

Many thanks to the reviewers for their second round of feedback. We have made an additional change to the manuscript based on this, detailed here along with changes in response to editor comments.

- SSP realism. While this point in the paper is referring to another paper which discusses this point, we agree that it is best to highlight SSP5 here as reviewer 3 suggests, due to the specific expected role of climate impacts here. We have therefore removed the mentions of other scenarios in this sentence.
- General non-FRIDA readers. While we agree with the usefulness of drawing in readers interested in climate damage functions more broadly, we feel the edits made to address this point made usefully by the reviewers in the first revision round are sufficient for our intended purposes. On this point we agree with the editor on the usefulness of GMD as a home for documentation-specific papers, which we have tried to balance with a wider relevance.

Additionally, regarding two points raised by the editor:

- Code and Data Availability. We have created an umbrella Zenodo to connect to the 6 Zenodo records needed here, and have referred to this in this section now.
- References not accepted at this stage. We have updated the references where previous preprints have now been accepted; all cited papers now have DOIs and cite the most recent version.

Finally, regrettably one contributor to this work was missed from the author list in the previous version, though they contributed to the modelling work and manuscript review. We have corrected this here.