arXiv:1105.0522v1 [stat.AP] 3 May 2011

*The Annals of Applied Statistics*
2011, Vol. 5, No. 1, 96–98
DOI: 10.1214/10-AOAS409
Main article DOI: 10.1214/10-AOAS398
© Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 2011

# DISCUSSION OF: A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF MULTIPLE TEMPERATURE PROXIES: ARE RECONSTRUCTIONS OF SURFACE TEMPERATURES OVER THE LAST 1000 YEARS RELIABLE?

By Jonathan Rougier

*University of Bristol*

The authors are to be congratulated on the clarity of their paper, which gives discussants and readers much to sink their teeth into. My comments are somewhat critical, but this should in no way devalue this paper as an important contribution to the ongoing debate concerning the information about historical climates that is recoverable from proxies. Figure 14, in particular, provides much food for thought.

In Section 3.2, comparing the proxy-based reconstruction of climate to measures based on actual climate (in-sample mean and ARMA model) is not very helpful for assessing the performance of the proxy—in fact, it confirms information already presented about the nature of the climate process and the relative variability of the proxies. This distracts from the more pertinent finding in Section 3.3 that the proxy-based reconstruction seems to perform no better than various random proxies. Again, though, this result is not necessarily detrimental to the proxy. If one generates 1138 random sequences of length 149 with roughly the right time-series properties, one should not be surprised to find that a 1139th sequence is near the span of a small subset, and it is a testament to the Lasso procedure that it seems to be doing a good job at picking this subset out. Hold-outs at the end of the calibration period would provide a more powerful test; for hold-outs in the middle, one can be fairly confident that if the Lasso finds a match at both ends, then the middle will fit reasonably well. In Section 3.5, the finding that large numbers of pseudo-proxies are selected can be explained in the same way. Moreover, the Lasso procedure will have a bias against selecting actual proxies, if they are correlated with each other. Overall, I do not think that Section 3 presents evidence against the proxies.

Received September 2010.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article published by the Institute of Mathematical Statistics in *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 2011, Vol. 5, No. 1, 96–98. This reprint differs from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

I am bemused by Section 5. First, let us be very clear that this is not a "fully Bayesian" analysis. What we have here is a normalised likelihood function over $\beta$ and $\sigma$ masquerading as a posterior distribution, in order to implement a sampling procedure over the model parameters. This seems a perfectly reasonable ad-hockery [although a Normal Inverse Gamma conjugate analysis would be more conventional; see O'Hagan and Forster (2004), Chapter 11], but to call it "fully Bayesian" is stretching the point. No attempt has been made to write down a joint probability distribution over the observations and the predictands, notably one that accounts for the possibility of auto-correlated error in the proxy reconstruction. Furthermore, the reconstructions are clearly not conditional on the calibration data, which is what the authors assert in Section 5.3. If they were, then there would be no reconstruction uncertainty over the calibration period.

Then there is Figure 15, which is referred to repeatedly to show the poor performance of the proxy-based reconstruction over the calibration period, particularly the 1990s. The statistical model for this figure is initialised with temperatures from 1999 and 2000. But 1998 was probably the warmest year of the millennium, as the authors themselves cite in Section 1, and so the two initialisation values are going to start the reconstruction curve too low. What we may have here is an artifact of a somewhat arbitrary choice of initialisation period. The authors must present evidence that the curve is robust to these choices.

Finally, I have a deeper concern, not about the authors' paper in particular, but about the general principles of reconstruction discussed here. There is a rich literature on statistical methods for reconstructions; ter Braak (1995) provides a review. In this literature, a distinction is made between the "classical" approach, in which the proxies $X$ are regressed on climate quantities $Y$, and the "inverse" approach in which the climate quantities are regressed on the proxies. An advantage of the inverse approach is that it is very tractable—it can proceed one climate quantity at a time, and it leads to a simple plug-in approach in which the historical proxy $x_0$ is used directly to predict the historical climate value $y_0$. The classical approach, on the other hand, is a joint reconstruction over several climate quantities, and requires more complicated methods to predict $y_0$ from $x_0$, such as numerical optimisation (or a Bayesian approach). In its favour, however, the classical approach respects the dominant causal direction (from climate to the proxies) and the statistical model can reflect known features of the ecological response function. The broad finding regarding these two approaches is unsurprising: the classical approach performs better in extrapolation. Given that historical climate reconstruction is clearly an extrapolation from the climate in the calibration period, and given that the proxies generally respond to multiple aspects of climate, the use of the inverse approach, as

adopted by the authors and their forerunners, seems to me to sacrifice too much to tractability.

## REFERENCES

O'Hagan, A. and Forster, J. (2004). *Bayesian Inference*, 2nd ed. *Kendall's Advanced Theory of Statistics* **2b**. Edward Arnold, London.

ter Braak, C. (1995). Non-linear methods for multivariate statistical calibration and their use in palaeoecology: A comparison of inverse ($k$-nearest neighbours, partial least squares and weighted averaging partial least squares) and classical approaches. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* **28** 165–180.

Department of Mathematics
University of Bristol
University Walk
Bristol BS8 1TW
United Kingdom
E-mail: j.c.rougier@bristol.ac.uk