

Dear Dr. Schmidt et al.,

I have now received two reviews and your correspondence to your paper “Cosmogenic nuclide and solute flux data from central Cuba emphasize the importance of both physical and chemical denudation in highly weathered landscapes”.

Reviewer #1 suggests that revisions are minor with tendencies to moderate revisions, while reviewer #2 suggest major revisions. My own tendency goes into the same direction as Reviewer #1, such that I will decide after seeing the revised (track-changed) manuscript if another round of reviews will be necessary.

Common issues that both reviewers point out relate to confusing terminology, and calculation of weathering rates from dissolved load measurements. I think the authors received here good suggestions on how to improve the paper, and the associated changes are probably more towards moderate than actually “major” in terms of scientific changes.

I also have issues with summing up “sediment generation rates” and rock dissolution rates, as these two approaches do cover very different temporal scales. I am also a bit intrigued by the fact that you seem to observe highest rock dissolution rates but lowest cosmo rates for sedimentary rocks. I would have expected high dissolution rates for the volcanic and carbonate-bearing rocks instead, and would suggest that you discuss reasons for this in more detail, one of them potentially including a bias from using quartz-based nuclides in rocks where quartz is of minor abundance. I understand that taking these lithologies apart is very difficult, because of restricted field access, but perhaps the approach suggested by Reviewer #1 on Ca and Na partitioning might help here. However, you mention several times in the MS that lithologic control is very important in this landscape- hence, giving more information about the different rock types is essential for me.

All the best, Hella Wittmann-Oelze