The reviewer provided a number of very helpful comments, including finding a major typographical error in a table. The error, associated with one well (#142), was due to transcription of field data into a table. The result for pH appeared to have changed in a counter-intuitive way, from basic to neutral following addition of an oxidant (chlorine bleach). The reviewer was astute in pointing out that the result did not seem to be correct, and in fact it was not, because the initial reading prior to purging the well (post-chlorination) was actually 8.56 rather than 7.56 as originally reported in the draft. Many thanks for helping us to avoid publishing this erroneous result.

The reviewer’s comments were also very informative on a range of matters included throughout the paper and we made the changes suggested. The revised draft will be posted in the place of the original.