



# A simple framework for likely climate projections applied to tropical width

Daniel Baldassare<sup>1</sup> · Thomas Reichler<sup>1</sup>

Received: 17 January 2024 / Accepted: 1 July 2024

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2024

## Abstract

The increasing use of climate projections in adaptation necessitates a consistent method for producing estimates of likely future conditions from available climate model data. Many climate projections are produced using high emission scenarios and an evenly weighted ensemble of all available climate models despite substantial evidence that the continuously rising emissions in high emission scenarios are unrealistic, and that some models are more reliable than others. While high emission scenarios can be used to generate a more significant climate change signal and are often not intended to be interpreted as projections, a reader who is a non-expert on climate scenarios may not understand this nuance. As a result, unlikely climate projections could be inadvertently used to plan crucial adaptation efforts for future warming. Here, we present a simple and easy to use framework for creating projections of our likely future climate by combining existing methods. The framework involves three measures: selecting the most likely emission scenario, choosing the most reliable models, and debiasing against observational or reanalysis data. Each of these steps allows for a range of methods with varying complexity, precision, and utility. To demonstrate our framework and its components, we use the simplest applicable methods to estimate future changes in tropical width, a hydrologically important climate feature. Our projections show that the likely tropical expansion by the end of this century is roughly half of some previously reported estimates, largely due to the selected emission scenario. This simple framework can be easily applied to other climate features, allowing for better estimates of likely future conditions.

## 1 Introduction

Adapting to our changing climate requires accurate information about the likely future. However, extracting estimates of probable future conditions from climate model simulations is challenging because the emissions scenarios and participating models of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP) differ so greatly. Simple variations in data processing methods such as model selection can produce a wide range of climate projections, complicating adaptation efforts. Recent estimates of future emissions and warming indicate that some simulations are more realistic than others, allowing for more precise estimates of probable future conditions. However, studies have often used implausibly high emission scenarios and included less-realistic models (Hausfather and Peters 2020a), creating a situation where the prevalence of these simulations could cause improbable

projections to be interpreted as our likely future. Here, we present a simple framework which uses probable estimates of future emissions, removes less realistic models, and debiases model outputs to create more realistic projections of the likely future climate.

In the last few years, substantial evidence has emerged that the high emission CMIP scenarios RCP 8.5 and SSP5-8.5 do not represent a plausible future (Hausfather and Peters 2020b; Huard et al. 2022; Srikrishnan et al. 2022). Multiple recent reports suggest that global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will peak before 2025 (Climate Analytics 2023, IEA 2023, BloombergNEF 2024), in disagreement with the continuously rising emissions in the high emission scenarios. This change in thought is further demonstrated by the recent interest by the ScenarioMIP working group in using a less intense high emission scenario than RCP 8.5 or SSP5-8.5 in CMIP7 due to these scenarios becoming increasingly unlikely (van Vuuren et al. 2023). While high emission scenarios should be considered as a low probability, high consequence potential future (Schwalm et al. 2020; Kemp et al. 2022), the implausibility of the current high emission scenarios limits their utility for planning purposes.

✉ Daniel Baldassare  
daniel.baldassare@utah.edu

<sup>1</sup> Department of Atmospheric Sciences, University of Utah,  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA

Additionally, more realistic scenarios such as SSP2-4.5 have been less frequently studied than these high emission scenarios, creating a relative scarcity of more probable future climate projections (Pielke and Ritchie 2021; Burgess et al. 2022). Although SSP2-4.5 is less extreme than SSP5-8.5, it still represents a substantially warmer future, with severe societal and ecological impacts necessitating strong adaptation and mitigation (Cook et al. 2020; Spinoni et al. 2020).

High emission scenarios are often chosen in theoretical studies to create larger signal-to-noise ratios, or due to data availability. Notably, many studies are explicit in describing these scenarios as a high-emission future or worst-case scenario. However, due to the prevalence of studies which have used this scenario, a reader who is not an expert in climate scenarios may assume that these studies are projections of a probable future. In addition, it may be interpreted that the frustratingly slow progress on decarbonization suggests that the high emission scenario is likely. Regardless, because of the focus on high emission scenarios, the estimates of probable future conditions necessary for adaptation are under-reported for many parts of the climate system.

In addition to focusing on implausible scenarios, many projections have used ensembles which include less reliable models. A sizable portion of CMIP6 models have climate sensitivities which are improbable, primarily due to being too large, decreasing the representativeness of both the ensemble spread and mean (Sherwood et al. 2020; Liang et al. 2020; Tierney et al. 2020; Hausfather et al. 2022). One easily calculated climate sensitivity metric, the transient climate response (TCR), measures the relationship between temperature increase and carbon dioxide increase once carbon dioxide concentration has doubled. The International Panel on Climate Change Sixth Assessment Report (IPCC-AR6) calculated TCR by combining multiple methods, resulting in the estimated likely ( $1\sigma$ ) range of 1.4–2.2 K (Arias et al. 2021), which we also use in this study. Because climate models vary so greatly, as measured by TCR and other metrics, many techniques have been developed for creating weighted ensembles based on model skill (Brunner et al. 2020a). For example, by weighting models based on performance and independence, Brunner et al. (2020b) projected less intense warming from CMIP6 models. Here, we focus our model selection on TCR in an effort to present a simple version of this framework, though considering other metrics of model performance may also prove useful.

The final procedure in our framework is to debias the models. Biases in individual models and the ensemble mean have been well documented in CMIP6, with only modest improvements relative to CMIP5 (Kim et al. 2020). Because of this issue, a variety of methods for debiasing have been proposed, from simple mean subtraction to more advanced methods (Teutschbein and Seibert, 2012). In addition to discussion over the benefits of each method, the utility of

debiasing has been debated for some applications (Laux et al. 2021), though some have argued that the negative effects of bias correction are not detectable (Maraun et al. 2017). To present a simple version of the debiasing without introducing large and potentially spurious changes to the tropical width projections, we focus on removing the minor circulation change biases associated with the present-day circulation, similar to those previously reported in Kidston and Gerber (2010), Simpson and Polvani (2016), Curtis et al. (2020), and Simpson et al. (2021).

We create projections of tropical width to showcase our proposed framework and the impact of each of its measures. Tropical width is a societally important feature of the climate system, as the poleward edge of the tropics is associated with sharp latitudinal gradients in precipitation (Lu et al. 2007; Schmidt and Grise 2017). Over the satellite era (1979-present), the latitudinal width of the tropics has increased due to many factors including natural variability, global warming, and stratospheric ozone depletion (Grise et al. 2019; Waugh et al. 2015). While temperature is projected to increase in the twenty-first century under all CMIP6 scenarios, stratospheric ozone depletion peaked at the end of the twentieth century and is projected to decline in the twenty-first century (WMO, 2022), countering the increase in tropical extent associated with warming (Perlwitz 2011).

Recent tropical width modeling studies either focused primarily on the high emission scenarios or included multiple scenarios with no emphasis on which projections are most probable. For example, Staten et al. (2018) and Grise and Davis (2020) only considered the high emission scenarios RCP 8.5 and SSP5-8.5 respectively. Tao et al. (2016), Allen and Ajoku (2016), and Xia et al. (2020) analyzed several scenarios, showing that tropical widening trends increase with emission intensity. Of these five studies, none considered model sensitivity, resulting in models with TCR outside of the likely range being included in the analyses. Using our simple framework, we attempt to project the most probable future tropical edge latitude and compare our results against those derived from methods such as those from Grise and Davis (2020). As we will show, our framework leads to a substantial reduction in estimated tropical expansion compared to these methods.

## 2 Data and methods

We used CMIP6 (Eyring et al. 2016) zonal surface-wind and 2 m air temperature data for the historical period 1850–2014 and for three forcing levels from 2015–2099: SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.5, and SSP5-8.5. Zonal surface-wind and temperature data were acquired for all available CMIP6 models (Table 1). We selected 28 models based on the availability of data for both variables across all three forcings. TCR values

**Table 1** CMIP6 models used in this study with associated TCR values. Models with TCR below likely range of 1.4–2.2 K are marked in green, while those with TCR values greater than this range are in red

Number	Model	TCR (K)
1	ACCESS-CM2	1.96
2	ACCESS-ESM1-5	1.97
3	AWI-CM-1-1-MR	2.03
4	BCC-CSM2-MR	1.55
5	CAMS-CSM1-0	1.73
6	CMCC-CM2-SR5	2.14
7	CMCC-ESM2	1.92
8	CNRM-CM6-1	2.22
9	CNRM-CM6-1-HR	2.46
10	CNRM-ESM2-1	1.83
11	CanESM5	2.71
12	CanESM5-CanOE	2.71
13	FGOALS-g3	1.50
14	GFDL-ESM4	1.63
15	HadGEM3-GC31-LL	2.49
16	IITM-ESM	1.66
17	INM-CM4-8	1.30
18	INM-CM5-0	1.41
19	IPSL-CM6A-LR	2.35
20	KACE-1-0-G	2.04
21	MCM-UA-1-0	1.90
22	MIROC-ES2L	1.49
23	MIROC6	1.55
24	MPI-ESM1-2-HR	1.64
25	MPI-ESM1-2-LR	1.82
26	MRI-ESM2-0	1.67
27	NESM3	2.72
28	UKESM1-0-LL	2.77
	<b>Average for All Models</b>	<b>1.97</b>
	<b>Average for Likely TCR Models</b>	<b>1.76</b>

were acquired from Hausfather et al. (2022) and checked against Nijssen et al. (2020). Of the 28 models, 1 has a TCR of less than 1.4 K, 19 have TCR values in the likely range of 1.4–2.2 K calculated in IPCC-AR6 (Arias et al. 2021), and 8 have TCR values greater than 2.2 K. To provide observation-based estimates of the present-day tropical width, we used monthly averaged ERA5 (Hersbach et al. 2020) reanalysis data for zonal surface-wind from the satellite era (1979–2014). This period was chosen as a compromise between length and quality as there are fewer remote observations before 1979.

ERA5 is chosen as it is the successor to ERA-Interim, which is shown in Davis and Davis (2018) and Chemke and Polvani (2019) to be physically reasonable for phenomena associated with Hadley cell width and circulation strength. ERA5 is chosen over ERA-Interim due to the improved

resolution and accuracy (Hersbach et al. 2020), and a recent study demonstrating that ERA5 produces internally consistent estimates of Hadley cell width using the chosen metric (Baldassare et al. 2023).

Zonal surface-wind data from both ERA5 and CMIP6 were zonally and annually averaged and then used to compute the latitudes of the tropical edge over the two hemispheres using the zonal surface-wind zero crossing method in the software package PyTropD (Adam et al. 2018). PyTropD uses spline interpolation to determine the tropical edge latitude, decreasing the impact of resolution differences between models. The zonal surface-wind zero crossing method is chosen over other methods such as the meridional stream function due to the consistency in estimates from ERA5 (Baldassare et al. 2023), though similar results were obtained using the meridional stream function (not shown).


Annual mean global averages of 2-m temperature were computed from CMIP6.

For both ERA5 and CMIP6, uncertainties are calculated through bootstrapping, using 10,000 samples with replacement. To focus on the likely changes to tropical width, we use the  $1\sigma$  uncertainty range throughout, consistent with the likely range from IPCC-AR6 (Arias et al. 2021). For the final projections shown in Fig. 6, the uncertainty range is calculated by summing the bootstrapped uncertainties of the 30-year mean of the model projected tropical edge latitude, present-day ERA5 tropical edge latitude, and the uncertainty of the ensemble mean.

### 3 Forcing selection

Choosing the most representative emission scenario is the most critical step in producing a likely climate projection. To select the forcing scenario, we suggest comparing the emissions from each scenario to trustworthy emissions projections and probabilistic emissions models. This flexible method allows for potential refinements in climate projections following the anticipated emergence of additional emission scenarios and improved emission projections. For this study, we begin by comparing the emissions from the three SSP scenarios to the “Policies and Action”, “2030 Targets Only”, and “Pledges & Targets” projections from the Climate Action Tracker (Climate Action Tracker 2022). These three projections represent twenty-first century emissions resulting from different assumptions in the implementation of national emission reduction pledges. All three projections most closely match SSP2-4.5 while also projecting emissions which are less than 1/3 of SSP5-8.5 emissions by the end of the century (Fig. 1). None of the projections match SSP1-2.6 as the negative emissions needed for this scenario do not exist in the Climate Action Tracker projections. Next, we consider recent studies comparing each scenario to probabilistic integrated assessment models (Srikrishnan et al. 2022; Huard et al. 2022), both of which indicate that SSP2-4.5 is the most likely scenario in the late twenty-first century. Following these comparisons, we conclude that SSP2-4.5 is currently the most likely scenario, while the frequently used SSP5-8.5 is very unlikely.

The importance of forcing selection is shown by the substantial differences in projected tropical expansion between emission scenarios (Fig. 2). The three scenarios shown are SSP1-2.6, an improbable low-emission scenario which limits warming to around 1.5 °C; SSP2-4.5, the most likely scenario with moderate emission reductions; and SSP5-8.5, an unlikely high-emission scenario with continuously rising emissions. In the Southern Hemisphere (SH), tropical expansion begins in the early twentieth century and accelerates after 1960, coinciding with the start of ozone depletion




**Fig. 1** Greenhouse gas emissions from CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O in gigaton of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent per year for three SSP scenarios and three Climate Action Tracker projections. Equivalent CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated by multiplying the CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions by their respective global warming potentials and adding these values to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Climate Action Tracker data is from the Climate Action Tracker (Climate Action Tracker 2022), and SSP scenario data is from Riahi et al. (2017)

(Polvani et al. 2011; Solomon et al. 2005), while the weaker Northern Hemisphere (NH) expansion only becomes noticeable after 1990. Because CMIP6 models project ozone recovery by the late twenty-first century (Revell et al. 2022), the larger SH expansion compared to the NH is unrelated to changes in ozone and indicates that the SH tropical width is more sensitive to the warming from increased greenhouse gases, in agreement with previous studies (Watt-Meyer et al. 2019). In addition, the greater sensitivity in the SH results in forcing differences which are larger than intermodel differences, in contrast to the NH where intermodel differences are greater (Fig. S1). As shown in Fig. 2, by the end of the twenty-first century, the projected SH expansion under the low and high emission scenarios differs by a factor of three, and the expansion from SSP5-8.5 is roughly twice that of SSP2-4.5.

### 4 Model selection

While selecting the most likely emission scenario SSP2-4.5 has a large impact on the tropical width projections, the full ensemble is still composed of models with implausible rates of future warming. We attempt to correct this issue by focusing on models with reasonable TCR values, discarding models outside of the likely climate sensitivity range of 1.4–2.2 K from IPCC-AR6 (Arias et al. 2021). Because more CMIP6 models have high TCR than low TCR values, our moderate ensemble has an average TCR of 1.76 K compared to the full ensemble average of 1.97 K (Table 1).


**Fig. 2** Ensemble mean tropical edge latitude change relative to 1850–1879 for 28 CMIP6 models from three forcing scenarios. Thin lines represent the raw ensemble mean while thick lines result from a Gaussian smoothing



For SSP2-4.5, the moderate TCR ensemble projects less warming and less tropical expansion than the full ensemble as shown by the difference between the ensemble averages

(Fig. 3). There is an approximately linear relationship between warming and tropical expansion, with a greater slope in the SH and for higher forcing simulations. Although

**Fig. 3** Changes in tropical edge and temperature from 1850–1879 to 2070–2099. Models with TCR values between 1.4 and 2.2 K are denoted by triangles, and models with TCR outside of this likely range are marked as circles. Large symbols denote ensemble means with their  $1\sigma$  range, with the large circle representing the ensemble mean of all models, and the large triangle representing the mean of moderate TCR models. For each forcing level, a linear best fit from all 28 models is displayed in the corresponding color



the slopes of the regression lines for all three scenarios are positive, they are significantly different from zero at the two-sided 95% confidence level only for the high forcing simulations in both hemispheres. For all scenarios in both hemispheres, the larger temperature increase projected by the full ensemble results in more expansion than the moderate TCR ensemble. Because of the greater sensitivity, the TCR filtering is more impactful in the SH, similar to the forcing selection shown previously.


Previous studies found an insignificant relationship in the NH between tropical widening and equilibrium climate sensitivity, which measures temperature change once climate has reached equilibrium following a pulse of carbon dioxide (Grise and Polvani 2014, 2016; De et al. 2021). However, we find that TCR is significantly correlated with tropical widening in both hemispheres, requiring the removal of overly sensitive models for realistic tropical width projections (Fig. 4). The disagreement between our study and previous studies could be the result of different models or metrics, but may also be due to the fact that by 2100 the scenario simulations are not yet in equilibrium, causing TCR to be a better predictor of the projected twenty-first century warming and widening than equilibrium climate sensitivity.


## 5 Debiasing model outputs

Now that we have chosen the most likely emission scenario and constructed an ensemble of the most reasonable models, the final measure is to debias the models. Depending on the feature of interest, debiasing may be necessary due

to limitations in climate simulations (Laux et al. 2021). For example, both individual models and ensembles have been shown to inaccurately represent satellite era precipitation in the tropics (Kim et al. 2020). These issues may become especially pronounced when focusing on a subset of precipitation or a more specific region or time period, an example being the large 95th percentile precipitation biases in October through December in East Africa shown in Ayugi et al. (2021). As here we are focusing on zonally averaged features of the annual mean Hadley cell, a climate feature which is generally well simulated (Chemke and Polvani 2019), debiasing may not be as beneficial and could introduce spurious changes as observed from other debiasing methods (Cannon et al. 2015). To demonstrate this step in the framework without introducing large and questionable changes to the projections, we choose to perform a relatively simple debiasing, focusing on a minor and statistically insignificant tendency for models with equatorward biased jets tend to exhibit more widening than other models (Kidston and Gerber 2010; Simpson and Polvani 2016; Curtis et al. 2020; Simpson et al. 2021). To analyze whether present-day biases in the latitude of the Hadley cell edge exhibit a similar relationship in the chosen CMIP6 models, we calculate the corresponding statistics for each model (Fig. 5). Similar to previous studies (Kidston and Gerber 2010; Simpson and Polvani 2016; Curtis et al. 2020; Simpson et al. 2021), we find that the models with equatorward biased present-day tropical width project more future widening in both hemispheres. While Fig. 5 shows the results for 2070–2099, this feature is present throughout the twenty-first century, though it is not statistically significant. Because the ensemble mean

**Fig. 4** Projected tropical edge latitude change (2070–2099 – 1850–1869) by transient climate response for all CMIP6 models using SSP5-8.5. The shaded gray region denotes the likely TCR range of 1.4–2.2 K according to IPCC-AR6 (Arias et al. 2021)





**Fig. 5** Tropical expansion between 1985–2014 and 2070–2099 by 1985–2014 tropical edge latitude for moderate TCR models using SSP2-4.5. The stars denote the raw (black) and debiased (red) ensemble means, with the  $1\sigma$  range shown. The vertical dashed line marks the mean tropical edge in ERA5 from 1985–2014 with the gray shaded region depicting the  $1\sigma$  range calculated from bootstrapping. The green line is a linear best fit of all models prior to debiasing.  $R^2$  is nearly zero in both hemispheres

present-day tropical edge is biased equatorwards relative to ERA5 in both hemispheres, roughly 0.3 degrees in the NH and 0.1 degrees in the SH, the tendency for equatorward biased models to project more expansion may result in an overestimation of future expansion.

To debias the projections, we remove this tendency from the models by the following process, which is performed in each year  $j$  and repeated for both hemispheres as demonstrated in Fig. S2. First, the present-day (1985–2014) tropical edge for each model  $\phi_i$  and for ERA5  $\phi_{ERA5}$  is calculated, as well as the future tropical edge in each model, using 30-year mean data centered on the year of interest  $j$ . For each model  $i$  in each year  $j$ , the present-day tropical edge

$\phi_i$  is subtracted from the future tropical edge, resulting in the change of tropical edge  $\Delta\phi_{i,j}$ . A linear best fit is calculated between the tropical edge changes and present-day tropical edges of all models in each year  $j$ , producing the intercept  $a_j$  and slope  $b_j$ . Next, from the linear best fit, each model’s estimated expansion  $\Delta\hat{\phi}_{i,j}$  is

$$\Delta\hat{\phi}_{i,j} = a_j + b_j\phi_i \tag{1}$$

and the residual  $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ , which is the difference between the estimated and the actual expansion, is

$$\varepsilon_{i,j} = \Delta\phi_{i,j} - \Delta\hat{\phi}_{i,j} \tag{2}$$


Finally, the debiased expansion  $\Delta\tilde{\phi}_{i,j}$  is given by the sum of the expansion projected by the best fit line at the ERA5 present-day edge and the residual

$$\Delta\tilde{\phi}_{i,j} = a_j + b_j\phi_{ERA5} + \varepsilon_{i,j} = \Delta\phi_{i,j} + b_j(\phi_{ERA5} - \phi_i) \tag{3}$$

This results in small reductions in projected expansion, which are not statistically significant in either hemisphere, and are larger in later years and in the NH. While in this example the debiasing has minor impacts, for climate features with large known biases such as extreme precipitation, debiasing may be useful for providing more realistic projections (Xu et al. 2021).

## 6 Likely tropical width projections

In Fig. 6, we compare the projections from our simple framework (blue) to those from a more “typical” methodology such as Grise and Davis (2020) (red), which uses an ensemble of all CMIP6 models with SSP5-8.5 as the forcing scenario. Compared to this methodology, our framework projects roughly half of the tropical expansion. The decrease is primarily the result of using the moderate emission scenario, though the TCR selection results in a further reduction in expansion. Our framework (Fig. 6, blue) projects a twenty-first century tropical widening of 0.1 degrees in the NH, which is within the likely range of the late twentieth century as measured by the  $1\sigma$  range of the ERA5 mean (1985–2014). In contrast, the projected twenty-first century SH widening of 0.5 degrees is significant, further demonstrating the hemispheric differences in sensitivity. These results strongly differ from the projections of expansion from “typical” methods (Fig. 6, red), which are significant at the  $1\sigma$  level in both hemispheres. The “typical” methods (Fig. 6, red) estimate roughly 0.5 degrees of expansion in the NH and 1.1 degrees in the SH. The differences between our framework and the previous approaches are larger in the SH due to the greater sensitivity, although by the end of the twenty-first century the difference is also significant



**Fig. 6** Tropical edge latitude following “typical” approaches (red) and the proposed framework (blue). The value presented for each year is the 30-year mean centered on the year of interest. The “typical” approach described here uses the mean of all CMIP6 models under SSP5-8.5. Our framework includes only the models with moderate TCR values, uses SSP2-4.5 as forcing, and debiases the relationship between present-day tropical edge bias and future expansion. In addition, for both methods we subtract the ERA5 present-day mean to remove mean biases. The thick areas in each color represent the 1 $\sigma$  range from bootstrapping

in the NH. Following our methodology, the best estimate for the absolute position of the tropical edge at the end of the twenty-first century is 31.1 degrees in the NH and 32.6 degrees in the SH.

## 7 Summary and discussion

Following our methodology, the likely end of century NH expansion relative to present is about 0.1 degrees while the SH expansion is roughly 0.5 degrees, both of which are considerably smaller than the estimates from methods used in some previous studies, for example Grise and Davis (2020) (Fig. 6). Each measure of our proposed framework has distinct impacts on the projected tropical expansion. Focusing on the more likely moderate emission scenario roughly halves the expansion in both hemispheres. Excluding models with TCR values outside of a likely range decreases projected warming, causing a further reduction in expansion of roughly 0.1 degrees

globally, primarily due to reduced expansion in the Southern Hemisphere. The removal of model biases similar to Kidston and Gerber (2010), Simpson and Polvani (2016), Curtis et al. (2020), and Simpson et al. (2021) further decreases projected expansion in both hemispheres.

The framework we have described creates probable projections of future climate using available climate model data. The measures in this framework are adaptable for different applications and can be modified as better information or methods become available. The emission scenario selection will likely change due to revised estimates of future emissions and the creation of new scenarios. Additionally, the emission selection could be improved through the consideration of other relevant factors such as aerosols, which have spatially heterogeneous impacts and may be especially impactful for certain regions (Persad et al. 2023) or climate features (Zhao et al. 2020). The model selection could be refined by considering multiple measures of skill based on historical observations or theoretical arguments, or by using a more sophisticated weighting method. For some climate features the debiasing step could be ignored, while for other features, debiasing could be modified by utilizing methods tailored to the system of interest. As it stands, the simple methods presented here produce improved climate projections with minimal effort.

**Supplementary Information** The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-024-07335-7>.

**Acknowledgements** The authors acknowledge the Climate Data Store for providing ERA5 data (<https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu>) as well as the CEDA archive for providing CMIP6 data (<https://catalogue.ceda.ac.uk>). We acknowledge the World Climate Research Programme, which, through its Working Group on Coupled Modeling, coordinated and promoted CMIP6. We thank the climate modeling groups for producing and making available their model output.

**Author contributions** DB performed the numerical analysis and wrote the initial draft of the manuscript. Both authors were equally involved in the design of the study, the interpretation of the results, and the review of the manuscript.

**Funding** This work has been funded by NSF Grant 2103013.

**Code and data availability** CMIP6 data was acquired from the CEDA Archive <https://catalogue.ceda.ac.uk>. ERA5 data can be downloaded at <https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu> (Hersbach et al. 2020).

## Declarations

**Ethics approval** Not applicable.

**Consent to participate** Not applicable.

**Consent for publication** Not applicable.

**Competing interests** The authors have no competing interests.

## References

- Adam O, Grise KM, Staten P, Simpson IR, Davis SM, Davis NA, Waugh DW, Birner T, Ming A (2018) The TROPD software package (V1): Standardized methods for calculating tropical-width diagnostics. *Geosci Model Dev* 11(10):4339–4357. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-4339-2018>
- Allen RJ, Ajoku O (2016) Future aerosol reductions and widening of the northern tropical belt. *J Geophys Res: Atmospheres* 121:6765–6786. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD024803>
- Arias PA, Bellouin N, Coppola E, Jones RG, Krinner G, Marotzke J, Naik V, Palmer MD, Plattner G-K, Rogelj J, Rojas M, Sillmann J, Storelvmo T, Thorne PW, Trewin B, Achuta Rao K, Adhikary B, Allan RP, Armour K, Bala G, Barimalala R, Berger S, Canadell JG, Cassou C, Cherchi A, Collins W, Collins WD, Connors SL, Corti S, Cruz F, Dentener FJ, Dereczynski C, Di Luca A, Diongue Niang A, Doblus-Reyes FJ, Dosio A, Douville H, Engelbrecht F, Eyring V, Fischer E, Forster P, Fox-Kemper B, Fuglestedt JS, Fyfe JC, Gillett NP, Goldfarb L, Gorodetskaya I, Gutierrez JM, Hamdi R, Hawkins E, Hewitt HT, Hope P, Islam AS, Jones C, Kaufman DS, Kopp RE, Kosaka Y, Kossin J, Krakovska S, Lee J-Y, Li J, Mauritsen T, Maycock TK, Meinshausen M, Min S-K, Monteiro PMS, Ngo-Duc T, Otto F, Pinto I, Pirani A, Raghavan K, Ranasinghe R, Ruane AC, Ruiz L, Sallée J-B, Samset BH, Sathyendranath S, Seneviratne SI, Sörensson AA, Szopa S, Takayabu I, Tréguier A-M, van den Hurk B, Vautard R, von Schuckmann K, Zaehle S, Zhang X, Zickfeld K (2021) Technical Summary. In *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte V, Zhai P, Pirani A, Connors SL, Péan C, Berger S, Caud N, Chen Y, Goldfarb L, Gomis MI, Huang M, Leitzell K, Lonnoy E, Matthews JBR, Maycock TK, Waterfield T, Yelekçi O, Yu R, Zhou B (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 33–144. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.002>
- Ayugi B, Zhihong J, Zhu H, Ngoma H, Babaousmail H, Rizwan K, Dike V (2021) Comparison of CMIP6 and CMIP5 models in simulating mean and extreme precipitation over East Africa. *Int J Climatol* 41:6474–6496. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.7207>
- Baldassare D, Reichler T, Plink-Björklund P, Slawson J (2023) Large uncertainty in observed estimates of tropical width from the meridional stream function. *Weather Climate Dyn* 4(2):531–541. <https://doi.org/10.5194/wcd-4-531-2023>
- BloombergNEF: New Energy Outlook 2024. 2024
- Brunner L, McSweeney C, Ballinger AP, Befort DJ, Benassi M, Booth B, Coppola E, de Vries H, Harris G, Hegerl GC, Knutti R, Lenderink G, Lowe J, Nogherotto R, O'Reilly C, Qasmi S, Ribes A, Stocchi P, Undorf S (2020a) Comparing methods to constrain future European climate projections using a consistent framework. *J Clim* 33(20):8671–8692. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli-d-19-0953.1>
- Brunner L, Pendergrass AG, Lehner F, Merrifield AL, Lorenz R, Knutti R (2020b) Reduced global warming from CMIP6 projections when weighting models by performance and Independence. *Earth System Dynamics* 11(4):995–1012. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-11-995-2020>
- Burgess MG, Pielke R, Ritchie J (2022) Catastrophic climate risks should be neither understated nor overstated. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 119(42). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2214347119>
- Cannon AJ, Sobie SR, Murdock TQ (2015) Bias correction of GCM precipitation by quantile mapping: How well do methods preserve changes in quantiles and extremes? *J Clim* 28:6938–6959. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli-d-14-00754.1>
- Chemke R, Polvani LM (2019) Opposite tropical circulation trends in climate models and in reanalyses. *Nat Geosci* 12:528–532. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0383-x>
- Climate Action Tracker (2022). The CAT Thermometer. November 2022. Available at: <https://climateactiontracker.org/global/cat-thermometer/> Copyright © 2022 by Climate Analytics and NewClimate Institute. All rights reserved. Accessed 1 June 2023
- Climate Analytics (2023) When will global emissions peak?
- Cook BI, Mankin JS, Marvel K, Williams AP, Smerdon JE, Anchukaitis KJ (2020) Twenty-first century drought projections in the CMIP6 forcing scenarios. *Earth's Future* 8(6). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019ef001461>
- Curtis PE, Ceppi P, Zappa G (2020) Role of the mean state for the Southern Hemispheric jet stream response to CO2 forcing in CMIP6 models. *Environ Res Lett* 15:064011. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab8331>
- Davis NA, Davis SM (2018) Reconciling hadley cell expansion trend estimates in reanalyses. *Geophys Res Lett* 45. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018gl079593>
- De B, Tselioudis G, Polvani LM (2021) Improved representation of atmospheric dynamics in CMIP6 models removes climate sensitivity dependence on Hadley cell climatological extent. *Atmos Sci Lett* 23(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/asl.1073>
- Eyring V, Bony S, Meehl GA, Senior CA, Stevens B, Stouffer RJ, Taylor KE (2016) Overview of the coupled model intercomparison project phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization. *Geosci Model Dev* 9:1937–1958. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016>
- Grise KM, Davis SM (2020) Hadley cell expansion in CMIP6 models. *Atmos Chem Phys* 20(9):5249–5268. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-5249-2020>
- Grise KM, Polvani LM (2014) The response of Midlatitude Jets to increased CO2: Distinguishing the roles of sea surface temperature and direct radiative forcing. *Geophys Res Lett* 41(19):6863–6871. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014gl061638>
- Grise KM, Polvani LM (2016) Is climate sensitivity related to dynamical sensitivity? *J Geophys Res: Atmospheres* 121(10):5159–5176. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015jd024687>
- Grise KM, Davis SM, Simpson IR, Waugh DW, Fu Q, Allen RJ, Rosenlof KH, Ummenhofer CC, Karnauskas KB, Maycock AC, Quan X-W, Birner T, Staten PW (2019) Recent tropical expansion: Natural variability or forced response? *J Clim* 32(5):1551–1571. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli-d-18-0444.1>
- Hausfather Z, Peters GP (2020a) Emissions – the ‘business as usual’ story is misleading. *Nature* 577(7792):618–620. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-00177-3>
- Hausfather Z, Peters GP (2020b) RCP8.5 is a problematic scenario for near-term emissions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 117(45):27791–27792. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2017124117>
- Hausfather Z, Marvel K, Schmidt GA, Nielsen-Gammon JW, Zelinka M (2022) Climate simulations: Recognize the ‘Hot Model’ problem. *Nature* 605(7908):26–29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-01192-2>
- Hersbach H, Bell B, Berrisford P, Hirahara S, Horányi A, Muñoz-Sabater J, Nicolas J, Peubey C, Radu R, Schepers D, Simmons A, Soci C, Abdalla S, Abellan X, Balsamo G, Bechtold P, Biavati G, Bidlot J, Bonavita M, Chiara G, Dahlgren P, Dee D, Diamantakis M, Dragani R, Flemming J, Forbes R, Fuentes M, Geer A, Haimberger L, Healy S, Hogan RJ, Hólm E, Janisková M, Keeley S, Laloyaux P, Lopez P, Lupu C, Radnoti G, Rosnay P, Rozum I, Vamborg F, Villaume S, Thépaut JN (2020) The ERA5 global reanalysis. *Quart J Royal Meteorol Soc* 146(730):1999–2049. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803> (data available at: <https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu>, last access: 1 December 2023)
- Huard D, Fyke J, Capellán-Pérez I, Matthews HD, Partanen AI (2022) Estimating the likelihood of GHG concentration

- scenarios from Probabilistic Integrated Assessment Model Simulations. *Earth's Future* 10(10). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022ef002715>
- IEA: World Energy Outlook 2023. <https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-outlook-2023>. Accessed 1 June 2023
- Kemp L, Xu C, Depledge J, Ebi KL, Gibbins G, Kohler TA, Rockström J, Scheffer M, Schellnhuber HJ, Steffen W, Lenton TM (2022) Climate endgame: Exploring catastrophic climate change scenarios. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 119(34). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2108146119>
- Kidston J, Gerber EP (2010) Intermodel variability of the poleward shift of the austral jet stream in the CMIP3 integrations linked to biases in 20th century climatology. *Geophys Res Lett* 37(9). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010gl042873>
- Kim Y-H, Min S-K, Zhang X, Sillmann J, Sandstad M (2020) Evaluation of the CMIP6 multi-model ensemble for climate extreme indices. *Weather and Climate Extremes* 29:100269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2020.100269>
- Laux P, Rötter RP, Webber H, Dieng D, Rahimi J, Wei J, Faye B, Srivastava AK, Bliefernicht J, Adeyeri O, Arnault J, Kunstmann H (2021) To bias correct or not to bias correct? an agricultural impact modelers' perspective on Regional Climate Model Data. *Agric for Meteorol* 304–305:108406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2021.108406>
- Liang Y, Gillett NP, Monahan AH (2020) Climate model projections of 21st century global warming constrained using the observed warming trend. *Geophys Res Lett* 47(12). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019gl086757>
- Lu J, Vecchi GA, Reichler T (2007) Expansion of the Hadley cell under Global Warming. *Geophys Res Lett* 34(6). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006gl028443>
- Maraun D, Shepherd TG, Widmann M, Zappa G, Walton D, Gutiérrez JM, Hagemann S, Richter I, Soares PM, Hall A, Mearns LO (2017) Towards process-informed bias correction of climate change simulations. *Nat Clim Chang* 7(11):764–773. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3418>
- Nijse FJ, Cox PM, Williamson MS (2020) Emergent constraints on transient climate response (TCR) and Equilibrium Climate sensitivity (ECS) from historical warming in CMIP5 and CMIP6 models. *Earth System Dynamics* 11(3):737–750. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-11-737-2020>
- Perlwitz J (2011) Tug of war on the Jet Stream. *Nat Clim Chang* 1(1):29–31. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1065>
- Persad G, Samset BH, Wilcox LJ, Allen RJ, Bollasina MA, Booth BBB, Bonfils C, Crocker T, Joshi M, Lund MT, Marvel K, Merikanto J, Nordling K, Undorf S, van Vuuren DP, Westervelt DM, Zhao A (2023) Rapidly evolving aerosol emissions are a dangerous omission from near-term climate risk assessments. *Environmental Research: Climate* 2:032001. <https://doi.org/10.1088/2752-5295/acd6af>
- Pielke R, Ritchie J (2021) Distorting the view of our climate future: The misuse and abuse of climate pathways and scenarios. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 72:101890. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101890>
- Polvani LM, Waugh DW, Correa GJ, Son S-W (2011) Stratospheric ozone depletion: The main driver of twentieth-century atmospheric circulation changes in the Southern Hemisphere. *J Clim* 24(3):795–812. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010jcli3772.1>
- Revell LE, Robertson F, Douglas H, Morgenstern O, Frame D (2022) Influence of ozone forcing on 21st century Southern Hemisphere surface westerlies in CMIP6 models. *Geophys Res Lett* 49(6). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022gl098252>
- Riahi K, van Vuuren DP, Kriegler E, Edmonds J, O'Neill BC, Fujimori S, Bauer N, Calvin K, Dellink R, Fricko O, Lutz W, Popp A, Cuaserna JC, Samir KC, Leimbach M, Jiang L, Kram T, Rao S, Emmerling J, Ebi K, Hasegawa T, Havlik P, Humpenöder F, Da Silva LA, Smith S, Stehfest E, Bosetti V, Eom J, Gernaat D, Masui T, Rogelj J, Strefler J, Drouet L, Krey V, Luderer G, Harmsen M, Takahashi K, Baumstark L, Doelman JC, Kainuma M, Klimont Z, Marangoni G, Lotze-Campen H, Obersteiner M, Tabeau A, Tavoni M (2017) The shared socioeconomic pathways and their energy, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions implications: An overview. *Global Environ Change* 42:153–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.009>
- Schmidt DF, Grise KM (2017) The response of local precipitation and sea level pressure to Hadley cell expansion. *Geophys Res Lett* 44(20). <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017gl075380>
- Schwalm CR, Glendon S, Duffy PB (2020) RCP8.5 tracks cumulative CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 117(33):19656–19657. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2007117117>
- Sherwood SC, Webb MJ, Annan JD, Armour KC, Forster PM, Hargreaves JC, Hegerl G, Klein SA, Marvel KD, Rohling EJ, Watanabe M, Andrews T, Braconnot P, Bretherton CS, Foster GL, Hausfather Z, von der Heydt AS, Knutti R, Mauritsen T, Norris JR, Proistosescu C, Rugenstein M, Schmidt GA, Tokarska KB, Zelinka MD (2020) An assessment of Earth's climate sensitivity using multiple lines of evidence. *Rev Geophys* 58(4). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019rg000678>
- Simpson IR, Polvani LM (2016) Revisiting the relationship between jet position, forced response, and annular mode variability in the southern midlatitudes. *Geophys Res Lett* 43:2896–2903. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016gl067989>
- Simpson IR, McKinnon KA, Davenport FV, Tingley M, Lehner F, Al Fahad A, Chen D (2021) Emergent Constraints on the Large-Scale Atmospheric Circulation and Regional Hydroclimate: Do They Still Work in CMIP6 and How Much Can They Actually Constrain the Future? *J Clim* 34:6355–6377. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli-d-21-0055.1>
- Solomon S, Thompson DW, Portmann RW, Oltmans SJ, Thompson AM (2005) On the distribution and variability of ozone in the tropical upper troposphere: Implications for tropical deep convection and chemical-dynamical coupling. *Geophys Res Lett* 32(23). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005gl024323>
- Spinoni J, Barbosa P, Bucchignani E, Cassano J, Cavazos T, Christensen JH, Christensen OB, Coppola E, Evans J, Geyer B, Giorgi F, Hadjinicolaou P, Jacob D, Katzfey J, Koenigk T, Laprise R, Lennard CJ, Kurnaz ML, Li D, Llopart M, McCormick N, Naumann G, Nikulin G, Ozturk T, Panitz H-J, Porfiri da Rocha R, Rockel B, Solman SA, Syktus J, Tangang F, Teichmann C, Vautard R, Vogt JV, Winger K, Zittis G, Dosio A (2020) Future global meteorological drought hot spots: A study based on Cordex Data. *J Clim* 33(9):3635–3661. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli-d-19-0084.1>
- Srikrishnan V, Guan Y, Tol RS, Keller K (2022) Probabilistic projections of Baseline Twenty-first century CO<sub>2</sub> emissions using a simple calibrated integrated assessment model. *Climatic Change* 170(3–4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-021-03279-7>
- Staten PW, Lu J, Grise KM, Davis SM, Birner T (2018) Re-examining tropical expansion. *Nat Clim Chang* 8(9):768–775. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0246-2>
- Tao L, Hu Y, Liu J (2016) Anthropogenic forcing on the Hadley circulation in CMIP5 simulations. *Clim Dyn* 46(9–10):3337–3350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-015-2772-1>
- Teutschbein C, Seibert J (2012) Bias correction of regional climate model simulations for hydrological climate-change impact studies: Review and evaluation of different methods. *J Hydrol* 456–457:12–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.05.052>
- Tierney JE, Poulsen CJ, Montañez IP, Bhattacharya T, Feng R, Ford HL, Hönisch B, Inglis GN, Petersen SV, Sagoo N, Tabor CR, Thirumalai K, Zhu J, Burls NJ, Foster GL, Goddard Y, Huber BT, Ivany LC, Kirtland Turner S, Lunt DJ, McElwain JC, Mills BJ, Otto-Bliesner BL, Ridgwell A, Zhang YG (2020) Past climates

- inform our future. *Science* 370(6517). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay3701>
- van Vuuren D, Tebaldi C, O'Neill BC (2023) ScenarioMIP SSC and workshop participants. Pathway to next generation scenarios for CMIP7. 10.5281/zenodo.818611
- Watt-Meyer O, Frierson DM, Fu Q (2019) Hemispheric asymmetry of tropical expansion under co2 forcing. *Geophys Res Lett* 46(15):9231–9240. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019gl083695>
- Waugh DW, Garfinkel CI, Polvani LM (2015) Drivers of the recent tropical expansion in the Southern Hemisphere: Changing ssts or ozone depletion? *J Clim* 28(16):6581–6586. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli-d-15-0138.1>
- World Meteorological Organization (WMO), Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2022, GAW Report No. 278, 509 pp., WMO, Geneva, 2022
- Xia Y, Hu Y, Liu J (2020) Comparison of trends in the Hadley circulation between CMIP6 and CMIP5. *Science Bulletin* 65(19):1667–1674. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scib.2020.06.011>
- Xu Z, Han Y, Tam C-Y, Yang Z-L, Fu C (2021) Bias-corrected CMIP6 global dataset for dynamical downscaling of the historical and future climate (1979–2100). *Scientific Data* 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-021-01079-3>
- Zhao X, Allen RJ, Wood T, Maycock AC (2020) Tropical Belt Width Proportionately More Sensitive to Aerosols Than Greenhouse Gases. *Geophys Res Lett* 47. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019gl086425>

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.