**ATOC5860 – Application Lab #1**

**Significance Testing Using Bootstrapping and Z/T-tests**

**in class Thursday January 20 and Tuesday January 25, 2020**

**Notebook #1 – Statistical significance using Bootstrapping**

**ATOC7500\_applicationlab1\_bootstrapping.ipynb**

**LEARNING GOALS:**

1) Use an ipython notebook to read in csv file, print variables, calculate basic statistics, do a bootstrap, make histogram plot

2) Hypothesis testing and statistical significance testing using bootstrapping

**DATA and UNDERLYING SCIENCE:**

In this notebook, you will analyze the relationship between Tropical Pacific Sea Surface Temperature (SST) anomalies and Colorado snowpack. Specifically, you will test the hypothesis that December Pacific SST anomalies driven by the El Nino Southern Oscillation affect the total wintertime snow accumulation at Loveland Pass, Colorado. When SSTs in the central Pacific are anomalously warm/cold, the position of the mid-latitude jet shifts and precipitation in the United States shifts. This notebook will guide you through an analysis to investigate the connections between December Nino3.4 SST anomalies (in units of °C) and the following April 1 Loveland Pass, Colorado Snow Water Equivalence (in units of inches). Note that SWE is a measure of the amount of water contained in the snowpack. To convert to snow depth, you multiply by ~5 (the exact value depends on the snow density).

The Loveland Pass SWE data are from:

<https://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/snow/>

The Nino3.4 data are from:

<https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/gcos_wgsp/Timeseries/Nino34/>

**Questions to guide your analysis of Notebook #1:**

For full credit: write answers to the questions and then upload this document to your github along with notebook #1 (including any edits that you make).

1) Composite Loveland Pass, Colorado snowpack. Fill out the following table showing the April 1 SWE in all years, in El Nino years (conditioned on Nino3.4 being 1 degree C warmer than average), and in La Nina years (condition on Nino3.4 being 1 degree C cooler than average).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Mean SWE** | **Std. Dev. SWE** | **N (# years)** |
| **All years** | **16.33** | **4.22** | **81** |
| **El Nino Years** | **15.29** | **4** | **16** |
| **La Nina Years** | **17.78** | **4.11** | **15** |

2) Use hypothesis testing to assess if the differences in snowpack are statistically significant. Write the 5 steps. Test your hypothesis using bootstrapping.

1. State the significance level (alpha)

2. State the null hypothesis H0 and the alternative H1

3. State the statistic to be used, and the assumptions required to use it

4. State the critical region

5. Evaluate the statistic and state the conclusion

Instructions for bootstrap: Say there are N years with El Nino conditions. Instead of averaging the Loveland SWE in those N years, randomly grab N Loveland SWE values and take their average. Then do this again, and again, and again 1000 times. In the end you will end up with a distribution of SWE averages in the case of random sampling, i.e., the distribution you would expect if there was no physical relationship between Nino3.4 SST anomalies and Loveland Pass SWE.

1. Plot a histogram of this distribution and provide basic statistics describing this distribution( (mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum).

avg: 16.39958125

std: 1.0641589348922167

min: 13.075

max: 20.38125

Chart, histogram
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1. Quantify the likelihood of getting your value of mean SWE by chance alone using percentiles of this bootstrapped distribution. What is the probability that differences between the El Nino composite and all years occurred by chance? What is the probability that differences between the La Nina composite and all years occurred by chance?

I’ll report the results of the two-tailed z-stat tests here because they seem to answer the question better.

Likelihood of the El Niño differences occurring by chance: 30.81%

Likelihood of the La Niña differences occurring by chance: 17.17%

3) Test the sensitivity of the results obtained in 2) by changing the number of bootstraps, the statistical significance level, or the definition of El Nino/La Nina (e.g., change the temperature threshold so that El Nino is defined using a 0.5 degree C temperature anomaly or a 3 degree C temperature anomaly). In other words – play and learn something about the robustness of your conclusions.

I reduced the temperature threshold for both El Niño and La Ninã events to 0.5 degree C. Now there are more events, so the bootstrap sizes have also changed.

The likelihood of the El Niño anomalies occurring by chance remains fairly high: 31.41%

The likelihood of the La Niña anomalies occurring by chance drops to a statistically significant value: 4.24%

4) Maybe you want to see if you get the same answer when you use a t-test… Maybe you want to set up the bootstrap in another way?? Another bootstrapping approach is provided by Vineel Yettella (ATOC Ph.D. 2018). Check these out and see what you find!!

Vineel’s approach uses resampling with replacement to generate a confidence interval for the difference in April 1 SWE between El Niño/La Niña years and the entire record. Similar to the bootstrapping approach with 1degC temperature anomaly, these results show that the difference is not statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. If I change the anomaly to 0.5degC however, the La Niña difference confidence interval stops spanning 0, indicating that SWE in La Niña years is statistically different from the normal SWE at a 95% confidence. This is very similar to using the other bootstrapping approach.

**Notebook #2 – Statistical significance using z/t-tests**

**ATOC7500\_applicationlab1\_ztest\_ttest.ipynb**

**LEARNING GOALS:**

1) Use an ipython notebook to read in a netcdf file, make line plots and histograms, and calculate statistics

2) Calculate statistical significance of the changes in a standardized mean using a z-statistic and a t-statistic

3) Calculate confidence intervals for model-projected global warming using z-statistic and t-statistic.

**DATA and UNDERLYING SCIENCE:**

You will be plotting *munged* climate model output from the Community Earth System Model (CESM) Large Ensemble Project. The Large Ensemble Project includes a 42-member ensemble of fully coupled climate model simulations for the period 1920-2100 (*note: only the original 30 are provided here*). Each individual ensemble member is subject to the same radiative forcing scenario (historical up to 2005 and high greenhouse gas emission scenario (RCP8.5) thereafter), but begins from a slightly different initial atmospheric state (created by randomly perturbing temperatures at the level of round-off error). In the notebook, you will compare the ensemble remembers with a 2600-year-long model simulation having constant pre-industrial (1850) radiative forcing conditions (perpetual 1850). By comparing the ensemble members to each other and to the 1850 control, you can assess the climate change in the presence of internal climate variability.

**More information on the CESM Large Ensemble Project can be found at:**

<http://www.cesm.ucar.edu/projects/community-projects/LENS/>

**Questions to guide your analysis of Notebook #2:**

For full credit: write answers to the questions and then upload this document to your github along with notebook #1 (including any edits that you make).

1) Use the 2600-year long 1850 control run to calculate population statistics with constant forcing (in the absence of climate change). Find the population mean and population standard deviation for CESM1 global annual mean surface temperature. Standardize the data and again find the population mean and population standard deviation. Plot a histogram of the standardized data. Is the distribution Gaussian?

The unstandardized population mean is 287.11K and the unstandardized population standard deviation is 0.1K.

The standardized population mean is 0, and the standardized population standard deviation is 1. 🡨 This is because we standardized the distribution.

The distribution is gaussian.

Chart, histogram
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2) Calculate global warming in the first ensemble member over a given time period defined by the startyear and endyear variables. Compare the warming in this first ensemble member with the 1850 control run statistics and assess if the warming is statistically significant. Use hypothesis testing and state the 5 steps. What is your null hypothesis? Try using a z-statistic (appropriate for N>30) and a t-statistic (appropriate for N<30). What is the probability that the warming in the first ensemble member occurred by chance? Change the startyear and endyear variables – When does global warming become statistically significant in the first ensemble member?

Hypothesis testing steps:

1. Significance level alpha = 0.05 (95% confidence)
2. Null hypothesis: The mean temperature in the first ensemble member is the same as the mean temperature in the control run. Alternative: The mean temperature in the first ensemble member is not the same as the mean temperature in the control run.
3. We use a t-statistic because we only use 20 years of data from the first ensemble member. This requires us to assume that the data are normally distributed.
4. State the critical region: t\_0.025(N=20) = 2.262, z\_0.025 = 1.96
5. Evaluate the statistic and state the conclusion. The t-statistic is 37.12. t > t\_crit, so we can reject the null hypothesis at 95% confidence. The z-statistic is 35.36. z > z\_crit, so again we can reject the null hypothesis at 95% confidence.

If we keep the time interval at 10 years, global warming becomes statistically significant in the 1975-1985 period, but is not statistically significant in the 1970-1980 period.

3) Many climate modeling centers run only a handful of ensemble members for climate change projections. Given that the CESM Large Ensemble has lots of members, you can calculate the warming over the 21st century and place confidence intervals in that warming by assessing the spread across ensemble members. Calculate confidence intervals using both a z-statistic and a t-statistic. How different are they? Plot a histogram of global warming in the ensemble members – Is a normal distribution a good approximation? Re-do your confidence interval analysis by assuming that you only had 6 ensemble members or 3 ensemble members. How many members do you need? Look at the difference between a 95% confidence interval and a 99% confidence interval.

Confidence intervals (surface temperature increase) on all 30 ensemble members:

z-statistic:

3.61-3.66 (95%)

3.6-3.66 (99%)

t-statistic:

3.61-3.66 (95%)

3.6-3.67 (99%)

I don’t think that a normal distribution is a great approximation, but we could use an f-statistic to test it if we wanted.
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With 6 ensemble members, the confidence intervals widen significantly:

95% confidence limits - t-statistic

3.60

3.68

99% confidence limits - t-statistic

3.57

3.71

It isn’t clear to me how many members we would need for the warming to be normally distributed, but the confidence intervals narrow significantly with 15 members. I think that you could always had more members to try and improve your confidence interval.