

1 **Reply to comment by Rutherford et al. on “Erroneous Model**
2 **Field Representations in Multiple Pseudoproxy Studies:**
3 **Corrections and Implications”[†]**

4 **JASON E. SMERDON ^{*} AND ALEXEY KAPLAN**

Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University, Palisades, NY

5 **DANIEL E. AMRHEIN**

Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA

^{*}*Corresponding author address:* Jason E. Smerdon, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University, 61 Route 9W, P.O. Box 1000, Palisades, NY 10964. E-mail: jsmerdon@ldeo.columbia.edu

[†]LDEO contribution number XXXX

6 *Rutherford et al.* (2011, hereinafter R11) confirm the errors in *Mann et al.* (2005) and
7 *Mann et al.* (2007a, hereinafter M07) involving the processing of the CCSM (*Ammann et al.*
8 2007) and the GKSS (*González-Rouco et al.* 2003) millennial simulations, as we described in
9 *Smerdon et al.* (2010, hereinafter S10). This is the principal information of note in R11 and
10 it serves to underscore the necessity of our efforts to correct previous results in the published
11 literature. Nevertheless, R11 also advance several additional arguments that require further
12 detailed responses herein.

13 R11 initially make a distinction in their Comment between the two versions of the regu-
14 larized expectation maximization (RegEM) method (*Schneider* 2001), with the apparent pur-
15 pose of: (1) asserting that the RegEM method using truncated total least squares (RegEM-
16 TTLS) is a better climate field reconstruction (CFR) method than RegEM using ridge
17 regression (RegEM-Ridge), the latter of which is used by S10 to discuss the impact of the
18 errors that they identified; and (2) implying that only errors in the peer-reviewed literature
19 regarding RegEM-TTLS need to be corrected, while errors associated with RegEM-Ridge
20 presumably do not. Leaving aside a more detailed discussion of the relative performance of
21 these two RegEM regularization schemes, suffice it to say that any CFR method could have
22 been used to describe the errors discovered by S10, making methodological distinctions in
23 this context immaterial. Moreover, a methodological distinction as applied in (2) is clearly
24 incorrect. Certainly every number published in the peer-reviewed literature is either correct
25 or requires correction, regardless of its methodological provenance. R11 also provide a list
26 of studies published subsequent to M07 (or even after S10) that are allegedly not affected by
27 the errors discussed by S10. While we welcome the news that these later studies were not af-
28 fected by the errors that we have identified, their existence is not germane to the occurrence

29 of previous errors or the need for their correction. Furthermore, no attempts were made in
30 the later publications mentioned by R11 to address the errors in the previous pseudoproxy
31 studies or to clearly indicate that the newer studies were free of those errors. It therefore
32 is important to note that no methodological distinctions or references to subsequent papers
33 circumvent the fact that important errors were present in the underlying pseudoproxy data
34 used in multiple earlier studies and that these associated publications required corrections.

35 R11 subsequently insist that the M07 errors in the regridded GKSS model field were
36 previously addressed in a Comment/Reply exchange between *Smerdon et al.* (2008b) and
37 *Rutherford et al.* (2008) and that “*the GKSS experiments have been re-executed and the*
38 *results published in Rutherford et al. (2008).*” The incompleteness of this previous exchange
39 was specifically discussed by S10, who demonstrated that the source, scale, and character
40 of the problem with the incorrectly regridded GKSS field had not been made clear in the
41 exchange, nor had the complete set of GKSS results from M07 been corrected. Additionally,
42 no corrections were made to the incorrectly regridded GKSS data at the M07 supplemental
43 website until after S10 was submitted to the *Journal of Climate*, almost two years after
44 *Rutherford et al.* (2008) was published. It also must be noted that the impression given
45 by *Rutherford et al.* (2008) was that M07 had correctly applied the *surface* function from
46 the Generic Mapping Tools (GMT) software package (*Wessel and Smith* 1991) to yield an
47 interpolated GKSS model field that was only somewhat different from a bilinear interpolation
48 scheme. We welcome the fact that R11 have now offered an explanation for the real cause of
49 the problem: it was “*an apparent error in the longitude files,*” and not a regular feature of the
50 GMT *surface* function. Nevertheless, given the relative vagueness of the R11 explanation,
51 further clarification is needed.

52 Here we use the GKSS annual surface temperature mean from 1880-1980 C.E. (in keeping
53 with S10) to demonstrate the presumed source of the error in M07. Figure 1a shows this
54 field averaged by S10 onto a 5° spatial grid, but still in its native longitude range (0° – 360°).
55 We apply the GMT *surface* function to the field shown in Figure 1a, obtaining the correctly
56 gridded version of the field shown in Figure 1c with the longitudinal range changed to -180° –
57 180° (we do not endorse the use of the *surface* function for the purpose of regridding fields
58 in general, but we employ it here to reproduce the M07 regridding problem). This result
59 was accomplished using an *-fg* flag in the call of the *surface* function to ensure that the
60 spatial grid was interpreted as geographic coordinates and not as regular numbers. In the
61 absence of the *-fg* flag, the latter interpretation is made and the *surface* function attributes
62 no input data to the grid points with negative longitudes because the input data range from
63 0° to 360° . Consequently, the Western Hemisphere (WH) is interpolated with a continuous
64 bi-harmonic surface anchored only by the points on its eastern boundary. The resulting field
65 is shown in Figure 1d and has a striking resemblance to the M07 product shown in Figure
66 1b. Figure 2 replots Figures 1b and 1d over the range 0° – 360° and illustrates, in both cases,
67 the effect of the anchoring of the WH on its eastern boundary and the resulting discontinuity
68 of the global field at 180° longitude. This example identifies the likely source of the problem
69 in the M07 regridded GKSS field as a mismatch between the ranges of the input and output
70 longitude values that presumably occurred as a result of the “*error in the longitude files,*” to
71 which R11 refer. While we have used the *-fg* flag for simple demonstration purposes, the root
72 of the M07 error does not hinge on the use of any specific flag – it is principally associated
73 with a failure to match input and output longitudes.

74 R11 go on to make several arguments related to the use of the CCSM field and pseudo-

75 proxies in general. We do not contest the point that their incorrect sampling of the CCSM
76 field constitutes an experiment that can be reinterpreted (this point was made by S10),
77 nor do we disagree that other sampling schemes could be intentionally used in pseudoproxy
78 experiments. We nevertheless fail to understand the relevance of these points with regard
79 to correcting previous errors in the literature or the need to accurately report experimental
80 designs.

81 A final point on which we disagree with R11 is the importance of the Niño3 statistics
82 reported in M07. These statistics have not been corrected for the CCSM or ECHO-g pseudo-
83 proxy experiments in M07, in spite of the insistence by R11 that all of the M07 experiments
84 were corrected by *Rutherford et al.* (2008). R11 dismiss the significance of the Niño3 statis-
85 tics by arguing that the M07 paper “*focused on the Northern Hemisphere mean and the overall*
86 *field reconstruction,*” but fail to acknowledge that the reconstructed Niño3 index was one of
87 only two diagnostics used by M07 to assess the spatial skill of the RegEM-TTLS method.
88 This method has subsequently been used by *Mann et al.* (2009a) and *Mann et al.* (2009b)
89 to derive real-world CFRs in which the spatial skill of the RegEM-TTLS method is funda-
90 mentally important, including reconstructions of the Niño3 region that are specifically used
91 for calculations and dynamic interpretations. In both studies, the pseudoproxy tests of M07
92 are used as important methodological validation. *Mann et al.* (2009a), for instance, specifi-
93 cally cite M07 as the study in which their employed CFR method (RegEM-TTLS) “*has been*
94 *rigorously tested with synthetic “pseudoproxy” networks generated from forced climate model*
95 *simulations.*” The Niño3 reconstruction statistics in M07 therefore cannot be considered
96 insignificant because they are in fact the only published pseudoproxy results to date that
97 specifically purport to evaluate the skill of the RegEM-TTLS method in reconstructing the

98 Niño3 index in a global CFR context.

99 We conclude by reiterating the importance of maintaining consistent and correctly doc-
100 umented pseudoproxy experiments for testing CFR methods. The advantage of such ex-
101 periments lies in their ability to provide an objective and common testbed on which recon-
102 struction methods can be systematically evaluated and compared. This advantage is lost if
103 pseudoproxy experiments are inaccurately described or incorrectly executed. The purpose of
104 S10 was to correct errors affecting or confusing discussions in at least seven published papers
105 (*Mann et al.* 2005, 2007a,b; *Smerdon and Kaplan* 2007; *Smerdon et al.* 2008a,b; *Rutherford*
106 *et al.* 2008). Such corrections are fundamentally important for avoiding the perpetuation of
107 these errors in the published literature and to improve testing and development of methods
108 for reconstructing climate fields during the Common Era.

109 *Acknowledgments.*

110 This research was supported by the National Science Foundation by grant ATM-0902436
111 and by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration by grant NA07OAR4310060.
112 We thank J. F. González-Rouco for providing the original GKSS data, Phil Mele for lending
113 his GMT expertise, and Naomi Naik for guidance about portable data access scripts. Sup-
114 plementary code and data for this manuscript are available at [http://www.ldeo.columbia.](http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/~jsmerdon/2011_jclim_supplement.html)
115 [edu/~jsmerdon/2011_jclim_supplement.html](http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/~jsmerdon/2011_jclim_supplement.html).

116

REFERENCES

117

- 118 Ammann, C. M., F. Joos, D. S. Schimel, B. L. Otto-Bliesner, and R. A. Tomas, 2007:
119 Solar influence on climate during the past millennium: Results from transient simulations
120 with the NCAR Climate System Model. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA*, **104**, 3713-3718,
121 doi:10.1073-pnas.0605064.103.
- 122 González-Rouco, F., H. von Storch, and E. Zorita, 2003: Deep soil temperature as proxy for
123 surface air-temperature in a coupled model simulation of the last thousand years. *Geophys.*
124 *Res. Lett.*, **30**, 21, 2116, doi:10.1029/2003GL018264.
- 125 Mann, M. E., S. Rutherford, E. Wahl, and C. Ammann, 2005: Testing the fidelity of methods
126 used in proxy-based reconstructions of past climate. *J. Climate*, **18**, 4097-4107.
- 127 Mann, M. E., S. Rutherford, E. Wahl, and C. Ammann, 2007a: Robustness of
128 proxy-based climate field reconstruction methods. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **112**, D12109,
129 doi:10.1029/2006JD008272.
- 130 Mann, M.E., S. Rutherford, E. Wahl, and C. Ammann, 2007b: Reply. *J. Climate*, **20**, 5671-
131 5674.
- 132 Mann, M.E., Z. Zhang, S. Rutherford, R.S. Bradley, M.K. Hughes, D. Shindell, C. Ammann,
133 G. Faluvegi, F. Ni, 2009a: Global Signatures and Dynamical Origins of the Little Ice Age
134 and the Medieval Climate Anomaly. *Science*, 326, 5957, 1256-1260, DOI: 10.1126/sci-
135 ence.1177303, 2009.

136 Mann, M.E., J.D. Woodruff, J.P. Donnelly, and Z. Zhang, 2009b: Atlantic hurricanes and
137 climate over the past 1,500 years. *Nature*, 460, 880-883, doi:10.1038/nature08219.

138 Rutherford, S., M. E. Mann, E. Wahl, and C. Ammann, 2008: Reply to comment by Jason
139 E. Smerdon et al. on “Robustness of proxy-based climate field reconstruction methods”.
140 *J. Geophys. Res.*, **113**, D18107, doi:10.1029/2008JD009964.

141 Rutherford, S., M. E. Mann, E. Wahl, and C. Ammann, 2010: Comment on “Erroneous
142 Model Field Representations in Multiple Pseudoproxy Studies: Corrections and Implica-
143 tions”. *J. Climate*, in review.

144 Schneider, T., 2001: Analysis of incomplete climate data: Estimation of mean values and
145 covariance matrices and imputation of missing values. *J. Climate*, **14**, 853-887.

146 Smerdon, J.E., and A. Kaplan, 2007: Comments on “Testing the fidelity of methods used in
147 proxy-based reconstructions of past climate”: The role of the standardization interval. *J.*
148 *Climate*, **20**, 22, 5666-5670.

149 Smerdon, J.E., A. Kaplan, and D. Chang, 2008a: On the standardization sensitivity of
150 RegEM climate field reconstructions. *J. Climate*, **21**, 24, 6710-6723.

151 Smerdon, J.E., J. F. González-Rouco, and E. Zorita, 2008b: Comment on “Robustness of
152 proxy-based climate field reconstruction methods” by Michael E. Mann et al. *J. Geophys.*
153 *Res.*, **113**, D18106, doi:10.1029/2007JD009542.


154 Smerdon, J.E., A. Kaplan, and D.E. Amrhein, 2010: Erroneous Model Field Representations
155 in Multiple Pseudoproxy Studies: Corrections and Implications. *J. Climate*, **23**, 5548-5554,
156 doi:10.1175/2010JCLI3742.1.

157 Wessel, P., and W. H. F. Smith, 1991: Free software helps map and display data. *Eos Trans.*
158 *AGU*, **72**, 441, doi:10.1029/90EO00319.


159 List of Figures

- 160 1 (a) Annual GKSS surface temperature mean field between 1880-1980 C.E., as
161 in S10; (b) same as (a) but for the version regrided, used, and archived by
162 M07; (c) same as (a) but after correctly applying the GMT *surface* function
163 (the longitude range has been changed to -180° – 180° as in panel (b)); (d) same
164 as (c) but without the *-fg* flag in the call of the *surface* function, resulting in
165 large-scale smoothing of the WH due to the loss of all WH data. 10
- 166 2 Panels (a) and (b) are for the same data as those in panels (b) and (d) in
167 Figure 1, but for the longitudinal range 0° – 360° to show the anchoring of the
168 smoothed WH on its eastern boundary and the resulting discontinuity of the
169 global field at 180° : (a) M07 processing; (b) resulting field after applying the
170 *surface* function to the field in Figure 1a while omitting the *-fg* flag. 11


(a) Correctly processed, S10



(b) Incorrectly processed, M07



(c) Correct Application of GMT Surface Function



(d) Incorrect Application of GMT Surface Function





FIG. 1. (a) Annual GKSS surface temperature mean field between 1880-1980 C.E., as in S10; (b) same as (a) but for the version regridded, used, and archived by M07; (c) same as (a) but after correctly applying the GMT *surface* function (the longitude range has been changed to -180° – 180° as in panel (b)); (d) same as (c) but without the *-fg* flag in the call of the *surface* function, resulting in large-scale smoothing of the WH due to the loss of all WH data.




FIG. 2. Panels (a) and (b) are for the same data as those in panels (b) and (d) in Figure 1, but for the longitudinal range 0° – 360° to show the anchoring of the smoothed WH on its eastern boundary and the resulting discontinuity of the global field at 180° : (a) M07 processing; (b) resulting field after applying the *surface* function to the field in Figure 1a while omitting the *-fg* flag.