



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_49758
Title of the Manuscript:	MODFLOW's River Package. Part 2
Type of the Article	Correction, combining analytical and numerical approaches

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	None	
Minor REVISION comments	None	
Optional/General 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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Luka Malenica
Department, University & Country	University of Split, Croatia