

*General comments:*

1. As already mentioned by referee 1 the objectives of the manuscript need to be formulated. It should also be made clear what is new in this manuscript compared to the older manuscripts of the author, so that one can understand why the manuscript is “worth” to be published as a “Short communication”.
2. It should be made clearer for which purposes the method might be used in the future including references to some recent literature, where this method might be helpful. In lines 309-310 the author states that the method “...provides a qualitative rather than quantitative assessment of the susceptibility of the eroding surfaces...”. To me it is not clear how this qualitative method (ranking of soil erodibility) can help in calculations of carbon mobilization or chemical pollutants (Line 313-314) mentioned by the author.
3. In general, the manuscript is clearly written. However, in several passages one single sentence extends over more than three lines. Please separate these sentences into several ones to improve understanding, e.g. lines 37-41, 286-290, 336-339, 339-343 and possibly more passages.
4. The derivation of equation 5 is not clear, in line 188 I guess equation 2 is meant instead of equation 1?
5. Line 235ff: I recommend making an overview table that shows the important parameters of the experiments and their variations.