

## ***Interactive comment on “Assess arsenic distribution in groundwater applying GIS in capital of Punjab, Pakistan” by M. M. Akhtar et al.***

**F. Guzzetti (Editor)**

f.guzzetti@irpi.cnr.it

Received and published: 8 June 2015

Dear Mr. Akhtar and Mr. Mohamadi,

your submission to NHESS entitled "Assess arsenic distribution in groundwater applying GIS in capital of Punjab, Pakistan" has now received the comments of two independent reviewers.

The two referees concur in saying that the topic covered by the manuscript is of potential interest, but they also agree that the manuscript does not contain new scientific findings, or evidence.

I have analyzed the paper myself, and I agree with the reviewers that although the topic

C923

covered is timely and of potential general interest, the manuscript does not contain sufficient new findings to support publication, in its present form.

I also share the opinion of the second - and most critical - reviewer that the paper, as it stands, is poorly organized. Indeed, it is difficult to decide what are the facts, what are the previous findings from the literature, and what are the conclusions and the opinions of the authors.

Despite the severe problems that the manuscript currently shows, I have decided that I will reconsider it after a major and thorough revision.

Please note that this does not guarantee that your resubmission will be accepted, necessarily. Your resubmission will be critically examined by the same reviewers who examined the first submission.

If you decide to prepare a revised version of your work, please consider (and address) all the comments made by the two reviewers, and particularly those made by the second and most critical reviewer.

It is very important that the revised manuscript will be better structured, written more clearly, that the facts are separated from the conclusions (omitting opinions, as much as possible), that previous work is properly acknowledged and - most important (!) - that the new findings of the work are clearly outlined. Quality of the figures, and particularly the charts and graphs, needs to be improved.

A detailed list of all the changes made, together with a list of the responses to the comments and requests of the referees, is also necessary.

Sincerely,

Fausto Guzzetti NHESS Executive Editor

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 2119, 2015.

C924