ESD Reviews: The potential for structural errors in emergent constraints

Benjamin M. Sanderson[1,3], Angeline G. Pendergrass[2,3], Charles D. Koven[4], Florent Brient[5], Ben B. B. Booth[6], Rosie A. Fisher[1,3] and Reto Knutti[7]

[1]CERFACS, Toulouse, France
[2]Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA
[3]National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA
[4]Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, CA, USA
[5]LMD/IPSL, Sorbonne Université, Paris, France
[6]UK Met Office, Exeter, UK
[7]ETH Zurich, Switzerland

Correspondence to: Benjamin Sanderson (sanderson@cerfacs.fr)

ABSTRACT

Studies of 'emergent constraints' have frequently proposed that a single metric can constrain future responses of the Earth system to anthropogenic emissions. Here, we illustrate that strong relationships between observables and future climate across an ensemble can arise from common structural model assumptions with few degrees of freedom. Such cases have the potential to produce strong, yet overconfident constraints when processes are represented in a common, oversimplified fashion throughout the ensemble. We consider these issues in the context of a collection of published constraints; and argue that although emergent constraints are potentially powerful tools for understanding ensemble response variation and relevant observables, the their naïve application of emergent constraints alone to estimate reduce uncertainties in unknown climate responses could lead to bias and overconfidence in constrained projections. The prevalence of this thinking has led to literature which made statements on the probability bounds of key climate variables that were confident yet inconsistent between studies. Together with statistical robustness and a mechanism, assessments of climate responses must include multiple lines of evidence to identify biases that can arise from shared, oversimplified modeling assumptions which impact both present and future climate simulations in order to mitigate against the influence of shared structural biases.

Commented [RK1]: Move to the back?
That made staements on the … variables that were confidenct yet inconsistent…

Commented [RK2]: Or "a mechanism"?-

Commented [AGP3]: I'm thinking "shared" might be less ambiguous than "common", because "common" could also mean "typical", but here I think we specifically want it to mean assumptions that are shared among all the models in the ensemble

1 INTRODUCTION

Models of the climate system face a particular challenge: their primary purpose is to project the future response of the Earth system to forcings which have yet to be realized. Confidence in models' future projections cannot come from iterative verification and improvement, but instead must be grounded in a combination of an understanding of the adequacy of simulation of relevant Earth System feedback processes, together with an assessment of the degree to which the models can represent historical behaviour. The latter can potentially provide metrics or constraints that can inform which configurations of each model are most defensible as tools to project future climates.

In climate model development and calibration, these types of constraints are utilised in an extended expert assessment where biases in climatology and historical trends are iteratively reduced and addressed through improved process representation and parameter adjustment (Hourdin et al., 2017; Mauritsen et al., 2012; Schmidt et al., 2017), or systematically through the use of perturbed ensembles and formal inference (Tett et al., 2017; Williamson et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2018). Adequate performance on a subset of metrics is generally accepted as necessary for consideration

as a member of the collection of climate models (Eyring et al., 2016) used to assess future change in IPCC assessment reports (Pachauri et al., 2014) - for example, the need for models to conserve energy or to broadly reproduce the observed global mean temperature evolution of the 20th Century. Other performance metrics may be of particular interest to specific modeling centers - for example, reducing biases in the simulation of a particular regional climate or for a particular application (for example, for simulating climate features relevant for energy infrastructure (Golaz et al., 2019) or optimizing model performance at high latitudes (Tjiputra et al., 2020).

45

Recent literature (Bretherton and Caldwell, 2020; Brient, 2019; Cox, 2019; Eyring et al., 2019; Hall et al., 2019; Klein and Hall, 2015) has also focused on a class of "emergent" constraints which differs conceptually in that the relevance of the metric is defended by the existence of a correlation between a potentially observable metric and a projected future climate response, within an ensemble of ESM simulations. Emergent constraints are generally applied in a regression framework, where the ensemble is used to define a predictive relationship which can be combined with observations to produce an estimate of constrained projected values. Examples include constraints of Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity (hereafter ECS) from aspects of natural variability (Cox et al., 2018b) and cloud properties (Brient and Schneider, 2016; Sherwood et al., 2014), Transient Climate Response (TCR) from observed warming trends (Nijsse et al., 2020; Tokarska et al., 2020), and future carbon cycle (Cox, 2019) and ice-albedo feedbacks (Cox, 2019; Qu and Hall, 2007; Thackeray and Hall, 2019) from their observed seasonal variations.

50

55

There are a number of factors that have been recognized which might lead to overconfidence in the projections from emergent constraints. The first is that, because of the relatively small sample size in CMIP ensembles (or small effective sample size due to model interdependencies (Knutti et al., 2013; Masson and Knutti, 2011; Sanderson et al., 2015)) and the large number of outputs, it is inevitable that some variables will be correlated with climate response metrics by chance (Caldwell et al., 2014). This means that our confidence in a constraint cannot arise from correlation across the ensemble alone, but must also include the plausibility of the proposed mechanism which relates the predictor to the future climate response (Caldwell et al., 2018). However, although many published emergent constraints propose a physical explanation for an underlying process which might jointly control the predictor and predictand, robust demonstration of a mechanism often requires tools which are not available, such as systematic sampling of parameters and process representations in models (Hall et al., 2019; Klein and Hall, 2015)

60

65

At least some emergent constraints can be shown to be overconfident using existing data, by considering new models which are outliers in previously proposed relationships (Klein and Hall, 2015; Schlund et al., 2020) or lack of agreement of different constraints on the same quantity in the literature (Brient, 2019). Such disagreement might arise due to inconsistency in the definition of a climate response: for example, if ECS is in fact dependent on the climate state then the value inferred from cooling during the last glacial maximum would differ from that inferred from recent decades. But overconfidence could also arise from overly strong statistical assumptions on the robustness of ensemble-derived relationships (Williamson and Sansom, 2019). The standard regression model uses an ensemble-derived regression relationship between predictor (the potentially measurable variable) and predictand (the unknown climate response) to make a calibrated projection, implicitly assuming the real world is *exchangeable* with models in the ensemble, which is to say that the relationship is equally likely to apply to the real world as to members of the model ensemble.

70

75

It is generally understood that Earth System Models, like any model, contain errors and approximations which mean we would not expect this assumption of exchangeability to hold. We know that the models which populate our ensembles are subject to limits of resolution and complexity. This means that they can be considered only as approximations of the real world, likely with more in common with each other than reality (an issue which can be compounded by replicated assumptions and components within the ensemble; (Caldwell et al., 2014; Sanderson et al., 2015)).

80

However, although the mean and variance of ensemble projections may be subject to biases, the standard regression model used in ECs makes a strong additional assumption of exchangeability that intra-ensemble relationships are

85

applicable to the real world, potentially leading to a confident yet incorrect constrained projection. Even in the presence of a strong correlation and a plausible physical mechanism explaining the constraint in simulations (Caldwell et al., 2018), the correlation might only arise due to common simplifications throughout the ensemble. Such concerns have led to debate as to whether emergent constraints should be included in integrative assessments of uncertainty in ECS (Sherwood et al., 2020), underlining the need for a robust framework in which to consider emergent constraints as lines of evidence.

90

A first step towards more robust use of emergent constraints is to combine different lines of evidence (Bretherton and Caldwell, 2020; Brient, 2019), effectively relaxing the assumption that a single constraint is reliable (but maintaining that constraints have some potential value, even if they disagree). However, enacting this approach requires considering additional factors: the degree to which each component constraint has a plausible mechanism (Caldwell et al., 2018) and the degree of independence assumed between different constraints (Bretherton and Caldwell, 2020).

95

Uncertainties in the relationship and in the source ensemble can at least be represented by framing the problem in a Bayesian framework (Hargreaves et al., 2012; Renoult et al., 2020) or using information theory approaches (Brient and Schneider, 2016). These frameworks can naturally allow the integration of multiple constraints by effectively weighting the climate responses of different models in the ensemble by likelihood informed by a set of constraints – however these approaches do not test the fundamental implicit assumptions of the regression framework used in most published ECs. Critically, they can also be expanded to represent the likelihood that ensemble members are exchangeable with reality (Williamson and Sansom, 2019), which is effectively assumed in most studies published to date. But even in an ideal case, elements of the calibration of the statistical model parameters would remain somewhat subjective, conditional on prior assumptions about climate responses and chosen metrics of model adequacy and interdependency.

100

105

In the following section, we discuss how emergent constraints could hypothetically arise due to structural deficiencies in how processes are represented in the model - a predictor-predictand relationship could exist within the common simplified framework of model parameterizations, which would be overly confident if applied to the real world. To illustrate this, we consider a situation where we know that our ensemble explores only a single model structure which is oversimplified compared to the real world.

110

2 A LESSON FROM PARAMETER PERTURBATION EXPERIMENTS

Although the concept of emergent constraints as applied to multi-model ensembles has become popular in the last decade, the general formulation was used previously in the perturbed parameter literature. (Piani et al., 2005)Piani et al., 2005 used a statistical formulation which might today be classified as an emergent constraint, identifying statistical modes of variability which were correlated with climate sensitivity in a large ensemble of perturbed parameter experiments (PPEs), then using observations to produce constrained estimates of ECS. The ensemble used in this case was sufficiently large (Stainforth et al., 2005) that the relationships were statistically robust in sample, but were found to be inaccurate when applied to an out of sample set of simulations (in this case, predicting the climate sensitivity of members of the CMIP ensemble (Sanderson, 2013)).

115

120

To understand why this is the case, we must consider the conceptual differences between perturbed-parameter and multi-model ensembles. In PPEs, a single model structure is used, and both predictors and predictands are functions of the parameters which are perturbed in the experiment. Emergent constraints in a PPE are generally easy to find (Knutti et al., 2006; Piani et al., 2005; Sanderson, 2011; Yokohata et al., 2010) because there is a low-dimensional functional relationship between predictors and future response in the ensemble - both are, by construction, functions of the perturbed input parameters. Feedback variation in a PPE is a function of a subset of the parameters which have been perturbed; thus, if any potentially observable quantities are also functions of those same parameters, an emergent constraint is automatically present. Due to this underlying parametric structure, many emergent constraints can be found in a PPE; but they are not individually useful, because there are no model versions which satisfy all constraints

125

130 simultaneously due to the structural component of model error which cannot be tuned (Sanderson et al., 2008), and their predictions are generally not applicable to other models (Sanderson, 2011, 2013; Yokohata et al., 2010) (an effect which has been observed in multi-structure PPEs(Kamae et al., 2016)).

In model calibration exercises, structural errors in a single model manifest through differences in optimal parameter configurations which arise from prioritizing different observations in the cost function. For example, different optimal
135 parameter configurations minimize errors in the Amazon and Indonesian rainforests (McNeall et al., 2016), implying an underlying structural error in the model which requires that a global calibration must be a trade-off in biases in the two regions, leaving an irreducible error which cannot be eliminated by parameter adjustment alone.

It is understood that probabilistic predictions of future changes made from a PPE must be robust in the face of this irreducible error (Rougier, 2007). In some cases, the MME has been used as an out of sample test to assess
140 overconfidence in predictions made from relationships within the PPE (Sanderson, 2013; Sexton and Murphy, 2012). The correspondence between model errors and the model parameter space also allows for the conceptualization and quantification of error trade-offs through 'history matching' (McNeall et al., 2016; Williamson et al., 2013) (approaches which rule out parts of parameter space that perform poorly in multiple metrics). Such approaches can retain a subset of model variants with comparable net errors but with different tradeoffs (in the simple example above,
145 including model versions which minimize errors in either the Amazon or Indonesian rainforests).

Such strategies seek to incorporate model performance in reproducing a range of observables using a model which is imperfect, where it is understood that placing all emphasis on a single observable (as in an emergent constraint) would lead to overconfidence. In a PPE, this is demonstrable because we have a wider structural sample (the MME) in which predictions can be tested, and because model errors can be represented as a function of model parameters which helps
150 us both conceptualize and quantify systematic errors.

In a MME, we do not have similar out-of-sample estimates to illustrate the limitations of ensemble-derived correlations, and there is not necessarily a simple underlying parametric structure which allows us to quantify how assumptions map onto errors. Our experience with PPEs has shown that emergent constraints can arise due to an underlying parametric structure - which is present by construction in a PPE, but may also be effectively present in an
155 MME if the same parameterizations are used throughout the ensemble. This is a potential source of overconfidence in existing ECs which is not generally accounted for.

If a MME includes subsets of models with common structural assumptions, it is also possible that ECs may exist within a given subset. In such cases, confidence in the emergent constraint should be conditioned on the degree to which the models in the subset are plausible. Underlying these uncertainties is a requirement for independently
160 assessing the likelihood or plausibility of model structures.

In short, we cannot easily quantify the impacts of structural error in MME-derived ECs, but equally, it is not justifiable to assume that the MME is interchangeable with reality or that common structural errors are absent. Indeed, the very presence of an EC for a given process in an MME might be indicative of a lack of diversity of process representation because constraints are more likely to emerge if there are limited effective degrees of freedom represented in the
165 ensemble. Robust multi-metric approaches which are a demonstrable necessity in a PPE are equally advisable in an MME.

3 THE NATURE OF MULTI-MODEL EMERGENT CONSTRAINTS

How then do we assess whether an ensemble is sufficiently structurally diverse that an emergent constraint arising from it could be applicable to the real world? In a PPE, constraints can be tested to some extent by testing
170 relationships in the MME, which we can assume contains a larger structural sample; but for a MME, we have no such superset. If an emergent constraint has been found in a MME (providing it has not been demonstrated to be statistically

Commented [RK6]: Check ref format "D. Williamson"

Commented [RK7]: I'm confused on this one, this appears many times below. If you spell it out you would say "in a multi" not "in an multi", no?

4

spurious by, for example, additional models which significantly weaken the correlation (Klein and Hall, 2015)), it then remains to assess the degree to which that emergent constraint can be applied to reality (Williamson and Sansom, 2019).

175   Here, we propose that ECs can be categorised conceptually, and by doing so, the nature of their potential structural errors can be better evaluated. We consider three 'kinds' of EC:

3.1 CONSTRAINTS OF THE FIRST KIND: BIAS PERSISTENCE/SIGNAL EMERGENCE

The first kind of constraint includes cases where the measured quantity and the unknown quantity are of the same nature, such that both are expressions of a system's response to a forcing with comparable spatial and temporal
180   features. For example, if the observed historical warming in a MME is used to constrain the warming in a future scenario (Jiménez-de-la-Cuesta and Mauritsen, 2019), both predictor and predictand are expressions of global mean warming in response to a gradually increasing greenhouse gas forcing (constraining Transient Climate Response through observed warming (Nijsse et al., 2020) could be argued to fall into this category). Other examples include the conditioning of future sea-ice extent trends on historical trends (Boé et al., 2009; Knutti et al., 2017; Mahlstein
185   and Knutti, 2012), constraining the range of future soil moisture with its observed transient historical trends (Douville and Plazzotta, 2017) and the persistence of carbon dioxide concentration biases in emissions-driven simulations (Hoffman et al., 2014). Similarly, (Kessler and Tjiputra, 2016)Kessler and Tjiputra, 2016 show a relationship between the present day and future uptake of carbon in the Southern Ocean, while (Goris et al., 2018) show that similar bias persistence exists for deep ocean carbon uptake in the north Atlantic.

190   These examples all broadly concern an emergent transient signal in response to a gradual increase in anthropogenic forcing over time, so they are effectively statements that a bias in transient response is likely to persist if forcing continues to increase at the same rate. Because these constraints directly measure the trend itself, they are relatively insensitive to model assumptions in how and why a trend is simulated, provided there exists a robust relationship between the given aspect of future behaviour and its historical trend.

195   This assumption is valid if it can be defended that both predictor and projected quantity are describable as functions of the same emerging trend. The resulting EC is effectively a (potentially nonlinear) extrapolation, where the strength of the relationship is conditional on the degree to which models represent similar nonlinearities. The relationship is not strongly conditional on underlying structural assumptions because biases are manifested similarly in the historical and future trends. The strength of the correlation in the EC reflects the degree to which models agree on the form of
200   the extrapolation, and thus the only concern for overconfidence is if the relationship between past and future trends is similarly biased in many models (through the common omission of a state-dependent nonlinearity, for example, or a missing forcing in one period in most models).

Constraints of this type are similar to the classical detection problem (Hegerl and Zwiers, 2011; Ribes et al., 2017) where the amplitude of an emerging signal in response to a forcing is estimated in the presence of noise arising from
205   internal variability and other confounding forcers. There exists a large literature in performing such detection of a signal response to a forcing in the context of noise, model errors and other confounding forcings (Hegerl and Zwiers, 2011).

3.2 CONSTRAINTS OF THE SECOND KIND: PROCESS ISOLATION

The second kind of EC involves the identification of a primary mechanism which governs the future response, and the
210   subsequent proposal of an observable quantity which constrains the strength of that feedback within the ensemble. There are a large number of ECs which fall into this category for ECS (Brient et al., 2016; Lipat et al., 2017; Sherwood et al., 2014; Siler et al., 2018; Su et al., 2014; Tian, 2015; Trenberth and Fasullo, 2010; Volodin, 2008; Zhai et al., 2015b), in most cases involving mechanistic constraints on the response of shallow convective clouds to warming (considered to be the primary source of uncertainty in ECS in CMIP5 (Andrews et al., 2012) and CMIP6 (Zelinka et

5

Commented [RK8]: ?

Commented [RK9]: Check ref "n.d."

Commented [RK10]: e.g. Mahlstein 2012 JGR
http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016709

Commented [RK11]: Chgeck brackts in refs.

Commented [RK12]: Does it need to increase? It could also remain constant I think.

Commented [BS13R12]: I would argue against that in timescale depedent feedback cases where the specific feedbacks constrained are linked to the rate of increase of forcing.

215   al., 2020)). Other studies propose to directly constrain individual cloud feedbacks (Brient et al., 2016; Gordon and Klein, 2014; Qu et al., 2014; Siler et al., 2018) or future precipitation changes (Allen and Ingram, 2002; Watanabe et al., 2018). In the ocean, similar process-based constraints were propsed in (Terhaar et al., 2020)Terhaar et al., 2020, which found a relationship between ocean acidification and Arctic deepwater formation, which was in turn related to present day Arctic surface water densities.

220   Emergent constraints obtained by statistical data-mining (either transparently or otherwise) (Caldwell et al., 2014) can potentially fit into this category, though in order to be defensible, such constraints must be demonstrated to be statistically robust (Caldwell et al., 2014) and also provide a plausible mechanism to explain why the candidate process is the dominant factor in explaining ensemble variance in future response, and why the proposed observable is an expected metric of that process (Caldwell et al., 2018; Hall et al., 2019).

225   However, unlike constraints of the first kind, a process-based constraint does not describe uncertainty in future response in a general sense - at best, it describes the leading order process which explains variability in future response across the ensemble. A plausible, robust, process-based EC is still conditional on the plausibility of the relevant process as it is represented in the class of models used in the ensemble. However, confidence in process representation can be assessed and potentially increased through consideration of the plausbility of common model assumptions (Klein and Hall, 2015) or identification of independent observables which can be used to assess the degree to which models represent relevant processes (Terhaar et al., 2020).

3.3 CONSTRAINTS OF THE THIRD KIND: FREQUENCY SUBSTITUTION

The third kind of constraint proposes that the future response to a given forcing **A** can be constrained using the response of the system to a different forcing **B**, the response to which is potentially observable. Unlike constraints of the second kind, this logic does not require a specific feedback mechanism. Unlike constraints of the first kind (a special case), it is also not *a priori* true that the response of the system to one forcing **B** is controlled by the same processes which control the future response **A**. There are thus a larger number of potential sources of structural error compared to the first kind of constraint, as the simulation of responses to *both* **A** and **B** may have ensemble-wide biases and missing components. In this case, those potential biases may arise only in the simulation of the predictor or only the predictand, and so errors have the potential to weaken the constraint.

In such cases, the forcing associated with **B** differs from **A** in terms of its timescale or mechanism.   Examples of this third kind of constraint have taken **B** as the seasonal cycle (Covey et al., 2000; Knutti et al., 2006; Zhai et al., 2015b), the inter-annual variability simulated by the models (Cox et al., 2018b; Masson and Knutti, 2013a) (though it is arguable whether such unforced variability is in-fact measurable (Rypdal et al., 2018)) or the response to paleoclimate forcings (Hargreaves et al., 2012; Hegerl et al., 2006; Royer et al., 2007; Schmidt et al., 2014) or volcanic events (Boer et al., 2007; Plazzotta et al., 2018; Wigley, 2005). Similar approaches have used the seasonal cycle in snow albedo to constrain sea ice trends (Qu and Hall, 2014), future extreme precipitation (O'Gorman, 2012) and vegetation carbon responses to warming (Cox et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2014; Wenzel et al., 2014). (Kwiatkowski et al., 2017)Kwiatkowski et al., 2017 found that the sensitivity of tropical ocean productivity to internal variability driven temperature change was related to future changes in productivity under anthropogenic global warming. The concept can be taken further - using tendencies of forecasts on a timescale of hours to constrain long term responses to climate change (Palmer, 2020; Rodwell and Palmer, 2007).

Because our confidence in the EC arises partly from the existence of the correlation within the ensemble itself, we must carefully assess the possibility that the emergent relationship arises due to common assumptions which are deployed throughout the ensemble. Furthermore, it is more likely that a relationship will emerge if the common assumptions are simple, with a small number of effective degrees of freedom in calibration (see Figure 1, in the simple-model example which follows).

Commented [RK14]: Check ref format "G. A. Schmidt»

Commented [RK15]: Check brackts in ref.

Commented [RK16]: Knutti 2006 J Climate

Commented [RK17]: We did this years before Cox in Masson 2013 Jclimate and showed that in most cases it doesn't work.

Commented [RK18]: Check brackets in refs

For example, many CMIP-class models use similar temperature-scaling assumptions for soil respiration (Shao et al., 2013). There is evidence that the majority of soil carbon stocks in the CMIP5 archive can be explained by a reduced order function of soil temperature and plant productivity which notably fails to reproduce observed carbon stocks (Todd-Brown et al., 2013) - implying a common structural bias. A constraint on the future temperature response in CMIP (Cox et al., 2013) could be argued to effectively be a calibration of a low-order soil respiration model.

In such a situation, where the CMIP models have a common and/or low-order structure, differing only in their calibration - the MME is in fact a PPE in disguise. Our assumption that the ensemble represents a complete set of plausible structural variants interchangeable with reality is far from the truth, and worse, an ensemble with such structural limitations is more likely to produce constraints of the third kind (as we see in the simple example which follows) because the response to any forcing is effectively governed by a small number of degrees of freedom. Although there may be a robust intra-ensemble relationship between the response to a short-timescale forcing and a long-timescale forcing, this relationship may be the direct product of a simple common structural framework. In order to have confidence in the constrained projection, it is then necessary to assess whether that common framework is both adequate and also the only plausible mechanistic model for the process.

It should also be noted that these 'kinds' of constraint might be potentially useful in an illustrative sense, but they are not absolute. Some published constraints undoubtedly have elements of more than one type. For example, (Zhai et al., 2015b)Zhai et al., 2015b has elements of both 2nd- and 3rd-kind constraints, in that it isolates a primary long term feedback process and constrains it using the response to short term forcing (seasonal variability, in this case). Another example is constraining transient climate response from observed warming (Knutti and Tomassini, 2008; Nijsse et al., 2020; Schurer et al., 2018; Tokarska et al., 2020), which has elements of 1st- and 3rd-kind constraints. The transient warming response to an idealized forcing is constrained with its response to historical emissions, which is a 1st-kind constraint But there are also conceptual differences between these forcing pathways (most notably the presence of transient aerosol forcing in the real world) and the resulting dominant feedback processes, which introduce elements of a third-kind constraint. Ultimately, the greater the differences between the forced response considered in the constraint and that measured in the predictand, the more the constraint itself depends on the structural assumptions present in the ensemble.

4 A SIMPLE EXAMPLE

We can illustrate these concepts using ensembles created from two different classes of simple climate model.

4.1 HEURISTIC MODEL STRUCTURES

4.1.1 SINGLE-LAYER MODEL

The first model uses a single timescale of response, corresponding conceptually to an ocean represented by a single thermodynamic slab:

$$C \frac{dT'}{dt} = F(t) - \lambda T' \tag{1}$$

where C is the heat capacity of the Earth system, T' is the global mean temperature anomaly, F is the time-dependent climate forcing and λ is the climate sensitivity parameter.

Commented [RK19]: Check brackets in ref.

Commented [RK20]: Fix "n.d." Tokarska 2020 SciAdv

Figure 1. An illustration of the three kinds of emergent constraint in two structurally-different ensembles. (a) an
295 **idealised forcing timeseries used for each of the simulations - a (noisy) linear ramping of radiative forcing from years 0-140 followed by (noisy) constant forcing from years 140-280. (b) shows the response in 50-member perturbed parameter ensembles of two energy balance models, with one (red) and two (blue) timescales of response. (c) a constraint of the first kind, showing TCR (warming after 70 years of 1 percent annual increase in CO_2 concentrations) as a predictor of T140 (warming at time of CO_2 quadrupling, 140 years in the same**
300 **experiment). (d) warming after a further 140 years of constant (quadrupled) CO_2 concentrations. (e,f) constraints of the second kind, using the feedback parameter 'lambda' to predict warming after (140, 280) years. (g,h) constraints of the third kind, using a variability metric (Cox et al., 2018b) derived from detrended temperature timeseries in years 1-70 as a predictor warming after (140, 280) years. In each case, colored points show members of the model ensemble, lines show bootstrap regression estimates, grey vertical bars show the 10th, 50th and 90th**
305 **percentile of the (hypothetical) observed uncertainty distribution. Colored box/whisker plots show the 5/95th and 25/75th percentiles ~~of the resulting constraint~~ illustrating the prediction interval from each ensemble. Variance explained by the predictor for one and two layer models is printed in red and blue text respectively.**

4.1.2 TWO-LAYER MODEL

8

The second model is slightly more complex, with the addition of a deep ocean (Geoffroy et al., 2013):

$$C \frac{dT'}{dt} = F(t) - \lambda T' - \varepsilon \gamma (T' - T_0') \tag{2}$$

$$C_0 \frac{dT_0'}{dt} = \gamma (T' - T_0') \tag{3}$$

,

Where C_0 is the heat capacity and T_0' is the temperature anomaly of a deep ocean layer, γ is the thermal diffusion coefficient of heat exchange between the two layers, and ε is the efficacy of heat transfer to the deep ocean (see (Geoffroy et al., 2013)~~Geoffroy et al., 2013~~)).

4.2 IDEALIZED EXPERIMENTS

We conduct an idealised climate change experiment where for the first 140 years, CO_2 concentrations are increased by 1 percent each year resulting in a gradual linear increase in forcing over time, followed by an equilibration period:

$$F(t) = at + b\eta(t), t < 140. \tag{4}$$

A transient component of the forcing is provided by the first term, where a=0.05 (corresponding approximately to the 1 percent CO_2 ramping experiment), and a random component is provided by the second term, where $\eta(t)$ is white Gaussian noise, scaled by the factor b=0.5. In the second 140 years, the transient component of the forcing is held constant:

$$F(t) = 140\,a + b\eta(t), t \geq 140, \tag{5}$$

With each model, we produce a range of responses by creating an ensemble with parameters sampled in latin hypercube - in the first case $[C, \lambda]$ and in the second case, $[C, C_o, \lambda, \varepsilon, \gamma]$. Finally, we consider how different types of artificial 'observation' would constrain the projected response. Parameter ranges for the two-layer model are informed by (Geoffroy et al., 2013)., and manually adjusted in the one-layer model to produce a comparable range of transient warming after 140 years (T140 herein, see Table 1).

Parameter	Symbol (Units)	Minimum (1 layer model)	Maximum (1 layer model)	Minimum (2 layer model)	Maximum (2 layer model)
Upper ocean heat capacity	C (Wm^{-2}K^{-1}yr)	10	20	2	10
Feedback parameter	λ (Wm^{-2}K^{-1})	0.5	2	0.5	5
Deep ocean heat capacity	C$_0$ (Wm^{-2}K^{-1}yr)	-	-	50	500
Deep ocean diffusion coefficient	γ (Wm^{-2}K^{-1})	-	-	0.5	3
Deep ocean efficacy	ε (unitless)	-	-	0.8	2.5

Table 1. Parameters used in the one- and two-layer models in the idealized example, and the upper and lower bounds of the sampling range used in the ensemble construction.

In these simple models, we can test constraints of different types and illustrate their sensitivity to common structural differences between the two ensembles. We consider three constraints for future response in each of these models, and then interpret their relative skill.

A 1st-kind constraint can be created by using the transient warming observed after 70 years (T70) to predict T140. In this example, the EC exists in both ensembles (though its slope differs a little between the two ensemble types): transient warming is near-linear in time in both cases, and so behaviour at year 140 can be extrapolated from years 1-70. However, for the case of warming at 280 years (T280, i.e. an additional 140 years after forcing is stabilized), we see a strong relationship between T70 and T280 only in the single layer model (Figure 1d). In the two layer model, the temperature response in the first 140 years of linear forcing increase is a combination of both slow (deep) and fast (shallow) timescale components, and transient warming at year 70 can be extrapolated (even if we don't know the relative contribution of the slow and fast components of the warming). However, when the forcing stabilizes at year 140, the shallow component quickly saturates and remaining warming is due to deep ocean equilibration alone. Thus, this additional degree of freedom (shallow vs deep contribution to transient warming) is unconstrained, and T70 is a worse constraint on T280. The one layer model does not have this additional degree of freedom, and thus T70 is a good constraint on T280 - but only because of the structural simplifications present in the model. Because the nature of the forcing differs between the transient and equilibrium stages of the experiment, the constraint of T280 using T70 is a 3rd-kind constraint in our classification system.

We can consider a constraint of the 2nd kind by assessing how independent data constraining a parameter in the models would constrain its projections. In Figures 1(e,f) we illustrate how knowledge of the λ parameter would act as a constraint in two ensembles (as a proxy for information about physical processes in CMIP-class models). In the single-timescale model, λ acts as a near-perfect predictor of warming after 140 and 280 years, and constraining ensemble spread using that parameter would have a large effect. In contrast, in the two-timescale model, the correlation is weak. Although the lambda parameter controls feedbacks (and equilibrium response) in both models, transient response in the two layer model is strongly governed by deep ocean heat uptake. We know that heat uptake by the deep ocean is an important mechanism for Earth's warming in transient scenarios (Geoffroy et al., 2013a), so we have introduced a common structural flaw in models that do not account for the role of the deep ocean. That flaw allows for an apparently strong EC in the single-timescale model ensemble which is not present in the more realistic ensemble.

The one-layer model ensemble samples a similar range of transient warming as the two-layer model in the first 140 years. For some applications, the one-layer model may be sufficient to model further transient warming, but the strength of an EC based on λ depends on the over-simplistic structure of the one layer model, which leads to a demonstrably overconfident result in this case.

We can also construct a 3rd kind constraint such as the ψ variability metric similar to that used by (Cox et al., 2018b), where the variance and lag-covariance of temperature variability is used as a predictor of climate sensitivity (though there are conceptual differences to Cox 2018, given our model here does not have an internal source of noise). In this case in Figure 1(g,h), we consider the ψ metric as a predictor of T140 and T280 in our two ensembles. Once again, the metric is a strong predictor for both T140 and T280 in the one-layer ensemble. Meanwhile, in the two layer ensemble, the correlation with T140 is weaker (with a different slope to the one-layer case). There is little to no correlation between T280 and ψ. As with the first-kind constraint, both the EC relationship slope and its strength as a predictor depend on common structural assumptions, with a stronger apparent relationship in the ensemble with fewer degrees of freedom.

In these simple examples, we can understand EC behavior in the context of the model assumptions. Both model types can produce similar transient evolution until forcing is fixed, but then the responses diverge, revealing very different

10

equilibration behaviour (see Figure 1b). The single-layer model equilibrates to a change in forcing over 1-2 decades (depending on the exact choices of C and λ), so that after 140 years, most of the response to the forcing experienced to date has already been realized in the model temperature response, and little additional warming is subsequently seen. T70, T140 and T280 are all (to first order) controlled by the λ parameter. On the other hand, the-two layer model does not fully equilibrate to a step change in forcing for centuries - so the transient response to forcing which define T70 and T140 is controlled by both λ and the deep ocean heat uptake parameters (C$_o$, ε, γ). In this model, neither T70 nor λ are singularly informative about how the model equilibrates.

This illustrates a key issue with the emergent constraint framework: if one has access only to the one-layer model ensemble, one would conclude that λ or T70 are strong emergent constraints on T280, and the strength of the relationship might be used as evidence for the physical plausibility of the EC. But instead, in this case, the strength of the relationship is indicative that the single layer model is lacking (in this case a deep ocean), and the parameters of the shallow ocean have been adjusted to compensate for this bias in reproducing observed transient behavior. Furthermore, if independent data on the real-world value of λ was available and was used to constrain the response of the single-layer model (and the real world was in fact more appropriately modeled by including the deep ocean), the resulting constrained prediction would be precise but inaccurate because that prediction would be conditional on a common structural assumption that is incorrect.

More generally, the strength of an emergent relationship must be considered in the context of the degrees of freedom which are varied in the ensemble being considered. In the simple example considered here, the historical forced response can act as a constraint on the future response because the forcing term is held constant across the ensemble. In CMIP, the presence of uncertainty in the forcing timeseries due, in a large part, to uncertain aerosol effects render historical warming as a poor constraint on future warming (Forest et al., 2002; Knutti et al., 2002) due to compensating forcing and feedback terms in ensemble members (Kiehl, 2007; Knutti, 2008), except in cases where the aerosol forcing term is relatively constant over the time period considered (Nijsse et al., 2020; Tokarska et al., 2020), or additional information is included to disambiguate the responses to different forcings (Allen and Stott, 2003; Hegerl et al., 2000; Kettleborough et al., 2007). In effect, this suggests that the long term historical warming in CMIP is not a useful constraint because it has already been 'used' by model developers who consider reproducing historical warming to be a necessary condition for acceptability of a released model, leading to an ensemble which is converged on the observed global mean historical temperature record, but with a range of trade-offs in forcing and net feedback.

5 ASSESSING STRUCTURAL ROBUSTNESS IN CMIP EMERGENT CONSTRAINTS

Clearly, the models in the example above are vastly simpler than those used in CMIP, but these examples illustrate relationships which could emerge in those more complex models, and how they might be incorrectly utilized. Such errors could occur in CMIP-derived ECs if there are processes that are parameterised in a common, overly-simplistic fashion across the ensemble. Furthermore, irrespective of increasing model complexity, it is likely that this argument could always be made - one could *always* imagine a more complex or complete model than the standard at any given time. In this context, a single EC will continue to be at best a conditional statement which could be proved inaccurate or overconfident by the following generation of models.

But for the increasing body of ECs which have been published using CMIP data, how concerned should we be about overconfidence due to common structural errors? This question does not replace those credibility tests which have already been proposed in the literature (Caldwell et al., 2018; Hall et al., 2019): robustness to change in ensemble samples, plausibility of mechanism and evidence of the mechanism and feedback variability from supporting model diagnostics. But for ECs which appear to pass these tests, an assessment of the underlying model assumptions is then necessary. Here we assess a small number of ECs as case studies, and how their applicability is to some degree conditional.

5.1 PERSISTENT BIAS OF CO_2 CONCENTRATIONS

We consider first an example of an EC of the 'first kind' (Hoffman et al., 2014) which uses the present day carbon dioxide concentration to constrain future carbon dioxide concentrations. Their primary finding is that a historical bias persists into the future in a transient emissions scenario. This exploitation of bias-persistence might be overconfident if the CMIP5 models were missing or misrepresenting key land surface or ocean processes which might differently alter future and historical CO_2 concentrations.

The net carbon uptake by the Earth system represents the combined contributions of land and ocean components, with greater agreement in models on the net effects than the consituents (Friedlingstein et al., 2014). In the ocean, there is evidence of common biases in CMIP5, for example in mixing and the uptake of carbon in the Southern Ocean (Sallée et al., 2013). If such biases are compensated through other parameters in order to improve global estimates of net ocean carbon uptake – then ensemble-derived relationships between past and present carbon uptake have the potential to be biased by common errors in the Southern Ocean (Terhaar et al., 2021).

In the land surface representation, there are a number of processes missing from a subset or the entirety of the CMIP5 ensemble. For example, nitrogen limitation was implemented in only one model in the CMIP5 generation of models (Zaehle et al., 2015), where it was found to have the capacity to significantly alter land carbon uptake. For an emergent constraint exploiting the persistence of a CO_2 concentration bias, this is potentially an issue if nitrogen availability is not currently limiting, but becomes a limiting factor in a future state. A larger fraction of CMIP6 models include nitrogen limitation with diverse implementations. Nitrogen was not found to strongly influence historical carbon uptake - but a future effect has not been explicitly ruled out by studies to date (Davies-Barnard et al., 2020), so a repeat of the Hoffman study would be a useful test of the robustness of the EC to a significant structural change between the CMIP5 and CMIP6 generation of land surface models.

There remain a number of additional processes which could potentially influence future carbon uptake that are not comprehensively implemented. Phosphorus limitation has potentially large impacts on the future Amazonian carbon sink (Fleischer et al., 2019), and is absent from CMIP5 models, but present in a small subset of CMIP6 models (Arora et al., 2020). The impact on the carbon sink of potential changes in tree mortality in response to CO_2 and forest productivity. is both critical and absent from CMIP6 class models (Brienen et al., 2020; Needham et al., 2020), as are complex fire-vegetation feedback processes (Teckentrup et al., 2019), diversity in responses to drought (Fisher et al., 2010; Levine et al., 2016; Longo et al., 2018; Sakschewski et al., 2016) vegetation damage under unprecedented heat extremes (Teskey et al., 2015), wind events and pathogen damage (McDowell et al., 2018). These all have the potential to introduce climate-vegetation feedbacks which are currently not represented in the CMIP6 ensemble.

Thus our confidence in the persistence of the models' present day CO_2 bias persisting into the future is reduced because there are processes which are potentially highly significant and are broadly absent from current generation models. However, the nature of a first-kind constraint means that the integrative carbon cycle response is used as both predictor and predictand, and so this kind of constraint could remain robust as long as structural omissions had similar effects on CO_2 concentrations in the past and the future. In short, it is a filter on models which have been accurate thus far in simulating the quantity we are ultimately interested in measuring - an arguably necessary (but not sufficient) condition for projecting that quantity into the future. Because the net carbon feedback is being constrained directly, the method is (somewhat) insensitive to the representation of processes which make up that feedback.

5.2 HISTORICAL CONSTRAINTS ON SOIL-CARBON TEMPERATURE RELATIONSHIPS

We next consider the study by (Cox et al., 2013), which relates tropical land carbon uptake-temperature feedback and the historical relationship between growth rate of atmospheric CO_2 and tropical temperature anomalies. Other studies (Chadburn et al., 2017; Varney et al., 2020) have considered similar relationships using spatial variability as a predictor. In CMIP5 models, this constraint (of the 'third-kind') was very strong (Cox et al., 2013). In this case, the focus on the carbon-temperature component of the total carbon feedback isolated the effect of soil respiration

Commented [RK24]: Here's a new one on Southern Ocean carbon uptake constraints. Haven't read it but it say the ensemble is biased and too wide. https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/7/18/eabd5964

Commented [RK25]: potentially?

Commented [RK26]: The study by Cox et al.(2013)?

465 temperature response - which in CMIP5 dominates both the predictor and the predictand for the EC. Our confidence in the EC thus firstly depends on whether soil respiration is represented in a common, oversimplified fashion in the CMIP5 ensemble. Independent studies have found that inter-model differences in soil carbon uptake are dominated by the parameterisation choices for soil heterotrophic respiration rather than structural differences (Todd-Brown et al., 2013), and that a lack of ability to represent grid-scale variation in soil carbon levels indicates the potential missing
470 processes. Non-coupled models representing higher levels of microbial complexity and vertical resolution suggest that CMIP-class models may be underestimating the range of potential future soil carbon uptake (Shi et al., 2018).

In CMIP6 models, there remains indication that spatial variability continues to provide predictive information on future soil carbon dynamics (Varney et al., 2020), but the role of soil respiration in the total carbon-temperature feedback is less dominant (Arora et al., 2020), with vegetation productivity responses also playing a role in the
475 ensemble variance. This increases the structural diversity of the relevant model components, and has the potential to weaken the strength of the CMIP5 correlation. A repeated analysis of the method of (Cox et al., 2013) for the CMIP6 ensemble would be therefore of interest for testing whether the correlation remains equally strong in CMIP6.

Commented [RK27]: Of the method used by Cox et al. (2013)?

5.3 CONSTRAINTS ON FUTURE OCEAN CARBON UPTAKE

There exist a number of studies which have considered relationships between aspects of present day and future
480 ocean circulation. (Kessler and Tjiputra, 2016)Kessler and Tjiputra, 2016 propose a constraint between the contemporary and future uptake of carbon in the Southern Ocean, which in the framework laid out here would be regognised as a first-kind constraint: a trend or rate observed today persists into the future. The southern ocean carbon uptake is conditional on both physical and biological model assumptions, and there are potential common CMIP biases in Southern Ocean mixed layer depths (Sallée et al., 2013) and seasonal SST cycle and
485 models with compensating biases in productivity (Mongwe et al., 2016), However, as discussed in Section 3.1, such trend extrapolation constraints can remain robust to such compensating biases in the absence of nonlinearities.

Commented [RK28]: Check brackets in ref.

(Goris et al., 2018)Goris et al., 2018 also constrains future oceanic carbon uptake, identifying that models which more efficiently mix carbon down into deeper layers in historical climate continue to do so in the future (a first
490 kind constraint), and that such models show a larger seasonal cycle in North Atlantic shallow ocean carbon concentrations due to summer productivity and winter mixing of carbon into the deep ocean (a third kind constraint). The process identification, and multi-metric constraint potentially add robustness to this approach – but the constraints remain subject to potential common mis-representation of ocean biota in the ensemble, such as the common underrepresentation of winter North Atlantic productivity in all CMIP models shown by
495 (Goris et al., 2018)Goris et al., 2018, and common underestimation of Atlantic Meridional Overturning Cirulation variability (Yan et al., 2018), both of which have the potential to bias the simulated seasonal carbon concentration anomalies, as well as the derived emergent relationship slope.

Commented [RK29]: Check brackets in ref.

Commented [RK30]: If you keep this then close it at the end. But it gets very long...

Commented [RK31]: Check brackets in ref.
In - >by?

(Kwiatkowski et al., 2017)Kwiatkowski et al., 2017 identify a strong relationship between the long-term sensitivity of tropical ocean primary production to rising equatorial sea surface temperatures and the
500 interannual sensitivity of primary production to El Niño/Southern Oscillation (ENSO)-driven SST anomalies – a classical second kind constraint where the sensitivity of ocean biota temperature variation arising from natural variability is used to infer knowledge about the repsonse to future warming. Such a relationship identifies that the parametric dependencies of tropical producivity are similar for long term warming and internal variability, but once again, conclusions are subject to potential errors in assessing observed
505 productivity (Stock, 2019), as well as common biases in the effect of resolved scale on productivity (McKiver et al., 2015).

Commented [RK32]: Check brackets in ref.

13

5.4 CONSTRAINING TRANSIENT CLIMATE RESPONSE WITH OBSERVED WARMING

The constraint of TCR detailed by (Nijsse et al., 2020)Nijsse et al., 2020 (and also (Tokarska et al., 2020)Tokarska et al., 2020) use observed transient warming as a predictor of future warming. In this case, the EC falls into the 'first kind' category - the predictor and predictand are conceptually similar in that they both represent the transient global mean warming response to a CO_2 forcing which is monotonically increasing at broadly comparable rates - but there are differences in terms of the forcing magnitude (present day CO_2 levels are less than the double pre-industrial level used in the formal TCR definition), and also due to other forcing terms due to, for example, aerosols and land use change. The authors minimise the role of aerosol forcing changes by considering a time period (1975 to 2013) in which there is relatively constant global mean aerosol forcing - leaving a time period in which greenhouse gas forcing changes are dominant.

The presence of a strong correlation in CMIP6, if used as a constraint, tends to rule our the upper end of the CMIP6 TCR range (values of 2.3K and above). Unlike equilibrium response (where models show rather diverse equilibrium warming trajectories (Rugenstein et al., 2020)), CMIP models tend to uniformly exhibit near-linear warming trajectories in response to transient forcing (Gregory et al., 2015), differing only in the temperature growth rate - thus making a strong constraint with effectively one degree of freedom. However, the CMIP5 ensemble indicates a weaker and more noisy relationship between observed warming and TCR, and combining the two ensembles leads to a weaker overall correlation in (Tokarska et al., 2020). Until the origins of these differences are better understood, the application of the CMIP6 EC to rule out higher values should be treated with caution.

indicates that, at least in this ensemble, transient warming remains broadly constant in response to linearly increasing forcing, and uncertainties in the extrapolation of transient warming are sufficiently small that the inter-model spread of TCR can be constrained. Unlike equilibrium response (where models show rather diverse equilibrium warming trajectories (Rugenstein et al., 2020)), CMIP models tend to uniformly exhibit near-linear warming trajectories in response to transient forcing, differing only in the temperature growth rate - thus making a strong constraint with effectively one degree of freedom.

These constraints suggest that historical transient warming well explains future transient warming response to linearly increasing forcing. Our simple model example in Section 4.l highlights how a given transient warming rate can be explained with a range of combinations of climate feedback, ocean heat storage and heat distribution parameters, and that in the event of forcing stabilization, lack of knowledge of these individual parameters will make equilibration behaviour (ECS, as an example) less strongly constrained by historical transient warming. As such, the constraint of TCR from observed warming in a period where primarily only greenhouse gas forcing is changing is likely to be quite robust, leaving the primary question of the utility of TCR itself as a metric of response in future projections.

The TCR metric is, by construction, insensitive to carbon cycle dynamics and aerosol forcing plus potential 'tipping points' (Lenton et al., 2019) if they are unrepresented in current generation models. TCR is also a combined function of climate feedbacks and ocean heat uptake dynamics, and models which share the same value of TCR can have different warming trajectories long after forcing levels stabilise (Sanderson, 2020). As such, inter-timescale relationships (such as those between TCR and warming in the last 30 years), are conditioned on the breakdown of composite feedback timescales in the ensemble. If the ensemble variance in TCR is attributable to varying fast timescale processes, this may result in a different slope than if slow timescale processes were varied.

As such, the emergent constraint on TCR and warming until 2100 in realistic scenarios is likely to be robust, but may not observed warming does not itself constrain equilibrium or post-2100 warming under mitigation (Sherwood et al., 2020), where large uncertainties in the interplay between ocean circulation dynamical responses to warming (Rose and Rayborn, 2016), nonstationary climate feedbacks (Proistosescu and Huybers, 2017; Zelinka et al., 2020)(Zelinka et al., 2020) and long term carbon feedbacks (Koven et al., 2021) are areas of active research.

14

5.5 Process-based constraints on climate sensitivity

Here, we consider an example of a 2nd kind process constraint (Sherwood et al., 2014) on equilibrium climate sensitivity in CMIP5 - though the arguments would be equally applicable to other plausible process-based constraints (Brient et al., 2016; Brient and Schneider, 2016; Zhai et al., 2015a). Sherwood proposes two indirect metrics of lower tropospheric mixing which are related to future reductions in boundary layer clouds (the cloud feedback which is itself the largest component of inter-model spread in ECS (Pincus et al., 2018)). The postulated physical mechanism is that models with larger boundary layer mixing will experience stronger ventilation of moisture from the lower troposphere as the atmosphere warms and humidity increases, so these models ultimately experience the most extreme loss of boundary layer clouds. Independent studies have assessed the Sherwood constraints to have a plausible mechanism, with correlated warming patterns occurring in regions which are consistent with the constraint (Brient, 2019; Caldwell et al., 2018). Together with the relatively strong correlation porposed by Sherwood, this makes the study one of the more compelling examples of a physical constraint on ECS in a multi-model ensemble.

If indeed the constraint proposed by Sherwood et al. is a robust predictor of ECS within CMIP5, the structural robustness of the constraint concerns the degree to which CMIP5 is a representative sample for comparison with reality. This question can itself be divided into three questions: (1) is the process itself sufficiently well represented in CMIP5 to be informative, (2) are there other processes which are absent, undersampled or commonly misrepresented in CMIP5 models which might bias ECS and (3) are there common structural biases which might impact the predictors - the mixing proxies in this case, thus biasing the conclusion of the constraint.

For the first question of boundary layer process accuracy, there is a structurally rich selection of boundary layer schemes in CMIP5 (Edwards et al., 2020) which reduces the chance that the EC is a product of structural homogeneity in the ensemble. There is, however, some evidence that there exist ensemble-wide climatological biases in the current generation of models which can be attributed to common boundary layer mixing structural errors in CMIP5 (Wei et al., 2017). Most CMIP5 generation models rely on low-order turbulence closure schemes which assume, to some degree, a representative length scale for temperature and wind gradients based on Monin-Obukhov similarity theory (Monin and Obukhov, 1957), often complemented by bulk convection schemes or energy closure arguments to resolve remaining boundary layer mixing. The testing of the persistence of the EC in CMIP6, which includes models with higher order closure schemes which do not make this explicit assumption (Bogenschutz et al., 2018), thus broadening the diversity of representation of boundary layer mixing in the ensemble and creating a useful test of structural robustness for the CMIP5 era constraints.

The second question relates less to the representation of the process in question (shallow convection and boundary layer processes), and more to everything else in the model which could potentially influence ECS in CMIP5, but might be undersampled (or not represented at all). To put this another way, are boundary layer processes responsible for ECS variation in CMIP5 because they are the most uncertain in an absolute sense, or because we have failed to adequately explore uncertainty in other feedback processes? For example, the transition from CMIP5 to CMIP6 saw many models shift in their representation of mixed-phase clouds which are thought to explain high ECS values in a number of CMIP6 models (Zelinka et al., 2020), so it is unclear Sherwood's constraint would represent that shift given the process responsible differs from the primary axis of CMIP5 variability.

Perturbed parameter experiments have reported ranges in ECS which have been dominated by deep convective (Sanderson et al., 2010) or mid-layer cloud response (Shiogama et al., 2012), and hence it is not surprising that Sherwood's constraint on low cloud feedbacks has proven less effective at constraining ECS in a PPE (Kamae et al., 2016). If the range of deep convective and mid-layer cloud feedbacks seen in these PPEs cannot be otherwise ruled

595   out, this raises a concern for the degree to which CMIP5 has sampled the climate feedback space, and thus structural robustness of Sherwood's constraint used in isolation.

    The final question for process-based constraints on ECS is the degree to which predictive metrics in the ensemble could be biased by the omission or misrepresentation of other processes. For boundary layer measurements in CMIP5,
600   biases in the land surface scheme are known to project onto boundary layer climatologies (Holtslag et al., 2007), which in the case of CMIP5 was responsible for ensemble-wide systematic biases due to common soil moisture biases (Svensson and Lindvall, 2015) - but given that the Sherwood constraint is focussed on ocean, it seems unlikely that these effects are highly influential. However, biases in boundary layer simulation have been attributed to cloud morphology (Bony et al., 2020), large scale flow, gravity wave and surface drag parameterizations (Sandu et al., 2013), so there remains the possibility of an ensemble-wide bias in the predictor if any of these processes are commonly
605   misrepresented.

5.6 CONSTRAINING CLIMATE SENSITIVITY WITH FLUCTUATION-DISSIPATION RELATIONSHIPS

    We finally consider a third-kind constraint on ECS (Cox et al., 2018b) which relates a metric of internal variability
610   (Psi, a function of the lag-covariance structure of the global mean temperature timeseries) to the models' ECS. The constraint exploits the fluctuation-dissipation theorem (Kubo, 1966; Leith, 1975), which relates the linear response of a dynamical system to its noise characteristics. The result is somewhat dependent on subjective choices in the derivation of the unforced lag-covariance term (Brown et al., 2018), the length of sample used (Rypdal et al., 2018), the subset of CMIP5 models used in the ensemble (Po-Chedley et al., 2018) - which together might imply that there
615   are uncertainties involved in the practical application of the constraint using the historical record which were not represented in the original study.

    Setting aside for a moment these practical issues associated with measuring unforced variability in reality - there is reasonable evidence that there might exist a relationship between control model variability and climate sensitivity in the CMIP5 ensemble (Cox et al., 2018a) (whether that unforced variability is measurable in practice is a different
620   question). The fact that this idealised relationship exists both in simple models (Williamson et al., 2019), and in the CMIP5 ensemble (where both internal variability and ECS are emergent properties of a large number of interacting processes which are diversely sampled within the ensemble) provide some additional confidence, but newer studies suggest a significantly weaker relationship in CMIP6 (Schlund et al., 2020), even though the CMIP6 models exhibit a wider range of ECS (Meehl et al., 2020).

625   Understanding the disagreement between a number of plausible (Caldwell et al., 2018) process-based ECs which constrain ECS to higher values (Brient and Schneider, 2016; Sherwood et al., 2014; Zhai et al., 2015b) and fluctuation-dissipation arguments which suggest lower values (Cox et al., 2018b) may thus require a joint consideration of structural and implementation errors. The process constraints are strongly conditional on the sampling of feedback processes in the CMIP ensemble itself. If the CMIP5 ensemble is under-sampling other types of radiative feedback
630   (e.g. deep convection, mid-level cloud response), then this uncertainty is not represented within the constrained distribution obtained from using an EC on boundary layer processes. Such structural uncertainty might be expected to be less applicable to the fluctuation-dissipation constraint because the variability of global mean temperature is an integrative property of all feedbacks in the system, it is less conditional on any single feedback type being well sampled in the ensemble.

635   However, the practical limitations of the short historical record confounded by other climate forcers may prevent its useful application in practice because the unforced variability of the system is not sufficiently knowable to form a strong constraint on ECS. The results may also be sensitive to the metric and the set of models used; an earlier study

Commented [RK38]: See above

Commented [RK39]: Practice?
"In British English, which is also called International English, *practise* is a verb and *practice* is a noun. American English tends to avoid *practise* altogether, using *practice* as both the noun and verb form."
https://www.dictionary.com/e/practice-vs-practise/

Commented [AGP40R39]: Ya my way is much easier here

Commented [RK41]: Practice?

using a similar idea found no constraint (Masson and Knutti, 2013b), and in some cases reversed signs of correlations between CMIP and PPEs, thus questioning the robustness of the approach. Other studies (Annan et al., 2020) have performed objective Bayesian constraint of ECS through climate variability in simple models, finding a wider constrained range than suggested by Cox et al. (2018). The large discrepancy between the strength of the relationship in CMIP5 and CMIP6 further lowers our confidence in the constraint – implying either the fluctuation-dissipation relationship in CMIP5 was a sampling artifact or that the additional degrees of freedom in feedback variance in CMIP6 (Zelinka et al., 2020) compared with CMIP5 complicate the fluctutation-dissipation relationship which would be expected from simple models with a single feedback parameter.

6 CONCLUSIONS

We have highlighted here that ~~the existence of disagreement among published constraints suggests that structural errors exist in the CMIP multi-model ensemble, and that some published constraints may be spurious. A~~ common structural assumptionse in the CMIP multi-model ensemble may lead to strong EC relationships, especially if assumptions have only a small number of degrees of freedom - and that such situations may arise from ~~indicate~~ a lack of ensemble structural diversity ~~which might be necessary for robust uncertainty quantification~~. In such cases, ECs can play a powerful role in identifying dominant ensemble feedback variation and mechanism – potentially illuminating the strengths and limitations of ensemble process representation and highlighting relevant observables. However, the direct application of ECs to constrain the range of projected outcomes relative to the original ensemble distribution may lead to significant overconfidence in these cases, where the presence of the EC itself may indicate a lack of structural diversity in process representation in the original ensemble.

It remains to consider how an assessment of potential structural errors in an emergent constraint should be used. The focus of published papers and their use in, e.g., IPCC assessments, has often been on the constrained result itself (Cox et al., 2013, 2018b), but these constraints may be overconfident in the face of a potential or demonstrated structural error. A more robust interpretation of an EC is that it provides potentially observable information related to aspects of ensemble response variation, but not necessarily that the projection can be accurately constrained directly with that information. In our simple example, given the presence of a relationship between λ and T280 in the single-layer ensemble, it might be accurate to interpret that the processes represented within λ could be relevant to long term temperature evolution, but unjustified to actually constrain T280 directly.

If this logic is applied to the more complex models which are used in climate assessments, such information could potentially highlight which processes control ensemble spread in projections, where model development needs to assess whether current process representations are adequate and appropriately diverse, whether there are alternative process models which could be incorporated into CMIP-class models, and where available observations have not been fully exploited to calibrate models.

This information could also motivate more focus on the simulation of the predictor variable - are there processes which are missing in the current generation of models which could be implemented in future versions? The presence of an emergent constraint should also act as a warning sign that a process in the ensemble may be represented in a structurally homogeneous fashion. Such an effect could be compounded if there are only a small number of effective degrees of freedom sampled in the ensemble.   It is thus critical to assess whether common simplifications in the ensemble are creating or influencing emergent relationships.

The use of an EC as the sole constraint of a projected quantity is effectively a ~~model~~ weighting of model projected outcomes which considers only a subset of ~~model~~ potential performance metrics included within the EC itself, and disregarding other aspects of model performance ~~which are not represented within the EC itself (~~even though that one metric may characterize many aspects of the climate, or itself be a sum of different metrics). This should give us pause, because studies of model weighting have demonstrated that using a single metric that only captures specific aspects of climate is likely to result in an overconfident result (Knutti et al., 2017; Lorenz et al., 2018). As such, care

must be taken to recognise that even if an EC exists, structural biases may preclude a simple assessment that those models closest to the observed value have the most trustworthy response. For example, if calibration trade-offs prevent models from being tuned to match observations in two locations simultaneously, this may complicate the application of an emergent constraint which uses simulated climate in one of those locations as a predictor of response.

685

Persistence of ECs in successive generations of models should increase to some degree confidence that emergent constraints are not statistical artifacts (Caldwell et al., 2014; Schlund et al., 2020), but it remains possible that common structural simplifications could persist for multiple ensemble generations. The development of multi-metric approaches (Bretherton and Caldwell, 2020; Brient, 2019; Brunner et al., 2020; Huber et al., 2011; Karpechko et al.,

690 2013; Schlund et al., 2020) could provide greater robustness to structural errors, given that a lesser reliance is placed on any single axis of inter-model variability. Even if two constraints are identified for the same physical process, and the metrics are highly correlated within the ensemble (Caldwell et al., 2018), there may be some advantage in combining their results, given the potential for differing and potentially independent biases in observations of the two quantities (Lorenz et al., 2018). Though uncertainty in observational products themselves must still be sampled where

695 possible, multi-metric approaches have the potential to reduce observational uncertainty on constraints (Brunner et al., 2019). The idea of multi-variate metrics of model performance is not new, and generic multi-variate metrics of model climatological errors are perhaps the default approach for assessing the skill and plausibility of different models during assessment (Baker and Taylor, 2016; Gleckler et al., 2008; Wilde et al., 2011). But, weighting models based on general climatological performance over a large number of variables has little effect (Sanderson et al., 2017) which

700 does not tend to significantly decrease the projection uncertainty in the unweighted ensemble.

There is also a growing potential to improve structural robustness by moving from 'top-down' emergent constraints which use the ensemble to identify correlations between net system responses (such as climate sensitivity) and observables, and 'bottom-up' constraints which identify and constrain single identifiable processes. The former approach (as applied, for example in (Sherwood et al., 2014)) might exploit the fact that ensemble variance in net

705 response is dominated by one process (ECS variance dominated by lower tropospheric mixing, in this case) – but the resulting constraint ignores potential uncertainty in other feedbacks which might be inadequately sampled in the ensemble. Bottom-up approaches such as the process decomposition of factors controlling carbon uptake in the Southern Ocean (Terhaar et al., 2021) or the 'cloud controlling factors' for individual types of cloud feedback by (Klein et al., 2017)Klein et al., 2017 have the potential to isolate and quantify structural assumptions in composite

710 elements of a net response, allowing the individual assessment of constraints in each component, and the isolation of ensemble structural assumptions in the associated processes.

ECs could play a useful role by defining reduced-space metrics which consider only those aspects of model performance that are relevant to a particular future response. Multi-metric emergent constraints may provide a useful 'third way': they are less sensitive to structural errors than single-metric emergent constraints, and can be targeted

715 toward processes that may drive future responses more accurately than generic performance metrics which do not explicitly account for the relevance of an observable to a given response (Baker and Taylor, 2016; Collier et al., 2018).

There is undoubtedly also rich information to be gained from ECs which disagree - a rare quantitative indicator of projection-relevant structural error in climate model simulations. If inconsistent constraints are proven to be statistically robust, these inconsistencies could provide guidance in future development cycles - highlighting key

720 biases shared among models related to missing or misrepresented processes which might be important in properly representing feedbacks of interest.

The collection of simulations and projections available in CMIP represents a formidable amount of data (Williams et al., 2016), but its scale does not justify considering CMIP to be a comprehensive sample of possible representations of the Earth System. Parametric uncertainties and computational limitations on resolution and ensemble size limit the

725 degree to which our current ensembles represent the tails of the distribution of possible future change, and any statement of uncertainty of the future evolution of the climate system can only be made robustly in the context of these

18

uncertainties. Emergent constraints, if used less literally, could play a powerful role in understanding the ensemble we have; a combination of more robust statistical frameworks, better understanding of the ensemble's nature and multi-metric techniques could provide new opportunities for understanding how the Earth might respond to climate forcing.

CODE AVAILABILITY

Code for this study is available on an open github repository at https://github.com/benmsanderson/structure_ec

DATA AVAILABILITY

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

Benjamin Sanderson performed analyses and wrote the main text. Angeline Pendergrass provided text feedback and suggestions for analysis. Ben Booth provided text feedback and helped develop the conceptual basis for paper. Charles Koven, Florent Brient, Rosie Fisher provided text feedback. Reto Knutti provided extensive text feedback.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Allen, M. R. and Ingram, W. J.: Constraints on future changes in climate and the hydrologic cycle, Nature, 419(6903), 224–232, doi:10.1038/nature01092, 2002.

Allen, M. R. and Stott, P. A.: Estimating signal amplitudes in optimal fingerprinting, part I: theory, Clim. Dyn., 21(5–6), 477–491, doi:10.1007/s00382-003-0313-9, 2003.

Andrews, T., Gregory, J. M., Webb, M. J. and Taylor, K. E.: Forcing, feedbacks and climate sensitivity in CMIP5 coupled atmosphere-ocean climate models, Geophysical Research Letters, 39(9), doi:10.1029/2012gl051607, 2012.

Annan, J. D., Hargreaves, J. C., Mauritsen, T. and Stevens, B.: What could we learn about climate sensitivity from variability in the surface temperature record?, Earth System Dynamics, 11(3), 709–719, doi:10.5194/esd-11-709-2020, 2020.

Arora, V. K., Katavouta, A., Williams, R. G., Jones, C. D., Brovkin, V., Friedlingstein, P., Schwinger, J., Bopp, L., Boucher, O., Cadule, P., Chamberlain, M. A., Christian, J. R., Delire, C., Fisher, R. A., Hajima, T., Ilyina, T., Joetzjer, E., Kawamiya, M., Koven, C. D., Krasting, J. P., Law, R. M., Lawrence, D. M., Lenton, A., Lindsay, K., Pongratz, J., Raddatz, T., Séférian, R., Tachiiri, K., Tjiputra, J. F., Wiltshire, A., Wu, T. and Ziehn, T.: Carbon–concentration and carbon–climate feedbacks in CMIP6 models and their comparison to CMIP5 models, Biogeosciences, 17(16), 4173–4222, doi:10.5194/bg-17-4173-2020, 2020.

Baker, N. C. and Taylor, P. C.: A Framework for Evaluating Climate Model Performance Metrics, J. Clim., 29(5), 1773–1782, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0114.1, 2016.

Boé, J., Hall, A. and Qu, X.: September sea-ice cover in the Arctic Ocean projected to vanish by 2100, Nat. Geosci., 2(5), 341–343, doi:10.1038/ngeo467, 2009.

Boer, G. J., Stowasser, M. and Hamilton, K.: Inferring climate sensitivity from volcanic events, Climate Dynamics, 28(5), 481–502, doi:10.1007/s00382-006-0193-x, 2007.

Bogenschutz, P. A., Gettelman, A., Hannay, C., Larson, V. E., Neale, R. B., Craig, C. and Chen, C.-C.: The Path to CAM6: Coupled Simulations with CAM5.4 and CAM5.5, , doi:10.5194/gmd-2017-129, 2018.

Bony, S., Schulz, H., Vial, J. and Stevens, B.: Sugar, Gravel, Fish, and Flowers: Dependence of Mesoscale Patterns of Trade-Wind Clouds on Environmental Conditions, Geophys. Res. Lett., 47(7), e2019GL085988, doi:10.1029/2019GL085988, 2020.

Bretherton, C. and Caldwell, P.: Combining Emergent Constraints for Climate Sensitivity, Journal of Climate, 33(17), 7413–7430, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0911.1, 2020.

Brienen, R. J. W., Caldwell, L., Duchesne, L., Voelker, S., Barichivich, J., Baliva, M., Ceccantini, G., Di Filippo, A., Helama, S., Locosselli, G. M., Lopez, L., Piovesan, G., Schöngart, J., Villalba, R. and Gloor, E.: Forest carbon sink neutralized by pervasive growth-lifespan trade-offs, Nat. Commun., 11(1), 1–10, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-17966-z, 2020.

Brient, F.: Reducing uncertainties in climate projections with emergent constraints: Concepts, Examples and Prospects, Advances in Atmospheric Sciences, 37, 1–15, doi:https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00376-019-9140-8, 2019.

Brient, F. and Schneider, T.: Constraints on Climate Sensitivity from Space-Based Measurements of Low-Cloud Reflection, Journal of Climate, 29(16), 5821–5835, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-15-0897.1, 2016.

Brient, F., Schneider, T., Tan, Z., Bony, S., Qu, X. and Hall, A.: Shallowness of tropical low clouds as a predictor of climate models' response to warming, Clim. Dyn., 47(1–2), 433–449, doi:10.1007/s00382-015-2846-0, 2016.

Brown, P. T., Stolpe, M. B. and Caldeira, K.: Assumptions for emergent constraints, Nature, 563(7729), E1–E3, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0638-5, 2018.

Brunner, L., Lorenz, R., Zumwald, M. and Knutti, R.: Quantifying uncertainty in European climate projections using combined performance-independence weighting, Environ. Res. Lett., 14(12), 124010, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab492f, 2019.

Brunner, L., Pendergrass, A. G., Lehner, F., Merrifield, A. L., Lorenz, R. and Knutti, R.: Reduced global warming from CMIP6 projections when weighting models by performance and independence, Earth System Dynamics Discussions, 1–23, doi:10.5194/esd-2020-23, 2020.

Caldwell, P. M., Bretherton, C. S., Zelinka, M. D., Klein, S. A., Santer, B. D. and Sanderson, B. M.: Statistical significance of climate sensitivity predictors obtained by data mining, Geophysical Research Letters, 41(5), 1803–1808, doi:10.1002/2014gl059205, 2014.

Caldwell, P. M., Zelinka, M. D. and Klein, S. A.: Evaluating Emergent Constraints on Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity, Journal of Climate, 31(10), 3921–3942, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-17-0631.1, 2018.

Chadburn, S. E., Burke, E. J., Cox, P. M., Friedlingstein, P., Hugelius, G. and Westermann, S.: An observation-based constraint on permafrost loss as a function of global warming, Nat. Clim. Chang., 7(5), 340–344, doi:10.1038/nclimate3262, 2017.

20

Field Code Changed

Collier, N., Hoffman, F. M., Lawrence, D. M., Keppel-Aleks, G., Koven, C. D., Riley, W. J., Mu, M. and Randerson, J. T.: The International Land Model Benchmarking (ILAMB) System: Design, Theory, and Implementation, Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, 10(11), 2731–2754, doi:10.1029/2018ms001354, 2018.

800   Covey, C., Abe-Ouchi, A., Boer, G. J., Boville, B. A., Cubasch, U., Fairhead, L., Flato, G. M., Gordon, H., Guilyardi, E., Jiang, X., Johns, T. C., Le Treut, H., Madec, G., Meehl, G. A., Miller, R., Noda, A., Power, S. B., Roeckner, E., Russell, G., Schneider, E. K., Stouffer, R. J., Terray, L. and von Storch, J.-S.: The seasonal cycle in coupled ocean-atmosphere general circulation models, Clim. Dyn., 16(10–11), 775–787, doi:10.1007/s003820000081, 2000.

Cox, P. M.: Emergent Constraints on Climate-Carbon Cycle Feedbacks, Curr Clim Change Rep, 5(4), 275–281, doi:10.1007/s40641-019-00141-y, 2019.

805   Cox, P. M., Pearson, D., Booth, B. B., Friedlingstein, P., Huntingford, C., Jones, C. D. and Luke, C. M.: Sensitivity of tropical carbon to climate change constrained by carbon dioxide variability, Nature, 494(7437), 341–344, doi:10.1038/nature11882, 2013.

Cox, P. M., Williamson, M. S., Nijsse, F. J. M. M. and Huntingford, C.: Cox et al. reply, Nature, 563(7729), E10–E15, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0641-x, 2018a.

810   Cox, P. M., Huntingford, C. and Williamson, M. S.: Emergent constraint on equilibrium climate sensitivity from global temperature variability, Nature, 553(7688), 319–322, doi:10.1038/nature25450, 2018b.

Davies-Barnard, T., Meyerholt, J., Zaehle, S., Friedlingstein, P., Brovkin, V., Fan, Y., Fisher, R. A., Jones, C. D., Lee, H., Peano, D., Smith, B., Wårlind, D. and Wiltshire, A.: Nitrogen Cycling in CMIP6 Land Surface Models: Progress and Limitations, , Biogeosciences, 17, 5129–5148, doi:10.5194/bg-2019-513, 2020.

815   Douville, H. and Plazzotta, M.: Midlatitude Summer Drying: An Underestimated Threat in CMIP5 Models?, Geophysical Research Letters, 44(19), 9967–9975, doi:10.1002/2017gl075353, 2017.

Edwards, J. M., Beljaars, A. C. M., Holtslag, A. A. M. and Lock, A. P.: Representation of Boundary-Layer Processes in Numerical Weather Prediction and Climate Models, Boundary-Layer Meteorology, doi:10.1007/s10546-020-00530-z, 2020.

Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R. J. and Taylor, K. E.: Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization, Geoscientific Model Development (Online), 9(LLNL-JRNL-736881) [online]
820   Available from: https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1408987, 2016.

Eyring, V., Cox, P. M., Flato, G. M., Gleckler, P. J., Abramowitz, G., Caldwell, P., Collins, W. D., Gier, B. K., Hall, A. D., Hoffman, F. M., Hurtt, G. C., Jahn, A., Jones, C. D., Klein, S. A., Krasting, J. P., Kwiatkowski, L., Lorenz, R., Maloney, E., Meehl, G. A., Pendergrass, A. G., Pincus, R., Ruane, A. C., Russell, J. L., Sanderson, B. M., Santer, B. D., Sherwood, S. C., Simpson, I. R., Stouffer, R. J. and Williamson, M. S.: Taking climate model evaluation to the next level, Nature Climate Change, 9(2), 102–110, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0355-y, 2019.

825   Fisher, R., McDowell, N., Purves, D. and Moorcroft, P.: Assessing uncertainties in a second-generation dynamic vegetation model caused by ecological scale limitations, New [online] Available from: https://nph.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03340.x%4010.1002/%28ISSN%291469-8137%28CAT%29FeatureIssues%28VI%29Amazonianrainforestsanddrought, 2010.

Fleischer, K., Rammig, A., De Kauwe, M. G., Walker, A. P., Domingues, T. F., Fuchslueger, L., Garcia, S., Goll, D. S., Grandis, A., Jiang, M., Haverd, V., Hofhansl, F., Holm, J. A., Kruijt, B., Leung, F., Mercado, L. M., Norby, R. J., Pak, B., von Randow, C., Quesada, C.
830   A., Schaap, K. J., Valverde-Barrantes, O. J., Wang, Y.-P., Yang, X., Zaehle, S., Zhu, Q. and Lapola, D. M.: Amazon forest response to CO2 fertilization dependent on plant phosphorus acquisition, Nature Geoscience, 12(9), 736–741, doi:10.1038/s41561-019-0404-9, 2019.

Forest, C. E., Stone, P. H., Sokolov, A. P., Allen, M. R. and Webster, M. D.: Quantifying uncertainties in climate system properties with the use of recent climate observations, Science, 295(5552), 113–117, doi:10.1126/science.1064419, 2002.

Friedlingstein, P., Meinshausen, M., Arora, V. K., Jones, C. D., Anav, A., Liddicoat, S. K. and Knutti, R.: Uncertainties in CMIP5 Climate
835   Projections due to Carbon Cycle Feedbacks, Journal of Climate, 27(2), 511–526, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-12-00579.1, 2014.

Geoffroy, O., Saint-Martin, D., Bellon, G., Voldoire, A., Olivié, D. J. L. and Tytéca, S.: Transient Climate Response in a Two-Layer Energy-Balance Model. Part II: Representation of the Efficacy of Deep-Ocean Heat Uptake and Validation for CMIP5 AOGCMs, Journal of Climate, 26(6), 1859–1876, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-12-00196.1, 2013.

Gleckler, P. J., Taylor, K. E. and Doutriaux, C.: Performance metrics for climate models, Journal of Geophysical Research, 113(D6),
840   doi:10.1029/2007jd008972, 2008.

Golaz, J., Caldwell, P. M., Van Roekel, L. P., Petersen, M. R., Tang, Q., Wolfe, J. D., Abeshu, G., Anantharaj, V., Asay-Davis, X. S., Bader, D. C., Baldwin, S. A., Bisht, G., Bogenschutz, P. A., Branstetter, M., Brunke, M. A., Brus, S. R., Burrows, S. M., Cameron-Smith, P. J., Donahue, A. S., Deakin, M., Easter, R. C., Evans, K. J., Feng, Y., Flanner, M., Foucar, J. G., Fyke, J. G., Griffin, B. M., Hannay, C., Harrop, B. E., Hoffman, M. J., Hunke, E. C., Jacob, R. L., Jacobsen, D. W., Jeffery, N., Jones, P. W., Keen, N. D., Klein, S. A., Larson, V. E., Leung, L. R., Li, H., Lin, W.,
845   Lipscomb, W. H., Ma, P., Mahajan, S., Maltrud, M. E., Mametjanov, A., McClean, J. L., McCoy, R. B., Neale, R. B., Price, S. F., Qian, Y., Rasch, P. J., Reeves Eyre, J. E. J., Riley, W. J., Ringler, T. D., Roberts, A. F., Roesler, E. L., Salinger, A. G., Shaheen, Z., Shi, X., Singh, B., Tang, J.,

21

Taylor, M. A., Thornton, P. E., Turner, A. K., Veneziani, M., Wan, H., Wang, H., Wang, S., Williams, D. N., Wolfram, P. J., Worley, P. H., Xie, S., Yang, Y., Yoon, J., Zelinka, M. D., Zender, C. S., Zeng, X., Zhang, C., Zhang, K., Zhang, Y., Zheng, X., Zhou, T. and Zhu, Q.: The DOE E3SM Coupled Model Version 1: Overview and Evaluation at Standard Resolution, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 11(7), 2089–2129, doi:10.1029/2018MS001603, 2019.

Gordon, N. D. and Klein, S. A.: Low-cloud optical depth feedback in climate models, J. Geophys. Res. D: Atmos., 119(10), 6052–6065, doi:10.1002/2013JD021052, 2014.

Goris, N., Tjiputra, J. F., Olsen, A., Schwinger, J., Lauvset, S. K. and Jeansson, E.: Constraining projection-based estimates of the future North Atlantic carbon uptake, J. Clim., 31(10), 3959–3978, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-17-0564.1, 2018.

Gregory, J. M., Andrews, T. and Good, P.: The inconstancy of the transient climate response parameter under increasing CO2, Philos. Trans. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci., 373(2054), 20140417, doi:10.1098/rsta.2014.0417, 2015.

Hall, A., Cox, P., Huntingford, C. and Klein, S.: Progressing emergent constraints on future climate change, Nature Climate Change, 9(4), 269–278, doi:10.1038/s41558-019-0436-6, 2019.

Hargreaves, J. C., Annan, J. D., Yoshimori, M. and Abe-Ouchi, A.: Can the Last Glacial Maximum constrain climate sensitivity?, Geophysical Research Letters, 39(24), doi:10.1029/2012gl053872, 2012.

Hegerl, G. and Zwiers, F.: Use of models in detection and attribution of climate change, Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 2(4), 570–591, doi:10.1002/wcc.121, 2011.

Hegerl, G. C., Stott, P. A., Allen, M. R., Mitchell, J. F. B., Tett, S. F. B. and Cubasch, U.: Optimal detection and attribution of climate change: sensitivity of results to climate model differences, Clim. Dyn., 16(10–11), 737–754, doi:10.1007/s003820000071, 2000.

Hegerl, G. C., Crowley, T. J., Hyde, W. T. and Frame, D. J.: Climate sensitivity constrained by temperature reconstructions over the past seven centuries, Nature, 440(7087), 1029–1032, doi:10.1038/nature04679, 2006.

Hoffman, F. M., Randerson, J. T., Arora, V. K., Bao, Q., Cadule, P., Ji, D., Jones, C. D., Kawamiya, M., Khatiwala, S., Lindsay, K., Obata, A., Shevliakova, E., Six, K. D., Tjiputra, J. F., Volodin, E. M. and Wu, T.: Causes and implications of persistent atmospheric carbon dioxide biases in Earth System Models, Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences, 119(2), 141–162, doi:10.1002/2013jg002381, 2014.

Holtslag, A. A. M., Steeneveld, G. J. and van de Wiel, B. J. H.: Role of land-surface temperature feedback on model performance for the stable boundary layer, Atmospheric Boundary Layers, 205–220, doi:10.1007/978-0-387-74321-9_14, 2007.

Hourdin, F., Mauritsen, T., Gettelman, A., Golaz, J.-C., Balaji, V., Duan, Q., Folini, D., Ji, D., Klocke, D., Qian, Y., Rauser, F., Rio, C., Tomassini, L., Watanabe, M. and Williamson, D.: The Art and Science of Climate Model Tuning, Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 98(3), 589–602, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00135.1, 2017.

Huber, M., Mahlstein, I., Wild, M., Fasullo, J. and Knutti, R.: Constraints on Climate Sensitivity from Radiation Patterns in Climate Models, J. Clim., 24(4), 1034–1052, doi:10.1175/2010JCLI3403.1, 2011.

Jiménez-de-la-Cuesta, D., and Mauritsen, T.: Emergent constraints on Earth's transient and equilibrium response to doubled CO 2 from post-1970s global warming, Nat. Geosci., 12(11), 902–905 [online] Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41561-019-0463-y, 2019.

Kamae, Y., Shiogama, H., Watanabe, M., Ogura, T., Yokohata, T. and Kimoto, M.: Lower-Tropospheric Mixing as a Constraint on Cloud Feedback in a Multiparameter Multiphysics Ensemble, J. Clim., 29(17), 6259–6275, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0042.1, 2016.

Karpechko, A. Y., Maraun, D. and Eyring, V.: Improving Antarctic total ozone projections by a process-oriented multiple diagnostic ensemble regression, J. Atmos. Sci., 70(12), 3959–3976, doi:10.1175/jas-d-13-071.1, 2013.

Kessler, A. and Tjiputra, J.: The Southern Ocean as a constraint to reduce uncertainty in future ocean carbon sinks, Earth Syst. Dyn., 7(2), 295–312, doi:10.5194/esd-7-295-2016, 2016.

Kettleborough, J. A., Booth, B. B. B., Stott, P. A. and Allen, M. R.: Estimates of uncertainty in predictions of global mean surface temperature, J. Clim., 20(5), 843–855, doi:10.1175/jcli4012.1, 2007.

Kiehl, J. T.: Twentieth century climate model response and climate sensitivity, Geophys. Res. Lett., 34(22), doi:10.1029/2007gl031383, 2007.

Klein, S. A. and Hall, A.: Emergent Constraints for Cloud Feedbacks, Current Climate Change Reports, 1(4), 276–287, doi:10.1007/s40641-015-0027-1, 2015.

Klein, S. A., Hall, A., Norris, J. R. and Pincus, R.: Low-cloud feedbacks from cloud-controlling factors: A review, Surv. Geophys., 38(6), 1307–1329, doi:10.1007/s10712-017-9433-3, 2017.

Knutti, R.: Why are climate models reproducing the observed global surface warming so well?, Geophys. Res. Lett., 35(18), doi:10.1029/2008gl034932, 2008.

22

895 Knutti, R. and Tomassini, L.: Constraints on the transient climate response from observed global temperature and ocean heat uptake, Geophysical Research Letters, 35(9), doi:10.1029/2007gl032904, 2008.

Knutti, R., Stocker, T. F., Joos, F. and Plattner, G.-K.: Constraints on radiative forcing and future climate change from observations and climate model ensembles, Nature, 416(6882), 719–723, doi:10.1038/416719a, 2002.

Knutti, R., Meehl, G. A., Allen, M. R. and Stainforth, D. A.: Constraining Climate Sensitivity from the Seasonal Cycle in Surface Temperature, Journal of Climate, 19(17), 4224–4233, doi:10.1175/jcli3865.1, 2006.

900 Knutti, R., Masson, D. and Gettelman, A.: Climate model genealogy: Generation CMIP5 and how we got there, Geophys. Res. Lett., 40(6), 1194–1199, doi:10.1002/grl.50256, 2013.

Knutti, R., Sedláček, J., Sanderson, B. M., Lorenz, R., Fischer, E. M. and Eyring, V.: A climate model projection weighting scheme accounting for performance and interdependence, Geophysical Research Letters, doi:10.1002/2016gl072012, 2017.

Koven, C., Arora, V. K., Cadule, P., Fisher, R. A., Jones, C. D., Lawrence, D. M., Lewis, J., Lindsey, K., Mathesius, S., Meinshausen, M., Mills,
905 M., Nicholls, Z., Sanderson, B. M., Swart, N. C., Wieder, W. R. and Zickfeld, K.: 23rd Century surprises: Long-term dynamics of the climate and carbon cycle under both high and net negative emissions scenarios, , doi:10.5194/esd-2021-23, 2021.

Kubo, R.: The fluctuation-dissipation theorem, Rep. Prog. Phys., 29(1), 255, doi:10.1088/0034-4885/29/1/306, 1966.

Kwiatkowski, L., Bopp, L., Aumont, O., Ciais, P., Cox, P. M., Laufkötter, C., Li, Y. and Séférian, R.: Emergent constraints on projections of declining primary production in the tropical oceans, Nat. Clim. Chang., 7(5), 355–358, doi:10.1038/nclimate3265, 2017.

910 Leith, C. E.: Climate Response and Fluctuation Dissipation, Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences, 32(10), 2022–2026, doi:10.1175/1520-0469(1975)032<2022:crafd>2.0.co;2, 1975.

Lenton, T. M., Rockström, J., Gaffney, O., Rahmstorf, S., Richardson, K., Steffen, W. and Schellnhuber, H. J.: Climate tipping points — too risky to bet against, Nature, 575(7784), 592–595, doi:10.1038/d41586-019-03595-0, 2019.

Levine, N. M., Zhang, K., Longo, M., Baccini, A., Phillips, O. L., Lewis, S. L., Alvarez-Dávila, E., de Andrade, A. C. S., Brienen, R. J. W., Erwin,
915 T. L., Feldpausch, T. R., Mendoza, A. L. M., Vargas, P. N., Prieto, A., Silva-Espejo, J. E., Malhi, Y. and Moorcroft, P. R.: Ecosystem heterogeneity determines the ecological resilience of the Amazon to climate change, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113(3), 793–797, doi:10.1073/pnas.1511344112, 2016.

Lipat, B. R., Tselioudis, G., Grise, K. M. and Polvani, L. M.: CMIP5 models' shortwave cloud radiative response and climate sensitivity linked to the climatological Hadley cell extent, Geophysical Research Letters, 44(11), 5739–5748, doi:10.1002/2017gl073151, 2017.

920 Longo, M., Knox, R. G., Levine, N. M., Alves, L. F., Bonal, D., Camargo, P. B., Fitzjarrald, D. R., Hayek, M. N., Restrepo-Coupe, N., Saleska, S. R., da Silva, R., Stark, S. C., Tapajós, R. P., Wiedemann, K. T., Zhang, K., Wofsy, S. C. and Moorcroft, P. R.: Ecosystem heterogeneity and diversity mitigate Amazon forest resilience to frequent extreme droughts, New Phytol., 219(3), 914–931, doi:10.1111/nph.15185, 2018.

Lorenz, R., Herger, N., Sedláček, J., Eyring, V., Fischer, E. M. and Knutti, R.: Prospects and Caveats of Weighting Climate Models for Summer Maximum Temperature Projections Over North America, J. Geophys. Res. D: Atmos., 123(9), 4509–4526, doi:10.1029/2017JD027992, 2018.

925 Mahlstein, I. and Knutti, R.: September Arctic sea ice predicted to disappear near 2°C global warming above present, J. Geophys. Res., 117(D6), doi:10.1029/2011jd016709, 2012.

Masson, D. and Knutti, R.: Climate model genealogy, Geophys. Res. Lett., 38(8), doi:10.1029/2011gl046864, 2011.

Masson, D. and Knutti, R.: Predictor screening, calibration, and observational constraints in climate model ensembles: An illustration using climate sensitivity, J. Clim., 26(3), 887–898, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-11-00540.1, 2013a.

930 Masson, D. and Knutti, R.: Predictor Screening, Calibration, and Observational Constraints in Climate Model Ensembles: An Illustration Using Climate Sensitivity, J. Clim., 26(3), 887–898, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00540.1, 2013b.

Mauritsen, T., Stevens, B., Roeckner, E., Crueger, T., Esch, M., Giorgetta, M., Haak, H., Jungclaus, J., Klocke, D., Matei, D., Mikolajewicz, U., Notz, D., Pincus, R., Schmidt, H. and Tomassini, L.: Tuning the climate of a global model, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 4(3), doi:10.1029/2012MS000154, 2012.

935 McDowell, N., Allen, C. D., Anderson-Teixeira, K., Brando, P., Brienen, R., Chambers, J., Christoffersen, B., Davies, S., Doughty, C., Duque, A., Espirito-Santo, F., Fisher, R., Fontes, C. G., Galbraith, D., Goodsman, D., Grossiord, C., Hartmann, H., Holm, J., Johnson, D. J., Kassim, A. R., Keller, M., Koven, C., Kueppers, L., Kumagai, T., Malhi, Y., McMahon, S. M., Mencuccini, M., Meir, P., Moorcroft, P., Muller-Landau, H. C., Phillips, O., Powell, T., Sierra, C. A., Sperry, J., Warren, J., Xu, C. and Xu, X.: Drivers and mechanisms of tree mortality in moist tropical forests, New Phytol., 219(3), 851–869, doi:10.1111/nph.15027, 2018.

940 McKiver, W. J., Vichi, M., Lovato, T., Storto, A. and Masina, S.: Impact of increased grid resolution on global marine biogeochemistry, J. Mar. Syst., 147, 153–168, doi:10.1016/j.jmarsys.2014.10.003, 2015.

23

McNeall, D., Williams, J., Booth, B., Betts, R., Challenor, P., Wiltshire, A. and Sexton, D.: The impact of structural error on parameter constraint in a climate model, Earth System Dynamics, 7(4), 917–935, doi:10.5194/esd-7-917-2016, 2016.

Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Eyring, V., Flato, G., Lamarque, J.-F., Stouffer, R. J., Taylor, K. E. and Schlund, M.: Context for interpreting equilibrium climate sensitivity and transient climate response from the CMIP6 Earth system models, Sci. Adv., 6(26), eaba1981, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aba1981, 2020.

Mongwe, N. P., Chang, N. and Monteiro, P. M. S.: The seasonal cycle as a mode to diagnose biases in modelled CO_2 fluxes in the Southern Ocean, Ocean Model. (Oxf.), 106, 90–103, doi:10.1016/j.ocemod.2016.09.006, 2016.

Monin, A. S. and Obukhov, A. M.: Basic Regularity in Turbulent Mixing in the Surface Layer of the Atmosphere. [online] Available from: https://books.google.com/books/about/Basic_Regularity_in_Turbulent_Mixing_in.html?hl=&id=7KMJAQAAIAAJ, 1957.

Needham, J. F., Chambers, J., Fisher, R., Knox, R. and Koven, C. D.: Forest responses to simulated elevated CO under alternate hypotheses of size- and age-dependent mortality, Glob. Chang. Biol., doi:10.1111/gcb.15254, 2020.

Nijsse, F., Cox, P. M. and Williamson, M. S.: An emergent constraint on Transient Climate Response from simulated historical warming in CMIP6 models, Earth System Dynamics Discussions, 2020, 1–14 [online] Available from: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3aae/d1f981ca631352848a475d39b8b1cac8e1f1.pdf, 2020.

O'Gorman, P. A.: Sensitivity of tropical precipitation extremes to climate change, Nat. Geosci., 5(10), 697–700, doi:10.1038/ngeo1568, 2012.

Pachauri, R. K., Allen, M. R., Barros, V. R., Broome, J., Cramer, W., Christ, R., Church, J. A., Clarke, L., Dahe, Q., Dasgupta, P., Dubash, N. K., Edenhofer, O., Elgizouli, I., Field, C. B., Forster, P., Friedlingstein, P., Fuglestvedt, J., Gomez-Echeverri, L., Hallegatte, S., Hegerl, G., Howden, M., Jiang, K., Jimenez Cisneroz, B., Kattsov, V., Lee, H., Mach, K. J., Marotzke, J., Mastrandrea, M. D., Meyer, L., Minx, J., Mulugetta, Y., O'Brien, K., Oppenheimer, M., Pereira, J. J., Pichs-Madruga, R., Plattner, G.-K., Pörtner, H.-O., Power, S. B., Preston, B., Ravindranath, N. H., Reisinger, A., Riahi, K., Rusticucci, M., Scholes, R., Seyboth, K., Sokona, Y., Stavins, R., Stocker, T. F., Tschakert, P., van Vuuren, D. and van Ypserle, J.-P.: Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by R. K. Pachauri and L. Meyer, IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland. [online] Available from: https://epic.awi.de/id/eprint/37530/ (Accessed 30 January 2020), 2014.

Palmer, T.: Short-term tests validate long-term estimates of climate change, Nature, 582(7811), 185–186, doi:10.1038/d41586-020-01484-5, 2020.

Piani, C., Frame, D. J., Stainforth, D. A. and Allen, M. R.: Constraints on climate change from a multi-thousand member ensemble of simulations, Geophysical Research Letters, 32(23), doi:10.1029/2005gl024452, 2005.

Pincus, R., Winker, D., Bony, S. and Stevens, B.: Shallow Clouds, Water Vapor, Circulation, and Climate Sensitivity, Springer. [online] Available from: https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=UdldDwAAQBAJ, 2018.

Plazzotta, M., Séférian, R., Douville, H., Kravitz, B. and Tjiputra, J.: Land Surface Cooling Induced by Sulfate Geoengineering Constrained by Major Volcanic Eruptions, Geophys. Res. Lett., 45(11), 5663–5671, doi:10.1029/2018GL077583, 2018.

Po-Chedley, S., Proistosescu, C., Armour, K. C. and Santer, B. D.: Climate constraint reflects forced signal, Nature, 563(7729), E6–E9, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0640-y, 2018.

Proistosescu, C. and Huybers, P. J.: Slow climate mode reconciles historical and model-based estimates of climate sensitivity, Sci Adv, 3(7), e1602821, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1602821, 2017.

Qu, X. and Hall, A.: What Controls the Strength of Snow-Albedo Feedback?, Journal of Climate, 20(15), 3971–3981, doi:10.1175/jcli4186.1, 2007.

Qu, X. and Hall, A.: On the persistent spread in snow-albedo feedback, Climate Dynamics, 42(1–2), 69–81, doi:10.1007/s00382-013-1774-0, 2014.

Qu, X., Hall, A., Klein, S. A. and Caldwell, P. M.: On the spread of changes in marine low cloud cover in climate model simulations of the 21st century, Climate Dynamics, 42(9–10), 2603–2626, doi:10.1007/s00382-013-1945-z, 2014.

Renoult, M., Annan, J. D., Hargreaves, J. C., Sagoo, N., Flynn, C., Kapsch, M.-L., Mikolajewicz, U., Ohgaito, R. and Mauritsen, T.: A Bayesian framework for emergent constraints: case studies of climate sensitivity with PMIP, Clim. Past Discuss., 1–29, doi:10.5194/cp-2019-162, 2020.

Ribes, A., Zwiers, F. W., Azaïs, J.-M. and Naveau, P.: A new statistical approach to climate change detection and attribution, Climate Dynamics, 48(1–2), 367–386, doi:10.1007/s00382-016-3079-6, 2017.

Rodwell, M. J. and Palmer, T. N.: Using numerical weather prediction to assess climate models, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 133(622), 129–146, doi:10.1002/qj.23, 2007.

Rose, B. E. J. and Rayborn, L.: The effects of ocean heat uptake on transient climate sensitivity, Curr. Clim. Change Rep., 2(4), 190–201, doi:10.1007/s40641-016-0048-4, 2016.

24

Rougier, J.: Probabilistic Inference for Future Climate Using an Ensemble of Climate Model Evaluations, Climatic Change, 81(3–4), 247–264, doi:10.1007/s10584-006-9156-9, 2007.

Royer, D. L., Berner, R. A. and Park, J.: Climate sensitivity constrained by CO2 concentrations over the past 420 million years, Nature, 446(7135), 530–532, doi:10.1038/nature05699, 2007.

Rugenstein, M., Bloch-Johnson, J., Gregory, J., Andrews, T., Mauritsen, T., Li, C., Frölicher, T. L., Paynter, D., Danabasoglu, G., Yang, S., Dufresne, J., Cao, L., Schmidt, G. A., Abe-Ouchi, A., Geoffroy, O. and Knutti, R.: Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity Estimated by Equilibrating Climate Models, Geophys. Res. Lett., 47(4), 1029, doi:10.1029/2019GL083898, 2020.

Rypdal, M., Fredriksen, H.-B., Rypdal, K. and Steene, R. J.: Emergent constraints on climate sensitivity, Nature, 563(7729), E4–E5, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0639-4, 2018.

Sakschewski, B., von Bloh, W., Boit, A., Poorter, L., Peña-Claros, M., Heinke, J., Joshi, J. and Thonicke, K.: Resilience of Amazon forests emerges from plant trait diversity, Nat. Clim. Chang., 6(11), 1032–1036, doi:10.1038/nclimate3109, 2016.

Sallée, J.-B., Shuckburgh, E., Bruneau, N., Meijers, A. J. S., Bracegirdle, T. J., Wang, Z. and Roy, T.: Assessment of Southern Ocean water mass circulation and characteristics in CMIP5 models: Historical bias and forcing response, J. Geophys. Res. Oceans, 118(4), 1830–1844, doi:10.1002/jgrc.20135, 2013.

Sanderson, B.: Relating climate sensitivity indices to projection uncertainty, , doi:10.5194/esd-11-721-2020, 2020.

Sanderson, B. M.: A Multimodel Study of Parametric Uncertainty in Predictions of Climate Response to Rising Greenhouse Gas Concentrations, Journal of Climate, 24(5), 1362–1377, doi:10.1175/2010jcli3498.1, 2011.

Sanderson, B. M.: On the estimation of systematic error in regression-based predictions of climate sensitivity, Climatic Change, 118(3–4), 757–770, doi:10.1007/s10584-012-0671-6, 2013.

Sanderson, B. M., Knutti, R., Aina, T., Christensen, C., Faull, N., Frame, D. J., Ingram, W. J., Piani, C., Stainforth, D. A., Stone, D. A. and Allen, M. R.: Constraints on Model Response to Greenhouse Gas Forcing and the Role of Subgrid-Scale Processes, Journal of Climate, 21(11), 2384–2400, doi:10.1175/2008jcli1869.1, 2008.

Sanderson, B. M., Shell, K. M. and Ingram, W.: Climate feedbacks determined using radiative kernels in a multi-thousand member ensemble of AOGCMs, Climate Dynamics, 35(7–8), 1219–1236, doi:10.1007/s00382-009-0661-1, 2010.

Sanderson, B. M., Knutti, R. and Caldwell, P.: A Representative Democracy to Reduce Interdependency in a Multimodel Ensemble, Journal of Climate, 28(13), 5171–5194, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-14-00362.1, 2015.

Sanderson, B. M., Wehner, M. and Knutti, R.: Skill and independence weighting for multi-model assessments, Geoscientific Model Development, 10(6), 2379–2395, doi:10.5194/gmd-10-2379-2017, 2017.

Sandu, I., Beljaars, A., Bechtold, P., Mauritsen, T. and Balsamo, G.: Why is it so difficult to represent stably stratified conditions in numerical weather prediction (NWP) models?: STABLE CONDITIONS IN NWP MODELS, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 5(2), 117–133, doi:10.1002/jame.20013, 2013.

Schlund, M., Lauer, A., Gentine, P., Sherwood, S. C. and Eyring, V.: Emergent constraints on equilibrium climate sensitivity in CMIP5: do they hold for CMIP6?, Earth Syst. Dyn., 11(4), 1233–1258, doi:10.5194/esd-11-1233-2020, 2020.

Schmidt, G. A., Annan, J. D., Bartlein, P. J., Cook, B. I., Guilyardi, E., Hargreaves, J. C., Harrison, S. P., Kageyama, M., LeGrande, A. N., Konecky, B., Lovejoy, S., Mann, M. E., Masson-Delmotte, V., Risi, C., Thompson, D., Timmermann, A., Tremblay, L.-B. and Yiou, P.: Using palaeo-climate comparisons to constrain future projections in CMIP5, Clim. Past, 10(1), 221–250, doi:10.5194/cp-10-221-2014, 2014.

Schmidt, G. A., Bader, D., Donner, L. J., Elsaesser, G. S., Golaz, J.-C., Hannay, C., Molod, A., Neale, R. and Saha, S.: Practice and philosophy of climate model tuning across six U.S. modeling centers, Geosci. Model Dev., 10, 3207–3223, doi:10.5194/gmd-2017-30, 2017.

Schurer, A., Hegerl, G., Ribes, A., Polson, D., Morice, C. and Tett, S.: Estimating the Transient Climate Response from Observed Warming, Journal of Climate, 31(20), 8645–8663, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-17-0717.1, 2018.

Sexton, D. M. H. and Murphy, J. M.: Multivariate probabilistic projections using imperfect climate models. Part II: robustness of methodological choices and consequences for climate sensitivity, Climate Dynamics, 38(11–12), 2543–2558, doi:10.1007/s00382-011-1209-8, 2012.

Shao, P., Zeng, X., Moore, D. J. P. and Zeng, X.: Soil microbial respiration from observations and Earth System Models, Environmental Research Letters, 8(3), 034034, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/3/034034, 2013.

Sherwood, S. C., Bony, S. and Dufresne, J.-L.: Spread in model climate sensitivity traced to atmospheric convective mixing, Nature, 505(7481), 37–42, doi:10.1038/nature12829, 2014.

25

Sherwood, S. C., Webb, M. J., Annan, J. D., Armour, K. C., Forster, P. M., Hargreaves, J. C., Hegerl, G., Klein, S. A., Marvel, K. D., Rohling, E. J., Watanabe, M., Andrews, T., Braconnot, P., Bretherton, C. S., Foster, G. L., Hausfather, Z., von der Heydt, A. S., Knutti, R., Mauritsen, T., Norris, J. R., Proistosescu, C., Rugenstein, M., Schmidt, G. A., Tokarska, K. B. and Zelinka, M. D.: An Assessment of Earth's Climate Sensitivity Using Multiple Lines of Evidence, Rev. Geophys., 58(4), e2019RG000678, doi:10.1029/2019RG000678, 2020.

Shi, Z., Crowell, S., Luo, Y. and Moore, B., 3rd: Model structures amplify uncertainty in predicted soil carbon responses to climate change, Nat. Commun., 9(1), 2171, doi:10.1038/s41467-018-04526-9, 2018.

Shiogama, H., Watanabe, M., Yoshimori, M., Yokohata, T., Ogura, T., Annan, J. D., Hargreaves, J. C., Abe, M., Kamae, Y., O'ishi, R., Nobui, R., Emori, S., Nozawa, T., Abe-Ouchi, A. and Kimoto, M.: Perturbed physics ensemble using the MIROC5 coupled atmosphere–ocean GCM without flux corrections: experimental design and results, Clim. Dyn., 39(12), 3041–3056, doi:10.1007/s00382-012-1441-x, 2012.

Siler, N., Po-Chedley, S. and Bretherton, C. S.: Variability in modeled cloud feedback tied to differences in the climatological spatial pattern of clouds, Clim. Dyn., 50(3–4), 1209–1220, doi:10.1007/s00382-017-3673-2, 2018.

Stainforth, D. A., Aina, T., Christensen, C., Collins, M., Faull, N., Frame, D. J., Kettleborough, J. A., Knight, S., Martin, A., Murphy, J. M., Piani, C., Sexton, D., Smith, L. A., Spicer, R. A., Thorpe, A. J. and Allen, M. R.: Uncertainty in predictions of the climate response to rising levels of greenhouse gases, Nature, 433(7024), 403–406, doi:10.1038/nature03301, 2005.

Stock, C. A.: Comparing apples to oranges: Perspectives on satellite-based primary production estimates drawn from a global biogeochemical model, J. Mar. Res., 77(2), 259–282, doi:10.1357/002224019828474296, 2019.

Su, H., Jiang, J. H., Zhai, C., Shen, T. J., David Neelin, J., Stephens, G. L. and Yung, Y. L.: Weakening and strengthening structures in the Hadley Circulation change under global warming and implications for cloud response and climate sensitivity, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 119(10), 5787–5805, doi:10.1002/2014jd021642, 2014.

Svensson, G. and Lindvall, J.: Evaluation of Near-Surface Variables and the Vertical Structure of the Boundary Layer in CMIP5 Models, Journal of Climate, 28(13), 5233–5253, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-14-00596.1, 2015.

Teckentrup, L., Harrison, S. P., Hantson, S., Heil, A., Melton, J. R., Forrest, M., Li, F., Yue, C., Arneth, A., Hickler, T. and Others: Response of simulated burned area to historical changes in environmental and anthropogenic factors: a comparison of seven fire models, Biogeosciences, 16, 3883–3910 [online] Available from: https://pure.mpg.de/pubman/faces/ViewItemOverviewPage.jsp?itemId=item_3172034, 2019.

Terhaar, J., Kwiatkowski, L. and Bopp, L.: Emergent constraint on Arctic Ocean acidification in the twenty-first century, Nature, 582(7812), 379–383, doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2360-3, 2020.

Terhaar, J., Frölicher, T. L. and Joos, F.: Southern Ocean anthropogenic carbon sink constrained by sea surface salinity, Sci. Adv., 7(18), doi:10.1126/sciadv.abd5964, 2021.

Teskey, R., Wertin, T., Bauweraerts, I., Ameye, M., McGuire, M. A. and Steppe, K.: Responses of tree species to heat waves and extreme heat events, Plant Cell Environ., 38(9), 1699–1712, doi:10.1111/pce.12417, 2015.

Tett, S. F. B., Yamazaki, K., Mineter, M. J., Cartis, C. and Eizenberg, N.: Calibrating climate models using inverse methods: case studies with HadAM3, HadAM3P and HadCM3, Geoscientific Model Development, 10 [online] Available from: https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:849e6e43-bb4c-4038-9d26-39bc0559128e, 2017.

Thackeray, C. W. and Hall, A.: An emergent constraint on future Arctic sea-ice albedo feedback, Nature Climate Change, 9(12), 972–978, doi:10.1038/s41558-019-0619-1, 2019.

Tian, B.: Spread of model climate sensitivity linked to double-Intertropical Convergence Zone bias, Geophysical Research Letters, 42(10), 4133–4141, doi:10.1002/2015gl064119, 2015.

Tjiputra, J. F., Schwinger, J., Bentsen, M., Morée, A. L., Gao, S., Bethke, I., Heinze, C., Goris, N., Gupta, A., He, Y., Olivié, D., Seland, Ø. and Schulz, M.: Ocean biogeochemistry in the Norwegian Earth System Model version 2 (NorESM2), Geosci. Model Dev., 13, 2393–2431, doi:10.5194/gmd-2019-347, 2020.

Todd-Brown, K. E. O., Randerson, J. T., Post, W. M., Hoffman, F. M., Tarnocai, C., Schuur, E. A. G. and Allison, S. D.: Causes of variation in soil carbon simulations from CMIP5 Earth system models and comparison with observations, Biogeosciences, 10(3), 1717–1736, doi:10.5194/bg-10-1717-2013, 2013.

Tokarska, K. B., Stolpe, M. B., Sippel, S., Fischer, E. M., Smith, C. J., Lehner, F. and Knutti, R.: Past warming trend constrains future warming in CMIP6 models, Science Advances, 6(12), eaaz9549, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aaz9549, 2020.

Trenberth, K. E. and Fasullo, J. T.: Simulation of Present-Day and Twenty-First-Century Energy Budgets of the Southern Oceans, J. Clim., 23(2), 440–454, doi:10.1175/2009JCLI3152.1, 2010.

Varney, R. M., Chadburn, S. E., Friedlingstein, P., Burke, E. J., Koven, C. D., Hugelius, G. and Cox, P. M.: A spatial emergent constraint on the sensitivity of soil carbon turnover to global warming, Nat. Commun., 11(1), 1–8, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-19208-8, 2020.

26

Volodin, E. M.: Relation between temperature sensitivity to doubled carbon dioxide and the distribution of clouds in current climate models, Izv. Atmos. Ocean. Phys., 44(3), 288–299, doi:10.1134/S0001433808030043, 2008.

Wang, J., Zeng, N., Liu, Y. and Bao, Q.: To what extent can interannual CO_2 variability constrain carbon cycle sensitivity to climate change in CMIP5 Earth System Models?, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41(10), 3535–3544, doi:10.1002/2014GL060004, 2014.

Watanabe, M., Kamae, Y., Shiogama, H., DeAngelis, A. M. and Suzuki, K.: Low clouds link equilibrium climate sensitivity to hydrological sensitivity, Nat. Clim. Chang., 8(10), 901–906, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0272-0, 2018.

Wei, N., Zhou, L. and Dai, Y.: Evaluation of simulated climatological diurnal temperature range in CMIP5 models from the perspective of planetary boundary layer turbulent mixing, Clim. Dyn., 49(1–2), 1–22, doi:10.1007/s00382-016-3323-0, 2017.

Wenzel, S., Cox, P. M., Eyring, V. and Friedlingstein, P.: Emergent constraints on climate-carbon cycle feedbacks in the CMIP5 Earth system models, J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci., 119(5), 794–807, doi:10.1002/2013JG002591, 2014.

Wigley, T. M. L.: Effect of climate sensitivity on the response to volcanic forcing, Journal of Geophysical Research, 110(D9), doi:10.1029/2004jd005557, 2005.

Wilde, P. de, de Wilde, P. and Tian, W.: Towards probabilistic performance metrics for climate change impact studies, Energy and Buildings, 43(11), 3013–3018, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2011.07.014, 2011.

Williams, D. N., Balaji, V., Cinquini, L., Denvil, S., Duffy, D., Evans, B., Ferraro, R., Hansen, R., Lautenschlager, M. and Trenham, C.: A Global Repository for Planet-Sized Experiments and Observations, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 97(5), 803–816, doi:10.1175/bams-d-15-00132.1, 2016.

Williamson, D., Goldstein, M., Allison, L., Blaker, A., Challenor, P., Jackson, L. and Yamazaki, K.: History matching for exploring and reducing climate model parameter space using observations and a large perturbed physics ensemble, Clim. Dyn., 41(7), 1703–1729, doi:10.1007/s00382-013-1896-4, 2013.

Williamson, D. B. and Sansom, P. G.: How Are Emergent Constraints Quantifying Uncertainty and What Do They Leave Behind?, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 100(12), 2571–2588, doi:10.1175/bams-d-19-0131.1, 2019.

Williamson, M. S., Cox, P. M. and Nijsse, F. J. M. M.: Theoretical foundations of emergent constraints: relationships between climate sensitivity and global temperature variability in conceptual models, Dyn Stat Clim Syst, 3(1), doi:10.1093/climsys/dzy006, 2019.

Yan, X., Zhang, R. and Knutson, T. R.: Underestimated AMOC variability and implications for AMV and predictability in CMIP models, Geophys. Res. Lett., 45(9), 4319–4328, doi:10.1029/2018gl077378, 2018.

Yokohata, T., Webb, M. J., Collins, M., Williams, K. D., Yoshimori, M., Hargreaves, J. C. and Annan, J. D.: Structural Similarities and Differences in Climate Responses to CO2 Increase between Two Perturbed Physics Ensembles, Journal of Climate, 23(6), 1392–1410, doi:10.1175/2009jcli2917.1, 2010.

Zaehle, S., Jones, C. D., Houlton, B., Lamarque, J.-F. and Robertson, E.: Nitrogen Availability Reduces CMIP5 Projections of Twenty-First-Century Land Carbon Uptake*, Journal of Climate, 28(6), 2494–2511, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-13-00776.1, 2015.

Zelinka, M. D., Myers, T. A., McCoy, D. T., Po-Chedley, S., Caldwell, P. M., Ceppi, P., Klein, S. A. and Taylor, K. E.: Causes of Higher Climate Sensitivity in CMIP6 Models, Geophysical Research Letters, 47(1), doi:10.1029/2019gl085782, 2020.

Zhai, C., Jiang, J. H. and Su, H.: Long-term cloud change imprinted in seasonal cloud variation: More evidence of high climate sensitivity, Geophysical Research Letters, 42(20), 8729–8737, doi:10.1002/2015gl065911, 2015a.

Zhai, C., Jiang, J. H. and Su, H.: Long-term cloud change imprinted in seasonal cloud variation: More evidence of high climate sensitivity: Cloud Feedback and Seasonal Variation, Geophys. Res. Lett., 42(20), 8729–8737, doi:10.1002/2015GL065911, 2015b.

Zhang, T., Zhang, M., Lin, W., Lin, Y., Xue, W., Yu, H., He, J., Xin, X., Ma, H.-Y., Xie, S. and Zheng, W.: Automatic tuning of the Community Atmospheric Model (CAM5) by using short-term hindcasts with an improved downhill simplex optimization method, Geoscientific Model Development, 11(12), 5189–5201, doi:10.5194/gmd-11-5189-2018, 2018.Allen, M. R. and Ingram, W. J.: Constraints on future changes in climate and the hydrologic cycle, Nature, 419(6903), 224–232, doi:10.1038/nature01092, 2002.

Allen, M. R. and Stott, P. A.: Estimating signal amplitudes in optimal fingerprinting, part I: theory, Clim. Dyn., 21(5–6), 477–491, doi:10.1007/s00382-003-0313-9, 2003.

Andrews, T., Gregory, J. M., Webb, M. J. and Taylor, K. E.: Forcing, feedbacks and climate sensitivity in CMIP5 coupled atmosphere-ocean climate models, Geophysical Research Letters, 39(9), doi:10.1029/2012gl051607, 2012.

Annan, J. D., Hargreaves, J. C., Mauritsen, T. and Stevens, B.: What could we learn about climate sensitivity from variability in the surface temperature record?, Earth System Dynamics, 11(3), 709–719, doi:10.5194/esd-11-709-2020, 2020.

27

1130 Arora, V. K., Katavouta, A., Williams, R. G., Jones, C. D., Brovkin, V., Friedlingstein, P., Schwinger, J., Bopp, L., Boucher, O., Cadule, P., Chamberlain, M. A., Christian, J. R., Delire, C., Fisher, R. A., Hajima, T., Ilyina, T., Joetzjer, E., Kawamiya, M., Koven, C. D., Krasting, J. P., Law, R. M., Lawrence, D. M., Lenton, A., Lindsay, K., Pongratz, J., Raddatz, T., Séférian, R., Tachiiri, K., Tjiputra, J. F., Wiltshire, A., Wu, T. and Ziehn, T.: Carbon–concentration and carbon–climate feedbacks in CMIP6 models and their comparison to CMIP5 models, Biogeosciences, 17(16), 4173–4222, doi:10.5194/bg-17-4173-2020, 2020.

1135 Baker, N. C. and Taylor, P. C.: A Framework for Evaluating Climate Model Performance Metrics, J. Clim., 29(5), 1773–1782, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0114.1, 2016.

Boé, J., Hall, A. and Qu, X.: September sea-ice cover in the Arctic Ocean projected to vanish by 2100, Nat. Geosci., 2(5), 341–343, doi:10.1038/ngeo467, 2009.

1140 Boer, G. J., Stowasser, M. and Hamilton, K.: Inferring climate sensitivity from volcanic events, Climate Dynamics, 28(5), 481–502, doi:10.1007/s00382-006-0193-x, 2007.

Bogenschutz, P. A., Gettelman, A., Hannay, C., Larson, V. E., Neale, R. B., Craig, C. and Chen, C. C.: The Path to CAM6: Coupled Simulations with CAM5.4 and CAM5.5, , doi:10.5194/gmd-2017-129, 2018.

Bony, S., Schulz, H., Vial, J. and Stevens, B.: Sugar, Gravel, Fish, and Flowers: Dependence of Mesoscale Patterns of Trade-Wind Clouds on Environmental Conditions, Geophys. Res. Lett., 47(7), e2019GL085988, doi:10.1029/2019GL085988, 2020.

1145 Bracegirdle, T. J. and Stephenson, D. B.: On the Robustness of Emergent Constraints Used in Multimodel Climate Change Projections of Arctic Warming, J. Clim., 26(2), 669–678, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00537.1, 2013.

Bretherton, C. and Caldwell, P.: Combining Emergent Constraints for Climate Sensitivity, Journal of Climate, 33(17), 7413–7430, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0911.1, 2020.

Brienen, R. J. W., Caldwell, L., Duchesne, L., Voelker, S., Barichivich, J., Baliva, M., Ceccantini, G., Di Filippo, A., Helama, S., Locosselli, G. 1150 M., Lopez, L., Piovesan, G., Schöngart, J., Villalba, R. and Gloor, E.: Forest carbon sink neutralized by pervasive growth-lifespan trade-offs, Nat. Commun., 11(1), 1–10, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-17966-z, 2020.

Brient, F.: Reducing uncertainties in climate projections with emergent constraints: Concepts, Examples and Prospects, Advances in Atmospheric Sciences, 37, 1–15, doi:https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00376-019-9140-8, 2019.

Brient, F. and Schneider, T.: Constraints on Climate Sensitivity from Space-Based Measurements of Low-Cloud Reflection, Journal of Climate, 1155 29(16), 5821–5835, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-15-0897.1, 2016.

Brient, F., Schneider, T., Tan, Z., Bony, S., Qu, X. and Hall, A.: Shallowness of tropical low clouds as a predictor of climate models' response to warming, Clim. Dyn., 47(1–2), 433–449, doi:10.1007/s00382-015-2846-0, 2016.

Brown, P. T., Stolpe, M. B. and Caldeira, K.: Assumptions for emergent constraints, Nature, 563(7729), E1–E3, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0638-5, 2018.

1160 Brunner, L., Lorenz, R., Zumwald, M. and Knutti, R.: Quantifying uncertainty in European climate projections using combined performance-independence weighting, Environ. Res. Lett., 14(12), 124010, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab492f, 2019.

Brunner, L., Pendergrass, A. G., Lehner, F., Merrifield, A. L., Lorenz, R. and Knutti, R.: Reduced global warming from CMIP6 projections when weighting models by performance and independence, Earth System Dynamics Discussions, 1–23, doi:10.5194/esd-2020-23, 2020.

Caldwell, P. M., Bretherton, C. S., Zelinka, M. D., Klein, S. A., Santer, B. D. and Sanderson, B. M.: Statistical significance of climate sensitivity 1165 predictors obtained by data mining, Geophysical Research Letters, 41(5), 1803–1808, doi:10.1002/2014gl059205, 2014.

Caldwell, P. M., Zelinka, M. D. and Klein, S. A.: Evaluating Emergent Constraints on Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity, Journal of Climate, 31(10), 3921–3942, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-17-0631.1, 2018.

Chadburn, S. E., Burke, E. J., Cox, P. M., Friedlingstein, P., Hugelius, G. and Westermann, S.: An observation-based constraint on permafrost loss as a function of global warming, Nat. Clim. Chang., 7(5), 340–344, doi:10.1038/nclimate3262, 2017.

1170 Chatterjee, S. and Hadi, A. S.: Influential Observations, High Leverage Points, and Outliers in Linear Regression, Statistical Science, 1(3), 379–393, doi:10.1214/ss/1177013622, 1986.

Collier, N., Hoffman, F. M., Lawrence, D. M., Keppel-Aleks, G., Koven, C. D., Riley, W. J., Mu, M. and Randerson, J. T.: The International Land Model Benchmarking (ILAMB) System: Design, Theory, and Implementation, Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, 10(11), 2731–2754, doi:10.1029/2018ms001354, 2018.

1175 Covey, C., Abe-Ouchi, A., Boer, G. J., Boville, B. A., Cubasch, U., Fairhead, L., Flato, G. M., Gordon, H., Guilyardi, E., Jiang, X., Johns, T. C., Le Treut, H., Madec, G., Meehl, G. A., Miller, R., Noda, A., Power, S. B., Roeckner, E., Russell, G., Schneider, E. K., Stouffer, R. J., Terray, L.

28

and von Storch, J. S.: The seasonal cycle in coupled ocean-atmosphere general circulation models, Clim. Dyn., 16(10–11), 775–787, doi:10.1007/s003820000081, 2000.

Cox, P. M.: Emergent Constraints on Climate-Carbon Cycle Feedbacks, Curr Clim Change Rep, 5(4), 275–281, doi:10.1007/s40641-019-00141-y, 2019.

Cox, P. M., Pearson, D., Booth, B. B., Friedlingstein, P., Huntingford, C., Jones, C. D. and Luke, C. M.: Sensitivity of tropical carbon to climate change constrained by carbon dioxide variability, Nature, 494(7437), 341–344, doi:10.1038/nature11882, 2013.

Cox, P. M., Williamson, M. S., Nijsse, F. J. M. M. and Huntingford, C.: Cox et al. reply, Nature, 563(7729), E10–E15, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0641-x, 2018a.

Cox, P. M., Huntingford, C. and Williamson, M. S.: Emergent constraint on equilibrium climate sensitivity from global temperature variability, Nature, 553(7688), 319–322, doi:10.1038/nature25450, 2018b.

Davies-Barnard, T., Meyerholt, J., Zaehle, S., Friedlingstein, P., Brovkin, V., Fan, Y., Fisher, R. A., Jones, C. D., Lee, H., Peano, D., Smith, B., Wårlind, D. and Wiltshire, A.: Nitrogen Cycling in CMIP6 Land Surface Models: Progress and Limitations, , Biogeosciences, 17, 5129–5148, doi:10.5194/bg-2019-513, 2020.

Douville, H. and Plazzotta, M.: Midlatitude Summer Drying: An Underestimated Threat in CMIP5 Models?, Geophysical Research Letters, 44(19), 9967–9975, doi:10.1002/2017gl075353, 2017.

Edwards, J. M., Beljaars, A. C. M., Holtslag, A. A. M. and Lock, A. P.: Representation of Boundary-Layer Processes in Numerical Weather Prediction and Climate Models, Boundary-Layer Meteorology, doi:10.1007/s10546-020-00530-z, 2020.

Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R. J. and Taylor, K. E.: Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization, Geoscientific Model Development (Online), 9(LLNL JRNL-736881) [online] Available from: https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1408987, 2016.

Eyring, V., Cox, P. M., Flato, G. M., Gleckler, P. J., Abramowitz, G., Caldwell, P., Collins, W. D., Gier, B. K., Hall, A. D., Hoffman, F. M., Hurtt, G. C., Jahn, A., Jones, C. D., Klein, S. A., Krasting, J. P., Kwiatkowski, L., Lorenz, R., Maloney, E., Meehl, G. A., Pendergrass, A. G., Pincus, R., Ruane, A. C., Russell, J. L., Sanderson, B. M., Santer, B. D., Sherwood, S. C., Simpson, I. R., Stouffer, R. J. and Williamson, M. S.: Taking climate model evaluation to the next level, Nature Climate Change, 9(2), 102–110, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0355-y, 2019.

Fisher, R., McDowell, N., Purves, D. and Moorcroft, P.: Assessing uncertainties in a second-generation dynamic vegetation model caused by ecological scale limitations, New [online] Available from: https://nph.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03340.x%4010.1002/%28ISSN%291469-8137%28CAT%29FeatureIssues%28VI%29Amazonianrainforestsanddrought, 2010.

Fleischer, K., Rammig, A., De Kauwe, M. G., Walker, A. P., Domingues, T. F., Fuchslueger, L., Garcia, S., Goll, D. S., Grandis, A., Jiang, M., Haverd, V., Hofhansl, F., Holm, J. A., Kruijt, B., Leung, F., Medlyn, B. E., Mercado, L. M., Norby, R. J., Pak, B., von Randow, C., Quesada, C. A., Schaap, K. J., Valverde-Barrantes, O. J., Wang, Y.-P., Yang, X., Zaehle, S., Zhu, Q. and Lapola, D. M.: Amazon forest response to CO2 fertilization dependent on plant phosphorus acquisition, Nature Geoscience, 12(9), 736–741, doi:10.1038/s41561-019-0404-9, 2019.

Forest, C. E., Stone, P. H., Sokolov, A. P., Allen, M. R. and Webster, M. D.: Quantifying uncertainties in climate system properties with the use of recent climate observations, Science, 295(5552), 113–117, doi:10.1126/science.1064419, 2002.

Friedlingstein, P., Meinshausen, M., Arora, V. K., Jones, C. D., Anav, A., Liddicoat, S. K. and Knutti, R.: Uncertainties in CMIP5 Climate Projections due to Carbon Cycle Feedbacks, Journal of Climate, 27(2), 511–526, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-12-00579.1, 2014.

Geoffroy, O., Saint-Martin, D., Bellon, G., Voldoire, A., Olivié, D. J. L. and Tytéca, S.: Transient Climate Response in a Two-Layer Energy-Balance Model. Part II: Representation of the Efficacy of Deep-Ocean Heat Uptake and Validation for CMIP5 AOGCMs, Journal of Climate, 26(6), 1859–1876, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-12-00196.1, 2013.

Gleckler, P. J., Taylor, K. E. and Doutriaux, C.: Performance metrics for climate models, Journal of Geophysical Research, 113(D6), doi:10.1029/2007jd008972, 2008.

Golaz, J., Caldwell, P. M., Van Roekel, L. P., Petersen, M. R., Tang, Q., Wolfe, J. D., Abeshu, G., Anantharaj, V., Asay-Davis, X. S., Bader, D. C., Baldwin, S. A., Bisht, G., Bogenschutz, P. A., Branstetter, M., Brunke, M. A., Brus, S. R., Burrows, S. M., Cameron-Smith, P. J., Donahue, A. S., Deakin, M., Easter, R. C., Evans, K. J., Feng, Y., Flanner, M., Foucar, J. G., Fyke, J. G., Griffin, B. M., Hannay, C., Harrop, B. E., Hoffman, M. J., Hunke, E. C., Jacob, R. L., Jacobsen, D. W., Jeffery, N., Jones, P. W., Keen, N. D., Klein, S. A., Larson, V. E., Leung, L. R., Li, H., Lin, W., Lipscomb, W. H., Ma, P., Mahajan, S., Maltrud, M. E., Mametjanov, A., McClean, J. L., McCoy, R. B., Neale, R. B., Price, S. F., Qian, Y., Rasch, P. J., Reeves Eyre, J. E. J., Riley, W. J., Ringler, T. D., Roberts, A. F., Roesler, E. L., Salinger, A. G., Shaheen, Z., Shi, X., Singh, B., Tang, J., Taylor, M. A., Thornton, P. E., Turner, A. K., Veneziani, M., Wan, H., Wang, H., Wang, S., Williams, D. N., Wolfram, P. J., Worley, P. H., Xie, S., Yang, Y., Yoon, J., Zelinka, M. D., Zender, C. S., Zeng, X., Zhang, C., Zhang, K., Zhang, Y., Zheng, X., Zhou, T. and Zhu, Q.: The DOE E3SM Coupled Model Version 1: Overview and Evaluation at Standard Resolution, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 11(7), 2089–2129, doi:10.1029/2018MS001603, 2019.

29

Gordon, N. D. and Klein, S. A.: Low cloud optical depth feedback in climate models, J. Geophys. Res. D: Atmos., 119(10), 6052–6065, doi:10.1002/2013JD021052, 2014.

Goris, N., Tjiputra, J. F., Olsen, A., Schwinger, J., Lauvset, S. K. and Jeansson, E.: Constraining projection-based estimates of the future North Atlantic carbon uptake, J. Clim., 31(10), 3959–3978, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-17-0564.1, 2018.

Hall, A., Cox, P., Huntingford, C. and Klein, S.: Progressing emergent constraints on future climate change, Nature Climate Change, 9(4), 269–278, doi:10.1038/s41558-019-0436-6, 2019.

Hargreaves, J. C., Annan, J. D., Yoshimori, M. and Abe-Ouchi, A.: Can the Last Glacial Maximum constrain climate sensitivity?, Geophysical Research Letters, 39(24), doi:10.1029/2012gl053872, 2012.

Hegerl, G. and Zwiers, F.: Use of models in detection and attribution of climate change, Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 2(4), 570–591, doi:10.1002/wcc.121, 2011.

Hegerl, G. C., Stott, P. A., Allen, M. R., Mitchell, J. F. B., Tett, S. F. B. and Cubasch, U.: Optimal detection and attribution of climate change: sensitivity of results to climate model differences, Clim. Dyn., 16(10–11), 737–754, doi:10.1007/s003820000071, 2000.

Hegerl, G. C., Crowley, T. J., Hyde, W. T. and Frame, D. J.: Climate sensitivity constrained by temperature reconstructions over the past seven centuries, Nature, 440(7087), 1029–1032, doi:10.1038/nature04679, 2006.

Hoffman, F. M., Randerson, J. T., Arora, V. K., Bao, Q., Cadule, P., Ji, D., Jones, C. D., Kawamiya, M., Khatiwala, S., Lindsay, K., Obata, A., Shevliakova, E., Six, K. D., Tjiputra, J. F., Volodin, E. M. and Wu, T.: Causes and implications of persistent atmospheric carbon dioxide biases in Earth System Models, Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences, 119(2), 141–162, doi:10.1002/2013jg002381, 2014.

Holtslag, A. A. M., Steeneveld, G. J. and van de Wiel, B. J. H.: Role of land-surface temperature feedback on model performance for the stable boundary layer, Atmospheric Boundary Layers, 205–220, doi:10.1007/978-0-387-74321-9_14, 2007.

Hourdin, F., Mauritsen, T., Gettelman, A., Golaz, J.-C., Balaji, V., Duan, Q., Folini, D., Ji, D., Klocke, D., Qian, Y., Rauser, F., Rio, C., Tomassini, L., Watanabe, M. and Williamson, D.: The Art and Science of Climate Model Tuning, Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 98(3), 589–602, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00135.1, 2017.

Huber, M., Mahlstein, I., Wild, M., Fasullo, J. and Knutti, R.: Constraints on Climate Sensitivity from Radiation Patterns in Climate Models, J. Clim., 24(4), 1034–1052, doi:10.1175/2010JCLI3403.1, 2011.

Jiménez-de-la-Cuesta, D. and Mauritsen, T.: Emergent constraints on Earth's transient and equilibrium response to doubled CO_2 from post-1970s global warming, Nat. Geosci., 12(11), 902–905 [online] Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41561-019-0463-y, 2019.

Kamae, Y., Shiogama, H., Watanabe, M., Ogura, T., Yokohata, T. and Kimoto, M.: Lower-Tropospheric Mixing as a Constraint on Cloud Feedback in a Multiparameter Multiphysics Ensemble, J. Clim., 29(17), 6259–6275, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0042.1, 2016.

Karpechko, A. Y., Maraun, D. and Eyring, V.: Improving Antarctic total ozone projections by a process-oriented multiple diagnostic ensemble regression, J. Atmos. Sci., 70(12), 3959–3976, doi:10.1175/jas-d-13-071.1, 2013.

Kessler, A. and Tjiputra, J.: The Southern Ocean as a constraint to reduce uncertainty in future ocean carbon sinks, Earth Syst. Dyn., 7(2), 295–312, doi:10.5194/esd-7-295-2016, 2016.

Kettleborough, J. A., Booth, B. B. B., Stott, P. A. and Allen, M. R.: Estimates of uncertainty in predictions of global mean surface temperature, J. Clim., 20(5), 843–855, doi:10.1175/jcli4012.1, 2007.

Kiehl, J. T.: Twentieth century climate model response and climate sensitivity, Geophys. Res. Lett., 34(22), doi:10.1029/2007gl031383, 2007.

Klein, S. A. and Hall, A.: Emergent Constraints for Cloud Feedbacks, Current Climate Change Reports, 1(4), 276–287, doi:10.1007/s40641-015-0027-1, 2015.

Klein, S. A., Zhang, Y., Zelinka, M. D., Pincus, R., Boyle, J. and Gleckler, P. J.: Are climate model simulations of clouds improving? An evaluation using the ISCCP simulator, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 118(3), 1329–1342, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50141, 2013.

Klein, S. A., Hall, A., Norris, J. R. and Pincus, R.: Low-cloud feedbacks from cloud-controlling factors: A review, Surv. Geophys., 38(6), 1307–1329, doi:10.1007/s10712-017-9433-3, 2017.

Knutti, R.: Why are climate models reproducing the observed global surface warming so well?, Geophys. Res. Lett., 35(18), doi:10.1029/2008gl034932, 2008.

Knutti, R. and Tomassini, L.: Constraints on the transient climate response from observed global temperature and ocean heat uptake, Geophysical Research Letters, 35(9), doi:10.1029/2007gl032904, 2008.

30

Knutti, R., Stocker, T. F., Joos, F. and Plattner, G. K.: Constraints on radiative forcing and future climate change from observations and climate model ensembles, Nature, 416(6882), 719–723, doi:10.1038/416719a, 2002.

Knutti, R., Meehl, G. A., Allen, M. R. and Stainforth, D. A.: Constraining Climate Sensitivity from the Seasonal Cycle in Surface Temperature, Journal of Climate, 19(17), 4224–4233, doi:10.1175/jcli3865.1, 2006.

Knutti, R., Masson, D. and Gettelman, A.: Climate model genealogy: Generation CMIP5 and how we got there, Geophys. Res. Lett., 40(6), 1194–1199, doi:10.1002/grl.50256, 2013.

Knutti, R., Sedláček, J., Sanderson, B. M., Lorenz, R., Fischer, E. M. and Eyring, V.: A climate model projection weighting scheme accounting for performance and interdependence, Geophysical Research Letters, doi:10.1002/2016gl072012, 2017.

Koven, C., Arora, V. K., Cadule, P., Fisher, R. A., Jones, C. D., Lawrence, D. M., Lewis, J., Lindsey, K., Mathesius, S., Meinshausen, M., Mills, M., Nicholls, Z., Sanderson, B. M., Swart, N. C., Wieder, W. R. and Zickfeld, K.: 23rd Century surprises: Long-term dynamics of the climate and carbon cycle under both high and net negative emissions scenarios, , doi:10.5194/esd-2021-23, 2021.

Kubo, R.: The fluctuation-dissipation theorem, Rep. Prog. Phys., 29(1), 255, doi:10.1088/0034-4885/29/1/306, 1966.

Kwiatkowski, L., Bopp, L., Aumont, O., Ciais, P., Cox, P. M., Laufkötter, C., Li, Y. and Séférian, R.: Emergent constraints on projections of declining primary production in the tropical oceans, Nat. Clim. Chang., 7(5), 355–358, doi:10.1038/nclimate3265, 2017.

Leith, C. E.: Climate Response and Fluctuation Dissipation, Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences, 32(10), 2022–2026, doi:10.1175/1520-0469(1975)032<2022:crafd>2.0.co;2, 1975.

Lenton, T. M., Rockström, J., Gaffney, O., Rahmstorf, S., Richardson, K., Steffen, W. and Schellnhuber, H. J.: Climate tipping points — too risky to bet against, Nature, 575(7784), 592–595, doi:10.1038/d41586-019-03595-0, 2019.

Levine, N. M., Zhang, K., Longo, M., Baccini, A., Phillips, O. L., Lewis, S. L., Alvarez-Dávila, E., de Andrade, A. C. S., Brienen, R. J. W., Erwin, T. L., Feldpausch, T. R., Mendoza, A. L. M., Vargas, P. N., Prieto, A., Silva-Espejo, J. E., Malhi, Y. and Moorcroft, P. R.: Ecosystem heterogeneity determines the ecological resilience of the Amazon to climate change, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113(3), 793–797, doi:10.1073/pnas.1511344112, 2016.

Lipat, B. R., Tselioudis, G., Grise, K. M. and Polvani, L. M.: CMIP5 models' shortwave cloud radiative response and climate sensitivity linked to the climatological Hadley cell extent, Geophysical Research Letters, 44(11), 5739–5748, doi:10.1002/2017gl073151, 2017.

Longo, M., Knox, R. G., Levine, N. M., Alves, L. F., Bonal, D., Camargo, P. B., Fitzjarrald, D. R., Hayek, M. N., Restrepo-Coupe, N., Saleska, S. R., da Silva, R., Stark, S. C., Tapajós, R. P., Wiedemann, K. T., Zhang, K., Wofsy, S. C. and Moorcroft, P. R.: Ecosystem heterogeneity and diversity mitigate Amazon forest resilience to frequent extreme droughts, New Phytol., 219(3), 914–931, doi:10.1111/nph.15185, 2018.

Lorenz, R., Herger, N., Sedláček, J., Eyring, V., Fischer, E. M. and Knutti, R.: Prospects and Caveats of Weighting Climate Models for Summer Maximum Temperature Projections Over North America, J. Geophys. Res. D: Atmos., 123(9), 4509–4526, doi:10.1029/2017JD027992, 2018.

Mahlstein, I. and Knutti, R.: September Arctic sea ice predicted to disappear near 2°C global warming above present, J. Geophys. Res., 117(D6), doi:10.1029/2011jd016709, 2012.

Masson, D. and Knutti, R.: Climate model genealogy, Geophys. Res. Lett., 38(8), doi:10.1029/2011gl046864, 2011.

Masson, D. and Knutti, R.: Predictor screening, calibration, and observational constraints in climate model ensembles: An illustration using climate sensitivity, J. Clim., 26(3), 887–898, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-11-00540.1, 2013a.

Masson, D. and Knutti, R.: Predictor Screening, Calibration, and Observational Constraints in Climate Model Ensembles: An Illustration Using Climate Sensitivity, J. Clim., 26(3), 887–898, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00540.1, 2013b.

Mauritsen, T., Stevens, B., Roeckner, E., Crueger, T., Esch, M., Giorgetta, M., Haak, H., Jungclaus, J., Klocke, D., Matei, D., Mikolajewicz, U., Notz, D., Pincus, R., Schmidt, H. and Tomassini, L.: Tuning the climate of a global model, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 4(3), doi:10.1029/2012MS000154, 2012.

McDowell, N., Allen, C. D., Anderson-Teixeira, K., Brando, P., Brienen, R., Chambers, J., Christoffersen, B., Davies, S., Doughty, C., Duque, A., Espirito-Santo, F., Fisher, R., Fontes, C. G., Galbraith, D., Goodsman, D., Grossiord, C., Hartmann, H., Holm, J., Johnson, D. J., Kassim, A. R., Keller, M., Koven, C., Kueppers, L., Kumagai, T., Malhi, Y., McMahon, S. M., Mencuccini, M., Meir, P., Moorcroft, P., Muller-Landau, H. C., Phillips, O. L., Powell, T., Sierra, C. A., Sperry, J., Warren, J., Xu, C. and Xu, X.: Drivers and mechanisms of tree mortality in moist tropical forests, New Phytol., 219(3), 851–869, doi:10.1111/nph.15027, 2018.

McKiver, W. J., Vichi, M., Lovato, T., Storto, A. and Masina, S.: Impact of increased grid resolution on global marine biogeochemistry, J. Mar. Syst., 147, 153–168, doi:10.1016/j.jmarsys.2014.10.003, 2015.

McNeall, D., Williams, J., Booth, B., Betts, R., Challenor, P., Wiltshire, A. and Sexton, D.: The impact of structural error on parameter constraint in a climate model, Earth System Dynamics, 7(4), 917–935, doi:10.5194/esd-7-917-2016, 2016.

31

1320 Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Eyring, V., Flato, G., Lamarque, J.-F., Stouffer, R. J., Taylor, K. E. and Schlund, M.: Context for interpreting equilibrium climate sensitivity and transient climate response from the CMIP6 Earth system models, Sci. Adv., 6(26), eaba1981, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aba1981, 2020.

Mongwe, N. P., Chang, N. and Monteiro, P. M. S.: The seasonal cycle as a mode to diagnose biases in modelled CO2 fluxes in the Southern Ocean, Ocean Model. (Oxf.), 106, 90–103, doi:10.1016/j.ocemod.2016.09.006, 2016.

1325 Monin, A. S. and Obukhov, A. M.: Basic Regularity in Turbulent Mixing in the Surface Layer of the Atmosphere. [online] Available from: https://books.google.com/books/about/Basic_Regularity_in_Turbulent_Mixing_in.html?hl=&id=7KMJAQAAIAAJ, 1957.

Needham, J. F., Chambers, J., Fisher, R., Knox, R. and Koven, C. D.: Forest responses to simulated elevated CO under alternate hypotheses of size- and age-dependent mortality, Glob. Chang. Biol., doi:10.1111/gcb.15254, 2020.

1330 Nijsse, F., Cox, P. M. and Williamson, M. S.: An emergent constraint on Transient Climate Response from simulated historical warming in CMIP6 models, Earth System Dynamics Discussions, 2020, 1-14 [online] Available from: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3aae/d1f981ca631352848a475d39b8b1cac8e1f1.pdf, 2020.

O'Gorman, P. A.: Sensitivity of tropical precipitation extremes to climate change, Nat. Geosci., 5(10), 697–700, doi:10.1038/ngeo1568, 2012.

Pachauri, R. K., Allen, M. R., Barros, V. R., Broome, J., Cramer, W., Christ, R., Church, J. A., Clarke, L., Dahe, Q., Dasgupta, P., Dubash, N. K.,
1335 Edenhofer, O., Elgizouli, I., Field, C. B., Forster, P., Friedlingstein, P., Fuglestvedt, J., Gomez-Echeverri, L., Hallegatte, S., Hegerl, G., Howden, M., Jiang, K., Jimenez Cisneroz, B., Kattsov, V., Lee, H., Mach, K. J., Marotzke, J., Mastrandrea, M. D., Meyer, L., Minx, J., Mulugetta, Y., O'Brien, K., Oppenheimer, M., Pereira, J. J., Pichs-Madruga, R., Plattner, G.-K., Pörtner, H.-O., Power, S. B., Preston, B., Ravindranath, N. H., Reisinger, A., Riahi, K., Rusticucci, M., Scholes, R., Seyboth, K., Sokona, Y., Stavins, R., Stocker, T. F., Tschakert, P., van Vuuren, D. and van Ypserle, J.-P.: Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by R. K. Pachauri and L. Meyer, IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland. [online] Available from:
1340 https://epic.awi.de/id/eprint/37530/ (Accessed 30 January 2020), 2014.

Palmer, T.: Short-term tests validate long-term estimates of climate change, Nature, 582(7811), 185–186, doi:10.1038/d41586-020-01484-5, 2020.

Piani, C., Frame, D. J., Stainforth, D. A. and Allen, M. R.: Constraints on climate change from a multi-thousand member ensemble of simulations, Geophysical Research Letters, 32(23), doi:10.1029/2005gl024452, 2005.

Pincus, R., Winker, D., Bony, S. and Stevens, B.: Shallow Clouds, Water Vapor, Circulation, and Climate Sensitivity, Springer. [online] Available
1345 from: https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=UdldDwAAQBAJ, 2018.

Plazzotta, M., Séférian, R., Douville, H., Kravitz, B. and Tjiputra, J.: Land Surface Cooling Induced by Sulfate Geoengineering Constrained by Major Volcanic Eruptions, Geophys. Res. Lett., 45(11), 5663–5671, doi:10.1029/2018GL077583, 2018.

Po-Chedley, S., Proistosescu, C., Armour, K. C. and Santer, B. D.: Climate constraint reflects forced signal, Nature, 563(7729), E6–E9, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0640-y, 2018.

1350 Qu, X. and Hall, A.: What Controls the Strength of Snow-Albedo Feedback?, Journal of Climate, 20(15), 3971–3981, doi:10.1175/jcli4186.1, 2007.

Qu, X. and Hall, A.: On the persistent spread in snow-albedo feedback, Climate Dynamics, 42(1–2), 69–81, doi:10.1007/s00382-013-1774-0, 2014.

Qu, X., Hall, A., Klein, S. A. and Caldwell, P. M.: On the spread of changes in marine low-cloud cover in climate model simulations of the 21st century, Climate Dynamics, 42(9–10), 2603–2626, doi:10.1007/s00382-013-1945-z, 2014.

Renoult, M., Annan, J. D., Hargreaves, J. C., Sagoo, N., Flynn, C., Kapsch, M.-L., Mikolajewicz, U., Ohgaito, R. and Mauritsen, T.: A Bayesian
1355 framework for emergent constraints: case studies of climate sensitivity with PMIP, Clim. Past Discuss., 1–29, doi:10.5194/cp-2019-162, 2020.

Ribes, A., Zwiers, F. W., Azaïs, J.-M. and Naveau, P.: A new statistical approach to climate change detection and attribution, Climate Dynamics, 48(1–2), 367–386, doi:10.1007/s00382-016-3079-6, 2017.

Rodwell, M. J. and Palmer, T. N.: Using numerical weather prediction to assess climate models, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 133(622), 129–146, doi:10.1002/qj.23, 2007.

1360 Rose, B. E. J. and Rayborn, L.: The effects of ocean heat uptake on transient climate sensitivity, Curr. Clim. Change Rep., 2(4), 190–201, doi:10.1007/s40641-016-0048-4, 2016.

Rougier, J.: Probabilistic Inference for Future Climate Using an Ensemble of Climate Model Evaluations, Climatic Change, 81(3–4), 247–264, doi:10.1007/s10584-006-9156-9, 2007.

Royer, D. L., Berner, R. A. and Park, J.: Climate sensitivity constrained by CO2 concentrations over the past 420 million years, Nature, 446(7135),
1365 530–532, doi:10.1038/nature05699, 2007.

Rugenstein, M., Bloch-Johnson, J., Gregory, J., Andrews, T., Mauritsen, T., Li, C., Frölicher, T. L., Paynter, D., Danabasoglu, G., Yang, S., Dufresne, J., Cao, L., Schmidt, G. A., Abe-Ouchi, A., Geoffroy, O. and Knutti, R.: Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity Estimated by Equilibrating Climate Models, Geophys. Res. Lett., 47(4), 1029, doi:10.1029/2019GL083898, 2020.

Rypdal, M., Fredriksen, H. B., Rypdal, K. and Steene, R. J.: Emergent constraints on climate sensitivity, Nature, 563(7729), E4–E5, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0639-4, 2018.

Sakschewski, B., von Bloh, W., Boit, A., Poorter, L., Peña-Claros, M., Heinke, J., Joshi, J. and Thonicke, K.: Resilience of Amazon forests emerges from plant trait diversity, Nat. Clim. Chang., 6(11), 1032–1036, doi:10.1038/nclimate3109, 2016.

Sallée, J.-B., Shuckburgh, E., Bruneau, N., Meijers, A. J. S., Bracegirdle, T. J., Wang, Z. and Roy, T.: Assessment of Southern Ocean water mass circulation and characteristics in CMIP5 models: Historical bias and forcing response, J. Geophys. Res. Oceans, 118(4), 1830–1844, doi:10.1002/jgrc.20135, 2013.

Sanderson, B.: Relating climate sensitivity indices to projection uncertainty, , doi:10.5194/esd-11-721-2020, 2020.

Sanderson, B. M.: A Multimodel Study of Parametric Uncertainty in Predictions of Climate Response to Rising Greenhouse Gas Concentrations, Journal of Climate, 24(5), 1362–1377, doi:10.1175/2010jcli3498.1, 2011.

Sanderson, B. M.: On the estimation of systematic error in regression-based predictions of climate sensitivity, Climatic Change, 118(3–4), 757–770, doi:10.1007/s10584-012-0671-6, 2013.

Sanderson, B. M., Knutti, R., Aina, T., Christensen, C., Faull, N., Frame, D. J., Ingram, W. J., Piani, C., Stainforth, D. A., Stone, D. A. and Allen, M. R.: Constraints on Model Response to Greenhouse Gas Forcing and the Role of Subgrid-Scale Processes, Journal of Climate, 21(11), 2384–2400, doi:10.1175/2008jcli1869.1, 2008.

Sanderson, B. M., Shell, K. M. and Ingram, W.: Climate feedbacks determined using radiative kernels in a multi-thousand member ensemble of AOGCMs, Climate Dynamics, 35(7–8), 1219–1236, doi:10.1007/s00382-009-0661-1, 2010.

Sanderson, B. M., Knutti, R. and Caldwell, P.: A Representative Democracy to Reduce Interdependency in a Multimodel Ensemble, Journal of Climate, 28(13), 5171–5194, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-14-00362.1, 2015.

Sanderson, B. M., Wehner, M. and Knutti, R.: Skill and independence weighting for multi-model assessments, Geoscientific Model Development, 10(6), 2379–2395, doi:10.5194/gmd-10-2379-2017, 2017.

Sandu, I., Beljaars, A., Bechtold, P., Mauritsen, T. and Balsamo, G.: Why is it so difficult to represent stably stratified conditions in numerical weather prediction (NWP) models?: STABLE CONDITIONS IN NWP MODELS, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 5(2), 117–133, doi:10.1002/jame.20013, 2013.

Schlund, M., Lauer, A., Gentine, P., Sherwood, S. C. and Eyring, V.: Emergent constraints on equilibrium climate sensitivity in CMIP5: do they hold for CMIP6?, Earth Syst. Dyn., 11(4), 1233–1258, doi:10.5194/esd-11-1233-2020, 2020.

Schmidt, G. A., Annan, J. D., Bartlein, P. J., Cook, B. I., Guilyardi, E., Hargreaves, J. C., Harrison, S. P., Kageyama, M., LeGrande, A. N., Konecky, B., Lovejoy, S., Mann, M. E., Masson-Delmotte, V., Risi, C., Thompson, D., Timmermann, A., Tremblay, L.-B. and Yiou, P.: Using palaeo-climate comparisons to constrain future projections in CMIP5, Clim. Past, 10(1), 221–250, doi:10.5194/cp-10-221-2014, 2014.

Schmidt, G. A., Bader, D., Donner, L. J., Elsaesser, G. S., Golaz, J.-C., Hannay, C., Molod, A., Neale, R. and Saha, S.: Practice and philosophy of climate model tuning across six U.S. modeling centers, Geosci. Model Dev., 10, 3207–3223, doi:10.5194/gmd-2017-30, 2017.

Schurer, A., Hegerl, G., Ribes, A., Polson, D., Morice, C. and Tett, S.: Estimating the Transient Climate Response from Observed Warming, Journal of Climate, 31(20), 8645–8663, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-17-0717.1, 2018.

Sexton, D. M. H. and Murphy, J. M.: Multivariate probabilistic projections using imperfect climate models. Part II: robustness of methodological choices and consequences for climate sensitivity, Climate Dynamics, 38(11–12), 2543–2558, doi:10.1007/s00382-011-1209-8, 2012.

Shao, P., Zeng, X., Moore, D. J. P. and Zeng, X.: Soil microbial respiration from observations and Earth System Models, Environmental Research Letters, 8(3), 034034, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/3/034034, 2013.

Sherwood, S. C., Bony, S. and Dufresne, J. L.: Spread in model climate sensitivity traced to atmospheric convective mixing, Nature, 505(7481), 37–42, doi:10.1038/nature12829, 2014.

Sherwood, S. C., Webb, M. J., Annan, J. D., Armour, K. C., Forster, P. M., Hargreaves, J. C., Hegerl, G., Klein, S. A., Marvel, K. D., Rohling, E. J., Watanabe, M., Andrews, T., Braconnot, P., Bretherton, C. S., Foster, G. L., Hausfather, Z., von der Heydt, A. S., Knutti, R., Mauritsen, T., Norris, J. R., Proistosescu, C., Rugenstein, M., Schmidt, G. A., Tokarska, K. B. and Zelinka, M. D.: An Assessment of Earth's Climate Sensitivity Using Multiple Lines of Evidence, Rev. Geophys., 58(4), e2019RG000678, doi:10.1029/2019RG000678, 2020.

Shi, Z., Crowell, S., Luo, Y. and Moore, B., 3rd: Model structures amplify uncertainty in predicted soil carbon responses to climate change, Nat. Commun., 9(1), 2171, doi:10.1038/s41467-018-04526-9, 2018.

33

1415 Shiogama, H., Watanabe, M., Yoshimori, M., Yokohata, T., Ogura, T., Annan, J. D., Hargreaves, J. C., Abe, M., Kamae, Y., O'ishi, R., Nobui, R., Emori, S., Nozawa, T., Abe-Ouchi, A. and Kimoto, M.: Perturbed physics ensemble using the MIROC5 coupled atmosphere–ocean GCM without flux corrections: experimental design and results, Clim. Dyn., 39(12), 3041–3056, doi:10.1007/s00382-012-1441-x, 2012.

Siler, N., Po-Chedley, S. and Bretherton, C. S.: Variability in modeled cloud feedback tied to differences in the climatological spatial pattern of clouds, Clim. Dyn., 50(3–4), 1209–1220, doi:10.1007/s00382-017-3673-2, 2018.

1420 Stainforth, D. A., Aina, T., Christensen, C., Collins, M., Faull, N., Frame, D. J., Kettleborough, J. A., Knight, S., Martin, A., Murphy, J. M., Piani, C., Sexton, D., Smith, L. A., Spicer, R. A., Thorpe, A. J. and Allen, M. R.: Uncertainty in predictions of the climate response to rising levels of greenhouse gases, Nature, 433(7024), 403–406, doi:10.1038/nature03301, 2005.

Stock, C. A.: Comparing apples to oranges: Perspectives on satellite-based primary production estimates drawn from a global biogeochemical model, J. Mar. Res., 77(2), 259–282, doi:10.1357/002224019828474296, 2019.

Su, H., Jiang, J. H., Zhai, C., Shen, T. J., David Neelin, J., Stephens, G. L. and Yung, Y. L.: Weakening and strengthening structures in the Hadley
1425 Circulation change under global warming and implications for cloud response and climate sensitivity, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 119(10), 5787–5805, doi:10.1002/2014jd021642, 2014.

Svensson, G. and Lindvall, J.: Evaluation of Near-Surface Variables and the Vertical Structure of the Boundary Layer in CMIP5 Models, Journal of Climate, 28(13), 5233–5253, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-14-00596.1, 2015.

Teckentrup, L., Harrison, S. P., Hantson, S., Heil, A., Melton, J. R., Forrest, M., Li, F., Yue, C., Arneth, A., Hickler, T. and Others: Response of
1430 simulated burned area to historical changes in environmental and anthropogenic factors: a comparison of seven fire models, Biogeosciences, 16, 3883–3910 [online] Available from: https://pure.mpg.de/pubman/faces/ViewItemOverviewPage.jsp?itemId=item_3172034, 2019.

Terhaar, J., Kwiatkowski, L. and Bopp, L.: Emergent constraint on Arctic Ocean acidification in the twenty-first century, Nature, 582(7812), 379–383, doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2360-3, 2020.

Terhaar, J., Frölicher, T. L. and Joos, F.: Southern Ocean anthropogenic carbon sink constrained by sea surface salinity, Sci. Adv., 7(18),
1435 doi:10.1126/sciadv.abd5964, 2021.

Teskey, R., Wertin, T., Bauweraerts, I., Ameye, M., McGuire, M. A. and Steppe, K.: Responses of tree species to heat waves and extreme heat events, Plant Cell Environ., 38(9), 1699–1712, doi:10.1111/pce.12417, 2015.

Tett, S. F. B., Yamazaki, K., Mineter, M. J., Cartis, C. and Eizenberg, N.: Calibrating climate models using inverse methods: case studies with
HadAM3, HadAM3P and HadCM3, Geoscientific Model Development, 10 [online] Available from: https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:849e6e43-
1440 bb4c-4038-9d26-39bc0559128e, 2017.

Thackeray, C. W. and Hall, A.: An emergent constraint on future Arctic sea-ice albedo feedback, Nature Climate Change, 9(12), 972–978, doi:10.1038/s41558-019-0619-1, 2019.

Tian, B.: Spread of model climate sensitivity linked to double-Intertropical Convergence Zone bias, Geophysical Research Letters, 42(10), 4133–4141, doi:10.1002/2015gl064119, 2015.

1445 Tjiputra, J. F., Schwinger, J., Bentsen, M., Morée, A. L., Gao, S., Bethke, I., Heinze, C., Goris, N., Gupta, A., He, Y., Olivié, D., Seland, Ø. and Schulz, M.: Ocean biogeochemistry in the Norwegian Earth System Model version 2 (NorESM2), Geosci. Model Dev., 13, 2393–2431, doi:10.5194/gmd-2019-347, 2020.

Todd-Brown, K. E. O., Randerson, J. T., Post, W. M., Hoffman, F. M., Tarnocai, C., Schuur, E. A. G. and Allison, S. D.: Causes of variation in soil carbon simulations from CMIP5 Earth system models and comparison with observations, Biogeosciences, 10(3), 1717–1736, doi:10.5194/bg-
1450 10-1717-2013, 2013.

Tokarska, K. B., Stolpe, M. B., Sippel, S., Fischer, E. M., Smith, C. J., Lehner, F. and Knutti, R.: Past warming trend constrains future warming in CMIP6 models, Science Advances, 6(12), eaaz9549, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aaz9549, 2020.

Trenberth, K. E. and Fasullo, J. T.: Simulation of Present-Day and Twenty-First-Century Energy Budgets of the Southern Oceans, J. Clim., 23(2), 440–454, doi:10.1175/2009JCLI3152.1, 2010.

1455 Varney, R. M., Chadburn, S. E., Friedlingstein, P., Burke, E. J., Koven, C. D., Hugelius, G. and Cox, P. M.: A spatial emergent constraint on the sensitivity of soil carbon turnover to global warming, Nat. Commun., 11(1), 1–8, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-19208-8, 2020.

Volodin, E. M.: Relation between temperature sensitivity to doubled carbon dioxide and the distribution of clouds in current climate models, Izv. Atmos. Ocean. Phys., 44(3), 288–299, doi:10.1134/S0001433808030043, 2008.

Wang, J., Zeng, N., Liu, Y. and Bao, Q.: To what extent can interannual CO_2 variability constrain carbon cycle sensitivity to climate change in
1460 CMIP5 Earth System Models?, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41(10), 3535–3544, doi:10.1002/2014GL060004, 2014.

34

Watanabe, M., Kamae, Y., Shiogama, H., DeAngelis, A. M. and Suzuki, K.: Low clouds link equilibrium climate sensitivity to hydrological sensitivity, Nat. Clim. Chang., 8(10), 901–906, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0272-0, 2018.

Wei, N., Zhou, L. and Dai, Y.: Evaluation of simulated climatological diurnal temperature range in CMIP5 models from the perspective of planetary boundary layer turbulent mixing, Clim. Dyn., 49(1–2), 1–22, doi:10.1007/s00382-016-3323-0, 2017.

Wenzel, S., Cox, P. M., Eyring, V. and Friedlingstein, P.: Emergent constraints on climate carbon cycle feedbacks in the CMIP5 Earth system models, J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci., 119(5), 794–807, doi:10.1002/2013JG002591, 2014.

Wigley, T. M. L.: Effect of climate sensitivity on the response to volcanic forcing, Journal of Geophysical Research, 110(D9), doi:10.1029/2004jd005557, 2005.

Wilde, P. de, de Wilde, P. and Tian, W.: Towards probabilistic performance metrics for climate change impact studies, Energy and Buildings, 43(11), 3013–3018, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2011.07.014, 2011.

Williams, D. N., Balaji, V., Cinquini, L., Denvil, S., Duffy, D., Evans, B., Ferraro, R., Hansen, R., Lautenschlager, M. and Trenham, C.: A Global Repository for Planet-Sized Experiments and Observations, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 97(5), 803–816, doi:10.1175/bams-d-15-00132.1, 2016.

Williamson, D., Goldstein, M., Allison, L., Blaker, A., Challenor, P., Jackson, L. and Yamazaki, K.: History matching for exploring and reducing climate model parameter space using observations and a large perturbed physics ensemble, Clim. Dyn., 41(7), 1703–1729, doi:10.1007/s00382-013-1896-4, 2013.

Williamson, D. B. and Sansom, P. G.: How Are Emergent Constraints Quantifying Uncertainty and What Do They Leave Behind?, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 100(12), 2571–2588, doi:10.1175/bams-d-19-0131.1, 2019.

Williamson, M. S., Cox, P. M. and Nijsse, F. J. M. M.: Theoretical foundations of emergent constraints: relationships between climate sensitivity and global temperature variability in conceptual models, Dyn Stat Clim Syst, 3(1), doi:10.1093/climsys/dzy006, 2019.

Yan, X., Zhang, R. and Knutson, T. R.: Underestimated AMOC variability and implications for AMV and predictability in CMIP models, Geophys. Res. Lett., 45(9), 4319–4328, doi:10.1029/2018gl077378, 2018.

Yokohata, T., Webb, M. J., Collins, M., Williams, K. D., Yoshimori, M., Hargreaves, J. C. and Annan, J. D.: Structural Similarities and Differences in Climate Responses to CO2 Increase between Two Perturbed Physics Ensembles, Journal of Climate, 23(6), 1392–1410, doi:10.1175/2009jcli2917.1, 2010.

Zaehle, S., Jones, C. D., Houlton, B., Lamarque, J.-F. and Robertson, E.: Nitrogen Availability Reduces CMIP5 Projections of Twenty-First-Century Land Carbon Uptake*, Journal of Climate, 28(6), 2494–2511, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-13-00776.1, 2015.

Zelinka, M. D., Myers, T. A., McCoy, D. T., Po-Chedley, S., Caldwell, P. M., Ceppi, P., Klein, S. A. and Taylor, K. E.: Causes of Higher Climate Sensitivity in CMIP6 Models, Geophysical Research Letters, 47(1), doi:10.1029/2019gl085782, 2020.

Zhai, C., Jiang, J. H. and Su, H.: Long-term cloud change imprinted in seasonal cloud variation: More evidence of high climate sensitivity, Geophysical Research Letters, 42(20), 8729–8737, doi:10.1002/2015gl065911, 2015a.

Zhai, C., Jiang, J. H. and Su, H.: Long-term cloud change imprinted in seasonal cloud variation: More evidence of high climate sensitivity: Cloud Feedback and Seasonal Variation, Geophys. Res. Lett., 42(20), 8729–8737, doi:10.1002/2015GL065911, 2015b.

Zhang, T., Zhang, M., Lin, W., Lin, Y., Xue, W., Yu, H., He, J., Xin, X., Ma, H.-Y., Xie, S. and Zheng, W.: Automatic tuning of the Community Atmosphere Model (CAM5) by using short-term hindcasts with an improved downhill simplex optimization method, Geoscientific Model Development, 11(12), 5189–5201, doi:10.5194/gmd-11-5189-2018, 2018.