

***Interactive comment on “Development of a predictive model to determine micropollutant removal using granular activated carbon” by D. J. de Ridder et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 3 November 2009

1. The paper is clear in its objectives, written well and structured in an orderly, logical way. Well done. 2. It is not clear why the experimental carbon concentrations were selected to be so high. In this way, almost half the data points seem to have been “wasted” due to removal at or very near 100%. Whilst (almost) complete removal would be the full-scale objective, the research questions would have been better served with lower removals more evenly spaced. 3. What were the criteria for inclusion of data points for modelling? There were 7 bottles for each of 21 compounds, resulting in 147 potential data points. But only 30, 39 and 62 data points were used for the three modelling scenarios. With such a high data rejection rate, there is a danger that the compounds could have ended up with significantly different modelling weights. 4. It is

C70

assumed that the four compounds used for validation were selected randomly. With 21 available compounds, it may be more convincing to use a larger validation set. 5. The paper would be improved if more details were provided in response the points raised above.

---

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., 2, 189, 2009.