

Interactive comment on “Performance Characteristics of a Small Hammer Head Pump” by Krishpersad Manohar et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 20 May 2019

In this paper a design and prototype of a small hammer head pump is presented and the performance of the pump is demonstrated. The topic is of interest and the paper is well written. However, it lacks some (scientific) reasoning, which should be addressed in a next version of the manuscript.

General comments: - A clear objective (and knowledge gap) at the end of the introduction is missing. It should be stated what the drawbacks of the previous designs was, what the research gap is and thus the research question - Use conventional lay-out of manuscript: introduction, Materials and methods, Results and discussion, conclusion - Explain what the innovation in the design of the pump is in the section “pump design and construction” - Relate the results of the experiments to other, similar work (give references) and theory.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Specific comments: - 42, do not use words like “perfect” (and also “very”, “a lot” etc.) - 45-46, explain how with “ponds”, “lakes”, and “wells”, “a form of flow can be created” - 58, delete “construction” - 60, in Figure 1 the word “exhausted water” and in Figure 3 “waste water” is used. Please synchronize and avoid the word “waste water” since this has another connotation. - 93, explain to what reference the “input head” is related. - 117-127, not of interest, so please delete. - 133-134, explain if this was to be expected (and give reference) - 140-141, explain if this was to be expected (and give reference)

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/dwes-2019-7>, 2019.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

