



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	<p>1. The overall procedure of this study is wrong. You have to respect the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">× Build the conceptual model,× Calibrate the model,× Validate the model× Use the model for prediction <p>Step 1 is missing.</p> <p>2. The abstract is too short. you should briefly talk about the method used and the silent results.</p> <p>3. This objective is not clear. You cannot calibrate a model that is not build! First, you have to build a model that predict the fate of brine water disposal into an aquifer, secondly, you would have to calibrate and validate that model.</p> <p>4. Where is the model you are talking about? It would be difficult to follow you calibrating a model that does not exist. You should know that Visual modflow is a software and not a model. So; present your conceptual model.</p> <p>5. What is the type of soil used? How many layers have you used and why? The soils was it disturbed or undisturbed? You previously talk of layer one, this mean that you have at least two layers. Here you give the properties of only one layer, what about the others layers?</p> <p>6. More description are required for the observation points. How are they monitored? How do you evaluate the water concentration in salt?</p> <p>7. The main problem in the result section is that you did not show how you got the set of data used to build the model. Data for calibration are from the lab experiment, what about the model data? This lead to a doubtful result. The figures 1 and 2 have no meaning for my point.</p> <p>8. You cannot delineate the flow direction with only two observation points.</p> <p>9. For an original research, the scope of virtual aquifer is out of date. You should identify a real portion of a coastal aquifer and experiment your research there.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10. I doubt that this can be helpful to the scientific community.	
Minor REVISION comments	Language and manuscript structure	
Optional/General comments	You will see more comments on the manuscript.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alain Leopold FOUEPE
Department, University & Country	Hydrological Research Centre, Yaounde, Cameroon