

## **Access review, peer review, and interactive public discussion (HESSD)**

Manuscripts submitted to HESS at first undergo a rapid access review by the editor (initial manuscript evaluation), which is not meant to be a full scientific review but to identify and sort out manuscripts with obvious deficiencies in view of the above principal evaluation criteria. Since a HESSD paper will be publicly accessible on the web, it should meet general criteria of readability. It should be well-written, well-referenced and well-structured. Figures and tables should be in good shape and referred to accordingly. In addition, the paper should contribute something new and interesting to the hydrological community.

If they are not immediately rejected, they will be published on the Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions (HESSD) website, the discussion forum of HESS, where they are subject to full peer review and interactive public discussion.

In the full review and interactive discussion, the referees and other interested members of the scientific community are asked to take into account all of the following aspects:

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of HESS?

Yes

2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data?

Yes

3. Are substantial conclusions reached?

Yes

4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined?

Yes

5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions?

Yes

6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)?

Yes

7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution?

Yes

8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper?

Yes

9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?

Yes

10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear?

Yes

11. Is the language fluent and precise?

Yes

12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used?

Yes

13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated?

No

14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate?

Yes

15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate?

Yes

Review comments to “Hydraulic and transport parameter assessment using column infiltration experiments”

By A. Younes, T. A. Mara, M. Fahs, O. Grunenberger, and Ph. Ackerer

General comment:

According to response to my previous review, the authors have incorporated my suggestions into the manuscript, because the authors made all the improvements I recommended. The authors had also polished the manuscript for English spelling and terminology, and it is significantly improved from the previous version. The improved manuscript has made the methods and results understandable to the readers.

In my view, this paper deals with an interesting and highly complicated issue. The authors have completed the response in this paper. Therefore, I recommend this paper for publication in the journal.