

Interactive comment on “Present challenges for future water sustainable cities: a case study from Italy” by L. Bonzanigo and G. Sinnona

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 20 October 2013

General comments

The paper deals with the sensitivity of the cities of Parma and Ferrara to droughts. The data are collected in two workshops and the methods is based on an Australian concept (Water Sensitive Urban Design). The paper is well written and worth to be published.

Specific comments

Entire document: check when “which” and when “that” should be used. Pg 3: some references are missing (e.g. line 5 “these kinds. . . . coming years”; line 15-20) Pg 3, line 20: What is meant by “black-outs”? Pg 4, line 3: references are missing “pollution. . . aquifers” (very general statement) Pg 4, line 10-13: do not give conclusion in introduc-

C105

tion Pg 4: combine “Materials and Methods” sections Pg 4, line 18-19: “Populous”? Shouldn’t it be “populated”? Pg 5, line 7: “position the river downstream. . .” should be “position at the river, downstream. . .” Pg 5, line 8: “orography” should be “topography” Pg 5, line 9-12: this is a strange sentence, as an engineer I do not understand what the authors mean. How can pipelines be damaged by a drop in water level in the river? Pg 5, line 14: “km2” should be “per km2” Pg 5, line 17: what the authors mean by “worsening quality”? What are the water quality parameters that are “worsened”? Pg 6, line 5-7: Is a type of repetition and should be mentioned in the Introduction, not in Materials and Methods section Pg 6, line 25: “it follows that” should be “as a consequence”. Pg 7, line 6: Delete figure 1 (it is not the author’s own). Pg 7 (and onwards), when introduced “water sensitive urban design” (avoid capitals), then afterwards only use abbreviation (WSUD), the same holds true for “ecological sustainable design” Pg 7, line 18-20: repetition of line 7-10, so delete. Pg 8, line 2: “in which” should be “where” Pg 8, line 15: “appears” should be “appeared” (happened at the workshops) Pg 9, line 4: “seems” must be “seemed” Pg 9, line 4-5: “as mentioned above. . .” Avoid repetitions! Pg 9, line 10: “admit” should be “admitted” Pg 9, line 16: “on” should be “in” Pg 9, line 24: as an engineer, I do not understand how pollution can happen via these wells Pg 10, line 3: “efforts “ are not “spent” Pg 10, line 6: “failed” should be “fails” Pg 10, line 22: “producer” should be “producers” Pg 10, line 23: what the authors mean by a “precise database” Pg 10, line 24: “available water” should be “water available” Pg 11, line 4-6: see comment above: Pg 5, line 9-12 Pg 11, line 7: “fashion” should be “way” Pg 11, line 12 and 26: avoid “at present”, because when the paper is old it is “in the past”. Pg 11, line 16-20: This is a subjective, general statement that should not be in the Result and Discussion section, unless it is a result from the workshops and then it should be formulated like this. Pg 12, 8-13: This is not part of the study so should be deleted. Pg 12, line 14-16: I do not understand “In addition,. . . approach” can be concluded from the results. Pg 12, line 18: start the Conclusion section with a small summary of the work done. Pg 13, line 3: Based on what the authors conclude that the “WSUD principles lay far in the future” (I cannot conclude this from the results and

C106

discussion). Pg 13, line 9-12: this is not a conclusion from the work the authors did. In general: do not conclude things that are outside of the scope of the research.

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., 6, 151, 2013.