

## **Erratum to: No consensus on consensus: the challenge of finding a universal approach to measuring and mapping ensemble consistency in GCM projections**

**Carol F. McSweeney · Richard G. Jones**

Published online: 29 August 2013

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

**Erratum to: Climatic Change (2013) 119(3-4):617–629**  
**DOI: 10.1007/s10584-013-0781-9**

The abstract is printed incorrectly and should read as follows:

Communicating information about consistency in projections is crucial to the successful understanding, interpretation and appropriate application of information from climate models about future climate and its uncertainties. However, mapping the consistency of model projections in such a way that this information is communicated clearly remains a challenge that several recently published papers have sought to address in the run up to the IPCC AR5. We highlight that three remaining issues have not been fully addressed by the literature to date. 1.) While additional information about regions where projected changes in rainfall are not ‘statistically significant’ can provide useful information for policy, the spatial scale at which changes are assessed has a substantial impact on the signal-to-noise ratio, and thus the detectability of changes. We demonstrate that by spatially smoothing the model projections we can provide more information about the nature of the signal for larger regions of the world. 2.) Combining information about magnitude, consistency and statistical significance of projected changes in a single map can cause reduced legibility. We demonstrate the difficulty in finding a ‘universal’ method suitable for a wide range of audiences. 3.) We highlight that regions where projected changes in average rainfall are not statistically significant, changes in variability may still cause significant impacts. We stress the need to communicate this effectively in order to avoid misleading users. Finally, we comment on regions of the world where messages for users of climate information about ensemble consistency have changed since AR4, noting that these changes are due largely to changes in the methods of consistency rather than any discernable differences between the CMIP3 and CMIP5 ensembles.

The caption for figure 4 in this paper is incorrect. It should read:

Fig. 4 Comparison between the consistency in projections of future rainfall for the CMIP3 and CMIP5 ensembles using the ‘3-party democracy’ method described in Section 3. CMIP5 projections are shown for scenario RCP6.0 while CMIP3 projections are for SRESA1B.

---

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10584-013-0781-9>.

C. F. McSweeney (✉) · R. G. Jones  
Met Office Hadley Centre, FitzRoy Road, Exeter EX1 3PB, UK  
e-mail: carol.mcsweeney@metoffice.gov.uk