

I have some minor comments that mainly encompass typos (see attached document). Please correct those, but I don't need to see the manuscript again.

(pasted here for reference)-

Thank you for addressing my comments. Some short comments below, that are mainly technical.

Thank you for the constructive and helpful feedback on our manuscript.

Lines 15-17: Please correct typos and messed up text fragments.

We have made this correction.

Line 22: Same here.

We have made this correction.

Line 36/37: Would change to something like: “Prior to its deposition on Earth’s surface by precipitation or dry fallout, ^{10}Be resides in the stratosphere and in the troposphere due to atmospheric circulation for 2 years and 55 days, respectively”.

We have edited this sentence (and the following sentence) based on this comment.

Line 40: “.. the solid phase at approximately...?”

We have made this edit.

Line 57: The citation of von Blanckenburg et al., 2014 refers to weathering rates measured from marine sediments. I would not cite this here, as you are referring to watershed-scale rates.

We replace the citation with: Wittmann, H., von Blanckenburg, F., Dannhaus, N., Bouchez, J., Gaillardet, J., Guyot, J.L., Maurice, L., Roig, H., Filizola, N. and Christl, M., 2015. A test of the cosmogenic ^{10}Be (meteoric)/ ^9Be proxy for simultaneously determining basin-wide

erosion rates, denudation rates, and the degree of weathering in the Amazon basin. Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 120(12), pp.2498-2528.

Lines 211: ..desorption losses “according to Clow et al., 2020:” ?

We have made this edit.

Line 268 (heading” Would suggest to change it to ”Comparing inventory-based fluxes against...”.

We have made this edit.

Line 296: Correct to CaCl₂.

We have made this correction.

Line 460: factor of 12? Is this the full range in variability?

We have edited this sentence so it is more explicit: “. For example, the highest GCM-based flux prediction is 7–13 times greater than the lowest erosion and desorption-corrected flux inferred for the Washington gulch South site, but our watershed-average predictions only differ from GCM-based predictions by a factor of 1.0 to 1.9.”

Table 2: Sure that the ¹⁰Be concentration given is in “1000” (10³) atoms/g? Let ´s also reduce the precision of the numbers in the last two columns (e.g. change to 578x10³ atoms/g). In the text, you call it “atom”.

Yes – the concentrations are on the order of 10⁸ atoms per gram. We have changed the units in the table to 10⁶ atoms per gram, which reduces the reported precision. We were inconsistent in our use of “atom” and “atoms” and now use “atoms” in the text and tables.

Fig. 4, superscript Meteoric“¹⁰Be flux in y-axis

We have made this correction.

Fig. 7, The IC flux “origin” in SWE appears twice. Is one of them supposed to be the “standard”?

We have made this correction.

We have also made several additional changes to correct other minor editorial mistakes.