

This is a repository copy of *Coverage bias in the HadCRUT4 temperature series and its impact on recent temperature trends*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/95784/>

Version: Submitted Version

---

**Article:**

Cowtan, Kevin [orcid.org/0000-0002-0189-1437](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0189-1437) and Way, Robert G. (2014) Coverage bias in the HadCRUT4 temperature series and its impact on recent temperature trends. Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society. pp. 1935-1944. ISSN: 0035-9009

<https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2297>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



---

# Coverage bias in the HadCRUT4 temperature series and its impact on recent temperature trends.

Kevin Cowtan<sup>a\*</sup> Robert Way<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Chemistry, University of York, UK*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Geography, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada*

\*Correspondence to: kevin.cowtan@york.ac.uk

---

Incomplete global coverage is a potential source of bias in global temperature reconstructions if the unsampled regions are not uniformly distributed over the planet's surface. The widely used HadCRUT4 dataset covers on average about 84% of the globe over recent decades, with the unsampled regions being concentrated at the poles and over Africa. Three existing reconstructions with near-global coverage are examined, each suggesting that HadCRUT4 is subject to significant bias due to its treatment of unobserved regions.

Two alternative approaches for reconstructing global temperatures are explored, one based on an optimal interpolation algorithm and the other a hybrid method incorporating additional information from the satellite temperature record. The methods are validated on the basis of their skill at reconstructing omitted sets of observations. Both methods provide superior results than excluding the unsampled regions, with the hybrid method showing particular skill around the regions where no observations are available.

Temperature trends are compared for the hybrid global temperature reconstruction and the raw HadCRUT4 data. The widely quoted trend since 1997 in the hybrid global reconstruction is two and a half times greater than the corresponding trend in the coverage-biased HadCRUT4 data. The impact of coverage bias in the HadCRUT4 data leads to an overestimation of global temperature during the late-1990s and an underestimation of global temperatures over the past decade. Trends starting in 1997 or 1998 are therefore maximally misleading with respect to the global trend. The issue is exacerbated by the strong El Niño event of 1997-1998, which also tends to suppress trends starting during those years. Copyright © 0000 Royal Meteorological Society

**Key Words:** Instrumental temperature record, coverage bias, temperature trends

*Received ...*

## 1. Introduction

The instrumental temperature record, based on land-based weather station readings and sea surface temperature readings from ships and buoys, forms a vital source of information concerning climate over the last century and beyond. Time series of local monthly average temperatures (gridded datasets) and global averages are produced by several organisations, with the HadCRUT product of the Hadley Center and Climatic Research Unit being one of the most widely cited (Morice *et al.* 2012). The GISTEMP product from NASA's Goddard institute (Hansen *et al.* 2010) and the NCDC product (Smith *et al.* 2008) are also widely used. A new land-only product from the Berkeley Earth 'BEST' project (Muller *et al.* 2012) has introduced a number of statistical improvements in the handling of data homogenisation and coverage.

All these temperature reconstructions are based on in situ readings using thermometers. While the production and calibration of reliable thermometers has been well established for several centuries, how the thermometers are used to obtain meteorological data can significantly influence the results. The introduction of the Stevenson screen provided a significant step towards the collection of reliable air temperature data from land stations, however some biases remain in both the land and sea surface temperature data.

Most of the biases have been studied at length and addressed by both data-only approaches (i.e. using just the temperature observations) and meta-data based approaches (i.e. including additional information such as time of observation and measurement methodology, see for example Peterson and Vose 1997). The most widely studied sources of measurement bias in the land temperature record are the time of observation (Karl *et al.* 1986),

instrumentation type, and the 'Urban Heat Island' (UHI) effect (Hausfather *et al.* 2013).

Two recent results are particularly noteworthy. A comprehensive study of US stations by Williams *et al.* (2012) compared pairs of stations and correlated differences in the data with metadata analysis to conclude that time of observation and instrumentation location and type were the principal sources of bias in the weather station data. The BEST analysis (Muller *et al.* 2012) addresses these two source of bias in a different way, using a data-only approach to divide each station record into segments which show no discontinuity with respect to consensus local climatology. The agreement between the data-only approach of BEST and the metadata based approach of NCDC provides strong support for the reliability of the resulting record.

Practices for measuring sea surface temperatures have also changed over time, leading to biases in the resulting data. Early measurements were performed using uninsulated buckets to bring sea water on deck, while more recent measurements have used insulated buckets, engine room intake temperatures, and anchored or free-floating buoys (Kennedy *et al.* 2011). Measurements using uninsulated buckets tend to be biased cool due to evaporation from the bucket, while engine room intake temperatures tend to be biased warm due to heating of the water by the ship infrastructure. A discontinuity in the raw temperature record due to a transition from the use of uninsulated buckets to engine room intakes at the beginning of the second world war was quantified by Folland and Parker (1995) and is addressed by a 'bucket correction' in the widely used versions of the instrumental temperature record. More recently, a second discontinuity was identified by Thompson *et al.* (2008) by comparison of the instrumental temperature record with climate model outputs. Kennedy *et al.* (2011) conducted a detailed metadata analysis which has led to further corrections

to the SST data, addressing the discontinuity at the end of WWII. This work also introduced a smaller upward adjustment to recent temperatures due to a transition away from warm-biased engine room sensors to measurements by buoys. These corrections are currently only present in the Hadley/CRU temperature record (Morice *et al.* 2012).

Other sources of temperature data include reanalysis data, which are determined by using a weather model to reconstruct a global temperature field on the basis of multiple sources of data (e.g. Kalnay *et al.* 1996), and the satellite temperature record (Spencer 1990; Mears and Wentz 2009). The satellite temperature record is of particular interest because it provides a uniform sampling with near-global coverage. However the satellite microwave sounding units measure lower troposphere rather than surface temperatures and so are not directly comparable to the in situ temperature record. Furthermore there are temporal uncertainties in the satellite record arising from satellite failure and replacement and the numerous corrections required to construct a homogeneous record. Contamination of the microwave signal from different surface types is also an issue, particularly over ice and at high altitude (Mears *et al.* 2003).

### 1.1. Coverage bias

A further important source of bias arises from the estimation of a global mean temperature from the incompletely sampled gridded dataset. Weather stations coverage is best in the temperate latitudes and particularly in developed nations. Coverage of the polar regions is particularly poor, with no coverage of Antarctica before the 1950's, and limited coverage of the Arctic to this day. Poor sampling of the fastest warming parts of the planet leads to an underestimation of the global trend in the instrumental temperature record (Met Office 2009). This problem is exacerbated by the use of equal-angle (5 degree) grids by

the Hadley/CRU record (Stokes 2011). Since equal-angle grid cells become smaller at higher latitudes, more stations are required to achieve full coverage when in practice fewer stations are available.

Coverage bias becomes an issue when different parts of the planet are changing temperature at different rates. As a result it is a particular issue over recent decades, owing to the different rates of warming between the tropics and poles, and between land and ocean (Hansen *et al.* 2006). Changes in the Arctic and Antarctic are particularly problematic because the coverage is poor in these regions.

While short term trends are generally treated with a suitable level of caution by specialists in the field, they feature significantly in the public discourse on climate change (e.g. Global Warming Policy Foundation 2012; Daily Mail 2012; The Telegraph 2013), and have also been the subject of scholarly studies into the possible impact of both aerosol emissions (Kaufmann *et al.* 2011) and ocean heat uptake in climate models (Meehl *et al.* 2011) on short term trends. A common factor in all these works is an attempt explain or draw conclusions from the comparatively slow warming seen in some versions of the instrumental temperature record over the past decade and a half. However to do so without first addressing the issue of coverage bias is to ignore a very significant confounding factor in the analysis.

NASA's GISTEMP temperature record (Hansen *et al.* 2010) attempts to address the coverage issue by extrapolating temperatures into unmeasured regions by means of kernel smoothing using a conical kernel of radius 1200km. The Berkeley Earth (BEST) project have adopted an optimal interpolation method (kriging), although only for land temperatures at this stage (Muller *et al.* 2012). A recent memo from this project (Rohde 2013) suggests that the simple kernel smoothing method used by GISTEMP gives results which are close to the optimal method. However each of

these approaches assumes that the unobserved high latitude temperature field varies in a similar way to the observed temperatures at lower latitudes.

The potential impact of coverage bias may be estimated by use of three (near) global temperature reconstructions: The extrapolated GISTEMP data, the UAH satellite data, and the NCEP/NCAR reanalysis data (the NCEP/DOE AMIP-II Reanalysis-2 gives similar results). Figure (1) shows temperature trend maps for the period 1997/01-2012/12 for HadCRUT4 and each of these three series (the significance of the start date will become clear shortly).

Note that GISTEMP, UAH and NCEP/NCAR all show significantly faster warming in the Arctic than over the planet as a whole, and GISTEMP and NCEP/NCAR also show faster warming in the Antarctic. Both of these regions are omitted in the HadCRUT4 data. If the other datasets are right, this should lead to a cool bias due to coverage in the HadCRUT4 temperature series.

A preliminary estimate of the size of the bias may be calculated from the three global temperature series. For each series the coverage of the temperature field for each month is reduced to match that of the HadCRUT4 data for that month. Global mean temperature estimates are calculated for both the full- and reduced-coverage temperature fields. The difference between these values gives an estimate of the coverage bias. The bias estimate can vary dramatically from month to month as weather systems move in and out of the omitted regions, however a 60 month moving average, shown in Figure (2), shows long term variations. All the global series show a shift from a warm to a cool bias over the past two decades, with the sharpest decline starting around 1998. The GISTEMP and UAH estimates for HadCRUT4 coverage bias are very similar, providing some support for the GISTEMP extrapolation approach. The NCEP/NCAR data show a much faster transition to a cool bias followed by a plateau, raising a question over the GISTEMP assumption

that temperatures at high latitudes vary similarly to those at lower latitudes.

The timing of this change in bias after 1998 is significant because it also corresponds to a strong El Nino event (leading to a warm year) and is often suggested as the start of a hiatus in global warming (e.g. Meehl *et al.* 2011). However the consensus of the three global temperature series is that short term trends starting around 1997-1998 will be maximally misleading in the estimation of underlying trends, because they are distorted by the full effect of both coverage bias and the strong 1997-1998 El Nino event.

The purpose of this work is to address the issue of coverage bias through the development of new methods for global temperature reconstruction building on the HadCRUT4 data.

## 2. Global temperature reconstruction

In order to construct a global surface temperature series, either surface temperature observations or proxies which allows their estimation are required. No static weather station observations are available for the central Arctic, and thus a proxy is the only option. Hansen *et al.* (2006) used the UAH satellite data to argue that a warm Arctic anomaly responsible for the GISTEMP temperature record in 2005 was genuine. The satellite data has near global coverage, and the global distribution of satellite temperatures for any given month is correlated with the surface temperatures, with a mean (Pearson) correlation of 0.61 between GISTEMP and UAH when using the same baseline period. Therefore the satellite data will be used as a proxy for surface temperature to construct a geographically complete hybrid temperature record.

The UAH satellite data is used in preference to data from RSS because RSS omits the critical high latitude temperature data, which is most impacted by the surface

contamination issue. This work aims to mitigate surface contamination bias by use of the in situ data. The UAH data is also interpolated at latitudes above  $85^{\circ}$ , however the interpolated region is small compared to the unobserved region of the in situ data.

The use of the satellite temperatures as a proxy rather than a direct measurement of surface temperature brings additional requirements. Firstly, the satellite and in situ observations must be on a common baseline. Secondly, an appropriate method for mapping satellite observations of lower troposphere temperatures onto surface temperatures is required. Thirdly, the method must be validated to ensure that it has skill in predicting unobserved temperature values. The validation step will also serve as a check on the possible issues identified so far such as the mismatch between surface and lower troposphere temperatures and surface contamination of the MSU signal.

The mapping and validation steps will make use of the optimal interpolation algorithm known as kriging. For the mapping, kriging will be used to estimate a slowly varying function of grid coordinates corresponding to the offset between the satellite and surface temperatures. For the validation step, kriging will provide a baseline against which to compare the skill of the hybrid method.

### 2.1. The impact of the baseline period

The surface temperature calculation is usually performed using temperature anomalies, which represent the deviation of the current temperature from the mean over a chosen baseline period. For the HadCRUT4 data, the station data are normalised so that the mean over the period 1961–1990 for a given month of the year is zero for each station with sufficient records. The UAH map data uses a similar approach with the mean for each map cell normalised to zero over the period 1981–2010 for a given month of the year.

A problem arises when coverage changes over time. Because the Arctic has warmed significantly since the end of the HadCRUT4 baseline period, a drop in Arctic coverage leads to a cool bias in the mean of the observed cells. This effect increases as conditions diverge from the baseline period. To obtain realistic short term trends, the baseline period should be as similar to the trend period as possible. For similar reasons, when constructing a hybrid temperature series, the two source map series should have the same baseline period.

The HadCRUT4 map series was therefore renormalised to match the UAH baseline period of 1981–2010. For each map cell and each month of the year, the mean value of that cell during the baseline period was determined. If at least 15 of the 30 possible observations were present, an offset was applied to every value for that cell and month to bring the mean to zero; otherwise the cell was marked as unobserved for the whole period.

Renormalization is not a neutral step - coverage is very slightly reduced, however the impact of changes in coverage over recent periods is also reduced. Coverage of the renormalized HadCRUT4 map series is reduced by about 2%.

### 2.2. Kriging

Kriging (Cressie 1990) is a linear approach to interpolation/extrapolation in which the values of the field are determined in accordance with a given covariance structure, where the covariance structure is usually a radial function which is determined from the covariance of those observations which are present. The radial function is usually a simple function, such as an exponential, although Muller *et al.* (2012) use the exponential of a higher order polynomial.

Kriging is an important method in geophysics, offering the following benefits:

1. The reconstructed values vary smoothly and match the observed values at the coordinates of the observations.
2. For well behaved covariance functions the reconstructed values approach the global mean as the distance from the nearest observation increases, i.e. the method is conservative with respect to poor coverage.
3. When a reconstructed value is produced based on a cluster of observation in one direction and a single observation in another, the cluster values are downweighted in accordance with the amount of independent information they contribute to the reconstructed value. Area weighting is an emergent property of the method, with observations being weighted by cell size in densely sampled regions, and by the region over which the observation is informative in sparse regions.

The kriging calculation is described in detail in Appendix A, however in outline the steps are as follows:

- Determine the radial covariance function from the observations which are available.
- Construct a covariance matrix for the observed coordinates.
- Construct a vector of covariances between the observed coordinates and some coordinate at which an estimate of the field is desired.
- Solve the resulting system of equations for the to obtain a vector of weights. The estimated value of the field at the target coordinate is given by the dot product of vectors of weights and the observations.

There are differences between the method employed here and that of Muller *et al.* (2012). Muller *et al.* used simple kriging, which assumes that the expectation of the unknown field is zero - this was a valid approach for that work since the expectation of the field had already been subtracted out

in the form of a time varying climate term. In this work, the expectation of the field (i.e. the global mean temperature) is to be determined so ordinary kriging, which makes no such assumption, is required. Ordinary kriging introduces an additional constraint that the weights must sum to unity, and thus the applying a constant offset to all the observations leads to a corresponding offset in every extrapolated value.

In this work the kriging calculation will be applied to the reconstruction of gridded temperature values using the grid cells for which observations are available, in contrast to Muller *et al.* who use individual stations as the observations. This will enable a correspondence between the gridded satellite data and the surface data, and also makes it computationally realistic to construct a full matrix of cell covariances rather than the sparse matrix used by Muller *et al.*, allowing a global reconstruction from any starting data. In a 5 degree sampled grid there are 2592 cells, and so the correlation matrix can contain up to  $8.7m$  ( $2591^2$ ) elements. The covariance function was modelled by a simple exponential function of distance, ensuring a strongly diagonal covariance matrix and a numerically stable calculation.

Kriging the gridded data also has some significant disadvantages: Information about station position within a cell is lost, cells with a single station receive the same weight as cells with many, and (equivalently) no account is taken of the uncertainty in a cell value. The acceptability of these compromises will become apparent in the validation step.

Grid cells for which observations are available are assumed to be exact, and are therefore unmodified by the calculation. This is not a necessary assumption of kriging, but for the purposes of estimating global mean temperatures it is a convenient simplification and means that the resulting temperature fields will preserve the features of the source data.

### 2.3. The hybrid calculation

The hybrid surface-satellite temperature calculation is extremely simple in form:

$$T_x^{hybrid} = \text{krig}(T_x^{surf} - sT_x^{sat}) + sT_x^{sat} \quad (1)$$

where  $T_x^{surf}$  is the surface temperature of the grid cell at coordinate  $x$ ,  $T_x^{sat}$  is the satellite temperature, and  $s$  is a scale factor applied to the satellite temperatures. The difference between the surface and satellite temperatures may only be calculated for cells where surface temperatures are available, so the result has incomplete coverage, which is completed by the kriging operator. The resulting global coverage field is added to the scaled satellite temperatures to produce the hybrid temperature field. The scale factor  $s$  serves to allow for a difference in scale between surface and lower troposphere (LT) temperatures.

The krigged difference field has the following properties:

1. Where a surface temperature observation is present, it is the difference between the surface and satellite temperatures.
2. Near a surface temperature observation the value of the field will be similar to the difference at the nearest observed coordinate.
3. Far from any surface temperature observation the value of the field will approach the difference between the global means of the surface and satellite fields.

These properties translate to the following properties for the hybrid field:

1. Where a surface temperature observation is present, the hybrid field is equal to the surface temperature.
2. Near a surface temperature observation the value of the field will be similar to the nearest observed coordinate.

3. Far from any surface temperature observation the value of the field will approach the value of the satellite field, adjusted by the difference in global mean between the surface and satellite fields.

The hybrid field around an isolated surface observation will match the satellite data in gradient and curvature, with a constant offset to fit the surface observation at the grid centre.

In other words the behaviour is what one would intuitively expect from a hybrid temperature reconstruction, with the distances over which a surface observation can dictate local temperatures determined by the autocorrelation of the difference field itself.

Any temporal inhomogeneity in the satellite data is eliminated, because the satellite data is tied to the surface temperature observations on a month-by-month basis. Spatial inhomogeneity, for example due to surface contamination of the tropospheric temperature observations, remains an issue only if inhomogeneity varies over distances significantly shorter than the range of the kriging calculation.

### 2.4. Validation

The satellite data does not provide direct surface temperature observations, and thus must be treated as a proxy dataset. Also the kriging calculation implemented here does not account for uncertainties in the observations, or even the number of observations in a grid cell. Each of these factors mean that the method can not be assumed to be valid, and therefore the skill of the method must be proven by reconstructing temperature observations which have been hidden from the calculation. For the following tests, the HadCRUT4 ensemble median and UAH data were used over the period 1979/01-2012/12. The UAH data were upscaled to a 5x5 degree grid. Two methods

will be employed; the first being a 36-fold cross validation approach modified to deal with the spatial autocorrelation of the data.

In the cross validation calculation, a contiguous group of either 1, 3, or 5 latitude bands are omitted from the temperature map data for a given month. The central latitude band of the omitted region is then reconstructed by one of the following methods:

- Null reconstruction - the target cells are set to the (area weighted) mean of the rest of the map.
- Kriging - the target cells are reconstructed using the kriging calculation.
- Hybrid - the target cells are reconstructed using the hybrid method. This approach is repeated for different values of the satellite scale factor  $s$ .

The calculation is repeated 36 times, omitting the latitude bands bracketing each of the 36 latitude bands in turn. The 36 reconstructed bands are then combined to create a composite map in which every cell has been reconstructed using only cells more than a certain distance from that cell. The three extrapolation ranges are illustrated in Figure (3).

The skill of the temperature reconstruction methods may be measured in terms of the RMS difference between the reconstructed and original map over all the months in the reconstruction - the results are shown in Figure (4). Maps are shown for the null reconstruction, kriging, and the hybrid method with  $s = 1.0$  for the three extrapolation ranges. For the null reconstruction the range makes no difference to the results and so only the range 1 case is shown.

The null reconstruction provides surprisingly good predictions over the oceans (apart from the El Nino region), which reflects the fact that sea surface temperatures vary much less from the global mean than land temperatures. The agreement over land however is poor, as expected.

The kriging reconstruction is better over both land and oceans for ranges of 1 and 2 cells. At longer ranges the North Pacific SST reconstructions begin to be distorted by land temperatures from Siberia and Alaska, however the reconstructed land temperatures remain superior to the null reconstruction.

The hybrid reconstructions show a significantly different behaviour. For a range of 1 cell, the results are very similar to kriging, but as the range increases the land and SST reconstructions deteriorate at high latitudes at a uniform rate over land and ocean. Thus the land reconstruction is significantly better, while the SST reconstruction is worse than either the kriging or null reconstructions.

These results suggest that a combined method in which the hybrid method is used for land temperatures and kriging (or hybrid with a low weight) for SST reconstructions. Such an approach would ideally be implemented as part of the Hadley calculation using the unmerged land and SST data for each of the 100 ensemble members. A crude approximation based on the merged data is possible, but will suffer from land-ocean contamination in coastal cells.

The reconstructions are compared numerically in Table 1, which shows the RMS difference between the original and reconstructed maps averaged over all the months in the temperature series. Results are given for the null and kriging reconstructions, and for the hybrid calculation with  $s$  varying from 0.2 to 1.4. Best results are obtained for  $s \approx 0.6$ , representing a compromise between the improving land reconstruction and deteriorating SST reconstruction. The value of the RMS difference is bounded by the noise level in the grid values.

Of more interest in this work are the accuracy of the global temperature reconstructions. The previous results do not directly address this question because the regions of the globe affected by poor coverage are not uniformly distributed. Since no observations are available for these

regions, an estimate must be made on the basis of the error in reconstructing temperatures at the boundaries of the unobserved regions.

Three test cases are therefore constructed by further reducing the coverage of the HadCRUT4 data at the edges of the unobserved regions. A mask is applied to remove the values from cells whose centres are within 600, 1150 or 1700km of a cell with no observations. The masked cells will be reconstructed by the three methods used earlier, and the reconstructed values compared to the observations. The coverage of the original and reduced coverage datasets is illustrated in Figure 5. The 600km dataset involves omitting an additional 16% of the globe from the observed data, comparable to the 18% already missing from that data.

Two tests are used for comparing the results:

1. A difference map is calculated between the original and reconstructed temperatures for the masked cells. The mean and RMS of this map give a measure of the bias and error in reconstructing cells in the geographical regions of interest over a range of distances from the nearest observation.
2. The differences for the masked cells are extrapolated into the regions of the map where no observations are available, using inverse distance interpolation (weighted by distance<sup>-4</sup>). All cells for which observations are available are then set to zero. This gives an estimate of how the global mean temperature estimate would be biased if the unobserved cells were reconstructed with the same error as the closest available reconstructed cells.

For each test the bias (measured by the area weighted mean of the difference between the original and reconstructed values), and the error (measured by the area

weighted RMS difference between the original and reconstructed values) are presented for the period from 2005 on when bias is expected to be critical.

The results of reconstructing the omitted cells are shown in Table (2). Kriging gives a lower RMS error over the masked region than the null reconstruction in every case, although its performance degrades as the extrapolation range increases, and the bias is variable. The hybrid method gives both a better mean bias and RMS error than Kriging, and the results degrade more slowly with increasing extrapolation range. The optimal scale factor  $s$  for the satellite data is in the range 0.8-1.2 in each case. The month-by-month error for the 600km test using null, kriging and hybrid ( $s = 1$ ) reconstructions is shown in Figure (6) for the years 1997-2012. The reduced error of the kriging and hybrid reconstructions is apparent, and the hybrid reconstruction also avoids the significant cool bias in the other reconstructions over the period 2009-2011.

The results of projecting of the reconstructed values into the unobserved region are shown in Table (3). This presents a harder challenge, since the unobserved region is being reconstructed primarily from those cells most remote from any included observation, and the fragmentary coverage means that the effective extrapolation range for such cells is much larger than the quoted figure. Accordingly, for the 600km calculation kriging is only marginally better than no reconstruction and at longer ranges it provides no benefit. However the hybrid method shows a significant benefit at all ranges with only limited degradation with range.

These results indicate that reconstruction of the regions of the globe where coverage is poor is best achieved with the hybrid method, using a scale for the satellite data in the region of 1.0. This is in contrast with the result for the globe in general, where optimal results are achieved by a combination of the kriging and hybrid methods to cover

land and ocean, or failing that a hybrid calculation with the satellite data down-weighted.

What is the reason for this difference? The largest coverage holes are over Antarctica, Africa and the Arctic. Antarctica and Africa are land, where the hybrid method performs best. The unobserved region of the Arctic is primarily sea ice. From the point of view of the atmosphere, snow covered ice is similar to snow covered land. More importantly the additional heat transfer mechanism provided by the mixing of surface water is not present (Barry and Chorley 2009), so there is reason to suspect that the Arctic may behave more like land and thus be better predicted by the hybrid method. However it is also possible that this result arises from Arctic temperature measurements coming primarily from land stations, e.g. Alert, Canada and Tikhaya Bay, Russia.

### 3. Global reconstruction results

The kriging and hybrid methods have been applied to the full HadCRUT4 ensemble median data to obtain global temperature reconstructions. A global mean temperature estimate is then calculated using an area weighted mean of the map cells. The results are compared over the period of the satellite data in Figure (8) using 12 and 60 month moving averages. The kriging and hybrid reconstructions are compared to the null reconstruction, which corresponds to the HadCRUT4 data except in that the baseline period has been adjusted and a global mean is calculated instead of the Hadley practice of calculating the mean of the hemispheric means.

The kriging and hybrid reconstructions give very consistent results over most of the satellite era, but show divergence from the null series over parts of the record. Of particular interest are the periods 2005-present when the new reconstructions show warmer temperatures than the null series, and 1997-2000 when the new reconstructions are

cooler than the null series, with the hybrid results showing cooler temperatures than kriging. The 60 month moving average shows the impact of coverage, both on the 1998 peak and more significantly on recent temperatures.

How do different regions of the planet contribute to coverage bias? The difference between the null and hybrid reconstructions is calculated for three latitude bands. The mean of the resulting maps provides a measure of coverage bias due to limited coverage in each band in turn. The results are shown in Figure (7) using 12 and 60 month moving averages. Incomplete coverage of the rapidly warming Arctic is the principal cause of coverage bias since 2005, despite the comparatively limited area affected. The Antarctic shows much more variability on short time scales owing to the larger area affected, however there is less trend. Notable however is a large warm bias spanning the period 1997-2000. The rest of the world (of which central Africa is the primary region of poor coverage) contributes comparatively little temperature bias. The 60 month smooth gives a clearer picture of the effect of bias on longer term trends. The sum of these contributions is comparable to the results in Figure (1).

Trends from 1997 to the present are particularly impacted by coverage bias (and have also been the subject of significant media coverage, see for example The Telegraph 2013). The trends over this period have therefore been calculated for the three series and are given in Table (4), along with corresponding trends for the HadCRUT4, NCDC, GISTEMP and NCEP/NCAR temperature data. Both the kriging and hybrid series yield similar trends and both show faster warming than GISTEMP. The difference in trend between the original HadCRUT4 data and the null reconstruction is apparent, and arises from the reduction in bias due to changes in coverage over the trend period as discussed in section (2.1).

The NCEP/NCAR trend is higher than for the observational records. Most of this difference comes from mid-latitudes and from ocean rather than land data (see supplementary information), however the high latitude trends are in good agreement with the hybrid reconstruction. The increased trend in the kriging reconstruction in comparison to GISTEMP is probably related to the additional corrections in the HadSST3 data.

The trends in the global series do not reach the  $2\sigma$  significance level primarily because inter-annual variability due to the El Niño southern oscillation (ENSO) inflates the uncertainty. Foster and Rahmstorf (2011) find that removing the ENSO influence and other natural influences reduces the trend uncertainty sufficiently to make the remaining trend statistically significant.

The coverage bias in the HadCRUT4 data estimated using the hybrid data is shown in Table (5). It is notable that the trend bias is maximised for starting dates around 1998, and then again around 2003. Also of interest is the effect on the statistical significance of the trend, which increases as the number of months raised to the power  $3/2$ . A rough estimate of this impact may be calculated from the ratio of the bias trend to the uncertainty in the temperature trend. By this metric temperature trends starting in 1997 are maximally misleading with respect to the statistical significance of the resulting trend.

The impact of coverage bias on the 1997–2012 trend is greatest in the winter and smallest in the summer: The estimated bias in the trend is  $-0.087^{\circ}\text{C decade}^{-1}$  (DJF),  $-0.049^{\circ}\text{C decade}^{-1}$  (MAM),  $-0.028^{\circ}\text{C decade}^{-1}$  (JJA) and  $-0.055^{\circ}\text{C decade}^{-1}$  (SON).

### 3.1. Uncertainty in the global temperature reconstruction

The uncertainty in the HadCRUT4 global temperature reconstruction arises from a number of sources and is discussed in detail by Morice *et al.* (2012). Since the

reconstructions presented here preserve the map cell values for cells where HadCRUT4 has data, most of those uncertainties are unaffected by this analysis.

The principal difference comes in the coverage uncertainty term. Morice *et al.* (2012) estimate this by reducing the coverage of the NCEP/NCAR data to match the HadCRUT4 data for every available month from the reanalysis and determining the error in the resulting global temperature estimate. A similar approach may be applied for the kriging method, however the hybrid method is problematic in that it is dependent on the satellite temperature observations, which in turn contribute to the reanalysis data.

Currently the best available estimate of the coverage uncertainty is therefore that obtained in the validation tests in section 2.4, and presented in tables (2) and (3). The 600km coverage reduced data leaves an additional area of the globe unobserved which is comparable to the area uncovered in the HadCRUT4 data, however extrapolation to a radius of 1200km is required to achieve global coverage. On this basis the uncertainty due to coverage bias is estimated at between  $0.028$  and  $0.049^{\circ}\text{C}$  for the kriging results and between  $0.018$  and  $0.033^{\circ}\text{C}$  for the hybrid results. These values must be combined with the other uncertainties as outlined by Morice *et al.* (2012).

## 4. Discussion

This study raises the following issues:

1. Global temperature reconstructions from diverse sources all suggest significant coverage bias in the HadCRUT4 record over the past decades or two.
2. A method for producing a global temperature reconstruction from incomplete data must pass rigorous validation tests. Several such tests are proposed.
3. A hybrid reconstruction using satellite data as a proxy for surface temperatures has been tested,

and outperforms conventional extrapolation for the regions of interest.

4. The impact of coverage on recent temperature trends leads to trends starting around 1997 being particularly misleading.

The Arctic has experienced a very rapid temperature change over recent years through some combination of polar amplification of greenhouse warming, albedo change due to both black carbon and snow/ice loss and possibly some contribution of multidecadal variability (AMAP 2011; Semenov *et al.* 2010). The pace of this change means that Arctic coverage has dominated bias in the global temperature estimates, despite the unobserved region being rather smaller than in the Antarctic. On this basis the problem of coverage bias may exist whenever the Arctic has experienced rapid warming (or cooling) in the past. However, given the magnitude of recent Arctic warming and polar amplification relative to global trends, it is expected those previous periods of warming (or cooling) in the Arctic are unlikely to bias the record to a greater extent than the bias recorded in recent decades by this study.

The main benefit of the hybrid method is to bring observational data to bear on the question of coverage bias. However the method is dependent on the satellite data and so only applicable from 1979. Given that the hybrid results are not very different from the kriging results, simple extrapolation appears to be justified for current levels of global coverage. In practice the choice of extrapolation method makes little difference once the Antarctic stations are available: Kriging, the GISTEMP kernel smoothing method, inverse distance weighting and even basic nearest neighbour give very similar results, especially used in combination with a 1200km cutoff as employed by GISTEMP (see supplementary information). For periods prior to the establishment of the Antarctic

stations when coverage is less complete, coverage bias remain an issue.

The impact of coverage bias on trends starting around 1997-1998 is particularly unfortunate, given that the strong El Nino event of 1997-1998 (and a string of La Nina events over recent years) has also impacted trends over the same period (Foster and Rahmstorf 2011). As a result, the widespread reporting of HadCRUT4 temperature trends starting in 1997 or 1998 is doubly misleading with respect to the underlying temperature trend.

The NCDC temperature series has similar coverage issues around the poles to the HadCRUT4 data, although coverage at low latitudes is better. The mean coverage above 60N since 1979 is 63% for the NCDC data compared to 65% for HadCRUT4. Since most of the bias comes from higher latitudes, recent trends in the NCDC data are expected to be similarly impacted to the HadCRUT4 trends.

A station-by-station investigation of the skill of the reconstruction methods across the Arctic and Antarctic would be of interest in further characterizing the behaviour of the two reconstruction methods described here. The possibility of separate methods or satellite scale factors for land and ocean data is interesting, although it raises the issue of whether sea ice should be treated as land or ocean. It is hoped that the preliminary global temperature reconstructions presented here, by highlighting the potential scale of the bias in the short-term temperature trends, will provide an impetus for other groups to look at the problem using more sophisticated tools such as climate and reanalysis models.

Data and methods for this paper are available at <http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~kdc3/papers/coverage2013>.

## Acknowledgements

This work was produced without funding in the authors' own time, however KC is grateful to the University of York for providing web space for distribution of the data and methods. The authors would also like to acknowledge the online community of professional and amateur climate scientists who have provided helpful comments and advice over the 18 months of the work, and in particular John Kennedy at the Hadley Centre who provided useful feedback on some very rudimentary initial results.

## References

- AMAP. 2011. Snow, water, ice and permafrost in the arctic (swipa). Oslo: Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP). .
- Barry R, Chorley R. 2009. *Atmosphere, weather & climate*. Routledge.
- Cressie N. 1990. The origins of kriging. *Mathematical Geology* **22**(3): 239–252.
- Daily Mail. 2012. Global warming stopped 16 years ago, reveals met office report quietly released... and here is the chart to prove it. URL <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2217286/Global-warming-stopped-16-years-ago-reveals-Met-Office-report-quietly-released-chart-prove-it.html>. Retrieved: 2013-03-12.
- Folland C, Parker D. 1995. Correction of instrumental biases in historical sea surface temperature data. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* **121**(522): 319–367.
- Foster G, Rahmstorf S. 2011. Global temperature evolution 1979–2010. *Environmental Research Letters* **6**(4): 044 022.
- Global Warming Policy Foundation. 2012. No underlying global warming in recent years. URL <http://www.thegwpf.org/no-underlying-global-warming-in-recent-years/>. Retrieved: 2013-03-12.
- Hansen J, Ruedy R, Sato M, Lo K. 2010. Global surface temperature change. *Reviews of Geophysics* **48**(4): RG4004.
- Hansen J, Sato M, Ruedy R, Lo K, Lea DW, Medina-Elizade M. 2006. Global temperature change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **103**(39): 14 288–14 293.
- Hausfather Z, Menne MJ, Williams CN, Masters T, Broberg R, Jones D. 2013. Quantifying the effect of urbanization on us historical climatology network temperature records. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* .
- Kalnay E, Kanamitsu M, Kistler R, Collins W, Deaven D, Gandin L, Iredell M, Saha S, White G, Woollen J, *et al.* 1996. The ncep/ncar 40-year reanalysis project. *Bulletin of the American meteorological Society* **77**(3): 437–471.
- Karl TR, Williams Jr CN, Young PJ, Wendland WM. 1986. A model to estimate the time of observation bias associated with monthly mean maximum, minimum and mean temperatures for the united states. *Journal of Climate and Applied Meteorology* **25**(2): 145–160.
- Kaufmann RK, Kauppi H, Mann ML, Stock JH. 2011. Reconciling anthropogenic climate change with observed temperature 1998–2008. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108**(29): 11 790–11 793.
- Kennedy J, Rayner N, Smith R, Parker D, Saunby M. 2011. Reassessing biases and other uncertainties in sea surface temperature observations measured in situ since 1850: 2. biases and homogenization. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **116**(D14): D14 104.
- Mears CA, Schabel MC, Wentz FJ. 2003. A reanalysis of the msu channel 2 tropospheric temperature record. *Journal of Climate* **16**(22): 3650–3664.
- Mears CA, Wentz FJ. 2009. Construction of the remote sensing systems v3. 2 atmospheric temperature records from the msu and amsu microwave sounders. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology* **26**(6): 1040–1056.
- Meehl GA, Arblaster JM, Fasullo JT, Hu A, Trenberth KE. 2011. Model-based evidence of deep-ocean heat uptake during surface-temperature hiatus periods. *Nature Climate Change* **1**(7): 360–364.
- Met Office. 2009. New evidence confirms land warming record. URL <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/news/releases/archive/2009/land-warming-record>. Retrieved: 2013-03-01.
- Morice CP, Kennedy JJ, Rayner NA, Jones PD. 2012. Quantifying uncertainties in global and regional temperature change using an ensemble of observational estimates: The hadcrut4 data set. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **117**(D8): D08 101.
- Muller RA, Rohde R, Jacobsen R, Muller E, Perlmuter S, Rosenfeld A, Wurtele J, Groom D, Wickham C. 2012. A new estimate of the average earth surface land temperature spanning 1753 to 2011. *Geoinformatics & Geostatistics: An Overview* .
- Peterson TC, Vose RS. 1997. An overview of the global historical climatology network temperature database. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* **78**(12): 2837–2850.
- Rohde R. 2013. Comparison of berkeley earth, nasa giss, and hadley cru averaging techniques on ideal synthetic data. URL <http://berkeleyearth.org/pdf/robert-rohde-memo.pdf>.

Retrieved: 2013-03-01.

- Semenov VA, Latif M, Dommenges D, Keenlyside NS, Strehz A, Martin T, Park W. 2010. The impact of north atlantic-arctic multidecadal variability on northern hemisphere surface air temperature. *Journal of Climate* **23**(21): 5668–5677.
- Smith TM, Reynolds RW, Peterson TC, Lawrimore J. 2008. Improvements to noaa's historical merged land-ocean surface temperature analysis (1880–2006). *Journal of Climate* **21**(10): 2283–2296.
- Spencer RW. 1990. Precise monitoring of global temperature trends. *Science* **247**: 1558–1558.
- Stokes N. 2011. Cell weighting schemes for the earth. URL <http://moyhu.blogspot.pt/2011/08/cell-weighting-schemes-for-earth.html>. Retrieved: 2013-03-01.
- The Telegraph. 2013. Look at the graph to see the evidence of global warming. URL <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/globalwarming/9919121/Look-at-the-graph-to-see-the-evidence-of-global-warming.html>. Retrieved: 2013-03-12.
- Thompson DW, Kennedy JJ, Wallace JM, Jones PD. 2008. A large discontinuity in the mid-twentieth century in observed global-mean surface temperature. *Nature* **453**(7195): 646–649.
- Williams CN, Menne MJ, Thorne PW. 2012. Benchmarking the performance of pairwise homogenization of surface temperatures in the united states. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **117**(D5): D05 116.

## A. Ordinary Kriging

Ordinary kriging is applied to reconstruct a field for which the covariance function as a function of distance is known, but the mean of the field is unknown. Values of the field at a coordinate  $\vec{x}$  are estimated using a linear combination of the observed values at coordinates  $\vec{x}_i, i = 1 \dots N$ . For a field  $T$ :

$$T(\vec{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i(\vec{x}) T(\vec{x}_i) \quad (2)$$

$\lambda_i$  is the weight given to the observation at coordinate  $\vec{x}_i$ . The weights are determined to minimize the variance of the estimate at each position, and are determined from the by solving the following matrix equation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1(\vec{x}) \\ \dots \\ \lambda_N(\vec{x}) \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_1) & \dots & C(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_N) & 1 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ C(\vec{x}_N, \vec{x}_1) & \dots & C(\vec{x}_N, \vec{x}_N) & 1 \\ 1 & \dots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} C(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_1) \\ \dots \\ C(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_N) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

$C(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$  is the covariance of observations located at coordinates  $\vec{x}, \vec{y}$ . It is usually approximated as a function of the distance between  $\vec{x}$  and  $\vec{y}$ , which is in turn calculated using the available observations.

The use of kriging with gridded rather than station data limits the number of observations available, so a parsimonious parameterisation is adopted. A single exponential term provides a reasonable fit to the semivariogram, using a function of the following form.

$$C(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \alpha \exp(-(|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|)/d) \quad (4)$$

$\alpha$  and  $d$  are the parameters of the covariance function. For the purposes of this work,  $\alpha$  is irrelevant, however  $d$  provides a scale length for the extrapolation function in kilometres.

$d$  is determined from the semivariogram of the observed data, by calculating the square of the difference between

every pair of observed temperatures in every month of the data and averaging the results in 300km radial bins. The resulting values are subtracted from the RMS difference for cells more than 5000km apart to give a covariance estimate. The analytic approximation  $C$  is fitted to this data. For the HadCRUT4 data  $d$  has a value of approximately 830km, and for the hybrid data 680km.

Muller *et al.* (2012) calculate inter-station correlations directly instead of using the variogram, and use the correlations instead of covariances. This approach was tested with the gridded data and gave rise to values of  $d$  about 25% larger than the variogram method, however the resulting temperature series were essentially the same.

Table 1. RMS difference between original and reconstructed cell temperatures calculated over all observed cells when omitting one or more rows of data and reconstructing the central row from rows separated by the specified distance.

Method	RMS error in reconstruction ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )		
	1 cell/550km	2 cells/1100km	3 cells/1650km
Null	1.07	1.08	1.08
Krig	0.68	0.90	1.03
Hybrid 0.2	0.67	0.86	0.96
Hybrid 0.4	0.67	0.84	0.91
Hybrid 0.6	0.67	0.83	0.89
Hybrid 0.8	0.67	0.84	0.90
Hybrid 1.0	0.68	0.87	0.94
Hybrid 1.2	0.69	0.92	1.02
Hybrid 1.4	0.70	0.97	1.12

Table 2. Mean bias and RMS error between original and reconstructed global temperatures calculated over the *omitted cells* using the reconstructed values for the omitted cells. Results are for the period 2005/01-2012/12 and are given for the three reduced coverage maps described in Figure (5).

Method	Mean bias (°C)			RMS error (°C)		
	600km	1150km	1700km	600km	1150km	1700km
Null	-0.021	-0.027	-0.022	0.043	0.074	0.091
Krig	-0.002	-0.026	-0.023	0.023	0.064	0.085
Hybrid 0.2	-0.002	-0.022	-0.013	0.021	0.055	0.069
Hybrid 0.4	-0.014	-0.017	-0.010	0.023	0.047	0.054
Hybrid 0.6	-0.011	-0.013	-0.012	0.021	0.040	0.054
Hybrid 0.8	-0.002	-0.008	-0.007	0.017	0.035	0.050
Hybrid 1.0	-0.007	-0.003	-0.005	0.018	0.033	0.051
Hybrid 1.2	-0.002	0.001	-0.001	0.017	0.035	0.056
Hybrid 1.4	-0.001	-0.004	0.003	0.017	0.047	0.064

Table 3. Mean bias and RMS error between original and reconstructed global temperatures calculated over the *unobserved cells* by extrapolating the reconstructed values for the omitted cells into the unobserved region. Results are for the period 2005/01-2012/12 and are given for the three reduced coverage maps described in Figure (5).


Method	Mean bias (°C)			RMS error (°C)		
	600km	1150km	1700km	600km	1150km	1700km
Null	-0.032	-0.033	-0.032	0.070	0.071	0.071
Krig	-0.033	-0.033	-0.032	0.068	0.073	0.073
Hybrid 0.2	-0.005	-0.028	-0.028	0.055	0.063	0.063
Hybrid 0.4	-0.026	-0.024	-0.008	0.052	0.055	0.051
Hybrid 0.6	-0.022	-0.019	-0.019	0.046	0.049	0.048
Hybrid 0.8	-0.019	-0.015	-0.009	0.042	0.045	0.043
Hybrid 1.0	-0.016	-0.004	-0.010	0.042	0.043	0.044
Hybrid 1.2	-0.007	-0.006	-0.006	0.041	0.047	0.047
Hybrid 1.4	-0.010	0.000	-0.002	0.049	0.050	0.052

Table 4. Temperature trend in  $^{\circ}\text{C decade}^{-1}$  in the GISTEMP, NOAA and HadCRUT4 temperature series and in the null, kriging and hybrid reconstructions. The standard error in the trend is calculated according to the method of Foster and Rahmstorf (2011) assuming an ARMA(1,1) error model.


Dataset	Trend $\pm \sigma$
NCEP/NCAR	$0.178 \pm 0.107$
GISTEMP	$0.080 \pm 0.067$
NOAA	$0.043 \pm 0.062$
HadCRUT4	$0.046 \pm 0.063$
Null reconstruction	$0.064 \pm 0.078$
Kriging	$0.108 \pm 0.073$
Hybrid $s = 1.0$	$0.119 \pm 0.076$

Table 5. Bias in HadCRUT4 temperature trends running from various dates to the present, estimated using the hybrid data ( $s = 1.0$ ), in units of  $^{\circ}\text{C decade}^{-1}$ . The impact of the bias on the significance of the trend is given in the third column.


Start year	Trend bias	Significance bias
1990	-0.020	-0.39
1991	-0.020	-0.38
1992	-0.027	-0.47
1993	-0.030	-0.50
1994	-0.034	-0.54
1995	-0.036	-0.52
1996	-0.039	-0.51
1997	-0.055	-0.70
1998	-0.058	-0.67
1999	-0.056	-0.60
2000	-0.055	-0.54
2001	-0.057	-0.53
2002	-0.056	-0.46
2003	-0.083	-0.58
2004	-0.081	-0.48
2005	-0.045	-0.22




**Figure 1.** Temperature trends for the 16 year period 1997/1-2012/12 in  $^{\circ}\text{C decade}^{-1}$  for HadCRUT4 and three near global reconstructions: GISTEMP extrapolated surface temperatures, UAH satellite data and NCEP/NCAR reanalysis data. Areas with no coverage are shown with hatching. Note that the cylindrical projection exaggerates the missing area at high latitudes.




**Figure 2.** Potential coverage bias in the HadCRUT4 data estimated using three global temperature series. A 60 month moving average has been applied to the data.




**Figure 3.** Illustration of the 36-fold cross validation tests, in which 1, 3 or 5 rows are omitted and the central row reconstructed, requiring extrapolation over different ranges.




**Figure 4.** RMS difference in °C between observed temperatures and 36-fold cross validated reconstruction, omitting different numbers of latitude bands to control the minimum extrapolation range as illustrated in Figure (3).




**Figure 5.** Original and reduced coverage datasets used in testing skill in reconstructing temperatures at the edges of the unobserved regions. Maps are for 2000/01. Coverage percentages in the legend are averages over the period 1979/01-2012/12.



**Figure 6.** Error in the reconstruction of the mean temperature of the observed region of the HadCRUT4 data using only data from a map whose coverage has been reduced by 600km around every unobserved grid cell. Error in °C are shown by month on the period 1997/01–2012/12 for the null, kriging and hybrid ( $s = 1.0$ ) reconstructions.



**Figure 7.** Coverage bias in the HadCRUT4 global mean (rather than mean of the hemispheric means) estimated using the hybrid ( $s = 1.0$ ) reconstruction. Contributions are shown for three latitude bands and for the whole globe. The data are shown with (a) a 12 month moving average and (b) a 60 month moving average.



**Figure 8.** Comparison of null, kriging and hybrid reconstructions of the HadCRUT4 data over the period 1979/1-2012/12. The data are shown with (a) a 12 month moving average and (b) a 60 month moving average.