

To L. Malatesta

The final version of the manuscript addresses all my comments and is ready for publication. I noted a few extra small issues in the text that I paste below. I am glad that the other reviewer could cover the analytical part that lied beyond my expertise.

I look forward to this method being applied to more sites in the future!

Thank you for your last reading and overall support of our work. We did all the corrections suggested except at l 179, where it sounded odd to us.

To Klaus Wilcken

I have made few comments regarding the language to the attached file. These arise often from the impression the used sentence structure leaves to the reader and occasionally are unnecessarily confrontational.

Thank you for these useful suggestions, we reworded the text according to them.

Please consider errors when discussion results. For example, erosion rates for VERM1 and VERM3 can be argued to be indistinguishable as they overlap within 1 sigma due to large errors. This is of course unfortunate and limits the geological interpretation of the results but is not detriment for this manuscript where the focus is on the new methodology.

We reworded the corresponding sentences according to Klaus Wilcken's suggestion, in particular by using more conditional about the differences between erosion rates.

Please clarify/expand on the possible bias due to temporal changes in "catchment". It appears clear on the schematic Fig. 1(a) that one colluvium wedge will correspond to a well-defined catchment above. However, this might not be the case if the cliff is relatively straight, and/or the size of the catchment might change as the erosion of the cliff progresses. However, it seems the authors have considered this and adopted sampling strategy where several colluvium wedges are sampled and combining them to average out this possible bias. I believe the manuscript can be improved here by (1) including a more direct upfront discussion about this, and (2) update the Fig 1 (a) schematic to reflect the adopted sampling strategy.

Klaus Wilcken is perfectly right, some of the samples correspond to relatively straight cliff. In that case we apply the same strategy: we walked along an about 50m-long transect and collected sand at about 5 to 10 points and then mixed them to reach about 1kg. The production rate is defined by the polygon limited by the 50m transect and the top and foot of the cliff. This is illustrated in the supplementary information. About the sample weight, if we had to redo the sampling, we would take rather 2 or 3 kg instead of 1 kg because this is the low quartz content that is responsible for our large analytical uncertainties of our ^{10}Be concentrations.

Use consistent units, currently [yr] and [a] are used interchangeably. Use one or the other.

OK.