

## ***Interactive comment on “A parsimonious analytical model for simulating multispecies plume migration” by J.-S. Chen et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 28 October 2015

Review of “A parasimonious analytical model for simulating multispecies plume migration” by J.S. Chen et al.

This is a nice piece of work advancing the multispecies plume (2D) migration from an analytical standpoint. The literature review is almost complete and through, the mathematical model is based on a technique developed by the same author (Dr. Chen) in 2012, but with substantially new materials and a physically based boundary condition (third-type or Rubin type) and extension to 2D. The solutions have been compared with carefully designed and proved numerical solutions. The examples used in the paper are relevant to actual applications and the details of all the derivation and programming are nicely documented. The figures are also well presented. The paper is well written and easy to follow.

C4504

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



The following revisions are necessary to improve the quality of the paper.

1. I think the title has to be changed. First of all, the word “parsimonious” should be deleted (as it is not parsimonious to me at all). Also, the author may want to add “two-dimensional” in the title as the problem investigated is 2D in nature.

2. I also think the use of “verified” or “verification” is inappropriate. A numerical solution cannot be used to verify an analytical solution per se, as it itself may involve the potential (and sometimes hidden) numerical errors. I think a better word is “compared” or “comparison” instead.

3. Despite the fact that the authors have done a careful review of the previous studies. Some important references are still missing. For instance, the paper of “Mieles, J., and Zhan, H., Analytical solutions of one-dimensional multispecies reactive transport in a permeable reactive barrier-aquifer system, Journal of Contaminant Hydrology, 134-135, 54-68, 2012. doi: 10.1016/j.jconhyd.2012.04.002” is closely related to this study and is a reference that should be included. The study of Mieles and Zhan (2002) dealt with the multispecies transport in a permeable reactive barrier (PRB)-aquifer system, with similar use of the third-type or mixed type boundary condition and other boundary conditions and the technique of Laplace transform.

4. In equations (13)-(15), there are a number of parameters introduced without explanation. Although the authors explained them in the Appendix, I still think it is necessary to explain a few key parameters in the main text. For instance, the and terms, et al. Otherwise, it is difficult to follow the mathematics.

5. In section 3.3, the author mentioned three verifications at the first sentence, but then only discussed two cases in the first and second paragraphs. The third case is only mentioned from the third paragraph. It should be revised. I suggest moving the first sentence of the third paragraph “The third verification example is . . .” to the first paragraph of section 3.3.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

6. For the FORTRAN program, what type of FORTRAN program? (FORTRAN 95?). Also, since the summations terms involved (M and N) are so large for some cases, how long is it going to take for the program to generate the result? (CPU time? PC or Workstation?) This type of information should be mentioned for the application of the method.

In summary, I recommend a moderate revision.

(note: some special symbols are missing in this plain text version of the review)

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 8675, 2015.

**HESD**

12, C4504–C4506, 2015

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C4506

