Reviewer #3: This is very interesting paper. If his claim is proven to be true, the issue of climate scenarios' uncertainty raised in this paper will resound in so many science communities which rely on the reliability of long-term climate prediction outputs. The claim that errors due to cloud bias are propagating should be important in quantifying the accuracy (not precision) of climate prediction. In my opinion, despite the claim that very large uncertainty is inherent in model predictions for 2100 is very striking, it sounds fairly reasonable like what is always required in physical science. Thus I think that this paper needs to be published in the end.

There are some important questions to make sure that the claim of this paper is correct. The forcing error due to cloud bias may be damped by Stefan-Boltzmann feedback that may be intrinsic in current climate models. The perturbed surface temperatures at time i due to cloud bias will be partly restored at time i+1 by the release of energy proportional to the surface temperature change since the climate system should follow Stefan-Boltzmann law. That is, the warmer surface temperature by 1°C would naturally cause more emission of thermal flux from the surface by approximately 3.7 W m-2 to space, reducing the system's internal energy and naturally restoring the surface temperature back to the initial state when unperturbed. There is an issue of restoration time depending on climate sensitivity and heat capacity, but in any event, restoration of perturbed temperatures by climate forcings is indeed the basic characteristic of nature. I presume that the cloud forcing bias per se may be amplified, but the temperature responses to that cloud forcing may not be amplified due to this climate system characteristic, making modeled projections not to be scattered as much as this paper has estimated. Please discuss this possibility somewhere. In addition, cloud fraction bias is not all, leading to error of ±4 W/m2 of cloud forcing. Models have many different substances such as sea ice/snow, vegetation, cloud properties, and precipitation, etc. all of which also act to add error, or compensate error. Then even so, why are model-projected temperatures not too variant in the year of 2100 in Figure 4. I hope that the author can properly reflect my concerns in the manuscript, so readers can be confident with the claim of this study.