

## **Asymmetric seasonal temperature trends**

Judah L. Cohen<sup>1</sup>, Jason C. Furtado<sup>1</sup>, Mathew Barlow<sup>2</sup>, Vladimir A. Alexeev<sup>3</sup> and Jessica E. Cherry<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Atmospheric and Environmental Research, Lexington, Massachusetts 02421, USA.

<sup>2</sup>Environmental, Earth, and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Massachusetts Lowell, Massachusetts 01854, USA.

<sup>3</sup>International Arctic Research Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK 99775, USA.

1 **Current consensus on global climate change predicts warming trends driven by**  
2 **anthropogenic forcing, with maximum temperature changes projected in the**  
3 **Northern Hemisphere (NH) high latitudes during winter. Yet, global**  
4 **temperature trends show little warming over the most recent decade or so.**  
5 **For longer time periods appropriate to the assessment of trends, however,**  
6 **global temperatures have experienced significant warming for all seasons**  
7 **except winter, when cooling trends exist instead across large stretches of**  
8 **eastern North America and northern Eurasia. Hence, the most recent lapse in**  
9 **global warming is a seasonal phenomenon, prevalent only in boreal winter.**  
10 **Additionally, we show that the largest regional contributor to global**  
11 **temperature trends over the past two decades is land surface temperature in**  
12 **the NH extratropics. Therefore, proposed mechanisms explaining the**

13 **fluctuations in global annual temperature trends should address this apparent**  
14 **seasonal asymmetry.**

15

## 16 **1. Introduction**

17 Global surface temperatures are projected to warm due to rapid increases in  
18 greenhouse gases (GHGs) and over the entire length of the instrumental record,  
19 temperatures have undergone a warming trend [*IPCC, 2007*]. However it has been noted  
20 that the global warming trend has slowed and even halted since the late 1990s [e.g.,  
21 *Easterling and Wehner, 2009; Kaufmann et al., 2011*]. Several studies have offered  
22 explanations for the recent cessation in the global temperature trend, including climate  
23 variations of the North Atlantic and equatorial Pacific oceans [*Keenlyside et al., 2008;*  
24 *Meehl et al., 2011*], variations in solar activity [*Lean and Rind, 2009*], changes in  
25 stratospheric water vapor [*Solomon et al., 2010*], and tropospheric aerosols [*Kaufmann et*  
26 *al., 2011*]. The sudden absence of a warming trend is not particularly unique or even  
27 unexpected. Easterling and Wehner [2009], through running decadal trend analysis, show  
28 that even the observed record has decadal spans of little to no warming. Even coupled  
29 climate model simulations of a future warmer world due to increased GHGs contain periods  
30 of little to no warming [*Easterling and Wehner, 2009; Meehl et al., 2011*]. Indeed, large-  
31 scale modes of natural variability in the atmosphere and ocean may work to negate  
32 radiative warming on decadal timescales.

33 The aforementioned studies discuss the absence of a warming trend or even a cooling  
34 trend in the context of global annual temperatures. Yet, analysis of temperature trends

35 seasonally is not extensively reported, both in the observational record and in coupled  
36 climate model simulations. As we will illustrate, recent trends in global surface  
37 temperatures are seasonally-dependent; i.e., only Northern Hemisphere (NH) extratropical  
38 land surface temperatures during boreal winter display a systematic waning of the warming  
39 trend to a near-neutral trend of late. The implications of this finding are important for  
40 testing the relative importance of the proposed mechanisms suggested for the cessation of  
41 the warming trend and for evaluating how coupled climate models can handle such  
42 seasonal asymmetries.

43

## 44 **2. Observational Data and Model Output**

45 Observational surface temperature data originate from two sources: (1) The  
46 Climate Research Unit land air temperature dataset, version 3 [CRUTEM3; *Brohan et al.*,  
47 2006]; and (2) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration Modern Era  
48 Retrospective-Analysis for Research and Applications [NASA MERRA; *Rienecker et al.*,  
49 2011]. The CRUTEM3 dataset, consisting of monthly land station-based temperature  
50 anomalies, are on a regular  $5^\circ \times 5^\circ$  longitude/latitude grid globally. The data are provided  
51 as anomalies, using the 1961-1990 period as the base period, and extend from 1850 to  
52 present. NASA MERRA monthly-mean surface temperatures reside on a  $1.25^\circ \times 1.25^\circ$  grid  
53 globally, covering land and ocean, starting from 1979 to present. Monthly-mean anomalies  
54 from MERRA are computed by removing the climatological monthly means (1979-2011)  
55 from the raw data.

56 Coupled-climate model output are provided from the Coupled Model Intercomparison

57 Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) multi-model ensemble archive, available for download from the  
58 Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) at the Lawrence  
59 Livermore National Laboratory (more information on the program is provided online at  
60 <http://cmip-pcmdi.llnl.gov/cmip5/>). We used all available ensemble members of the  
61 decadal1980 scenario (i.e., the model runs are initialized with conditions as in 1980 and run  
62 for 30 years using mainly observed natural and anthropogenic forcing). Six models were  
63 available and analyzed for this study (see Table 1), each with multiple realizations. Surface  
64 temperature output from the models is interpolated from their native model grids to a  
65 common 2.5° by 2.5° longitude/latitude grid for comparison. Surface temperature  
66 anomalies are then computed by removing the climatological monthly mean from 1980-  
67 2010. Model results are shown as the ensemble-mean of all models and all realizations.

68 When examining seasonal temperature trends, seasons are defined as follows:  
69 December – February (DJF) as boreal winter, March – May (MAM) as boreal spring, June  
70 – August (JJA) as boreal summer, and September – November (SON) as boreal fall. To test  
71 the robustness of any trends, given that the period 1999-2010 spans twelve years, we  
72 computed and tested the significance of multiple periods divisible by six. Therefore we  
73 also computed the temperature trend for the following periods: 2005-2010, 1999-2010,  
74 1993-2010 and 1987-2010. For completeness, we also computed the trend and significance  
75 for the longer period 1979-2010, which includes the full period that satellite data is  
76 assimilated into the reanalysis datasets [*Kalnay et al.*, 1996]. Trends for all periods are  
77 shown in degrees Celsius per five years for comparative purposes.

78

### 79 3. Results and Discussion

80 Figure 1 presents the linear temperature changes from the CRUTEM3 dataset over  
81 five periods (1979-2010, 1987-2010, 1993-2010, 1998-2010, and 2005-2010) and four  
82 regions: globally (Fig. 1a), the NH extratropics (20-90°N; Fig. 1b), the tropics (20°N-20°S;  
83 Fig. 1c) and the Southern Hemisphere (SH) extratropics (20°-90°S; Fig. 1d). Examining  
84 the annual temperature trends, we find that the rate of global temperature increase has  
85 diminished when looking at more recent periods, and this phenomenon is seen outside of  
86 the tropics. Indeed, only the tropics display a significant warming trend for the 1999-2010  
87 interval (Fig. 1c) – elsewhere the trends are not significantly different from zero. The NH  
88 extratropics contains large trends (Fig. 1b), as expected from examining land surface  
89 records, while the SH extratropical landmasses have much smaller trends (Fig. 1d).

90 Upon examining temperature trends seasonally, the global temperature record reveals  
91 that significant warming occurs in three seasons (boreal spring, summer, and fall) for the  
92 four earliest periods (i.e., 1979-2010, 1987-2010, 1993-2010, and 1999-2010). However,  
93 boreal winter (DJF) is the glaring exception in the record – only when starting from 1979-  
94 2010 is the DJF warming significant. For the following periods, the trend is no longer  
95 significant and even turns negative over the last decade. The only sub-region that mirrors  
96 this behavior in global temperature trends is the NH extratropics (Fig. 1b).

97 To check the robustness of this seasonal asymmetry and also examine potential  
98 influences of ocean temperatures on the global temperature trend, we repeat the analysis  
99 from Fig. 1 but using NASA MERRA surface temperature data (Fig. 2). Inclusion of sea  
100 surface temperatures (SSTs) with land temperatures yields similar trend results as from the

101 land-only CRUTEM3 data – i.e., insignificant winter warming trends since the 1980s  
102 despite significant warming in the other seasons (Fig. 2a). Global linear temperature trends  
103 are also dominated by the trends in the NH extratropics (Figs. 2b and 2e). When examining  
104 changes in the trend in NH land and ocean temperatures, we find that SSTs exhibit robust,  
105 significant warming annually and seasonally as late as a start in 1993 (Fig. 2e). Land  
106 regions show similar robust warming annually and for all seasons but winter, the only  
107 season with no statistically significant warming for any period (Fig. 2b). The tropics have  
108 no significant trends in land temperatures or SSTs except when going back to 1979 (Figs.  
109 2c and 2f), and trends in the SH ocean and land are somewhat more random and even  
110 inconsistent between MERRA and the CRUTEM3 datasets (Figs. 2d and 2g; differences  
111 are likely a function of different sampling). Staggering start and end dates by 1-2 years  
112 yields similar results for both NASA MERRA and CRUTEM3 (not shown). Hence, we  
113 confidently conclude that the cessation of global winter warming since 1987 is mostly  
114 attributable to neutral or even cooling temperature trends across the NH extratropical  
115 landmasses. We further computed the same trends using an observational ocean dataset  
116 [*Smith et al.*, 2008 (shown in Supplementary Fig. S1)] and ERA-Interim [*Dee et al.*, 2011  
117 (not shown)] and though trends differ slightly by region, the absence of winter warming is  
118 still tied to NH extratropical land cooling.

119 Focusing on the NH extratropical land surface temperature trends since 1987, Figure  
120 3 shows both the area-averaged temperature anomaly seasonally (Fig. 3a) and spatially  
121 (Figs. 3b-3e). Rapid and significant warming is clearly evident in all seasons but winter,  
122 with the boreal fall land surface temperatures warming the most rapidly. For DJF, the  
123 linear temperature trend is nearly zero. Of importance is the spatial pattern of the linear

124 temperature trends (Figs. 3b-3e). For boreal summer and fall, except for select areas, most  
125 of the NH landmasses are experiencing strong warming trends, at or exceeding 1°C per  
126 decade in central and northern Eurasia (Figs. 3d and 3e). Except for pronounced cooling in  
127 western and northwestern North America, boreal spring temperatures also are warming  
128 strongly (Fig. 3c). However, corresponding to the near-neutral wintertime trend are large  
129 regions of significantly strong cooling trends across Europe, northern and central Asia, and  
130 parts of central and eastern North America (Fig. 3b). This spatial pattern of temperature  
131 trends is reminiscent of the temperature regression pattern associated with the negative  
132 phase of the Arctic Oscillation [AO; e.g., *Thompson and Wallace, 2001*]. Indeed, the  
133 pattern correlation between the winter temperature trend pattern and the temperature  
134 anomaly pattern associated with the negative phase of the AO is 0.85 ( $p < 0.01$ ).

135       The absence of a warming trend in winter is especially surprising given that coupled  
136 climate models project the strongest warming across the NH during boreal winter due to  
137 ‘winter (or Arctic, polar) amplification’ [*Holland and Bitz, 2003; Alexeev et al., 2005;*  
138 *Langen and Alexeev, 2007; Serreze and Barry, 2011*]. We computed the seasonal  
139 temperature trends and anomalies from the decadal 1980 runs available from the CMIP5  
140 model archive for the period 1987-2010. Independent of region or season, the models  
141 forecast positive temperature trends throughout all time periods, with insignificant warming  
142 only over the 2000s (see Supplementary Fig. S2). The model simulated interannual  
143 seasonal temperatures are compared with the NASA MERRA seasonal temperature  
144 anomalies in Figure 4. The annual ensemble-mean NH extratropical land surface  
145 temperatures (solid black line in Fig. 4a) track well with the observed annual NH

146 extratropical land surface temperatures (red line in Fig. 4a), though the ensemble-mean  
147 slightly underestimates the total linear trend for the period ( $\Delta T_{\text{ENSMEAN}} = 0.32^{\circ}\text{C}$  versus  
148  $\Delta T_{\text{OBS}} = 0.49^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). For a more complete comparison of the observed temperatures with the  
149 model simulated temperatures we include a spaghetti plot of all ensemble members in  
150 Figure S3.

151 The models also simulate closely the seasonal trends for spring, summer and fall. For  
152 winter, while there is much more interannual variability in the observed versus simulated  
153 temperatures (the observed temperature falls outside the  $1\sigma$  envelope two thirds of the time,  
154 double what is expected), the correspondence between DJF observed and simulated  
155 temperature trends remains the weakest of the four. Clearly, the difference in the boreal  
156 winter temperature trends represents some poorly resolved or missing forcing that is less  
157 influential in the other three seasons. We also note that the models predict robust cooling  
158 in all seasons due to the radiative forcing from the volcanic eruption of Mount Pinatubo.  
159 The simulated cooling is similar to the observations in all seasons except winter. This  
160 suggests that radiative forcing important in spring, summer and fall is likely masked by  
161 dynamic forcing associated with wave driving in winter. Ongoing research suggests that the  
162 models are deficient in simulating fall snow cover variability and wave forced stratosphere-  
163 troposphere coupling, which is contributing to poor model simulations of the AO and NH  
164 winter climate trends [e.g. *Hardiman et al.*, 2008; *Cohen et al.*, 2012]. As the leading mode  
165 of NH wintertime climate variability, differences in the observed versus simulated AO are  
166 likely an important factor. Indeed, when examining the evolution of the AO and associated  
167 sea level pressure trends across the NH, we find a divergence in the observed trends – the



168 observations illustrate a trend toward *negative* AO conditions during DJF, while the models  
169 actually suggest a slight *positive* trend in the index (Supplementary Fig. S4a). Spatially,  
170 observations indicate statistically significant positive trends in sea level pressure (SLP) at  
171 high latitudes with statistically significant negative trends in SLP at lower latitudes (i.e., a  
172 negative AO pattern), while the models predict no significant SLP trends over the period.

173

#### 174 **4. Summary and Conclusions**

175 Analysis of monthly and annual temperatures over the past decade shows that the  
176 positive global temperature trend has become insignificant and small. Based on previously  
177 reported analysis of the observations and modelling studies this is neither inconsistent with  
178 a warming planet nor unexpected; and computation of global temperature trends over  
179 longer periods does exhibit statistically significant warming. However, upon examining the  
180 trends seasonally, more interesting and significant findings are discovered. In examining  
181 the NH extratropical landmasses, the biggest contributor to global temperature trends, we  
182 find substantial divergence in trends between boreal winter and the other three seasons. A  
183 statistically significant warming trend is *absent* across NH landmasses during DJF going  
184 back to at least 1987, with either wintertime near-neutral or cooling trends. In contrast,  
185 significant warming is found for the other three seasons over the same time period.

186 Based on current literature and our own examination of the latest coupled climate  
187 models, the lack of a significant warming trend in winter spanning nearly three decades is  
188 not likely or expected (less than 10% of the ensemble members analyzed in this study  
189 predicted no warming in winter). Therefore, we argue that any attribution study on the  
190 recent cessation of global warming should explicitly explain the seasonally asymmetric

191 nature of the temperature trend. For example, studies that attribute the recent cooling to  
192 diminished shortwave radiation at the surface are at a great disadvantage since their  
193 influence is maximized during boreal summer and minimized during boreal winter,  
194 opposite to what has been observed.

195       There are theories that argue for recent cooling that is limited to the winter season.  
196 One theory is known as ‘warm Arctic cold continents,’ where a warmer Arctic and  
197 declining Arctic sea ice are contributing to colder winters across the NH continents [*Honda*  
198 *et al.* 2009; *Budikova*, 2009; *Francis et al.*, 2009; *Overland and Wang*, 2010; *Petoukhov*  
199 *and Semenov*, 2010; *Serreze et al.*, 2011]. A second theory is that increasing fall Eurasian  
200 snow cover that may also be related to a warming Arctic is forcing a negative trend in the  
201 winter AO [*Cohen and Barlow*, 2005; *Cohen et al.*, 2009; *Cohen et al.*, 2012]. As Figure 3b  
202 illustrates, the observed winter temperature trend spatially resembles the pattern of  
203 temperatures associated with the negative phase of the AO. Therefore, the inability of the  
204 models to simulate the observed trend in the AO (Fig. S4), may partly explain the poorly  
205 simulated DJF temperature trends.

206

207 Acknowledgements. JLC is supported by the National Science Foundation grants ARC-  
208 0909459 and ARC-0909457 and NOAA grant NA10OAR4310163. VA and JEC were  
209 supported by the National Science Foundation grants ARC 0909525 and Japan Agency for  
210 Marine-Earth Science and Technology. The authors acknowledge the climate modelling  
211 groups (listed in table S1 of this paper), the World Climate Research Programme's (WCRP)  
212 Working Group on Coupled Modelling (WGCM), and the Global Organization for Earth  
213 System Science Portals (GO-ESSP) for producing and making the CMIP5 model  
214 simulations available for analysis.

215

216 **References**

- 217 Alexeev, V. A., P. L. Langen, and J. R. Bates (2005), Polar amplification of surface  
218 warming on an aquaplanet in "ghost forcing" experiments without sea ice  
219 feedbacks, *Climate Dynamics*, 24 (7-8), 655-666, doi: 10.1007/s00382-005-0018-3.
- 220 Brohan, P., J. J. Kennedy, I. Harris, S. F. B. Tett, and P. D. Jones (2006), Uncertainty  
221 estimates in regional and global observed temperature changes: A new dataset from  
222 1850, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111, D12106, doi:10.1029/2005JD006548.
- 223 Budikova, D. (2009), Role of Arctic sea ice in global atmospheric circulation: A review.  
224 *Global Planet. Change*, 68(3), 149–163.
- 225 Cohen, J., and M. Barlow (2005), The NAO, the AO, and global warming: How closely  
226 related? *J. Climate*, 18, 4498–4513, doi: 10.1175/JCLI3530.1.
- 227 Cohen, J., M. Barlow, and K. Saito (2009), Decadal fluctuations in planetary wave forcing  
228 modulate global warming in late boreal winter, *J. Climate*, 22, 4418–4426, doi:  
229 10.1175/2009JCLI2931.1.
- 230 Cohen, J., J. C. Furtado, M. A. Barlow, V. A. Alexeev and J. E. Cherry (2012) Arctic  
231 warming, increasing fall snow cover and widespread boreal winter cooling,  
232 *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 7, 014007 [doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/1/014007](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/7/1/014007).
- 233 Dee, D. P., and Co-Authors (2011), The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and  
234 performance of the data assimilation system, *Quart. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 137, 553-  
235 597.
- 236 Easterling, D. R., and M. F. Wehner (2009), Is the climate warming or cooling?, *Geophys.*  
237 *Res. Lett.*, 36, L08706, doi:10.1029/2009GL037810.

- 238 Francis, J. A., W. Chan, D. J. Leathers, J. R. Miller, and D. E. Veron (2009), Winter  
239 Northern Hemisphere weather patterns remember summer Arctic sea-ice extent,  
240 *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *36*, L07503, doi:10.1029/2009GL037274.
- 241 Hardiman, S. C., P. J. Kushner, and J. Cohen (2008) Investigating the ability of general  
242 circulation models to capture the effects of Eurasian snow cover on winter climate,  
243 *J. Geophys. Res.*, *113*, D21123, doi:10.1029/2008JD010623.
- 244 Holland, M. M. and C. M. Bitz (2003), Polar amplification of climate change in coupled  
245 models, *Climate Dynamics*, *21*, 221–232.
- 246 Honda, M., J. Inoue, and S. Yamane (2009), Influence of low Arctic sea-ice minima on  
247 anomalously cold Eurasian winters, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *36*, L08707,  
248 doi:10.1029/2008GL037079.
- 249 IPCC (2007), *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working*  
250 *Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on*  
251 *Climate Change* [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. B.  
252 Averyt, M. Tignor and H. L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press,  
253 Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 996 pp.
- 254 Kalnay, E., M. Kanamitsu, R. Kistler, W. Collins, D. Deaven, L. Gandin, M. Iredell, S.  
255 Saha, G. White, J. Woollen, Y. Zhu, M. Chelliah, W. Ebisuzaki, W. Higgins, J.  
256 Janowiak, K. C. Mo, C. Ropelewski, J. Wang, A. Leetmaa, R. Reynolds, R. Jenne,  
257 and D. Joseph (1996), The NCEP/NCAR 40-Year reanalysis project, *Bull. Amer.*  
258 *Meteor. Soc.*, *77*, 437-471, doi: 10.1175/1520-  
259 0477(1996)077<0437:TNYRP>2.0.CO;2.
- 260 Kaufmann, R. K., H. Kauppi, M. L. Mann, and J. H. Stock, (2011), Reconciling

- 261 anthropogenic climate change with observed temperature 1998–2008, *Proc. Nat.*  
262 *Acad. Sci.*, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1102467108.
- 263 Langen, P. L., and V. A. Alexeev (2007), Polar amplification as a preferred response in an  
264 aquaplanet GCM, *Climate Dynamics*, 29(2-3), 305-317, doi:10.1007/s00382-006-  
265 0221-x.
- 266 Lean, J. L., and D. H. Rind (2009), How will Earth's surface temperature change in future  
267 decades? *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36, L15708, doi:10.1029/2009GL038932.
- 268 Keenlyside, N. S., M. Latif, J. Jungclaus, L. Kornblueh, and E. Roeckner (2008),  
269 Advancing decadal-scale climate prediction in the North Atlantic sector, *Nature*,  
270 453(84-88), doi:10.1038/nature06921.
- 271 Meehl, G. A., J. M. Arblaster, J. T. Fasullo, A. Hu, and K. E. Trenberth (2011), Model-  
272 based evidence of deep-ocean heat uptake during surface-temperature hiatus  
273 periods, *Nature Climate Change*, doi:10.1038/nclimate1229.
- 274 Overland, J. E., and M. Wang (2010), Large-scale atmospheric circulation changes are  
275 associated with the recent loss of Arctic sea ice, *Tellus*, 62A, 1-9.
- 276 Petoukhov, V., and V. A. Semenov (2010), A link between reduced Barents-Kara sea ice  
277 and cold winter extremes over northern continents, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, D21111,  
278 doi:10.1029/2009JD013568.
- 279 Rienecker, M. M. *et al.* (2011), MERRA - NASA's Modern-Era Retrospective Analysis for  
280 Research and Applications, *J. Climate*, 24, 3624-3648, doi: 10.1175/JCLI-D-11-  
281 00015.1.
- 282 Serreze, M. C. and R. G. Barry (2011), Processes and impacts of Arctic amplification: A  
283 research synthesis, *Global and Planetary Change*, 77, 85–96.

- 284 Serreze, M. C., A. P. Barrett, and J. J. Cassano (2011), Circulation and surface controls on  
285 the lower tropospheric air temperature field of the Arctic, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *116*,  
286 D07104, doi:10.1029/2010JD015127.
- 287 Smith, T. M., R. W. Reynolds, T. C. Peterson, and J. Lawrimore (2008), Improvements to  
288 NOAA's historical Merged Land-Ocean Surface Temperature Analysis (1880-  
289 2006), *J. Climate*, *21*, 2283-2296.
- 290 Solomon, S., K. H. Rosenlof, R. W. Portmann, J. S. Daniel, S. M. Davis, T. J. Sanford, and  
291 G.-K. Plattner (2010), Contributions of Stratospheric Water Vapor to Decadal  
292 Changes in the Rate of Global Warming, *Science*, *327*, 1219-1223,  
293 doi:10.1126/science.1182488.
- 294 Thompson, D. W. J., and J. M. Wallace (2001), Regional climate impacts of the Northern  
295 Hemisphere Annular Mode, *Science*, *293*, 85–89.
- 296

296 **Figure Legends**

297 **FIG. 1.** (a) The linear trend in area-averaged global land surface temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$  per 5  
 298 years) determined from CRUTEM3 for five different periods: 1979-2010 (dark red), 1987-  
 299 2010 (light blue), 1993-2010 (green), 1999-2010 (orange), and 2005-2010 (pink). Filled  
 300 bars represent trends that are significant at the 95% significance level. (b) As in (a) but  
 301 only for the NH ( $20^{\circ}\text{N}$ - $90^{\circ}\text{N}$ ). (c) As in (a) but for the tropics ( $20^{\circ}\text{N}$ - $20^{\circ}\text{S}$ ). (d) As in (a)  
 302 but for the Southern Hemisphere (SH;  $20^{\circ}\text{S}$ - $90^{\circ}\text{S}$ ).

303

304 **FIG. 2.** (a) The linear trend in area-averaged global surface temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$  per 5 years)  
 305 over *land and ocean* from the NASA MERRA dataset. Filled bars represent trends that are  
 306 significant at the 95% significance level. (b)-(d) The linear trend in averaged *land* surface  
 307 temperature only ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$  per 5 years) in the (b) NH ( $20^{\circ}\text{N}$ - $90^{\circ}\text{N}$ ), (c) tropics ( $20^{\circ}\text{N}$ - $20^{\circ}\text{S}$ ), and  
 308 (d) SH ( $20^{\circ}\text{S}$ - $90^{\circ}\text{S}$ ). Filled bars as in (a). (e)-(g) As in (b)-(d) but for *ocean* surface  
 309 temperatures.

310

311 **FIG. 3.** (a) Surface temperature anomalies (solid lines;  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) from CRUTEM3 averaged  
 312 poleward of  $20^{\circ}\text{N}$  from 1988 – 2010 for the four seasons: winter (DJF), spring (MAM),  
 313 summer (JJA), and fall (SON). Linear trend lines (dashed lines) superimposed for each  
 314 season, with the magnitude of the trend ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$  per 10 years) and statistical significance shown.  
 315 The spatial pattern of linear trends in surface temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$  per 10 years) are shown for:  
 316 b) winter, c) spring, d) summer and e) fall.

317

318 **FIG. 4.** (a) (red line) Annual land surface temperature anomaly ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), area-averaged  
319 poleward of  $20^{\circ}\text{N}$ , from NASA MERRA from 1987-2010. (black line) The CMIP5  
320 ensemble-mean annual land surface anomaly, area-averaged poleward of  $20^{\circ}\text{N}$ . Gray  
321 shading represents  $\pm 1\sigma$  from the ensemble-mean. (b)-(e) As in (a) but for (b) DJF, (c)  
322 MAM, (d) JJA, and (e) SON-averaged NH land surface temperature anomaly.

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334



334 **Table 1.** The six coupled climate models from the CMIP5 model archive analyzed for this study. Number of  
 335 ensemble members for the decadal1980 scenario is also indicated.

<b>Modelling Agency, Country</b>	<b>Model Name</b>	<b>Ensemble Members</b>
Canadian Climate Centre for Modelling and Analysis, Canada	CanCM4	10
Météo-France/Centre National de Recherches Météorologiques, France	CNRM-CM5	10
Hadley Centre for Climate Prediction and Research/Met Office, United Kingdom	HadCM3	10
Center for Climate System Research, Japan	MIROC4h	3
Center for Climate System Research, Japan	MIROC5	6
Meteorological Research Institute, Japan	MRI-CGCM3	3

336

337











# NOAA ERSSTv3b




**Fig. S1.** (a) The linear trend in °C per 5 years area-averaged global ocean surface temperature (°C), determined from NOAA ERSSTv3b for five different periods: 1979–2010 (dark red), 1987–2010 (light blue), 1993–2010 (green), 1999–2010 (orange), and 2005–2010 (pink). Filled bars represent trends that are significant at the 95% significance level. (b) As in (a) but only for the NH (20°N–90°N). (c) As in (a) but for the tropics (20°N–20°S). (d) As in (a) but for the Southern Hemisphere (SH; 20°S–90°S).

**CMIP5 ENSMEAN  
(decadal1980)**




**Fig. S2.** The linear trend in area-averaged global surface temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$  per 5 years) over *land and ocean* from the CMIP5 decadal1980 simulations. Filled bars represent trends that are significant at the 95% significance level. (b)-(d) The linear trend in averaged *land* surface temperature only ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$  per 5 years) in the (b) NH ( $20^{\circ}\text{N}-90^{\circ}\text{N}$ ), (c) the tropics ( $20^{\circ}\text{N}-20^{\circ}\text{S}$ ), and (d) the SH ( $20^{\circ}\text{S}-90^{\circ}\text{S}$ ). Filled bars as in (a). (e)-(g) As in (b)-(d) but for *ocean* surface temperatures.



**Fig. S3** (a) Annual land surface temperature anomaly ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), area-averaged poleward of  $20^{\circ}\text{N}$ , from 1987-2010 from NASA MERRA (red), the 42 individual model runs (gray), and the ensemble-mean (black). (b)-(e) As in (a) but for (b) DJF, (c) MAM, (d) JJA, and (e) SON.





**Fig. S4.** (a) The standardized DJF average AO index (defined as the difference in sea level pressure between regions between 35-55°N and regions poleward of 65°N) from MERRA (red), the six CMIP5 models (gray), and the ensemble-mean of all models (black) from 1986/87-2009/10. (b) The decadal SLP trend (hPa per 10 years) from MERRA for 1986/87-2009/10. (c) As in (b) but the CMIP5 ensemble-mean decadal trend in SLP. Values that exceed the 95% confidence interval are delineated by gray contour (i.e., none of the values in (c) are significant).