



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_48519
Title of the Manuscript:	Validating Visual Modflow Numerical Model To Predict Future Impact Of Brine Disposal On Groundwater
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract is not suitable, there are not any introduction about the problem or any justification. I suggest including one figure with domain complete and the grid distribution. It is mandatory to describe into the discussion the calibration and validation data in steady and unsteady state. Calibration in Visual Modflow let us study the model robustly. By other hand, Authors have correlations between model and experimental data which can be compared with Modflow calibration and validation results	The abstract was lengthened, we have talked about the methodology and the results (line 6 to line 13) A figure with domain complete and the grid distribution was added in page 4 line 77 The model was calibrated and the model results revealed that there was a great agreement between the results obtained from the model and the laboratory experiment where the correlation coefficient obtained from the model for the COB3 was 0.991, While for HOB1 was 0.901.
Minor REVISION comments	Fig 1 only shows 4 data series and on the plot there are 6 series. Literature revision is too short, is not representative of the knowledge about models and simulation tools.	The figure was modified as shown in page 6 line 108 The literature was modified as shown in page 2
Optional/General comments	It is a good tool application paper. Structure, references, grammar but authors and vocabulary are suitable. However, authors shall improve results discussion, in this sense, some of results and methodology of reference 4 must be introduced to understand this paper properly.	The results(in page 6) and the methodology(in lines from 62 to 72) of this reference was introduced in a modified way

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No