Climate Dynamics manuscript No. (will be inserted by the editor)

- <sup>1</sup> Supplementary Material: Contrasting lightning projection
- <sup>2</sup> using the lightning potential index adapted in a
- <sup>3</sup> convection-permitting regional climate model
- 4 Erwan Brisson · Ulrich Blahak · Philippe
- 5 Lucas-Picher · Christopher Purr · Bodo
- 6 Ahrens
- 7 the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later
- 8 This document encompasses two figures. These figures are not necessary to
- <sup>9</sup> understand the analyses described in this study but provide additional information
- 10 to the reader.

- Goethe University Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany Centre National de Recherche Meteorologique, CNRS, Toulouse, France E-mail: erwan.brisson@gmail.com P. Lucas-Picher
- Centre National de Recherche Meteorologique, CNRS, Toulouse, France
- U. Blahak

Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD), Offenbach, Germany

B. Ahrens

Goethe University Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany

C. Purr

Goethe University Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany

E. Brisson



Fig. S1: Latitudinal average of daily flash rate for the EC-Earth historical driven simulation (solid green line) and the EC-Earth RCP8.5 driven simulation (purple dashed line). The output of the LPI parameterization is shown in the left column, significant difference between the two simulations at the 5% level.



Fig. S2: The dependency of the mean daily flash rate on daily mean temperature for the EC-Earth historical driven simulation (green) and the EC-Earth RCP8.5 driven simulation (purple). The rugs at the bottom and the top of the plots show the occurrence of a given temperature for the corresponding simulations. Flash rates are binned to temperature values (i.e., one point per 1 K). These values are plotted for both the LPI (left column) and the CAPE×PREC (right column) parameterizations and for all the day values on the top, Morning values (from 0:00 UTC to 11:00 UTC) on the second row, and Afternoon values (from 12:00 UTC to 23:00 UTC) on the bottom. Stars indicate a significant difference between the two simulations at the 5% level. This significance is only indicated for points for which the sample size exceeds 100 days.