Paper	Citation
Adams et al. 2017	This paper details the LANDLAB v1.0 OverlandFlow component. "By default, m_{sp} and n_{sp} have set values of m_{sp} = 0.5 and n_{sp} = 1.0 that can be adjusted by the model user."
Braun and Willett, 2013	Basis for the FastScape fluvial geomorphic model. The authors used m/n = 0.5 for their sample solution. However, the authors do explore the effect of the value n from 1.0 to 4.0 on the computational time needed to solve their implicit scheme.
Egholm et al., 2013	m/n = 0.5; however, there is unlikely to be scale invariance because their stream power incision model is more complex than the one we analyze. They employ a term that protects the bed from incision due to an alluvial cover.
Fox et al. 2014	This paper presents an inversion method for backing out paleorock uplift rates in Taiwan. The analysis uses the ratio m/n = 0.5.
Goren et al., 2014	*Table 1* lists the default values where m = 0.5 and n = 1.0. Also uses h = 2.0, which means hm/n = 1.0. This paper is the basis for the DAC model.
Harel et al., 2016	m/n = 0.51 +/- 0.14 from a global analysis. This value is not statistically significant from 0.5.
Hobley et al., 2017	This paper details LANDLAB. "This is primarily to maintain dimensionally sensible units for K while still honoring the widely observed ratio of m/n ~ 0.5, interpreted from channel concavities of natural rivers at apparent topographic steady state."
Passalacqua et al., 2006	*Equation 2* shows a "special case of the general governing equation, widely used in landscape modeling [*e.g. Rodriguez-Iturbe and Rinaldo*, 1997] with $m/n \approx 0.5$."
Pelletier, 2004	Uses the value m/n = 0.5 to explore landscape evolution models with persistent drainage migration.
Willet et al., 2014	In their **Response of χ to a Change in Drainage Area** section, they "assume that h = 2 and m/n = 0.5." The sample simulations using the DAC model uses m = 0.5 and n = 1.0. They also fit various values of m/n when regressing chi vs. elevation plots in real drainage basins.
Whipple and Tucker, 1999	"For typical values of the exponent…" in empirical relations they cite in their paper, "...the m/n ratio is predicted to fall into a narrow range near 0.5." This paper is widely cited when choosing an appropriate value of m/n. They state the range is between 0.3 and 0.6, near 0.5.
Whipple et al. 2017	In this recent paper, the authors investigate whether low-relief, high-elevation surfaces are formed by preservation of relic landscapes or stream piracy, applied to the Tibetan Plateau. Their sample simulations are conducted with the stream power incision model with m/n = 0.5
Whipple et al. 2017	This paper compares response timescales for divide migration and drainage capture. In all cases of their analysis, m/n = 0.5.
Yang et al. 2015	Their DAC 2D simulations used n = 1 and m = 0.5, but they used different values of m/n for their χ profiles. They test a variety of m/n values, but end up using m/n = 0.45. This paper also investigates the morphology of the Tibetan Plateau as does Whipple et al. 2017.

Adams, J. M., Gasparini, N. M., Hobley, D. E. J., Tucker, G. E., Hutton, E. W. H., Nudurupati, S. S. and Istanbulluoglu, E.: The Landlab v1.0 OverlandFlow component: a Python tool for computing shallow-water flow across watersheds, Geoscientific Model Development, 10(4), 1645–1663, doi:10.5194/gmd-10-1645-2017, 2017.

Braun, J. and Willett, S. D.: A very efficient O(n), implicit and parallel method to solve the stream power equation governing fluvial incision and landscape evolution, Geomorphology, 180–181, 170–179, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.10.008, 2013.

Egholm, D. L., Knudsen, M. F. and Sandiford, M.: Lifespan of mountain ranges scaled by feedbacks between landsliding and erosion by rivers, Nature, 498(7455), 475–478, doi:10.1038/nature12218, 2013.

Fox, M., Goren, L., May, D. A. and Willett, S. D.: Inversion of fluvial channels for paleorock uplift rates in Taiwan, Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 119(9), 1853–1875, doi:10.1002/2014JF003196, 2014.

Goren, L., Willett, S. D., Herman, F. and Braun, J.: Coupled numerical-analytical approach to landscape evolution modeling, Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, 39(4), 522–545, doi:10.1002/esp.3514, 2014a.

Harel, M.-A., Mudd, S. M. and Attal, M.: Global analysis of the stream power law parameters based on worldwide 10 Be denudation rates, Geomorphology, 268, 184–196, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2016.05.035, 2016.

Hobley, D. E. J., Adams, J. M., Nudurupati, S. S., Hutton, E. W. H., Gasparini, N. M., Istanbulluoglu, E. and Tucker, G. E.: Creative computing with Landlab: an open-source toolkit for building, coupling, and exploring two-dimensional numerical models of Earth-surface dynamics, Earth Surface Dynamics, 5(1), 21–46, doi:10.5194/esurf-5-21-2017, 2017.

Passalacqua, P., Porté-Agel, F., Foufoula-Georgiou, E. and Paola, C.: Application of dynamic subgrid-scale concepts from large-eddy simulation to modeling landscape evolution, Water Resources Research, 42(6), n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2006WR004879, 2006.

Pelletier, J. D.: Persistent drainage migration in a numerical landscape evolution model, Geophysical Research Letters, 31(20), doi:10.1029/2004GL020802, 2004.

Rodríguez-Iturbe, I. and Rinaldo, A.: Fractal River Basins: Chance and Self-Organization, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge., 1997.

Willett, S. D., McCoy, S. W., Perron, J. T., Goren, L. and Chen, C.-Y.: Dynamic Reorganization of River Basins, Science, 343(6175), 1248765–1248765, doi:10.1126/science.1248765, 2014.

Whipple, K. X. and Tucker, G. E.: Dynamics of the stream-power river incision model: Implications for height limits of mountain ranges, landscape response timescales, and research needs, Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 104(B8), 17661–17674, doi:10.1029/1999JB900120, 1999.

Whipple, K. X., DiBiase, R. A., Ouimet, W. B. and Forte, A. M.: Preservation or piracy: Diagnosing low-relief, high-elevation surface formation mechanisms, Geology, 45(1), 91–94, doi:10.1130/G38490.1, 2017a.

Whipple, K. X., Forte, A. M., DiBiase, R. A., Gasparini, N. M. and Ouimet, W. B.: Timescales of landscape response to divide migration and drainage capture: Implications for the role of divide mobility in landscape evolution: Landscape Response to Divide Mobility, Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 122(1), 248–273, doi:10.1002/2016JF003973, 2017b.

Yang, R., Willett, S. D. and Goren, L.: In situ low-relief landscape formation as a result of?river network disruption, Nature, 520(7548), 526–529, doi:10.1038/nature14354, 2015.