to-do

# 05.02.2021

* word count too high (limit is 4000 words) (DONE)
* demand-side (go to Creutzig paper for suggestion on wording here) (DONE)
* more recent European energy and co2eq footprint estimate (DONE)
* ‘weighted’ problem - need to explain that it is ‘population weighted’, explain once in the methods section? (DONE)
* better explanation of deciles
* finalize aggregate sector names (DONE)
* line 222 - note on limits of deciles. Discussion on limitations of the deciles…short one in methods section then natural language in its place in the ms? Definitely need to fully discuss in SI limitations section
* subsidies: discuss in limitations? can we find some external stuff on this?
* consumption basket note (remove - but save somewhere) (DONE)
* CBAM - remove last part …, ‘..depending..’ and citation above beside ‘carbon border adjustment mechanism’ (DONE)
* new IEA scenario - if it exists, include it
* better discussion on scenarios: where to pick up CCS?
* severe material deprivation: Helga reworks sentence (DONE)
* ‘I struggle…’ note the confusion (remove?) (DONE)
* on the empirical results from our study year (2015): use imperfect not present
* fig.1: D01-D10 (not Q01-Q10) (intensities figures too) (DONE)
* fig. 2: 1) a,b,c sequence, 2) legend discrete, not continuous, 3) move facet titles to x-axes
* fig. 3: all labels (DONE)
* table 1: subheading: demand-scenarios, supply-scenarios - start with supply side and have GJ declining from first row (DONE) - GEA-efficiency correct type?
* fig. 4: all labels (DONE)
* fig. 5: 1) ridgelines with numbers inside, 2) create 2 versions we can look at and decide on, 3) show more scenarios in the SI version of the figure?

# 10.02.2021

* better explanation of supply-side scenarios - how are energy savings achieved…through efficiency improvements? demand reductions?
* one crazy assumption from Julia & LED (in conclusions) (check both - maybe keep living space assumption)
* ask Paul on his conclusion references