Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2020-576-AC3, 2021

Hydrology and Earth System Sciences
Open Access
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Nonstationary weather and water extremes: a review of methods for their detection, attribution, and management" *by* Louise J. Slater et al.

Louise J. Slater et al.

louise.slater@ouce.ox.ac.uk

Received and published: 14 February 2021

We thank Reviewer 3 for constructive comments on our manuscript. These comments are helpful and will improve the quality of our review article. Below we provide the Reviewer's comments verbatim in black font, and our responses immediately below each comment in blue font.

The authors present a review of methods and metrics for the detection, attribution and management of extreme events. Given the large body of literature on these topics, the

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

authors have identified an area ripe for a solid review that will benefit the community. The manuscript is a very large piece of work that contains a lot of useful and interesting material. In order for the reader to extract the most from this material, particularly new readers to this field, I would like the authors to enhance the educative components of this review. To this end I recommend improving the graphics (or adding tables) to distill the complexity for the reader into clear, concise overviews of the topics and discussions.

We are grateful to the Reviewer for their positive comments on our manuscript. We will strengthen the educational components of the review by enhancing figures or adding tables, as appropriate (details below).

Figures 1, 2, 5b, 6, 7, 8 are good, but Figures 3, 4, 5a should be revised into conceptual diagrams to help the reader. Figure 7 is a good conceptual diagram, but it is not tightly linked to the text, so could be replaced. For example, Figure 2 gives an overview of the workflow in this type of analysis, which is excellent, and the structure of the manuscript follows this workflow. Within each main section, or large sub-section, it would be good to have a conceptual diagram that helps the reader understand the relevant concepts within that section. The text could then be more tightly linked to these figures and then the reader would see the concepts and understand more the logic flow within each section.

We agree about ensuring the figures are consistently referred to throughout each section, to help guide the reader.

- Figure 3 (Metrics): we will ensure each of the panels is referred to within the text (if it is not already)
- Figure 4 (Examples of trends): we will ensure each of the panels is referred to within the text and we will also include a table which summarises the different indices, to help guide the reader.
- Figure 5a (Homogeneity): we will improve this figure and make sure it is clear.
- Figure 7 (Drivers of extremes): we will make sure this diagram is referred to and

explained within the text; we think it serves a purpose and do not wish to replace it.

Another aspect that I would encourage further work on is linking more to existing reviews of detection and or attribution of extreme events to climate change. I was expecting reference to works like Hulme (2014), Zhai et al. (2018), Ummenhofer Meehl (2017) and Easterling et al. (2016).
Thank you. We will make sure we cite all existing works as appropriate, including references to Hulme (2014), Zhai et al.(2018), Ummenhofer and Meehl (2017), and Easterling et al. (2016).

Overall, I am very happy with the content of the review – it is a major piece of work that draws together a lot of diverse material. I think this review could be made even more useful by improving the Figures to help the reader get the most out of this material.
We are very grateful for these positive comments and will implement the suggestions provided by the Reviewer.

Specific comments Page 2, line 12-13: Is deciding whether a time series should be treated as stationary or not for the purposes of managing extremes "one of the greatest challenges" facing scientists and practitioners today? I agree it is a challenge, but as you point out in this paragraph, the impact of picking the wrong model is a difference in uncertainty. Given the numerous uncertainties in this topic, I am not convinced this is one of the greatest challenges we face.

We will rephrase this sentence and instead highlight that it is a difficult topic.

Page 2, line 14: apparent trends in, and or correlations between, stationary long-memory / auto-correlated / smoothed time series has a long history, which could be highlighted by adding references to Slutzky (1937), Wunsch (1999), Yule (1926) and

the Slutzky-Yule effect.
Thank you. We will discuss these points, with references to Slutzky (1937), Wunsch (1999), Yule (1926), and the Slutzky-Yule effect.

Page 3, line 9: another example of interdecadal to multidecadal hazard-rich and hazard-poor fluctuations is the flood- and drought-dominated regimes of rivers in eastern NSW, Australia (Warner, 1987).
Thank you, we will add reference to Warner (1987).

Page 3, line 12: the sentence "However, there is yet no comprehensive, introductory overview of these methods across hydroclimatic extremes, or overarching discussion of key challenges that can arise." is a challenge to read. How about "However, a comprehensive, introductory overview of these methods across hydroclimatic extremes, including an overarching discussion of the key challenges that can arise, has not been published to date."
Thank you, we will adjust the sentence structure as suggested.

Page 3, last paragraph: in the paper roadmap presented in this paragraph, no mention is made of the "discussion of key challenges" highlighted in the justification for the paper. Is the discussion scattered throughout the sections or presented in a particular location. Please signpost that discussion in the paper roadmap.
Yes, the challenges are described throughout the manuscript. We will rephrase the roadmap so this is clear.

Section 2.1: There are a lot of different metrics for each variable extreme presented here. A table with one row per metric that summaries the variables, metrics, inputs, etc would be useful here to distill the complexity for the reader. An alternative to a table

would be to revise Figure 3 (see next comment).
We will revise Figure 3 (next comment) and the accompanying text. Additionally, we may include a table that summarises the variables and metrics.

Figure 3: many of the terms marked in 3a are not actually used in the text – loss curve, excess rainfall, centroid of rainfall excess. If the Table suggestion above is too difficult, then an improved figure to tightly link the ideas discussed in Section 2.1 with the image shown would help the reader. The idea of example conceptual time series for each variable with features of interest highlighted is good, but the features highlighted need to align with the text better. An improved version of this diagram could enhance the readers understanding of the material in this section.
We will improve Figure 3 as well as the text to make sure that all features highlighted on the figure are systematically described within the text.

Section 2.2 Figure 4: Again there is a lot to digest in this section and I don't think Figure 4 is helping the reader to understand the concepts. Rather than showing example results, I think a conceptual diagram of some of the concepts discussed would be more useful here. Then the text could be tightly linked to the diagram to help the reader follow the narrative and understand the differences in metrics.
We believe the current Figure 4 (examples of trends) is helpful for a reader who is new to the topic. It is difficult to envisage a what a conceptual diagram here might look like, but if we have an idea we will try to implement it. Additionally, we will ensure the current figure is better linked to the text.

Page 10, line 7: change "more strongly that the individual" to "more strongly than the individual".
We will alter this.

Page 12, line 11-12: you could mention the CAMELs initiative/papers here, which seek to publish large integrated hydrologic datasets for regions of the world.
We will mention the CAMELs papers in the revised manuscript, including CAMELS USA, GB, Australia, Brazil, Chile (Addor et al., 2017; Fowler et al., 2021; Coxon et al., 2020; Chagas et al., 2020; Alvarez-Garreton et al., 2018).

Page 12, line 18: the paper by Thyer et al (2006) on how long a record needs to be for stochastic model identification (random, AR1 or HMM) could also be mentioned here as it suggests we need very long records to adequately identify our stationary models (let alone our non-stationary ones).
We will include a discussion of this with reference to Thyer et al (2006).

Page 13, line 2: change “with and perhaps a global "change point" in climate” to “with perhaps a global "change point" in climate”.
We will alter this.

Page 13, line 6: Variability of the time series is taken into account in the calculation of significance. It is better to say that for a high variability time series it takes a longer record to statistically identify a change of a given magnitude than the same change in a lower variability time series. See Chiew McMahon (1993) for a discussion of this issue.
Thank you. We will alter this sentence, with reference to Chiew & McMahon (1993).

Page 13, line 22-27: I totally agree about the importance of using long records for trend detection and the danger of short record lengths. Another area being explored to extend data back in time for insights into current conditions is palaeo-hydroclimatic reconstructions. For example, Freund et al (2017) reconstructed warm and cool

season rainfall in Australia to then investigate recent observed trend magnitude in the context of palaeoclimatic variability. Hydroclimatic reconstructions of the last 500 years have great potential to place recent observations into a long-term context that is not achievable from short observation based record lengths alone.
Thank you, yes. We will include discussion of palaeo-hydroclimatic reconstructions and will include a reference to Freund et al. (2017).

Page 14, line 15-23: I think people use the Mann-Kendall test because it does not assume a linear trend. The stated reason here is skewness – however, skewness can be resolved by transforming the data (Box-Cox). Linear regression only identifies linear trends, whereas Mann-Kendall identifies any monotonic trend, which is a much more useful/general feature of the Mann-Kendall test. Also the Thiel-Sen slope is not a test, it is just a way to estimate the magnitude of the trend. Also a reference to Hamed (2009a, b) for applying the Mann-Kendall test to auto-correlated data would be good to add.
Yes - we will clarify these points, including references to Hamed (2009a,b).

Page 15, line 9: it is worth mentioning that the AIC and BIC assess the trade-off between goodness of fit and model complexity. More complex models are penalised, so they have to improve the goodness of fit enough to overcome the complexity penalty. At the moment the sentence is all about better fit, when it should be about better fit even when the increase in model complexity is taken into account.
Yes, indeed. We will make sure the trade-off is described in the text.

Figure 6: While I agree the GA nonstationary model has the lowest BIC value and has a nice flat worm, it is interesting to note that the BIC values of the other three models are fairly similar to the GA nonstationary value. If you were to plot 6b for the other three models, would you also achieve an acceptable fit? Are any of the four models

not an acceptable fit? It may well be that all four models are "acceptable", but the GA nonstationary is slightly more acceptable than the rest. If you present this Figure as an example of what can be done with GAMLSS models, then it would be good to more fully explore the results to justify the argument that the GA nonstationary model is the best model and the others are not.
We agree that when the difference in AIC/BIC is small, then other models may be equally acceptable (e.g. Wagenmakers and Farrell, 2004). We will include a discussion of this point in the text.

Page 20, line 13+: in this discussion of changes in flooding in a warmer world, it would be good to highlight the finding from Wasko & Nathan (2019, Figure 7) that lower annual recurrence interval floods are more likely to be reduced due to drier antecedent soil moisture conditions, whereas higher annual recurrence interval floods are more likely to increase due to increases in extreme rainfall.
We will include this finding with reference to Wasko and Nathan (2019).

Page 23, line 23: remove the repetition of "to continue".
We will make the change.

Section 7.2: I was expecting to see mention of climateprediction.net and or weather@home (https://www.climateprediction.net/ models/weatherathome/), which are ensemble runs of global or regional climate models that can be used to quantify internal ensemble variance and compare it to observed events.
A discussion of climateprediction.net and weather@home will be added, with reference to the key papers.

References

Chiew FHS, McMahon TA 1993. Detection of trend or change in annual flow of Australian rivers. International Journal of Climatology, 13(6): 643-653.
Easterling DR, Kunkel KE, Wehner MF, Sun L 2016. Detection and attribution of climate extremes in the observed record. Weather and Climate Extremes, 11: 17-27.
Freund M, Henley BJ, Karoly DJ, Allen KJ, Baker PJ 2017. Multi-century cool-and warmseason rainfall reconstructions for Australia's major climatic regions. Climate of the Past, 13: 1751-1770.
Hamed KH 2009a. Exact distribution of the Mann–Kendall trend test statistic for persistent data. Journal of Hydrology, 365(1-2): 86-94.
Hamed KH 2009b. Enhancing the effectiveness of prewhitening in trend analysis of hydrologic data. Journal of Hydrology, 368(1-4): 143-155.
Hulme M 2014. Attributing weather extremes to 'climate change' A review. Progress in Physical Geography, 38(4): 499-511.
Slutzky E (1937). The summation of random causes as the source of cyclic processes. Econometrica, 5(2): 105–146.
Thyer M, Frost AJ, Kuczera G 2006. Parameter estimation and model identification for stochastic models of annual hydrological data: Is the observed record long enough?. Journal of Hydrology, 330(1-2): 313-328.
Ummenhofer CC, Meehl GA 2017. Extreme weather and climate events with ecological relevance: a review. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 372(1723): 20160135.
Wasko C, Nathan R 2019. Influence of changes in rainfall and soil moisture on trends in flooding. Journal of Hydrology, 575: 432-441.
Warner RF 1987. The impacts of alternating flood-and drought-dominated regimes on channel morphology at Penrith, New South Wales, Australia. IAHS-AISH publication, (168): 327-338.
Wunsch C (1999). The interpretation of short climate records, with comments on the North Atlantic and southern oscillations. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 80(2): 245–255.

Yule GU (1926). Why do we sometimes get nonsense-correlations between time-series? A study in sampling and the nature of time-series. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 89(1): 1–63.
Zhai P, Zhou B, Chen Y 2018. A review of climate change attribution studies. Journal of Meteorological Research, 32(5): 671-692.

References

Addor, N., Newman, A. J., Mizukami, N., and Clark, M. P.: The CAMELS data set: catchment attributes and meteorology for large-sample studies, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 21, 5293–5313, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-5293-2017, 2017.

Alvarez-Garreton, C., Mendoza, P. A., Boisier, J. P., Addor, N., Galleguillos, M., Zambrano-Bigiarini, M., Lara, A., Puelma, C., Cortes, G., Garreaud, R., et al.: The CAMELS-CL dataset: catchment attributes and meteorology for large sample studies–Chile dataset, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 22, 5817–5846, 2018.

Chagas, V. B., Chaffe, P. L., Addor, N., Fan, F. M., Fleischmann, A. S., Paiva, R. C., and Siqueira, V. A.: CAMELS-BR: hydrometeorological time series and landscape attributes for 897 catchments in Brazil, Earth System Science Data, 12, 2075–2096, 2020.

Chiew, F. and McMahon, T.: Detection of trend or change in annual flow of Australian rivers, International Journal of Climatology, 13,643–653, 1993

Coxon, G., Addor, N., Bloomfield, J. P., Freer, J., Fry, M., Hannaford, J., Howden, N. J., Lane, R., Lewis, M., Robinson, E. L., et al.:CAMELS-GB: hydrometeorological time series and landscape attributes for 671 catchments in Great Britain, Earth System Science Data,12, 2459–2483, 2020.

Easterling, D. R., Kunkel, K. E., Wehner, M. F., and Sun, L.: Detection and attribution of climate extremes in the observed record, Weather and Climate Extremes, 11, 17–27, 2016

Fowler, K. J., Acharya, S. C., Addor, N., Chou, C., and Peel, M. C.: CAMELS-AUS: Hydrometeorological time series and landscape attributes for 222 catchments in Australia, Earth System Science Data Discussions, pp. 1–30, 2021.

Freund, M., Henley, B. J., Karoly, D. J., Allen, K. J., and Baker, P. J.: Multi-century cool-and warm-season rainfall reconstructions for Australia's major climatic regions, 2017.

Hamed, K.: Enhancing the effectiveness of prewhitening in trend analysis of hydrologic data, Journal of hydrology, 368, 143–155, 2009a.

Hamed, K.: Exact distribution of the Mann–Kendall trend test statistic for persistent data, Journal of hydrology, 365, 86–94, 2009b.

Hulme, M.: Attributing weather extremes to 'climate change' A review, Progress in Physical Geography, 38, 499–511, 2014.

Slutzky, E.: The summation of random causes as the source of cyclic processes, Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society, pp.105–146, 1937.

Thyer, M., Frost, A. J., and Kuczera, G.: Parameter estimation and model identification for stochastic models of annual hydrological data: Is25the observed record long enough?, Journal of Hydrology, 330, 313–328, 2006.

Ummenhofer, C. C. and Meehl, G. A.: Extreme weather and climate events with ecological relevance: a review, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 372, 20160 135, 2017.

Wagenmakers, E.-J. and Farrell, S.: AIC model selection using Akaike weights, Psychonomic bulletin & review, 11, 192–196, 2004.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

Warner, R. F.: The impacts of alternating flood-and drought-dominated regimes on channel morphology at Penrith, New South Wales, Australia, IAHS-AISH publication, pp. 327–338, 1987.

Wasko, C. and Nathan, R.: Influence of changes in rainfall and soil moisture on trends in flooding, Journal of Hydrology, 575, 432–441,2019.

Wunsch, C.: The interpretation of short climate records, with comments on the North Atlantic and Southern Oscillations, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 80, 245–256, 1999

Yule, G. U.: Why do we sometimes get nonsense-correlations between Time-Series? A study in sampling and the nature of time-series, Journal of the royal statistical society, 89, 1–63, 1926

Zhai, P., Zhou, B., and Chen, Y.: A review of climate change attribution studies, Journal of Meteorological Research, 32, 671–692, 2018.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2020-576, 2020.