

Review of: "Assessment of soil erosion in the Cesar watershed, an initial step toward the restoration of the Cesar River"

Haile Getnet¹

¹ Woldia University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors and Journal Staffs, first I would like to ask excuse about my delay due to local unrest around my locality and there was no internet access around me for the last two weeks. I will compensate by responding on time for the next time if I engaged in a similar work.

Dear Authors:

On the title what did u assess?

Assessment of soil erosion in the Cesar watershed, an initial step toward the restoration of the Cesar River.

Soil erosion is found in all land use system and everywhere in the world but the severity and level of occurrence may be different, therefore, what did u assess from the study area? Severity? Impact? Coverage? Frequency? You should specify what could be assessed.

From the abstract: The abstract is shallower and it did not describe the objectives and other necessary details including the main methodologies even the results as needed.

On key words: there is ecosystem service but the word is not frequently stated in the document therefore you should rethink about it.

Introduction: The introduction part somehow has shown inconsistency and lack of coherence.

L4 states about the concern of water quality but u didn't say anything about water quality throughout the document

L8 The authors were talking about the gradual loss of soil fertility but as we know from reality, erosion has contributed to the existence of an alarming rate of the loss of soil fertility, therefore, u should elaborate it according to the reality and general truth. If not you must put the reference with justifiable reasons.

The other problem/unclear ideas have been observed in the document starting from the introduction to the conclusion that was the Cesar River and Cesar watershed were used interchangeably therefore, they must demarcated.

Result and discussion:

Page 8

The erosion rate was fluctuated from 1990 to 2000 the erosion rate was very high but from 2000 to 2010 it becomes low therefore, the reason behind must be discussed and presented in the result. Is that due to land use change? Or from rainfall amount? Or else? U should put clearly the possible reason of the event.

On this part some figures/ numbers must be written in the correct decimal number don't use comma instead of decimal for example you must write 99.77 t/h/yr but not 99,77 (t/h/yr).

In the same way on page 9: u should write the number in the correct way 2.30% instead of 2,30%

B. Analysis of critical points of soil erosion:

On page 11, The statement like In general, areas with relatively low erosion rates can be attributed to anthropogenic processes influenced by changing land use. However, these areas may show a less pronounced dispersion, possibly due to the uncertainty associated with the variables influencing the model, particularly the topographic factor'

The written statement is not in line with the general truth that stated anthropogenic factors have more contribution to the accelerating of erosion in every circumstance. Therefore, this statement should be written according to the general truth.

On the same page, the word Cesar River should be changed to Cesar watershed.

On the last page 11, the stated possible solution to erosion prevention is only afforestation but erosion control is multidimensional and requires multiple solutions, therefore, the afforestation and reforestations are the long-term possible solutions but what about the short-term supplementary solutions? What about others? It needs more details on the possible solution to contribute to the sustainability of the watershed and water bodies.

In general the paper work is so good and it will contribute more on the areas but it requires more discussion and amendment especially on the result and discursion part. I hope the authors will amend their work and submit again.