

A. Tables to summarise algorithm performance

The numbers in the following tables for non-biased stations/ stations with zero RMSE don't necessarily match with the numbers of homogeneous stations in table two from chapter five. This is because the numbers in chapter five were the number of stations with no identifiable inhomogeneities, whereas the numbers here are the numbers of stations with no inhomogeneities at all.

Table A.1. A summary of algorithm performance using bias, which is defined as the difference in means between the clean and released or clean and returned series and is therefore measured in $^{\circ}\text{C}$. Absolute bias refers to the value obtained by taking the modulus of the bias thereby forcing it to be positive. When percentage recovery is referred to the letters indicate the following: I = Improved; a PR less than 75 indicating the improvement is not large enough and in brackets between 125 and 200, which indicates a bias better than before, but that has overshot the true value. GI = Greatly improved; a PR between 75 and 125. MW = Made worse; a PR of less than 0 or greater than 200 indicating that homogenisation increased the station bias, potentially by 'correcting' it too far. U = Unchanged; PR of 0, values in brackets in this column indicate that the bias is unchanged because the station was already unbiased. For the best and worst stations the groupings are simply improved: PR between 0 and 200, Unchanged: PR = 0 and Made worse: PR is less than 0 or greater than 200. Values in brackets in the column referring to non-biased stations indicate the quantity of stations that have an absolute bias less than 0.05°C , which therefore effectively have a bias of zero when rounded to point one degree precision.

Scenario	Algorithm	Region bias	No. positively biased (mean bias)	No. negatively biased (mean bias)	No. non-biased (to measurement precision)	Sum absolute biases	Percentage recovery				PR best stats				PR worst stats				Best stats mean bias			
							GI	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW
WYW1	Released	0.053	37 (0.44)	36 (-0.34)	2 (18)	28.52	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	0.27	
	MACD	-0.016	38 (0.11)	35 (-0.35)	2 (27)	9.42	25	10 (7)	19 (2)	12	0	9	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	-0.16	
	Climatol-D	-0.035	27 (0.11)	46 (-0.12)	2 (29)	8.49	32	5 (2)	27 (2)	7	0	10	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0.01	-0.11	
	Climatol-M	0.047	36 (0.41)	37 (-0.30)	2 (18)	25.93	1	51 (0)	15 (2)	6	2	8	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.25	
	MASH	-0.012	32 (0.13)	43 (-0.12)	0 (30)	9.03	38	16 (4)	0 (0)	17	5	0	5	8	0	2	2	-0.003	0.06	0.06		
	ACMANT2	-0.037	24 (0.08)	50 (-0.09)	1 (33)	6.43	35	13 (10)	2 (1)	14	4	2	4	10	0	0	0	0.02	-0.10	-0.10		
	DAP1	0.067	41 (0.35)	33 (-0.28)	1 (16)	23.64	2	25 (4)	36 (1)	7	0	9	1	6	3	1	1	0.02	0.28	0.28		
	HOM1	0.062	39 (0.37)	35 (-0.28)	1 (16)	24.25	3	21 (1)	42 (1)	7	0	9	1	5	4	1	1	0.02	0.30	0.30		
	SPLIDHOM1	0.064	39 (0.37)	35 (-0.28)	1 (16)	24.34	2	22 (2)	42 (1)	6	0	9	1	5	4	1	1	0.02	0.31	0.31		

Table A.2. A summary of algorithm performance using RMSE, which is the root mean squared error between clean and returned series or clean and released series (see chapter 6 section 3.2), reported in $^{\circ}\text{C}$. Percentage recovery here cannot be greater than 100 as it is not possible to overshoot perfection because RMSE is constrained to be positive. The categories of PR are: I = Improved; PR between 0 and 75; GI = Greatly improved; a PR of between 75 and 100. MW = Made worse; a PR of less than 0, and U = Unchanged; a PR of 0 (values in brackets indicate no improvement possible because of perfection).

Scenario	Algorithm	Region	RMSE	No. perfect RMSEs (to measurement precision)	Range of RMSEs in best stats	Range of RMSEs in worst stats	Percentage recovery		PR best stats		PR worst stats		PR value for region				
							GI	I	MW	U	I	U	MW				
WYW1	Released		0.726	2 (4)	(0, 0.11)	(-1.17, 1.95)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
	MACD		0.304	2 (5)	(0, 0.26)	(0.10, 1.50)	17	30	7	19 (2)	0	9	1	10	0	0	58.10
	Climatol-D		0.272	2 (6)	(0, 0.11)	(0.11, 1.20)	21	25	0	27 (2)	0	10	0	9	1	0	62.54
	Climatol-M		0.659	2 (4)	(0, 0.11)	(1.04, 1.78)	0	56	2	15 (2)	1	7	2	10	0	0	9.22
	MASH		0.333	0 (0)	(0.09, 0.23)	(0.17, 1.70)	12	46	17	0 (0)	1	0	9	8	0	2	54.15
	ACMANT2		0.242	1 (1)	(0, 0.26)	(0.11, 0.80)	14	49	9	2 (1)	2	2	6	10	0	0	66.60
	DAP1		0.649	1 (3)	(0, 0.23)	(0.45, 1.79)	0	26	12	36 (1)	0	9	1	6	1	3	10.62
	HOM1		0.662	1 (3)	(0, 0.23)	(0.44, 1.95)	0	24	8	42 (1)	0	9	1	5	4	1	8.75
	SPLIDHOM1		0.661	1 (3)	(0, 0.23)	(0.44, 1.95)	0	24	8	42 (1)	0	9	1	5	4	1	8.93

Table A.3. A summary of algorithm performance on linear trend recovery. Note that 'significant trends preserved' (the value in brackets in the 'significant trends' column) refers to where a trend that is significant in the clean data is also significant in the released or returned data. This value is red only when the trend's significance is preserved and when its value is also preserved (with a 0.05°C buffer to allow for slight changes). All trends are in the units of $^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{decade}$. The range of percentage recovery values are the same as for bias and therefore table 1 should be seen for PR classifications used here.

Table A.4. A summary of algorithm performance when considering similarity in inter-annual and inter-decadal variability using correlations of loess smooths. Loess smooths were compared between clean and released and returned data using Spearman rank correlations and it is these correlations that were used in the calculation of percentage recovery. PR values cannot be greater than 100 and therefore are constrained to be the same as for RMSE. Colour coding of table rows to represent algorithms is the same as for other tables.

Scenario	PR for inter-decadal smooths			PR for inter-decadal worst			PR for inter-annual smooths			PR for inter-annual best			PR for inter-annual annual worst			Biggest correlation decrease (station ID)			Overall correlation for region		
	GI	I	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	D	Y	
WYW1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.623	0.888	
	27	17	10	19(2)	0	9	1	9	0	1	34	14	6	19(2)	0	9	1	9	0	1	0.018 (23)
	31	13	2	27(2)	0	10	0	9	1	0	39	7	0	27(2)	0	10	0	9	1	0	0.05 (20) NA
	0	52	6	15(2)	1	7	2	9	1	0	0	56	2	15(2)	1	7	2	10	0	0	0.0001 (23)
	39	21	15	0(0)	4	0	6	9	0	1	48	17	10	0(0)	4	0	6	10	0	0	0.009 (45)
	43	13	16	2(1)	2	2	6	9	0	1	52	8	12	2(1)	1	2	7	9	0	1	0.56 (47)
	4	24	10	36(1)	0	9	1	7	3	0	1	30	8	36(1)	0	9	1	7	0	3	1.16 (33)
	4	18	10	42(1)	0	9	1	6	4	0	5	20	7	42(1)	0	9	1	6	4	0	0.13 (33) 0.678
	4	19	9	42(1)	0	9	1	6	4	0	4	22	6	42(1)	0	9	1	6	4	0	1.17 (33) 0.676

Table A.5. A summary of algorithm performance on variability recovery. Variability between stations was compared using ratios of standard deviations relative to the clean series. The variability increases and decreases columns are relative to the released series; that is if returned stations were made more (less) variable than the released series what was the percentage recovery of this change? The groupings are the same as for bias, but without the 'unchanged' option as this is moot when these columns pertain specifically to variabilities that have been changed. The sums of the numbers in these columns do not equal the values in columns three and four as those pertain to the variability relative to the clean series.

Scenario	Algorithm	No. stats more variable than clean	No. stats less variable than clean	Variability increases	Variability decreases	PR best stats			PR worst stats			
						GI	I	MW	GI	I	MW	I
WYW1	Released	56	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MACD	43	30	5	0	7	10	25	6	21 (2)	0	9
	Climatol-D	42	31	0	3	6	13	18	6	29 (2)	0	9
	Climatol-M	53	20	1	2	12	2	29	12	17 (2)	0	7
	MASH	40	35	0	2	28	10	16	19	0 (0)	3	7
	ACMANT2	43	31	2	4	12	9	31	14	3 (1)	3	5
	DAP1	51	23	0	0	21	3	6	8	37 (1)	0	9
	HOM1	50	24	0	0	18	1	6	7	43 (1)	0	9
	SPLIDHOM1	50	24	0	0	19	2	5	6	43 (1)	0	9

Table A.6. A summary of algorithm performance on recovery and preservation of extremes. Extremes were here compared on like for like days. That is, if an algorithm did not preserve the day of the extreme it was not credited with preserving it at all. Measurement error is important here as single days are being focussed on, whereas for all other statistics aggregation of some kind has occurred and therefore random measurement error would be expected to have cancelled out. The measurement error here was calculated as 0.14°C from Brohan et al. [2006] and the number of values exact to measurement precision is indicated in brackets. Where extremes are referred to as being ‘too warm’ or ‘too cool’ here the implication is that they are more than 0.14°C away from the observed value.

Scenario	Algorithm	Warm extremes			Cold extremes			Too cool in returned			Too warm in returned			Too cool in returned		
		Exact (± 0.14)	Too warm in returned	Too cool in returned	Exact (± 0.14)	Too warm in returned	Too cool in returned	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW
WYW1	Released	46 (56)	-	-	-	-	-	13 (26)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MACD	48 (59)	2	3	1	3	7	0	22 (42)	9	3	2	5	10	4	
	Climatol-D	48 (62)	2	4	0	5	6	0	20 (44)	6	5	3	3	11	3	
	Climatol-M	46 (56)	4	4	0	5	6	0	14 (26)	19	7	0	15	8	0	
	MASH	43 (56)	3	0	3	2	3	8	16 (38)	9	1	9	13	1	4	
	ACMANT2	49 (62)	0	4	1	4	3	1	23 (48)	4	3	3	8	5	4	
	DAP1	47 (57)	0	7	1	1	9	0	12 (25)	3	22	2	4	18	1	
	HOM1	45 (55)	1	7	1	2	9	0	13 (26)	2	23	1	3	18	2	
	SPLIDHOM1	46 (56)	1	7	1	1	9	0	12 (24)	2	24	1	3	18	3	

Table A.7. A table to summarise algorithm detection ability when a window of thirty days either side of a change point was used. Colour coding is the same as for other tables, apart from that blue now represents DAP1, HOM1 and SPLIDHOM1 as all three of these algorithms had the same change point detection method applied and therefore yielded the same results. Values in brackets for hits, false alarms and CSI indicate the values that are obtained if you count multiple hits and multiple false alarms within a single window. The value not in brackets for CSI is when only multiple false alarms in windows are counted, but not multiple hits as the justification for the latter is more complicated. All values for hit rate (HR) and false alarm rate (FAR) are calculated from non-bracketed quantities. Abbreviations used in this table are as follows: CO = constant offset; EV = explanatory variables; SC = shelter changes; SR = station relocations.

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Misses	CRs	HR	FAR	Freq. bias	Critical Success Index	Prop. CO IHs found	Prop. EV IHs found	Prop. large IHs found	Prop. medium IHs found	Prop. small IHs found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found	Prop. urbanisation IHs found
WYW1	57 (58)	40 (63)	193	279	0.228	0.125	0.467	0.182 (0.185)	51.3%	9.88%	76.7%	26.0%	2.06%	20.7%	26.3%	20.5%
	55 (55)	12 (12)	195	307	0.220	0.038	0.261	0.210 (0.210)	51.3%	8.72%	83.3%	24.4%	0%	19.8%	26.3%	18.2%
	88 (88)	56 (58)	162	263	0.352	0.176	0.568	0.286 (0.286)	62.8%	22.7%	96.7%	46.3%	2.06%	35.1%	40.0%	25.0%
	58 (58)	95 (103)	192	224	0.232	0.298	0.626	0.164 (0.164)	29.5%	20.3%	40.0%	35.0%	3.09%	19.80%	24.2%	29.5%
	4 (4)	40 (42)	246	279	0.016	0.125	0.179	0.014 (0.014)	1.28%	1.74%	3.33%	1.63%	1.03%	1.80%	0%	4.55%

Table A.8. A table to summarise algorithm detection ability when a window of ninety days either side of a change point was used. See comments for table 7.

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Misses	CRs	HR	FAR	Freq. bias	Critical Success Index	Prop. CO IHs found	Prop. EV IHs found	Prop. medium IHs found	Prop. large IHs found	Prop. small IHs found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found	Prop. urbanisation IHs found
WYW1	73 (77)	24 (45)	177	284	0.292	0.078	0.467	0.247 (0.258)	60.3%	15.1%	93.3%	35.0%	2.06%	27.0%	33.7%	25.0%
	64 (64)	6 (6)	186	302	0.256	0.019	0.261	0.250 (0.250)	53.8%	12.8%	83.3%	29.3%	3.09%	23.4%	30.5%	20.5%
	109 (109)	39 (41)	141	269	0.436	0.127	0.568	0.375 (0.375)	71.7%	30.8%	96.7%	60.2%	6.18%	44.1%	46.3%	36.4%
	109 (109)	49 (55)	141	259	0.436	0.159	0.626	0.357 (0.357)	64.1%	34.3%	70.0%	64.2%	9.28%	44.1%	45.3%	38.6%
	19 (19)	26 (27)	231	282	0.076	0.084	0.179	0.069 (0.069)	14.1%	4.65%	20.0%	9.76%	1.03%	6.31%	6.32%	13.6%

Table A.10. As in table 2, but for Wyoming scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Algorithm	Region RMSE	No. perfect RMSEs (to measurement precision)	Percentage recovery			PR best stats	PR worst stats	PR value for region	
				Range of RMSEs in best stats	Range of RMSEs in worst stats	GI	MW	U	MW	U
WYWW2	Released	0.654	11 (15)	(0, 0)	(1.25, 2.53)	-	-	-	-	-
	MACD	0.264	7 (13)	(0, 0.29)	(0.10, 0.89)	36	54	20	41 (7)	0
	Climatol-D	0.249	18 (11)	(0, 0)	(0.06, 0.55)	44	41	4	58 (11)	0
	Climatol-M	0.600	14 (11)	(0, 0.07)	(1.12, 2.28)	0	108	4	36 (10)	0
	MASH	0.217	0 (2)	(0, 0.11)	(0.12, 0.72)	31	94	33	0 (0)	0
	ACMANT2	0.192	9 (4)	(0, 0.16)	(0.09, 0.59)	40	88	16	10 (4)	0
	DAP1	0.536	8 (12)	(0, 0.24)	(0.43, 1.42)	6	58	13	73 (8)	0
	HOM1	0.538	8 (12)	(0, 0.23)	(0.47, 1.42)	6	56	12	76 (8)	0
	SPLIDHOM1	0.536	8 (11)	(0, 0.23)	(0.42, 1.42)	6	56	13	75 (8)	0
WYWW3	Released	0.696	9 (13)	(0, 0.02)	(1.34, 2.73)	-	-	-	-	-
	MACD	0.252	6 (13)	(0, 0.20)	(0.10, 0.58)	32	62	22	36 (6)	0
	Climatol-D	0.237	8 (14)	(0, 0.05)	(0.10, 0.58)	42	43	3	62 (8)	0
	Climatol-M	0.246	7 (13)	(0, 0.13)	(0.10, 1.88)	41	75	8	27 (7)	0
	MASH	0.258	0 (4)	(0.02, 0.12)	(0.16, 1.84)	37	97	24	0 (0)	1
	ACMANT2	0.238	4 (8)	(0, 0.14)	(0.11, 1.84)	43	89	14	8 (4)	0
	DAP1	0.615	9 (13)	(0, 0.02)	(1.34, 2.39)	4	62	10	73 (9)	0
	HOM1	0.627	9 (14)	(0, 0.02)	(1.34, 2.50)	3	58	9	79 (9)	0
	SPLIDHOM1	0.622	9 (14)	(0, 0.02)	(1.34, 2.39)	3	59	9	78 (9)	0

Table A.13. As in table 5, but for Wyoming scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Algorithm	Table A.13. As in table 5, but for Wyoming scenarios 2 and 3.			PR best stats			PR worst stats					
		No. stats less variable than clean	No. stats more variable than clean	No. stats less variable than clean	Variability increases	Variability decreases	Variability unchanged (because of perfection)	I	U	MW	I	U	MW
WYW2	Released	110	37	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MACD	93	58	3	9	16	23	45	14	48 (7)	0	6	4
	Climatol-D	95	52	2	8	8	30	31	10	69 (11)	0	8	0
	Climatol-M	104	44	0	6	16	4	66	20	46 (10)	0	9	1
	MASH	97	61	3	6	62	10	34	43	0 (0)	0	10	2
	ACMANT2	92	62	1	14	23	33	48	25	14 (4)	0	4	6
	DAP1	94	56	0	0	30	8	18	21	81 (8)	0	8	2
	HOM1	90	60	0	0	29	8	15	22	84 (8)	0	2	2
	SPLIDHOM1	94	56	0	0	27	10	19	19	83 (8)	0	8	2
WYW3	Released	130	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MACD	108	44	0	2	22	31	46	15	42 (6)	0	7	3
	Climatol-D	119	31	1	3	14	30	36	4	70 (8)	0	9	1
	Climatol-M	90	61	1	1	28	20	41	33	34 (7)	0	8	2
	MASH	103	55	2	3	55	19	48	31	0 (0)	1	9	7
	ACMANT2	113	41	2	3	36	31	59	15	12 (4)	0	4	6
	DAP1	113	36	0	1	35	6	20	14	82 (9)	0	10	0
	HOM	109	40	0	0	28	6	23	13	88 (9)	0	10	0
	SPLIDHOM1	109	40	0	0	33	12	9	17	87 (9)	0	10	4

Table A.14. As in table 6, but for Wyoming scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Algorithm	Warm extremes						Cold extremes					
		Exact (± 0.14)		Too warm in returned		Too cool in returned		Exact (± 0.14)		Too warm in returned		Too cool in returned	
		I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW
WYW2	Released	101 (113)	-	-	-	-	-	38 (69)	-	-	-	-	-
	MACD	102 (126)	2	11	1	7	11	0	40 (91)	8	12	4	18
	Climatol-D	104 (127)	1	13	0	3	12	2	48 (101)	4	9	1	23
	Climatol-M	101 (113)	14	8	0	11	12	0	40 (69)	24	14	0	30
	MASH	102 (129)	7	3	4	7	3	5	38 (87)	14	3	7	24
	ACMANT2	106 (140)	4	2	1	6	4	1	46 (121)	2	2	4	15
	DAP1	101 (113)	1	20	2	3	19	0	38 (70)	4	27	7	39
	HOM1	101 (113)	1	20	2	3	19	0	40 (73)	5	28	3	40
	SPLIDHOM1	101 (113)	1	20	2	3	19	0	38 (72)	6	28	3	3
WYW3	Released	114 (125)	-	-	-	-	-	51 (68)	-	-	-	-	-
	MACD	117 (131)	6	6	1	4	9	1	56 (89)	5	10	2	25
	Climatol-D	116 (132)	6	5	0	1	14	0	62 (100)	4	6	1	19
	Climatol-M	115 (138)	1	4	2	7	6	0	58 (99)	9	5	5	20
	MASH	101 (124)	3	4	5	9	4	9	49 (101)	11	3	8	24
	ACMANT2	121 (139)	6	3	0	2	5	3	58 (121)	4	4	2	13
	DAP1	114 (126)	2	11	0	17	2	0	51 (72)	10	25	1	7
	HOM1	114 (125)	2	12	0	1	18	0	52 (74)	8	26	3	4
	SPLIDHOM1	114 (126)	2	12	0	1	17	0	53 (73)	8	27	2	4

Table A.15. As in table 7, but for Wyoming scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Misses	CRs	Freq. bias	Critical Success Index	Prop. CO IHS found	Prop. EV IHS found	Prop. large IHS found	Prop. medium IHS found	Prop. small IHS found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found	Prop. urbanisation IHS found			
WYW2	87 (87)	71 (138)	376	547	0.188	0.115	0.470	0.145 (0.145)	39.7%	9.15%	86.0%	22.5%	0%	17.8%	23.1%	11.6%	
	87 (87)	31 (31)	376	587	0.188	0.050	0.246	0.176 (0.176)	40.4%	8.83%	88.4%	20.7%	1.51%	22.0%	19.4%	10.5%	
148 (148)	100 (105)	315	518	0.320	0.162	0.528	0.261 (0.261)	54.1%	21.8%	90.7%	43.7%	6.06%	30.9%	37.1%	23.3%	23.3%	
94 (94)	193 (214)	369	425	0.203	0.312	0.641	0.139 (0.139)	26.0%	17.7%	39.5%	29.3%	6.06%	22.5%	19.4%	17.4%	17.4%	
16 (16)	92 (95)	447	526	0.035	0.149	0.230	0.029 (0.029)	6.16%	2.21%	9.30%	4.95%	0.51%	4.71%	2.69%	2.33%	2.33%	
WYW3	107 (109)	84 (146)	338	513	0.240	0.141	0.566	0.181 (0.184)	57.7%	9.09%	88.5%	22.8%	1.82%	19.3%	29.5%	NA	NA
	106 (106)	18 (18)	339	579	0.238	0.030	0.274	0.229 (0.229)	60.6%	7.47%	88.5%	22.8%	1.21%	19.7%	28.5%	NA	NA
102 (102)	96 (101)	343	501	0.229	0.161	0.454	0.187 (0.187)	49.6%	11.0%	65.6%	25.6%	3.64%	18.5%	28.0%	NA	NA	
105 (105)	202 (231)	340	394	0.236	0.339	0.752	0.155 (0.155)	36.5%	17.9%	36.1%	28.8%	12.1%	22.3%	25.1%	NA	NA	
7 (7)	87 (93)	438	510	0.016	0.146	0.225	0.013 (0.013)	2.92%	0.97%	1.64%	2.74%	0%	2.10%	0.97%	NA	NA	

Table A.16. As in table 8, but for Wyoming scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Misses	CRs	FAR	HR	Freq. bias	Critical Success Index	Prop. CO IHs found	Prop. EV IHs found	Prop. large IHs found	Prop. medium IHs found	Prop. small IHs found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found	Prop. urbanisation IHs found
WYW2	114 (115)	52 (114)	349	555	0.246	0.086	0.470	0.198 (0.199)	47.9%	13.9%	90.7%	32.9%	1.01%	24.1%	28.5%	17.4%
102 (102)	18 (18)	361	589	0.220	0.030	0.246	0.212 (0.212)	45.2%	11.4%	88.4%	27.0%	2.02%	24.6%	22.6%	15.1%	
201 (201)	51 (54)	262	556	0.434	0.084	0.528	0.389 (0.389)	65.1%	33.4%	97.7%	62.2%	10.6%	44.5%	47.8%	31.4%	
182 (182)	118 (129)	281	489	0.393	0.194	0.641	0.307 (0.307)	51.4%	33.8%	88.4%	54.5%	11.6%	40.3%	41.4%	32.6%	
48 (48)	60 (63)	415	547	0.104	0.099	0.230	0.091 (0.091)	19.9%	5.99%	39.5%	12.2%	2.02%	11.0%	11.83%	5.81%	
WYW3	138 (140)	56 (117)	307	529	0.310	0.096	0.567	0.246 (0.248)	69.3%	14.0%	98.4%	34.2%	1.82%	26.5%	36.2%	NA
118 (118)	9 (9)	327	576	0.265	0.014	0.274	0.260 (0.260)	65.0%	9.42%	91.8%	25.6%	3.64%	22.7%	30.9%	NA	
137 (137)	66 (68)	308	519	0.308	0.113	0.454	0.267 (0.267)	60.6%	17.5%	75.4%	37.4%	5.45%	26.1%	36.2%	NA	
202 (203)	116 (136)	243	468	0.454	0.199	0.753	0.347 (0.348)	70.8%	34.1%	80.3%	54.3%	20.6%	42.9%	48.3%	NA	
48 (48)	51 (54)	397	534	0.108	0.087	0.225	0.096 (0.096)	27.7%	3.25%	29.5%	13.2%	0.61%	9.66%	12.1%	NA	

Table A.17. As in table 1, but for Wyoming scenario 4 and the South East scenario 1.

Scenario	Algorithm	Region bias	No. positively biased (mean bias)	Percentage recovery			PR best stats			PR worst stats			Best stats mean bias			Worst stats mean bias	
				No. negatively biased (mean bias)	No. non-biased (to measurement precision)	Sum absolute biases	GI	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	
WYW4	Released	0.041	34 (0.48)	39 (-0.34)	2 (12)	29.62	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	0.20
	MACD	0.043	50 (0.14)	25 (-0.15)	0 (15)	10.90	26	14 (6)	4 (0)	25	2	1	7	10	0	0	0.02
	Climatol-D	0	37 (0.14)	38 (-0.13)	0 (18)	10.33	23	10 (6)	21 (0)	15	1	4	5	10	0	0	0.05
	Climatol-M	0.021	37 (0.22)	38 (-0.18)	0 (22)	14.90	24	17 (7)	0 (0)	27	3	0	7	8	0	2	0.01
	MASH	0.022	38 (0.18)	37 (-0.14)	0 (26)	11.97	29	22 (4)	0 (0)	20	3	0	7	7	0	3	0.03
	ACMANT2	-0.044	28 (0.10)	47 (-0.13)	0 (24)	8.75	31	6 (9)	6 (0)	23	1	1	8	9	0	1	-0.06
	DAP1	0.023	34 (0.43)	39 (-0.33)	2 (12)	27.74	0	18 (0)	53 (2)	2	0	10	0	4	6	0	0.01
	HOM1	0.025	34 (0.44)	39 (-0.34)	2 (12)	29.20	0	17 (0)	54 (2)	2	0	10	0	3	7	0	0.01
	SPLIDHOM1	0.026	34 (0.44)	39 (-0.33)	12 (2)	28.04	0	17 (0)	54 (2)	2	0	10	0	3	7	0	0.01
SEW1	Released	-0.078	64 (0.34)	86 (-0.39)	3 (44)	55.82	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.04
	Climatol-D	-0.040	47 (0.03)	103 (-0.08)	3 (105)	9.31	72	10 (9)	52 (3)	7	0	10	0	10	0	0	-0.04
	Climatol-M	-0.054	31 (0.12)	120 (-0.10)	2 (80)	15.77	64	19 (17)	23 (2)	28	0	5	5	10	0	0	0.09
	MASH	-0.005	74 (0.09)	79 (-0.09)	0 (91)	13.49	77	28 (15)	0 (0)	33	3	0	7	10	0	0	0.16
	ACMANT2	-0.040	45 (0.06)	106 (-0.08)	2 (96)	11.37	75	20 (15)	13 (2)	28	0	4	6	10	0	-0.02	
	DAP1	-0.084	55 (0.20)	95 (-0.25)	3 (59)	34.60	25	45 (2)	65 (3)	13	0	10	0	10	0	0	0
	HOM1	-0.091	56 (0.23)	94 (-0.28)	3 (56)	39.32	21	43 (2)	69 (3)	15	0	10	0	8	1	0	-0.06
	SPLIDHOM1	-0.085	56 (0.19)	94 (-0.25)	3 (58)	34.73	25	45 (2)	65 (3)	13	0	10	0	10	0	0	-0.01

Table A.18. As in table 2, but for Wyoming scenario 4 and the South East scenario 1.

Scenario	Algorithm	Region RMSE	No. perfect RMSEs (to measurement precision)	Range of RMSEs in best stats	Range of RMSEs in worst stats	Percentage recovery			PR best stats	PR worst stats	PR value for region
						GI	I	MW			
WYW4	Released	0.785	2 (4)	(0, 0.14)	(1.20, 2.38)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MACD	0.347	0 (2)	(0.03, 0.44)	(0.21, 0.64)	10	28	33	4 (0)	1	9 10 0 0
	Climatol-D	0.292	0 (1)	(0.09, 0.21)	(0.16, 0.29)	15	22	17	21 (0)	0	4 6 10 0 0 55.78
	Climatol-M	0.478	0 (0)	(0.12, 0.29)	(0.29, 1.76)	6	31	38	0 (0)	0	10 8 0 2 62.80
	MASH	0.415	0 (0)	(0.14, 0.40)	(0.27, 1.67)	4	40	31	0	0	10 8 0 2 39.07
	ACMANT2	0.301	0 (0)	(0.12, 0.37)	(0.17, 1.13)	16	35	18	6 (0)	0	10 8 0 2 47.18
	DAP1	0.762	2 (4)	(0, 0.14)	(1.20, 2.38)	0	16	4	53 (2)	0	10 4 6 0 2.96
	HOM1	0.767	2 (4)	(0, 0.14)	(1.20, 2.38)	0	13	6	54 (2)	0	10 3 7 0 2.28
	SPLIDHOM1	0.767	2 (4)	(0, 0.14)	(1.20, 2.38)	0	14	5	54 (2)	0	10 3 7 0 2.36
SEW1	Released	0.730	3 (18)	(0, 0.03)	(0, 0.03)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	0.177	3 (27)	(0, 0.03)	(0.04, 0.23)	36	39	3	52 (3)	0	10 10 0 0 75.75
	Climatol-M	0.478	2 (14)	(0, 0.17)	(0.08, 1.52)	43	60	25	23 (2)	0	5 5 10 0 0 39.07
	MASH	0.256	0 (9)	(0.01, 0.12)	(0.10, 1.51)	48	64	41	0 (0)	0	10 10 0 0 64.95
	ACMANT2	0.215	2 (12)	(0, 0.09)	(0.11, 0.63)	43	74	21	13 (2)	0	4 6 10 0 0 70.47
	DAP1	0.525	3 (18)	(0, 0.03)	(0.57, 1.64)	9	65	11	65 (3)	0	10 10 0 0 28.11
	HOM1	0.699	3 (18)	(0, 0.03)	(0.57, 3.97)	8	59	14	69 (3)	0	10 8 1 1 4.21
	SPLIDHOM1	0.526	18 (3)	(0, 0.03)	(0.57, 1.65)	9	64	12	65 (3)	0	10 10 0 0 27.93

Scenario	Algorithm	Table A.21. As in table 5, but for Wyoming scenario 4 and the South East scenario 1.								PR worst stats					
		No. stats more variable than clean	No. stats less variable than clean	Variability increases	Variability decreases	Variability unchanged from released (because of perfection)	GI	I	MW	GI	I	MW	I	U	MW
WYW4	Released	55	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MACD	32	43	3	5	8	9	24	22	4 (0)	1	1	8	9	0
	Climato-D	44	31	2	5	3	9	26	9	21 (0)	3	4	3	10	0
	Climato-M	45	30	2	5	18	4	29	17	0 (0)	4	0	6	7	0
	MASH	36	39	0	1	25	6	19	24	0 (0)	1	0	9	8	0
	ACMANT2	45	30	0	7	9	8	29	16	6 (0)	1	1	8	10	0
	DAP1	51	22	0	0	11	2	3	4	55 (2)	0	10	0	0	6
	HOM	53	20	0	0	11	3	4	1	56 (2)	0	10	0	1	7
	SPLIDHOM1	54	19	0	0	11	3	3	2	56 (2)	0	10	0	1	7
SEW1	Released	114	36	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climato-D	97	53	2	5	11	33	38	9	55 (3)	0	10	0	10	0
	Climato-M	101	50	6	6	40	14	42	20	25 (2)	1	5	4	8	0
	MASH	86	67	3	7	35	36	34	38	0 (0)	4	0	6	9	0
	ACMANT2	90	61	2	14	19	32	51	20	15 (2)	4	4	2	10	0
	DAP1	90	60	0	3	31	5	26	20	68 (3)	0	10	0	4	0
	HOM	87	63	1	1	30	6	22	21	72 (3)	0	10	0	4	1
	SPLIDHOM1	92	58	1	1	34	7	22	20	68 (3)	0	10	0	4	0

Table A.22. As in table 6, but for Wyoming scenario 4 and the South East scenario 1.

Scenario	Algorithm	Warm extremes						Cold extremes									
		Exact (± 0.14)			Too warm in returned			Too cool in returned			Exact (± 0.14)			Too warm in returned			
		I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	
WYW4	Released	56 (63)	-	-	-	-	-	11 (22)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MACD	42 (55)	2	1	6	1	2	8	15 (31)	16	3	11	8	3	3	3	3
	Climatol-D	52 (59)	0	2	4	0	3	7	16 (36)	10	11	0	7	10	1	1	1
	Climatol-M	42 (48)	0	3	1	0	4	19	15 (33)	14	12	0	5	9	2	2	2
	MASH	14 (15)	0	1	2	2	0	55	16 (29)	21	3	6	6	1	9	9	9
	ACMANT2	46 (56)	0	3	0	1	4	11	10 (16)	8	7	2	7	7	3	3	3
	DAP1	56 (63)	0	6	0	0	6	0	11 (22)	2	25	2	1	21	2	2	2
	HOM1	56 (63)	0	6	0	0	6	0	11 (23)	1	25	1	0	22	3	3	3
	SPLIDHOM1	56 (63)	0	6	0	0	6	0	11 (24)	0	25	1	1	21	3	3	3
SEW1	Released	84 (101)	-	-	-	-	-	47 (67)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	100 (134)	0	6	0	4	9	0	72 (107)	6	9	1	11	15	4	4	4
	Climatol-M	79 (126)	0	7	0	9	10	1	59 (95)	9	8	3	14	11	13	13	13
	MASH	84 (124)	8	3	1	9	3	5	48 (98)	11	5	4	11	7	17	17	17
	ACMANT2	97 (134)	4	3	0	6	5	1	60 (104)	8	5	5	11	5	15	15	15
	DAP1	87 (106)	2	15	0	5	22	3	50 (77)	12	14	2	17	26	5	5	5
	HOM1	86 (106)	2	17	0	2	23	3	52 (79)	12	15	1	14	26	6	6	6
	SPLIDHOM1	87 (108)	2	15	0	3	22	3	50 (74)	14	13	2	19	25	6	6	6

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Misses	CRs	HR	FAR	Freq. bias	Critical Success Index	Prop. CO IHS found	Prop. EV IHS found	Prop. large IHS found	Prop. medium IHS found	Prop. small IHS found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found	Prop. urbanisation IHS found
WYW4	44 (46)	132 (293)	208	189	0.175	0.411	1.309	0.081 (0.084)	38.5%	8.05%	75.0%	15.9%	0%	11.7%	27.4%	10.9%
	40 (40)	22 (23)	212	299	0.159	0.070	0.243	0.145 (0.145)	38.5%	5.75%	65.6%	14.3%	1.06%	14.4%	18.9%	13.0%
	36 (36)	31 (31)	216	290	0.143	0.097	0.259	0.127 (0.127)	32.1%	6.32%	40.6%	17.5%	1.06%	12.6%	20.0%	6.52%
	39 (39)	79 (89)	213	241	0.155	0.247	0.498	0.114 (0.114)	29.5%	9.20%	50.0%	17.5%	1.06%	12.6%	18.9%	15.2%
	0 (0)	27 (27)	252	294	0	0.084	0.104	0 (0)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SEW1	101 (101)	40 (42)	262	470	0.278	0.078	0.379	0.249 (0.249)	63.5%	3.26%	95.6%	58.0%	3.04%	24.1%	47.1%	7.32%
	85 (85)	108 (117)	278	402	0.234	0.212	0.516	0.177 (0.177)	47.3%	6.98%	73.3%	43.2%	6.09%	19.1%	37.8%	11.0%
	72 (73)	198 (246)	291	311	0.198	0.389	0.849	0.118 (0.120)	29.7%	13.0%	40.0%	26.1%	13.5%	21.0%	20.2%	17.1%
	14 (14)	90 (92)	349	420	0.039	0.176	0.281	0.031 (0.031)	8.78%	0.47%	15.6%	5.68%	0.87%	4.32%	5.04%	1.22%

Table A.26. As in table 2, but for the South East scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Algorithm	Region RMSE	No. perfect RMSEs (to measurement precision)	Range of RMSEs in best stats	Range of RMSEs in worst stats	Percentage recovery	PR best stats			PR worst stats			PR value for region
							GI	I	MW	U	MW	I	
SEW2	Released	0.552	11 (37)	(0, 0)	(1.28, 2.21)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Climatol-D	0.118	14 (58)	(0, 0)	(0.02, 0.24)	70 55 2	72 (11) 0	10 0	10 0	0 0	0 0	78.55		
Climatol-M	0.185	7 (45)	(0, 0.07)	(0.04, 1.51)	62 77 17	47 (7) 0	3 10	10 0	0 0	0 0	66.57		
MASH	0.181	0 (28)	(0, 0.07)	(0.04, 1.42)	54 97 59	0 (0) 0	0 0	10 9	0 0	1 1	67.17		
ACMANT2	0.138	9 (40)	(0, 0.08)	(0.05, 0.37)	59 98 22	22 (9) 0	8 2	10 0	0 0	0 0	74.99		
DAP1	0.352	11 (37)	(0, 0)	(0.16, 1.42)	9 97 13	80 (11) 0	10 0	9 1	0 0	0 0	36.31		
HOM1	0.364	11 (37)	(0, 0)	(0.17, 1.42)	8 97 13	81 (11) 0	10 0	9 1	0 0	0 0	34.21		
SPLIDHOM1	0.351	11 (37)	(0, 0)	(0.16, 1.42)	9 98 12	80 (11) 0	10 0	9 1	0 0	0 0	36.49		
SEW3	Released	0.643	8 (37)	(0, 0.02)	(1.25, 2.37)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Climatol-D	0.121	12 (67)	(0, 0.02)	(0.05, 0.20)	95 32 4	71 (8) 0	10 0	10 0	0 0	0 0	81.14		
Climatol-M	0.271	5 (49)	(0, 0.08)	(0.05, 2.87)	87 51 22	45 (5) 0	5 5	8 0	0 2	0 2	57.78		
MASH	0.221	0 (18)	(0.02, 0.13)	(0.12, 1.73)	77 64 69	0 (0) 0	0 0	10 9	0 0	1 1	65.64		
ACMANT2	0.156	5 (48)	(0, 0.16)	(0.12, 0.77)	75 70 29	31 (5) 0	6 4	10 0	0 0	0 0	75.71		
DAP1	0.411	6 (38)	(0, 0.02)	(0.24, 1.63)	17 104 14	69 (6) 0	9 1	10 0	0 0	0 0	35.97		
HOM1	0.459	6 (37)	(0, 0.02)	(0.19, 2.13)	13 95 16	80 (6) 0	9 1	9 0	0 1	0 1	28.36		
SPLIDHOM1	0.410	6 (38)	(0, 0.02)	(0.23, 1.63)	18 104 13	69 (6) 0	9 1	10 0	0 0	0 0	36.20		

Table A.27. As in table 3, but for the South East scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Algorithm	Decadal trends ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)	Positive trends	Negative trends	No. of signif. trends (preserved)	Percentage recovery		PR best stats	PR worst stats	Regional average trend	PR for regional average trend	
						GI	I	MW	U	I	MW	U
SEW2	Clean Released	-0.060 -0.975	0.201 0.722	196 142	0.056 0.157	14 68	-0.017 -0.163	4 91 (1)	- -	- -	- -	- -
	Climatol-D	-0.056	0.174	197	0.065	13	-0.017	9 (3)	105	7 (11)	0	10
	Climatol-M	-0.041	0.206	204	0.068	6	-0.022	9 (3)	105	12 (15)	24	47 (7)
	MASH	-0.031	0.264	203	0.062	7	-0.011	10 (3)	121	33 (17)	39	0 (0)
	ACMANT2	-0.038	0.281	201	0.064	9	-0.013	6 (3)	119	20 (17)	23	22 (9)
	DAP1	-0.435	0.547	155	0.096	55	-0.076	55 (2)	38	63 (5)	14	79 (11)
	HOM1	-0.446	0.547	157	0.094	53	-0.080	56 (2)	38	63 (5)	13	80 (11)
	SPLIDHOM1	-0.433	0.547	155	0.095	55	-0.078	56 (2)	38	63 (5)	14	79 (11)
SEW3	Clean Released	-0.067 -0.676	0.198 0.729	189 127	0.060 0.170	21 83	-0.016 -0.184	3 91 (1)	- -	- -	- -	- -
	Climatol-D	-0.103	0.200	184	0.058	26	-0.025	4 (3)	112	5 (6)	7	71 (8)
	Climatol-M	-0.628	0.313	201	0.058	9	-0.024	5 (3)	116	10 (10)	24	45 (5)
	MASH	-0.259	0.178	187	0.055	23	-0.029	5 (3)	120	18 (11)	61	0 (0)
	ACMANT2	-0.151	0.216	198	0.055	12	-0.025	2 (2)	122	13 (7)	32	31 (5)
	DAP1	-0.558	0.454	149	0.101	61	-0.087	51 (2)	47	65 (5)	18	69 (6)
	HOM	-0.581	0.481	148	0.106	62	-0.097	53 (2)	42	60 (8)	14	80 (6)
	SPLIDHOM1	-0.520	0.454	148	0.102	62	-0.085	50 (2)	45	64 (6)	20	69 (6)

Scenario	Algorithm	No. stats more variable than clean	No. stats less variable than clean	Variability increases	Variability decreases	Variability unchanged from released (because of perfection)			PR best stats			PR worst stats		
						GI	I	MW	GI	I	MW	I	U	MW
SEW2	Released	160	39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climato-D	135	61	3	7	15	46	45	11	83 (11)	0	10	0	0
	Climato-M	141	62	2	9	43	35	49	18	54 (7)	0	7	0	3
	MASH	125	85	1	11	65	24	61	48	0 (0)	0	10	8	0
	ACMANT2	133	68	1	9	37	38	67	27	31 (9)	0	8	2	1
	DAP1	133	66	1	1	54	7	23	33	91 (11)	0	10	0	2
	HOM	135	64	1	4	53	5	25	30	92 (11)	0	10	0	1
	SPLIDHOM1	130	69	1	2	53	4	26	33	91 (11)	0	10	0	2
SEW3	Released	157	45	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climato-D	116	82	2	4	8	53	50	14	79 (8)	0	10	0	0
	Climato-M	114	91	1	6	21	33	67	32	50 (5)	1	5	4	3
	MASH	127	83	2	9	59	33	61	46	0 (0)	0	10	7	0
	ACMANT2	121	84	1	9	24	40	70	30	36 (5)	1	6	3	1
	DAP1	126	78	1	0	56	8	33	37	75 (6)	0	3	7	5
	HOM	129	75	0	2	60	8	20	34	86 (6)	0	9	1	0
	SPLIDHOM1	126	78	1	1	56	9	32	36	75 (6)	0	3	7	4

Table A.30. As in table 6, but for the South East scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Table A.31. As in table 7, but for the South East scenarios 2 and 3.													
			Misses	CRs	HR	FAR	Freq. bias	Critical Success Index	Prop. CO IHs found	Prop. EV IHs found	Prop. large IHs found	Prop. medium IHs found	Prop. small IHs found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found	Prop. urbanisation IHs found
SEW2	135 (135)	37 (442)	310	611	0.303	0.057	0.376	0.277 (0.277)	62.5%	7.66%	97.9%	64.7%	4.30%	31.3%	44.2%	12.2%
	111 (111)	126 (136)	334	533	0.249	0.194	0.528	0.191 (0.191)	49.5%	7.66%	76.6%	47.9%	6.45%	24.5%	34.1%	14.8%
	97 (97)	240 (292)	348	408	0.218	0.370	0.835	0.132 (0.132)	33.7%	21.7%	40.4%	43.7%	9.32%	18.8%	26.8%	20.9%
	31 (31)	117 (123)	414	531	0.070	0.181	0.328	0.055 (0.055)	12.5%	3.07%	10.6%	20.2%	0.72%	4.17%	12.3%	5.22%
SEW3	155 (155)	29 (33)	288	620	0.350	0.045	0.424	0.326 (0.326)	77.2%	1.22%	98.2%	71.3%	1.59%	29.6%	43.4%	NA
	116 (116)	115 (120)	327	534	0.262	0.177	0.533	0.206 (0.206)	53.3%	4.47%	67.3%	48.5%	5.16%	24.1%	29.5%	NA
	95 (96)	238 (277)	348	410	0.214	0.367	0.844	0.132 (0.133)	36.5%	9.35%	30.9%	34.6%	12.3%	18.9%	25.4%	NA
	36 (36)	127 (133)	407	520	0.081	0.196	0.386	0.063 (0.063)	16.8%	1.22%	16.4%	16.9%	1.59%	6.67%	6.59%	NA

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Table A.32. As in table 8, but for the South East scenarios 2 and 3.													
			Misses	CRs	HR	FAR	Freq. bias	Critical Success Index	Prop. CO IHs found	Prop. EV IHs found	Prop. large IHs found	Prop. medium IHs found	Prop. small IHs found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found	Prop. urbanisation IHs found
SEW2	151 (151)	25 (30)	294	614	0.339	0.039	0.376	0.331 (0.331)	66.8%	10.7%	100%	72.3%	6.45%	33.3%	47.1%	19.1%
	153 (153)	91 (98)	292	547	0.344	0.143	0.528	0.282 (0.282)	59.8%	16.5%	89.4%	63.0%	12.9%	34.9%	41.3%	25.2%
	186 (188)	168 (207)	259	471	0.418	0.263	0.835	0.285 (0.287)	63.6%	26.4%	85.1%	76.5%	19.7%	41.1%	47.8%	35.7%
	80 (80)	74 (77)	365	565	0.180	0.116	0.328	0.153 (0.153)	32.6%	7.66%	42.6%	40.3%	4.30%	17.7%	23.9%	11.3%
SEW3	169 (169)	16 (20)	274	624	0.381	0.025	0.424	0.372 (0.372)	82.7%	2.44%	98.2%	78.7%	3.17%	33.0%	46.2%	NA
	166 (166)	70 (71)	277	570	0.375	0.109	0.533	0.323 (0.323)	73.1%	8.94%	89.1%	67.6%	9.92%	33.3%	43.9%	NA
	207 (210)	143 (166)	236	496	0.467	0.224	0.844	0.340 (0.343)	79.7%	20.3%	78.2%	75.7%	24.2%	40.7%	56.1%	NA
	88 (87)	77 (81)	355	560	0.199	0.122	0.386	0.168 (0.168)	41.1%	2.85%	45.6%	38.2%	4.37%	16.3%	25.4%	NA

Table A.33. As in table 1, but for the North East scenarios 1 and 2.

Scenario	Algorithm	Region bias	No. positively biased (mean bias)	No. negatively biased (mean bias)	No. non-biased (to measurement precision)	Sum absolute biases	Percentage recovery			PR best stats			PR worst stats			Best stats mean bias	Worst stats mean bias
							GI	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	
NEW1	Released	-0.097	58 (0.33)	85 (-0.40)	3 (25)	53.47	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.27
	Climatol-D	-0.042	51 (0.05)	90 (-0.10)	5 (88)	11.37	73	7 (7)	50 (3)	6	0	10	0	0	0	0	0
	Climatol-M	-0.032	57 (0.05)	86 (-0.09)	3 (87)	10.65	83	11 (7)	30 (3)	12	1	9	0	10	0	0	0.03
	MASH	-0.055	56 (0.04)	100 (-0.10)	0 (69)	11.52	81	28 (11)	0 (0)	26	2	0	8	10	0	0	-0.03
	ACMANT2	-0.051	36 (0.04)	108 (-0.08)	2 (77)	10.15	77	24 (8)	19 (2)	16	1	7	2	10	0	0	-0.02
	DAP1	-0.070	58 (0.23)	86 (-0.27)	2 (35)	36.89	13	62 (0)	54 (2)	15	0	8	2	10	0	-0.01	0.12
	HOM1	-0.097	58 (0.23)	86 (-0.27)	2 (35)	36.96	15	61 (0)	55 (2)	13	0	8	2	10	0	0.10	0.10
	SPLIDHOM1	-0.097	58 (0.23)	86 (-0.27)	2 (36)	36.96	14	61 (0)	55 (2)	14	0	8	2	10	0	-0.01	0.13
NEW2	Released	-0.075	83 (0.29)	118 (-0.34)	6 (39)	64.68	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-0.20
	Climatol-D	-0.025	79 (0.06)	122 (-0.08)	6 (112)	14.51	91	14 (6)	73 (6)	17	0	10	0	10	0	0	-0.10
	Climatol-M	-0.026	69 (0.03)	132 (-0.06)	6 (148)	10.00	117	17 (12)	34 (6)	21	0	9	1	10	0	0	-0.02
	MASH	-0.040	78 (0.03)	129 (-0.08)	0 (128)	13.34	101	50 (17)	0 (0)	39	1	0	9	10	0	0	-0.06
	ACMANT2	-0.037	46 (0.04)	160 (0.06)	1 (124)	11.46	102	36 (20)	18 (1)	30	0	2	8	10	0	-0.03	0.02

Table A.34. As in table 2, but for the North East scenarios 1 and 2.

Scenario	Algorithm	Region RMSE	No. perfect RMSEs (to measurement precision)	Range of RMSEs in best stats	Range of RMSEs in worst stats	Percentage recovery	PR best stats			PR worst stats			PR value for region
							GI	I	MW	U	I	U	
NEW1	Released	0.694	3 (9)	(0,0.06)	(1.42, 1.80)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	0.191	5 (18)	(0, 0.06)	(0.06, 0.39)	51	38	2	50 (5)	0	10	0	72.37
	Climatol-M	0.184	3 (16)	(0, 0.06)	(0.09, 0.33)	61	49	3	30 (3)	1	9	0	73.50
	MASH	0.187	0 (3)	(0.03, 0.18)	(0.09, 0.31)	51	71	24	0 (0)	1	0	9	73.11
	ACMANT2	0.174	2 (13)	(0, 0.16)	(0.08, 0.42)	56	61	8	19 (2)	1	7	2	75.99
	DAP1	0.535	2 (9)	(0, 0.08)	(0.18, 1.50)	7	69	14	54 (2)	0	8	2	23.03
	HOM1	0.536	2 (9)	(0, 0.08)	(0.17, 1.49)	7	69	13	55 (2)	0	8	2	22.76
	SPLIDHOM1	0.536	2 (9)	(0, 0.08)	(0.17, 1.50)	7	68	14	55 (2)	0	8	2	22.90
NEW2	Released	0.631	6 (13)	(0, 0.03)	(1.32, 2.40)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	0.179	6 (20)	(0, 0.03)	(0.03, 0.52)	67	57	4	73 (6)	0	10	0	71.64
	Climatol-M	0.155	6 (16)	(0, 0.13)	(0.04, 0.18)	71	89	7	34 (6)	0	9	1	75.36
	MASH	0.215	0 (5)	(0, 0.13)	(0.08, 0.57)	53	121	33	0 (0)	0	10	0	65.88
	ACMANT2	0.164	1 (13)	(0, 0.10)	(0.09, 0.31)	66	103	19	18 (1)	0	2	8	74.02

Table A.35. As in table 3, but for the North East scenarios 1 and 2.

Table A.36. As in table 4, but for the North East scenarios 1 and 2.

Scenario	PR for inter-decadal smooths		PR for inter-decadal worst		PR for inter-annual smooths		PR for inter-annual worst		PR for inter-annual best		PR for inter-annual annual		Biggest correlation decrease (station ID)		Overall correlation for region			
	GI	I	MW	U	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U			
NEW1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.706 0.876		
	54	31	6	50 (5)	0	10	0	0	79	14	0	50 (3)	0	10	0	0.978 0.991		
	80	24	9	30 (3)	1	9	0	1	91	21	1	30 (3)	1	9	0	0.987 0.993		
	84	25	16	19 (2)	1	7	2	9	94	25	6	19 (2)	1	7	2	0.990 0.995		
	79	44	23	0 (0)	2	0	8	10	0	96	36	14	0 (0)	2	0	0.989 0.994		
	14	64	12	54 (2)	0	8	2	10	0	18	64	8	54 (2)	0	8	2 0.823 0.926		
	13	64	12	55 (2)	0	8	2	10	0	19	62	8	55 (2)	0	8	2 0.821 0.935		
	14	64	11	55 (2)	0	8	2	10	0	18	62	9	55 (2)	0	8	2 0.821 0.935		
NEW2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.764 0.899		
	85	30	13	73 (6)	0	10	0	8	0	2	106	21	1	73 (6)	0	10	0 0.401 (109) 0 (91) 0.977 0.992	
	118	36	13	34 (6)	0	9	1	9	0	1	136	27	4	34 (6)	0	9	1 0.038 (175) 0.004 (111) 0.990 0.995	
	123	53	31	0 (0)	0	0	0	10	9	0	1	144	37	26	0 (0)	0	10	0 0.098 (199) 0.012 (56) 0.991 0.995
	133	30	25	18 (1)	1	2	7	9	0	1	133	35	20	18 (1)	0	2	8 0.070 (126) 0.024 (145) 0.990 0.995	

Scenario	Algorithm	Table A.37. As in table 5, but for the North East scenarios 1 and 2.						PR worst stats					
		No. stats less variable than clean	No. stats more variable than clean	Variability increases	Variability decreases	Variability unchanged (because of perfection)	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW
NEW1	Released	91	52	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	69	72	2	14	8	24	27	18	53 (3)	0	10	7
	Climatol-M	67	76	5	19	16	23	24	26	33 (3)	0	9	1
	MASH	95	51	5	20	51	19	28	23	0 (0)	0	0	10
	ACMANT2	76	68	2	18	19	29	30	27	21 (2)	0	7	3
	DAP1	80	64	0	14	33	5	9	29	56 (2)	0	8	2
	HOM1	84	60	2	11	30	3	15	28	57	0	8	2
	SPLIDHOM1	81	63	1	13	32	2	13	28	57	0	8	2
NEW2	Released	116	85	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	95	106	3	24	16	28	32	25	79 (6)	0	10	0
	Climatol-M	84	117	12	23	19	30	35	48	40 (6)	1	9	0
	MASH	110	97	17	27	50	34	44	35	0 (0)	1	0	9
	ACMANT2	100	106	3	26	38	21	44	56	19	0	1	9

Table A.38. As in table 6, but for the North East scenarios 1 and 2.

Scenario	Algorithm	Warm extremes						Cold extremes					
		Exact (± 0.14)		Too warm in returned		Too cool in returned		Exact (± 0.14)		Too warm in returned		Too cool in returned	
		I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW
NEW1	Released	68 (80)	-	-	-	-	-	38 (56)	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	77 (101)	5	7	1	10	20	2	63 (104)	3	6	1	13
	Climatol-M	84 (113)	4	7	2	10	8	2	64 (116)	4	4	1	10
	MASH	75 (114)	6	1	2	16	4	3	52 (100)	3	1	3	23
	ACMANT2	77 (116)	6	2	0	12	7	3	58 (117)	3	1	1	12
	DAP1	75 (96)	4	13	2	7	23	1	44 (70)	13	12	7	12
	HOM1	77 (96)	6	13	1	6	24	0	45 (73)	10	12	5	13
	SPLIDHOM1	76 (93)	6	13	1	10	23	0	43 (70)	11	11	7	13
NEW2	Released	106 (123)	-	-	-	-	-	59 (98)	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	122 (159)	1	8	3	10	26	0	77 (149)	2	12	2	17
	Climatol-M	122 (172)	5	3	2	10	14	1	90 (160)	7	6	2	16
	MASH	100 (168)	6	2	5	15	4	7	64 (138)	11	6	4	22
	ACMANT2	119 (174)	6	1	2	14	8	2	74 (156)	0	4	3	20

Table A.39. As in table 7, but for the North East scenarios 1 and 2.

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Misses	CRs	HR	FAR	Freq. bias	Critical Success Index	Prop. CO IHS found	Prop. EV IHS found	Prop. large IHS found	Prop. medium IHS found	Prop. small IHS found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found	Prop. urbanisation IHS found
NEW1	94 (94)	28 (29)	357	564	0.208	0.047	0.383	0.196 (0.196)	43.7%	10.4%	83.7%	39.4%	1.09%	18.8%	26.2%	15.2%
	94 (94)	88 (93)	357	504	0.208	0.149	0.402	0.173 (0.173)	35.9%	13.9%	69.4%	42.5%	2.18%	17.3%	26.2%	18.5%
	75 (76)	188 (215)	376	404	0.166	0.318	0.624	0.113 (0.114)	24.6%	12.9%	38.8%	33.1%	5.09%	13.6%	12.3%	17.4%
	1 (2)	94 (113)	450	498	0.002	0.159	0.248	0.002 (0.004)	0%	0.32%	0%	0.79%	0%	0.60%	0%	0%
NEW2	153 (153)	40 (42)	431	743	0.262	0.051	0.324	0.244 (0.244)	55.4%	12.8%	90.6%	52.1%	2.04%	18.2%	41.0%	17.2%
	139 (139)	143 (152)	445	640	0.238	0.183	0.487	0.189 (0.189)	44.0%	14.5%	71.7%	42.6%	6.12%	19.4%	33.3%	16.4%
	143 (147)	244 (274)	441	539	0.245	0.312	0.703	0.167 (0.171)	37.0%	18.8%	45.3%	43.1%	11.1%	22.5%	31.4%	16.4%

Table A.40. As in table 8, but for the North East scenarios 1 and 2.

Table A.41. As in table 1, but for the North East scenario 3 and South West scenario 1.

Scenario	Algorithm	Region bias	No. positively biased (mean bias)	No. negatively biased (mean bias)	No. non-biased (to measurement precision)	Sum absolute biases	Percentage recovery			PR best stats			PR worst stats			Best stats mean bias	Worst stats mean bias
							GI	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	
NEW3	Released	-0.024	96 (0.38)	99 (-0.42)	12 (54)	78.13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-0.11
Climatol-D	-0.001	87 (0.03)	107 (-0.03)	13 (134)	12.15	104	12 (8)	64 (12)	7	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	-0.01
Climatol-M	-0.007	109 (0.04)	87 (-0.06)	11 (157)	9.53	127	12 (8)	34 (11)	15	0	9	1	10	0	0	-0.01	0.01
MASH	0.001	118 (0.05)	89 (-0.06)	0 (140)	11.35	124	28 (16)	1 (0)	38	0	0	10	10	0	0	0.02	-0.05
ACMANT2	-0.004	91 (0.04)	106 (-0.04)	10 (162)	7.98	128	22 (13)	11 (10)	23	0	8	2	10	0	0	-0.01	0
SWW1	Released	0.015	71 (0.31)	70 (-0.28)	10 (53)	41.64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.25
Climatol-D	-0.018	64 (0.05)	77 (-0.08)	10 (98)	9.27	69	6 (3)	55 (10)	8	0	10	0	10	0	0	-0.01	-0.01
Climatol-M	0.004	68 (0.14)	76 (-0.12)	7 (72)	18.34	58	11 (12)	33 (7)	30	0	7	3	8	0	2	0.04	-0.04
MASH	-0.017	65 (0.08)	86 (-0.09)	0 (87)	13.33	70	20 (14)	1 (0)	46	0	0	10	8	0	2	-0.02	-0.07
ACMANT2	-0.050	38 (0.06)	110 (-0.09)	3 (69)	11.70	62	16 (13)	17 (3)	40	0	4	6	10	0	0	-0.02	-0.07
DAP1	0.011	70 (0.24)	71 (-0.21)	10 (60)	32.62	10	37 (3)	78 (10)	13	0	10	0	6	3	1	0	.29
HOM1	0.008	69 (0.24)	72 (-0.22)	10 (60)	32.55	9	38 (2)	78 (10)	14	0	10	0	6	3	1	0	0.28
SPLIDHOM1	0.010	71 (0.24)	70 (-0.22)	10 (60)	32.59	10	36 (3)	78 (10)	14	0	10	0	6	3	1	0	0.29

Table A.42. As in table 2, but for the North East scenario 3 and South West scenario 1.

Scenario	Algorithm	Region RMSE	No. perfect RMSEs (to measurement precision)	Range of RMSEs in best stats			Range of RMSEs in worst stats			Percentage recovery			PR best stats			PR worst stats			PR value for region		
				GI	I	MW	U	I	MW	U	I	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW			
NEW3	Released	0.733	12 (20)	(0, 0)	(1.61, 2.17)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Climatol-D	0.169	13 (41)	(0, 0)	(0.06, 0.34)	88	42	1	64 (12)	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	77.01			
Climatol-M	0.190	11 (31)	(0, 0.09)	(0.09, 0.34)	91	62	9	34 (11)	0	9	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	74.10			
MASH	0.168	0 (8)	(0.01, 0.17)	(0.11, 0.68)	75	94	37	1 (0)	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	77.03		
ACMANT2	0.165	23 (10)	(0, 0.09)	(0.07, 0.71)	86	82	18	11 (10)	0	8	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	77.50		
SWW1	Released	0.576	10 (18)	(0, 0.02)	(1.13, 1.92)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Climatol-D	0.196	10 (20)	(0, 0.02)	(0.07, 0.28)	39	42	5	55 (10)	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	66.04		
Climatol-M	0.310	7 (13)	(0, 0.25)	(0.09, 1.66)	29	56	26	33 (7)	0	7	3	8	0	2	0	2	0	0	46.09		
MASH	0.276	0 (8)	(0.04, 0.15)	(0.08, 1.73)	38	72	40	1 (0)	0	0	10	8	0	2	0	2	0	0	52.06		
ACMANT2	0.195	3 (8)	(0, 0.24)	(0.07, 0.81)	36	60	35	17 (3)	0	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	66.21		
DAP1	0.491	10 (16)	(0, 0.02)	(0.44, 1.92)	1	45	17	78 (10)	0	10	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	14.79		
HOM1	0.492	10 (16)	(0, 0.02)	(0.46, 1.92)	1	45	17	78 (10)	0	10	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	14.57		
SPLIDHOM1	0.491	10 (16)	(0, 0.02)	(0.44, 1.92)	1	45	17	78 (10)	0	10	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	14.80		

Table A.43. As in table 3, but for the North East scenario 3 and South West scenario 1.

Scen.	Algorithm	Decadal trends (°C)	Positive trends	Negative trends	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	Percentage recovery			PR best stats	PR worst stats	Regional average trend	PR for regional average trend		
											GI	I	MW						
NEW3	Clean	0.141	0.340	207	0.236	0	-	203	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.236	-		
	Rel	-0.738	1.145	174	0.314	33	-0.207	163 (73)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.231	-		
	CD	0.020	0.345	207	0.239	0	-	201 (188)	113	4 (9)	5	64 (12)	0	0	10	0	0.239	152.20	
	CM	0.131	0.340	207	0.235	0	-	201 (199)	131	6 (13)	12	34 (11)	0	1	9	10	0	0.235	78.56
	MASH	0.131	0.404	207	0.237	0	-	203 (196)	136	24 (15)	31	1 (0)	0	10	0	0	0	0.236	103.14
	A2	0.164	0.419	207	0.242	0	-	204 (198)	134	16 (14)	22	11 (10)	0	2	8	10	0	0.241	183.79
SWW1	Clean	-0.107	0.272	123	0.135	28	-0.051	68	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.098	-		
	Rel	-0.759	0.800	101	0.221	50	-0.191	94 (27)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.083	-		
	CD	-0.156	0.405	124	0.141	27	-0.047	73 (59)	69	4 (7)	6	55 (10)	0	0	10	0	0	0.105	144.11
	CM	-0.118	0.405	136	0.121	15	-0.037	66 (48)	65	6 (20)	20	33 (7)	0	3	7	9	1	0	128.70
	MASH	-0.103	0.290	122	0.139	29	-0.043	68 (61)	83	23 (8)	36	1 (0)	0	10	0	0	0	0.103	129.04
	A2	-0.064	0.297	131	0.143	20	-0.022	81 (56)	73	14 (17)	27	17 (3)	0	6	4	10	0	0.119	234.56
	D1	-0.678	0.655	109	0.185	42	-0.154	87 (30)	12	41 (1)	9	78 (10)	0	0	10	7	0	3	49.32
	H1	-0.678	0.655	109	0.187	42	-0.157	88 (30)	13	41 (1)	8	78 (10)	0	0	10	7	0	3	61.83
	S1	-0.678	0.655	109	0.187	43	-0.150	88 (30)	12	41 (1)	9	78 (10)	0	0	10	7	0	3	49.94

Scenario	Overall correlation for region											
	Biggest correlation decrease (station ID)						Biggest correlation increase (station ID)					
	PR for inter-decadal worst			PR for inter-annual smooths			PR for inter-decadal best			PR for inter-annual smooths		
GI	I	MW	U	GI	I	MW	U	GI	I	MW	U	Y
NEW3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	110	17	3	64 (13)	0	10	0	126	5	0	64 (12)	0
	123	28	11	34 (11)	0	9	1	139	18	5	34 (11)	0
	137	47	22	1 (0)	0	0	10	0	146	38	22	1 (0)
	139	22	25	11 (10)	0	8	2	9	0	1	139	30
SWW1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	53	21	12	55 (10)	0	10	0	1	69	11	6	55 (10)
	48	29	34	33 (7)	0	7	3	0	63	26	22	33 (7)
	80	31	39	1 (0)	0	0	10	0	90	26	34	1 (0)
	66	30	35	17 (3)	0	4	6	9	0	80	20	31
	13	38	12	78 (10)	0	10	0	7	15	41	7	78 (10)
	13	38	12	78 (10)	0	10	0	7	3	0	15	40
	13	38	12	78 (10)	0	10	0	7	0	0	8	78 (10)
	13	38	12	78 (10)	0	10	0	7	3	0	15	40
	13	38	12	78 (10)	0	10	0	7	0	0	8	78 (10)
	13	38	12	78 (10)	0	10	0	7	3	0	15	40
	13	38	12	78 (10)	0	10	0	7	3	0	15	40
	13	38	12	78 (10)	0	10	0	7	3	0	15	40

Scenario	Algorithm	Table A.45. As in table 5, but for the North East scenario 3 and South West scenario 1.						PR worst stats					
		No. stats more variable than clean	No. stats less variable than clean	Variability increases	Variability decreases	Variability unchanged (because of perfection)		I	U	MW	I	U	MW
NEW3	Released	117	78	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	97	97	4	18	17	37	30	24	76 (12)	0	10	9
	Climatol-M	91	105	8	22	23	32	33	44	45 (11)	0	9	0
	MASH	110	97	15	29	48	24	49	41	1 (0)	0	10	8
	ACMANT2	103	94	2	31	38	32	44	39	21 (10)	0	8	2
SWW1	Released	83	58	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	61	80	0	10	3	16	32	25	65 (10)	0	10	9
	Climatol-M	55	89	1	13	14	15	32	36	40 (7)	0	7	3
	MASH	62	89	5	25	24	21	30	45	1 (0)	0	0	10
	ACMANT2	69	79	0	17	20	18	42	34	20 (3)	0	4	6
	DAP1	74	67	1	6	21	4	12	19	88 (10)	0	10	0
	HOM	78	63	1	7	23	5	11	16	88 (10)	0	10	0
	SPLIDHOM1	75	66	2	6	22	5	10	18	88 (10)	0	10	0

Table A.46. As in table 6, but for the North East scenario 3 and South West scenario 1.

Scenario	Algorithm	Warm extremes						Cold extremes								
		Exact (± 0.14)			Too warm in returned			Exact (± 0.14)			Too warm in returned			Too cool in returned		
		I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW
NEW3	Released	101 (119)	-	-	-	-	-	70 (95)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	122 (151)	8	15	3	10	19	1	106 (167)	8	9	2	7	11	3	
	Climatol-M	122 (167)	7	9	4	9	8	2	94 (168)	14	5	1	10	4	5	
	MASH	105 (168)	12	5	6	9	5	2	72 (147)	24	2	5	22	3	4	
	ACMANT2	125 (169)	9	6	4	12	5	2	94 (175)	8	3	3	10	4	4	
SWW1	Released	103 (127)	-	-	-	-	-	70 (94)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Climatol-D	105 (134)	0	4	4	2	7	0	81 (116)	6	5	5	5	11	3	
	Climatol-M	105 (131)	1	6	2	2	7	2	72 (109)	5	5	15	5	8	4	
	MASH	97 (119)	1	5	1	9	4	12	68 (120)	6	2	6	7	3	7	
	ACMANT2	96 (123)	1	2	5	6	4	10	68 (108)	6	1	3	17	3	13	
	DAP1	104 (128)	0	10	1	1	11	0	72 (99)	3	19	0	3	25	2	
	HOM1	103 (128)	0	10	1	0	11	1	74 (100)	1	19	0	4	25	2	
	SPLIDHOM1	103 (128)	0	10	1	0	11	1	72 (99)	1	19	0	4	26	2	

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Table A.47. As in table 7, but for the North East scenario 3 and South West scenario 1.			Prop. CO IHS found	Prop. EV IHS found	Prop. large IHS found	Prop. medium IHS found	Prop. small IHS found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found	Prop. urbanisation IHS found
			Misses	CRs	HR								
NEW3	188 (188)	20 (20)	353	723	0.348	0.027	0.383	0.335 (0.335)	74.2%	12.7%	59.6%	2.84%	27.2% NA
	155 (155)	119 (120)	386	624	0.287	0.160	0.506	0.234 (0.234)	54.1%	14.4%	69.7%	49.9%	6.38% 35.9% NA
	131 (132)	214 (242)	410	528	0.242	0.288	0.693	0.167 (0.168)	43.8%	13.3%	40.8%	39.9%	9.57% 20.4% 28.2% NA
SWW1	78 (78)	50 (89)	287	461	0.214	0.098	0.448	0.172 (0.172)	40.4%	10.0%	75.6%	37.0%	0% 22.5% 26.8% 9.64%
	62 (62)	102 (108)	303	408	0.170	0.200	0.555	0.131 (0.131)	31.6%	8.30%	56.1%	27.6%	2.03% 17.8% 20.9% 8.43%
	77 (77)	170 (200)	288	336	0.211	0.336	0.757	0.136 (0.136)	28.7%	16.6%	46.3%	36.2%	6.09% 24.0% 22.9% 13.3% 6.02%
	18 (18)	63 (67)	347	449	0.049	0.123	0.224	0.042 (0.042)	8.08%	3.06%	19.5%	7.09%	0.51% 4.58% 4.65% 6.02%

Table A.48. As in table 8, but for the North East scenario 3 and South West scenario 1.

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Misses	CRs	HR	FAR	Freq. bias	Critical Success Index	Prop. CO IHS found	Prop. EV IHS found	Prop. large IHS found	Prop. medium IHS found	Prop. small IHS found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found	Prop. urbanisation IHS found
NEW3	198 (198)	10 (10)	343	718	0.366	0.014	0.383	0.359 (0.359)	75.8%	14.7%	93.4%	63.4%	3.90%	28.7%	45.0%	NA
	211 (211)	64 (64)	330	664	0.390	0.088	0.506	0.349 (0.349)	72.2%	20.5%	85.5%	61.7%	11.7%	32.6%	45.8%	NA
SWW1	256 (258)	107 (118)	285	620	0.473	0.147	0.693	0.388 (0.390)	79.4%	29.4%	82.9%	71.0%	22.3%	43.7%	51.1%	NA
	100 (100)	31 (68)	265	465	0.274	0.063	0.448	0.231 (0.231)	50.7%	13.5%	90.2%	47.2%	1.52%	29.5%	32.7%	14.5%
	95 (95)	69 (77)	270	425	0.260	0.140	0.456	0.215 (0.215)	45.6%	14.4%	63.4%	48.0%	4.06%	25.6%	32.7%	14.5%
	145 (145)	110 (133)	220	379	0.397	0.225	0.757	0.291 (0.291)	60.3%	27.5%	85.4%	71.7%	9.64%	38.0%	49.0%	25.3%
	39 (39)	42 (45)	326	455	0.107	0.085	0.224	0.095 (0.095)	19.9%	5.24%	36.6%	15.7%	2.03%	10.1%	11.8%	9.64%

Table A.49. As in table 1 , but for the South West scenarios 2 and 3.

Scen.	Algorithm	Region bias	No. positively biased (mean bias)	No. negatively biased (mean bias)	No. non-biased (to measurement precision)	Sum absolute biases	Percentage recovery			PR best stats			PR worst stats			Best stats mean bias			Worst stats mean bias		
							GI	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW		
SWW2	Released	-0.061	86 (0.33)	121 (-0.35)	15 (65)	71.03	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
	Climatol-D	-0.027	86 (0.04)	120 (-0.08)	16 (149)	12.32	104	14 (11)	71 (15)	7	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.05		
	Climatol-M	-0.057	70 (0.10)	146 (-0.13)	6 (99)	26.13	80	23 (22)	45 (6)	46	0	4	6	9	0	1	0.01	-0.30			
	MASH	-0.053	86 (0.05)	136 (-0.12)	0 (133)	19.81	97	33 (21)	0 (0)	71	0	0	10	9	0	1	-0.01	-0.20			
	ACMANT2	-0.061	39 (0.07)	175 (-0.09)	8 (98)	19.14	101	28 (14)	17 (8)	54	0	6	4	10	0	0	-0.04	-0.06			
	DAP1	-0.058	92 (0.19)	1117 (-0.26)	13 (82)	47.36	29	59 (5)	98 (13)	18	0	8	2	9	1	0	0.01	-0.22			
	HOM1	-0.063	89 (0.19)	120 (-0.26)	13 (82)	48.23	27	60 (6)	98 (13)	18	0	8	2	9	1	0	0.01	-0.23			
	SPLIDHOM1	-0.057	92 (0.18)	1117 (-0.26)	13 (82)	47.49	29	60 (5)	98 (13)	17	0	8	2	9	1	0	0.01	-0.22			
SWW3	Released	-0.003	111 (0.39)	102 (-0.43)	9 (65)	87.72	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0.22			
	Climatol-D	0.027	145 (0.06)	66 (-0.05)	11 (155)	12.66	116	10 (11)	69 (9)	7	0	10	0	0	0	0	0.01	-0.22			
	Climatol-M	-0.007	121 (0.09)	94 (-0.14)	7 (112)	24.44	100	21 (16)	41 (7)	37	0	9	1	10	0	0	-0.01	-0.03			
	MASH	0.016	123 (0.07)	98 (-0.05)	1 (140)	14.40	119	36 (19)	0 (1)	47	0	1	9	10	0	0	-0.01	0.04			
	ACMANT2	-0.020	104 (0.07)	1116 (-0.10)	2 (102)	19.03	110	24 (14)	17 (2)	55	0	2	8	10	0	0	-0.05	-0.03			
	DAP1	0.012	114 (0.28)	99 (-0.30)	9 (77)	61.87	27	59 (5)	105 (9)	17	0	10	0	8	1	1	0	0.57			
	HOM1	0.007	112 (0.29)	101 (-0.30)	9 (78)	62.71	25	61 (4)	106 (9)	17	0	10	0	8	1	1	0	0.49			
	SPLIDHOM1	0.012	114 (0.28)	99 (-0.30)	9 (78)	61.97	26	61 (4)	105 (9)	17	0	10	0	8	1	1	1	1			

Table A.50. As in table 2, but for the South West scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Algorithm	Region RMSE	No. perfect RMSEs (to measurement precision)	Range of RMSEs in best stats	Range of RMSEs in worst stats	Percentage recovery	PR best stats			PR worst stats			PR value for region
							GI	I	MW	U	MW	I	
SWWW2	Released	0.658	20 (13)	(0, 0)	(1.36, 3.62)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	0.164	28 (16)	(0, 0)	(0.05, 0.31)	80	58	0	71 (13)	0	10	0	75.15
	Climatol-M	0.289	6 (12)	(0, 0.22)	(0.11, 1.77)	60	73	38	45 (6)	0	4	6	56.56
	MASH	0.254	0 (6)	(0.03, 0.12)	(0.08, 1.47)	66	108	48	0 (0)	0	10	10	61.43
	ACMANT2	0.207	8 (11)	(0, 0.25)	(0.11, 0.64)	65	90	42	17 (8)	0	6	4	68.49
	DAP1	0.526	13 (18)	(0, 0.21)	(0.16, 3.02)	5	86	20	98 (13)	0	8	2	20.07
	HOM1	0.529	13 (18)	(0, 0.16)	(0.17, 2.95)	4	87	20	98 (13)	0	8	2	19.61
	SPLIDHOM1	0.525	13 (18)	(0, 0.19)	(0.16, 3.01)	5	86	20	98 (13)	0	8	2	20.14
SWWW3	Released	0.796	9 (22)	(0, 0.01)	(1.57, 3.88)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climatol-D	0.182	11 (37)	(0, 0.01)	(0.07, 0.38)	95	47	2	69 (9)	0	10	0	77.16
	Climatol-M	0.259	7 (28)	(0, 0.09)	(0.09, 0.65)	76	73	25	41 (7)	0	9	1	67.47
	MASH	0.204	0 (7)	(0, 0.17)	(0.10, 0.29)	85	84	53	0 (0)	0	10	0	74.42
	ACMANT2	0.251	2 (13)	(0, 0.33)	(0.14, 0.39)	82	74	47	17 (2)	0	2	8	68.47
	DAP1	0.610	9 (20)	(0, 0.01)	(0.69, 3.12)	9	84	15	105 (9)	0	10	0	23.35
	HOM1	0.629	9 (20)	(0, 0.01)	(0.77, 3.12)	6	84	17	106 (9)	0	10	0	20.99
	SPLIDHOM1	0.610	9 (20)	(0, 0.01)	(0.73, 3.13)	9	85	14	105 (9)	0	10	0	23.32

Table A.51. As in table 3, but for the South West scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Algorithm	Decadal trends (°C)						Percentage recovery						PR best stats						PR worst stats						Regional average trend						PR for regional average trend
		Min	Max	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean			
SWW2	Clean	-0.137	0.291	180	0.136	42	-0.047	102	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.099	-		
	Released	-0.790	1.107	160	0.251	62	-0.184	153	(35)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.126	-			
	Climatol-D	-0.196	0.319	182	0.142	40	-0.048	117	(92)	118	7 (10)	3	71 (13)	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75.30	-		
	Climatol-M	-0.075	0.678	215	0.131	7	-0.030	117	(87)	100	16 (20)	35	45 (6)	0	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12.89	-		
	MASH	-0.097	0.300	180	0.145	42	-0.038	115	(95)	119	33 (20)	50	0 (0)	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67.89	-		
	ACMANT2	-0.248	0.424	204	0.140	18	-0.031	130	(87)	112	18 (20)	47	17 (8)	0	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.79	-		
	DAP1	-0.435	1.107	170	0.202	52	-0.121	135	(44)	28	57 (7)	19	98 (13)	0	2	8	8	1	1	0	124	10.32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	HOM1	-0.438	1.107	171	0.205	51	-0.122	136	(43)	25	61 (7)	18	98 (13)	0	2	8	8	1	1	0	127	-1.89	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	SPLIDHOM1	-0.442	1.107	169	0.204	53	-0.120	135	(44)	27	60 (7)	17	98 (13)	0	2	8	8	1	1	0	124	9.54	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
SWW3	Clean	-0.128	0.283	179	0.135	43	-0.047	104	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.098	-			
	Released	-1.271	0.967	143	0.265	79	-0.223	146	(45)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.090	-				
	Climatol-D	-0.251	0.314	175	0.127	47	-0.053	93	(98)	122	8 (6)	6	69 (11)	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30.00	-		
	Climatol-M	-0.097	0.380	199	0.114	23	-0.034	88	(76)	112	15 (20)	27	41 (7)	0	9	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77.72	-		
	MASH	-0.095	0.321	175	0.129	47	-0.039	90	(90)	137	30 (11)	44	0 (0)	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25.95	-		
	ACMANT2	-0.055	0.552	184	0.131	38	-0.018	92	(85)	116	22 (13)	52	17 (2)	0	2	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168.02	-		
	DAP1	-1.046	0.828	149	0.203	73	-0.141	121	(43)	32	58 (7)	11	105 (9)	0	10	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-17.37	-		
	HOM1	-1.045	0.835	149	0.208	73	-0.144	123	(41)	31	58 (7)	11	106 (9)	0	10	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9.20	-		
	SPLIDHOM1	-1.048	0.827	149	0.204	26	-0.142	122	(42)	29	62 (6)	11	105 (9)	0	10	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-17.96	-		

Table A.52. As in table 4, but for the South West scenarios 2 and 3.

Table A.53. As in table 5, but for the South West scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Algorithm	No. stats more variable than clean	No. stats less variable than clean	Variability increases	Variability decreases	Variability unchanged (because of perfection)	PR best stats			PR worst stats		
							MW			MW		
							I	U	MW	I	U	MW
SWW2	Released	132	75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climato-D	97	109	1	10	7	25	52	41	86 (15)	0	10
	Climato-M	101	115	12	13	28	22	44	52	51 (6)	0	4
	MASH	99	123	4	29	29	26	66	68	0 (0)	0	10
	ACMANT2	103	111	0	24	28	26	62	57	25 (8)	0	6
	DAP1	123	86	2	4	44	10	18	33	111 (13)	0	8
	HOM1	125	84	1	8	43	7	22	30	111 (13)	0	8
	SPLIDHOM1	124	85	3	5	43	9	20	31	111 (13)	0	8
SWW3	Released	151	62	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Climato-D	104	107	3	5	7	44	52	33	78 (9)	0	10
	Climato-M	102	113	3	22	24	33	41	48	48 (7)	0	9
	MASH	130	92	9	21	59	27	61	45	0 (0)	0	10
	ACMANT2	103	117	1	16	24	33	63	49	19 (2)	1	2
	DAP1	137	76	0	5	43	9	33	18	114 (9)	0	10
	HOM	137	76	0	5	41	8	30	23	115 (9)	0	10
	SPLIDHOM1	138	75	0	5	45	8	33	17	114 (9)	0	10

Table A.54: As in table 6, but for the South West scenarios 2 and 3.

Scenario	Algorithm	Warm extremes						Cold extremes						
		Exact (± 0.14)		Too warm in returned		Too cool in returned		Exact (± 0.14)		Too warm in returned		Too cool in returned		
		I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	I	U	MW	
SWW2	Released	166 (187)	-	-	-	-	-	95 (120)	-	-	-	-	-	
	Climatol-D	170 (196)	1	9	1	4	10	1	122 (176)	6	11	0	11	18
	Climatol-M	157 (181)	0	8	2	9	11	11	95 (144)	14	10	8	14	14
	MASH	145 (181)	2	3	4	8	10	14	111 (171)	12	5	3	1	10
	ACMANT2	156 (184)	1	5	4	9	5	14	105 (164)	6	5	0	21	9
	DAP1	169 (192)	0	12	0	4	13	1	95 (128)	9	30	1	5	48
	HOM1	166 (191)	0	12	0	5	13	1	93 (127)	8	31	2	5	48
	SPLIDHOM1	168 (194)	0	12	0	2	13	1	94 (127)	10	30	1	5	48
SWW3	Released	146 (160)	-	-	-	-	-	94 (117)	-	-	-	-	-	
	Climatol-D	156 (180)	5	16	3	5	13	0	130 (181)	16	11	1	5	8
	Climatol-M	152 (171)	8	15	2	7	16	3	111 (162)	20	9	6	7	15
	MASH	132 (170)	12	8	7	6	7	12	102 (170)	14	4	8	13	9
	ACMANT2	147 (179)	4	9	5	7	9	9	111 (172)	10	3	6	7	12
	DAP1	146 (162)	5	27	1	1	26	0	98 (128)	6	35	2	7	43
	HOM1	147 (163)	3	27	1	1	27	0	98 (129)	6	34	2	6	45
	SPLIDHOM1	146 (160)	6	27	1	2	26	0	98 (124)	10	34	2	7	44

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Misses	CRs	HR	FAR	Freq. bias	Critical Success Index	Table A.55. As in table 7, but for the South West scenarios 2 and 3.			Prop. medium IHs found	Prop. large IHs found	Prop. EV IHs found	Prop. CO IHs found	Prop. EV IHs found	Prop. CO IHs found	Prop. small IHs found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found	Prop. urbanisation IHs found
									SWW2	SWW3	SWW4										
SWW2	143 (143)	54 (58)	388	689	0.269	0.073	0.366	0.243 (0.243)	45.7%	16.8%	85.5%	46.9%	0.70%	20.4%	38.3%	16.4%					
	107 (107)	176 (195)	424	566	0.202	0.237	0.555	0.147 (0.147)	37.6%	10.7%	56.5%	37.7%	0.70%	20.4%	23.4%	14.1%					
	108 (108)	263 (313)	423	476	0.203	0.356	0.778	0.128 (0.128)	29.6%	15.4%	42.0%	38.3%	4.18%	16.6%	24.3%	18.8%					
	32 (32)	113 (116)	499	630	0.060	0.152	0.272	0.049 (0.049)	11.3%	3.19%	18.8%	8.57%	1.39%	5.52%	7.66%	3.91%					
SWW3	176 (176)	44 (56)	342	692	0.340	0.060	0.449	0.307 (0.307)	62.1%	15.9%	89.1%	50.6%	1.61%	28.8%	38.1%	NA					
	141 (141)	144 (149)	377	592	0.272	0.196	0.560	0.211 (0.211)	51.2%	11.7%	66.3%	41.0%	2.82%	23.6%	30.1%	NA					
	102 (102)	283 (327)	416	450	0.197	0.386	0.834	0.121 (0.121)	35.0%	9.84%	30.4%	32.0%	6.85%	18.3%	20.8%	NA					
	25 (25)	124 (131)	493	612	0.048	0.168	0.301	0.039 (0.039)	8.37%	2.54%	17.4%	5.06%	0%	3.06%	6.23%	NA					

Scenario	Hits	FAs	Table A.56. As in table 8, but for the South West scenarios 2 and 3.												
			Misses	CRs	FAR	HR	Freq. bias	Critical Success Index	Prop. CO IHs found	Prop. EV IHs found	Prop. large IHs found	Prop. medium IHs found	Prop. small IHs found	Prop. SCs found	Prop. SRs found
SWW2	168 (168)	33 (36)	695	0.316	0.045	0.366	0.296 (0.296)	51.1%	21.2%	94.2%	54.9%	24.4%	43.2%	21.9%	
	150 (150)	138 (154)	381	0.282	0.190	0.555	0.219 (0.219)	46.2%	18.6%	69.6%	52.6%	34.8%	33.8%	24.2%	
	215 (215)	171 (204)	316	0.405	0.238	0.778	0.293 (0.293)	58.6%	30.7%	84.1%	71.4%	11.1%	33.7%	48.6%	35.9%
	72 (72)	76 (77)	459	0.136	0.104	0.272	0.118 (0.118)	24.2%	7.83%	42.0%	21.7%	1.74%	11.0%	18.5%	8.59%
SWW3	198 (198)	22 (33)	320	0.382	0.030	0.448	0.359 (0.359)	70.4%	17.5%	94.6%	59.6%	2.02%	34.1%	41.5%	NA
	196 (196)	90 (94)	322	0.378	0.123	0.560	0.320 (0.320)	69.0%	17.8%	78.3%	60.1%	6.85%	34.5%	44.7%	NA
	236 (236)	165 (192)	282	0.456	0.227	0.834	0.332 (0.332)	76.8%	25.4%	78.3%	73.0%	13.7%	39.3%	50.5%	NA
	71 (71)	83 (85)	447	0.137	0.114	0.301	0.118 (0.118)	25.1%	6.35%	41.3%	18.0%	0.40%	10.5%	16.3%	NA