

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

Nancy Alvan Romero¹

¹ Sapienza University of Rome

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1) The whole article needs an English review. There are some basic English grammar that need to be correct.

For example : incorrect: It crosses the Department of Cesar...

correct: it crosses Cesar's Department

2) The abstract needs to be focused better. Focus on what you talk about, in this case you need to focus about the assessment of soil erosion? the restoration of the Cesar river? the Magdalena river?

3) When you affirm some information you need to talk about the source of that information. For example: "The Magdalena River stands out the largest contributor of sediment in South America. Where are you take that information? if there are not studies about it how do you know that that M.R. is the largest contributor of sediment???"

4) In the Fig. 1 there are some names refers to Cesar river that doesn't correspond to the information writing in the text. Is Cesar down? Lower Cesar? Middle Cesar or Cesar Middle?.

All that you write in the text need to correspond to that you show (fig., photo, etc)

2

5) The formulas need to be written in a correct way. $K=2$ not $K=$ or $K=$

2

6) Fig. 2 a) 1991-2000, b) 2001-2010, c) 2010-2020 It's that timeline correct? or for c) maybe was necessary correct to 2011-2020?

Therefore, the most important contribution I can make is to tell you that you need to check again and again the article; every written word needs to be in accordance with what you show.