

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Removal of radio N-nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA) from drinking water by coagulation and Powdered Activated Carbon (PAC) adsorption” by J. Chung et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 8 April 2009

Manuscript entitled “Removal of Radio N-Nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA) From Drinking Water by Coagulation and Powdered Activated Carbon (PAC) Adsorption” by J Chung, Y Yoon, M Kim, S.-B. Lee, H.-J. Kim, and C.-K. Choi

This paper describes a removal of low level of NDMA in raw drinking water, and shows how its efficiency can be improved by a contact time and PAC dosage under the given combination of filtration processes with PAC. While the paper makes a new and valuable insight to membrane scientists and engineers, lots of logical and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript may hinder the research merits. So, authors had better address the following issues at a minimum, before the paper is considered for

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



publication.

In abstract, authors consider international readers to have a broad sense. Think about why your manuscript is important and what your recommendation is in this manuscript. Most well-rounded papers include these issues in abstract: importance of your manuscript, objectives of this study, methods employed, main conclusions reached, and implication or recommendation. Also some errors should be corrected: for instance, provide full name in a first appearance, check the passive voice, and provide better expression in the last two sentences.

In contrast to an abstract, author(s) provides a tedious and prolonged talk to reach their objectives of this study in introduction section. In introduction section, you should not only show your expert knowledge on this specific area, but provide a concise and well-turned expression. Please better clarify the objective(s) of this and the results of other researches.

Materials and methods section also have lots of grammatical errors, requiring fairly minor revision. Check which one is correct: RDW “collected from a local water treatment plant (WTP)” or “collected from a local wastewater treatment plant”. Provide full name instead of “alum”. Remove a parenthesis, “[]”

Even though authors did not provide all detailed (or full) discussion on the obtained results to the readers, they should often extend their reasonable idea as far as they could go. Of course, this may depend on style of international journals, but current manuscript appears to have too narrow summary regarding a discussion of the results.

In many papers, author(s) often provides a list of summaries in conclusion section. So, reviewer recommends author(s) to summarize their results based on subheading in results section. Current conclusion, in a reviewer’s opinion, also conveys too slim idea to the readers, and in particular the last two sentences in this section should be corrected.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Figure legends in one or between figures should be generally identical (please unify their font and size). In particular, the legends in Figure 5 should be corrected: MF with out PAC and MF (UF) with out PAC

Finally, a reviewer recommends author(s) to correct grammatical errors of the manuscript with native English speakers. If author(s) takes into account all the above factors, the article can be accepted for publication in the Journal.

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., 2, 79, 2009.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

