

Article: Confronting vicinity of the surface water and sea shore in a shallow glaciogenic aquifer in southern Finland by S. Luoma et al.

Reply to the comments received on 16 December 2014.

Thank you very much for your comments. We have made corrections in the updated manuscript with an English check. All corrections were marked in **red colour** in the manuscript final version (26Dec).

Editor Initial Decision: Publish subject to minor revisions (Editor review) (16 Dec 2014) by Przemyslaw Wachniew Comments to the Author:

1. The reviewers have not raised that question but the original manuscript contains many grammatical and stylistic errors. Please, read the text carefully and make sure that all your statements are clearly expressed and the language is corrected before the manuscript gets at the proof stage. The typical errors seem to be wrong endings of verbs (wrong person, active form instead of passive) and wrong or lack of prepositions. I am not sure if KMNO₄ consumption can be "present" in water (page 8668, line 19-20), I would also recommend "filtered" instead of "filtrated".

We had an English correction for the manuscript (26Dec).

- "I am not sure if KMNO₄ consumption can be "present" in water (page 8668, line 19-20)?"

You are right! The text was change to "The KMnO₄ consumption values..." in the manuscript.Done!

- "I would also recommend "filtered" instead of "filtrated"."

at this question, do you mean the word "filtrated" from page 8658, line15 (it is only the place where this text exists in this manuscript)? It is done! The word "filtrated" was replaced by "filtered" in the manuscript.

2. The replies to reviewers' comments promise that the novelty of your research is highlited in the rewritten conclusions but the replies do not elaborate on that. I am very keen to see how you have handled this question.

We re-wrote the conclusion part and also the objective section to emphasize the main finding from our study. The corrections are marked in red colour.