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Please note that the world country boundaries in Figs. 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, and S3 in the published paper were inconsistent with those used for the statistical analysis of cropping intensity values at the national level. We have revised those figures by updating the world country boundary lines to make them consistent throughout the article. We kindly suggest checking these corrections when reading our paper. The corrected version of Fig. S3 can be found in the Supplement.
Figure 1. Spatial distribution of the land cover and cropland layer products used for the global 30 m cropland extent generation.

Figure 5. Global uncertainty map of GCI30 during 2016–2018, where regions in red represent higher uncertainty, and those in blue represent lower uncertainty.
Figure 6. Geographical distribution of global CI types during 2016 to 2018 identified by GCI30. The area statistics along latitude and longitude are derived with an interval of 5°. The area unit is $1 \times 10^6$ km$^2$.

Figure 8. Average and standard deviation (SD) of TNCC during 2016 to 2018 at the national and AEZ levels.
Figure 9. Statistics of annual CI differences at national level between GCI30 and four existing products. GCI30 $-$ MCD12Q2 represents the differences between GCI30 and the “NumCycles” layer of MCD12Q2; GCI30 $-$ VIP4 represents the differences between GCI30 and the “Number of Seasons” layer of VIP4; GCI30 $-$ R&F represents the differences between GCI30 and harvest frequency by Ray and Foley (2013); GCI30 $-$ SACRA represents the differences between GCI30 and CI by Kotsuki and Tanaka (2015).