

Interactive comment on “Status of organochlorine pesticides in the drinking water well-field located in the Delhi region of the flood plains of river Yamuna” by P. K. Mutiyar et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 26 September 2011

The manuscript presents pesticide occurrences in a well field in the Delhi region. Two different well types were investigated for pesticide occurrences for pre- and post-monsoon seasons. It is an interesting and informative monitoring study, which provides extensive data on the quality of well based water supply in Delhi area. Even though the overall study is good in quality, some major points should be pointed out:

- 1- Only one sample from each well was taken for OCP analyses, which makes the data somewhat controversial. It was also said in the text that one sample was chosen for OCP analyses and choosing criteria was not mentioned.
- 2- The differences between two well types should be included in the manuscript. Loca-

C26

tion, depth, major process differences should be addressed in order to give a comparison chance to the reader.

- 3- In Table 2 the MDL values were given as 0.01 ng/L for all investigated pesticides. This value is extremely low when it is compared with the other research studies which used GC-MS/MS with SPE sample pre-treatment method. For example in one article (Snyder, Shane A. , Wert, Eric C. , Rexing, David J. , Zegers, Ronald E. and Drury, Douglas D.(2006)'Ozone Oxidation of Endocrine Disruptors and Pharmaceuticals in Surface Water and Wastewater', *Ozone: Science & Engineering*, 28: 6, 445 – 460) the MDL for DDT was found to be 10 ng/L. Was the MDL value (0.01 ng/L) found by the researchers or the value was taken from another source or reference. Either way a better explanation should be given for this value.

- 4- The reasons for different OCP levels for each sampling site could be explained in more detail by giving the specifics about the sampling sites (location, soil properties, distance to the feeding water source-Yamuna River, etc.)

There are also some minor typographical errors through out the manuscript.

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., 4, 85, 2011.

C27