Corrigendum to Clim. Past, 16, 1715–1735, 2020
https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-16-1715-2020-corrigendum

Climate of the Past
Open Access
EGU

Corrigendum to
"A Bayesian framework for emergent constraints: case studies of climate sensitivity with PMIP" published in Clim. Past, 16, 1715–1735, 2020

Martin Renoult[1], James Douglas Annan[2], Julia Catherine Hargreaves[2], Navjit Sagoo[1], Clare Flynn[1], Marie-Luise Kapsch[3], Qiang Li[4], Gerrit Lohmann[5], Uwe Mikolajewicz[3], Rumi Ohgaito[6], Xiaoxu Shi[5], Qiong Zhang[4], and Thorsten Mauritsen[1]

[1]Department of Meteorology, Bolin Centre for Climate Research, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden
[2]Blue Skies Research Ltd, Settle, United Kingdom
[3]Max Planck Institute for Meteorology, Hamburg, Germany
[4]Department of Physical Geography, Bolin Centre for Climate Research, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden
[5]Alfred Wegener Institute, Helmholtz Centre for Polar and Marine Research, Bremerhaven, Germany
[6]Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology, Yokohama, Japan

Correspondence: Martin Renoult (martin.renoult@misu.su.se)

Published: 22 April 2021

During paper preparation, the climate sensitivity value of the NorESM-L model for PMIP3 was wrongly reported as 2.1, instead of 3.1 (Haywood et al., 2013). However, the correct value was used in all computations. A corrected Table 1 can be found below.

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Table 1. Models, tropical temperature (T_{tropical}) outputs, and climate sensitivity (S) used in this study.

Experiment	Figure reference	Model	T^{a}_{tropical}	S	S reference
PMIP2 LGM	1	MIROC	−2.75	4.0	K-1 Model Developers (2004)
PMIP2 LGM	2	IPSL	−2.83	4.4	Randall et al. (2007)
PMIP2 LGM	3	CCSM	−2.12	2.7	Randall et al. (2007)
PMIP2 LGM	4	ECHAM	−3.16	3.4	Randall et al. (2007)
PMIP2 LGM	5	FGOALS	−2.36	2.3	Randall et al. (2007)
PMIP2 LGM	6	HadCM3[b]	−2.77	3.3	Randall et al. (2007)
PMIP2 LGM	7	ECBILT[b]	−1.34	1.8	Goosse et al. (2005)
PMIP3/CMIP5 LGM	8	CCSM4[b]	−2.6	3.2	Andrews et al. (2012)
PMIP3/CMIP5 LGM	9	IPSL-CM5A-LR[b]	−3.38	4.13	Andrews et al. (2012)
PMIP3/CMIP5 LGM	10	MIROC-ESM	−2.52	4.67	Sueyoshi et al. (2013)
PMIP3/CMIP5 LGM	11	MPI-ESM-P	−2.56	3.45	Andrews et al. (2012)
PMIP3/CMIP5 LGM	12	CNRM-CM5[b]	−1.67	3.25	Andrews et al. (2012)
PMIP3/CMIP5 LGM	13	MRI-CGCM3[b]	−2.82	2.6	Andrews et al. (2012)
PMIP3/CMIP5 LGM	14	FGOALS-g2[b]	−3.15	3.37	Masa Yoshimori (personal communication, 2013)[c]
PMIP4/CMIP6 LGM	24	MPI-ESM1.2-LR[b]	−2.06	3.01	Mauritsen et al. (2019)
PMIP4/CMIP6 LGM	25	MIROC-ES2L[b]	−2.23	2.66	Hajima et al. (2020), Ohgaito et al. (2020)
PMIP4/CMIP6 LGM	26	INM-CM4-8[b]	−2.43	1.81	This study
PMIP4/CMIP6 LGM	27	AWI-ESM-1-1-LR[b]	−1.75	3.61	This study
PMIP3/CMIP5 PlioMIP1	15	CCSM4[b]	1.03	3.2	Haywood et al. (2013)
PMIP3/CMIP5 PlioMIP1	16	IPSLCM5A	1.33	3.4	Haywood et al. (2013)
PMIP3/CMIP5 PlioMIP1	17	MIROC4m[b]	1.99	4.05	Haywood et al. (2013)
PMIP3/CMIP5 PlioMIP1	18	GISS ModelE2-R	1.16	2.8	Haywood et al. (2013)
PMIP3/CMIP5 PlioMIP1	19	COSMOS[b]	2.18	4.1	Haywood et al. (2013)
PMIP3/CMIP5 PlioMIP1	20	MRI-CGCM2.3[b]	1.15	3.2	Haywood et al. (2013)
PMIP3/CMIP5 PlioMIP1	21	HadCM3[b]	1.93	3.3	Randall et al. (2007)
PMIP3/CMIP5 PlioMIP1	22	NorESM-L	1.45	3.1	Haywood et al. (2013)
PMIP3/CMIP5 PlioMIP1	23	FGOALS-g2[b]	2.14	3.37	Masa Yoshimori (personal communication, 2013)[c]
PMIP4/CMIP6 PlioMIP2	28	GISS-E2-1-G[b]	0.92	2.6	This study
PMIP4/CMIP6 PlioMIP2	29	IPSL-CM6A-LR[b]	2.12	4.5	This study
PMIP4/CMIP6 PlioMIP2	30	NorESM1-F[b]	1.37	2.29	Guo et al. (2019)
PMIP4/CMIP6 PlioMIP2	31	CESM2[b]	3.5	5.3	Gettelman et al. (2019)
PMIP4/CMIP6 PlioMIP2	32	EC-EARTH3.3[b]	2.94	4.3	Wyser et al. (2019)

[a] For the LGM simulations (generations PMIP2, PMIP3, and PMIP4), the tropical average was defined between 20° S and 30° N (Hargreaves et al., 2012). For the mPWP simulations (generations PlioMIP1 and PlioMIP2), the tropical average was defined between 30° S and 30° N (Hargreaves and Annan, 2016). All temperature values are defined as changes compared with pre-industrial values. [b] The latest version of a model that was kept for the approach described in Sect. 3.3. [c] Calculated using the Gregory method on 150 years of output, making it consistent with the values of Andrews et al. (2012).

https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-16-1715-2020