Author Correction: Emission budgets and pathways consistent with limiting warming to 1.5 °C

Richard J. Millar, Jan S. Fuglestad, Pierre Friedlingstein, Joeri Rogelj, Michael J. Grubb, H. Damon Matthews, Ragnhild B. Skeie, Piers M. Forster, David J. Frame and Myles R. Allen

Correction to: *Nature Geoscience* <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo3031>, published online 18 September 2017.

In the version of this Article originally published, a coding error resulted in the erroneous inclusion of a subset of RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 simulations in the sets used for RCP2.6 and RCP6, respectively, leading to an incorrect depiction of the data of the latter two sets in Fig. 1b and RCP2.6 in Table 2. This coding error has now been corrected. The graphic and quantitative changes in the corrected Fig. 1b and Table 2 are contrasted with the originally published display items below. The core conclusions of the paper are not affected, but some numerical values and statements have also been updated as a result; these are listed below. All these errors have now been corrected in the online versions of this Article.

Corrected statements.

Statement 1 (section: Abstract)

Original:

“... Earth system model members of the CMIP5 ensemble with no mitigation of other climate drivers, increasing to 240 GtC with ambitious non-CO₂ mitigation.”

Corrected:

“... Earth system model members of the CMIP5 ensemble with no mitigation of other climate drivers.”

Statement 2 (section: Carbon budgets and scenarios for ambitious climate goals)

Original:

“This allows more CO₂-induced warming for the same total, increasing the median TEB of the CMIP5 distribution for an additional 0.6 °C to 303 GtC and the 66th percentile to 242 GtC.”

Corrected:

“This should allow more CO₂-induced warming for the same total. However, due to the smaller subset of available models in the RCP2.6 scenario, it is not possible to identify any robust shifts in the percentiles of the TEB distribution from the RCP8.5 scenario.”

Statement 3 (section: Adaptive mitigation and carbon budgets)

Original:

“...in good agreement with the 242 GtC TEB for the 66th percentile of the CMIP5 distribution for 0.6 °C warming above the 2010–2019 average in the RCP2.6 scenario (Table 2).”

Corrected:

“...about 25% higher than the 204 GtC TEB for the 66th percentile of the CMIP5 distribution for 0.6 °C warming above the 2010–2019 average in the RCP8.5 scenario (Table 1).”

Fig. 1b | Original and corrected panels.

Table 2 | The original and corrected values of Table 2 in the originally published Article. Future cumulative budgets (GtC) from January 2015 for percentiles of the distribution of RCP2.6 simulations of CMIP5 models and various levels of future warming above the modelled 2010–2019 average.

Warming above		Percentiles of CMIP5 models			
2010–2019 average	90%	66%	50%	33%	10%
(°C)					
(a) Original					
0.3	89	106	118	133	245
0.4	106	152	173	193	NA
0.5	126	191	214	258	NA
0.6	143	242	303	NA	NA
0.7	170	291	NA	NA	NA
0.8	177	372	NA	NA	NA
0.9	277	NA	NA	NA	NA
1.0	468	NA	NA	NA	NA
1.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
(b) Corrected					
0.3	88	104	123	127	273
0.4	106	152	162	206	NA
0.5	126	171	194	247	NA
0.6	143	196	352	NA	NA
0.7	160	224	NA	NA	NA
0.8	178	280	NA	NA	NA
0.9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Published online: 14 May 2018

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-018-0153-1>