

Manuscript EGU sphere-2022-1512 - revised version

Long-term monitoring (1953-2019) of geomorphologically active sections of Little Ice Age lateral moraines in the context of changing meteorological conditions

by Altmann et al.

General comments:

The current manuscript I was invited to review constitutes the revised version of a preprint submitted to ESurf I reviewed myself some time ago. As usual in such cases, I revisited my initial review and primarily focused how the authors addressed it, either by making changes in the manuscript in response to my comments and recommendations or by explaining and elaborating why they disagree with my suggestions and did not or only partly follow them. Additionally, I also had a brief check on the initial comments of the second reviewer to get an overall impression on the quality of the revision performed by the authors.

At first, I am very satisfied that the authors followed my suggestion and in their improved version of the manuscript avoid the excessive use of acronyms and abbreviations initially criticised. The manuscript now reads much more fluently and is much more easy to follow, in particular for readers not familiar with the topic. The authors also followed almost all those other minor technical issues I commented on in my review. Language and structure of the manuscript are now on the level required for final acceptance.

Alongside these technical issues I initially recommend that the authors should extend the discussion chapter by exploring some of their most interesting findings, for example that their investigated active gully systems still are active and show, despite a decrease of sediment yield in most cases, no stabilisation. Another points I suggested to discuss in more detail were the 'sediment activity concept' and a potential future impact of an increase in frequency or magnitude of heavy-precipitation events among the 'meteorological drivers'.

Although the authors did not entirely agree with my suggestions and only partly made some additions in response to them, they explained their reasoning in a convincing fashion and I fully accept their intentions in the context of the submitted manuscript. Because my recommendation to extend the discussion should not have understood as necessary amendment or 'flaw' impacting the scientific quality of the study, also under this aspect the manuscript is now in a form acceptable for publication.

My recommendation is now to accept the revised version for publication.