



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

King, AD;Borowiak, AR;Brown, JR;Frame, DJ;Harrington, LJ;Min, SK;Pendergrass, A;Rugenstein, M;Sniderman, JMK;Stone, DA

Title:

Transient and Quasi-Equilibrium Climate States at 1.5°C and 2°C Global Warming

Date:

2021-11-01

Citation:

King, A. D., Borowiak, A. R., Brown, J. R., Frame, D. J., Harrington, L. J., Min, S. K., Pendergrass, A., Rugenstein, M., Sniderman, J. M. K. & Stone, D. A. (2021). Transient and Quasi-Equilibrium Climate States at 1.5°C and 2°C Global Warming. *Earth S Future*, 9 (11), <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EF002274>.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/302425>

License:

[CC BY NC ND](#)

Earth's Future

RESEARCH ARTICLE











10.1029/2021EF002274

Transient and Quasi-Equilibrium Climate States at 1.5°C and 2°C Global Warming



Key Points:

- Warming patterns at Paris Agreement limits differ substantially between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates
- Summer climate changes over northern land are clearer in a transient climate than a stabilized climate at the same global warming level
- Projections of regional climate designed for the Paris Agreement limits are only useful if the rate of global warming is explicit

Andrew D. King^{1,2} , Alexander R. Borowiak^{1,2} , Josephine R. Brown^{1,2} ,
David J. Frame³ , Luke J. Harrington³ , Seung-Ki Min^{4,5} , Angeline Pendergrass^{6,7} ,
Maria Rugestein⁸ , J. M. Kale Sniderman¹ , and Dáithí A. Stone⁹ 

¹School of Geography, Earth, and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia, ²ARC Centre of Excellence for Climate Extremes, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia, ³School of Geography, Environment and Earth Sciences, New Zealand Climate Change Research Institute, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand, ⁴Division of Environmental Science and Engineering, Pohang University of Science and Technology, Pohang, South Korea, ⁵Institute for Convergence Research and Education in Advanced Technology, Yonsei University, Incheon, South Korea, ⁶Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA, ⁷National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA, ⁸Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA, ⁹NIWA, Wellington, New Zealand

Supporting Information:

Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article.

Correspondence to:

A. D. King,
andrew.king@unimelb.edu.au

Citation:

King, A. D., Borowiak, A. R., Brown, J. R., Frame, D. J., Harrington, L. J., Min, S.-K., et al. (2021). Transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states at 1.5°C and 2°C global warming. *Earth's Future*, 9, e2021EF002274. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EF002274>

Received 17 JUN 2021
Accepted 14 OCT 2021

Abstract Recent climate change is characterized by rapid global warming, but the goal of the Paris Agreement is to achieve a stable climate where global temperatures remain well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels. Inferences about conditions at or below 2°C are usually made based on transient climate projections. To better understand climate change impacts on natural and human systems under the Paris Agreement, we must understand how a stable climate may differ from transient conditions at the same warming level. Here we examine differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates using a statistical framework applied to greenhouse gas-only model simulations. This allows us to infer climate change patterns at 1.5°C and 2°C global warming in both transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states. We find substantial local differences between seasonal-average temperatures dependent on the rate of global warming, with mid-latitude land regions in boreal summer considerably warmer in a transient climate than a quasi-equilibrium state at both 1.5°C and 2°C global warming. In a rapidly warming world, such locations may experience a temporary emergence of a local climate change signal that weakens if the global climate stabilizes and the Paris Agreement goals are met. Our research demonstrates that the rate of global warming must be considered in regional projections.

Plain Language Summary The world has warmed quickly since around 1970, prompting efforts to mitigate climate change and to stabilize global temperatures between 1.5°C and 2°C above pre-industrial levels. We explore the differences between a rapidly warming climate and one with little change in global temperature over time. We find that a fast-warming climate is characterized by warmer temperatures over Northern Hemisphere mid-latitude land regions than a stable climate at the same level of global warming. The opposite is true in the Southern Ocean where slower warming occurs because of the lag in warming of the deep ocean, so as the global climate stabilizes that region continues to warm. As the world continues to warm, some land locations, such as the interior of North America and Eurasia, may experience a temporary emergence of a climate change signal that weakens if the climate stabilizes and the Paris Agreement goals are met. The difference between fast-warming and stable climates can be very large locally, so they must be considered in planning for adapting to future climate change.

1. Introduction

The planet is warming rapidly and, to date, has already warmed around 1.2°C relative to early-industrial levels due to human influences (Haustein et al., 2017). In an effort to reduce the impacts of climate change, the Paris Agreement was developed with the aim of limiting global warming to well below 2°C and preferably below 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. Since 2015, when the Paris Agreement was developed, there have been many studies examining climate impacts at different global warming levels (GWLs) to quantify the benefits of limiting global warming. A variety of methods are used to generate quantitative estimates of climate change impacts at different GWLs, including time-slicing of existing model simulations (Schleussner

© 2021 The Authors. Earth's Future published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of American Geophysical Union. This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

et al., 2016), development of single coupled-model ensembles at GWLs (Sanderson et al., 2017), development of multi-model atmosphere-only ensembles (Mitchell et al., 2017), and pattern scaling (Seneviratne et al., 2016; Tebaldi & Knutti, 2018). These methods are described in James et al. (2017) and Masson-Delmotte et al. (2018). The methods listed above describe worlds at given GWLs with different rates of warming. For example, many studies have used time-slicing from rapid-warming scenarios (Schleussner et al., 2016) or a combination of scenarios (e.g., King et al., 2017) to extract climate information at specified GWLs, while others have used methods based on slower-warming or quasi-equilibrated climates (e.g., Lehner, Coats, et al., 2017; Wehner et al., 2018). While the Paris Agreement is not explicit, it has been argued that the aim is to stabilize global climate at a low GWL (Rogelj et al., 2017; Seneviratne et al., 2018), however, there is value in investigating transient warmer worlds given the current estimated rate of emissions reductions (*NDC Synthesis Report* | UNFCCC, 2021) and high likelihood of continued warming.

It has long been known that transient and equilibrated climates differ in their pattern of warming, with transient climates characterized by greater land-ocean temperature differences (Manabe et al., 1991). Slow warming in high-latitude ocean regions occurs on centennial and even millennial timescales, such that stabilized climates exhibit a different warming pattern to transient climates (Geoffroy & Saint-Martin, 2014; Long et al., 2014). The effects of climate stabilization have recently been elucidated further in multi-model experiments which highlight evolving patterns of warming over many centuries in simulations under fixed greenhouse gas concentrations (Huang et al., 2020; Rugenstein et al., 2019). Another recent study employed a time-slicing approach with a multi-model ensemble and found substantial differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates (King et al., 2020).

The majority of analyses examining effects of climate stabilization have used fixed-forcing simulations (i.e., constant greenhouse gas concentrations) so that individual climate models exhibit different amounts of global warming associated with their varying climate sensitivities. To examine the effects of climate stabilization at the Paris Agreement GWLs with a comparable set of transient model data requires a new approach. Here, we develop a framework for estimating differences in regional temperatures between transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states at the 1.5°C and 2°C GWLs informed by data across a wide range of simulated global temperatures. We use this approach to examine differences in the emergence of a human-caused climate change signal, adapting methods previously employed by Frame et al. (2017) and Hawkins et al. (2020) and applying them to the transient and quasi-equilibrium climates we generate.

The emergence of climate change signals in regional temperature and precipitation (Hawkins & Sutton, 2012; Lehner, Deser, & Terray, 2017; Mahlstein et al., 2011, 2012; Nguyen et al., 2018), climate extremes (Bador et al., 2016; Diffenbaugh & Scherer, 2011; Harrington et al., 2016; King et al., 2015), and other variables (Lo et al., 2020; Lyu et al., 2014) is useful as an index of how significantly the climate has changed since early-industrial times or is projected to change with future warming. The emergence of a climate change signal is often expressed as a time (i.e., the point when a novel climate has emerged from the variability of past climates) or a signal-to-noise ratio (S/N). Using S/N, we explore whether emergence of climate change signals differs between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates. While the emergence of climate change signals between high and low greenhouse gas emissions scenarios has been evaluated to some extent (e.g., Nguyen et al., 2018), climate stabilization effects and associated changes in warming patterns have not previously been investigated in the context of climate change emergence.

2. Data and Methods

We used surface air temperature (“tas”) from 10 models in the sixth phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6; Eyring et al., 2016) to form transient and quasi-equilibrium warmer climates (Table 1). We use only greenhouse gas-forced simulations to build transient and quasi-equilibrium climates to eliminate regional effects of anthropogenic aerosols, ozone change, and land use/cover change on surface temperature patterns which exist in other simulations. We define transient climates using the 1%CO₂ simulations where carbon dioxide increases by 1% per year from a pre-industrial level resulting in a warming climate (Figure 1a) with generally a greater rate of warming than observed. The quasi-equilibrium climate is defined from pre-industrial control simulations (piControl) and abrupt CO₂ forcing experiments where carbon dioxide is halved (Abrupt-0.5xCO₂), doubled (Abrupt-2xCO₂), or quadrupled (Abrupt-4xCO₂)

Table 1
Model Simulations Used in This Study

	Transient		Quasi-equilibrium		
	1%CO ₂	Abrupt-0.5xCO ₂	piControl	Abrupt-2xCO ₂	Abrupt-4xCO ₂
CanESM5	151	-	1,000	150	151
CESM2	150	150	1,200	150	150
CNRM-CM6-1	150	150	500	150	150
GISS-E2-1-G	151	151	851	151	151
GISS-E2-1-H	151	-	801	151	151
GISS-E2-2-G	151	-	151	151	151
HadGEM3-GC3.1-LL	150	150	550	150	150
IPSL-CM6A-LR	150	150	2,300	150	900
MIROC6	150	250	800	250	250
MRI-ESM2.0	151	151	701	151	151

Note. Model simulations are grouped by their use in forming transient (1%CO₂) and quasi-equilibrium climates (Abrupt-0.5xCO₂, piControl, Abrupt-2xCO₂, and Abrupt-4xCO₂). The number of model years in each experiment is listed.

relative to pre-industrial levels and then simulations are run for typically 150 years. The 1%CO₂, piControl, and Abrupt-4xCO₂ simulations form part of the CMIP6 Diagnostic, Evaluation and Characterization of Klima (DECK), while the Abrupt-0.5xCO₂ and Abrupt-2xCO₂ simulations are run as part of other projects (Good et al., 2016; Webb et al., 2017). The additional abrupt forcing simulations allow sampling from more of the distribution of global temperatures but limits the number of available models. The first 50 years of the abrupt forcing simulations are not used as these include a period of relatively rapid warming or cooling before the global-mean surface temperature (GMST) stabilizes to some extent. The entire piControl simulations are used and while there is some evidence of model drift (not shown; Irving et al., 2020), the piControl trends are nearer zero on average than for the abrupt forcing simulations (Figure 1a). The annual-average GMST trends from simulations chosen to make up the quasi-equilibrium climate are small, while trends from the 1%CO₂ simulations are considerably larger on average (Figure 1a). We note that the abrupt forcings simulations are not in full equilibrium (which is why we refer to these simulations as *quasi-equilibrium*) as it takes centuries for the simulated climate to reach a new steady state (Charney et al., 1979; Rugenstein et al., 2019).

Model temperature data were interpolated to a common regular 2° grid. Seasonal-average temperatures were calculated for boreal summer (JJA) and winter (DJF). All global-average and local seasonal-average temperatures were calculated as anomalies from the average of piControl data for their respective model. To extract local climates at 1.5°C and 2°C GWLs, a relationship was derived between the 11-year smoothed (running mean) annual-average GMST and the seasonal-average temperature at each gridbox for the transient and quasi-equilibrium data from each model. An example is shown in Figures 1b and 1c for the gridbox over Paris in JJA in the CESM2 model for transient and quasi-equilibrium climates respectively. A fourth-order polynomial statistical fit was applied to the data to enable extraction of local climates at specified GWLs as it has residuals of similar magnitude between the transient and quasi-equilibrium ensembles, despite the clustered nature of the quasi-equilibrium data (Figures S1 and S2 in Supporting Information S1). Several choices of fitting technique were considered (discussion in Supporting Information S1). The fourth-order polynomial is fit to the transient and quasi-equilibrium data separately and the associated equation is used to extract the gridbox seasonal-average temperature associated with the 1.5°C and 2°C GWLs. An analysis of sampling uncertainty effects on differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates was performed (Figure S3; discussion in Supporting Information S1).

An attempt at evaluation of this process for generating transient and quasi-equilibrium climates is made by comparing recent observed warming, using the Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature data set (Rohde




Figure 1. Global-mean surface temperature (GMST) trends in greenhouse gas-forced simulations and examples of GMST against Paris gridbox temperatures in transient and quasi-equilibrium warmer worlds. (a) Statistical distributions of all 30-year trends (including overlapping periods) in annual-average GMST extracted from all CMIP6 models listed in Table 1 for Abrupt-0.5xCO₂ (dark blue), piControl (light blue), Abrupt-2xCO₂ (orange), Abrupt-4xCO₂ (red), and 1%CO₂ (gray) simulations. The black cross marks the recent observed GMST trend from 1990 to 2020 in the BEST data set. Scatter plots of 11-year smoothed GMST against the Paris JJA-average gridbox temperatures in (b) the transient climate simulation and (c) the ensemble of quasi-equilibrium simulations for the CESM2 model. In each graph, the fourth-order polynomial fit is shown which is used to extract global warming levels (GWLs), such as the 2°C GWL example shown. In (c) the fourth-order polynomial fit for the transient climate is shown in light gray for easier visual comparison with the quasi-equilibrium fit.

et al., 2013; Rohde & Hausfather, 2020), with the statistical estimation of transient warming simulated by the climate models from 0.5°C to 1°C global warming (Figure S4; discussion in Supporting Information S1).

A variety of transient and quasi-equilibrium climates at 1.5°C and 2°C GWLs are inferred from the individual models in the CMIP6 ensemble. The spread between estimates of warmer climates between CMIP6 models is due to a combination of structural model differences and internal climate variability. The effect of model difference on the representation of transient warmer climates was examined by comparing the spread in CMIP6 estimates of these climates with the spread arising from simulations in the Max Planck

Institute-Grand Ensemble (MPI-GE; Maher et al., 2019) which is due to internal climate variability alone (Figure S5; discussion in Supporting Information S1).

The different emergent climate change signals between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates at 1.5°C and 2°C GWLs were explored as a way of elucidating the effects of the rate of global warming on local climates. The emergence of a climate change signal can be measured in different ways, such as Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests (Mahlstein et al., 2011) or probability ratios (Harrington et al., 2016), but the most commonly used method is S/N (Frame et al., 2017; Hawkins et al., 2020; Hawkins & Sutton, 2012; Nguyen et al., 2018). Signal and noise are calculated differently between studies; here the signal is simply the warming from the transient 1°C climate to the GWL in question as inferred from the fourth-order polynomial fit (similar to Frame et al., 2017). The noise is the standard deviation of residuals from the fourth-order polynomial fit in the transient climate for values between 0.5°C and 1°C global warming. This gives estimates of interannual climate variability that are relevant to recent climate. The S/N is then calculated for each model, and the ensemble-median for each location. The difference between S/N under transient and quasi-equilibrium climates at the same GWL is also computed. Smaller gridboxes at high latitudes likely inflate noise relative to low latitudes (e.g., Fischer et al., 2013), but mapped differences in S/N between climate states are less affected by this property.

3. Results

The multi-model ensemble-median warming pattern is broadly similar between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates at 1.5°C and 2°C global warming (Figure 2) with pattern correlations exceeding 0.9 in both seasons. Warmer climates under both transient and quasi-equilibrium states exhibit greater warming over land than ocean (Joshi et al., 2008), and Arctic amplification is evident in DJF (Kim et al., 2016; Screen & Simmonds, 2010). There are, however, substantial and consistent differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates, especially in JJA (Figures 2i and 2j). Differences between transient and stabilized climates may arise from a number of sources, including the land-sea contrast evident in equilibrium versus transient runs in other settings (Dong et al., 2009; Joshi et al., 2008; Lambert et al., 2011). Land-sea contrasts arise from differences in effective heat capacity and slow heat transport in the ocean (e.g., Long et al., 2014, 2020), atmospheric lapse rate and relative humidity over land and ocean (Joshi et al., 2008), biological responses including stomatal resistance (Dong et al., 2009; Joshi & Gregory, 2008), and also differences over polar oceans (Collins et al., 2013). Here, the constraint of the same global warming level in transient and quasi-equilibrium states necessitates local differences in one region to be offset by differences of the opposite sign elsewhere. Consistent with previous literature, differences are evident over continental mid-latitude regions in the Northern Hemisphere where the model ensemble-median JJA-average temperature is at least 0.5°C greater in a transient climate than a quasi-equilibrium climate over large areas; this is the case at both 1.5°C and 2°C GWLs. In contrast, in the Southern Ocean, in particular, a quasi-equilibrium climate is warmer than a transient climate at the same GWL. In DJF (Figures 2k and 2l), differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates are less striking but remain substantial in some regions. The overall pattern of differences shows strong seasonality. The strongest model agreement in the sign of the differences in transient and quasi-equilibrium temperatures tends to be in similar regions to where the largest differences in the ensemble-median are found. In at least nine of the 10 climate models, in JJA there are large swathes of Northern Hemisphere land regions that are locally warmer in transient climates than quasi-equilibrium climates for the same GWL.

The differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates can also be contextualized against the current climate and the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement. Figure 3 shows the ensemble-median difference between transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states as a percentage of the difference between the transient 1°C climate (analogous to the recent climate) and the quasi-equilibrium climate at the 1.5°C and 2°C GWLs (the long-term Paris Agreement goals). Over much of North America and Eurasia differences exceed 100% meaning that the local difference in JJA-average temperatures between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates exceeds the local warming anticipated between the recent climate and the Paris Agreement 1.5°C GWL (Figure 3a). Over the Southern Ocean there are large areas where differences are below -50%, which indicates that the difference in both JJA- and DJF-average temperatures between quasi-equilibrium and transient climates locally accounts for more than half of the local warming associated




Figure 2. Constructed transient and quasi-equilibrium climates at Paris Agreement global warming levels (GWLs) and their differences. Multi-model median warming pattern relative to transient 1°C GWL extracted for (a–d) transient warmer worlds at (a, c) 1.5°C global warming and (b, d) 2°C global warming for JJA and DJF respectively. Multi-model median warming pattern relative to transient 1°C GWL extracted for (e–h) quasi-equilibrium warmer worlds at (e, g) 1.5°C global warming and (f, h) 2°C global warming for JJA and DJF respectively. Maps of the multi-model median gridbox differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates at (i, k) 1.5°C GWL and (j, l) 2°C GWL in JJA and DJF respectively. Stippling in (i–l) indicates at least nine out of 10 model differences are of the same sign.

with global warming from the recent climate to the long-term 1.5°C GWL (Figures 3a and 3b). These results highlight how large the difference between transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states can be relative to projected warming associated with low global warming targets. This effect weakens when applied to higher GWLs, but even relative to projected warming to the 2°C GWL, local differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates at the 2°C GWL remain substantial. Areas where the warming between the transient 1°C GWL and the quasi-equilibrium 1.5°C and 2°C GWLs is very small, such as the North Atlantic, exhibit large percentage differences which are less meaningful.

The pattern of climate change emergence, as measured by the signal-to-noise, is also broadly similar between transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states with many low-latitude regions projected to experience S/N values greater than two (also known as “unfamiliar” climates relative to the recent climate; Frame et al., 2017) at 2°C global warming in either transient or quasi-equilibrium states (Figure 4). Higher S/N in low-latitude areas is a common feature in climate change emergence studies (Hawkins & Sutton, 2012; Mahlstein et al., 2011) and is primarily due to reduced interannual variability relative to higher latitudes.

Differences in S/N between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates are substantial due to differences in signal (S). Generally, land regions are projected to exhibit clearer emergence of local climate change signals under transient warming while oceans have higher S/N estimates in quasi-equilibrium climates for the same GWL. In boreal summer, S/N is greater by at least 0.5 over large swathes of the Northern Hemisphere mid-latitudes. This represents a substantial effect of the rate of global warming on the projected detectability of changes in local climates up to the Paris Agreement GWLs. Over large areas of North America and




Figure 3. Difference between transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states as a percentage of projected warming. Multi-model median maps of the difference between transient and quasi-equilibrium seasonal-average temperatures at (a, b) 1.5°C global warming and (c, d) 2°C global warming as a percentage of the projected warming from a transient 1°C climate to a quasi-equilibrium climate at the same global warming level. These maps are for (a, c) JJA- and (b, d) DJF-average temperatures. Black stippling indicates that at least nine out of 10 local model differences are of the same sign. Gray stippling indicates that both the multi-model median local difference is less than 0.2°C and the difference between the second and ninth ranked model by difference between transient and quasi-equilibrium seasonal temperature differences is less than 0.8°C.

Eurasia, summer-average temperatures would shift to becoming “unusual” (S/N between one and two; Frame et al., 2017) under a transient warming climate at the 1.5°C GWL, but under a quasi-equilibrium 1.5°C climate summer temperatures in these areas would remain similar to the recent climate (S/N less than one). The opposite is true for the Southern Ocean where climate change signals would continue to emerge as global climate stabilizes at a given GWL. These S/N estimates illustrate that there will be perceptible differences in local climate for many parts of the world between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates.

4. Discussion

In this study, we described a statistical framework for deriving comparable transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states at specified levels of global warming and under greenhouse gas-only forcings for the first time. We used this method to estimate differences between local temperatures in transient and quasi-equilibrium climates at the Paris Agreement GWLs of 1.5°C and 2°C above pre-industrial levels. We find substantial local differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates over some areas, particularly Northern Hemisphere mid-latitude land regions (warmer in a transient climate than a quasi-equilibrium state) and the Southern Ocean (cooler in a transient climate than a quasi-equilibrium state).




Figure 4. Emergence of local climate change signals under different levels of global warming for transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states. The signal-to-noise of local seasonal-average temperature changes in JJA and DJF at 1.5°C and 2°C global warming for transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states. Differences in signal-to-noise ratios between transient and quasi-equilibrium states are shown for (g, h) JJA and (i, j) DJF at 1.5°C and 2°C global warming respectively. Stippling in (i–l) indicates at least nine out of 10 model differences are of the same sign (identical to Figure 2).

This study adds to others which show differences in temperature patterns between rapid-warming and steady-state climates (Armour et al., 2013; Geoffroy & Saint-Martin, 2014; Huang et al., 2020; King et al., 2020; Manabe et al., 1991; Rugenstein et al., 2019). Indeed, it is encouraging that differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates found in this study broadly resemble those seen in previous analyses despite being generated using a different method and data set. This adds further weight to the need for decision-making based on climate projections to consider the path of global temperatures and rate of warming, as well as the amount of global warming. In particular, in heavily populated regions such as central Europe, parts of the Middle East, and East Asia, there is a strong indication that transient warming through a GWL is associated with much more local warming in boreal summer (broadly greater than 0.4°C) relative to a quasi-equilibrium climate at the same GWL. This results in very different possible local climates at the same amounts of global warming, so adaptation and mitigation planning informed by quantitative climate change information will need to account for the rate of global warming as well as the amount. Similarly, we find that the emergence of local climate changes differs between transient and quasi-equilibrium global climates. Stabilizing the climate at the 1.5°C GWL would result in substantially less perceptible temperature change in summer over North America and Eurasia than transient warming through the 1.5°C GWL.

While we believe this study to be helpful there are a number of caveats. As discussed in Supporting Information S1, the choice of fitting method was a compromise, with no ideal technique identified, and evaluation of the method was challenging. The use of 10 CMIP6 models gives an estimate of model differences and uncertainty, but the sample size is constrained by the limited set of models with Abrupt-0.5xCO₂ and Abrupt-2xCO₂ simulations. Other model simulations, such as those from the Scenario Model Intercomparison Project (ScenarioMIP; O'Neill et al., 2016) were considered, but the relatively small global temperature changes in the low-end emission simulations mean that extracting relationships between global and local temperatures from these simulations in isolation is challenging with unstable polynomial fits

and extrapolation to extract local temperatures at 1.5°C and 2°C GWLs a common problem. The use of greenhouse gas-only forced simulations allows for a more straightforward analysis and, given the central role of greenhouse gas emissions reductions in carbon budget estimates for meeting the Paris Agreement, a more policy-relevant study also. We note that aerosol forcings have been linked with local suppression of warming and a reduction in the interhemispheric temperature difference (Bonfils et al., 2020; Friedman et al., 2013). This effect may slightly reduce the comparability between the recent observed climate and our representation of it using the transient greenhouse gas-only simulations. We do not identify such an effect in our comparison of these data (Figure S4 in Supporting Information S1), but this may be related to natural decadal variability in the observational data and the presence of aerosol forcings in both observational periods examined for this comparison.

The use of a multi-model ensemble-median reduces effects of diverse model responses and internal variability in individual models affecting the results. Indeed, while most models produce broadly similar patterns of differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium worlds, there are rather different patterns in a minority of models (Figures S5 and S6 in Supporting Information S1). No models can be justifiably removed from the ensemble due to difficulties with evaluation discussed previously. It is possible that outlier models with unusual patterns of temperature difference may have passed climate “tipping points” that are physically realistic and important to consider in projections (Lenton et al., 2019; Steffen et al., 2018).

There is a clear gap in our model experiments that necessitates methods such as the one applied here for developing analyses highlighting substantial differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states at policy-relevant GWLs. New experiments would be beneficial if they involved participation of multiple modeling groups (given the large model differences shown in Figures S6 and S7 in Supporting Information S1) and could follow the framework of Sigmund et al. (2020), who ran multi-century simulations with some climate stabilization.

In this study, we discuss comparisons between *transient* and a *quasi-equilibrium* climate states. These terms can take on a host of different meanings. The transient climate analyzed here includes simulations mostly with slightly faster warming than the recent real-world trend (marked by cross in Figure 1a). If model simulations with a slightly lower rate of CO₂ increase were available (instead of 1% per year) these could be used to examine differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates and may result in slightly smaller differences than found here. By applying statistical fits on models separately, the effect of different models' transient climate responses on the pattern of differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states may be examined, but no significant effect is identified (not shown). We refer to *quasi-equilibrium* climates rather than equilibrium climates as the simulations used are not run for long enough to reach a full equilibrium. Even after hundreds of years there are changes occurring in temperature patterns (Rugenstein et al., 2019) as some aspects of the earth system are particularly slow to respond to climate forcings. Indeed, ocean regions with detectable differences between transient and quasi-equilibrium states in this study (e.g., the Southern Ocean) experience larger local temperature changes as the planet moves toward full equilibrium (Rugenstein et al., 2019). Other aspects of the climate system are expected to differ between transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states, such as rainfall patterns (Burls & Fedorov, 2017; Sniderman et al., 2019), deep ocean temperatures (Gillett et al., 2011), vegetation (Heinze et al., 2019), and ice sheets and sea ice (Blackport & Kushner, 2016; Hansen et al., 2013).

5. Conclusions

In this study, we have developed a framework for the comparison of transient and quasi-equilibrium climates at a prescribed level of global warming under greenhouse-gas forcings. We have shown that there are substantial differences in local-, seasonal-average temperatures between transient and quasi-equilibrium climate states at the Paris Agreement GWLs and that these differences are large compared to the projected warming to the 1.5°C and 2°C GWLs. The emergence of local climate change signals in seasonal temperature also differs between transient and quasi-equilibrium climates pointing to a return to weaker local climate change impacts in Northern Hemisphere mid-latitude land regions if society achieves a steady-state climate at 1.5°C global warming as compared to a continued rapidly warming climate. Our study

demonstrates the need for regional climate projections at GWLs to account for the substantial influence of the rate of global warming to prevent misinformed decision-making.

Data Availability Statement

All data used in this study are available to access in public repositories. The CMIP6 data are published here: <https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/cmip6/> and the MPI-GE data are published here: <https://esgf-data.dkrz.de/search/mip-ge/>. Data in this study were accessed through these ESGFs and the National Computing Infrastructure ESGF in Australia (<https://esgf.nci.org.au/projects/esgf-nci/>). The BEST data set is available publicly here: <http://berkeleyearth.org/data/>.

Acknowledgments

We thank the editor for handling our manuscript and the reviewers for providing constructive feedback. A. D. King was supported by the Australian Research Council (DE180100638). D. J. Frame, L. J. Harrington, and D. A. Stone were supported by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment of Aotearoa New Zealand through the Endeavour programme. S.-K. Min was supported by a National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the South Korean government (MSIT) (NRF-2018R1A5A1024958 and NRF-2021R1A2C3007366). A. G. Pendergrass was supported by the Regional and Global Model Analysis (RGMA) component of the Earth and Environmental System Modeling Program of the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Biological & Environmental Research (BER) via National Science Foundation IA 1947282. J. M. K. Sniderman was funded by Australian Research Council grant FL160100028 to Prof. Jon Woodhead. The authors acknowledge useful discussions with Ed Hawkins and Daniel Mitchell. We acknowledge the support of staff at the NCI facility in Australia and the World Climate Research Programme, which, through its Working Group on Coupled Modelling, coordinated and promoted CMIP6. We thank the climate modeling groups for producing and making available their model output, the Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF) for archiving the data and providing access, and the multiple funding agencies who support CMIP6 and ESGF.

References

- Armour, K. C., Bitz, C. M., & Roe, G. H. (2013). Time-varying climate sensitivity from regional feedbacks. *Journal of Climate*, 26(13), 4518–4534. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00544.1>
- Bador, M., Terray, L., & Boé, J. (2016). Emergence of human influence on summer record-breaking temperatures over Europe. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(1), 404–412. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL066560>
- Blackport, R., & Kushner, P. J. (2016). The transient and equilibrium climate response to rapid summertime sea ice loss in CCSM4. *Journal of Climate*, 29(2), 401–417. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0284.1>
- Bonfils, C., Santer, B. D., Fyfe, J. C., Marvel, K., Phillips, T. J., & Zimmerman, S. R. H. (2020). Human influence on joint changes in temperature, rainfall and continental aridity. *Nature Climate Change*, 10(8), 726–731. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0821-1>
- Burls, N. J., & Fedorov, A. V. (2017). Wetter subtropics in a warmer world: Contrasting past and future hydrological cycles. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114(49), 12888–12893. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1703421114>
- Charney, J. G., Arakawa, A., James Baker, D., Bolin, B., Dickinson, R. E., Goody, R. M., et al. (1979). *Carbon dioxide and climate: A scientific assessment*.
- Collins, M., Knutti, R., Arblaster, J. M., Dufresne, J., Fichet, T., Friedlingstein, P., et al. (2013). Long-term climate change: Projections, commitments and irreversibility. In G.-K. Stocker, D. Qin, P. M. M. Plattner, M. Tignor, S. K. Allen, J. Boschung, et al. (Eds.), *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. Retrieved from https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_Chapter12_FINAL.pdf
- Diffenbaugh, N. S., & Scherer, M. (2011). Observational and model evidence of global emergence of permanent, unprecedented heat in the 20th and 21st centuries. *Climatic Change*, 107(3), 615–624. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0112-y>
- Dong, B., Gregory, J. M., & Sutton, R. T. (2009). Understanding land-sea warming contrast in response to increasing greenhouse gases. Part I: Transient adjustment. *Journal of Climate*, 22(11), 3079–3097. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JCLI2652.1>
- Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R. J., & Taylor, K. E. (2016). Overview of the Coupled Model Inter-comparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9(5), 1937–1958. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016>
- Fischer, E. M., Beyerle, U., & Knutti, R. (2013). Robust spatially aggregated projections of climate extremes. *Nature Climate Change*, 3(12), 1033–1038. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2051>
- Frame, D., Joshi, M. M., Hawkins, E., Harrington, L. J., & de Roiste, M. (2017). Population-based emergence of unfamiliar climates. *Nature Climate Change*, 7(6), 407–411. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3297>
- Friedman, A. R., Hwang, Y.-T., Chiang, J. C. H., & Frierson, D. M. W. (2013). Interhemispheric temperature asymmetry over the twentieth century and in future projections. *Journal of Climate*, 26(15), 5419–5433. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00525.1>
- Geoffroy, O., & Saint-Martin, D. (2014). Pattern decomposition of the transient climate response. *Tellus, Series A: Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography*, 66(1), 23393. <https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusa.v66.23393>
- Gillett, N. P., Arora, V. K., Zickfeld, K., Marshall, S. J., & Merryfield, W. J. (2011). Ongoing climate change following a complete cessation of carbon dioxide emissions. *Nature Geoscience*, 4(2), 83–87. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1047>
- Good, P., Andrews, T., Chadwick, R., Dufresne, J. L., Gregory, J. M., Lowe, J. A., et al. (2016). NonlinMIP contribution to CMIP6: Model intercomparison project for non-linear mechanisms: Physical basis, experimental design and analysis principles (v1.0). *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9(11), 4019–4028. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-4019-2016>
- Hansen, J., Sato, M., Russell, G., & Kharecha, P. (2013). Climate sensitivity, sea level and atmospheric carbon dioxide. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical & Engineering Sciences*, 371(2001), 20120294. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2012.0294>
- Harrington, L. J., Frame, D. J., Fischer, E. M., Hawkins, E., Joshi, M. M., & Jones, C. D. (2016). Poorest countries experience earlier anthropogenic emergence of daily temperature extremes. *Environmental Research Letters*, 11(5), 055007. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/5/055007>
- Haustein, K., Allen, M. R., Forster, P. M., Otto, F. E. L., Mitchell, D. M., Matthews, H. D., & Frame, D. J. (2017). A real-time Global Warming Index. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 15417. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-14828-5>
- Hawkins, E., Frame, D., Harrington, L., Joshi, M. M., King, A. D., Rojas, M., & Sutton, R. (2020). Observed emergence of the climate change signal: From the familiar to the unknown. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(6). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL086259>
- Hawkins, E., & Sutton, R. (2012). Time of emergence of climate signals. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39(1). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL050087>
- Heinze, C., Eyring, V., Friedlingstein, P., Jones, C., Balkanski, Y., Collins, W., et al. (2019). ESD Reviews: Climate feedbacks in the Earth system and prospects for their evaluation. *Earth System Dynamics*, 10, 379, 452. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-10-379-2019>
- Huang, D., Dai, A., & Zhu, J. (2020). Are the transient and equilibrium climate change patterns similar in response to increased CO₂? *Journal of Climate*, 33(18), 8003–8023. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0749.1>
- Irving, D., Hobbs, W., Church, J., & Zika, J. (2020). A mass and energy conservation analysis of drift in the CMIP6 ensemble. *Journal of Climate*, 34(8), 1–43. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli-d-20-0281.1>

- James, R., Washington, R., Schleussner, C.-F., Rogelj, J., & Conway, D. (2017). Characterizing half-a-degree difference: A review of methods for identifying regional climate responses to global warming targets. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 8(2), e457. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.457>
- Joshi, M. M., & Gregory, J. (2008). Dependence of the land-sea contrast in surface climate response on the nature of the forcing. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35(24), L24802. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL036234>
- Joshi, M. M., Gregory, J. M., Webb, M. J., Sexton, D. M. H., & Johns, T. C. (2008). Mechanisms for the land/sea warming contrast exhibited by simulations of climate change. *Climate Dynamics*, 30(5), 455–465. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-007-0306-1>
- Kim, K.-Y., Hamlington, B. D., Na, H., & Kim, J. (2016). Mechanism of seasonal Arctic sea ice evolution and Arctic amplification. *The Cryosphere*, 10, 2191–2202. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-10-2191-2016>
- King, A. D., Donat, M. G., Fischer, E. M., Hawkins, E., Alexander, L. V., Karoly, D. J., et al. (2015). The timing of anthropogenic emergence in simulated climate extremes. *Environmental Research Letters*, 10(9), 094015. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/10/9/094015>
- King, A. D., Karoly, D. J., & Henley, B. J. (2017). Australian climate extremes at 1.5°C and 2°C of global warming. *Nature Climate Change*, 7(6), 412–416. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3296>
- King, A. D., Lane, T. P., Henley, B. J., & Brown, J. R. (2020). Global and regional impacts differ between transient and equilibrium warmer worlds. *Nature Climate Change*, 10(1), 42–47. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0658-7>
- Lambert, F. H., Webb, M. J., & Joshi, M. M. (2011). The relationship between land-ocean surface temperature contrast and radiative forcing. *Journal of Climate*, 24(13), 3239–3256. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2011JCLI3893.1>
- Lehner, F., Coats, S., Stocker, T. F., Pendergrass, A. G., Sanderson, B. M., Raible, C. C., & Smerdon, J. E. (2017). Projected drought risk in 1.5°C and 2°C warmer climates. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44(14), 7419–7428. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL074117>
- Lehner, F., Deser, C., & Terray, L. (2017). Toward a new estimate of “Time of Emergence” of anthropogenic warming: Insights from dynamical adjustment and a large initial-condition model ensemble. *Journal of Climate*, 30(19), 7739–7756. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0792.1>
- Lenton, T. M., Rockström, J., Gaffney, O., Rahmstorf, S., Richardson, K., Steffen, W., & Schellnhuber, H. J. (2019). Climate tipping points—Too risky to bet against nature. *Nature Research*, 575, 592–595. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03595-0>
- Lo, Y. T. E., Mitchell, D. M., Bohnenstengel, S. I., Collins, M., Hawkins, E., Hegerl, G. C., et al. (2020). U.K. climate projections: Summer daytime and nighttime urban heat island changes in England's major cities. *Journal of Climate*, 33(20), 9015–9030. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0961.1>
- Long, S.-M., Xie, S. P., Du, Y., Liu, Q., Zheng, X. T., Huang, G., et al. (2020). Effects of ocean slow response under low warming targets. *Journal of Climate*, 33(2), 477–496. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0213.1>
- Long, S.-M., Xie, S.-P., Zheng, X.-T., & Liu, Q. (2014). Fast and slow responses to global warming: Sea surface temperature and precipitation patterns. *Journal of Climate*, 27(1), 285–299. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-13-00297.1>
- Lyu, K., Zhang, X., Church, J. A., Slangen, A. B. A., & Hu, J. (2014). Time of emergence for regional sea-level change. *Nature Climate Change*, 4(11), 1006–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2397>
- Maher, N., Milinski, S., Suarez-Gutierrez, L., Botzet, M., Dobrynin, M., Kornbluh, L., et al. (2019). The Max Planck Institute grand ensemble: Enabling the exploration of climate system variability. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11(7), 2050–2069. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001639>
- Mahlstein, I., Knutti, R., Solomon, S., & Portmann, R. W. (2011). Early onset of significant local warming in low latitude countries. *Environmental Research Letters*, 6(3), 034009. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/6/3/034009>
- Mahlstein, I., Portmann, R. W., Daniel, J. S., Solomon, S., & Knutti, R. (2012). Perceptible changes in regional precipitation in a future climate. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39(5). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL050738>
- Manabe, S., Stouffer, R. J., Spelman, M. J., & Bryan, K. (1991). Transient responses of a coupled ocean–atmosphere model to gradual changes of atmospheric CO₂. Part I. Annual mean response. *Journal of Climate*, 4(8), 785–818. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(1991\)004<0785:TROACO>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1991)004<0785:TROACO>2.0.CO;2)
- Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pörtner, H. O., Roberts, D., Skea, J., Shukla, P. R., et al. (2018). Global warming of 1.5°C. In *An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change*.
- Mitchell, D., Achutarao, K., Allen, M., Bethke, I., Beyerle, U., Ciavarella, A., et al. (2017). Half a degree additional warming, prognosis and projected impacts (HAPPI): Background and experimental design. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10, 571–583. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-571-2017>
- Nguyen, T.-H., Min, S.-K., Paik, S., & Lee, D. (2018). Time of emergence in regional precipitation changes: An updated assessment using the CMIP5 multi-model ensemble. *Climate Dynamics*, 51(9–10), 3179–3193. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-018-4073-y>
- O'Neill, B. C., Tebaldi, C., Van Vuuren, D. P., Eyring, V., Friedlingstein, P., Hurtt, G., et al. (2016). The Scenario Model Intercomparison Project (ScenarioMIP) for CMIP6. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9(9), 3461–3482. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3461-2016>
- Rogelj, J., Schleussner, C.-F., & Hare, W. (2017). Getting it right matters: Temperature goal interpretations in geoscience research. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44(20), 10,662–10,665. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL075612>
- Rohde, R. A., & Hausfather, Z. (2020). The Berkeley Earth land/ocean temperature record. *Earth System Science Data*, 12(4), 3469–3479. <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-3469-2020>
- Rohde, R. A., Muller, R., Jacobsen, R., Perlmutter, S., & Mosher, S. (2013). Berkeley Earth temperature averaging process. *Geoinformatics & Geostatistics: An Overview*, 01(02). <https://doi.org/10.4172/2327-4581.1000103>
- Rugenstein, M., Bloch-Johnson, J., Abe-Ouchi, A., Andrews, T., Beyerle, U., Cao, L., et al. (2019). LongRunMIP: Motivation and design for a large collection of millennial-length AOGCM simulations. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 100(12), 2551–2570. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-19-0068.1>
- Sanderson, B. M., Xu, Y., Tebaldi, C., Wehner, M., Neill, B. O., Jahn, A., et al. (2017). Community Climate Simulations to assess avoided impacts in 1.5°C and 2°C futures. *Earth System Dynamics*, 8, 827–847. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-2017-4210.5194/esd-8-827-2017>
- Schleussner, C.-F., Lissner, T. K., Fischer, E. M., Wohland, J., Perrette, M., Golly, A., et al. (2016). Differential climate impacts for policy-relevant limits to global warming: The case of 1.5 & deg:C and 2 & deg:C. *Earth System Dynamics*, 7(2), 327–351. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-7-327-2016>
- Screen, J. A., & Simmonds, I. (2010). The central role of diminishing sea ice in recent Arctic temperature amplification. *Nature*, 464(7293), 1334–1337. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09051>
- Seneviratne, S. I., Donat, M. G., Pitman, A. J., Knutti, R., & Wilby, R. L. (2016). Allowable CO₂ emissions based on regional and impact-related climate targets. *Nature*, 529(7587), 477–483. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16542>

- Seneviratne, S. I., Rogelj, J., Séférian, R., Wartenburger, R., Allen, M. R., Cain, M., et al. (2018). The many possible climates from the Paris Agreement's aim of 1.5°C warming. *Nature*, *558*(7708), 41–49. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0181-4>
- Sigmond, M., Fyfe, J. C., Saenko, O. A., & Swart, N. C. (2020). Ongoing AMOC and related sea-level and temperature changes after achieving the Paris targets. *Nature Climate Change*, *10*(7), 672–677. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0786-0>
- Sniderman, J. M. K., Brown, J. R., Woodhead, J. D., King, A. D., Gillett, N. P., Tokarska, K. B., et al. (2019). Southern Hemisphere subtropical drying as a transient response to warming. *Nature Climate Change*, *9*, 232–236. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0397-9>
- Steffen, W., Rockström, J., Richardson, K., Lenton, T. M., Folke, C., Liverman, D., et al. (2018). Trajectories of the Earth System in the Anthropocene. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *115*, 8252, 8259. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1810141115>
- Tebaldi, C., & Knutti, R. (2018). Evaluating the accuracy of climate change pattern emulation for low warming targets. *Environmental Research Letters*, *13*(5), 055006. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aabef2>
- UNFCCC. (2021). *NDC synthesis report*. Retrieved from <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/nationally-determined-contributions-ndcs/nationally-determined-contributions-ndcs/ndc-synthesis-report#eq-5>
- Webb, M. J., Andrews, T., Bodas-Salcedo, A., Bony, S., Bretherton, C. S., Chadwick, R., et al. (2017). The Cloud Feedback Model Intercomparison Project (CFMIP) contribution to CMIP6. *Geoscientific Model Development*, *10*(1), 359–384. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-359-2017>
- Wehner, M., Stone, D., Mitchell, D., Shiogama, H., Fischer, E., Graff, L. S., et al. (2018). Changes in extremely hot days under stabilized 1.5 and 2.0°C global warming scenarios as simulated by the HAPPI multi-model ensemble. *Earth System Dynamics*, *9*(1), 299–311. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-9-299-2018>