

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

Francisco Martinez Carreaux¹

¹ Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article reports soil erodibility estimates in the Magdalena River basin, identified as a significant source of sediments, as well an important hydrographic system in Southamerica. In general, the report shows a reasonable number of references and the figures are acceptable (except Fig.3, which does not reads very clearly. In fact, I did not understood). However, this reviewer believes that these findings represent a narrow contribution to the field of study. In my opinion a paper should not be published in a journal, indexed or not (printed or online), just because the findings are "the first measurements or reports about something", but how such findings impact the knowledge achieved in the field of study. In spite of this, this reviewer recognises nevertheless that the report could be valuable for watershed management purposes in Colombia.

I respectfully ask the authors: is there any methodological, theoretical or empirical contribution to the field in your work? This must be clearly stated across the study. For example, a formulation based on RUSLE equation is a very common method for soil erosion estimation through different scales. So, where is the novelty here? By the way, what is an acceptable error margin for these estimates? This point was not critically addressed in the text. To emphasize this point, I show an example:

1. "In general, areas with relatively low erosion rates can be attributed to anthropogenic processes influenced by changing land use" Are you sure about this? Any reference to support this affirmation?
2. "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 [24]." Of course the uncertainty is always there, but deep is the impact of such parameters (and its inner dispersion) on your results. In fact, how confident are you about your results.

Other similar affirmations can be found in the text. These are some of the major points that I found in the report. Please, all my comments were made with the aim of contributing to improve your work wherever is possible.

Best regards,

FM

