

I agree with the authors and the reviewers, that the manuscript addresses an important topic: estimation of soil erosion rates in a large scale. As acknowledged by all, this task will lead to a number of methodological challenges.

The authors try to address those challenges by applying a spline-based interpolation technique, using different levels of additional external information, such as land use, rainfall, soil characteristics.

I feel that this can be a valuable approach in addressing the challenge of large scale erosion (maps). However, I think the authors do not show (enough) how superior their method is, compared to other techniques. Therefore, I suggest that the authors try to work along the remarks of the reviewers. I also agree with rev. #2 that one should compare with other independent soil erosion values, see also below.

In addition, I think that information about the values and the spatial distribution (maps) of the additional information (land use, rainfall, soil characteristics, topography) should be displayed. This needs to be given in the same spatial detail as the interpolation method uses this information.

I also wonder if the authors can give a measured/observed value of a lumped total erosion rate in a meso-scale region over some years (e.g. soil deposits in a reservoir) and compare such value(s) with their estimates. This would be particularly helpful to get more confidence into the very high erosion rates in the forest.

Other comment: Please do not display internationally disputed borders, as you do in your Fig. 1a, page 12, in your "AC1: Final response to the comments from two referees". This is not acceptable for publication in a final version.