Answers to Editorial Comments

I thank the author for a major revision of the manuscript. The reviewers and I appreciate your effort in substantially improving the manuscript. However there are still some critical issues that require major revision before the paper could be considered for final publication in WCD.

Thank you for the encouraging comments. I definitely appreciate the time and the effort the reviewers and the editorial board have put in considering my work. I have taken into account the remarks and I am happy to provide a new version of the manuscript which addresses the issues.

For instance, reviewer 2 points towards critical discrepancies between the snow rates in the EOBS data and ERA-5 which lead to statements not justified by both data sets and contradict findings related to snow-fall trends in CH in earlier literature. A work around could be to focus on the consistent trends in both data sets e.g. in maximum snowfall at the Adriatic Coast as suggested by R2.

I agree that there are critical discrepancies between EOBS and ERA5 data and this leads to contradicting findings for Switzerland. In the new version of the manuscript, I discuss this contradiction briefly and I focus only on consistent trends for both datasets for countries located in the Balkans as suggested by reviewer 2.

Another issue raised by reviewer 1 is the need for a clearer distinction of the different time scales involved or at least a clearer introduction to different time scales is needed. I hope that these second reviews encourage you for another major revision.

The time scales are now discussed in detail in the introduction (L35-40): "The focus of this study is to understand changes in daily heavy snowfalls at the scale of European regions and countries. Daily extreme snowfalls result from the interplay of both dynamical and thermodynamic factors, playing at different spatial and time scales: at local (few kms, few hours) scales, geographical features and convection may enhance snowfall precipitations. Persistence of convective snowfalls for several hours on the same region can provide large snowfall amounts detectable at daily time-scales. At synoptic scales, snowfalls are driven by extratropical cyclones (~1000 km, 2-6 days) traveling southwards in jet-stream meanders formed by the disruption of the normal westerly flow (Tibaldi et al. 1983, Barnes et al. 2014, Lehmann et al. 2015). Oscillations of the jet stream are associated with low-frequency variability of weather patterns that can modulate daily synoptic fields and snowfall events (Wallace et al. 2006). These conditions create a dipole consisting of high pressure structures over some regions and low pressure systems (extratropical cyclones) travelling southward in other regions."

Minor editorial comments:

Section 1

Paragraph starting in l40: It would be good to introduces jet variability also in terms of more classical weather regime literature. Suitable references are for instance: Vautard 1990, Michaelangeli et al. 1995, Yiou and Nogaj 2004 , Woollings et al. 2010, Madonna et al. 2017, ...

Thank you for suggesting this addition, I have added (L44-55): "The most common way to link low frequency variability to weather phenomena is the computation of daily weather regimes (Vautard et al. 1990, Michelangeli et al. 1995). In Nakamura et al. 1997 and Yiou et a. 2004, first connections between extreme weather events and weather regimes have been established. Madonna et al. 2017 found a clear link between eddy-driven jet variability and weather regimes in the North Atlantic-European sector. In winter, if blocking high pressure becomes established close to Greenland, cold air from polar latitudes can be advected towards western Europe (North Atlantic Oscillation negative phase (Cattiaux et al. 2010winter). When this weather pattern is associated with extratropical cyclones travelling southward from northern latitudes extreme snowfalls over UK, France, Benelux and the Iberian Peninsula are expected. If a high pressure ridge (Atlantic Ridge) extends from the Azores Islands towards the Icelandic region or the British isles, cold air coming from Russia or Scandinavia flows in the Mediterranean Sea. This can cause cyclogenesis in the Tyrrhenian (Genoa lows) or in the Adriatic seas triggering extreme snowfalls over Italy, the Balkans, Greece and Turkey (Buehler et al. 2011)."

l42: "confined north stream" -> Please check the formulation.

The sentence has been removed as part of the reorganisation of the introduction

paragraph starting in l64: Here would be a place to briefly discuss Kawase et al. 2016

Kawase is now introduced as suggested in the introduction (L70): "For Japan, Kawase et al. (2016) have shown that thermodynamic feedbacks from anthropogenic forcing may enhance extreme snowfalls in future climates via the interaction of the Japan Sea polar air mass convergence zone with the topography. A similar mechanisms exist also for the Mediterranean sea, as recently detailed in D'Errico et al. (2019)" and in the results section (L279)

Section 2

l85 / 87 / 115: Abbreviations - also common ones - need to be introduced with full words: ERA5, E-OBS, C3S, NUTS, NUST. Please provide a reference where NUTS-2 regions are defined & taken from.

All acronyms are defined, except for E-OBS that is not an acronym (to the best I could find). For EOBS it has been specified that it is an ECAD dataset. For NUTS regions a reference has been added.

Section 4

l206, discussion of Figures 7&8, it would help to be more quantitative now and state the actual values. Also Could you compute the country average CAPE & 2mT during the max SF events in both periods and show it as box-and-whisker plots as Figure 6a (or included there)? This would help a lot contrast cases/countries.

Thank you for the suggestion. The boxplots have been added to Figure6 (panels c) and d) and commented in the text (L212-217)

discussion of Figures 7&8&9, it would help to have a few more references to the subfigures, as you jump a lot through the panels…

Where necessary, I have added the precise information about the subpanels

l221, delete "fully"

corrected

l228 you mean Figure 9

corrected

l235: Not sure what is meant here, the initially northerly flow on the western flank of the Genoa Low and then cyclonically around back to the Alps in southerly flow? Or the anomalous so southerly flow in 9f? Please check and clarify.

This part for Switzerland has been removed. However, for the Balkans, at the end of section 4, I now recall the general mechanism for the enhancements of snowfall precipitations in the Balkans (275-280): "The rationale for explaining the changes is then the following: AR patterns happen with the same frequency in winter but associated with deeper cyclogenesis in the Adriatic or Thyrrenian sea. These cyclones find warmer surfaces and availability of humidity and CAPE, thus producing large snowfall amounts, enhanced by stau effect on the Balkans topography. This mechanism is similar to the one described for Japan in Kwase et al (2016) and for Italy in D'Errico et al 2019."

l272: Clarify that this is only true for the Mediterranean countries, not CH.

The analysis for Switzerland has been removed, so the text is now coherent.

Discussion in line 275: The results of Santos et al. 2016 might help to discuss your results more in the light of weather regimes.

I have added (L308-312): "Although winter total precipitations in future climate scenarios is expected to increase over Europe (Santos et al., 2016), global and regional warming is projected to reduce average and extreme snowfall precipitations at least in Central and Western Europe (de Vries et al., 2014). In the same study, de Vries et al. (2014) find that positive trends in snowfalls could still be observed for mountain areas (Alps and Scandinavia) in warmer climates. This seems coherent with the results found for Japan by Kawase et al. (2016) and in the present study for the Balkans."

l291: check spelling / citationstyle.

Spelling has been checked as well as citation style

References:

Madonna, E., C. Li, C. M. Grams, and T. Woollings, 2017: The link between eddy-driven jet variability and weather regimes in the North Atlantic-European sector. Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc, 143, 2960–2972, doi:10.1002/qj.3155.

Michelangeli, P.-A., R. Vautard, and B. Legras, 1995: Weather Regimes: Recurrence and Quasi Stationarity. J. Atmos. Sci., 52, 1237–1256, doi:10.1175/1520-0469(1995)052<1237:WRRAQS>2.0.CO;2.

Santos, J. A., M. Belo-Pereira, H. Fraga, and J. G. Pinto, 2016: Understanding climate change projections for precipitation over western Europe with a weather typing approach. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 121, 2015JD024399, doi:10.1002/2015JD024399.

Vautard, R., 1990: Multiple weather regimes over the North Atlantic: analysis of precursors and successors. Mon. Wea. Rev., 118, 2056–2081, doi:10.1175/1520-0493(1990)118<2056:MWROTN>2.0.CO;2.

Woollings, T., A. Hannachi, and B. Hoskins, 2010: Variability of the North Atlantic eddy-driven jet stream. Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc., 136, 856–868, doi:10.1002/qj.625.

Yiou, P., and M. Nogaj, 2004: Extreme climatic events and weather regimes over the North Atlantic: When and where? Geophys. Res. Lett., 31, doi:10.1029/2003GL019119. https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2003GL019119.

Non-public comments to the Author:
Dear Davide Ferranda,

thanks for your major revision. Having considered the two previous reviewers and based on my own review on the second version I am afraid to have to opt again for a major revision. The new version is almost a new paper, therefore new issues arised. I hope you feel encourage to tackle these issues.

Answer to reviewer 1

I would thank you for your substantial modification of the manuscript. Now I evaluate that this manuscript is greatly improved in quality and becomes suitable for the WCD paper, because there are rich data analyses and discussion for atmospheric fields that cause the increasing trends of local heavy snowfall. Although I would like to recommend minor revision for the manuscript, I think some questions or concerns are still remained to be addressed before the publication. I have the following comments and please consider for the revised manuscript.

1. Additional data analyses are nice for the thermodynamics and dynamics to explain the changes of heavy snowfall. However, I am wondering the reason (interpretation) why the more frequent AR pattern appears during the heavy snowfall events in the recent period? At first I thought this is because the frequency of the pattern increases during the recent period, yet the author writes "whereas the same evidence does not exist for the increase in Atlantic Ridge patterns" (L293-294). In

addition, the discussion with Figure 11 seems not to answer the question, since it rather relates to the (synoptic) flow patterns for heavy snowfall events but not the (large-scale) low-frequency variability patterns. Please add more discussion in the revised manuscript.

I agree that a more detailed explanation should be provided. The most important point is that, in the Balkans, there are no significant changes in the abundance of AR patterns for the countries analysed, but heavy snowfalls tend to be associated more with this pattern when they occur. At the end of section 4, I now recall the general mechanism for the enhancements of snowfall precipitations in the Balkans (275-280): "The rationale for explaining the changes is then the following: AR patterns happen with the same frequency in winter but associated with deeper cyclogenesis in the Adriatic or Thyrrenian sea. These cyclones find warmer surfaces and availability of humidity and CAPE, thus producing large snowfall amounts, enhanced by stau effect on the Balkans topography. This mechanism is similar to the one described for Japan in Kwase et al (2016) and for Italy in D'Errico et al 2019."

2. It is difficult to agree to use snowfall in reanalysis as the basis to select the 4 countries where heavy snowfall events increase, though I agree that the author focuses on the 4 countries. Can you reconstruct the logic in L169-174 and discussion for Fig. 6, can you find indirect evidence in observation such as precipitation rather than snowfall itself to explain the increasing trend of maximum snowfall? Otherwise, please emphasize throughout the text, such as abstract, that the increase of heavy snowfall is only in the reanalysis dataset.

This comment is common for Reviewer 1,2 and the editorial boarding. In the new version of the manuscript I therefore focus only on the countries showing consistent positive trends in EOBS and ERA5, namely Albania, Bosnia and Montenegro.

3. Time scales of atmospheric phenomena that drive the heavy snowfall events seem ambiguous. Although the author mentions to focus on synoptic and daily time scales (L38-39), synoptic phenomena and the low-frequency variability such as NAO or blocking are discussed without distinguishing. Low-frequency variability is not in synoptic time scale, yet there seems no description for the distinction. Therefore description in the paragraph L41-62 should be strengthened.

Following the suggestion of the reviewer, I have changed the introduction also describing the connection between low frequency variability and weather regimes more explicitly (L35-45): "The focus of this study is to understand changes in daily heavy snowfalls at the scale of European regions and countries. Daily extreme snowfalls result from the interplay of both dynamical and thermodynamic factors, playing at different spatial and time scales: at local (few kms, few hours) scales, geographical features and convection may enhance snowfall precipitations. Persistence of convective snowfalls for several hours on the same region can provide large snowfall amounts detectable at daily time-scales. At synoptic scales, snowfalls are driven by extratropical cyclones (~1000 km, 2-6 days) traveling southwards in jet-stream meanders formed by the disruption of the normal westerly flow (Tibaldi et al. 1983, Barnes et al. 2014, Lehmann et al. 2015). Oscillations of the jet stream are associated with low-frequency variability of weather patterns that can modulate daily synoptic fields and snowfall events (Wallace et al. 2006). These conditions create a dipole consisting of high pressure structures over some regions and low pressure systems (extratropical cyclones) travelling southward in other regions.

Also, does the author use "weather regimes" same as low-frequency variability? I cannot find their relation.

To specify better the relation I have added in the introduction (L44-57): "The most common way to link low frequency variability to weather phenomena is the computation of daily weather regimes (Vautard et al. 1990, Michelangeli et al. 1995). In Nakamura et al. 1997 and Yiou et al 2004, first connections between extreme weather events and weather regimes have been established. Madonna et al. 2017 found a clear link between eddy-driven jet variability and weather regimes in the North Atlantic-European sector. In winter, if blocking high pressure becomes established close to Greenland, cold air from polar latitudes can be advected towards western Europe (North Atlantic Oscillation negative phase (Cattiaux et al. 2010winter). When this weather pattern is associated with extratropical cyclones travelling southward from northern latitudes extreme snowfalls over UK, France, Benelux and the Iberian Peninsula are expected. If a high pressure ridge (Atlantic Ridge) extends from the Azores Islands towards the Icelandic region or the British isles, cold air coming from Russia or Scandinavia flows in the Mediterranean Sea. This can cause cyclogenesis in the Tyrrhenian (Genoa lows) or in the Adriatic seas triggering extreme snowfalls over Italy, the Balkans, Greece and Turkey (Buehler et al. 2011)."

Minor comments:
- You may change the significant level for snowfall difference (Figs. 3-4) with 10% confidence level, since it is difficult to find out the trend of (extreme) snowfall.

Thank you for the suggestion, I prefer to keep the 5% confidence level, that is the standard used in many climatological studies (also on extreme events)

- Significance tests is also needed for the data analysis of atmospheric fields (Figs 7-9) with typically 5 or 1% confidence level.

I have performed and added in the aforementioned figures 7-9 a sign test. Shaded areas represent grid points where at least 2/3 of the anomalies yield the same sign.

- Is it possible to comment what are the origins of synoptic cyclones in Fig 9? Are they extratropical cyclones traveling from the Atlantic or local meso-scale cyclones appearing in specific regions?

- L242 "Following the approaches of Nakamura et al. (1997) and Kawase et al. (2016)": these citations here seem strange, because they carefully analyzed atmospheric fields and investigate mechanisms behind. The paragraph is rather related to introduce weather regimes or probably low-frequency variability that can modulate synoptic fields and local snowfall events.

Thank you for this comment. The references in the sentences have been substituted with those to Vautard et al 1990 and Michelangeli et al. 1995.

Answers to Reviewer 2

General comments :

The article has been deeply rewritten, mainly following the Reviewers' comments. In particular the analysis is now performed at country level rather than at regional level, which I definitively support. There are also new analyses on CAPE, 2m temperatures and weather regimes. However I'm still puzzled about several points:

- Although the author claims that the agreement between ERA5 and EOBS is "remarkable" (L. 121), I see in Figures 1-2 quite large differences, and not only for Turkey (the color scale doesn't ease comparison but, e.g., there seems to be around 25-50% difference in all Scandinavia). It seems to me that ERA5 tends to overestimate EOBS.

Following the comment of the reviewer, the sentences have been rephrased (L128-130) as: "The agreement between the ERA5 and the E-OBSv20.0e data-set largely depends on the regions considered. Overall, the climatologies of snowfall provided by the two datasets have similar ranges although ERA5 tends to overestimate EOBSv20.0e"

- All the results of section 4 to explain positive trends in extreme snowfall are based on four countries : Albania (AL), Macedonia (ME), Switzerland (CH) and Turkey (TR). These countries are chosen because they show "the largest positive changes" in maximum snowfall in ERA 5 (L. 173). However according to Figure 4, three of these countries (namely CH, ME, TR) show strong negative trends in EOBS ! Therefore how much confidence can we have in the results for explaining positive trends? Note that the positive trend in ERA5 for Switzerland is in contradiction with several other studies based on snow stations (e.g. Scherrer et al. 2013, Marty and Blanchet, 2012)

This comment is common for Reviewer 1,2 and the editorial boarding. In the new version of the manuscript I therefore focus only on the countries showing consistent positive trends in EOBS and ERA5, namely Albania, Bosnia and Montenegro. For Switzerland, as pointed out by the referee, it has been added that: " the positive trend in ERA5 for Switzerland is in contradiction with several other studies based on snow stations (e.g. Scherrer et al. 2013, Marty and Blanchet, 2012)"

- What the author calls "Macedonia" in all the article seems actually to be the Montenegro (which indeed shows a positive trend in both ERA5 and EOBS)

Thank you for noticing this error. It is indeed Montenegro. This has been fixed through the manuscript.

- According to Figure 4, there are only 3 countries with strong positive trends in both ERA5 and EOBS: Bosnia, Montenegro, Albania. All three are located on the eastern flank of the Adriatic Sea. Therefore I suggest focusing on these three countries to attempt explaining positive trends.

Following the suggestion of the reviewer, all the analysis now focused on these three countries

- I didn't understand the results of the weather regime analysis. Whereas AL and ME show similar sea level pressure fields for the maxima, CH and TR show very different fields. Therefore isn't it inconsistent that for the four countries AR and BLO are found to be by far the most frequent weather regimes during the days of maximum snowfalls?

The analysis is now focused on AL,BO,ME so this problem is fixed. However, I would like to stress that although with some differences in the position of the cyclonic patterns over Europe, snowfalls in CH and TR are also associated with blocking or AR weather regimes, as described in the introduction. Indeed NAO+ or NAO- are zonal patterns characterized by westerly (NAO+) or easterly (NAO-) associated respectively with wet-mild (NAO+) conditions or cold-dry (NAO-) conditions.

Detailed comments:
- L 121 "is remarkable": as said above it seems to me there are quite large differences for different countries. To ease comparison I suggest 1) using a color scale with larger gradient, 2) showing the ratio ERA5/EOBS.

Thank you for the suggestion. I have removed remarkable and rephrased the sentence. I have also added in Figure 5, two panels showing the symmetric percentage error (x_ERA-x_EOBS)/(x_ERA+x_EOBS), where x is the average snowfall. This quantity is normalized in the range [-1, 1] and it shows that for southern Europe ERA is positively biased and for Central Europe is negatively biased (see discussion in L162-170).

- Figure 1c: why is part of Turkey missing ?

Thank you for noticing it. Part of the figure was missing because of some NaN present in the datasets. The average is now obtained by removing the NaN and the figures are fixed. This causes a change in the averaged values of the climatology that were underestimated. The trends however did not change in any appreciable way except for the magnitude.

- L 162 "notably ion the Balkans": I'd be more moderated on the Balkans because EOBS and ERA5 only agree on 3 countries.

"Notably in the Balkans" has been replaced with "specifically for some countries in the Balkans".

- L 173: "the largest positive changes, namely Albania (AL), Macedonia (ME), Switzerland (CH) and Turkey (TR)": as already said, among these countries actually ERA and EOBS only agree on AL…

As previously said, the analysis now focuses on AL, ME and BO

- In all Section 4, don't you mean Montenegro rather than Macedonia?

Thank you for noticing this error, that has now been corrected

- Figure 6 and L. 181-184: the difference are so small that it seems to me to be only sampling variability.

I would tend to agree, but the subsequent analyses show that the differences are associated with precise sea-level pressure patterns, temperature and CAPE anomalies

- L 188 "for Switzerland maxima of snowfalls tend to occur in December rather than in January": Yes, this is in accordance with Klein et al. 2016.

Thank you, but the analysis for Switzerland has been removed

- Figures 7-8-9: the green dots hide where we are supposed to look at. Please consider replacing the dots by the country borders.

Thank you for the suggestion. After several attempts, I still prefer this choice for presenting the figures. The new boxplots in Figure 6c,d, suggested by the editor, provide a quantitative "zoom" on the countries selected

- L 207 "and on the Alps for Switzerland": actually for CH, CAPE is large not only over the Alps, but rather over all eastern Europe.

The analysis for Switzerland has been removed

- L 214-215 "the local temperature difference … is small" : what would be large? For AL the difference is of 3°C. Isn't it large? For CH: is it red or white? The green dot is about the size of the country so it doesn't allow us to see the values.

Thank you for the remark, the analysis of the boxplots in Figure 6c,d allows now for more quantitative statements (L212-217): "The boxplots in Figure 6c-d) show the spatial regional average of t2m and CAPE during the days of the maximum snowfalls. The analysis for temperature (Figure 6c) suggests that maximum snowfalls tend to be associated with temperatures above the freezing point in the recent period and a reduced variability with respect to the first period. The analysis for CAPE (Figure 6d) is not very informative for two reasons: i) the distribution is highly non-Gaussian, it includes zeros and presents several outliers, ii) convective precipitations can originate in nearby regions and be transported. In

- L 235 "increase of CAPE over the central Med … Switzerland": I don't understand this interpretation. According to Figure 9, the maxima in CH are produced by Atlantic flows, so I don't get the interpretation in terms of Mediterranean CAPE.

The analysis for Switzerland has been removed

- L 245 "technique presented in Faranda et al. 2017": do you take the same thresholds as therein to produce the classification (98% and 2%)?

Yes, this is now specified in the text

- L 245 "five possible regimes" It would be helpful to show the composites of the five classes.

The composite are shown in Faranda et al. 2017 for NCEP but they are very similar for ERA5. Since the paper already counts several multipanel figures, the regimes are not shown but a precise reference to the figure 2 in Faranda et al 2017 is made.

- Figure 10 and L 248 "prevalence of BLO and AR patterns": as already said, I don't understand how BLO and AR can prevail for CH and TR whereas Figure 9 shows completely different influences for these countries.

Thank you, but the analysis for Switzerland has been removed

- L 251-254 “this patterns consists … Mediterranean basin”: according to Figure 9, this doesn’t seem to apply to CH.

Thank you, but the analysis for Switzerland has been removed

Typos and clarifications:
- L 147: positive IN Switzerland
- L 185 Figure 6 → Figure 6b
- L 186 date → average date?
- L 207 SwitZerland

Wherever still presents, these points have been fixed.

References:

Klein, G., Vitasse, Y., Rixen, C. et al. (2016) Shorter snow cover duration since 1970 in the Swiss Alps due to earlier snowmelt more than to later snow onset. Climatic Change 139, 637–649. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-016-1806-y

Marty, C., Blanchet, J. (2012) Long-term changes in annual maximum snow depth and snowfall in Switzerland based on extreme value statistics. Climatic Change 111, 705–721. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0159-9

Scherrer, Simon & Wüthrich, Christian & Croci-Maspoli, Mischa & Weingartner, Rolf & Appenzeller, Christof (2013). t. International Journal of Climatology, 33, 10.1002/joc.3653.

An attempt to explain recent changes in European snowfall extremes

Davide Faranda[1,2,3]

[1]Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, UMR 8212 CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, Université Paris-Saclay, IPSL, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

[2]London Mathematical Laboratory, 8 Margravine Gardens London, W6 8RH, UK

[3]LMD/IPSL, Ecole Normale Superieure, PSL research University, Paris, France

Correspondence: Davide Faranda (davide.faranda@lsce.ipsl.fr)

Abstract. The goal of this work is to investigate and explain recent changes in total and maximum yearly snowfall from daily data in light of ~~both~~ the current global warming ~~and the low-frequency~~ or the interdecadal variability of the atmospheric circulation. We focus on the period 1979-2018 and compare two different data-sets: the ERA5 reanalysis data and the E-OBSv20.0e data, where snowfall is identified from rainfall by applying a threshold on temperature. We compute changes as differences from quantities computed for the periods 1999-2018 and 1979-1998. On one hand, we show that the decline in average snowfall observed in almost all European regions is coherent with previous findings and ~~caused by~~ can be linked to global warming. On the other hand, we observe contrasting changes in maxima ~~. The Balkans and few other countries such as Switzerland and Turkey show an increase of heavy snowfall in the recent period. On one hand, we~~ and sometimes disagreement in the sign of changes in the two data-sets. Coherent positive trends are found for few countries in the Balkans. These have been investigated in details by looking at modifications in the atmospheric weather patterns as well as local thermodynamic factors concurring to large snowfall events. We link these changes to the ~~increased instability of atmospheric motions associated with snowfall extremes, which can trigger convection especially in the proximity of the Mediterranean Sea. On the other hand, we also find significant changes in weather patterns associated with snowfall maxima, with a stronger prevalence of Atlantic ridge patterns~~stronger prevalence of Atlantic ridge or Blocking patterns associated with deeper cyclonic structure over the Adriatic or the Tyrrhenian sea. These cyclones find warmer surfaces and large availability of humidity and CAPE, thus producing large snowfall amounts, enhanced by Stau effect on the Balkans topography.

1 Introduction

Heavy snowfalls can have a great impact on economy and society. In January 2017, a cold spell affected most of Eastern and Central Europe and part of southern Europe, causing the death of at least 60 people: The combination of snowfalls with a series of earthquake in Central Italy caused a disastrous avalanche that hit the town of Rigopiano in Abruzzo where a landslide swept and destroyed a hotel, causing several casualties (Frigo et al., 2018). On January 8th, accumulations of 22-23 cm have been measured in some points on the beach of Porto Cesareo, in Apulia. Inland, snow reached and exceeded 2 meters in height on the Apennines. Two further recent examples of snowfalls affecting large populated areas are the February/March 2012 snowstorm in northern Italy with up to 50 cm of snowfall measured in Bologna (Bisci et al., 2012), and the winter 2018 snowstorm Emma, which affected UK with up to 40cm snowfall in Wales and the disruption of air and rail transportation in London, Manchester and Liverpool areas (Tonks, 2018).

Besides their cost in terms of societal and economical impacts, these extreme events are often invoked by climate change denial groups to mystify the public opinion (Revkin, 2008) and it is therefore important to understand why, in an undeniable context of climate change, we do not observe a sharp decrease of their frequency/intensity. Indeed, although global temperature rise has driven an overall decrease of average snowfall in past decades (Déry and Brown, 2007) and this decreasing trend is expected to continue in future "business-as-usual" emission scenarios (Brutel-Vuilmet et al., 2013), it is not clear whether the same conclusions hold for extreme snowfall events. Atmospheric extreme weather events do not always have a trivial relation with average global warming (Murray and Ebi, 2012). The goal of this paper is to shed a light on recent changes in the dynamics of extreme snowfalls, by projecting the recent changes in frequency/intensity of extreme snowfalls on the large scale (synoptic) dynamical drivers and identifying possible small scale convective thermodynamic feedback.

Heavy snowfalls over large populated areas result from an The focus of this study is to understand changes in daily heavy snowfalls at the scale of European regions and countries. Daily extreme snowfalls result from the interplay of both dynamical and thermodynamic factors, acting at different spatial and time scales: at local scale, (few kms, few hours) scales, geographical features and convection may enhance snowfall precipitations, at . Persistence of convective snowfalls for several hours on the same region can provide large snowfall amounts detectable at daily time-scales. At synoptic scales, snowfalls are driven by extratropical cyclones ($\sim$1000 km, 2-6 days) traveling southwards in jet-stream meanders during formed by the disruption of the normal westerly flow (Tibaldi and Buzzi, 1983; Barnes et al., 2014; Lehmann and Coumou, 2015). The focus of this study is to understand changes in heavy snowfall at the scale of European regions and countries focusing on both thermodynamic and dynamical drivers acting at synoptic scales and daily timescales.

Mid-latitude atmospheric dynamics is driven by oscillations of the jet streamOscillations of the jet stream are associated with low-frequency variability of weather patterns that can modulate daily synoptic fields and snowfall events. (Wallace and Hobbs, 2006). Its strongest winds correspond to maxima of temperature gradients. Cold air is normally confined north stream and it is mixed to subtropical warm air only through the destabilization of the jet, with a disruption of the normal westerly flow by disturbances usually triggered by anticyclone wave breaking (Lehmann and Coumou, 2015). These conditions create a dipole consisting of high pressure structures over some regions and low pressure systems (extratropical cyclones) travelling southward in other regions. If these blocking highs become The most common way to link low frequency variability to weather phenomena is the computation of daily weather regimes (Vautard, 1990; Michelangeli et al., 1995). In Nakamura et al. (1997)and Yiou and Nogaj (2004), first connections between extreme weather events and weather regimes have been established. Madonna et al. (2017) found a clear link between eddy-driven jet variability and weather regimes in the

North Atlantic-European sector. In winter, if blocking high pressure becomes established close to Greenland, cold air from polar latitudes can be advected towards western Europe ~~, causing~~ (North Atlantic Oscillation negative phase (Cattiaux et al., 2010)). When this weather pattern is associated with extratropical cyclones travelling southward from northern latitudes extreme snowfalls over UK, France, Benelux and the Iberian Peninsula ~~(North Atlantic Oscillation negative patterns (Cattiaux et al., 2010))~~are expected. If a high pressure ridge (Atlantic Ridge) extends from the Azores Islands towards the Icelandic region or the British isles, cold air coming from Russia or Scandinavia flows in the Mediterranean Sea~~and leads to~~. This can cause cyclogenesis in the Tyrrhenian (Genoa lows) or in the Adriatic seas triggering extreme snowfalls over Italy, the Balkans, Greece and Turkey (Buehler et al., 2011).~~Since the modifications of the jet-stream dynamics are fundamental drivers of extreme snowfalls, understanding the response of atmospheric circulation to anthropogenic forcing is the first step to track the modifications in extreme snowfalls frequency/intensity and~~

When looking at long-term decadal trends in snowfalls, the analysis of weather patterns can provide important information to assess whether the changes in frequency and intensity are due to long term variability of the atmospheric circulation or induced by antrhopogenic forcing ~~(Strong et al., 2009; Overland and Wang, 2010; Wu and Zhang, 2010; Deser et al., 2017) . It is particularly important to determine whether the mid-latitude flows favour zonal or meridional patterns with changing anthropogenic forcing. It has been so far~~ (Strong et al., 2009; Overland and Wang, 2010; Woollings et al., 2010; Wu and Zhang, 2010; Des . So far, it has been very difficult to prove any significant shift in the dynamical patterns observed at mid-latitudes (Shepherd, 2014). ~~Existing studies are not conclusive enough to determine whether large scale drivers will modify frequency/intensity of extreme snowfalls under anthropogenic forcing.~~ On one side, Cohen et al. (2014) and Kim et al. (2014) showed that the recent increase of temperatures in the Arctic is associated with an amplification of planetary waves, affecting storm tracks and leading to enhanced winter conditions. On the other hand, several authors found a zonalization of the mid-latitude flow (Lorenz and DeWeaver, 2007; Chen et al., 2016; Screen et al., 2014; Faranda et al., 2019) and a minimal or even undetectable effect of the Arctic sea-ice on the meandering of the jet at mid-latitudes (Blackport et al., 2019; Screen, 2017; Screen et al., 2018).

Although heavy snowfalls are driven by the large scale atmospheric circulation, their effects can be greatly enhanced by local geographic constraints and thermodynamic feedbacks (Lüthi et al., 2019; Bartolini, 2019). Local features like the Alps in Europe ~~or~~ the Great Lakes in USA or the topography of Japanese islands may increase precipitation and provide relevant feedback to extreme snowfalls (Niziol et al., 1995). For Japan, Kawase et al. (2016) have shown that thermodynamic feedbacks from anthropogenic forcing may enhance extreme snowfalls in future climates via the interaction of the Japan Sea polar air mass convergence zone with the topography. A similar mechanisms exist also for the Mediterranean sea, as recently detailed in D'Errico et al. (2019). The mid-tropospheric cold winter air advection associated with the synoptic patterns flows over the relatively warmer waters of the Mediterranean sea ~~and~~ picks up water vapor from the ~~lake~~ water surface. This warmer and wetter air rises and cools as it moves away from the sea towards land areas forming convective clouds that transform moisture into snow. In the mountainous topography of the European continent, this phenomenon can be extremely powerful in triggering heavy snowfalls ~~(Beniston et al., 2018; Bartolini, 2019; D'Errico et al., 2019)~~(Beniston et al., 2018; Bartolini, 2019) even in future climate warming scenarios (D'Errico et al., 2019). We will also consider this effect in driving convection via the analysis of convective available potential energy patterns during extreme events.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we describe the data-sets used in this study and the difficulties arising in assessing the quality of snow data. In section 3 we compute the changes in snowfall extremes and discuss their consistency among the data-sets. In section 4 we focus on those countries showing an increase of maximum snowfall and explain these changes in light of the thermodynamics and the dynamics of the atmosphere at ~~synoptic~~ daily scales. Conclusions and limitations of this study are presented in section 5.

2 Data and Methods

Good quality snow data at synoptic or regional scales are difficult to obtain (Rasmussen et al., 2012). From an observational point of view, quality observational data-sets exist only at high mountains sites and in regions where snowfalls are recurrent phenomena. Excellent snow data-sets exist for Scandinavian countries as well as for the Alpine regions (Auer et al., 2005; Scherrer and Appenzeller, 2006; Isotta et al., 2014). Our goal is however to study changes in snowfall at a European level, not limiting our analysis to mountain areas but also to those regions where these phenomena are rare. We have therefore to rely on reanalyses as well as on gridded observational data. In this study we analyse the period 1979-2018 and use a reanalysis product (European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecast (ECMWF) Reanalysis 5th Generation product ERA5) as well as gridded observations data-set (European Climate Assesment Data E-OBSv20.0e). The reference data-set will be ERA5 (C3S), a very recent product by the ECMWF with high resolution (0.25° horizontal resolution) and accurate physical parametrizations. For the observations, we use E-OBSv20.0e (0.25 ° horizontal resolution) which contains gridded temperatures and precipitations observations (Cornes et al., 2018).

Another problem in comparing snow data issued from different sources is the choice of the variable associated with precipitating snow (Nitu and Wong, 2010). Snow precipitations can both be measured as snowfall (SF), or from snow-depth on the ground. Both the measurements have pros and cons. Snowfall is obtained by melting snow falling inside a heated rain gauge and it is expressed in Kg/m^2 or cm. An advantage of using this variable is the accuracy of the measurement. For obvious reasons, SF is mostly used by hydrologists as it has a direct connection with runoff and rivers discharge. Since the snow is immediately transformed into water, SF does not distinguish between snowfalls which produce accumulations on the ground or not. Snow depth is a measure of the snow height on the ground and it can be affected by several problems due to gravitational settling, wind packing, melting and re-crystallization. In this paper we will therefore use daily SF and express it in cm. We now explain how to get this quantity from the different data-sets considered in this study.

– For ERA5, we use the accumulated total snowfall that has fallen to the Earth's surface. This quantity consists of both snow due to the large-scale atmospheric flow and convective precipitations. It measures the total amount of water accumulated from the beginning of the forecast time to the end of the forecast step. The units given measure the depth the water would have if the snow melted and was spread evenly over the grid box. We get the snowfall from hourly data and construct the daily SF by summing up the snowfall in intervals of 24 hours. We chose ERA5 data-set as the preferential one for our study because of its physical consistency and the use of advanced assimilation techniques for its compilation.

– For E-OBSv20.0e [40.375W-50E,25.375N-75.375N] only land points, we do not dispose directly of snowfall data. We have to infer them from daily total precipitation and daily mean temperature data. We apply a simple algorithm which consists of considering as SF all precipitations occurred in days where the average temperature is below 2° C. Of course with this method we can have false positive as well as false negative events, but we have verified (not shown) that results do not depend qualitatively from the threshold providing that it is chosen between 0° C and 2.5° C. Since we use a threshold of 2° C, some of the precipitation would not be snowfall.

We now present the climatology for the two data-sets used in this study and focus on two quantities: yearly total snowfall SF (average 1979-2018) in Figure 1 and the maximum yearly snowfall SF from daily data (average 1979-2018) in Figure 2. We show results at two different levels, taken from the 2016 nomenclature of territorial units for statistics (NUTS) of the European union at regional (NUTS-2) and national (NUST-0) NUTS-0) level Commission (2016). These subdivisions are commonly used by stake-holders to assess impacts of climate variables on economy and society and are the reference adopted by several climate services such as Copernicus for its products (see, e.g. (Brandmueller et al., 2017)). Averaging from the grid-cell size to regional or national scales give us the possibility of both exploring the robustness of our study to coarse-grain and it also allows to remove part of the variability encountered for precipitation data at grid-level scales caused by model or data issues (Li et al., 2011; Tabari et al., 2016; Herold et al., 2017). In Figures 1-2, NUTS-2 results are prepresented represented in panels a,c) and NUTS-0 results in panels b,d). Despite local differences, the The agreement between the ERA5 and the E-OBSv20.0e data-set is remarkable and largely depends on the regions considered. Overall, the climatologies of snowfall provided by the two datasets have similar ranges although ERA5 tends to overestimate EOBSv20.0e. This confirms that converting precipitation to snowfall using a temperature threshold of 2° C is a good option to retrieve snowfall data from EOBSv20.0e. By analysing the climatology we remark that, at southern latitudes and on the plains, mean and max statistics tend to coincide because the number of snow days per year is limited, i.e. all snowfall is concentrated in one or few events. We can also observe from Figure 2 that coarse graining from NUTS-2 to NUTS-0 level heavily reduces the magnitude of yearly maximum SF.

3 Changes in snowfall

We now identify changes in snowfall as differences between average values of both yearly total SF and the maximum yearly SF for two different periods: 1979-1998 and 1999-2018. We subtract the first period from the second, so that positive changes correspond to an increase in snowfall and negative values to a decrease. To check statistical significance of changes, we perform a two sided T-test with confidence level 0.05 (Rushton, 1952). For the yearly total SF of ERA5 (Figure 3a,b) changes are negative for most of Northern, Central and Eastern Europe, whereas near-zero changes are observed in Western Europe. Largest negative changes are found in correspondence of mountain ranges such as the Alps, the Balkans and Scandinavian

Mountains. This decrease in snowfall is significant (green shading) over most of the Northern countries and the British Isles. When coarse grain from NUTS-2 to NUTS-0 level is applied, we can observe that positive changes tend to be averaged out, and significance of negative changes extend to almost all Northern Europe. The picture is similar for the EOBSv20.0e dataset (Figure 3c,d), with mountain regions and Northern countries showing a large decrease of yearly total SF. Positive changes are found in the Balkans at the NUTS-2 scale, but they are partially averaged out when coarse graining data to the NUTS-0 level (panel d). As for ERA5, negative trends are significant for Iceland, the United Kingdom, Finland, Latvia~~and Denmark~~, Denmark, Italy, France and Turkey.

For the maximum yearly SF, differences observed are generally milder and positive and negative changes are spatially scattered at the NUTS-2 level (Figure 4a,c) for both the datasets. There is however a certain agreement in maximum snowfall increase over eastern Europe and decrease over western Europe (excluding Spain) among the two data-sets. The NUTS-0 level (Figure 4b,d) provides a more coherent picture with Western Europe characterised by a decrease in maximum snowfall and Eastern Europe where some countries show increasing maximum SF. Significance of changes is low and scattered spatially without a clear geographical coherence. Large differences between the two datasets are found for Switzerland, Greece and Turkey. In ERA5 trends are positive Switzerland and Turkey (negative for Greece) and yield the opposite sign in EOBSv20.0e dataset. We can justify this difference for Greece and Switzerland using the data at the NUTS-2 level (Figure 4a,c) as they show for regions within those two countries positive and negative differences. At NUTS-0 level (Figure 4b,d) the averaging procedure can therefore provide trends of different signs in EOBSv20.0e and ERA5 datasets, depending on the magnitude of local SF maxima. The positive trend in ERA5 for Switzerland is in contradiction with several other studies based on snow stations (see e.g. Scherrer et al. (2013); Marty and Blanchet (2012)). For Turkey, the differences between datasets are evident already at the NUTS-2 level and cannot be explained with the spatial averaging. A possible justification comes from the low coherence of the two datasets~~over this country~~. This can be checked by computing the symmetric percentage error $\varsigma = (x_{ERA5} - x_{EOBS})/(x_{ERA5} + x_{EOBS})$, where x is the total average snowfall for each region and $\varsigma \in [-1\ 1]$ (Figure 5a,b) and the correlation coefficient R^2 between the daily time series of accumulated snowfall of the two datasets ~~, as shown in~~ (Figure 5~~for NUTS-2 (a)and NUTS-0 (b)~~c,d). ς shows that ERA5 tends to overestimate snowfall with respect to EOBS over Southern Europe and underestimate over Central Europe and the UK. Entire regions of Turkey, Portugal and Southern Italy show a weak correlation $R^2 \sim 0.3$ between the two datasets, pointing to some problems in the data assimilation possibly due to scarce availability of good quality meteorological data over those regions. Indeed correlation coefficient is larger for Northern European countries that dispose of high spatio-temporal data cover. ~~Correlation increases~~ The error ς reduces and the correlation coefficient R^2 increase when considering the NUTS-0 level, since local differences are averaged out.

The ensemble of these analyses suggest that whereas larger confidence can be attributed to a decrease in yearly snowfall over Northern Europe, changes are more uncertain for maximum snowfall. For the maxima, some coherence appears at country scale: negative changes over Western Europe and positive ones in Eastern Europe, ~~notably~~ specifically for some countries in the Balkans. The difference in the changes for average and maxima suggest a non-trivial relation between the occurrence of extreme snowfalls and global mean warming. In order to explain such changes, we will investigate the role of the atmospheric circulation for the countries ~~showing largest~~ in the Baking showing large positive maximum SF changes and with coherent trends between the two data-sets considered.

4 Thermodynamic and dynamical analysis for countries with increasing maximum snowfall

The analysis of Figures 2-3 suggests that changes for maximum snowfall are very scattered and even adjacent regions can show changes of different signs. This makes the single region analysis of trends almost meaningless as robust links between SF and large scale fields are likely to be very weak. We therefore focus on the NUTS-0 positive trends of ERA5. We decide to use ERA5 because snowfalls are produced by the model underlying the reanalysis and naturally associated with coherent circulation patterns. We discard the E-OBSv20.0e data-set as it does not contain other atmospheric variables that could help in tracking the atmospheric thermodynamics or the large-scale atmospheric circulation. ~~Sticking to ERA5, we identify the 4 countries showing the largest positive changes~~ We identify the 3 countries showing coherent positive changes for both datasets, namely Albania (AL), ~~Macedonia~~ Montenegro (ME), ~~Switzerland (CH)and Turkey (TR). The two~~ Bosnia (BA). The countries selected in the Balkans are interesting because they also show positive or zero trends for total yearly SF ~~. Switzerland and Turkey are worth studying because they show opposite trends between yearly total snowfall and extremes.~~ in the ERA5 data-set. In this section we focus on the intensity of positive changes regardless of their significance. As pointed out by Altman and Krzywinski (2017), statistical testing based on pvalues presents several limitations, and can produce misleading results even in designed experiments. Here, we privilege the physical complexity of the phenomenon, as information about pure statistical significance has already been discussed in the previous section. In Figure 6a) we show the box-plots of the yearly snowfall maxima organized in the two different periods (1979-1998 and 1999-2018) for the ~~4~~ 3 regions identified. Boxplots provide more detailed information on the nature of changes: whereas for ~~Turkey, Switzerland and Macedonia~~ Bosnia and Montenegro the bulk of the distribution shift towards larger values in the second period, for Albania increase of maximum snowfall is mostly due to two outliers, which occur at the end of the second period. For ~~Turkey, Albania and Macedonia~~ Albania and Montenegro the variability also increased in 1999-2018, while it ~~decreased for Switzerland~~is stationary for Bosnia.

The analysis presented in Figure 6b) aims at identifying possible seasonal variations of extreme snowfalls. In the polar plot, the radius corresponds to the average magnitude and the angle to the date of the year of SF maxima. For the ~~two countries in the Balkans~~countries considered, there is a tendency to observe heavy snowfall later in the winter season, ~~whereas for Switzerland maxima of snowfall tends to occur in December rather than in January.Change in seasonality of maxima occurrence do not show an evident, common shift.~~although the shift is rather modest.

To understand the nature of the changes, we will analyse the synoptic environment associated with snowfall events from both a thermodynamic and dynamical point of view, analysing indicators of stability of the atmosphere as well as circulation patterns (weather regimes) during the events.

4.1 Thermodynamic changes

The first hypothesis to explain the occurrence of increasing heavy snowfalls despite the current global warming trends is that starker sea surface - troposphere temperature contrasts might enhance moisture uptake in combination with reduced stability, that trigger ascending motions and local convergence during snowfall events. This possibility has been explored in other studies by looking at atmospheric stability and air-sea interaction during cold-air outbreaks, albeit for different regions (Papritz and Spengler, 2015, 2017; Czaja et al., 2019). Furthermore, in an event-based study of cold and snowy spells over Italy, D'Errico et al. (2019) link the recent enhancement in snowfalls on the Adriatic regions to the increase of convective precipitations from the Mediterranean sea, which is warming faster than the oceans at same latitudes because of its closed geometry (Gualdi et al., 2013). To explore this possibility, we look at changes in the stability of the flow during the maximum snowfalls using the Convective Available Potential Energy (CAPE, 2-meters temperatures (t2m, boxplot in Figure 76c) and the 2-meters temperatures (t2m, Convective Available Potential Energy (CAPE, boxplot in Figure 86d). The choice of CAPE as indicator of stability during snowfall is motivated by previous works (e.g. Schultz (1999); Olsson et al. (2017)) where snowfall extremes were co-associated with the occurrence of high CAPE values. The boxplots in Figure 6c-d) show the spatial regional average of t2m and CAPE during the days of the maximum snowfalls. The analysis for temperature (Figure 6c) suggests that maximum snowfalls tend to be associated with temperatures above the freezing point in the recent period and a reduced variability with respect to the first period. The analysis for CAPE (Figure 6d) is not very informative for two reasons: i) the distribution is highly non-Gaussian, it includes zeros and presents several outliers, ii) convective precipitations can originate in nearby regions and being transported.

In order to explore this possibility, from bloxpots in Figure 6 we move to the fields analysis in Figure 7 for CAPE and Figure 8 for t2m. From Figure 7 we remark that heavy snowfalls for the 4 3 countries under examination are generally associated with large values of CAPE on the Meditteranean areas (and on the Alps for Switerland)Adriatic sea. For both periods, the absolute values of CAPE reached during these events (Figure7a,b,d,e,g,h,j,k) are consistent with the range found by Olsson et al. (2017) for the enhancement of snowfall by sea-air interactions. When looking at differences (ΔCAPE) between the warmer (1999-2018) and colder (1979-1998) period (Figure 7c,f,i,l), we remark that for Albania and Macedonia there is an increase of CAPE , whereas the signal is absent for Switzerland and Turkey, (shaded regions indicate that at least 2/3 of the anomalies yield the same sign) suggesting that convective instability alone cannot be used to explain the changes, although it can be an important factor in Adriatic regions , consistently to what found in D'Errico et al. (2019)to trigger heavy precipitations on the Balkans. Furthermore, snowfall extremes tend to occur at or near the freezing point in both colder and warmer climates (O'Gorman, 2014). Figure 8 indicates that this is the case for both the periods considered and that the local temperature difference (Δt2m) between the 1979-1998 and 1999-2018 periods is small. The local temperature is important as it determines the maximum atmospheric moisture content and thus the thermodynamic component of the snowfall amount. While the warming of the Mediterranean Sea during these events (Figure 8c,f,i,l) favors evaporation, the fact that the temperature at the location of the snowfall does not vary, could cause a part of the excess moisture to precipitate out during the transport to this location, possibly reducing the thermodynamic enhancement of the snowfall.

4.2 Dynamical Analysis

Since thermodynamic effects alone cannot fully explain the positive changes in maximum snowfall, we also investigate the role of the atmospheric circulation as a driver of those changes. For other regions of the world, this kind of analysis has provided evidences of a prominent role of atmospheric circulation on the variability of extreme snowfall events (see e.g. Kawase et al. (2016) for Japan, Lute et al. (2015) for Andorra or Guan et al. (2010) for USA). For the countries examined in the present study, the motivation for such analysis comes from the evidence that recent decades show a winter more negative North Atlantic Oscillation patterns than the previous onesreduction in the abundance of zonal patterns (Guan et al., 2010).

We first present the sea-level pressure (msl) fields averaged during maxima of snowfall for both the periods in Figure9a,b,d,e,g,h,j,k) and their differences Δmsl in Figure79c,f,i,l). For Albania and Macedonia, average fields show the three countries considered, cyclonic patterns over the Adriatic sea Thyrrenian and the Adriatic sea can be identified for both the periods considered. Following pressure isobars, the flow is advected from sea-to land. In 1999-2018, cyclonic conditions further strengthened in the Balkans with negative Δmsl anomalies over Eastern Europe, suggesting that, in the recent period, moisture advection from the Adriatic Mediterranean sea to the Balkans has favored snow accumulations on both countries . For Switzerland, cyclonic conditions are present both North and South the Alps. A remarkable feature is the deepening of the so-called Genoa Low in the recent period. The Genoa-low has been previosly identified as a prominent driver of heavy snowfalls on the Alpsthe countries examined. These cyclonic patterns can originate from two different conditions: local cyclogenesis on the Adriatic sea driven by cold air intrusions from Siberia (Bisci et al., 2012) or cyclogenesis on the Thyrrenian sea (Genoa Lows) driven by polar air flowing through the Rhone Valley (Spreitzhofer, 2000). The Δmsl analysis (Figure 9c,f,i) shows the reinforcement of a Western Eastern Mediterranean cyclonic pattern in the second period. The isobars point to northerly southerly winds which favor uptake moisture from the Mediterranean Sea. Thus, the increase of CAPE over the Central Mediterranean Adriatic shown in Figure 7c,f,i), together with the reinforcement of the Genoa Lowpressure lows over Italy, could determine the increase in extreme snowfalls in Switzerland. Finally, Turkey analysis shows a deepening of the so-called Cyprus-low, a cyclonic structure that has been identified as responsible for snowfall in Greece (Houssos et al., 2007). As for the other countriesexamined, Cyprus-lows can advect moisture from the Mediterranean and the Black sea to the continental areas of the country, thus reinforcing precipitations. these countries.

Following the approaches of Nakamura et al. (1997) and Kawase et al. (2016)Vautard (1990) and Michelangeli et al. (1995) , we now analyse the shifts in daily weather regimes associated with extreme snowfalls. Weather regime search is performed by using the dynamical systems indicators introduced in Faranda et al. (2017) and using the sea-level pressure fields for the same domain specified in that study, namely latitudes 22.5N-70N, and longitudes 80W-50E. The technique presented in Faranda et al. (2017) allows to determine five possible regimes: North Atlantic Oscillation positive (NAO+) and negative (NAO-) phases, Blocking (BLO), Atlantic Ridge (AR) and non-attributable pattern patterns (N/A). These patterns have been previously identified in many studies over this domain (see e.g. Vautard (1990)). The patterns obtained for ERA5 do not differ significantly from those shown in Figure 2 in Faranda et al. (2017). Results are shown in Figure 10 for the countries examined and show a prevalence of BLO and AR patterns during extreme snowfall events. These patterns (see e.g. D'Errico et al. (2019) and references therein) favor meridional movements of air masses and therefore the intrusion of polar air to Mediterranean latitudes. It is remarkable that, for all the ~~four~~ three countries considered, the second period is characterised by an increase of Atlantic Ridge ~~patterns. This~~ and Blocking patterns. These pattern consists of high pressure over Western or Northern Europe, favoring ~~very~~ dry conditions over Western Mediterranean areas, and low pressure over Eastern Europe, triggering cyclogenesis on the ~~Estern~~ Mediterranean and favoring the intrusion of cold air from Siberia~~in the Mediterranean basin~~ (Raymond et al., 2018).

The previous analysis shows that the weather regimes shift is an important factor determining changes in extreme snowfall. However, the statistics presented in Figure 10 is limited ~~to the~~ by data availability. We therefore extend this analysis by performing an analogs search for the 5% closest sea-level pressure fields (according to the Euclidean distance) to those presented in Figure9a,b,d,e,g,h,j,k) (Yiou et al., 2013). Note that the results do not depend on the threshold used for the selection of analogs in the range 0.25% to 5%. For each of those fields, the analogs search is performed in all the dataset (1979-2018). We then plot in Figure 11 the number of analogs per year. A linear fit is applied to data. Besides ~~Switzerland~~ Bosnia (Figure 11c), for which the ~~decreasing~~ increasing trend in the number of Analogs is significant (5% level), for the other countries considered, trends are not significant. Furthermore no clear differences appear when searching analogs for 1979-1998 or 1999-2018 fields associated with extreme snowfalls. This means that the changes in circulation patterns associated with extremes are specific to those events, and seem not follow some general trends of the atmospheric circulation, thus suggesting a competition between thermodynamic and dynamical factors in their occurrence. The rationale for explaining the changes is the following: AR and BLO patterns occur with the same frequency in winter but their are associated with deeper cyclogenesis in the Adriatic or Thyrrenian sea in the recent period. These cyclones find warmer surfaces and large availability of humidity and CAPE, thus producing large snowfall amounts, enhanced by stau effect on the Balkans topography. This mechanism is similar to the one described for Japan in Kawase et al. (2016) and for Italy in D'Errico et al. (2019).

5 Conclusions

We have analysed recent changes in yearly total and maximum snowfall from ERA5 reanalysis and the E-OBSv20.0e datasets. We have identified a robust signal in the general decrease in the yearly total snowfall, in particular for Northern and Western Europe. For snowfall maxima, changes are more contrasted: negative changes persist over Western Europe, but in the proximity of the Mediterranean Sea we have identified a certain number of countries showing positive changes. We have focused our efforts in understanding the positive trends for maximum snowfalls in ~~the Balkans, Turkey and Switzerland using the ERA5 dataset~~some countries the Balkans which showed consistent positive trends for both the datasets considered. The thermodynamic analysis of atmospheric stability and 2-meters temperatures suggest that during recent heavy snowfall events the instability increases and convection is favored, an effect that could be linked to climate change (Ye et al., 1998). This can however be contrasted by the fact that excess moisture could precipitate out during the transport to the snowfall location due to temperatures close to freezing points. The thermodynamic analysis has been completed by an analysis of the atmospheric circulation patterns associated with extreme snowfall over these countries. Results show an enhancement of local cyclonic patterns and a tendency to observe ~~more~~ Atlantic Ridge patterns associated with extreme snowfalls in recent times. Even though this could suggest a relation between our finding and the arctic amplification caused by climate change (Vavrus et al., 2017), we stress that the length of the data-sets used is too short to attribute these changes to climate change and that they could be produced by the inter-decadal variability of the atmospheric circulation. Furthermore, the analogs analysis carried out in Section 4 did not show any particular trends in analogs for all the countries considered but ~~Switzerland~~Bosnia. Recent studies on whether these patterns are due to low-frequency variability of the Atlantic circulation or to climate change are debated (see, e.g., the discussion in Screen (2017)).

To summarize our findings, there is an interplay of circulation and thermodynamic factors to explain the observed trends in maximum snowfalls on the Balkans: the analysis of CAPE shows that large values of this quantity are associated with heavy snowfalls in the selected countries. CAPE values of 70 JKg^{-1} are enough to trigger convection during winter time and enhance snowfall precipitations (Olsson et al., 2017). Furthermore, for all countries analysed, the isobars associated with the cyclonic conditions embedded in Atlantic ridge patterns indicate winds blowing from sea to land, thus favoring the advection of moisture and the formation of convective precipitation. In addition, the ~~four~~ three countries analysed are characterised by mountain ranges that, in presence of sea-to-land flow, favors the Stau effect on ~~precipitationé Bica et al. (2007)~~ precipitations (Bica et al., 2007). Both thermodynamics and dynamics effect seem therefore to contribute to observed trends, although it is difficult to understand which factor prevails. Only the thermodynamic components of increasing instability can be linked to climate change ~~Ye et al. (1998), whereas the same evidence does not exist for the increase in Atlantic Ridge patterns~~(Ye et al., 1998). Although winter total precipitations in future climate scenarios is expected to increase over Europe (Santos et al., 2016), global and regional warming is projected to reduce average and extreme snowfall precipitations at least in Central and Western Europe (de Vries et al., 2014). In the same study, de Vries et al. (2014) find that positive trends in snowfalls could still be observed for high mountain areas (Alps and Scandinavia) in warmer climates. This seems coherent with the results found for Japan by Kawase et al. (2016) and in the present study for the Balkans.

This study comes with some caveats. First of all, the changes (especially those on the maxima) depend on the dataset chosen. Here we have focused on consistent trends between EOBSv20.0e and ERA5 and then used ERA5 for the analyses because of the consistent representation of snowfalls with the atmospheric circulation. The lack of longer and highly resolved data-sets for snowfall is a strong limitation and it adds up to the intrinsic difficulty of simulating snowfalls due to their highly non-linear behavior and the fact they involve phase transitions. In addition, we have not considered the effects on the trends of lower frequency variability mechanisms. There are sub-seasonal to seasonal conditions that can trigger snowy waves over Europe by modifying winter atmospheric circulation patterns: the role of stratospheric warming, the magnitude of snow cover on Siberia and in the Arctic region could be taken into account in future research on this topic, e.g. by following the approaches of Handorf et al. (2015, 2017) and Mori et al. (2019). At smaller scales, where convection is important, further studies could be based on searching the origin, transport pathways, and thermodynamic evolution of air masses involved in heavy snowfall episodes, via novel methodologies based on tracking trajectories of air masses as those introduced in Papritz and Spengler (2017), and by using convection permitting models to study sea-air-snow interactions (Bartolini, 2019).

6 Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank F Pons, S Fromang, P Yiou, M Vrac for the discussions and S Thao for the help with the ERA5 dataset. The author acknowledge the support of the INSU-CNRS-LEFE-MANU grant (project DINCLIC), as well as EUPHEME and DAMA. The author acknowledges two anonymous reviewers as well as the editorial board of WCD for useful comments on the manuscript.

Competing interests. The author declares no competing interest.

References

Altman, N. and Krzywinski, M.: Points of significance: interpreting P values, 2017.

Auer, I., Böhm, R., Jurković, A., Orlik, A., Potzmann, R., Schöner, W., Ungersböck, M., Brunetti, M., Nanni, T., Maugeri, M., et al.: A new instrumental precipitation dataset for the greater alpine region for the period 1800–2002, International Journal of Climatology: A Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 25, 139–166, 2005.

Barnes, E. A., Dunn-Sigouin, E., Masato, G., and Woollings, T.: Exploring recent trends in Northern Hemisphere blocking, Geophysical Research Letters, 41, 638–644, 2014.

Bartolini, W. M.: Convection-Permitting Ensemble Forecasts of the 10–12 December 2013 Lake-Effect Snow Event: Sensitivity to Microphysical, Planetary Boundary Layer, and Surface Layer Parameterizations, Ph.D. thesis, State University of New York at Albany, 2019.

Beniston, M., Farinotti, D., Stoffel, M., Andreassen, L. M., Coppola, E., Eckert, N., Fantini, A., Giacona, F., Hauck, C., Huss, M., et al.: The European mountain cryosphere: a review of its current state, trends, and future challenges, Cryosphere, 12, 759–794, 2018.

Bica, B., Knabl, T., Steinacker, R., Ratheiser, M., Dorninger, M., Lotteraner, C., Schneider, S., Chimani, B., Gepp, W., and Tschannett, S.: Thermally and dynamically induced pressure features over complex terrain from high-resolution analyses, Journal of applied meteorology and climatology, 46, 50–65, 2007.

Bisci, C., Fazzini, M., Beltrando, G., Cardillo, A., and Romeo, V.: The February 2012 exceptional snowfall along the Adriatic side of Central Italy, Meteorologische Zeitschrift, 21, 503–508, 2012.

Blackport, R., Screen, J. A., van der Wiel, K., and Bintanja, R.: Minimal influence of reduced Arctic sea ice on coincident cold winters in mid-latitudes, Nature Climate Change, 9, 697–704, 2019.

Brandmueller, T., Schäfer, G., Ekkehard, P., Müller, O., and Angelova-Tosheva, V.: Territorial indicators for policy purposes: NUTS regions and beyond, Regional Statistics, 7, 78–89, 2017.

Brutel-Vuilmet, C., Menegoz, M., and Krinner, G.: An analysis of present and future seasonal northern hemisphere land snow cover simulated by CMIP5 coupled climate models., Cryosphere, 7, 2013.

Buehler, T., Raible, C. C., and Stocker, T. F.: The relationship of winter season North Atlantic blocking frequencies to extreme cold or dry spells in the ERA-40, Tellus A: Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography, 63, 174–187, 2011.

(C3S), C. C. C. S.: ERA5: Fifth generation of ECMWF atmospheric reanalyses of the global climate, 2017.

Cattiaux, J., Vautard, R., Cassou, C., Yiou, P., Masson-Delmotte, V., and Codron, F.: Winter 2010 in Europe: A cold extreme in a warming climate, Geophysical Research Letters, 37, 2010.

Chen, H. W., Zhang, F., and Alley, R. B.: The robustness of midlatitude weather pattern changes due to Arctic sea ice loss, Journal of Climate, 29, 7831–7849, 2016.

Cohen, J., Screen, J. A., Furtado, J. C., Barlow, M., Whittleston, D., Coumou, D., Francis, J., Dethloff, K., Entekhabi, D., Overland, J., et al.: Recent Arctic amplification and extreme mid-latitude weather, Nature geoscience, 7, 627–637, 2014.

Commission, E.: Commission Regulation (EU) 2016/2066 of 21 November 2016 Amending the Annexes to Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Establishment of a Common Classification of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS), 2016.

Cornes, R. C., van der Schrier, G., van den Besselaar, E. J., and Jones, P. D.: An Ensemble Version of the E-OBS Temperature and Precipitation Data Sets, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 123, 9391–9409, 2018.

Czaja, A., Frankignoul, C., Minobe, S., and Vannière, B.: Simulating the Midlatitude Atmospheric Circulation: What Might We Gain From High-Resolution Modeling of Air-Sea Interactions?, Current Climate Change reports, 5, 390–406, 2019.

de Vries, H., Lenderink, G., and van Meijgaard, E.: Future snowfall in western and central Europe projected with a high-resolution regional climate model ensemble, Geophysical Research Letters, 41, 4294–4299, 2014.

D'Errico, M., Yiou, P., Nardini, C., Lunkeit, F., and Faranda, D.: Warmer Mediterranean temperatures do not decrease snowy cold spell intensity over Italy, Scientific Reports (under review), 2019.

Déry, S. J. and Brown, R. D.: Recent Northern Hemisphere snow cover extent trends and implications for the snow-albedo feedback, Geophysical Research Letters, 34, 2007.

Deser, C., Hurrell, J. W., and Phillips, A. S.: The role of the North Atlantic Oscillation in European climate projections, Climate dynamics, 49, 3141–3157, 2017.

Faranda, D., Messori, G., and Yiou, P.: Dynamical proxies of North Atlantic predictability and extremes, Scientific reports, 7, 41 278, 2017.

Faranda, D., Alvarez-Castro, M. C., Messori, G., Rodrigues, D., and Yiou, P.: The hammam effect or how a warm ocean enhances large scale atmospheric predictability, Nature communications, 10, 1316, 2019.

Frigo, B., Chiaia, B., Chiambretti, I., Bartelt, P., Maggioni, M., and Freppaz, M.: The January 18th 2017 Rigopiano disaster in Italy–analysis of the avalanche dynamics, in: Proc. Intl. Snow Science Workshop, Innsbruck, Austria, pp. 6–10, 2018.

Gualdi, S., Somot, S., Li, L., Artale, V., Adani, M., Bellucci, A., Braun, A., Calmanti, S., Carillo, A., Dell'Aquila, A., et al.: The CIRCE simulations: regional climate change projections with realistic representation of the Mediterranean Sea, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 94, 65–81, 2013.

Guan, B., Molotch, N. P., Waliser, D. E., Fetzer, E. J., and Neiman, P. J.: Extreme snowfall events linked to atmospheric rivers and surface air temperature via satellite measurements, Geophysical Research Letters, 37, 2010.

Handorf, D., Jaiser, R., Dethloff, K., Rinke, A., and Cohen, J.: Impacts of Arctic sea ice and continental snow cover changes on atmospheric winter teleconnections, Geophysical Research Letters, 42, 2367–2377, 2015.

Handorf, D., Dethloff, K., Erxleben, S., Jaiser, R., and Kurgansky, M. V.: Arctic-mid-latitude linkages in a nonlinear quasi-geostrophic atmospheric model, Advances in Meteorology, 2017, 2017.

Herold, N., Behrangi, A., and Alexander, L. V.: Large uncertainties in observed daily precipitation extremes over land, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 122, 668–681, 2017.

Houssos, E., Lolis, C., and Bartzokas, A.: The atmospheric conditions over Europe and the Mediterranean, favoring snow events in Athens, Greece, 2007.

Isotta, F. A., Frei, C., Weilguni, V., Perčec Tadić, M., Lassegues, P., Rudolf, B., Pavan, V., Cacciamani, C., Antolini, G., Ratto, S. M., et al.: The climate of daily precipitation in the Alps: development and analysis of a high-resolution grid dataset from pan-Alpine rain-gauge data, International Journal of Climatology, 34, 1657–1675, 2014.

Kawase, H., Murata, A., Mizuta, R., Sasaki, H., Nosaka, M., Ishii, M., and Takayabu, I.: Enhancement of heavy daily snowfall in central Japan due to global warming as projected by large ensemble of regional climate simulations, Climatic Change, 139, 265–278, 2016.

Kim, B.-M., Son, S.-W., Min, S.-K., Jeong, J.-H., Kim, S.-J., Zhang, X., Shim, T., and Yoon, J.-H.: Weakening of the stratospheric polar vortex by Arctic sea-ice loss, Nature communications, 5, 4646, 2014.

Lehmann, J. and Coumou, D.: The influence of mid-latitude storm tracks on hot, cold, dry and wet extremes, Scientific reports, 5, 17 491, 2015.

Li, F., Collins, W. D., Wehner, M. F., Williamson, D. L., Olson, J. G., and Algieri, C.: Impact of horizontal resolution on simulation of precipitation extremes in an aqua-planet version of Community Atmospheric Model (CAM3), Tellus A: Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography, 63, 884–892, 2011.

Lorenz, D. J. and DeWeaver, E. T.: Tropopause height and zonal wind response to global warming in the IPCC scenario integrations, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 112, 2007.

Lute, A., Abatzoglou, J., and Hegewisch, K.: Projected changes in snowfall extremes and interannual variability of snowfall in the western U nited S tates, Water Resources Research, 51, 960–972, 2015.

Lüthi, S., Ban, N., Kotlarski, S., Steger, C. R., Jonas, T., and Schär, C.: Projections of Alpine Snow-Cover in a High-Resolution Climate Simulation, Atmosphere, 10, 463, 2019.

Madonna, E., Li, C., Grams, C. M., and Woollings, T.: The link between eddy-driven jet variability and weather regimes in the North Atlantic-European sector, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 143, 2960–2972, 2017.

Marty, C. and Blanchet, J.: Long-term changes in annual maximum snow depth and snowfall in Switzerland based on extreme value statistics, Climatic Change, 111, 705–721, 2012.

Michelangeli, P.-A., Vautard, R., and Legras, B.: Weather regimes: Recurrence and quasi stationarity, Journal of the atmospheric sciences, 52, 1237–1256, 1995.

Mori, M., Kosaka, Y., Watanabe, M., Nakamura, H., and Kimoto, M.: A reconciled estimate of the influence of Arctic sea-ice loss on recent Eurasian cooling, Nature Climate Change, 9, 123–129, 2019.

Murray, V. and Ebi, K. L.: IPCC special report on managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation (SREX), 2012.

Nakamura, H., Nakamura, M., and Anderson, J. L.: The role of high-and low-frequency dynamics in blocking formation, Monthly Weather Review, 125, 2074–2093, 1997.

Nitu, R. and Wong, K.: CIMO survey on national summaries of methods and instruments for solid precipitation measurement at automatic weather stations, WMO, 2010.

Niziol, T. A., Snyder, W. R., and Waldstreicher, J. S.: Winter weather forecasting throughout the eastern United States. Part IV: Lake effect snow, Weather and Forecasting, 10, 61–77, 1995.

Olsson, T., Perttula, T., Jylhä, K., and Luomaranta, A.: Intense sea-effect snowfall case on the western coast of Finland, Advances in Science and Research, 14, 231, 2017.

Overland, J. E. and Wang, M.: Large-scale atmospheric circulation changes are associated with the recent loss of Arctic sea ice, Tellus A, 62, 1–9, 2010.

O'Gorman, P. A.: Contrasting responses of mean and extreme snowfall to climate change, Nature, 512, 416–418, 2014.

Papritz, L. and Spengler, T.: Analysis of the slope of isentropic surfaces and its tendencies over the North Atlantic, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 141, 3226–3238, 2015.

Papritz, L. and Spengler, T.: A Lagrangian climatology of wintertime cold air outbreaks in the Irminger and Nordic Seas and their role in shaping air–sea heat fluxes, Journal of Climate, 30, 2717–2737, 2017.

Rasmussen, R., Baker, B., Kochendorfer, J., Meyers, T., Landolt, S., Fischer, A. P., Black, J., Thériault, J. M., Kucera, P., Gochis, D., et al.: How well are we measuring snow: The NOAA/FAA/NCAR winter precipitation test bed, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 93, 811–829, 2012.

Raymond, F., Ullmann, A., Camberlin, P., Oueslati, B., and Drobinski, P.: Atmospheric conditions and weather regimes associated with extreme winter dry spells over the Mediterranean basin, Climate Dynamics, 50, 4437–4453, 2018.

Revkin, A.: Skeptics on human climate impact seize on cold spell, The New York Times, 2, 2008.

Rushton, S.: On a two-sided sequential t-test, Biometrika, 39, 302–308, 1952.

Santos, J. A., Belo-Pereira, M., Fraga, H., and Pinto, J. G.: Understanding climate change projections for precipitation over western Europe with a weather typing approach, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 121, 1170–1189, 2016.

Scherrer, S. C. and Appenzeller, C.: Swiss Alpine snow pack variability: major patterns and links to local climate and large-scale flow, Climate Research, 32, 187–199, 2006.

Scherrer, S. C., Wüthrich, C., Croci-Maspoli, M., Weingartner, R., and Appenzeller, C.: Snow variability in the Swiss Alps 1864–2009, International journal of climatology, 33, 3162–3173, 2013.

Schultz, D. M.: Lake-effect snowstorms in northern Utah and western New York with and without lightning, Weather and forecasting, 14, 1023–1031, 1999.

Screen, J. A.: The missing Northern European winter cooling response to Arctic sea ice loss, Nature communications, 8, 14 603, 2017.

Screen, J. A., Deser, C., Simmonds, I., and Tomas, R.: Atmospheric impacts of Arctic sea-ice loss, 1979–2009: Separating forced change from atmospheric internal variability, Climate dynamics, 43, 333–344, 2014.

Screen, J. A., Deser, C., Smith, D. M., Zhang, X., Blackport, R., Kushner, P. J., Oudar, T., McCusker, K. E., and Sun, L.: Consistency and discrepancy in the atmospheric response to Arctic sea-ice loss across climate models, Nature Geoscience, 11, 155–163, 2018.

Shepherd, T. G.: Atmospheric circulation as a source of uncertainty in climate change projections, Nature Geoscience, 7, 703–708, 2014.

Spreitzhofer, G.: On the characteristics of heavy multiple-day snowfalls in the Eastern Alps, Natural hazards, 21, 35–53, 2000.

Strong, C., Magnusdottir, G., and Stern, H.: Observed feedback between winter sea ice and the North Atlantic Oscillation, Journal of Climate, 22, 6021–6032, 2009.

Tabari, H., De Troch, R., Giot, O., Hamdi, R., Termonia, P., Saeed, S., Brisson, E., Van Lipzig, N., and Willems, P.: Local impact analysis of climate change on precipitation extremes: are high-resolution climate models needed for realistic simulations?, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 20, 3843–3857, 2016.

Tibaldi, S. and Buzzi, A.: Effects of orography on Mediterranean lee cyclogenesis and its relationship to European blocking, Tellus A: Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography, 35, 269–286, 1983.

Tonks, A.: Storm Emma in pictures: Worst snow storm to hit the UK in 50 years, The Express, 2018.

Vautard, R.: Multiple weather regimes over the North Atlantic: Analysis of precursors and successors, Monthly weather review, 118, 2056–2081, 1990.

Vavrus, S. J., Wang, F., Martin, J. E., Francis, J. A., Peings, Y., and Cattiaux, J.: Changes in North American atmospheric circulation and extreme weather: Influence of Arctic amplification and Northern Hemisphere snow cover, Journal of Climate, 30, 4317–4333, 2017.

Wallace, J. M. and Hobbs, P. V.: Atmospheric science: an introductory survey, vol. 92, Elsevier, 2006.

Woollings, T., Hannachi, A., Hoskins, B., and Turner, A.: A regime view of the North Atlantic Oscillation and its response to anthropogenic forcing, Journal of Climate, 23, 1291–1307, 2010.

Wu, Q. and Zhang, X.: Observed forcing-feedback processes between Northern Hemisphere atmospheric circulation and Arctic sea ice coverage, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 115, 2010.

Ye, B., Del Genio, A. D., and Lo, K. K.: CAPE variations in the current climate and in a climate change, Journal of Climate, 11, 1997–2015, 1998.

Yiou, P. and Nogaj, M.: Extreme climatic events and weather regimes over the North Atlantic: When and where?, Geophysical Research Letters, 31, 2004.

Yiou, P., Salameh, T., Drobinski, P., Menut, L., Vautard, R., and Vrac, M.: Ensemble reconstruction of the atmospheric column from surface pressure using analogues, Climate dynamics, 41, 1333–1344, 2013.



Figure 1. Yearly total snowfall SF (average 1979-2018) for the ERA5 (a,b) and the E-OBSv20.0e (c,d) data-sets. a,c) NUTS-0 level, b,d) NUTS-2 level.



Figure 2. Maximum yearly snowfall SF (average 1979-2018) for the ERA5 (a,b) and the E-OBSv20.0e (c,d) data-sets. a,c) NUTS-0 level, b,d) NUTS-2 level.



Figure 3. Differences in yearly total snowfall (SF) for two periods (average 1979-1998 subtracted from average 1999-2018) for the ERA5 (a,b), E-OBSv20.0e (c,d) data-sets. a,c) NUTS-0 level, b,d) NUTS-2 level. Significant differences are shown in shaded ~~green~~ grey (two-sided T-test, 5% confidence level) .



Figure 4. Differences in maximum yearly snowfall (SF) for two periods (average 1979-1998 subtracted from average 1999-2018) for the ERA5 (a,b), E-OBSv20.0e (c,d) data-sets. a,c) NUTS-0 level, b,d) NUTS-2 level. Significant differences are shown in shaded ~~green~~ grey (two-sided T-test, 5% confidence level) .



Figure 5. a,b) Symmetric percentage error ς on average snowfall c,d) Correlation coefficient R^2 for the SF daily snowfall time-series for ERA5 and E-OBSv20.0e. a,c) NUTS-2 level, b,d) NUTS-0 level



Figure 6. a) Boxplots of the maxima yearly snowfall (SF) for two periods 1979-1998 (red) and 1999-2018 (blue). ~~On each box, the central mark indicates the median, and the bottom and top edges of the box indicate the 25th and 75th percentiles, respectively. The whiskers extend to the most extreme data points and the outliers are plotted individually using the '+' symbol.~~ b) Seasonal analysis for maximum yearly snowfall SF. The polar plots show average maxima yearly snowfall for the two periods (different colors). Each symbol corresponds to a different country. The angle corresponds to a date of the year in counterclockwise sense. Albania (AL); ~~Macedonia~~ Montenegro (ME), ~~Switzerland~~ Bosnia (~~CH~~BA)~~; Turkey~~. Boxplot of 2-meters temperatures t2m (~~TR~~c) and CAPE (d) observed during extreme snowfall events. For boxplots, on each box, the central mark indicates the median, and the bottom and top edges of the box indicate the 25th and 75th percentiles, respectively. The whiskers extend to the most extreme data points and the outliers are plotted individually using the '+' symbol.



Figure 7. Average of convective available potential energy (CAPE) fields (J Kg^{-1}) during days of yearly maximum snowfall for the periods 1979-1998 (a,d,g~~,j~~) and 1999-2018 (b,e,h~~,k~~). Panels c,f,i~~,l~~) show the differences between the second and the first periods ΔCAPE. a,b,c) Albania (AL); d,e,f) ~~Macedonia~~ Montenegro (ME), g,h,~~j~~i) ~~Switzerland~~ Bosnia (~~CH~~BA)~~; j,k,l) Turkey (TR)~~. Green circles show the location of the most northwestern point of each country. Shaded areas represent grid points where at least 2/3 of the anomalies have the same sign.



Figure 8. Average of 2-meters temperature fields (°C) during days of yearly maximum snowfall for the periods 1979-1998 (a,d,g~~,j~~) and 1999-2018 (b,e,h~~,k~~). Panels c,f,i~~,l~~) show the differences between the second and the first periods Δt2m. a,b,c) Albania (AL); d,e,f) ~~Macedonia~~ Montenegro (ME), g,h,~~j~~i) ~~Switzerland~~ Bosnia (~~CH~~BA)~~; j,k,l) Turkey (TR)~~. Green circles show the location of the most northwestern point of each country. Shaded areas represent grid points where at least 2/3 of the anomalies have the same sign.



Figure 9. Average of sea-level pressure (msl) fields (hPa) during days of yearly maximum snowfall for the periods 1979-1998 (a,d,g~~,j~~) and 1999-2018 (b,e,h~~,k~~). Panels c,f,i~~,l~~) show the differences between the second and the first periods Δmsl. a,b,c) Albania (AL); d,e,f) ~~Macedonia~~ Montenegro (ME), g,h,~~j~~i) ~~Switzerland~~ Bosnia (~~CH~~BA)~~; j,k,l) Turkey (TR)~~. Green circles show the location of the most northwestern point of each country. Shaded areas represent grid points where at least 2/3 of the anomalies have the same sign.



Figure 10. Histograms of weather regimes during the days of maximum snowfalls. N/A: non attributable, NAO+: North Atlantic Oscillation positive phase, BLO: blocking, AR: Atlantic Ridge, NAO-: North Atlantic Oscillation negative phase, a) Albania (AL); b) Macedonia Montenegro (ME), c) Switzerland Bosnia (CHBA); d) Turkey (TR). Red bars correspond to 1979-1998 and blue ones to 1999-2018.



Figure 11. Number of analogs per year of the average sea-level pressure fields during days of yearly maximum snowfall for the periods 1979-1998 and 1999-2018. a) Albania (AL); b) ~~Macedonia~~ Montenegro (ME), c) ~~Switzerland~~ Bosnia (~~CH); d) Turkey (TR~~BA). Red corresponds to 1979-1998 and blue to 1999-2018.