Reconsidering the relationship of the El Niño–Southern Oscillation and the Indian monsoon using ensembles in Earth system models
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Abstract
We study the relationship between the El Niño–Southern Oscillation (ENSO) and the Indian summer monsoon in ensemble simulations from state-of-the-art climate models, the Max Planck Institute Earth System Model (MPI-ESM) and the Community Earth System Model (CESM). We consider two simple variables: the Tahiti–Darwin sea-level pressure difference and the Northern Indian precipitation. We utilize ensembles converged to the snapshot attractor of the system for analyzing possible changes (i) in the teleconnection between the fluctuations of the two variables, and (ii) in their climatic means. (i) We detect an increase in the strength of the teleconnection in the MPI-ESM under historical forcing between 1890 and 2005, which is in contrast with scientific consensus. In the MPI-ESM no similar increase is present between 2006 and 2099 under the Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5 (RCP8.5), and in a 110-year-long 1-percent pure CO2 scenario; neither is in the CESM between 1960 and 2100 with historical forcing and RCP8.5. The static susceptibility of the strength of the teleconnection with respect to radiative forcing (assuming an instantaneous and linear response) is at least three times larger in the historical MPI-ESM ensemble than in the others. (ii) In the other ensembles, the climatic mean is strongly displaced in the phase space projection spanned by the two variables. This displacement is nevertheless linear. However, the slope exhibits a strong seasonality, falsifying a hypothesis of a universal relation, an emergent constraint, that would be valid at all time scales between these two climatic means.

Significance statement
The response in the strength of the relationship between the fluctuations of the ENSO and of the Indian summer monsoon to increasing greenhouse-gas forcing is an open question. However, there is a consensus about weakening in the late 20th century. We reveal, using a carefully devised ensemble approach describing probability distributions correctly, strengthening for this period in the state-of-the-art Max Planck Institute Earth System Model. Neither here nor in the Community Earth System Model is similar strengthening present under 21th-century-like conditions (with stronger greenhouse-gas forcing). The forced response of corresponding climatic means proves to be linear, and to exhibit strong seasonality. Comparing different seasons is a new tool for looking for emergent constraints, the presence of which is excluded here.

Introduction
Probably the most important teleconnection phenomena are those of the El Niño–Southern Oscillation (ENSO) (Bjerknes, 1969; Neelin, 1998). The ENSO is a natural, irregular fluctuation in the tropical Pacific region, and mostly affects the tropical and the subtropical regions; however, it has an impact on the global climate system as well. A crucial and open question that has challenged scientists for decades is how the ENSO would change as a result of the increasing radiative forcing due to the increasing greenhouse gas concentrations. The IPCC has low confidence in what would exactly happen to the ENSO in the future, even though they have high confidence that the ENSO itself would continue (Christensen et al., 2013). There have been several studies (e.g. Guilyardi et al., 2009; Collins et al., 2010; Vecchi and Wittenberg, 2010) that aimed to reveal how the ENSO might respond to greenhouse-gas forcing. However, most of the applied methods have a common drawback: they use temporal averages (including variances, correlations, etc.) in a time-dependent dynamical system, i.e., in our changing climate, or in simplified models thereof.

In a changing climate, where one or more relevant parameters are changing in time, there can be no stationarity by definition, whereas stationarity is crucial for the applicability of temporal averages, as pointed out by Drótos et al. (2015). They illustrate this by taking a toy model, and calculating the traditionally used 30 yr temporal averages in a climate projection. They demonstrate that doing so leads to obtaining misleading information, like false trends. In realistic GCMs globally averaged quantities seem to behave better, but the problem proves to be significant for local quantities and teleconnections (Herein et al., 2016, Herein et al., 2017). Since the ENSO events are identified by temperatures that are warmer or cooler than average, and
teleconnections are defined as correlations between such anomalies, it is important to have a firmly established notion of averages when climatic means are shifting, as also pointed out by L’Heureux et al. (2013, 2017) and Lindsey et al. (2013).

To avoid the problem of evaluating time averages in a changing climate, at least in climate projections, in this study we turn to a gradually strengthening view according to which the relevant quantities of the climate system are the statistics taken over an ensemble of possible realizations evolved from various initial conditions (see e.g. Ghil et al., 2008; Bódai et al., 2011; Bódai and Tél, 2012; Deser et al., 2012; Daron and Stainforth, 2015; Kay et. al., 2015; Stevens, 2015; Bittner et al., 2016; Herein et al., 2016; Herein et al., 2017; Drótos et al., 2017; Hedemann et al., 2017; Lucarini et al., 2017; Suárez-Gutiérrez et al., 2017; Li et al., 2018). In contrast to weather forecast, one focuses here on long-term properties, independent of initial conditions, in order to characterize the internal variability, as well as the forced response of the climate. The mathematical concept that provides an appropriate framework is that of snapshot (Romeiras et al., 1990; Drótos et al., 2015) or pullback attractors (Arnold, 1998; Ghil et al., 2008; Chekroun et al., 2011); for details see section Methods.

Qualitatively speaking, the snapshot view implies that climate change can be better understood if we imagine many parallel Earth systems, instead of the one real Earth system, all of which are controlled by the same physics and are subject to the same external forcing; this method is thus also called that of parallel climate realizations in (Herein et al., 2017). From different initial conditions, these different realizations of the Earth system are evolving in parallel, and after some time, when the particular initial conditions have been forgotten (in the sense of a chaotic memory loss in dissipative systems), the ensemble characterizes correctly the plethora of all possible weather situations permitted in the Earth system. Individual members (realizations) of the ensemble produce different results that reflect the internal variability of the climate of the Earth system. For a thorough justification of the snapshot method in the climatic context, see Drótos et al. (2017).

We emphasize that this approach reflects the point of view of statistical mechanics, which is of great utility for studying the properties of a complex system. In particular, the climate system is a forced and dissipative dynamical system whose properties can be studied in the context of non-equilibrium statistical mechanics (Lucarini et al., 2017). We underline that, if we are far from tipping points, at each time the snapshot attractor of the climate system can be reconstructed from the time-independent attractor of a suitably defined background state (given in this case, naturally, by the pre-industrial conditions) using the Ruelle response theory (Ruelle, 2009; Lucarini et al., 2017).

In this paper we directly construct the snapshot attractor and its natural probability distribution, following Herein et al. (2017), where the snapshot method has already been applied successfully to investigate various teleconnections of the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) in a changing climate. It has been demonstrated in an intermediate-complexity climate model that correlation coefficients have to be taken with respect to the temporally evolving ensemble at each time instant. It has also been demonstrated that traditional correlation coefficients evaluated with respect to time in single detrended time series do not provide a statistically appropriate characterization. The climate indices constructed via temporal averaging have also been shown to take on incorrect values in a changing climate. In the model, the NAO teleconnection pattern has been found to survive the climate change, but its strength has been revealed to be time-dependent (Herein et al., 2017).

In this paper, we apply our new methodology to the relationship between the ENSO and the Indian summer monsoon. To our knowledge, it is the first time that the snapshot approach (taking care of the convergence) is used in the context of these phenomena. We analyze here the response of their relationship to scenarios with increasing radiative forcing in two different aspects: one is how the strength of the connection between the fluctuations of the two phenomena (called a ’teleconnection’) responds, and the other one is a simultaneous observation of the response of climatic means characterizing each phenomenon.

**Subjects of the study**

Our investigations concern ensemble simulations from two state-of-the-art climate models: the CESM (Hurrell et al., 2012; Kay et al., 2015) and the MPI-ESM (Giorgetta et al., 2013). In particular, we consider four ensembles in total. For details not covered here, see section Methods.

The CESM Large Ensemble (CESM-LE’, Kay et al. (2015)) consists of 35 members, and covers the time span of 1920-2100. Between 1920 and 2005, historical climate forcing (Lamarque et al., 2010) is used, and the RCP8.5 (van Vuuren et al., 2011) is applied afterwards, reaching a nominal radiative forcing of $Q = 8.3 \text{ W/m}^2$ by 2100. The MPI-ESM historical ensemble (MPI-ESM-H’ in what follows) has 100 members and runs from 1850 to 2005 under historical climate forcing (Lamarque et al., 2010). The nominal radiative forcing becomes thus $Q = 2.1 \text{ W/m}^2$ by 2005 (similarly as in the CESM-LE). The MPI-ESM RCP8.5 ensemble (which we shall call ‘MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E’) continues the previous runs between 2006 and 2099 under the RCP8.5 (van Vuuren et al., 2011) — by the time of our analysis, 77 members are available. Finally, the MPI-ESM 1-percent ensemble (’MPI-ESM-1pctE’ in what follows) consists of 68 members, and, similarly to the MPI-ESM-H’, it starts in 1850, with the same (pre-industrial-like) external conditions. Being an idealized experiment, the CO$_2$ concentration is increased in this case by 1 percent per year until 1999, while the concentrations of other greenhouse gases and radiative agents are kept constant. The nominal radiative forcing (calculated via the logarithmic response (Ramaswamy et al., 2001)) reached by 1999 is $Q = 8.3 \text{ W/m}^2$. 
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Fig. 1 gives an overview (Meinshausen et al., 2011) of the forcing scenarios, interpreted in terms of the nominal radiative forcing $Q$, in the timespans of our particular investigations (we discarded the beginning of each simulation except for the MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E — see later in this section). Note that the nominal radiative forcing $Q$ is not a parameter of the system, so that its time dependence is not a forcing from a dynamical point of view. Instead, we treat it as a proxy for the aggregated effect of all different forcing agents (which include different tracers in the atmosphere, as well as the varying solar activity and land use — except for the MPI-ESM-1pctE).

The models used here have already been studied regarding how reliable their ENSO characteristics are. It is known that both models underestimate the ENSO asymmetry, but all of the CMIP5 models suffer from this problem (Zhang and Sun, 2014). Generally the MPI-ESM showed relatively good ENSO characteristics compared to observations (Bellenger et al., 2014), and the CESM proved to be an even better tool to model the ENSO, with the results being usually in harmony with observations (Bellenger et al., 2014; Capotondi, 2013). The pattern of the monsoon precipitation is quite realistic in both models, however, the future projections for the Indian region generally have a moderate confidence (Freychet et al., 2015).

In order to ensure memory loss (i.e., convergence to the snapshot attractor (Drótos et al., 2015; Herein et al., 2016; Drótos et al., 2017), which is guaranteed by the fact that the phase space contracts as a result of the presence of dissipative processes), in most cases we drop the first 40 years of the simulation. We emphasize that, in principle, a detailed and dedicated investigation should be carried out in both models to determine the time scale of the convergence, as advocated also in Drótos et al. (2017). Due to technical limitations, however, this is far beyond the scope of the present study, which we believe to nevertheless provide with reliable results with the assumption of maximum 40 years for the convergence time.

A safe estimate of 40 years in CESM originates from the discussion of the relevant time scales in Kay et al. (2015) and from additional CESM results (Kim et al., 2017). As for the MPI-ESM, we suppose, on the one hand, that the relevant time scales are similar in different climate models of similar complexity in similar setups, and, on the other hand, unpublished preliminary results indeed suggest that the duration of a primary convergence should be considerably shorter than 40 years. Furthermore, the initialization scheme of the MPI-ESM-HE and the MPI-ESM-1pctE provide with ensembles that practically characterize a stationary attractor and its natural distribution correctly already at the time of the initialization. However, the members may not be statistically independent from each other, and, more importantly, the stationary attractor (obtained by eternally assuming conditions of 1850) does not coincide with the snapshot attractor of 1850 obtained under the historical forcing scenario of the previous years (Lamarque et al., 2010). For these reasons, it is favorable to drop the beginning (in particular, a time interval of the length of our upper estimate for the convergence time) of the simulations for ensuring memory loss and, at least in the MPI-ESM-HE, a corresponding convergence to the correct attractor of the historical forcing scenario. Since the initial conditions of the members of the MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E are the endpoints of the trajectories of the sufficiently long MPI-ESM-HE, such a drop is not needed for the MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E. For further details about this topic, see section Methods.

We emphasize that our estimates for the convergence time correspond to the convergence properties that are determined by the atmosphere and the upper ocean, and not those that characterize the deep ocean and its abyssal circulation. Since the latter have time scales of thousands of years, it seems to be reasonable to assume that the members of the ensemble do not yet spread in the corresponding variables within the course of less than two hundred years (i.e., within the time span of our study). According to this time-scale separation, we conjecture that the adjustment of the slow climate variables corresponding to the abyssal circulation does not influence substantially the statistical properties investigated here. Note that, otherwise, all the studies on the 21st-century climate change performed by looking at the properties of an ensemble of simulations would be
hopeless. The details of this time-scale separation in the climate system and its particular implications remain the topic of future research.

**Characterizing the ENSO in a changing climate**

The phases of the ENSO are traditionally characterized by looking at carefully constructed climate indexes, which surrogate the dominant features of the behavior of the climatic fields of interest. As a basis for the characterization, we consider the difference, denoted by $p_{an}$, between the monthly or seasonal mean of the sea level pressure at Tahiti and at Darwin (see section Methods). We intentionally choose such a simple variable, since it lacks the need of statistical preprocessing, thus avoiding possible corresponding ambiguities. The difference $p_{an}$ is the basis of the Southern Oscillation Index (SOI) as defined by the Bureau of Meteorology of the Australian Government, also called the Troup SOI: an anomalously low (high) value of $p_{an}$ indicates an El Niño (La Niña) phase (Troup, 1965).

In the Supporting Information (part I), we recall from Herein et al. (2017) that climate indices should be treated carefully in a changing climate. In particular, long-term temporal averaging has to be avoided in their definition, and should be replaced by averaging with respect to the ensemble (after convergence has occurred). Indices or any anomalies defined in this proper way do not carry information about temporal shifts in the climatic mean of the corresponding quantities (like $p_{an}$). Therefore, investigations of shifts in climatic means have to be carried out separately from those targeting the internal variability, an aspect of which is, however, characterized by anomalies or climate indices. In what follows, we shall present examples for both kinds of investigations.

**A forced response of the internal variability: the example of an ENSO teleconnection in a changing climate**

A special aspect of internal variability is the presence of teleconnections: for certain variables characterizing geographically distant regions, anomalies with respect to their climatic mean do not occur independently in a statistical sense. As an example in the case of the ENSO, if $p_{an}$ is anomalously high during the summer months, there is a good chance that the precipitation of the Indian monsoon is also anomalously high.

The simplest way to quantify the strength of the (tele-)connection between two given variables is via Pearson's correlation coefficient $r$ (Rogers and Nicewander, 1988). Note that the correlation coefficient is obtained, by definition, as the average of the product of the anomalies (as defined by subtracting the average and dividing by the standard deviation) of the corresponding quantities. Consequently, a correlation coefficient between anomalies is the same as that between the original quantities. We underline that Pearson's coefficient is limited to detect a linear correlation between the two quantities of interest; nonetheless, it is definitely useful for having a first order picture of the existing correlations in the fields.

In Herein et al. (2017) it has been demonstrated that the traditional evaluation of correlation coefficients, carried out via averaging over time, provides with grossly incorrect results. It is thus important to evaluate correlation coefficients with respect to the ensemble. As this can be done at any instant of time (after convergence), it also enables one to monitor the temporal evolution of the strength of the teleconnection during a climate change. This temporal evolution is one aspect of the response of internal variability to an external forcing. This is what we shall investigate in this Section for the teleconnection between the ENSO and the Indian monsoon.

In particular, we numerically evaluate the ensemble-based correlation coefficient using the sea level pressure difference between Tahiti and Darwin ($p_{an}$), and a particular characteristic of the Indian monsoon, the precipitation over Northern India ($P$) (see section Methods):

$$r = \frac{\langle p_{diff} P \rangle - \langle p_{diff} \rangle \langle P \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle p_{diff}^2 \rangle - \langle p_{diff} \rangle^2} \langle P^2 \rangle - \langle P \rangle^2},$$

where $\langle \ldots \rangle$ denotes averaging with respect to the ensemble.

Although the temporal character of the forcing is quite different in certain ensembles, the results are more easily compared if we plot them as a function of the radiative forcing $Q$ instead of time. One should keep in mind, however, that the response is always expected to exhibit some delay (Herein et al., 2016), and that the nominal radiative forcing $Q$ is just a proxy for the aggregated effects of different forcing agents (see section “Subjects of the study”). The results are presented in Fig. 2 for all ensembles considered. Due to the moderate size of the ensembles, especially for the CESM-LE but also strongly affecting the MPI-ESM ensembles, the numerical fluctuation of the signals are considerable, so much that one cannot read off meaningful coefficients for particular years (corresponding to individual data points in our representation). The fine structure of the time dependence thus remains hidden. What might be identified, however, from our plots are main trends (or their absence), with approximate values on a coarse-grained temporal resolution. Had our ensembles been of infinite size and, thus, able to describe accurately the distribution supported by the snapshot attractor, we would be able to have information at all scales.
We focus in Fig. 2 on the Indian summer, since we did not find considerable correlations for the spring and the autumn (as their precipitation is not of monsoonal origin), and the bounded nature of the precipitation (from below) introduces a strong nonlinearity for the winter. In Fig. 2a, the whole JJA season is taken, the main period of the Indian summer monsoon. Here the MPI-ESM ensembles seem to give a constant value, \( \approx 0.4 \), for the coefficient, both when plotted as a function of \( Q \) and when plotted as a function of the time \( t \) (see the inset). By a visual inspection, no trends can be identified even for the MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E or the MPI-ESM-1pctE. The value itself of the correlation coefficient is in harmony with the observations (Walker and Bliss, 1937; Parthasarathy and Pant, 1985). At the same time, the CESM shows very little positive correlation for JJA (with no trend either). Such a discrepancy is unexpected.

Fig. 2. The time evolution of the correlation coefficient \( r \), plotted as a function of the radiative forcing \( Q \), between the sea level pressure difference \( p_{\text{diff}} \) and the Northern Indian precipitation \( P \), in all three ensembles. The consecutive years are connected by lines. In the different panels, different intervals of the year, as indicated, are considered for which \( p_{\text{diff}} \) and \( P \) are averaged.

In the inset of panel (a), the time evolution is also given as a function of the time \( t \) (omitting the MPI-ESM-1pctE for better visibility).

In the further panels of Fig. 2, the characteristics of the individual months are considered. Fig. 2b shows that the two models approximately agree for June: all ensembles give a constant, positive coefficient, with a value of about 0.2 or 0.3. The coefficient of the CESM-LE is again slightly lower than those of the MPI-ESM ensembles, but the difference is not large. However, for July and August (Figs. 1c and 1d, respectively) the CESM-LE gives a much lower correlation coefficient than the MPI-ESM ensembles. In fact, the former coefficient is undoubtedly negative in August, which is in contrast with the observations and the general expectations. This different model behavior (of unknown origin) in July and August is what underlies the considerably smaller coefficient for the whole JJA season.

Note also in Fig. 2 that the correlation coefficient is typically smaller for any individual month than for the whole season, in any given ensemble.

After the visual inspection, we take to formally testing if the seasonal correlation coefficient for JJA is constant during the timespan of each of the four simulations. Posing a null hypothesis of a changing coefficient leaves the problem undetermined, hence we adapt the null hypothesis of a constant coefficient. Most of our tests are based on the fact that the distribution of the Fisher-transform (Fisher, 1915; 1921), i.e., the area hyperbolic tangent, which we shall denote by \( z \), of an estimate of a given correlation coefficient \( r \) calculated from an ensemble of given size follows a known distribution: it is a Gaussian with a standard deviation of \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{N - 3}} \), where \( N \) is the ensemble size (Fisher, 1936).
From our null hypothesis, it would follow that the Fisher-transforms $z$ of the estimates of our hypothetical constant coefficient calculated in the different years would be independently drawn samples from this known distribution. (In this exceptional case, independence is justified by finding the autocorrelation function of the time series of the correlation coefficient to be near zero and missing any trend in each ensemble.) Thanks to the Fisher-transform resulting in a known distribution, we, first, test by a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test if the estimates from the entire time series (denoting the corresponding p-value by $p_{KS0}$), and those from the first ($p_{KS1}$) and the second half ($p_{KS2}$) of the time series may originate from that known distribution with arbitrary mean. Second, assuming “yes” for an answer, and given that the known distribution resulting from the Fisher-transform is the normal distribution, we can test by a $t$-test if the estimates in the first and the second half of the time series may come from populations with the same mean ($p_{t12}$). Third, to complement the $t$-test, we test by a Mann–Kendall test for the presence of a monotonic trend without any assumption for the shape of the distribution ($p_{MK0}$). See section Methods for the description of the particular tests.

The numerical results in Table 1 for $p_{KS0}$, $p_{KS1}$ and $p_{KS2}$ indicate that the time series of all simulations, either in part or in total, may originate from the hypothesized (stationary) distribution, since all of these p-values are larger than any usual significance level. Surprisingly, we cannot reject stationarity for any of the MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E, the MPI-ESM-1pctE, and the CESM-LE according to $p_{t12}$ and $p_{MK0} > 0.05$; meanwhile, $p_{t12}$ and $p_{MK0}$ being much smaller than the usual significance levels, stationarity can be rejected for the MPI-ESM-HE. This is rather interesting, because the MPI-ESM-HE is subject to the weakest forcing within the considered set of simulations.

One might think that the ability to pose stronger statements for the MPI-ESM-HE originates from its larger ensemble size. In the Supporting Information (part II) we illustrate that it may only be the case for the CESM-LE, but not for the other ensembles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$p_{KS0}$</th>
<th>$p_{KS1}$</th>
<th>$p_{KS2}$</th>
<th>$p_{t12}$</th>
<th>$p_{MK0}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPI-ESM-HE</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>0.000021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI-ESM-1pctE</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESM-LE</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The p-values of several hypothesis tests in the different ensembles. See text for details.

We also conclude that the correlation coefficient may only increase from the first to the second half of the simulation in the case of the MPI-ESM-HE, since $p_{KS1} < 0.05$ for all those possible mean values of the above-mentioned distribution for which $p_{KS2} > 0.05$, and vice versa (not shown). We underline that this is opposing the consensus of the literature about a weakening teleconnection, see the section “Conclusions”.

Given this increase, we now check the sensitivity of our test of $p_{MK0}$ to the presence of a particular kind of a “mostly increasing trend”. We define this kind of signal as a linear increasing relation between the Fisher-transform $z$ of the correlation coefficient and the radiative forcing $Q$ (that is, not the time $t$). We assume this relation to hold at any time instant, i.e., that the response to radiative forcing is instantaneous. We pose our assumption for the Fisher-transform $z$ of the correlation coefficient instead of posing it for the correlation coefficient $r$ itself, because the value of the former (i.e., the area hyperbolic tangent of the latter) is unbounded, so that possible deviations from linearity that arise from a bounded range can be excluded. Note that our assumption implies that the radiative forcing $Q$ can serve as the dynamical forcing which the system is subject to.

By checking the sensitivity of our test to the kind of signal as defined above (not to be confused with climate sensitivity, i.e., the sensitivity of some statistics, or the entire distribution (Chekroun et al., 2011), of a variable of the climate system with respect to a parameter), we mean that we look for the sensitivity of some statistics, or the entire distribution (Chekroun et al., 2011), of a variable of the climate system with respect to a parameter, we mean that we look for the weakest such relation that results in a time series in which $p_{MK0}$ detects a trend at a significance level of 0.05 with a given probability $q = P(p_{MK0} < 0.05)$. We take the actual radiative forcing scenarios and ensemble sizes, and assume the same temporal mean for the Fisher-transform $z$ as the one observed in the actual ensembles. See section Methods for the details of our Monte Carlo algorithm, which is based on 100000 random time series for the circumstances of each ensemble, and which estimates the probability $q = P(p_{MK0} < 0.05)$ as the corresponding proportion among these 100000 time series.
The slope \( \chi \) between the Fisher-transform \( z \) of the correlation coefficient and the radiative forcing \( Q \) assuming an instantaneous linear relation between these two variables (the latter of which represents the dynamical forcing under the given assumption) is, in fact, the static susceptibility (the Fourier transform of the response function taken at zero frequency) of the former variable with respect to the latter one in the terminology of nonequilibrium statistical mechanics (Kubo et al., 1991); see Ruelle (2009) for susceptibilities in dynamical systems. Table 2 gives the results for the sensitivities of our test of \( p_{MK0} \) in the form of the smallest slopes \( \chi \) that would just be detected with two given probabilities \( q \): \( q = 0.50 \) gives the turning point to a more probable detection of the trend than not, and \( q = 0.95 \) gives a trend that is “almost certainly” detected. In Table 2, the values of the correlation coefficient \( r \) that would be present at the beginning and the end of the given simulations with the obtained slopes are also shown.

The results in Table 2 indicate that our hypothesis test is, in terms of the slope, much less sensitive in the MPI-ESM-HE than in the other three ensembles (i.e., small slopes are not detectable in the MPI-ESM-HE, only steep ones), while these other three ensembles are characterized by sensitivities similar to each other. The former finding is a natural consequence of the particular ranges of the radiative forcing \( Q \) in the particular ensembles: this range is small in the MPI-ESM-HE (see Fig. 1), therefore, a steep slope (steeper by a factor of 3) is needed to be present to detect a similar signal in \( z \) as in the other ensembles. Note, however, the counterintuitive nature of the fact that the MPI-ESM-HE is the least sensitive ensemble in terms of the slope (i.e., unlike in the other ensembles, small slopes cannot be detected), yet it is the only ensemble in which we could actually detect nonstationarity (a nonzero slope). The sensitivity in terms of an other measure, in that of the change in the correlation coefficient \( r \) from the beginning to the end of the simulations, i.e., in terms of the detectable signal in \( r \), is similar in all ensembles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( Q = \mathbb{P}(p_{MK0} &lt; 0.05) )</th>
<th>( \chi [1/(Wm^{-2})] )</th>
<th>( r ) at the beginning</th>
<th>( r ) at the end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPI-ESM-HE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPI-ESM-1pctE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CESM-LE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The slope \( \chi \) of the weakest linear increasing relation between the Fisher-transform \( z \) of the correlation coefficient and the radiative forcing \( Q \) that is detected by \( p_{MK0} \) at the significance level of 0.05 with a probability \( q \), under the circumstances of the given ensembles. The corresponding values of the correlation coefficient \( r \) are given for the beginning and the end of the simulations.

The same investigation of the sensitivity has been carried out for the test of \( p_{t12} \) as well. The results, given in Supporting Table S2 (in part III of the Supporting Information), lead to the same conclusions as for the test of \( p_{MK0} \). However, the quantitative values have to be treated with caution, since we explicitly deviate here from the assumptions of the \( t \)-test (see section Methods) by using a linear relation between the Fisher-transform \( z \) of the correlation coefficient and the ever-changing forcing.

To sum up, we actually detected nonstationarity in the MPI-ESM-HE, in which a slope \( \chi \) is “detectable” only if it is 3 times steeper than one that is “detectable” in the other ensembles. At the same time, we could not reject stationarity in the other ensembles. This means that, in terms of a linear and instantaneous relation, the strength of the response to radiative forcing, i.e., the static susceptibility \( \chi \), is estimated to be at least 3 times larger in the MPI-ESM-HE than in any of the other three ensembles.

Now let us try to directly estimate these susceptibilities. If we assume a linear response in terms of the Fisher-transform \( z \) of the correlation coefficient as a function of the radiative forcing \( Q \), the maximum likelihood estimate is given by the least squares linear regression (Press, 2007), since the errors of the data points, as mentioned, come from a Gaussian distribution.
with the same standard deviation (Fisher, 1936), and were found to be independent from each other. Table 3 gives the parameters, with their uncertainty, of the numerically fitted lines of the form of \( z = z_0 + \chi Q \). It becomes obvious that we cannot conclude about any pronounced relationship in the cases of the MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E, the MPI-ESM-1pctE, and the CESM-LE, while we find a well-fitting, positive-sloped line in the MPI-ESM-HE. This finding is also confirmed by the direct visual observation of the Fisher-transform \( z \) of the correlation coefficient as a function of the radiative forcing \( Q \), shown in Fig. 3. (Note in this figure that the regression line, i.e., the most likely linear relationship, is always less steep than what would be detectable by \( p_{MKS} \) more probably than not \((q = 0.50)\), except for the MPI-ESM-HE, in harmony with our finding that we can reject stationarity only for the MPI-ESM-HE.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensemble</th>
<th>( \chi [1/(\text{Wm}^2)] )</th>
<th>( z_0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPI-ESM-HE</td>
<td>0.073 ± 0.016</td>
<td>0.392 ± 0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E</td>
<td>-0.0004 ± 0.006</td>
<td>0.482 ± 0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI-ESM-1pctE</td>
<td>0.008 ± 0.008</td>
<td>0.421 ± 0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESM-LE</td>
<td>0.009 ± 0.006</td>
<td>0.065 ± 0.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The parameters, with their standard errors, of the least squares linear regression \( z = z_0 + \chi Q \) between the Fisher-transform \( z \) of the correlation coefficient and the radiative forcing \( Q \), in the different ensembles.

Fig. 3. The Fisher-transform \( z \) of the correlation coefficient as a function of the radiative forcing \( Q \), plotted with lines connecting neighboring datapoints. Thin and thick black lines correspond to the weakest linear increasing relations, from Table 2, that would be detectable by \( p_{MKS} \) at a significance level of 0.05 with a probability of \( q = 0.50 \) and \( q = 0.95 \), respectively. The thick orange line is the least squares linear regression from Table 3. The different panels consider different ensembles.

Since the relationship between the Fisher-transform \( z \) of the correlation coefficient and the radiative forcing \( Q \) has been found to be approximately linear, and \( Q \) increases mostly in the second half of the 20\(^{th}\) century within the time span of the MPI-ESM-HE (see Fig. 1), we conclude that the increase in the strength of the teleconnection between the ENSO and the Indian monsoon...
is also concentrated to this period. This is confirmed by scanning through all possible subintervals of the time span of the MPI-ESM-HE, and finding the smallest $p_{\text{MK0}}$ values (not shown) to be also concentrated to the second half of the 20th century.

The results presented in this Section are impossible to obtain with traditional techniques (which evaluate correlation coefficients over time in single realizations), as illustrated in the Supporting Information (part IV).

The forced response of the climatic mean of two quantities

Certain aspects of the forced response of the climate system can be represented by the displacement of the climatic mean in projections of the phase space. A point marking the instantaneous climatic mean in such a space represents a statistical signature of all kinds of weather situations permitted in the given time instant. If two such points in this space do not coincide, it means that the dynamical structure (the attractor itself), or, equally, the plethora of all possible weather situations, is different for the given two cases. In the language of thermodynamics, such a climatic mean is thus a “state indicator”, characterizing the “macroscopic” state of the system, but not its “microscopic” state (i.e., the particular realization). Plotting a point for each time instant during a climate change enables one to follow the evolution of this “state indicator” (characteristic of the dynamical structure, i.e., the attractor), clearly separated from the temporal fluctuations, which appear in any particular realization of the system, and which represent the internal variability.

This analysis of the forced response of the climatic mean is already meaningful for one variable, as shown in Supporting Fig. S2, and also in Drótos et al. (2015) and Herein et al. (2016). Actually, the term “global warming” (one specific aspect of climate change) refers to the increase in the climatic mean of the global surface temperature. If we use a phase space of more than one quantities, we can carry out an even more informative investigation: we can study if we find special relationships between the climatic means of these quantities. What we consider particularly interesting is to choose quantities whose fluctuations are already known to be correlated (“teleconnected”) so that we might expect their climatic means to respond to external forcings in a coordinated way as well. One possibility could be a universal functional relationship, which could reflect some robust mechanism, not affected by climate change, linking the investigated quantities. In the following, we focus on the pressure difference $p_{\text{diff}}$, which is related to the ENSO, and on the Northern Indian precipitation $P$, which is a characteristic of the Indian monsoon. To our current study, we shall include the investigation of the seasonality.

Since no considerable climatic shifts are observable in the MPI-ESM-HE, we show, in Fig. 4, numerical results for the other ensembles only. The seasonal cycle is clear and has a very similar shape in both models, with the Northern Indian precipitation $P$ concentrating on the months June-October, and the pressure difference $p_{\text{diff}}$ increasing from June to December, with a “stalling” from September to October. Although the magnitude of the precipitation is similar in the two models, that of the pressure difference is very different: the CESM exhibits a 200hPa offset to smaller values.
Fig. 4. The climatic mean (obtained as the ensemble average) in the sea level pressure difference $p_{\text{diff}}$ and the Northern Indian precipitation $P$. All different months (in the main plots) and seasons (in the insets) are plotted, see the numbering (1-12: January-December, 1-4: DJF-SON). For a given month or season, each data point represents a particular year. The different years are colored according to the color scales on the right. The thin black lines correspond to the slopes fitted by weighted total least squares (Krystek and Anton, 2007). (a) MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E, (b) MPI-ESM-1pctE, (c) CESM-LE.

In the individual months or seasons, the response of the climatic mean is almost identical in the two MPI-ESM ensembles, and it is somewhat different in the CESM-LE. In all ensembles, it closely follows a linear shape in the phase space projection of Fig. 4: both quantities $p_{\text{diff}}$ and $P$ increase. The increase of these quantities agrees with the literature (Power and Kociuba, 2011; Kitoh et al., 2013; Pascale et al., 2016). The linear shape might be a consequence of staying in the regime where the system’s response to the forcing is linear (Lucarini et al., 2017). The slopes are determined by the susceptibilities of the quantities in question to the applied forcing, and we numerically estimate these slopes by fitting lines with the method of the weighted total least squares (Krystek and Anton, 2007). The error of a given data point in each variable is assumed to be proportional to the standard deviation (taken with respect to the natural distribution) in that given variable in the particular year.

Note that in Fig. 4 the slopes of the fitted lines are different in the different months or seasons. As a consequence, there can be no universal functional relationship entangling the climatic means of the variables $p_{\text{diff}}$ and $P$, without involving additional variables, that would be valid at all time scales. The fact that the slope differs from month to month means that the linear response differs when considering different slices of the year. That is, not just the climatic means of $p_{\text{diff}}$ and $P$ fail to satisfy a universal relation, but this implies that nor can the response of these means to a given forcing be related by some function linking only these two variables.

Such a relationship between the response of the snow cover and that of the surface albedo was found by Qu and Hall (2007) by comparing different models. Similar relationships between responses of different quantities, and also between different types of responses of a single quantity, have since been found, and they have become to be referred to as “emergent constraints” (see e.g. Cox et al. (2013), Wenzel et al. (2016), Cox et al. (2018)). As a common feature, different types of emergent constraints are hoped to have the potential to reduce the uncertainty in climate projections evaluated over model ensembles. Our example illustrates that comparing different seasons instead of different models can also be a way of looking for emergent constraints. One should note, however, that even if a season-based study rejects a universally present emergent constraint between certain
variables, like here, it does not exclude the presence of an emergent constraint over a model ensemble if one given slice of the year is compared.

The strong seasonality in our case may be due to the seasonally varying circulation patterns that dominate the investigated regions. Note that the corresponding teleconnection, studied in section "A forced response of the internal variability", is observed only for the summer Indian precipitation, which means that it is also strongly affected by seasonality.

The most prominent feature of the seasonality of the response of the climatic means (Fig. 4) is as follows. The precipitation $P$ responds strongly only in and after the months of the Indian monsoon (June-October), in the form of a large increase, while the other months remaining mostly dry. At the same time, the pressure difference $p_{\text{diff}}$ does not exhibit an enhanced increase in June-September compared to other parts of the year. In the CESM-LE, actually, $p_{\text{diff}}$ exhibits almost no increase in June and July (see the almost vertical lines in Fig. 4c); the increase in $p_{\text{diff}}$ is only considerable in the later part of the year, from September, during which the increase in the precipitation $P$ gets weaker (as indicated by the lines turning to nearly horizontal from August to November in Fig. 4c). Such an absence of a summer response in $p_{\text{diff}}$ is not observed in the MPI-ESM ensembles (Figs. 4a-b). Nevertheless, both models show that one variable can undergo strong changes without corresponding in-phase changes in the other variable.

We note that other choices for the representation of the East-West pressure difference may lead to different trends, cf. Power and Kociuba (2011) and also Vecchi et al. (2006). The phenomenology presented here, however, is not expected to be specific to our choice.

We add that we found it impossible to approximate the correct results to some useful degree when we used the traditional temporal averaging to obtain the climatic means instead of averaging over the ensemble. In particular, we encountered very strong false trends. See the Supporting Information, part V, for details.

Conclusions

In this paper we analyzed ensemble simulations in the CESM and the MPI-ESM subject to historical forcing, to a 1 percent per year increase in the CO2 concentration, and to the RCP8.5. We were interested in the relationship between simple variables characterizing the ENSO and the Indian summer monsoon, both in terms of the fluctuations (the teleconnection) and in terms of the joint response of the climatic means of these variables.

We found that the MPI-ESM satisfactorily reproduces the expected features of the teleconnection, while the CESM behaves more unexpectedly. In the MPI-ESM, the teleconnection undergoes a considerable strengthening in the modeled historical period between 1890 and 2005, concentrated to the second half of the 20th century. In the same model, however, its strength changes only less, if it changes at all, between 2006 and 2099 under the RCP8.5, and also in a time interval of 110 years under a 1-percent pure CO2 scenario — in both of the latter scenarios, the radiative forcing is practically always higher, and covers a much wider range than in the historical forcing scenario (see Fig. 1). The change in the strength of the teleconnection can also be only smaller in the 1960-2100 time interval simulated according to historical forcing and the RCP8.5 in the CESM. Regardless of the particular magnitudes of the changes, the static susceptibility of the strength of this teleconnection with respect to radiative forcing (assuming an instantaneous and linear response) is much larger in the MPI-ESM-HE than in the other ensembles: we estimate that it is at least a factor of 3 larger.

The detailed analysis of these surprising conclusions is left for future work, but two simple explanations might be as follows. On the one hand, the response of the strength of the teleconnection to radiative forcing might be very complicated (e.g. extremely nonlinear, including the case of nonmonotonicity) in the investigated range of the forcing. On the other hand, the strength of the teleconnection might respond in a different way to variations in different forcing agents. Remember that the nominal radiative forcing $Q$ represents the aggregated effects from several different agents. In particular, volcanism is enhanced in the late 20th century. It is even possible that the increase in the nominal radiative forcing $Q$ and in the strength of the teleconnection is just a coincidence, the latter possibly resulting from mechanisms not related to the increase in the geographically averaged net energy flux.

The increasing strength of the studied teleconnection in the second half of the 20th century in the MPI-ESM is in sharp contrast with the consensus about its decreasing strength in the late 20th century (Krishna Kumar et al., 1999; Kinter et al., 2002; Ashrit et al., 2005; Boschat et al., 2012; Chowdary et al., 2012). At the same time, there is no consensus about the evolution of this strength in 21st-century climate projections (Ashrit et al., 2001; Ashrit et al., 2003; Ashrit et al., 2005; Annamalai et al., 2007; Li and Ting, 2015; Ruqing et al., 2015). It is recognized in many studies (Kinter et al., 2002; Ashrit et al., 2003; Ashrit et al., 2005; Annamalai et al., 2007; Kitoh, 2007; Chowdary et al., 2012; Li and Ting, 2015) that “modulations” in the studied correlation coefficient, when calculated over different time intervals (as done by e.g. Boschat et al. (2012) and Ruqing et al. (2015)) or over moving (sliding) time windows (as done by e.g. Krishna Kumar et al. (1999), Ashrit et al. (2001), Kinter et al. (2002), Ashrit et al. (2003), Ashrit et al. (2005), Annamalai et al. (2007), Kitoh (2007), Chowdary et al. (2012), Li and Ting (2015)), can appear as a result of internal variability, but these “modulations” are interpreted as actual changes in the strength
of the teleconnection. However, from a probabilistic point of view, the correlation coefficient characterizes the co-occurrences of anomalies over all possibilities permitted by the underlying probability distribution (by the internal variability itself), and any “modulations” can only result from an incorrect sampling of this probability distribution (which is the natural distribution supported by the attractor of the climate system).

Such an incorrect sampling is one performed by using (static or moving) time windows to calculate the correlation coefficient, as demonstrated in Herein et al. (2017) and confirmed in our current example in the Supporting Information (part IV) (and even taking an ensemble mean of such correlation coefficients would not eliminate the spurious properties of the analyzed signal unless the ensemble size were asymptotically large). A further possible source of the incorrect nature of the evaluation of correlation coefficients with respect to time is the presence of forced trends in the compared signals: a sound evaluation can only be carried out after removing such trends, see Herein et al. (2017), and previous works in the literature (see above) usually do not discuss if a detrending was carried out for the analysis (exception are e.g. Ashrit et al. (2003), Boschat et al. (2012) and Chowdary et al. (2012)). Although we found the detrending to be unimportant in the MPI-ESM-HE (see Supporting Information, part IV), stronger trends present in the climatic means of 21st-century simulations make this an important issue. We emphasize that with a correct sampling of the relevant probability distribution, a change in the correlation coefficient is only possible if this distribution is altered as a response to some external forcing.

It should be noted, however, that low-frequency components of the internal variability can indeed lead to longer periods of time when the relationship between the anomalies of the investigated variables appears to be stronger or weaker, and recognizing such periods would undoubtedly be of practical relevance. Nevertheless, in long-term climate projections in which initial conditions are forgotten, it is impossible, by definition, to predict the occurrences of such periods. What is more important, the technique of moving time windows artificially introduces such characteristics to the observed signals (cf. Supporting Information, part IV). It is thus hard to judge if the trends and “modulations” reported in the literature are such artifacts or correspond to some low-frequency modes of the internal variability.

Taking into account the above considerations, and without being able to select the “same” realization of the internal variability in our study, dedicated further investigations are required to decide if the discrepancy about the trends in the studied correlation coefficient, with special attention on the 20th-century behavior, between our results and those in the literature is due to the incorrect methodology of the existing analyses, or to modeling issues and differences. Nevertheless, our experience with the traditional techniques (see Supporting Information, part IV) suggests that the former aspect is relevant.

As a complementary investigation to that of teleconnections, visualizing the forced response of the climatic mean in low-dimensional projections of the phase space reveals separate information about relations or their absence between the selected quantities. Unlike for the teleconnection, we found obviously strong displacements in the phase space projection spanned by the Tahiti–Darwin sea-level pressure difference and the Northern Indian precipitation. In spite of these strong displacements, a linear relation between the response of these two quantities was revealed, which potentially originates from staying in the linear response regime. However, the slope exhibits a very strong seasonality, falsifying a hypothesis of a universal functional relationship (corresponding to an emergent constraint (Qu and Hall, 2007)) between these two quantities without involving further variables. As for the Northern Indian precipitation alone, we have shown that the summer monsoon gets much stronger in scenarios with an increasing radiative forcing.

Depending on the mechanism that gives rise to emergent constraints, our finding might have the important practical implication that the lack or presence of an emergent constraint in a certain model ensemble can be prompted by a seasonal analysis of a single model, similar to what is presented here. In particular, if seasonality does have an effect, any universal relationship that possibly exists between the investigated variables must involve further variables, too.

An additional important experience, illustrated in the Supporting Information (part V), is that temporal averages evaluated with running windows over single time series can produce strongly misleading trends for climatic means in GCMs. As previous work (Herein et al., 2017) has shown that correlation coefficients in GCMs cannot be evaluated meaningfully by this kind of averaging either (cf. the above discussion about the apparent “modulation” of the correlation coefficient), confirmed here in the Supporting Information (part IV), using this kind of averaging is a questionable practice for evaluating any statistics in general: the error of temporal averages (Drótos et al., 2016) needs to be investigated separately in different circumstances. As for the climate indices of the ENSO (or of any other climate feature), the traditionally used indices have to be updated and substituted by snapshot-based indices if the forcing is time-dependent (see the Supporting Information, part I).

We underline that the snapshot framework provides with the conceptually correct probability distribution for all variables of the climate system, it is mathematically established and is devoid of any subjectivity, and it can separate externally induced trends from internal fluctuations (including the characterization of teleconnections). We therefore call the attention of the climate research community to the importance of evaluating any statistics in long-term climate projections within this framework, preferably with increased ensemble sizes.
Methods

Snapshot method

Qualitatively speaking, a snapshot attractor exists in dissipative systems of arbitrary, non-periodic forcing, and it is a unique object of the phase space, to which an ensemble of trajectories converges within a basin of attraction. The initial condition of the ensemble is “forgotten” if the dissipative dynamics is also chaotic: after some time (called the convergence time), the evolution of the particular ensemble becomes independent of its initial position within the basin of attraction. The attractor characterizes the long-term behavior of the initially different trajectories, along with the distribution traced out by the ensemble, a probability distribution which is well-defined and unique. The snapshot attractor and its distribution may, of course, depend on time, and this is uniquely determined by the forcing scenario of the system. In contrast to the traditional temporal (e.g. 30-year) averages, the snapshot picture is always related to the instantaneous dynamical structure of the system. In climate-related investigations yearly or monthly quantities (e.g. a yearly average) can be considered instantaneous, since a year or a month is much shorter than the characteristic time scale of the changes.

Community Earth System Model-Large Ensemble (CESM-LE)

In this study results from the Community Earth System Model (CESM, Hurrell et al. (2012)), a state-of-the-art CMIP5 climate model are analyzed. The CESM community designed the CESM Large Ensemble (CESM-LE) with the explicit goal of enabling assessment of climate change in the presence of internal climate variability. All CESM-LE realizations use a single model version (CESM with the Community Atmosphere Model, version 5) at a resolution of 192 x 288 in latitudinal and longitudinal directions, with 30 atmospheric level. The core simulations “replay” approximately two centuries, years 1920–2100, under an external forcing that is historical (Lamarque et al., 2010) up to 2005 and follows the representative concentration pathway 8.5 (RCP8.5) (van Vuuren et al., 2011) afterwards. The ensemble members have small differences in the initial conditions. In this study the first 35 members of CESM-LE have been used. For the details see Kay et al. (2015).

MPI-ESM ensembles

The state-of-the-art CMIP5 climate model Max Planck Institute Earth System Model (MPI-ESM, Giorgetta et al. (2013)) was also used to produce ensembles to explore internal variability in a changing climate (Stevens, 2015; Bittner et al., 2016). The single configuration applied for this purpose is model version MPI-ESM1.1 in low resolution (LR) mode, which corresponds to a horizontal resolution of T63 with 47 vertical levels in the atmosphere, and to 1.5-degree horizontal resolution with 40 vertical levels in the ocean The historical ensemble (‘MPI-ESM-HE’) has 100 members and runs from 1850 to 2050 under historical climate forcing (Lamarque et al., 2010). The MPI-ESM RCP8.5 ensemble (MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E) continues the previous runs between 2006 and 2099 under the RCP8.5 (van Vuuren et al., 2011) — by the time of our analysis, 77 members are available. Finally, the MPI-ESM 1-percent ensemble (‘MPI-ESM-1pctE’), consists of 68 members, and, similarly to the MPI-ESM-HE, it starts in 1850, with the same (pre-industrial) external conditions. Being an idealized experiment, the CO₂ concentration is increased in this case by 1 percent per year until 1999, while the concentrations of other greenhouse gases and radiative agents are kept constant.

The initialization of each member in the MPI-ESM-HE and the MPI-ESM-1pctE is done by picking a particular time instant from a 2000-year-long pre-industrial control run, in which external conditions are kept at the 1850 level eternally. The different members thus sample the complete (atmospheric) attractor corresponding to 1850, but they might not be perfectly uncorrelated from each other, since the average time between their initializations is around 20 years, which is less than the 40-year “safety limit” for the convergence and for the corresponding memory loss (see the discussion in the last paragraphs of the first section). As the total length of the preindustrial run, 2000 years, is much longer than 40 years, the preindustrial attractor is nevertheless sampled correctly by the initial conditions, and their potential correlation can be interpreted as a smaller effective size of the ensembles at the beginning of the simulations (up to e.g. 1890).

While this is one reason to skip this initial period for the computations, a more important reason is that the stationary attractor of the preindustrial control run, obtained by assuming conditions of 1850 eternally, is not identical to the snapshot attractor of 1850 that is determined by the historical forcing scenario (Lamarque et al., 2010) before 1850. Although this difference is supposed to be small, it follows from its presence that also afterwards, in the initial years of the simulation, the ensemble members of the MPI-ESM-HE are not distributed according to the natural distribution of the historical forcing scenario. The members become distributed according to this natural distribution only after convergence takes place to this latter distribution (i.e., the 1850 initial conditions are forgotten). Our “safe estimate” is 1890 for the time when the convergence is ready, and we believe that this is a strong theoretical argument for discarding the preceding period before this year from the MPI-ESM-HE (unlike in e.g. Hedemann et al. (2017)). For consistency and comparability, it seems to be reasonable to discard this period from the MPI-ESM-1pctE, too. However, as for the MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E, the initial conditions of its members are the endpoints of the trajectories of the MPI-ESM-HE, which have already converged by 1890, i.e., earlier than the beginning of the MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E in 2006. Therefore, discarding of initial years is not needed in the MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E.
The numerical calculation of $p_{\text{null}}$ and $P$

For the sea-level pressure difference $p_{\text{null}}$ between Tahiti and Darwin, we took the sea-level pressure at the models’ gridpoints that are closest to (17°31’ S, 21°26’ E) for Tahiti and (12°28’ S, 130°50’ E) for Darwin, and calculated their difference.

For the precipitation over Northern India, $P$, a rectangular box domain has been used with its corners located at the following coordinates: (31° N, 76° E), (31° N, 88° E), (17° N, 76° E), and (17° N, 88° E). We chose this box as it contains the observed monsoon precipitation maxima along the Indian and the Nepalese Himalayas, which also appear in the models. The precipitation $P$ is obtained as the spatial mean of the total precipitation over this rectangular domain.

Hypothesis tests

For $p_{\text{KS0}}$, $p_{\text{KS1}}$ and $p_{\text{KS2}}$, we use the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test that tests whether some observed values may originate from a Gaussian distribution with a given mean and standard deviation (Massey, 1951). While the latter is determined by our null hypothesis, the mean is unknown. In the lack of any a priori assumption for the mean, we sweep through a very wide neighborhood of the mean value which we estimated from the observed data, with high resolution, and select the highest $p$-value that we encounter. We carried out the said Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests using the Matlab function ‘kstest’.

The value of $p_{\text{KS2}}$ is calculated from the unpaired two-sample $t$-test (Fisher, 1936), which assumes that the two observed datasets come from Gaussian distributions with the same standard deviation, and tests whether these two Gaussian distributions may have the same mean. In our case, $p_{\text{KS1}}$ and $p_{\text{KS2}}$ is intended precisely to test for deviations from the mentioned assumptions in the two datasets to be compared. The results for $p_{\text{KS1}}$ and $p_{\text{KS2}}$ (see section “A forced response of the internal variability: the example of an ENSO teleconnection in a changing climate”) does not exclude that the assumptions are fulfilled, so that the deviation from them cannot be extremely large. If we additionally consider that the $t$-test is relatively robust against deviations from its assumptions (Markowski and Markowski, 1990; Lumley et al., 2002), we conclude that carrying out the $t$-test provides with meaningful results. We carried out the said $t$-tests using the Matlab function ‘ttest2’.

The Mann-Kendall test (Mann, 1945; Kendall, 1975), which we use for $p_{\text{MK0}}$, tests the null hypothesis of the absence of a monotonic trend, without any assumption for the shape of the distribution. It is thus ideally suited for our purpose of testing stationarity if we suppose that a relatively weak forcing, like those in the ensembles studied in this paper, cannot result in nonmonotonic trends. Furthermore, if the absence of a monotonic trend can be rejected, this implies that stationarity can also be rejected. We carried out the Mann-Kendall tests using the user-defined Matlab function ‘Mann_Kendall’ available from https://uk.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/25531-mann-kendall-test.

Estimating the sensitivity of the Mann-Kendall test in the particular ensembles

Besides the $p_{\text{MK0}}$ value according to which we reject or not stationarity, it is also important to know how strong nonstationarity needs to be present for a rejection — this is what we regard as the sensitivity of the Mann-Kendall test. This sensitivity, of course, depends on the particular choice of the significance level $p_{\text{null}}$ for rejection.

Without additional constraints for the nonstationary signal, the sensitivity cannot be determined. With regards to the underlying physical process, we determine the sensitivity to the presence of an instantaneous, linear increasing relation between the Fisher-transform $z$ of the correlation coefficient and the radiative forcing $Q$ (i.e., not the time $t$).

By choosing an instantaneous relation we neglect the delay that is certainly present (Herein et al., 2016); this delay can be, however, assumed to be small compared to the time scale of the changes in the entire simulations. Unfortunately, we would be able to estimate the delay only if we knew the precise time series of the Fisher-transform $z$. It is even more important to recall from section “Subjects of the study” that the radiative forcing $Q$ is not the dynamical forcing which the system is subject to. By assuming a functional relationship between a variable (the Fisher-transform $z$ in our case) and the radiative forcing $Q$, we implicitly also assume that the latter can serve as the dynamical forcing. This can be regarded as an approximation, which can prove to be invalid if the data does not fit well to the assumed functional relationship. At least for the MPI-ESM-HE, a reasonable fit can be found (cf. Table 3 and Fig. 3), but note that this does not imply that the assumption or approximation is principally correct.

Assuming the linear relation defined above, we look for the weakest slope that results, under the imposed forcing of each simulation, in a time series that is rejected by the Mann-Kendall test to miss any monotonic trend (in what follows, we shall call this as the weakest nonstationarity that is ‘detectable’ or ‘detected’). Note that the radiative forcing is different in each ensemble simulation analyzed in our study, which is one reason why we have to carry out the estimation separately for each ensemble. Although there is a forcing scenario, the historical one, in which the radiative forcing $Q$ is not perfectly monotonic in time, a rejection still implies in this case that the corresponding, nonmonotonic time series of the Fisher-transform $z$ cannot be stationary.
The linear dependence of the Fisher-transform $z$ on the forcing with a given slope still does not determine the observed time series of $z$. Instead, each data point (corresponding to one particular year) in this time series is a sample drawn from a Gaussian distribution, the mean of which is the actual Fisher-transform $z$ in the given year, and the standard deviation of which is $1/\sqrt{N-3}$, where $N$ is the ensemble size (Fisher, 1936). (Note that this implies that data points of different years are drawn from different distributions, which differ in their mean, but not in their shape and standard deviation.) Because of the stochastic nature of the generation of the series, the weakest nonstationarity that is detectable cannot be determined definitely. For this reason, we proceed as follows, separately for each ensemble.

We assume that a particular slope is present, and we generate 100000 different time series according to the time-dependent distribution described in the previous paragraph. Among these 100000 different time series, the proportion $q$ of those in which rejection occurs is our Monte Carlo estimate for the probability $\mathcal{P}$ of detecting the nonstationarity. By varying the slope with successive approximation, we find the slope that corresponds to a given, prescribed detection probability $q = \mathcal{P}(p < p_{\text{sig}})$. Two intuitive choices for $q$ are $q = 0.50$, which gives the turning point to a more probable detection of the trend than not, and $q = 0.95$, which gives a trend that is “almost certainly” detected. The slope obtained this way is what we regard to characterize the sensitivity of the Mann-Kendall test to our assumed form of nonstationarity.
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Supporting Information, part I: The Southern Oscillation Index in a changing climate

The Southern Oscillation Index (SOI) is one of the most important climate indices; it is used to detect changes in ENSO both for the past and in predictions (Power and Kociuba, 2011). There are different definitions for the SOI, but all of them agree in using temporal averages. For simplicity, let us take the station-based definition by the Bureau of Meteorology of the Australian Government (BOM), which is also called the Troup SOI (Troup, 1965):

\[
SOI = 10 \frac{p_{\text{diff}}(t) - p_{\text{diff}}(t)}{\sqrt{p_{\text{diff}}(t^2) - p_{\text{diff}}(t)}^2}.
\]  

Here \(p_{\text{diff}}\) is the difference between the mean sea level pressures at Tahiti and Darwin for a particular month (in our paper, we allow for seasonal means as well). The overbar denotes long-term average over some fixed interval of time (e.g. between 1920 and 1950). What is called a La Niña (El Niño) phase corresponds to a positive (negative) value of the SOI if its magnitude exceeds 7 according to BOM.

The problem with (S1) is two-fold. First, the time averages are constants, so that \(p_{\text{diff}}\), the only time-dependent term, includes climatic trends instead of characterizing solely anomalies with respect to the instantaneous climatic mean (which is changing in time itself). This problem is illustrated well by considering different climatologies, i.e., taking the temporal averages over different time intervals: it turns out that the values of SOI can be dramatically misleading. Fig. S1 shows that we obtain several years when we can identify even both La Niña or El Niño phase depending on the applied climatology. See also Supplementary Discussion I of Herein et al. (2017).

Although there exist sophisticated methods for removing trends from time series, they can resolve the problem only approximately without an a priori knowledge of what should be identified as a trend (i.e., how the real expectation value of a given quantity evolves in time). Furthermore, the experience of Herein et al. (2016) and Herein et al. (2017) indicates that time averages of relevant quantities taken over single time series are influenced by internal variability too much to be able to represent expectation values faithfully. Note that both problems are present for any traditional definition of SOI (or that of any climate index), including those that normalize the sea-level pressures first and take the difference afterwards (e.g. Trenberth, 1976; 1984).

All conceptual problems are resolved, however, by a new, snapshot-based SOI (which we denote by SOI_E):

\[
SOI_E = 10 \frac{p_{\text{diff}}(t) - \langle p_{\text{diff}}(t) \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle p_{\text{diff}}(t^2) \rangle - \langle p_{\text{diff}}(t) \rangle^2}},
\]  

where \(\langle \ldots \rangle\) denotes averaging with respect to the ensemble in the given time instant \(t\) (but only after convergence took place). Evaluating the averages as such ensures the incorporation of the correct properties of the underlying probability distribution. In particular, SOI_E gives the deviation of \(p_{\text{diff}}\) of one given realization (note that this is the modeling equivalent of an instrumental record) from the expectation value of \(p_{\text{diff}}\), normalized by the standard deviation. This is so in any year, as a consequence of which a natural detrending is provided: the climatic mean of SOI_E is always zero, and the climatic standard deviation of it is always unity times 10.

Note that due to the perpetual zero mean and constant standard deviation, signatures of climate change may be observed only in higher moments of snapshot-based indices or anomalies, like (S2), so that shifts towards a particular phase or sign cannot exist in the sense of averages. On the contrary, climate change (a response to external forcing) is obviously detectable in ensemble means of non-detrended quantities, see e.g. Fig. S2, and the section entitled “The forced response of the climatic mean of two quantities” in the main text.
Supporting Fig. S1. The traditional Troup SOI (S1) for the month of November, in the first realization of CESM-LE, as a function of time. Panel (a) shows SOI calculated with a standard climatology (1920-1950), panel (b) shows the same with a different climatology (2070-2100). For the climatology the model data have been used. $p_{\text{diff}}$ of (S1) has been calculated according to section Methods.

Supporting Fig. S2. The November sea level pressure difference ($p_{\text{diff}}$) between Tahiti and Darwin versus time, in the first realization of CESM-LE (blue), and after averaging over the ensemble instantaneously (red). Grey color indicates all further members of the 35-member ensemble of CESM-LE. The ensemble average shows an enhanced increase (a “hockey stick”) after the year 2050. $p_{\text{diff}}$ has been calculated according to section Methods.
Supporting Information, part II

To check whether the ability to pose stronger statements for the MPI-ESM-HE in Table 1 originates from the larger size of this ensemble, we take 10000 examples of smaller subsets of the MPI-ESM-HE that are of the same size as the other three ensembles (77, 68, and and 35 members, respectively), and calculate the proportions $q$ (a Monte Carlo-type probability $P$) in which stationarity is rejected according to $p_{t12}$ and $p_{MK0}$. Given in Supporting Table S1, the high proportions for the 77-member and the 68-member subsets of the MPI-ESM-HE suggest that failing to reject stationarity in the MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E or the MPI-ESM-1pctE is not due to their smaller size. The more moderate proportions for the size of 35 members leaves the same question open for the CESM-LE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$q = P(p_{t12} &lt; 0.05)$</th>
<th>$q = P(p_{MK0} &lt; 0.05)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77 members</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 members</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 members</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting Table S1. The proportion $q$ in 10000 subsets of the MPI-ESM-HE of given size in which $p_{t12} < 0.05$ and $p_{MK0} < 0.05$, respectively.
### Supporting Information, part III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$q = P(p_{0.12} &lt; 0.05)$</th>
<th>$\chi [1/(\text{Wm}^2)]$</th>
<th>$r$ at the beginning</th>
<th>$r$ at the end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPI-ESM-HE</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPI-ESM-RCP8.5E</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPI-ESM-1pctE</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CESM-LE</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Supporting Table S2. The slope $\chi$ of the weakest linear increasing relation between the Fisher-transform $z$ of the correlation coefficient and the radiative forcing $Q$ that is detected by $p_{0.12}$ at the significance level of 0.05 with a probability $q$, under the circumstances of the given ensembles. The corresponding values of the correlation coefficient $r$ are given for the beginning and the end of the simulations.*
Supporting Information, part IV: The forced response of the correlation coefficient as obtained by evaluation over time

We shall illustrate here that the traditional technique for evaluating correlation coefficients and for investigating their time evolution can lead to strongly misleading results in our case. The traditional technique takes a single realization, and calculates the correlation coefficient with respect to time within some given time interval, a window, of length $\Delta t$. The time evolution of the correlation coefficient is obtained in this case by moving (sliding) this window along the time series. Since forced trends can obscure the relationship between the fluctuations, some kind of detrending of the two time series to be compared is usually needed. For illustrative purposes, we choose here one of the simplest detrending techniques: we subtract a moving average, calculated within a time window of length $\tau$, from the original time series.

We calculate the time evolution of the JJA correlation coefficient for two different members of the MPI-ESM-HE using the above-described technique, and we compare several values of the freely chosen parameters $\Delta t$ and $\tau$ (including a calculation without detrending, too). In Fig. S3, we compare the results to each other, to the actually observed time evolution (the forced response) in the ensemble, and to the estimate obtained by linearly regressing the Fisher-transform $z$ of the correlation coefficient to the radiative forcing $Q$ (see Section “A forced response of the internal variability”, and Table 3 in particular). It is obvious that the traditionally evaluated signals exhibit very little similarities with the correctly evaluated one and with the linear regression. In particular, the fluctuations are typically much larger, and long periods exhibiting apparent, false trends can be seen. This particular example is not sensitive to detrending, but the choice for the time window $\Delta t$, over which the correlation coefficient is evaluated, is important: with increasing $\Delta t$, the fluctuations become smaller, but the length of the periods with false trends increases (and, as a result, the slope of these false trends decreases). Nevertheless, the main character of the signal in a particular realization is similar for different values of $\Delta t$.

Note that both realizations can serve as an example for what can be instrumentally recorded on a planet whose climate system is described by the MPI-ESM, and which is subject to the historical forcing. It is then striking to see how different time evolution (“forced response”) can be obtained for the correlation coefficient in our two examples. On our hypothetical planet, climatologists in realization 1 (red in Fig. S3) would conclude that the teleconnection between the ENSO and the Indian summer monsoon underwent a very strong strengthening in the 20th century, from nearly negligible to very significant. On the same planet with the same forcing, climatologists in realization 3 would identify, from generally high values, a strong drop in the 1960s in the strength of the teleconnection, from which the strength can hardly “recover”. This strong dependence on the particular realization (note that all realizations are equally probable) illustrates that it is very hard (or maybe impossible) to draw conclusions about the forced response of the strength of teleconnections to greenhouse-gas forcing based on a single realization. For a more detailed analysis in an intermediate-complexity climate model, see Herein et al. (2017).

It is an open question if the fluctuations (“modulations”) of the traditionally evaluated correlation coefficient are related to some low-frequency mode of internal variability (cf. Section “Conclusions”). However, the strong dependence on $\Delta t$ suggests that at least the characteristics of the trends are artificial in our example.
Supporting Fig. S3. The time evolution of the JJA correlation coefficient $r$, plotted as a function of the time $t$, between the sea level pressure difference $p_{\text{diff}}$ and the Northern Indian precipitation $P$, in two realizations of the MPI-ESM-HE. The red and the blue line correspond to realizations 1 and 3, respectively. For comparison, the ensemble result and the linear regression (see Section “A forced response of the internal variability”) are also included as a thin and a thick gray line, respectively. In the different panels, different window lengths for the evaluation of the correlation coefficient (Δ$t$) and for the detrending (τ) are considered (in the upper row, no detrending is applied). See text for details.
Supporting Information, part V: The climatic mean’s forced response as obtained by temporal averaging

We shall check here what is obtained numerically in the phase-space projection chosen in our paper when the climatic mean is calculated by the traditional technique, which takes a temporal average for one time series (corresponding to a single member in the ensemble). For a shifting time series, a moving average needs to be taken to obtain the time evolution of the climatic mean.

Fig. S4 presents numerical results for an arbitrarily chosen member of the MPI-ESM-1pctE for different window lengths $\tau$. It is obvious for $\tau = 11$yr (Fig. S4a) that the internal variability is so strong that each month appears as a cloud of points without a prominent structure. Nevertheless, the clouds are elongated to some extent, and this elongation might be thought to represent the linear behavior identified in Fig. 4b. However, due to the inability of separating the effect of the internal variability from the forced response, we could not find any well-grounded method to fit lines to the clouds of points. A visual inspection may find the main direction of the elongation to be less steep in each month than the slope of the corresponding line in Fig. 4b. The reason for this is the much larger internal variability in $p_{\text{diff}}$ than in $P$. We thus learn that variable-dependent internal variability may introduce systematic errors into the interpretation of the time evolution represented in the corresponding phase-space projection.

One might try to filter out internal variability using longer windows. In Figs. S4b-d, the sets of points of individual months become less fuzzy indeed, they appear like curves instead of clouds. Since the ratio between the extension due to a real trend (the real response) and that due to internal variability (a signal to noise ratio) increases, the overall directions of the particular sets of points tend to get closer to the correct ones. Locally, however, we are facing very strong false trends for $\tau = 31$yr and 61yr (Figs. S4b-c): the local tangent of the curves deviates from the correct one (i.e., from the direction of the lines in Fig. S4a) by more than 90 degrees for sections corresponding to several decades. This means trends that are incorrect in their sign for the individual variables. Such false trends seem to be characteristics of moving averages in the presence of strong internal variability, and similar effects have been pointed out by Drótos et al. (2015) for one variable in the same context of climatic averages.

For $\tau = 91$yr (Fig. S4d), the false trends disappear, but the directions of the curves are still not reliable (note the spread between the different months from June to October, which is not present in Fig. 4b). At the same time, we are close here to reaching the upper bound for $\tau$ imposed by the length of the original data. To sum it up, we have found that temporal averaging for calculating responses in climatic means fails for the simulations considered in this paper. As for more extended data sets for which $\tau$ can be further increased, nonlinearities might appear in the response, for which temporal averaging introduces biases (Herein et al., 2016; Drótos et al., 2016). Therefore, temporal averaging cannot be applied without additional considerations in such cases either.
Supporting Fig. S4. The traditional climatic mean (obtained as a temporal average) in the sea level pressure difference $p_{\text{diff}}$ and the Northern Indian precipitation $P$. All different months are plotted, see the numbering (1-12: January-December). For a given month or season, each data point represents a particular year, on which the time window for averaging is centered. The different years are colored according to the color scales on the right. The different panels correspond to different window lengths $\tau$, as indicated.
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