Response to the Editor's comments (in red):

Comments to the author:
The authors have prepared an excellent paper and have accounted for almost all reviewer comments and where they have not, they had good arguments. The manuscript is well structured and written and in principle ready for publication. Thank you very much for your comments. We will follow your suggestions and will revise the manuscript accordingly. See our detailed answers below.

There are, however, some (minor) technical issues in the figures and tables, which should be looked at. The readability of some figures could be improved, and the display of similarly structured figures could be homogenized. In some table captions, information is missing. See the detailed cases below.

Figures:
Figures 5, 6, 11: As done in other figures with panels organized logically in rows and columns, it would be good to indicate variables for rows and columns already in the plots, as done e.g. exemplarily in Figure 12, 21a, 23, 24. This increases the initial readability of the figures very much, if the (abbreviated) variable text is not too long. This also refers to Fig. 17, 18, 19.
Figure 13: Delete "SST trend" from panels because all panels show the same.
Figure 14: same
Done. See the revised version.

I assume the resolution of the final submitted figures will be better than in this pdf. Yes, the final versions will have higher resolution.

Tables:
Table 2: Projections for which period? We added the historical and future periods.
Table 5: Should´t this table be at the end? We followed the rule that the numbering of figures and tables follow the first mentioning in the text. The editorial office may comment.
Table 7: Changes for which period? We added the historical and future periods.
Line 1177: The correct url is: https://baltic.earth Corrected.

For clarity and correctness minor language changes were performed in lines 539, 581, 591, 645, 651, 678, 701 and 841.

Markus Meier

On behalf of the co-authors