

General Comments

The authors' revisions represent a significant amount of work and address all of the major shortcomings of the previous version of the manuscript. The authors have addressed all important points I made and concerns I had well. Most notably, the focus of this manuscript is now clearer than before thanks to changes in text and title. (I think the change in title now better reflects the focus of the study and will catch the eyes especially the geomorphology and LEM community, which will likely benefit from this work the most.) Moreover, the authors addressed the noted lack of example-based comparisons to similar models. This is now addressed also by example presented in the new Fig. 5 – this is an important addition in my opinion, since it demonstrates by example some key differences between the LFPM and the commonly used SB model. Furthermore, the discussion was enhanced with a section on limitations and perspectives, which I believe will enhance the study's usefulness (and ensures a responsible and more informed use of the LFPM model).

Technical/Specific Comments and Suggestions

Line 95: Change to “It was adopted [...]”

Line 171: This seems identical to eq 14-15 in the previous version of the manuscript (see my previous comments on L135-144 in the first review) except written on one line. Please double check.

Fig 5: Add the dashed line (ramp “topography” to the legend).

Best wishes
Sebastian Mutz