

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

Arvind Dhaloiya

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thorough examination of this manuscript, the observations have been formulated and are outlined below:

1. The manuscript's language quality is below standard and requires significant improvement. It is recommended to revise and enhance the overall language expression to enhance the clarity and coherence of the content.
2. The abstract is lacking the inclusion of key findings and should be revised to incorporate them.
3. The study area encompasses 22,930 km² of the Cesar watershed. Conducting the study as a whole unit proved ineffective, leading to unclear and potentially arbitrary results. To enhance clarity, the investigation should be carried out at a micro-level.
4. The legend for figure 1, especially in section c, appears similar; it needs revision for improved clarity, and a higher quality image is recommended.
5. The resolution of various input data sets is disparate, and the method of their utilization lacks clarification in both the calculation and material sections. While it is mentioned that they were resampled at 2.5 km after calculation, the justification for this choice in terms of clarity and accuracy is inadequately explained. It appears that the author was keen to undertake this step, but a comprehensive explanation with suitable citations is necessary for a more robust and credible presentation.
6. The methodology section requires additional elaboration and citation. Some equations appear to deviate from established standards.
7. Both the result and discussion sections lack sufficient elaboration and employ language that is not optimal. The result and discussion are incomplete and require a more thorough explanation. The discussion section would benefit from the inclusion of recent and pertinent citations.
8. The map quality is poor; enhancing it by using higher DPI images is recommended.

Overall: The language quality is inadequate. The abstract falls short of expectations and require revision. The methodology section lacks sufficient elaboration, appropriate formulas, and citations. Additionally, the result and discussion sections need more thorough explanations and up-to-date citations. The quality of the maps is poor; improving it.

A major revision is recommended, incorporating the suggested points.

