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

Nareth Nut[1]

1 Royal University of Agriculture

The manuscript is well-written. However, I just have some comments and suggestions as below:

- All the abbreviation should be spell out before use to make the reader more understandable.

- No need to use Parentheses for the unit of soil erosion rate as they are used to enclose incidental or supplemental information or comments. Please check and revise them across the manuscript.

- For the unit of the soil erosion rate, it should be t/ha/y because the abbreviation for hectare is ha, while h or hr is for hour. Please check and revise them across the manuscript.

II. Methods

A. Study Area

- Please delete letter "a" in Fig. 1. It should be written (msl).

B. Data

The land use year is 2018 or 2020? Why did the year of land use maps (2000, 2010 and 2018) and generated RUSLE-GGS (2000, 2010 and 2020) were different?

- Indicate the locations of these two stations (Reposo and Canoas Bridge) in Fig. 1.

III. Results and Discussion

A. Spatiotemporal analysis of soil erosion:

- The word "area study" shall be changed to "study area".

- It may be good if the trend of precipitation (R-factor) can be checked during this period (2000-2010) to make sure that the decrease of soil erosion was due to the rainfall or land use changes to understand the main drivers of the change. Moreover, the area of each land use class for different years (2000, 2010 and 2018/2020) should be indicated as Table.

C. Towards Cesar River Restoration: The authors should provide or highlight some applicable countermeasures for

restoration activities at the potential areas or hotspots based on the research result aside from the possible solutions proposed by Ref 29.