I am surprised that authors get back after long time. Authors have taken into account my comments but there are still some issues to resolve. I would propose a major revision as I have seen the comments from the other reviewer.

Major issues:

- Authors did not convince both reviewers that it is better to use their proposal instead of applying an USLE with the available resolution of input data.
- The erosion rates in forest lands are very extreme and not justified. This can be connected to the erroneous outputs from NDVI calculations (I am very concerned about the NDVI. This is also confirmed by the difference with the study of Guo.
- The whole issue with LS factor and how authors present it. Previous studies in European LS-factor and the study of Borrelli in soil erosion in Italy demonstrated that the finer the resolution, the best are the LS-factor estimates and soil erosion model outputs. I do not agree with the what authors state in P12L13-14. The same confusion is created in P17L20-23. In the past studies in Europe it was shown that the finer the resolution, the best representation of the topography and then the more accurate the estimate of LS-factor and erosion rates.
- Table 1: quite confusion. What are the numbers in the row below the land uses? Moreover model numbers are missing in this table
- The low importance given in the model approach for R-factor is preoccupying.
- General comment about the methodology: Interpolating the soil erosion modelled point estimates is less appropriate than the application of model using input layers. Authors do not make clear statements of this and readers may be confused in making interpolation of erosion points even if they have the input layers. This point should be better addressed.

Some other issues:

- P2L15-15: The 2 sentences on water & wind erosion are repetitive
- P2L20. I don't agree with this sentence. It maybe that land use is improved and the soil erosion risk decreased.
- P3L3. Experts have always expertise
- P3L29: "seamless" is not appropriate.
- P5L3-5: The sentence is confusing
- P6L25L : for first time you present the factors R, K, L, S….B, E: and the reader does not know what those factors are. In the next page you describe them…but there should be a logical sequence.
- Eq (1): What is uk? Describe below..
- P7L27: soil families are not a good term
- Equation 2: What is q?
- What are the measurement units of factors in equation 2?
- L10P17: What is f(,)
- Tabl3e 5: What not provide the total soil loss and discuss on the comparison of soil loss with sediment loss?