From: **McDonald, Richard** <[rmcd@usgs.gov](mailto:rmcd@usgs.gov)>  
Date: Tue, Feb 12, 2019 at 11:33 AM  
Subject: GSFLOW 2.0 release Review  
To: Regan, Robert <[rsregan@usgs.gov](mailto:rsregan@usgs.gov)>

Hi Steve,

Attached are docs that I had review comments in. My general comment is that this is a pretty significant update, and asking the user to square all the changes in this version with previous documentation is a big ask.  But perhaps it's easier for folks who have experience with the application.  Also, I realize it's a big ask to update all the documentation.  For some user's just starting with GSFlow assimilating the changes with the primary documentation could be an impediment to getting started...

Author response: It would be nice to write a unifying document. MODFLOW and PRMS have relied on separate reports for each new capability (Package and Module, respectively) with release notes to provide some sense of unification. Hopefully, when a new version of GSFLOW is built based on MODFLOW-6 and PRMS-6, a unifying document will be made.

Some additional observations:

I tried running multiple simulations using the bat files simultaneously in cmd windows.  It looks like you can only run one at a time because after the first batch is executed subsequent runs fail because gsflow.log is in use.  That seems like a problem if users want to run multiple simulations.  Or maybe I'm missing something? perhaps running in separate directories solves the problem.  However I wonder if in general allowing the user to specify the .log file name would be useful?

Author response: typically, a user would not run multiple simulations at the same time. However, this does happen, and the log file is a problem. For the next release we’ll add an option to suppress writing the log file as well as the option to specify a name.

I successfully ran all bat files in sagehen

I successfully ran all bat files in sagehen\_restart

I successfully ran bat files in tahoe\_restart

Many of the equations in the PET update are difficult to read then they are long and subsequently wrapped.  I've commented on these in the pdf.

Author response: we have incorporated your editorial suggestions in the Update with responses to each comment included in the PDF version you provided.

I checked all the readme.txt files and had no comments on them.

I made sure that all the links worked

I made sure that all the files listed in the doc folder where there.

If there is anything else you would like me to review or check please let me know - happy to do it.

Let me know if you have any questions on my comments,

Thanks Steve,

Rich

Author response: thank you for an excellent review. We have incorporated almost all of your suggested changes to the release notes and other similar files.