

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.

J. Chung

jin-wook.chung@samsung.com

Received and published: 27 April 2009

Responses to Comments for Reviewer #1

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 publication.

Interactive
Comment

Comment 1. 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. Response: Thank you for the valuable suggestions. We have revised Abstract as suggested.

Comment 2. 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. Response: We have revised the text on page 5 to clarify them.

Comment 3. 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, “[]” Response: We have revised the manuscript for those grammatical errors by having a native English speaker review this manuscript. The RDW was collected from a local WTP. “alum” full name has been provided in the text on page 7.

Comment 4. 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. Response: Thank you for the suggestions. We have revised slightly the text as suggested.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Interactive
Comment

Comment 5. 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 sub-heading 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. Response: We have revised the manuscript as suggested on page 13.

Comment 6. 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. Response: Thank you for the valuable comments. We have revised those as suggested.

Please also note the [Supplement](#) to this comment.

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

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)






Fig. 1.




Fig. 2.




Fig. 3.




Fig. 4.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper





Fig. 5.

[Interactive Comment](#)**Fig. 6.**[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper




Fig. 7.