During the final proofreading we found a few small discrepancies between the numerical values given in the text and the figures that they refer to. None of the suggested changes alter the conclusions of the manuscript in any way, but they would make the manuscript more coherent and readable. Below a list of remarks together with the suggested changes:

1. TS1 (page 11, lines 9 – 11):  
   The numerical values in the text refer to an outdated version of Figure 6c that was updated during the writing process already before the review process. The discrepancy is obvious when comparing the values to the figure and would have confused the alert reader, but the relative changes in the values do not change much and do not change the conclusions of the paper. We therefore suggest changing the values as follows:
   * 3.5 ± 3.3% 🡪 4.0 ± 1.2%
   * 3.7x1010 🡪 4.1x1010
   * 3.6x1010 🡪 3.9x1010
   * 12.9 ± 2.9% 🡪 5.8 ± 1.2%
2. TS2 (page 11, line 65):  
   The text refers to the numerical value of the CLE scenario for 2050 in Figure 6d. Due to a read-out error in the data sheet the value actually given in the text is for the GLOB scenario for 2050. We therefore suggest changing the value as:
   * 0.29 W m-2 🡪 0.17 W m-2
3. TS3 (page 14, lines 42 – 43):  
   The text refers to Figure 7h. These numbers are only order of magnitude values, but from the figure it is quite clear that the uncertainty range is larger than stated (1.0 W m-2) instead of (0.5 W m-2). Furthermore, due to a typo, we say that at this place that the difference between scenarios is about 0.4 W m-2, while earlier in the text we say 0.5 W m-2. To be more consistent within the text, we suggest to also change this number. We therefore suggest changing the values as follows:
   * 0.4 W m-2 🡪 0.5 W m-2
   * 0.5 W m-2 🡪 1.0 W m-2