

Interactive comment on “Feasibility assessment of household based small arsenic removal technologies for achieving sustainable development goals” by M. S. Hossain et al.

M. S. Hossain et al.

mdho787@student.liu.se

Received and published: 28 July 2016

Response Letter to Referee 2

We are thankful for generous comments. We have revised our manuscript according to your generous comments and suggestions.

General comments:

The article addresses an interesting and urgent societal challenge related to drinking water supply, and is therefore closely linking to the scope of the journal. However, before it may be accepted for publication it is crucial that the authors revise the article as such that it may qualify as a scientific review.

C1

Response: Agreed and thank you for the truthful reply.

Comment: At present, the publication cites only 5 peer-reviewed publications, which is - in my opinion – insufficient to classify as a scientific review article.

Response: Agreed.

Comment: I would encourage the authors to restructure their article in such a way that it includes more citations in the field of arsenic removal in Bangladesh. Perhaps by searching for terms related to "household water treatment and storage", read-f, alcan, sidko, etc. the authors can extend their review further.

Response: Agreed and thankful for your generous suggestion.

Comment: There have been multiple publications in journals like Water Research, ES&T and Water Science and Technology that should be added to the review. After extending the review, I would encourage the authors to re-submit the manuscript.

Response: We are agreed with your proposal and have started for enhancing our manuscript according to your comments and suggestions.

Specific comments related to the abstract:

Comment: I8: consider changing "pure" to "safe"

Response: Agreed.

I15: "important role" - based on what information was determined that there was indeed an important role for SAR. I could not find this in the manuscript.

Response: SAR has been playing an important role to the 'rural arsenic affected poor people' as an option for accessing to arsenic-free drinking water.

We are revising our manuscript to make the arguments more clear to the readers.

Comment: I16 giuld lines = guidelines

C2

Response: Revised.

Comment: l17 "there is" seems misplaced

Response: Revised.

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/dwes-2016-1, 2016.