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This review of GSFLOW version 2.0 is based on the requirements set forth in <https://www2.usgs.gov/usgs-manual/im/IM-OSQI-2016-01.html>

1. The required disclaimer is present in GSFLOW\_Release\_Notes\_2.0.0.docx.

2. The software is documented in GSFLOW\_Release\_Notes\_2.0.0.docx or in documents referred to therein. All such referenced documents are included.

There is a misspelled word in Readme.txt in Data directory: “demonsatrates”.

In the releases notes, there is reference to a file named “GSFLOW\_Input\_Instructions.pdf”. The actual file is named “GSFLOW\_Input\_Instructions**.v.2.0.0**.doc”. Please be sure the file names match in the final version of the release notes. Similarly, there is a mismatch between “PRMS\_tables\_5.0.pdf” and “PRMS\_tables\_5.0**.0**.docx”

Be sure to update the release date in the release notes; right now it is set to Feb. 1, 2019.

On p.15-16 of the release notes there is the phrase “Distributed values values”. Is the second “values” supposed to be there?“Distributed values” is at the end of p. 15 followed by “values” at the beginning of p. 16.

I ran the Sagahen example. The PRMS results were identical to the ones in the distribution file but the MODFLOW heads differed by as much as 5. While a difference of 5 in values that are typically around 2500 is not so large, it is larger than what I would expect.

Author response: Thank you for your quick and valuable review. We really appreciate it!

Regarding editorial changes and filenames: all suggested edits were made, the Word version of the pdf files were made available to make it easier to provide editorial suggestions. These will be turned into PDF Files when finalized after the reviews. We would like to keep the Release date of 2/1/2019 as this refers to when source file version dates were finalized. These dates are written to some of the output files.

Regarding differences in results. We should have removed the head file in the output directory. One file in the output subdirectories as a way of forcing GIT to retain what should be empty subdirectories. That file was produced by the gsflow\_NWT.bat test, so the difference is understandable since gsflow.bat uses the PCG solver and gsflow\_NWT.bat uses the NWT solver. I'll be sure to make sure all output directories are empty when I put together the final release.

Also, I should have explained that all the tests have output files that were generated on my computer in the output-test subdirectories, such that running gsflow.bat should produce the same results as found in the data/sagehen/output-test/1\_GSFLOW\_mode.PCG subdirectory. Note, we did not include a few large output files (>10 MB) for the tests in the various output-text subdirectories to reduce the size of the distribution file.