

Notes on changes indicated in the response but not made in the manuscript

The responses to reviewers were not always reflected by the actual changes (or lack thereof) made in the revised manuscript. It seems that the additional text, as presented in the response document, was further edited in the manuscript, making it difficult to reconcile in some instances. Please ensure that these documents are consistent.

Inconsistencies that need attention (line numbers are from the response document):

- Lines 57-59. The text 'EMAC contains no dynamic vegetation model...' does not appear in the revised manuscript.
- Lines 114-117. These three sentences do not appear in the revised manuscript. This is especially important to address because it appears to be the only place where Figure 7 is cited.

Other technical corrections that should be made

Line 2. "Thus, their opening..." does not follow very well the previous sentence. Suggest "Leaf stomata are the conduit of transpiration, and their opening..."

Lines 14. Delete "but"?

Line 19 surfaces

Line 21. "with 60-75%" makes no sense here. Do you mean transpiration makes up 60-75% of ET?

Line 23. ET is already defined. Do you mean to define TE? Only do this if you continue to use the term throughout the paper.

Lines 24-25 and 28-29. There is too much duplication between these.

Line 99. What about non-water-stressed plants?

Line 158. VERTEX is not mentioned in Section 2.1.2.

Line 183. What is the reference (saf, 2018)?

Line 199. Priestly should be spelled "Priestley".

Line 251. "photosyntetic" – mis-spelt.

Line 310. "This is here also shown here...". Please correct.

Figure 7. This is not referenced in the text, although it was proposed to be in the reviewer response document.

Line 386 "... has a two effects ..." - delete "a"

Line 390. "... plant transpiration of plants ..." – please resolve duplication of "plant/s"

Lines 394-5. I'm sure that 2 m temperature does not double, especially in K units! Please revise.