

We appreciate the reviewer's positive evaluation of our work and the valuable suggestions provided.

We have carefully addressed each specific comment below:

Comment 1: Lines 34-35. “Groundwater contamination has become an increasingly critical issue, posing significant risks to environmental safety and public health”.

Answer 1: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We have incorporated the two recommended references into the revised manuscript.

Comment 2: Line 91. You need to disclose the general aim of the research.

Answer 2: We agree with the reviewer. The revised manuscript would clearly present our aims and innovations.

Comment 3: Line 91. You need to describe the specific objectives of your research by using numbers (e.g., i, ii, and iii). Line 92-onwards. You need to add more information on the boundary conditions. Line 92-onwards. Add more detail on the nature of the geological material modelled.

Answer 3: We appreciate this suggestion for improving clarity. The revised manuscript would refer to this comment.

Comment 4: Line 109. Overall, 9 equations in the manuscript are too many, not all of the are necessary. Equation 2 is very well known. Line 175. Equations on kriging (very well-known method) not necessary. Line 515. Assign a number to this equation.

Answer 4: Thank for this comment. We have deleted some well-known equations. The unnumbered equation at Line 515 will be assigned a number.

Comment 5: Figure 1-5. Room to make the figures larger. Figure 8. You need to discuss boundary conditions in more detail in the main body. Figure 8. Increase the graphic resolution of the figure.

Answer 5: Figures 1–5 will be enlarged for better readability, and the graphic resolution of Figure 8 will be increased. The revised manuscript would expand the discussion of boundary conditions.

We appreciate the reviewer's time and effort in evaluating our work and are confident that these revisions will improve the overall quality of the manuscript.