Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., 1, S1–S2, 2008 www.drink-water-eng-sci-discuss.net/1/S1/2008/ © Author(s) 2008. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.

Drinking Water Engineering and Science Discussions

DWESD

1, S1-S2, 2008

Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Micro-components survey of residential indoor water consumption in Chiang Mai" by Y. Otaki et al.

E. Blokker (Referee)

mirjam.blokker@kiwa.nl

Received and published: 15 February 2008

General comments:

The authors describe the measurements on residential water use in Chiang Mai. The data collection method is not new, the data interpretation is not new. There is much more literature available on water use in different countries, that can be used for reference.

The authors have looked at the influence of dry/wet season and of water source (community and municipality water) on total water use and water use per micro-component. The influence was found to be non-existing. I am wondering on what grounds the authors did expect a relevant influence (references?).

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Several statements on why water use was higher/lower than in Bangkok are not backed by data or references (pg 51, line 11; pg 52, lines 12-17; pg 53, lines 16-17; pg 55, lines 3-7).

The abstracts speaks of how water consumption can increase in the future. This is not discussed in the paper. In my opinion this is the most (or only) interesting part. I would suggest to look into this by comparing Chiang Ming and Bangkok with respect to installed appliances and culture/behaviour with respect to water use.

Specific comments:

Methods and Materials section is incomplete – e.g. how many days were measured, when were the measurements done, what type of households were measured, which appliances were actually installed, how often were meter sets exempted, etc.? Apparently there was a questionnaire (page 52), this was not described. Also, please explain the KS-test (what does this test?).

Results are plotted into many graphs – this can easily be brought back to less. Histograms (e.g. fig 4) need to be changed – the ground/community water and municipality water have their own relative frequency (can not be combined like this). Table 1 on its own bears no relevant information.

Not all references from text are in reference list, not all references in ref.list are referred to in the text.

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., 1, 45, 2008.

DWESD

1, S1-S2, 2008

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

