

Dear Dr. Schmidt et al.,

as requested, I had sent out the paper to Reviewer Erica Erlanger, but she declined the invitation. However, Claire Lukens had another look at the paper and she was highly satisfied with the changes.

As for myself, I have the following suggestions to you (below). I will accept the paper now, but please don't forget to incorporate these suggestions during the proof stage. Thank you. Overall, I agree with Dr. Lukens that the paper is now much improved over the previous version and I really appreciate your efforts!

With best regards, Hella

Line 29 Awkward wording. Perhaps rephrase to "in this environment, landscape-scale mass loss..."

Line 158 Typo "Blanckenburg" (here and elsewhere)

Line 280: Please indicate in the Table that for samples that have low Al/Be ratios, the rates of erosion are overestimates and should not be taken for true values. Some of the column headers are not conclusive.

Line 294 Please insert "weakly" before "positively correlated".

Line 323: include the year after Linari et al.

Line 350: now here is the place to state that in non-tropical catchments, chemical weathering rates from dissolved loads are often much lower than the rates obtained from cosmogenic nuclides, and briefly discuss integration time scale differences

Line 385 "longer"- relative to what? E.g. provide time frame.

Line 450ff.: I am a bit unsatisfied with the fact that the integration time scale difference between these methods is nowhere discussed before summing them up. Please include a short paragraph.