

1 **The regression of atmospheric concentration on carbon**
2 **dioxide emissions**

3 **J. S. Reid**

4 New Norfolk, Tasmania, Australia. 7140

5 **Key Points:**

- 6 • The impulse response of atmospheric CO₂ concentration to variations in emissions
7 can be estimated from observations.
8 • It decays to zero at infinite lag with no remnant fraction.
9 • The remnant fraction predicted by circulation models is due to their failure to ac-
10 count for eddy diffusion caused by deep ocean turbulence.

Corresponding author: J. S. Reid, johnsinclairreid@gmail.com

11 **Abstract**

12 The impulse response of CO₂ concentration due to variation in CO₂ emissions was es-
 13 timated from observed time series using the ARX method augmented by testing resid-
 14 uals for self-correlation. It was found to be a simple exponential with a half-time of 43
 15 years with no remnant component. The longer half times and large remnant fraction of
 16 the impulse response derived from ocean circulation models is attributed to the failure
 17 of these models to account for turbulent mixing in the deep ocean.

18 **Plain Language Summary**

19 When using climate models to make projections of future climate it is important
 20 to know how the atmospheric concentration of CO₂ will change in response to changes
 21 in carbon emissions. The “impulse response” of concentration due to emissions summarises
 22 the required information in a single curve from which the response to any arbitrary emis-
 23 sions scenario can be easily determined. It is a curve showing how the concentration will
 24 change following a single short impulse in emissions. The impulse responses widely ac-
 25 cepted by the modelling community all have a “remnant fraction” of between 10 and 20
 26 percent implying that this fraction of emitted CO₂ remains in the atmosphere forever.
 27 These curves are, themselves, based on circulation models similar to climate models. This
 28 paper develops a statistical technique for estimating the impulse response directly from
 29 the data while making no assumptions about the underlying physics. The impulse re-
 30 sponse estimated in this way shows that CO₂ remains in the atmosphere for a shorter
 31 time than hitherto supposed and has no remnant fraction. All the CO₂ presently gen-
 32 erated by fossil fuel will ultimately leave the atmosphere; half will be gone in the next
 33 half century.

34 **1 Introduction**

35 It is common practice across a wide range of sciences to treat physical quantities
 36 as ensemble parameters and to estimate them from sample statistics. A time series is
 37 a particularly type of sample, one in which a series of measurements are taken at equal
 38 intervals of time or averaged over equal intervals of time. The Pearson correlation co-
 39 efficient is often used to describe the relationship between contemporaneous time series,
 40 but it is a poor statistic because it does not account for temporal ordering. Two other
 41 statistics, which better summarize the relationship between two concurrent time series,
 42 are the impulse response and the sensitivity. The impulse response is the response of the
 43 endogenous or dependant variable to a short pulse in the exogenous or independent vari-
 44 able. The sensitivity is defined here as the response of the endogenous variable to unit
 45 step-function in the exogenous variable. It is the sum of terms (or integral) of the im-
 46 pulse response.

47 Both statistics can be estimated using the “autoregressive with exogenous variable”
 48 or ARX method. Their existence and the number of ARX regression coefficients required
 49 for their computation, is established by rejecting those configurations whose residuals
 50 show significant self-correlation. The impulse response is then found as the convolutional
 51 reciprocal of a sequence derived from the ARX regression coefficients. These ideas orig-
 52 inated with Box and Jenkins (1976). Here we derive these statistics using convolutional
 53 methods and apply them to carbon cycle time series.

54 The present statistical method makes no assumptions about the underlying physics,
 55 other than that the system under investigation is random, rather than deterministic, and
 56 that it is stationary and ergodic. It gives results which conflict with those based on nu-
 57 merical models.

58 2 The Model-Derived Carbon Cycle Impulse Response Function

A normalized Impulse Response Function $\mathfrak{S}(t)$ was first derived using a global circulation model by Maier-Reimer and Hasselmann (1987) (MRH), viz:

$$\mathfrak{S}(t) = A_0 + \sum_{j=1}^4 A_j \exp(-t/\tau_j) \quad (1)$$

Where the A_j are the proportions corresponding to various decay times, τ_j . A_0 is non-zero. The time constants, τ_j range from 1.2 years to 362.9 years. A very similar model, the HILDA model, was proposed by Siegenthaler and Joos (1992) which ultimately became the Bern model of the IPCC reports. The impulse response function, once known, is a great convenience for climate modellers because it allows atmospheric CO_2 concentration, $y(x)$, to be determined for any arbitrary emission rate, $x(t)$, using the convolution

$$y(x) = \int \mathfrak{S}(t-t')x(t')dt' \quad (2)$$

59 where $x(t)$ has been scaled to have the same units as $y(t)$.

60 In order to assess the non-linear response of pCO_2 to total carbon in the mixed layer, MRH ran their model using test input emission signals comprising increases of 25% , doubling and quadrupling of the initial atmospheric CO_2 concentration¹. The three impulse response functions are shown in Figure 1. Values of A_0 were 0.131, 0.142 and 0.166 respectively which determine the remnant fractions of atmospheric CO_2 under the three scenarios. 65

66 There is something very odd about this. Certainly we might expect a remnant fraction to remain in the atmosphere once the oceanic reservoir is saturated. What is odd is that the three remnant fractions are almost the same. In each case, we would expect the reservoir to take up roughly the same *absolute* amount of CO_2 before it becomes saturated, in which case a much larger *fraction* would remain in the atmosphere in the quadrupling case than in the 25% increase case. This is not shown as happening to the dotted curves in Figure 1. The similarity of the remnant fractions in the three cases does not imply saturation. Rather, it implies a partitioning of the available CO_2 between two reservoirs with a volume ratio of the order of $(1-r)/r$, where r is the remnant fraction. When we apply this to the MRH model, the oceanic reservoir into which atmospheric CO_2 is diffused has only about six times the CO_2 capacity of the atmosphere. Given that the ocean has been estimated to carry fifty times the steady-state, atmospheric load of CO_2 (Houghton et al., 2001), this is a remarkably small value. It implies that, in the MRH model, CO_2 is partitioned between the atmosphere and a small “sub-reservoir” from which little escapes into the remainder of the ocean, a sub-reservoir roughly comprising the moving water mass that constitutes the “conveyor belt” of the thermohaline circulation. 81

82 3 The ARX Method

83 For notational convenience, in the following, all sample means have been removed and random variables are assumed to have zero mean. 84

The autoregressive moving average method with a single exogenous variable, AR-MAX(p,q), is given at time, i , by:

$$Y_i = \alpha_0 x_i + \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_j \cdot y_{i-j} + \sum_{k=1}^q \beta_j \Xi_{i-k} \quad , \quad i = 1, \dots, N \quad (3)$$

¹ Their definition is slightly ambiguous. Their equation (5) defines it correctly but the accompanying text appears to define a “step response function”.

85 where the dependent random variable is Y_i , x_i is the exogenous variable, the y_i are past
 86 values of Y_i and the Ξ_i are unselfcorrelated random variables with zero mean. The re-
 87 gression coefficients α_0 , α_j and β_j are estimated from the data and p and q are small pos-
 88 itive integers. The notation is intended to make a clear distinction between random vari-
 89 ables which are Latin upper case, and constants, such as past values of random variables,
 90 which are Latin lower case. Equation (3) is a state space representation (Hamilton, 1994)
 91 describing states of the system at a succession of discrete instants; the random variable,
 92 Y_i , at one instant becomes the constant, y_i , in the following instant. The direction of time
 93 is important in regression, which, unlike correlation, allows causality to be inferred (Granger,
 94 1969).

95 There are software packages for parameter estimation available under the aegis of
 96 the major programming languages. Unfortunately some of these are flawed, because they
 97 estimate the exogenous parameter, α_0 , prior to estimating the other parameters, lead-
 98 ing to omitted-variable bias (Greene, 2003); all parameters must be estimated simulta-
 99 neously in a regression model.

100 Estimation of the MA coefficients, $\{\beta_i\}$, requires an iterative Kalman filter method
 101 which may not converge. The second, moving average summation in (3), describes a con-
 102 voluting or “blurring” function, so that $q > 1$ when the sampling interval, Δt , is too
 103 small. Estimation of the MA coefficients can be avoided by decimating the time series
 104 by q to give a new time series with a larger sampling interval, $q\Delta t$, for which the inno-
 105 vation sequence, $\{\Xi_m\}$, is unselfcorrelated. Then (3) becomes

$$Y_m = \alpha_0 x_m + \sum_{n=1}^p \alpha_n y_{m-n} + \Xi_m \quad , \quad m = 1, \dots, M \quad (4)$$

where $m = qi$, $qM \leq N$, The model summarized by (4) is an ARX(p) model for ‘au-
 toregressive with exogenous variable’. The regression coefficients, α_i , and their confidence
 limits are estimated using Ordinary Least Squares. The sequence of residuals, $\{\xi_m\}$, is
 given by

$$\xi_m = y_m - \left(\hat{\alpha}_0 x_m + \sum_{n=1}^p \hat{\alpha}_n y_{m-n} \right) \quad , \quad m = 1, \dots, M \quad (5)$$

106 where y_m is the sample value or ‘realization’ of Y_m and $\hat{\alpha}_0$ to $\hat{\alpha}_p$ are the regression co-
 107 efficient estimates. The $\{\xi_m\}$ are tested using the Ljung-Box, Q statistic with probabili-
 108 ty P (Ljung & Box, 1978). The minimum number of coefficients, \hat{p} , is found for which
 109 P is greater than some confidence level, say 0.1, for which it can be assumed the inno-
 110 vation sequence is not self-correlated.

Our best estimate of the relationship between the two time series is then

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\hat{p}} \hat{\gamma}_n y_{m-n} = \hat{\alpha}_0 x_m \quad (6)$$

where

$$\hat{\gamma}_0 = 1 \quad (7)$$

and

$$\hat{\gamma}_n = -\hat{\alpha}_n \quad , \quad n = 1, \dots, \hat{p} \quad (8)$$

111 The sequence $\{\gamma_n\}$ specified by (6) is the prediction error filter of the autoregressive pro-
 112 cess.

We can define a time series more precisely as a finite or semi-infinite sequence, $\{x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots\}$
 for which the index specifies successive equally spaced intervals of time. The convolu-
 tion, $c = \{c_k; k = 0, 1, \dots, r\} = a * b$, of two time series $a = \{a_i; i = 0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ and

$b = \{b_j; j = 0, 1, \dots, q\}$, is defined by

$$c_k = \sum_{i+j=k} a_i b_j \quad (9)$$

Under this definition convolution satisfies the commutative, associative and distributive laws of arithmetic. Note also that

$$\sum_i a_i \cdot \sum_j b_j = \sum_k \sum_{i+j=k} a_i b_j = \sum_k c_k \quad (10)$$

The sum on the left hand side of (6) is a convolution and (6) can be written

$$\hat{\gamma} * y = \hat{\alpha}_0 x \quad (11)$$

A more useful form of (11) is

$$y = \hat{I} * x \quad (12)$$

where \hat{I} is the convolutional reciprocal of $\hat{\gamma}/\hat{\alpha}_0$ given by

$$\hat{I} * \hat{\gamma} = \hat{\alpha}_0 \{1\} \quad (13)$$

and is termed the impulse response. It can be estimated numerically by iteration using (13) in the form

$$\hat{I}_m = \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{\alpha}_i \hat{I}_{m-i} + \hat{\alpha}_0 \delta_m \quad (14)$$

For display purposes and inter-comparison a normalized impulse response, \mathfrak{S} , may be used where

$$\mathfrak{S} * \gamma = \{1\} \quad (15)$$

113 Thus the normalized impulse response is the convolutional inverse of the prediction error
114 filter of the autoregressive process.

115 Like the regression coefficients, I is a property of the system under investigation
116 and \hat{I} is its estimate. Equation (12) describes the output of the system, y , in response
117 to *any* input sequence, x .

The sensitivity of the system, S , is defined here as the response at infinity to a unit step function, H_j , where $H_j = 0$ for $j < 0$ and $H_j = 1$ for $j \geq 0$. From (9)

$$S = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i+j=k} I_i H_j = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} I_k \quad (16)$$

118 i.e. it is the sum of the terms of the impulse response. It is a random variable on which
119 confidence limits can be placed.

According to (10) the sum of a convolution is equal to the product of the sums of the convoluting factors. Thus, from (13)

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} I_m \sum_{n=0}^p \gamma_n = S \sum_{n=0}^p \gamma_n = \alpha_0 \quad (17)$$

120 from which \hat{S} can be estimated in terms of the prediction error filter, $\{\hat{\gamma}_n\}$.

4 Estimating the Impulse Response from Observations

The ARX method developed above was applied to annual means (Meinshausen et al., 2017) of atmospheric CO₂ concentration, C_i , vs global fossil fuel emissions, E_i . Global fossil fuel emissions for the interval 1850 to 2014, were downloaded from the Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center (Boden et al., 2017).

Applying the Ljung-Box test to the residuals given by (5) for ARX(p) for $p = 0, \dots, 5$ resulted in zero probabilities in all cases. The ARMAX method revealed a significant moving average component with $q = 2$. For this reason both time series were decimated by 2 and the ARX / Ljung-Box method reapplied. The results for the decimated data are shown in Table 1. The probability, P , for the ARX(1) run has a value of 0.4359 indicating that the null hypothesis that the residuals are unselfcorrelated cannot be rejected. Thus the simplest regression relationship between C_i and E_i which unambiguously fits the data is the ARX(1) model, viz.:

$$C_i = \hat{\alpha}_0 E_i + \hat{\alpha}_1 C_{i-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N \quad (18)$$

where the estimated regression coefficients are $\hat{\alpha}_0 = 0.21$ and $\hat{\alpha}_1 = 0.969$ with 95 percent confidence limits 0.945 and 0.992. The prediction error filter is $\{1, -\hat{\alpha}_1\}$ which has convolutional inverse $\{1, \hat{\alpha}_1, \hat{\alpha}_1^2, \dots\}$, a geometric sequence with common ratio $\hat{\alpha}_1$. The n th term of the IRS estimate is given by

$$\hat{I}_n = \hat{\alpha}_0 \hat{\alpha}_1^n = \hat{\alpha}_0 \exp\left(-\frac{nq\Delta t}{\tau}\right) \quad (19)$$

and the impulse response can be regarded as discretely sampled from a continuous exponential function with time constant given by

$$\tau = -q\Delta t \ln(\hat{\alpha}_1) \quad (20)$$

Substituting $\hat{\alpha}_1$ and its confidence limits into (20) and multiplying by $\ln(2)$ gives a half-time of 43 years with confidence limits of 24 years and 193 years. The normalized impulse response is shown in Figure 1.

The sensitivity estimate, S , was 6.77 p.p.m.GtCO₂⁻¹.year with 95 percent, t-test confidence limits of 4.03 and 20.15 p.p.m.GtCO₂⁻¹.year. The probability that $S > 10^5$ was 0.012.

5 Discussion

The impulse response and sensitivity of CO₂ concentration estimated here are quite different from conventionally accepted values. The impulse response has an exponential decay with a single time constant and the sensitivity estimate is finite. These statistics were derived from an ARX regression model which was an excellent fit to the observations with no self-correlation evident in the residuals.

The impulse response function (1) due to Maier-Reimer and Hasselmann (1987) must be integrated from zero to infinity with respect to time in order to give the sensitivity. Their sensitivity is therefore infinite because of a non-zero constant in (1) according to which 13 percent of CO₂ emissions remains in the atmosphere indefinitely. In contrast the sensitivity estimated here from observations is finite, implying a serious shortcoming of their dynamical global ocean circulation model.

A possible explanation is the following. The deep ocean is bounded by a turbulent mixed layer and by the highly turbulent Antarctic Circumpolar Current. It is therefore likely to be internally mixed by a Kolmogorov cascade of turbulent eddies, some with spatial scales as large as ocean basins and with time scales of, perhaps, decades. Turbulence is a stochastic phenomenon which is difficult to observe at large spatial and tem-

149 poral scales and which cannot be readily emulated by deterministic models. The com-
 150 plexity of the eddy transports noted by Kamenkovich et al. (2021) calls for reconsider-
 151 ation of how they are estimated in practice, particularly in general circulation models.
 152 Eddy diffusion generated by such eddy transports would greatly increase the capacity
 153 of the deep ocean to absorb carbon dioxide and so would account for the shorter half time
 154 of the observed impulse response of atmospheric CO₂ concentration. Whatever the ex-
 155 planation, there is no observational evidence for the long half times and remnant com-
 156 ponent of atmospheric CO₂ concentration presently assumed by most modellers.

157 6 Open Research

158 Software and data used in the preparation of this article are available for down-
 159 load at Zenodo under the heading *Flawed Carbon Cycle Models*: DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6302014
 160 (<https://zenodo.org/record/6302014#.YhwtrjpxXct>)

161 References

- 162 Boden, T. A., Marland, G., & Andres, R. J. (2017). Global, regional, and national
 163 fossil-fuel co2 emissions. *Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak
 164 Ridge National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge, Tenn.,
 165 U.S.A.* Retrieved from [https://cdiac.ess-dive.lbl.gov/ftp/ndp030/
 166 global.1751.2014.ems](https://cdiac.ess-dive.lbl.gov/ftp/ndp030/global.1751.2014.ems) doi: 10.3334/CDIAC/00001_V2017
- 167 Box, G. E. P., & Jenkins, G. (1976). *Time series analysis: Forecasting and control*.
 168 San Francisco, CA: Holden-Day.
- 169 Granger, C. W. J. (1969). Investigating causal relations by econometric models and
 170 cross-spectral methods. *Econometrica*, *37*, 424-438. doi: 10.2307/1912791
- 171 Greene, W. H. (2003). *Econometric analysis (5th ed.)*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- 172 Hamilton, E. J. (1994). *Time series analysis*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Uni-
 173 versity Press.
- 174 Houghton, J. T., et al. (Eds.). (2001). *Ippc, 2001: climate change 2001: the scien-
 175 tific basis. contribution of working group 1 to the third assessment report of the
 176 intergovernmental panel on climate change*. London: Cambridge University
 177 Press.
- 178 Kamenkovich, I., Berloff, P., Haigh, M., Sun, L., & Lu, Y. (2021). Complexity of
 179 mesoscale eddy diffusivity in the ocean. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *48*(5),
 180 e2020GL091719. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley
 181 .com/doi/abs/10.1029/2020GL091719](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2020GL091719) (e2020GL091719 2020GL091719) doi:
 182 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL091719>
- 183 Ljung, G. M., & Box, G. E. P. (1978). On a measure of a lack of fit in time series
 184 models. *Biometrika*, *65*, 297-303. doi: 10.1093/biomet/65.2.297
- 185 Maier-Reimer, E., & Hasselmann, K. (1987). Transport and storage of co2 in the
 186 ocean - an inorganic ocean-circulation carbon cycle model. *Climate Dynamics*,
 187 *2*, 63-90. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01054491>
- 188 Meinshausen, M., Vogel, E., Nauels, A., & Lorbacher, K. (2017). Historical green-
 189 house gas concentrations for climate modelling (cmip6). *Geosci. Model Dev.*,
 190 *10*, 2057-2116. (<https://www.climatecollege.unimelb.edu.au/cmip6>)
- 191 Siegenthaler, U., & Joos, F. (1992). Use of a simple model for studying ocean tracer
 192 distributions and the global carbon cycle. *Tellus*, *44B*(3), 186-207.




Figure 1. The normalized impulse response, \mathfrak{S} , of Carbon Dioxide concentration due to an impulse in CO₂ emissions derived from observed time series using the ARX method (solid line). Also shown are the model-derived, normalized impulse response functions of Maier-Reimer and Hasselmann (1987) (dotted lines).

Run	Q	pvalue
C(t) vs E(t) only	513.5	0.0000
C(t) vs E(t), C(t-1)	28.5	0.4359
C(t) vs E(t), C(t-1), C(t-2)	28.6	0.3830
C(t) vs E(t) to C(t-3)	24.5	0.5483
C(t) vs E(t) to C(t-4)	24.3	0.5049
C(t) vs E(t) to C(t-5)	22.0	0.5796

Table 1. Ljung-Box parameter, Q , and its probability, P , for five ARX runs of CO₂ concentration, C , vs. global fossil fuel emissions, E . Both time series were decimated by 2.