

Dear Authors and Editor,

After reviewing the revised manuscript, it is my opinion that the paper reads well and should be published. This contribution should be of interest to a growing number of researchers investigating various aspects of EM methods being used to tease out geology vs. hydrology influences on EM measurements. I think the authors did a good and thorough job addressing my previous comments and I am happy with the way the revised manuscript reads. There are a few minor mistakes/comments that I am listing below.

Best Regards,

Line 82: Throughout the text, you use “EC” for electrical conductivity, but here “ σ ” is used instead?

Lines 98-99: Change “more” to “longer” Additionally, the part of the sentence describing the low-induction assumption (in parenthesis) and the validity of the McNeill equation is a bit repetitive and could be shortened.

Lines 342-342: Is it: “each dipole orientation reveals a different level of heterogeneities...” or, “each dipole orientation reveals different levels of heterogeneities...”?

Line 387: “thanks to the histogram” should be changed.

Lines 416: Please add an “a” to “with a shallower part...”