

Interactive comment on “Preventive strategy in response to climate change and infrastructural failures for Jakarta slum dwellers” by V. Pooroe and I. Prabaharyaka

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 25 March 2013

The paper deals with the interesting problem of water supply in slum areas and analyses the impact of a new approach. However, the link with climate change (see title) is not always clear and avoiding this link must be considered (thus changing the title). The structure of the paper is somewhat awkward and restructuring should be implemented before publication. A normal structure is: Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, Conclusion. The present Discussion section contains parts for the Introduction, parts for the Materials and Methods and parts for the Results section. The Results section should be extended with some original findings (as a result from the analyses). The Conclusion section should concentrate on the most important findings. The abstract should be revised accordingly (also considering the comments

C328

below). The following comments can further be made: - Pg 423, line 1: “493.59” should be “494” - Pg 423, line 2: “9.59” should be “9.6” - Pg 423, line 2-3: delete “the number. . .1.4%” (not relevant) - Pg 423, line 3-4: delete “This. . .considering more” (not relevant) - Pg 423, line 19: “recording” should be “recordings” - Pg 424, line 10: what is meant by “digitized urban water supply” - Pg 425; line 11: delete “alarming” (subjective) - Pg 425, line 11-12: “This. . .water quality” should be something like “This water quality results in the wasting of raw water due to treatment costs”. - Pg 425, line 15: delete “most” - Pg 425, line 16: “serviced mainly” should be “mainly serviced” - Pg 425, line 18; “exorbitant” should be “high” and “in” should be “on” - Pg 425, line 20; what is meant by “spoiled water storage”? - Pg 425, line 22: “the” should be “a” and “spent” should be “spend” (is general) - Pg 425, line 26-27: delete “of. . .Regulation” - Pg 425, line 29: “was” should be “is” (is general) - Pg 426, line 1: delete “in total” - Pg 426, line 1-2: what is the link between “proof of Land Tax” and “to be resident for more than 20 years”? - Pg 426, line 8: insert “in 2009” before “a pilot” - Pg 426, line 9: delete “in 2009”. - Pg 426, line 8-10: delete “In term. . .water usage” (duplication) - Pg 426, line 11: “was made possible” should be “was facilitated” - Pg 426, line 19: This seems to be part of the Results section, since it is part of the authors evaluation. - Pg 426, line 20: “set to” should be “was” - Pg 426, line 20-21: does this mean that the demand was higher than the capacity? - Pg 426, line 21: delete “only” - Pg 426, line 21: delete “nearly to” - Pg 426, line 22: delete “only” - Pg 426, line 25: delete “grossly” - Pg 426, line 26: delete “disputes and” - Pg 427, line 1: delete “agreed conditions” - Pg 427, line 6: delete “although” - Pg 427, line 6-7: delete “it is. . .preventive measurement” - Pg 427, line 9: “to date” should be “until 2012” - Pg 427, line 9: “are” should be “were” - Pg 427, line 10: “receive” should be “received” - Pg 427, line 6: delete “In the light of the climate change” - Pg 427, line 14-16: unclear what is meant. - Pg 427, line 16; “water sold” should be “sold water” - Pg 427, line 19: delete “uncollected” - Pg 427, line 21-pg 428, line 14: these are recommendations which should not be part of the Results section, only a small part could be mentioned in the conclusions sections - Pg 428, line 16: The conclusion section should start with a small resume of the work and should give

C329

the most important findings of the paper. Do not give too much emphasis on climate change (see above) - Pg 428, line 22: delete "to recharge the water storage" - Pg 428, line 23-26: delete "however. . .slum settlement" (avoid too many recommendations and concentrate on the work that was done).

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., 5, 421, 2012.

C330