

## ***Interactive comment on “Evaluation of human risks of surface and groundwater contaminated with Cd and Pb south of El-Minya Governorate, Egypt” by Salman Salman et al.***

**Salman Salman et al.**

asmoay@gmail.com

Received and published: 27 January 2019

Dear Reviewer Thank you very much for your efforts in reviewing this work and for your valuable comments which assist us to improve our article quality 1-In this paper Cd and Pb are monitored in groundwater and surface water and compared to WHO guidelines. The paper is poorly written and not very innovative, since most of the sampling was already done before. Through this work we applied human health risk assessment which nearly used for the first time in Egypt. I has great advantages than comparison with WHO guidelines. For example Pb exceeded WHO guidelines but according to the calculated HQnc it hasn't any health problem 2-General comments: -

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Give clear objective (and knowledge gap) at the end of the introduction. The objectives were rewritten at the abstract and the end of introduction 3- “Location” should be part of the Materials and Methods section (not of introduction) We moved it into the Materials and Methods section 4- Explain why Health Risk Assessment gives other information than WHO guidelines Because, it takes in consideration; age, body weight, metal concentration, exposure duration and daily intake. Page 2 lines20-21 5- Check language, including tenses. - Introduce abbreviations (like Cd and Pb) once and then use the abbreviations in the rest of the manuscript. - Structure the description of Cd and Pb in the introduction in the same way. - Use same structure for describing Cd and Pb (as on pg 2) - Avoid repetitions in the paper (like first 4 sentences on pg 3). All these comments were taken in consideration and done 6-Specific comments: - Pg 1, line 17, delete “in addition,: : : human activities” from abstract. - Pg1, line 21, 2x “pollutions” - Pg 1, line 22, amount = concentrations - Pg 1, line 24, content = concentrations - Pg 2, line 19, delete second “body” - Pg 5, line 16-17, delete sentence “the close: : :. their source”. - Pg 5, line 19-20, not relevant - Pg 5, line 24, insert “important” between “most” and “source” - Pg 6, line 4, “throwing” = “deposition” - Pg 6, line 5, “picked” = “collected” - Pg 6, line 13-15, not relevant here. - Pg 6, line 24, “rubbish” = “solid waste”. - Pg 7, line 2, “second water source”: : : “and the only one in the desert fringes” - Pg 7, line 3, delete “unfortunately” - Pg 7, line 4, delete “which lacking safe potable water source”. - Pg 7, line 7, “absorbance” = “adsorption” - Pg 7, line 10, “: : :desert road, is vulnerable as a result of the unconfined condition of the aquifers”. - Pg 7, line 14, which type of anthropogenic activities? - Pg 7, line 24, seem to be very high values.. - Pg 9, therefore treatment is needed before water containing Cd and Pb can be used for drinking. All these comments were taken in consideration and done

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.drink-water-eng-sci-discuss.net/dwes-2018-37/dwes-2018-37-AC6-supplement.pdf>

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



---

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/dwes-2018-37>, 2018.

DWESD

---

Interactive  
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

