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The paper is potentially interesting for the readers. However, there are some details that may be somewhat annoying for our colleagues. First, scientific English language is below any standards in this paper. The authors should ask a native English speaker or a professional translator to revise the text. Second, there are some disappointing mistakes in soil classification.

Table 1, the first soil: Stagnic should go before Glossic, Profondic is a secondary qualifier, and thus should go after the name of the RG.

Table 1, the second soil: Stagnic should go before Glossic, Profondica is a secondary qualifies, and the soil should be either Ochric or Himic, but not both of them.

Table 1, the forth soil: Profondic is a secondary qualifier.

Table 1, the fifth column: please change all the commas to decimal points.

Table 1, the sixth column: prism-like structure does not vexist in any international classification, though I can imagine what You mean. Please refer to FAO or USDA manuals for field soil description.

Figures 2 and 3: please try to follow internationally accepted terminology. I do not understand the expression "upper slope". Do You mean shoulder or backslope position? May we regard "upper footslope" and "lower footslope" as footslope and toeslope accordingly?