

RHITA: a web tool for real-time detection of extreme weather events

Greta Cazzaniga¹, Anastasia Akakpo-Numado¹, Patrick Brockmann¹, Adrien Burq¹, Mathieu Vrac¹, and Davide Faranda^{1,2,3}

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

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

³Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique/IPSL, École Normale Supérieure, PSL Research University, Sorbonne Université, École Polytechnique, IP Paris, CNRS, Paris, 75005, France

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

Abstract. Extreme weather hazards are increasing and stakeholders need rapid, transparent information during unfolding events. We present RHITA (Real-time Hazard Identification and Tracking Algorithm), an open-source framework and web tool for near real-time detection and tracking of weather-related hazards over Europe. RHITA identifies grid cells exceeding local quantile thresholds, groups them into spatial clusters, and links clusters through time to reconstruct three-dimensional events in longitude, latitude, and time. For each event, RHITA provides intensity, extent and duration metrics and estimates rarity through return periods derived from a long historical record. RHITA is operated with ECMWF open forecasts for daily monitoring and ERA5 reanalysis for a consistent historical archive from 1950 to 2024. We target four hazards: heatwaves, cold spells, heavy precipitation and strong winds. Key spatial and temporal parameters are optimized against EM-DAT disaster records (2000 to 2023). Applying RHITA to ERA5 yields a European climatology of hazard events and reveals robust increases in heatwave frequency, intensity and affected area, a decline in cold spell frequency, and more heterogeneous signals for heavy precipitation and strong winds at the continental scale. RHITA provides open access data and an interactive interface to support rapid hazard characterization, event contextualization and downstream risk analysis.

1 Introduction

Extreme weather events, including heatwaves, droughts, thunderstorms, and cyclones, pose significant threats to human lives and ecosystems (Forzieri et al., 2017; Guo et al., 2017; Ciscar et al., 2018; IPCC, 2021; Monteleone et al., 2023). Data from the Emergency Events Database (EM-DAT, Delforge et al. (2025)) indicate that in 2024, 393 natural hazard-related disasters were recorded. These events led to 16,753 fatalities and affected 167.2 million people, with an estimated \$241.95 billion in economic losses (Delforge et al., 2025).

Disasters typically result from the interaction of three key factors: hazard (e.g., extreme rainfall), exposure (e.g., populations in flood-prone areas or critical infrastructure such as power substations near rivers), and vulnerability (e.g., weak buildings collapsing during inundations) (UNDRR, 2017; Cardona et al., 2012). Climate change is increasing the likelihood and intensity of hazards, while urbanization, population growth, and increasingly interconnected infrastructure amplify exposure and vul-

nerability (IPCC, 2021; Seneviratne et al., 2021). Together, these dynamics are making disasters more complex and uncertain (Djalante et al., 2013; Pescaroli and Alexander, 2018).

Recent events illustrate these interactions. Severe floods struck southeastern Spain on October 29–30, 2024, triggered by stationary extreme storms associated with a cut-off low. The disaster resulted in over 200 casualties, the highest number of fatalities in a European flood event since 1967. More than 400 people were displaced, and hundreds of thousands were left without access to water and electricity, particularly in the Valencian Community (GDACS, 2024). In 2022, Europe experienced one of the most severe compound drought and heatwave events in recent history, affecting large parts of the continent (Tripathy and Mishra, 2023). The impacts were particularly strong in the Iberian Peninsula, France, Italy, the Northwest Balkans, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, and Scandinavia (Faranda et al., 2023). Record summer temperatures exacerbated drought conditions, causing water shortages and fueling widespread wildfires (Toreti et al., 2022; Faranda et al., 2023).

During and after disasters, stakeholders such as emergency responders and policymakers require rapid impact assessments to evaluate cascading risks and support decision-making (Pescaroli and Alexander, 2018). At the same time, the public, media, and insurers seek information on the rarity and underlying causes of extreme events. Understanding these causes is essential to distinguish between impacts driven primarily by hazard intensity and those linked to exposure or vulnerability. In this work, we focus on the *hazard* component and aim to characterize its role in disaster outcomes.

We introduce RHITA (Real-time Hazard Identification and Tracking Algorithm), a framework embedded in a public web tool (available at <https://data.ipsl.fr/rhita/>). RHITA provides a rapid spatio-temporal characterization of extreme events and evaluates their rarity based on multiple features, including average and maximum intensity, duration, and impacted area. The framework is designed for near real-time applications, while also being applied to historical data to construct a climatology of three-dimensional events. This dual use supports both immediate post-event analysis and longer-term resilience planning and statistical studies. The main contribution of RHITA is thus methodological and operational: it unifies hazard detection, three-dimensional tracking, climatological characterization and near real-time visualization within a single open framework, rather than introducing a conceptually new definition of extreme events.

Previous studies have proposed methodologies to detect and characterize specific types of extreme events. For instance, Lagrangian approaches have been used to track extreme precipitation events and quantify their spatial extent, duration, and severity (Nissen and Ulbrich, 2017). Operational systems, such as those developed by Météo-France, identify heatwaves and cold spells using multiple threshold-based criteria applied to national-scale temperature data (Ouzeau et al., 2016). For droughts, advanced techniques including three-dimensional DBSCAN clustering have been employed to track spatiotemporal evolution (Cammalleri and Toreti, 2023). The 3D connected components (CC3D) algorithm (Silversmith, 2021) has also been applied to the spatio-temporal tracking of heatwaves using gridded temperature data (Luo et al., 2022). More generally, clustering approaches are increasingly used to identify compound climate extremes (Tilloy et al., 2021; Messori et al., 2024). However, these methods are often hazard-specific, rarely designed for real-time applications, and seldom provide open-access databases within a unified multi-hazard framework.

The RHITA algorithm is designed to be flexible and applicable across multiple hazard types, both in real time and retrospectively. The associated website provides daily updates on the evolution of detected extreme events, including heatwaves,

cold spells, and storms, based on their hazard components: extreme temperatures, heavy precipitation, and strong winds. This enables a rapid comparison of ongoing events against historical benchmarks in terms of duration, intensity, and spatial extent.

60 By quantifying these characteristics, RHITA contributes to the assessment of hazard severity, a key component of climate risk alongside exposure and vulnerability.

In its present implementation, RHITA does not address droughts. This choice is deliberate and motivated by methodological considerations rather than by a lack of societal relevance. Droughts differ substantially from the hazards considered here because they evolve on longer temporal scales and result from cumulative hydrological processes, including soil moisture

65 depletion and evapotranspiration anomalies, that exhibit strong memory effects (Van Loon, 2015; Vicente-Serrano et al., 2010). Their identification therefore typically relies on dedicated indices such as the Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI), the Standardized Precipitation Evapotranspiration Index (SPEI), or soil-moisture-based anomalies (McKee et al., 1993; Vicente-Serrano et al., 2010; Cammalleri and Toreti, 2023), rather than on direct threshold exceedances of daily atmospheric variables. While the RHITA framework could in principle be extended to drought-related applications using accumulated or standardized

70 indices over longer aggregation windows, such an extension would require methodological adaptations beyond the scope of the present work and is left to future developments.

The website features an interactive interface aimed at supporting a wide range of users, with visualizations of hazard evolution, filtering by event type or severity, and exploration of metrics such as impacted area, duration, and intensity. It also allows the investigation of compound events, such as concurrent heatwaves or successive storms, which are particularly relevant for

75 risk assessment in contexts where multi-hazard interactions amplify impacts (Zscheischler et al., 2020).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the data sources, Section 3 details the detection algorithm and presents the training procedure. Section 4 presents the results of applying RHITA’s algorithm to reanalysis data for the period 1950–2024 to create a climatology of spatio-temporal extreme events. The discussion and the conclusion are respectively provided in Sec. 5 and 6. Finally, in Appendix A, the functionalities of the web platform are illustrated.

80 **2 Data**

2.1 Climate data

We rely on two datasets: (1) operational forecasts from the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) (European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF), 2025) and (2) the ERA5 reanalysis dataset (Hersbach et al., 2018), covering the period 1950–2024. ECMWF forecasts are used operationally for real-time event tracking, while

85 ERA5 is employed to construct the historical catalogue of events. The variables considered are daily mean temperature at 2 m above ground level, accumulated daily precipitation, and daily maximum sustained wind speed. The analysis focuses on Europe, within the geographical domain [30°N, 75°N, 30°W, 40°E].

The operational single-level forecasts are produced with the ECMWF Integrated Forecasting System (IFS) (ECMWF, 2024) and are distributed under the ECMWF open data license¹. ECMWF open forecast data are retrieved daily through the Open Data portal at <https://data.ecmwf.int/forecasts> (last access for the analyses presented here: 31–01–2026). We use the Atmospheric Model high-resolution 15-day forecast (HRES), provided at a spatial resolution of $0.25^\circ \times 0.25^\circ$, with four forecast cycles per day (00, 06, 12, and 18 UTC). For consistency and timeliness, we retain only the forecasts initialized at 00 UTC, which are disseminated between 05:45 and 06:12 UTC according to the ECMWF schedule.

For each forecast, we use temperature and neutral wind components at 10 m (u and v) at 3-hourly lead times (3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, and 24 h), as well as accumulated precipitation at 24 h lead time. The only preprocessing applied to the raw fields consists of standard daily aggregation: daily mean temperature at 2 m is computed by averaging the eight 3-hourly temperature values, while daily maximum sustained wind speed is calculated by first deriving wind speed at each lead time as $\sqrt{u^2 + v^2}$ and then retaining the maximum value over the day. Accumulated precipitation is taken directly from the 24 h lead-time field. No additional statistical bias correction, downscaling, or spatial filtering is applied prior to the RHITA detection procedure.

ERA5 reanalysis data are obtained from the Copernicus Climate Data Store² at a spatial resolution of $0.25^\circ \times 0.25^\circ$, with a typical latency of about five days. We retrieve daily variables using the CDSupdate Python package (Hisi et al., 2024) (available at <https://pypi.org/project/CDSupdate/>, last access: 31–01–2026), which automates the retrieval, processing, and aggregation of climate data from the CDS API and directly provides daily aggregates. The same variables as for the forecasts are used: daily mean temperature at 2 m, 24-hour accumulated precipitation, and daily maximum wind speed. As for the forecasts, no additional bias correction or post-processing is applied prior to the detection step, so that all preprocessing reduces to standard daily aggregation of the native ERA5 fields.

Events detected in real time using forecast data are re-evaluated every six months using ERA5 reanalysis and subsequently integrated into the historical database. We expect only limited differences between the two products, as ERA5 is initialized from ECMWF operational analyses at zero lead time.

2.2 Natural disasters data

We use the International Disasters Database (EM-DAT, Delforge et al., 2025; <https://public.emdat.be>, last access: 31–01–2026) as a reference dataset for optimizing the RHITA algorithm parameters. EM-DAT is the most comprehensive global database of disasters and catalogues high-impact events at the country level, including those driven by natural and technological hazards. For each recorded event, the database provides information such as casualties, economic losses, temporal extent, and event magnitude. Data are compiled from a wide range of sources, including UN agencies, non-governmental organizations, reinsurance companies, research institutes, and press agencies. Owing to this diversity, the dataset is not fully homogeneous and may contain reporting gaps and biases (Delforge et al., 2025).

The objective of RHITA is to construct a historical catalogue of significant disasters that is consistent with EM-DAT while offering a more quantitative and dynamical representation of events from the perspective of the underlying hazards. Focusing

¹<https://apps.ecmwf.int/datasets/licences/general/>, last access: 20–06–2025

²<https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/> (last access: 31–01–2026)

on Europe, we align EM-DAT with our optimization framework by filtering events based on the *disaster type* and *disaster subtype* fields. This results in three event categories: heatwaves, cold spells, and storms. The detailed filtering criteria are summarized in Table 1.

Although EM-DAT data are available from 1900 onward, records prior to 2000 are particularly affected by reporting biases and inconsistencies (Delforge et al., 2025). For this reason, we restrict the analysis to the period 2000–2023.

Table 1. EM-DAT filtering criteria for extreme event categorization

Extreme event	Disaster type	Disaster subtype
Heatwave	Extreme temperature	Heat wave
Cold spell	Extreme temperature	Cold wave, severe winter conditions
Storm	Flood, storm	Flash flood, riverine flood, extra-tropical storm, tropical cyclone

3 Methods

3.1 RHITA algorithm

The RHITA algorithm is implemented as a Python package (<https://github.com/gcazzaniga/rhita>) developed for the spatio-temporal detection of hazards associated with extreme weather events. The algorithm processes three-dimensional gridded datasets (longitude, latitude, time) in three main steps, described below and illustrated in Fig. 1.

- 1. Thresholding:** identification of grid cells exceeding a quantile-based or fixed threshold q , computed or selected over a historical reference period.
- 2. Spatial grouping:** at each time step, neighboring grid cells exceeding q are spatially grouped using a distance threshold d . The area of each spatial cluster is computed, and clusters with an area smaller than a minimum threshold $A_{\min}$ are discarded (e.g., the event marked by a red cross at time t_i in Fig. 1). Event centroids are then computed for each retained cluster.
- 3. Temporal tracking:** event centroids are linked across consecutive time steps using a centroid distance threshold d_c . If the distance between two centroids at successive time steps is smaller than d_c , the corresponding clusters are considered part of the same evolving event. This step naturally allows for event merging and splitting (see Event 1 in Fig. 1).

The algorithm depends on four key parameters: the quantile-based threshold q , the spatial distance threshold d , the minimum event area $A_{\min}$, and the centroid linking distance d_c . These parameters must be selected to reflect the relevant spatial and temporal scales of each hazard type. For the threshold q , we use the 0.99 quantile for extreme high temperatures, extreme winds, and heavy precipitation, and the 0.01 quantile for extreme low temperatures. Quantiles are computed at each gridpoint using all days from the 1950–2023 reference period. The choice of the 0.99 and 0.01 quantiles is consistent with previous




Figure 1. Schematic representation of the three steps of the RHITA algorithm.

percentile-based definitions of climate extremes that adopt comparable thresholds for temperature, precipitation, and wind events (Zhang et al., 2011; Perkins and Alexander, 2013; Russo et al., 2014; Schär et al., 2016; Crespi et al., 2020), and ensures that only the most pronounced anomalies relative to the local climatology are retained.

This choice represents a trade-off: the threshold must be sufficiently extreme to identify intense events, while remaining sensitive enough to capture less intense but potentially impactful events driven by long duration, large spatial extent, or high vulnerability of affected areas. Using local quantile-based thresholds allows adaptation to the strong climatological contrasts across the European domain, where fixed absolute thresholds would either saturate over warm and wet regions or fail to capture extremes over colder or drier areas (Schär et al., 2016). We note, however, that quantile thresholds are sensitive to the chosen reference period and that small variations of q around the adopted values can modify the number and characteristics of detected events. In the present work we do not attempt to provide a unique definition of extremes; rather, RHITA is designed as a transparent and reproducible operational framework whose threshold and tracking parameters can be re-tuned by users depending on the intended application. The resulting climatology should therefore be interpreted as one consistent realization within a family of possible algorithmic choices, an aspect that is further discussed in Sec. 5. The remaining parameters (d , $A_{\min}$, d_c) are optimized independently for each hazard type. The optimization procedure is described in Sec. 3.2.

Once events are detected, several metrics are computed to characterize their intensity, extent, and duration. These metrics are listed in Table 2, together with their mathematical definitions. For each hazard type and for metrics such as mean excess, maximum excess, total impacted area, and duration, we estimate the return period RP over the full historical time series and the entire European domain, as a measure of event rarity. The return period of a metric m is computed following Vezzoli et al.

(2012) as

$$RP_m = \lambda \cdot \frac{1}{1 - F_M(m)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\lambda = 1/\mu$, μ is the mean annual event occurrence rate, and $F_M(m)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of metric m .

In this study, RHITA is applied to detect heatwaves, cold spells, and storms using ERA5 reanalysis and ECMWF forecast data. In principle, however, the algorithm can be applied to any gridded dataset to provide a Lagrangian detection of spatio-temporal extreme events.

Table 2. Name, mathematical definition, and description of the metrics used to characterize the three-dimensional events.

Metric	Mathematical definition	Description
Mean excess	$\left \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} (x_{i,t} - q_i) \right $	Average exceedance above the threshold q_i across all grid cells and time steps, where $x_{i,t}$ is the value at grid cell i and time t , n_t is the number of grid cells at time t , T is the event duration, and $N = \sum_{t=1}^T n_t$ is the total event size.
Maximum excess	$\left \max_{i,t} (x_{i,t} - q_i) \right $	Maximum exceedance observed during the event, corresponding to the peak deviation from the threshold q_i .
Mean intensity	$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} x_{i,t}$	Spatio-temporal mean of the climate variable over all affected grid cells and time steps.
Maximum intensity	$\max_{i,t} x_{i,t}$	Maximum value of the climate variable observed in any grid cell during the event.
Total impacted area	$\sum_{t=1}^T A_t$	Cumulative affected area (km ²), where A_t is the area of all grid cells exceeding the threshold at time t .
Duration	T	Number of consecutive days during which the event is detected.

3.2 Parameters optimization

As described in Sec. 2.2, the EM-DAT database is used as a reference dataset for optimizing the RHITA parameters d , $A_{\min}$, and d_c . The optimization objective is to maximize the detection of extreme weather events associated with significant societal impacts.

For each hazard type, physically plausible parameter ranges are defined based on the characteristic spatial and temporal scales of the underlying atmospheric processes (see Sec. 1 of the Supplementary Material for details). A regular parameter grid is constructed, and a grid search is performed to evaluate all parameter combinations.

First, we identify all parameter triplets $(A_{\min}, d, d_c)$ that maximize the detection sensitivity – the so-called recall in machine learning terminology Juba and Le (2019) –, defined as

$$\text{sensitivity} = \frac{\text{true positives}}{\text{true positives} + \text{false negatives}}. \quad (2)$$

A positive detection is defined as an algorithm-detected event that satisfies two conditions: (1) spatial overlap with at least one country affected according to the EM-DAT record, and (2) temporal overlap within a ± 10 -day window around the EM-DAT event start or end dates. This temporal tolerance reflects the typical time scales of extreme weather phenomena, ranging from a few hours to one or two weeks (Holton and Hakim, 2013).

Whenever multiple parameter triplets achieve the same maximum sensitivity, the optimal configuration is selected by minimizing the cost function S :

$$S = \frac{n_s}{N_{\text{det}}} + \frac{n_c}{N_{\text{det}}} + \frac{|N_{\text{obs}} - N_{\text{det}}|}{\max(N_{\text{obs}}, N_{\text{det}})}, \quad (3)$$

where n_s is the number of erroneously split events, n_c the number of erroneously merged events, N_{det} the total number of events detected by the algorithm, and N_{obs} the number of events in the reference dataset.

The cost function consists of three normalized terms, each bounded between 0 and 1:

1. a splitting penalty quantifying erroneous event fragmentation;
2. a merging penalty quantifying erroneous event aggregation;
3. a counting discrepancy penalty quantifying deviations in the total number of events.

Because the reference dataset is affected by reporting gaps and biases inherent to human-compiled disaster databases, false positives (i.e., algorithm-detected events absent from EM-DAT) are intentionally not penalized in the optimization procedure. This design choice has important consequences for the interpretation of the validation. In a strict machine-learning sense, a balanced assessment based on precision or the F_1 score would also account for false positives (Juba and Le, 2019). In our case, however, EM-DAT cannot be regarded as a complete physical catalogue of meteorological extremes: many algorithm-detected events that do not appear in EM-DAT may correspond to genuine physical extremes that simply did not generate sufficiently documented societal impacts, either because they affected sparsely populated regions or because reporting standards differ across countries. Penalizing such cases as false positives would therefore implicitly calibrate RHITA against socio-economic reporting practices rather than against the physical occurrence of extremes. For this reason we prioritize sensitivity together with the splitting, merging and counting penalties of Eq. (3), which directly target the morphological consistency of the detected events with documented disasters, while accepting that the resulting validation metrics provide only a lower bound on the algorithmic skill from a purely meteorological perspective.

Heatwaves are identified as temperatures exceeding the 0.99 quantile, while cold spells correspond to temperatures below the 0.01 quantile. For heavy precipitation and wind extremes, the 0.99 quantile of daily accumulated precipitation and daily maximum sustained wind speed is used, respectively. For all hazard types, a minimum event duration threshold of three consecutive days is imposed.

The optimization is performed using EM-DAT records from 2000 to 2023, which are randomly split into training and validation sets. Two-thirds of the years are used for training, while the remaining one-third is used for validation. The optimized parameters for each hazard type are reported in Table 3. The optimization procedure yields sensitivities exceeding 0.75 for all hazards except cold spells.

Hazard	$A_{\min}$ [km ²]	d [km]	d_c [km]	Sensitivity (train)	Sensitivity (validation)
Cold spell	25 000	50	250	0.45	0.27
Heatwave	25 000	50	250	0.87	0.77
Heavy precipitation	25 000	200	550	0.81	0.86
Strong wind	25 000	200	550	–	–

Table 3. Optimized RHITA parameters for the detection of heatwaves, cold spells, heavy precipitation, and strong wind events.

Heatwaves and cold spells are optimized jointly, as reported in Table 3. This choice is motivated by the fact that temperature extremes over Europe are strongly linked to recurrent large-scale meteorological patterns, in particular quasi-stationary anticyclonic circulation and atmospheric blocking (Kautz et al., 2021). However, the algorithm exhibits lower detection skill for cold spells in both the training and validation phases. A plausible explanation is that cold spells are reported between 2 to 3 times more frequently than heatwaves in the EM-DAT database. This higher reporting rate likely includes many moderate events, whereas the algorithm applies a symmetric detection threshold designed to capture only the most extreme occurrences, leading to a larger fraction of missed cold spell events. Using a less stringent threshold for cold extremes (e.g., the 0.05 quantile) would mechanically increase the sensitivity against EM-DAT but would also implicitly calibrate RHITA to socio-economic reporting practices, which differ markedly between northern and southern European countries and between summer and winter hazards. Our choice of a symmetric threshold preserves a physically based and comparable definition of warm and cold temperature extremes, at the price of a lower recall for cold spell entries in EM-DAT. The resulting cold spell statistics should therefore be interpreted with caution, particularly for regions where moderate winter conditions are routinely reported as disasters.

Parameters for heavy precipitation are optimized separately using EM-DAT records filtered specifically for storm-related events (see Table 1). For wind detection, we adopt the same parameter set as for heavy precipitation. This choice reflects the difficulty of isolating wind-specific disasters in EM-DAT, where storm-related entries typically aggregate damages associated with both heavy precipitation and strong winds without a clean separation between the two drivers. Consequently, sensitivity metrics are not reported for wind events, and the wind configuration of RHITA should be regarded as a pragmatic approximation based on the assumption that strong winds and intense precipitation share comparable synoptic-scale spatial and temporal footprints, rather than as a hazard-specific calibration. The implications of this choice for the wind climatology are further discussed in Sec. 5.

To construct the European climatology, only detected events that, at least at one time step, impact a European country are retained. Events occurring entirely outside European countries within the analysis domain (e.g., exclusively over North Africa) are excluded from the climatology presented here.

4.1 Spatial distribution of detected hazards

Over Europe, RHITA detects a total of 760 heatwaves, 681 cold spells, 805 heavy precipitation events, and 686 strong wind events over the period 1950–2024. All detected events within the analysis domain are available for browsing and downloading through the RHITA web tool.

240 Figure 2 shows the spatial distribution of detected hazards across European countries. For each country, a pie chart represents the relative proportion of the four hazard types: heatwaves (red), cold spells (blue), extreme wind events (orange), and heavy precipitation events (light blue). In Southern Europe, RHITA detects a predominance of heatwaves and extreme wind events in Spain and Portugal. In Italy and Greece, as well as in most Western European countries, extreme precipitation and extreme wind events represent the largest fraction of detected hazards. In the United Kingdom and Ireland, heatwaves account for
245 a substantial share of detected events, with Ireland also exhibiting frequent strong wind events, while cold spells contribute more strongly in the United Kingdom. Central and Eastern Europe are characterized by a dominant contribution from heavy precipitation and wind events, with heatwaves generally detected more often than cold spells. In Northern Europe, the detected events are more evenly distributed across the four hazard types.

It is important to note that this aggregation is based on the geographical impact footprint of the detected events. Consequently,
250 a single event can contribute to multiple countries when its spatial extent affects more than one national territory.

4.2 Trends in event frequency across European subregions

To investigate large-scale spatial patterns in the temporal evolution of extreme event frequencies, detected events were aggregated by European subregions. The subregions considered are Central and Eastern Europe, Northern Europe, Southern Europe, and Western Europe, following the EuroVoc classification maintained by the Publications Office of the European
255 Union (Publications Office of the European Union). The list of countries included in each subregion is provided in Sec. 2 of the Supplementary Material.

For each subregion and hazard type, trends in yearly event frequency were assessed using the Mann-Kendall test (Mann, 1945; Kendall, 1948). When statistically significant, the magnitude of change was quantified using Theil-Sen’s slope estimator (Theil, 1950; Sen, 1968). Figure 3 summarizes the results, showing the change in yearly event frequency per decade for
260 statistically significant trends only.

Heatwaves exhibit a robust and significant increase in frequency across all four European subregions. The strongest increase is detected in Southern Europe, with an increase of 0.96 events per year per decade, followed by Western Europe (+0.73), Northern Europe (+0.56), and Central and Eastern Europe (+0.45). Cold spells display an opposite behavior, with decreasing frequencies, particularly in Northern Europe, where the yearly frequency declines by approximately 0.87 events per decade.

265 Trends in heavy precipitation and strong wind events are more heterogeneous across subregions. Nevertheless, a significant increase in strong wind events is detected in Western Europe (+0.33 events per year per decade), along with a significant increase in heavy precipitation events (+0.32 events per year per decade).




Figure 2. Spatial distribution of extreme weather events across Europe as detected by RHITA.

4.3 Trends in hazard characteristics at the European scale

In addition to event frequency, trends in event characteristics were analyzed at the European scale using the metrics defined in Table 2: mean excess, maximum excess, total impacted area, and duration. Trend detection was performed over the 1950–2024 period using the Mann-Kendall test at a 5% significance level, with trend magnitude estimated using Theil-Sen’s slope. This analysis is performed on the aggregated European climatology. As a result, regional-scale signals may be partially masked by spatial averaging. All figures supporting this analysis are provided in Sec. 3 of the Supplementary Material.

Heatwaves exhibit statistically significant increasing trends in several metrics. The maximum excess temperature increases by 0.07 °C per decade, while the mean excess increases by 0.02 °C per decade. The total impacted area per event also shows a significant increase of approximately 80 000 km² per decade, corresponding to roughly twice the surface area of Switzerland. No statistically significant trend is detected for event duration.

Cold spells display negative slopes for maximum excess temperature, mean excess temperature, and total impacted area. However, none of these trends are statistically significant at the 5% level. A statistically significant trend is detected for event duration, but the associated slope is close to zero, indicating a negligible change over the analyzed period.




Figure 3. Decadal changes in the yearly number of events aggregated by European subregion and hazard type. Only statistically significant trends are shown.

For heavy precipitation events, no statistically significant trends are detected for any of the analyzed metrics. The trends in maximum excess ($p = 0.094$) and mean excess ($p = 0.072$) are close to the significance threshold, while total impacted area ($p = 0.493$) and duration ($p = 0.851$) show no evidence of systematic change.

Extreme wind events show no statistically significant trends in mean or maximum excess, nor in total impacted area. A statistically significant trend is detected for event duration; however, the associated slope is close to zero, indicating no substantial change in duration over time.

5 Discussion

The climatology of weather-related hazards over Europe derived from RHITA highlights changes that are broadly consistent with the current scientific understanding summarized in the IPCC (2021). In particular, the detected increase in the frequency, intensity (as measured by maximum and mean excess temperature), and spatial extent of heatwaves across European subregions is consistent with a large body of observational and attribution studies documenting rising temperature extremes across Central and Eastern (Ruml et al., 2017; Lorenz et al., 2019), Southern (Pardo and Paredes-Fortuny, 2024; Paredes-Fortuny and Khodayar, 2023), and Northern Europe (Matthes et al., 2015; Vikhamar-Schuler et al., 2016). Similarly, the decreasing frequency of cold spells detected by RHITA aligns with documented long-term declines in winter cold extremes across Europe (Christiansen et al., 2018; Van Oldenborgh et al., 2019).

For heavy precipitation, RHITA detects a significant increase in event frequency in Central and Eastern Europe, in agreement with regional studies reporting positive trends in precipitation extremes in this region (Croitoru et al., 2016; Volosciuk et al., 2016; Zeder and Fischer, 2020). At the continental scale, however, no statistically significant trends are detected for precipitation intensity, duration, or impacted area. This absence of a uniform European-scale signal is consistent with previous findings
300 showing that trend detection in precipitation extremes is highly sensitive to the selected region, season, and metric (Hofstätter et al., 2018; André et al., 2024; Mathbout et al., 2018; Jézéquel et al., 2025). Evidence for increasing precipitation extremes is more frequently reported for specific seasons, particularly summer and winter, rather than year-round averages (Volosciuk et al., 2016)(Madsen et al., 2014; Helama et al., 2018). Aggregating across all seasons and over the spatially diverse European continent likely masks distinct regional and seasonal signals.

305 Although not statistically significant at the 5% level, the positive slopes detected for precipitation intensity metrics, with p-values close to the significance threshold (maximum excess: $p = 0.094$; mean excess: $p = 0.072$), suggest a tendency toward more intense events. This behavior is consistent with the IPCC (2021), which assesses a *likely* intensification of heavy precipitation across Europe. However, these results should be interpreted with caution, as they do not constitute robust continental-scale evidence and may reflect the combined influence of heterogeneous regional trends and methodological aggregation choices.

310 More generally, the absence of significant continental-scale trends in heavy precipitation, wind intensity, and event duration should not be interpreted as evidence of the absence of regional or seasonal changes. The Europe-wide aggregation adopted in Sec. 4.3 can mask substantial regional and seasonal heterogeneity, particularly for precipitation- and wind-related hazards whose drivers vary considerably between Mediterranean, Atlantic, continental and northern European climates and across the cool and warm seasons (Hofstätter et al., 2018; Mathbout et al., 2018; André et al., 2024; Jézéquel et al., 2025). The regional
315 analysis presented in Sec. 4.2, which already detects significant increases in heavy precipitation and strong wind frequencies in Western Europe and in heavy precipitation in Central and Eastern Europe, illustrates that meaningful signals do emerge once spatial aggregation is reduced. A finer seasonal and regional decomposition is beyond the scope of the present work but represents a natural direction for follow-up studies based on the open RHITA archive.

5.1 Sources of uncertainty and methodological caveats

320 Because RHITA is intended both as a near real-time monitoring framework and as a basis for climatological analyses, it is important to discuss explicitly the main sources of uncertainty affecting the detected events and the conclusions drawn from them. These uncertainties originate from three families of factors: the underlying meteorological products, the reference impact database used for calibration, and the algorithmic choices made within RHITA itself.

A first source of uncertainty stems from the spatial and temporal resolution of the ERA5 reanalysis and of the ECMWF
325 open forecasts. Both products are used at 0.25° horizontal resolution and at daily temporal aggregation, which is adequate for synoptic-scale and slowly evolving hazards such as heatwaves, persistent cold spells or extended storm systems but is not designed to resolve sub-daily and sub-grid convective phenomena. As a consequence, localized thunderstorms, isolated wind gusts, or short-lived intense rainfall associated with mesoscale convective systems may be smoothed out by the daily aggregation step and underestimated in both intensity and spatial extent. RHITA is therefore expected to perform best for

330 large-scale persistent hazards and to be less skillful for short-lived and highly localized convective extremes. In addition, ERA5 itself is known to display residual biases over orographically complex regions and in the representation of near-surface wind and precipitation (Hersbach et al., 2018; Betts et al., 2019; Lavers et al., 2022), and ECMWF forecast errors grow with lead time; both contribute to uncertainties in the estimated intensity, footprint, and rarity of detected events.

Nevertheless, to track and characterize convective events, it is possible to apply the RHITA algorithm to higher-resolution
335 datasets specifically designed to resolve such processes, such as radar-based precipitation products (e.g., Saltikoff et al. (2019)), satellite-derived estimates (e.g., Huffman et al. (2014)), and high-resolution numerical weather prediction outputs (e.g., Seity et al. (2011)).

A second source of uncertainty is associated with the use of EM-DAT as a reference dataset. EM-DAT is a socio-economically filtered archive of *reported* disasters and not a homogeneous physical record of meteorological extremes. Its content is af-
340 fected by reporting heterogeneities across countries, by evolving documentation standards over time, by national thresholds for declaring an event as a disaster, and by underlying differences in exposure and vulnerability (Delforge et al., 2025). Calibrating RHITA against EM-DAT therefore embeds a degree of socio-economic conditioning in the choice of algorithmic parameters. We mitigate this issue in two ways: by restricting the analysis to the period 2000–2023, for which EM-DAT is comparatively more homogeneous, and by deliberately not penalizing false positives in the optimization (Sec. 3.2), so that physically extreme
345 events not reported as disasters do not bias the parameter selection. Nevertheless, this means that the validation sensitivities reported in Table 3 should be interpreted as lower bounds and that the cold spell and wind statistics in particular remain less robust than those obtained for heatwaves and heavy precipitation.

A third source of uncertainty is intrinsic to any event-based methodology. The definition of an “event” in RHITA depends on the quantile threshold q , the spatial grouping distance d , the minimum area $A_{\min}$, the centroid linking distance d_c and the
350 minimum-duration constraint. These choices are physically motivated and have been optimized against EM-DAT, but they are not unique: alternative configurations would in general yield somewhat different counts, durations, and footprints, and would shift the boundary between what is classified as a single long event versus several shorter ones. The climatology presented here should therefore be understood as one consistent realization within a family of algorithmic choices, rather than as an absolute physical truth. In particular, continental-scale trend estimates can be sensitive to the chosen thresholds and aggregation criteria,
355 which adds methodological uncertainty on top of the statistical uncertainty of the Mann-Kendall and Theil-Sen estimators. The open implementation of RHITA is meant to make these dependencies fully traceable, so that users can re-tune the parameters for their own applications and assess the robustness of specific results.

Finally, throughout this work RHITA characterizes the *hazard* component of extreme events only, in terms of intensity, spatial extent, and duration of the associated meteorological fields. It does not attempt to quantify exposure or vulnerability, nor to
360 translate the detected hazards into impacts in terms of population affected, infrastructure damaged, or economic losses. Disaster severity in any given location reflects the joint contribution of hazard, exposure and vulnerability (UNDRR, 2017; Cardona et al., 2012), and two events with comparable physical intensity can lead to very different societal outcomes depending on the affected territory. The metrics provided by RHITA should therefore be combined with exposure and vulnerability information when used to support risk assessment or impact attribution studies.

This study introduces RHITA, a framework for the detection and tracking of weather-related hazards using gridded meteorological data, and applies it to construct a climatology of extreme events over Europe. The contribution of RHITA is primarily operational and methodological: rather than proposing a conceptually new definition of extremes, the framework unifies hazard detection, three-dimensional tracking, climatological characterization, and near real-time visualization within a single open and reproducible workflow. By combining operational forecasts with reanalysis data, RHITA enables both near real-time monitoring and retrospective analysis of heatwaves, cold spells, heavy precipitation events, and strong wind events through the same algorithmic chain. The results derived from the European climatology are consistent with established findings in the literature, particularly regarding increasing heatwave frequency, intensity, and spatial extent, as well as declining cold spell occurrence. For heavy precipitation and strong wind events, the analysis highlights more heterogeneous and less robust continental-scale signals, underscoring the sensitivity of trend detection to spatial aggregation, seasonal stratification, and event definition.

Several limitations of the RHITA framework should be acknowledged, and are discussed in detail in Sec. 5.1. The use of quantile-based thresholds and a minimum event duration implies that some impactful but moderately intense or short-lived events may not be detected. The reliance on ERA5 and ECMWF data at 0.25° resolution limits the ability to capture small-scale convective phenomena, such as localized thunderstorms, and short-lived severe weather events: RHITA is therefore expected to perform best for synoptic and large-scale persistent hazards and less reliably for highly localized convective extremes. The use of EM-DAT for parameter optimization introduces a degree of socio-economic conditioning, since EM-DAT reflects reported impacts rather than a purely physical record of meteorological extremes, and the resulting validation metrics should be interpreted as lower bounds, especially for cold spells and wind events. In addition, RHITA focuses exclusively on the hazard component of extreme events and does not attempt to characterize the underlying atmospheric dynamics or the resulting impacts in terms of exposure and vulnerability. As with any event-based methodology, the definition of what constitutes an extreme event remains partly subjective and dependent on parameter choices, and the climatology presented here should be regarded as one consistent realization within a family of possible algorithmic configurations.

Within these constraints, RHITA provides a consistent and transparent framework for identifying and characterizing hazard events across multiple types and time scales. Its design allows parameters to be adapted to different datasets, regions, and applications, making it suitable for both scientific analyses and operational monitoring contexts. Importantly, the same framework can be directly applied to climate model simulations, enabling the construction of consistent hazard-based climatologies under future climate scenarios. This opens the possibility to assess projected changes in event frequency, intensity, duration, and spatial extent in a manner that is directly comparable to present-day diagnostics. Future extensions could broaden the range of hazards considered, for example by adapting the framework to slow-onset phenomena such as droughts through accumulated or standardized indices, or by including additional impact-relevant variables. The open availability of the data and tools supports reproducibility and facilitates further investigation of extreme weather hazards under both current and future climate conditions.

Code and data availability. The RHITA algorithm is implemented as an open-source Python package available at <https://github.com/gcazzaniga/rhita>. The meteorological data used in this analysis are openly available from the following sources: ERA5 reanalysis data can be
400 accessed through the Copernicus Climate Data Store at <https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/>, while ECMWF operational forecast data are available via their Open Data portal at <https://data.ecmwf.int/forecasts>, through the ECMWF Python API `ecmwf-opendata`. The disaster event records were obtained from the EM-DAT database (<https://www.emdat.be/>). The RHITA web tool, developed at the LSCE and hosted by the Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace (IPSL), is accessible at <https://data.ipsl.fr/rhita/>. Historical time series of detected extreme events in csv format are available upon request by contacting the corresponding author.

405 **Appendix A: RHITA web tool**

The RHITA web tool, developed by the Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace (IPSL), is accessible at <https://data.ipsl.fr/rhita/>. The platform provides an interface for visualizing, exploring, and downloading the events detected by the RHITA algorithm. It is organized into two main sections: the *Real-time dashboard* and the *Historical archive*. Figures A1 and A2 show screenshots of these two interfaces.

410 A filtering panel located in the left sidebar applies to both dashboards. This panel allows users to select a specific hazard type (heatwave, cold spell, strong wind, or heavy precipitation), and the selection is propagated dynamically to all figures displayed within the dashboard.

The real-time dashboard focuses on events detected over a recent time window, extending from the previous fifteen days up to the current day. It is structured around three main components. First, an interactive map displays the centroids of the
415 detected events as bubbles. The bubble size is proportional to the *Total impacted area* metric (see Table 2), providing a visual indication of the relative spatial extent of ongoing or recent events, while the bubble color denotes the hazard type. Second, a table lists all events shown on the map, together with their main attributes. Third, a bar plot summarizes the total number of detected events by hazard type. Across all components, a consistent color convention is used: red for heatwaves, dark blue for cold spells, yellow for strong wind events, and light blue for heavy precipitation events.

420 Selecting an event on the map opens a dedicated page displaying its spatio-temporal evolution. This page includes an interactive map, implemented through a Web Map Service (WMS), which allows users to explore the geographical footprint of the event and its evolution over time. In addition to the visual representation, the page reports the full set of event metrics defined in Table 2, the estimated rarity of the event relative to the ERA5-based climatology, and the event start and end dates.

The Historical archive provides access to the complete catalog of detected events from 1950 to 2024. This section includes
425 statistical summary tables and graphical representations of event characteristics. In the upper panel, a multivariate scatter plot displays events over time, with event duration plotted against date. Bubble size is scaled according to the *maximum excess* metric, normalized between 0 and 100 to allow comparability across different hazard types. This temporal overview is complemented by bar charts (see Fig. A2) showing the total number of events grouped by country or by hazard type, as well as the distribution of event durations across the full archive.

Real-time dashboard

This page provides a live snapshot of all significant events that have occurred or are ongoing within the last 15 days. Discover how the event is evolving across space and time, and understand its rarity based on historical data.

Last updated: 28/01/2026 21:34:12





Figure A1. *Real-time dashboard* of the RHITA web tool. Screenshot from the RHITA website taken on 28 January 2026. The figure displays events affecting Europe between 14 and 28 January 2026. Small cold spell events are visible in northern and western Europe, while larger events are detected over southern Europe, particularly southern Italy.

430 When filtering events by country, some trajectories may appear that do not directly intersect the geographical boundaries of the selected country. This behavior arises because trajectories represent the centroids of detected events, whereas a country is considered affected when at least one grid cell belonging to the event’s spatial extent overlaps with that country.




Figure A2. *Historical archive dashboard* of the RHITA web tool. Screenshot from the RHITA website taken on 28 January 2026. The figure displays the bar charts summarizing the statistics of the hazards climatology grouped by country or hazard.

Author contributions. GC coded the tool and performed the analysis. GC, DF and MV conceived the methodology. PB developed the Vega-Lite-based data processing and interactive visualization components. CG contributed to the final user interface design. All authors contributed to writing and reviewing the article.

Competing interests. The authors also have no other competing interests to declare.

Acknowledgements. We would like to acknowledge and thank Laurent Crepeau and Vincent Douet for their significant contributions to the production deployment, operational management, and release-to-production of the RHITA web platform. We also acknowledge useful discussions with the members of the PowDev consortium and in particular Anne Barros, with Aglaé Jezequel, Matthieu Belin, Lou Madonnet, Pascal Yiou, Erika Coppola, Tommaso Alberti, Gabriele Messori and Marco Zanchi. We also acknowledge fruitful exchanges within the MedCyclones COST Action (CA19109) and the FutureMed COST Action (CA22162) communities. DF acknowledges the European Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 101003469 (XAIDA), the ANR project PowDev (Strategic Development of the power grids of the future, ANR reference: ANR-22-PETA-0016), the ANR project Templex (ANR-23-CE56-0002). This work also benefited from state aid managed by the National Research Agency under France 2030 bearing the references ANR-22-EXTR-0005 (TRACCS-PC4-EXTENDING project).

References

- André, J., d'Andrea, F., Drobinski, P., and Muller, C.: Regimes of precipitation change over Europe and the Mediterranean, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 129, e2023JD040413, 2024.
- Betts, A. K., Chan, D. Z., and Desjardins, R. L.: Near-surface biases in ERA5 over the Canadian Prairies, *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 7, 129, 2019.
- Cammalleri, C. and Toreti, A.: A generalized density-based algorithm for the spatiotemporal tracking of drought events, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 24, 537–548, 2023.
- Cardona, O. D., Van Aalst, M. K., Birkmann, J., Fordham, M., Mc Gregor, G., Rosa, P., Pulwarty, R. S., Schipper, E. L. F., Sinh, B. T., Décamps, H., et al.: Determinants of risk: exposure and vulnerability, in: *Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation: special report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change*, pp. 65–108, Cambridge University Press (CUP), 2012.
- Christiansen, B., Alvarez-Castro, C., Christidis, N., Ciavarella, A., Colfescu, I., Cowan, T., Eden, J., Hauser, M., Hempelmann, N., Klehmet, K., et al.: Was the cold European winter of 2009/10 modified by anthropogenic climate change? An attribution study, *Journal of Climate*, 31, 3387–3410, 2018.
- Ciscar, J.-C., Fisher-Vanden, K., and Lobell, D. B.: Synthesis and review: an inter-method comparison of climate change impacts on agriculture, *Environmental Research Letters*, 13, 070401, 2018.
- Crespi, A., Terzi, S., Cocuccioni, S., Zebisch, M., Berckmans, J., and Füssel, H.-M.: Climate-related hazard indices for Europe, 2020.
- Croitoru, A.-E., Piticar, A., and Burada, D. C.: Changes in precipitation extremes in Romania, *Quaternary International*, 415, 325–335, 2016.
- Delforge, D., Wathelet, V., Below, R., Sofia, C. L., Tonnelier, M., van Loenhout, J. A., and Speybroeck, N.: EM-DAT: the emergency events database, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, p. 105509, 2025.
- Djalante, R., Holley, C., Thomalla, F., and Carnegie, M.: Pathways for adaptive and integrated disaster resilience, *Natural hazards*, 69, 2105–2135, 2013.
- ECMWF: IFS Documentation CY49R1 - Part IV: Physical Processes, chap. 4, ECMWF, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21957/c731ee1102>, 2024.
- European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF): ECMWF Real-Time Forecasts Open Data, <https://doi.org/10.21957/open-data>, [Open data set], accessed=2025-06-06, 2025.
- Faranda, D., Pascale, S., and Bulut, B.: Persistent anticyclonic conditions and climate change exacerbated the exceptional 2022 European-Mediterranean drought, *Environmental Research Letters*, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/acbc37>, 2023.
- Forzieri, G., Cescatti, A., e Silva, F. B., and Feyen, L.: Increasing risk over time of weather-related hazards to the European population: a data-driven prognostic study, *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 1, e200–e208, 2017.
- GDACS: Overall Red Flood Alert in Spain, https://www.gdacs.org/documentmaps_IP.aspx?eventid=1102983&eventtype=FL, accessed: 2024-11-13, 2024.
- Guo, Y., Gasparrini, A., Armstrong, B. G., Tawatsupa, B., Tobias, A., Lavigne, E., Coelho, M. d. S. Z. S., Pan, X., Kim, H., Hashizume, M., et al.: Heat wave and mortality: a multicountry, multicomunity study, *Environmental health perspectives*, 125, 087006, 2017.
- Hersbach, H., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Biavati, G., Horányi, A., Muñoz Sabater, J., Nicolas, J., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Rozum, I., Schepers, D., Simmons, A., Soci, C., Dee, D., and Thépaut, J.-N.: ERA5 hourly data on single levels from 1959 to present, <https://doi.org/10.24381/cds.adbb2d47>, [data set], Accessed: 2025-06-06, 2018.

- Hisi, A. N., Robin, Y., Faranda, D., and Vrac, M.: CDSupdate: A meta-interface for ERA5 download request, management and storage, *SoftwareX*, 28, 101965, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.softx.2024.101965>, 2024.
- 485 Hofstätter, M., Lexer, A., Homann, M., and Blöschl, G.: Large-scale heavy precipitation over central Europe and the role of atmospheric cyclone track types, *International Journal of Climatology*, 38, e497–e517, 2018.
- Holton, J. R. and Hakim, G. J.: *An introduction to dynamic meteorology*, vol. 88, Academic press, 2013.
- Huffman, G. J., Bolvin, D. T., Braithwaite, D., Hsu, K., Joyce, R., Kidd, C., Nelkin, E. J., Sorooshian, S., Tan, J., and Xie, P.: NASA global precipitation measurement (GPM) integrated multi-satellite retrievals for GPM (IMERG), Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document
- 490 (ATBD), NASA/GSFC, Greenbelt, MD, USA, 2014.
- IPCC: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896>, 2021.
- Jézéquel, A., Faranda, D., Drobinski, P., and Lionello, P.: Extreme Event Attribution in the Mediterranean, *International Journal of Climatology*, p. e8799, <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.8799>, 2025.
- 495 Juba, B. and Le, H. S.: Precision-recall versus accuracy and the role of large data sets, in: *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 33, pp. 4039–4048, 2019.
- Kautz, L.-A., Martius, O., Pfahl, S., Pinto, J. G., Ramos, A. M., Sousa, P. M., and Woollings, T.: Atmospheric blocking and weather extremes over the Euro-Atlantic sector—a review, *Weather and Climate Dynamics Discussions*, 2021, 1–43, 2021.
- Kendall, M. G.: *Rank correlation methods.*, Griffin, ISBN 0852641990, 1948.
- 500 Lavers, D. A., Simmons, A., Vamborg, F., and Rodwell, M. J.: An evaluation of ERA5 precipitation for climate monitoring, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 148, 3152–3165, 2022.
- Lorenz, R., Stalhandske, Z., and Fischer, E. M.: Detection of a climate change signal in extreme heat, heat stress, and cold in Europe from observations, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 46, 8363–8374, 2019.
- Luo, M., Lau, N.-C., Liu, Z., Wu, S., and Wang, X.: An observational investigation of spatiotemporally contiguous heatwaves in China from
- 505 a 3D perspective, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49, e2022GL097714, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL097714>, 2022.
- Mann, H. B.: Nonparametric tests against trend, *Econometrica: Journal of the econometric society*, pp. 245–259, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/1907187>, 1945.
- Mathbout, S., Lopez-Bustins, J., Royé, D., Martin-Vide, J., Bech, J., and Rodrigo, F.: Observed changes in daily precipitation extremes at annual timescale over the eastern Mediterranean during 1961–2012, *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 175, 3875–3890, 2018.
- 510 Matthes, H., Rinke, A., and Dethloff, K.: Recent changes in Arctic temperature extremes: warm and cold spells during winter and summer, *Environmental Research Letters*, 10, 114020, 2015.
- McKee, T. B., Doesken, N. J., Kleist, J., et al.: The relationship of drought frequency and duration to time scales, in: *Proceedings of the 8th Conference on Applied Climatology*, vol. 17, pp. 179–183, Boston, 1993.
- Messori, G., Segalini, A., and Ramos, A. M.: Climatology and Trends in Concurrent Temperature Extremes in the Global Extratropics, *Earth System Dynamics Discussions*, 2024, 1–17, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-15-1207-2024>, 2024.
- Monteleone, B., Borzì, I., Bonaccorso, B., and Martina, M.: Quantifying crop vulnerability to weather-related extreme events and climate change through vulnerability curves, *Natural Hazards*, 116, 2761–2796, 2023.
- Nissen, K. M. and Ulbrich, U.: Increasing frequencies and changing characteristics of heavy precipitation events threatening infrastructure in Europe under climate change, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 17, 1177–1190, 2017.

- 520 OuzEAU, G., Soubeyroux, J.-M., Schneider, M., Vautard, R., and Planton, S.: Heat waves analysis over France in present and future climate: Application of a new method on the EURO-CORDEX ensemble, *Climate Services*, 4, 1–12, 2016.
- Pardo, S. K. and Paredes-Fortuny, L.: Uneven evolution of regional European summer heatwaves under climate change, *Weather and Climate Extremes*, 43, 100648, 2024.
- Paredes-Fortuny, L. and Khodayar, S.: Understanding the Magnification of Heatwaves over Spain: Relevant changes in the most extreme
525 events, *Weather and Climate Extremes*, 42, 100631, 2023.
- Perkins, S. E. and Alexander, L. V.: On the measurement of heat waves, *Journal of climate*, 26, 4500–4517, 2013.
- Pescaroli, G. and Alexander, D.: Understanding compound, interconnected, interacting, and cascading risks: a holistic framework, *Risk analysis*, 38, 2245–2257, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13128>, 2018.
- Publications Office of the European Union: EuroVoc, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/browse/eurovoc.html?params=72,7206,914#arrow_914.
- 530 Ruml, M., Gregorić, E., Vujadinović, M., Radovanović, S., Matović, G., Vuković, A., Počuča, V., and Stojičić, D.: Observed changes of temperature extremes in Serbia over the period 1961–2010, *Atmospheric Research*, 183, 26–41, 2017.
- Russo, S., Dosio, A., Graversen, R. G., Sillmann, J., Carrao, H., Dunbar, M. B., Singleton, A., Montagna, P., Barbola, P., and Vogt, J. V.: Magnitude of extreme heat waves in present climate and their projection in a warming world, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119, 12–500, 2014.
- 535 Saltikoff, E., Haase, G., Delobbe, L., Gaussiat, N., Martet, M., Idziorek, D., Leijnse, H., Novák, P., Lukach, M., and Stephan, K.: OPERA the radar project, *Atmosphere*, 10, 320, 2019.
- Schär, C., Ban, N., Fischer, E. M., Rajczak, J., Schmidli, J., Frei, C., Giorgi, F., Karl, T. R., Kendon, E. J., Tank, A. M. K., et al.: Percentile indices for assessing changes in heavy precipitation events, *Climatic Change*, 137, 201–216, 2016.
- Seity, Y., Brousseau, P., Malardel, S., Hello, G., Bénard, P., Bouttier, F., Lac, C., and Masson, V.: The AROME-France convective-scale
540 operational model, *Monthly Weather Review*, 139, 976–991, 2011.
- Sen, P. K.: Estimates of the regression coefficient based on Kendall’s tau, *Journal of the American statistical association*, 63, 1379–1389, 1968.
- Seneviratne, S. I., Zhang, X., Adnan, M., Badi, W., Dereczynski, C., Luca, A. D., Ghosh, S., Iskandar, I., Kossin, J., Lewis, S., et al.: Weather and climate extreme events in a changing climate, *Climate change 2021: The physical science basis: Working group I contribution to the sixth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change*, pp. 1513–1766, 2021.
- 545 Silversmith, W.: CC3D: Connected components on multilabel 3D images, <https://pypi.org/project/connected-components-3d/>, accessed: 2025-06-06, 2021.
- Theil, H.: A rank-invariant method of linear and polynomial regression analysis, *Indagationes mathematicae*, 12, 173, 1950.
- Tilloy, A., Malamud, B., and Joly-Laugel, A.: A methodology for the spatiotemporal identification of compound hazards: Wind and precipitation extremes in Great Britain (1979–2019), *Earth System Dynamics Discussions*, 2021, 1–45, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-13-993-2022>, 2021.
- 550 Toreti, A., Bavera, D., Acosta Navarro, J., Cammalleri, C., De Jager, A., Di Ciollo, C., Hrašt Essenfelder, A., Maetens, W., Magni, D., Masante, D., Mazzeschi, M., Niemeyer, S., and Spinoni, J.: Drought in Europe August 2022, Tech. Rep. EUR 31192 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, ISBN 978-92-76-55855-2, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2760/264241>, jRC130493, 2022.
- 555 Tripathy, K. P. and Mishra, A. K.: How unusual is the 2022 European compound drought and heatwave event?, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 50, e2023GL105453, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GL105453>, 2023.

- UNDRR: The Sendai Framework Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction. "Disaster"., <https://www.undrr.org/terminology/disaster>, accessed: 2024-11-13, 2017.
- Van Loon, A. F.: Hydrological drought explained, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water*, 2, 359–392, 2015.
- 560 Van Oldenborgh, G. J., Mitchell-Larson, E., Vecchi, G. A., De Vries, H., Vautard, R., and Otto, F.: Cold waves are getting milder in the northern midlatitudes, *Environmental Research Letters*, 14, 114 004, 2019.
- Vezzoli, R., Mercogliano, P., and Pecora, S.: A brief introduction to the concept of return period for univariate variables, *CMCC Research Paper*, 2012.
- Vicente-Serrano, S. M., Beguería, S., and López-Moreno, J. I.: A multiscalar drought index sensitive to global warming: the standardized precipitation evapotranspiration index, *Journal of climate*, 23, 1696–1718, 2010.
- 565 Vikhamar-Schuler, D., Isaksen, K., Haugen, J. E., Tømmervik, H., Luks, B., Schuler, T. V., and Bjerke, J. W.: Changes in winter warming events in the Nordic Arctic Region, *Journal of climate*, 29, 6223–6244, 2016.
- Volosciuk, C., Maraun, D., Semenov, V. A., Tilinina, N., Gulev, S. K., and Latif, M.: Rising Mediterranean sea surface temperatures amplify extreme summer precipitation in central Europe, *Scientific reports*, 6, 32 450, 2016.
- 570 Zeder, J. and Fischer, E. M.: Observed extreme precipitation trends and scaling in Central Europe, *Weather and Climate Extremes*, 29, 100 266, 2020.
- Zhang, X., Alexander, L., Hegerl, G. C., Jones, P., Tank, A. K., Peterson, T. C., Trewin, B., and Zwiers, F. W.: Indices for monitoring changes in extremes based on daily temperature and precipitation data, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 2, 851–870, 2011.
- Zscheischler, J., Martius, O., Westra, S., Bevacqua, E., Raymond, C., Horton, R. M., van den Hurk, B., AghaKouchak, A., Jézéquel, A., Mahecha, M. D., et al.: A typology of compound weather and climate events, *Nature reviews earth & environment*, 1, 333–347, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-0060-z>, 2020.
- 575