



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_49758
Title of the Manuscript:	MODFLOW's River Package. Part 2
	Correction, combining analytical and numerical approaches
Type of the Article	Original research articles

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	None	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	None	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The introduction is very short. Since this manuscript is part of at least two documents, I can only suppose that Part 1 contains comprehensive introduction. I suggest a few more sentences with short explanation and relation to Part 1.</p> <p>An analytical solution for saturated seepage (such as show in Figure 1.) is available for homogenous saturated flow conditions. Is this approach possible in a heterogeneous case?</p> <p>It would be interesting to comment the problem of determination thickness and hydraulic conductivity of clogging layer in practice.</p> <p>I suggest a several additional sentences at the beginning of Chapter 4 for better description of the numerical example.</p> <p>It would be interesting to compare this procedure with fine-grid numerical solution based on unsaturated flow equations (such as Richards eq.)</p>	<p>Such sentences have been added as suggested.</p> <p>This is a good question. This is why it is addressed and answered in a new section of the paper, section # 6.</p> <p>Another good question. Also addressed in the new section.</p> <p>That has been done.</p> <p>Also discussed in the new section.</p>

**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)	