

## ***Interactive comment on “Water supply project feasibilities in fringe areas of Kolkata, India” by K. Dutta Roy et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 21 October 2010

Interesting topic but paper is not well-structured. The use of extensive referencing is not necessary. The paper also presents a lot of figures and tables that are not substantial. The paper lost its quality due to that fact, and it resembles more to a literature review paper. I recommend the authors to concentrate more in a clear explanation of the methodology and a good explanation of the results. They have left this part to the end of the paper and it appears more as an incomplete summary. Specific comments: Pg. 3 Some grammatical corrections are needed. Use the past form of the verb in lines 3 and 5; you are referring to a 1963 report. Pg. 5 What WTP stands for? Was it mentioned before? Line 13, avoid the use of etc, is very vague. Pg. 6 Use "the" when referring to a specific institution or department. In line 16, use et al. when referring to more than two authors. Pg. 7 See comment of pg. 6. Use the past in line 3. Fig. 3 is not important. Pg. 8, 9 and 10 The information of Table 2 is not important and

C77

is unrelated to the main scope of the paper. What are the Indian standards? That is important. Use the past in line 2. The whole section of Water quality testing must be re-written. There is no brief narrative of testing procedures. It is a bad repetition and paraphrasing. There is no need of a lengthy description and with little substantial content. Avoid the use of “make:”, “model:” and “precision”. Correct line 18 (table 3 not 1) Pg. 11 What CCME stands for? Use the past form in line 5. Table 4 is not important. Pg. 12 Use we without referencing in line 22. Pg. 13 Avoid repetition of previously reported information. Pg. 14 Avoid the use of etc. The correlation matrix is important to be shown, but is not. Use the past in line 8. The reason given in line 10 to 11 is unclear. Why the variables were omitted? What is usual practice, SPSS is not a good reference to validate the statement and others statements in the text. The scree plot is not important. Where is the reference to Kaiser’s criterion? Pg. 15 What were the criteria for selection of variables? Where is the analysis of variance? The R2 is low. What do you mean by hypnotized in line 16? Pg. 16 It is another page that shows an unnecessary literature review. A few reference are enough. Pg. 17 The R2 for equation (4) is low. Fig. 7b clearly shows that a point is far away from the rest of data. Pg. 18 and 19 Use m3 instead of kL. Pg. 21, Section 8. This is the most important part of the paper. The authors should concentrate in this one, but avoiding repetition.

---

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., 3, 199, 2010.