
2 0304.1
- 3 Easterling, D.R., K.E. Kunkel, M.F. Wehner, and L. Sun, 2016: Detection and attribution of
4 climate extremes in the observed record. *Weather and Climate Extremes*, **11**, 17-27.
5 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2016.01.001>
- 6 Emanuel, K.A., 2013: Downscaling CMIP5 climate models shows increased tropical cyclone
7 activity over the 21st century. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **110**, 12219-
8 12224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1301293110>
- 9 Hannart, A., 2016: Integrated optimal fingerprinting: Method description and illustration.
10 *Journal of Climate*, **29**, 1977-1998. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/jcli-d-14-00124.1>
- 11 Hannart, A., A. Carrassi, M. Bocquet, M. Ghil, P. Naveau, M. Pulido, J. Ruiz, and P. Tandeo,
12 2016a: DADA: Data assimilation for the detection and attribution of weather and climate-
13 related events. *Climatic Change*, **136**, 155-174. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10584-016-1595-3>
- 14 Hannart, A., J. Pearl, F.E.L. Otto, P. Naveau, and M. Ghil, 2016b: Causal counterfactual theory
15 for the attribution of weather and climate-related events. *Bulletin of the American*
16 *Meteorological Society*, **97**, 99-110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/bams-d-14-00034.1>
- 17 Hasselmann, K., 1997: Multi-pattern fingerprint method for detection and attribution of climate
18 change. *Climate Dynamics*, **13**, 601-611. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s003820050185>
- 19 Hegerl, G. and F. Zwiers, 2011: Use of models in detection and attribution of climate change.
20 *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **2**, 570-591.
21 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/wcc.121>
- 22 Hegerl, G.C., F.W. Zwiers, P. Braconnot, N.P. Gillett, Y. Luo, J.A.M. Orsini, N. Nicholls, J.E.
23 Penner, and P.A. Stott, 2007: Understanding and attributing climate change. *Climate Change*
24 *2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth*
25 *Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Solomon, S., D. Qin,
26 M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H.L. Miller, Eds.
27 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 663-
28 745. http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch9.html
- 29 Hegerl, G.C., O. Hoegh-Guldberg, G. Casassa, M.P. Hoerling, R.S. Kovats, C. Parmesan, D.W.
30 Pierce, and P.A. Stott, 2010: Good practice guidance paper on detection and attribution
31 related to anthropogenic climate change. *Meeting Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on*
32 *Climate Change Expert Meeting on Detection and Attribution of Anthropogenic Climate*
33 *Change*. Stocker, T.F., C.B. Field, D. Qin, V. Barros, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, P.M.
34 Midgley, and K.L. Ebi, Eds. IPCC Working Group I Technical Support Unit, University of

- 1 Bern, Bern, Switzerland, 1-8. [http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/supporting-](http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/supporting-material/ipcc_good_practice_guidance_paper_anthropogenic.pdf)
2 [material/ipcc_good_practice_guidance_paper_anthropogenic.pdf](http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/supporting-material/ipcc_good_practice_guidance_paper_anthropogenic.pdf)
- 3 Horton, R.M., J.S. Mankin, C. Lesk, E. Coffel, and C. Raymond, 2016: A review of recent
4 advances in research on extreme heat events. *Current Climate Change Reports*, **2**, 242-259.
5 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40641-016-0042-x>
- 6 Hulme, M., 2014: Attributing weather extremes to 'climate change'. *Progress in Physical*
7 *Geography*, **38**, 499-511. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0309133314538644>
- 8 Knutson, T.R., F. Zeng, and A.T. Wittenberg, 2013: Multimodel assessment of regional surface
9 temperature trends: CMIP3 and CMIP5 twentieth-century simulations. *Journal of Climate*,
10 **26**, 8709-8743. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00567.1>
- 11 Lackmann, G.M., 2015: Hurricane Sandy before 1900 and after 2100. *Bulletin of the American*
12 *Meteorological Society*, **96 (12)**, 547-560. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-14-00123.1>
- 13 Magnusson, L., J.-R. Bidlot, S.T.K. Lang, A. Thorpe, N. Wedi, and M. Yamaguchi, 2014:
14 Evaluation of medium-range forecasts for Hurricane Sandy. *Monthly Weather Review*, **142**,
15 1962-1981. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/mwr-d-13-00228.1>
- 16 Mahlstein, I., R. Knutti, S. Solomon, and R.W. Portmann, 2011: Early onset of significant local
17 warming in low latitude countries. *Environmental Research Letters*, **6**, 034009.
18 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/6/3/034009>
- 19 Mao, Y., B. Nijssen, and D.P. Lettenmaier, 2015: Is climate change implicated in the 2013–2014
20 California drought? A hydrologic perspective. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **42**, 2805-2813.
21 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015GL063456>
- 22 Melillo, J.M., T.C. Richmond, and G.W. Yohe, eds., 2014: *Climate Change Impacts in the*
23 *United States: The Third National Climate Assessment*. U.S. Global Change Research
24 Program: Washington, D.C., 842 pp. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7930/J0Z31WJ2>
- 25 Murakami, H., G.A. Vecchi, T.L. Delworth, K. Paffendorf, L. Jia, R. Gudgel, and F. Zeng, 2015:
26 Investigating the influence of anthropogenic forcing and natural variability on the 2014
27 Hawaiian hurricane season [in "Explaining Extreme Events of 2014 from a Climate
28 Perspective"]. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, **96 (12)**, S115-S119.
29 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00119.1>
- 30 NAS, 2016: *Attribution of Extreme Weather Events in the Context of Climate Change*. The
31 National Academies Press, Washington, DC, 186 pp. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17226/21852>
- 32 Reed, A.J., M.E. Mann, K.A. Emanuel, N. Lin, B.P. Horton, A.C. Kemp, and J.P. Donnelly,
33 2015: Increased threat of tropical cyclones and coastal flooding to New York City during the

- 1 anthropogenic era. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **112**, 12610-12615.
2 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1513127112>
- 3 Ribes, A., F.W. Zwiers, J.-M. Azais, and P. Naveau, 2017: A new statistical approach to climate
4 change detection and attribution. *Climate Dynamics*, **48**, 367-386.
5 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3079-6>
- 6 Shepherd, T.G., 2016: A common framework for approaches to extreme event attribution.
7 *Current Climate Change Reports*, **2**, 28-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40641-016-0033-y>
- 8 Stern, D.I. and R.K. Kaufmann, 2014: Anthropogenic and natural causes of climate change.
9 *Climatic Change*, **122**, 257-269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10584-013-1007-x>
- 10 Stott, P., 2016: How climate change affects extreme weather events. *Science*, **352**, 1517-1518.
11 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf7271>
- 12 Stott, P.A., D.A. Stone, and M.R. Allen, 2004: Human contribution to the European heatwave of
13 2003. *Nature*, **432**, 610-614. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature03089>
- 14 Trenberth, K.E., J.T. Fasullo, and T.G. Shepherd, 2015: Attribution of climate extreme events.
15 *Nature Climate Change*, **5**, 725-730. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2657>
- 16 van den Dool, H., J. Huang, and Y. Fan, 2003: Performance and analysis of the constructed
17 analogue method applied to U.S. soil moisture over 1981–2001. *Journal of Geophysical*
18 *Research*, **108**, 8617. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2002JD003114>
- 19 van Oldenborgh, G.J., F.J. Doblas Reyes, S.S. Drijfhout, and E. Hawkins, 2013: Reliability of
20 regional climate model trends. *Environmental Research Letters*, **8**, 014055.
21 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/8/1/014055>
- 22 Williams, A.P., R. Seager, J.T. Abatzoglou, B.I. Cook, J.E. Smerdon, and E.R. Cook, 2015:
23 Contribution of anthropogenic warming to California drought during 2012–2014.
24 *Geophysical Research Letters*, **42**, 6819-6828. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064924>
- 25 Zwiers, F.W., X.B. Zhang, and Y. Feng, 2011: Anthropogenic influence on long return period
26 daily temperature extremes at regional scales. *Journal of Climate*, **24**, 881-892.
27 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/2010jcli3908.1>