

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

Juan Carlo Intriago Zambrano

j.c.intriagozambrano@tudelft.nl

Received and published: 4 June 2019

General Comments:

Hydrams, since their invention more than two centuries ago, have been attracting many researchers around the world. Therefore it is a relevant topic, but at the same time challenging while pursuing for innovation. In this sense, I suggest the authors to highlight as much as possible the actual contribution of their article to this specific field of knowledge. Maybe that contribution is more focused on the easiness of construction and installation, perhaps to its size or maybe to the ratio size / efficiency.

On the other hand, a main part not explicitly addressed in the introduction is the research gap and the consequent research objective. Therefore it is difficult to link the

C1

concluding remarks to the general work.

Moreover, it is highly recommended to keep the traditional structure of a scientific article: Introduction, Materials and methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion. That aside, it makes more sense to have the "Pump Design and Construction" and "Experimental Set-Up" sections being part of Materials and methods.

Specific comments:

L. 26: Not all the farmlands in the world meet the condition of being far from an electricity source yet close to a water source. Maybe a word like "usually" or "mostly" could fit, as long as evidence is provided for such an affirmation.

L. 26: It is better to explain why the relevance of being far from electricity sources, i.e. why is it a challenge/problem for farming. Besides, please think of what happens with diesel-based pumps, which do not rely on electricity.

L. 27: Is there evidence for stating "The water source is usually situated below the level of the farmlands"? Or perhaps it is better to say something more general, such as "there are cases where the water source...".

L. 28: There is the need of an introductory / transition sentence before "A water pump operating on the water hammer effect...". I suggest to introduce the reader why it is a challenge being far from electricity, and what can be done using hydropower. Then the explanation of the hydraulic ram pump will fit better in the storyline.

Ls. 31-38: The historic introduction, particularly if it does not go beyond the work done by Pierre Mongolfier, must be briefly summarized. Its constructive details are not relevant for the scope of the paper.

L. 39: In principle, no machine can be considered "perfect". Furthermore, what are the criteria to be considered as such? I recommend to use expressions like "highly reliable", or any other that reflects its degree of development. In addition, hydrams, compared to other similar technologies, are subject to constant wearing due to the

C2

aggressiveness of the water hammer effect, which is in turn their main drawback.

L. 41: It mentions "water was wasted", whereas the Fig. 1 refers to "exhausted water". It is important to keep consistency in the nomenclature, and making sure it matches with the usual terminology in the literature (e.g. "A Manual On The Hydraulic Ram For Pumping Water" by S.B. Watt, or "Hydraulic Ram Pumps: A guide to ram pump water supply systems" by Jeffrey et al.)

L. 43: About "once any form of flow can be created", it will be good to provide an insight on how this flow can be created after the different water sources, i.e. what kind of extra infrastructure it might need: dam, weir, drop, etc.

L. 44: The ram pump installed at a lower location than the water source is not an ideal scenario but a mandatory one. Otherwise the pump will not operate whatsoever.

L. 48-41: This paragraph describes the generic structure of a Hydram. I suggest to put that in the introduction, so in this section the specific parts and assembly methods of your prototype are directly described.

L. 61: Figs 1 and 2 could be put side to side, so the reader can make a quick correspondence between the scheme and the actual prototype.

L. 73-76: I recommend to match the parts of the experimental set-up, as described in this paragraph, with those of the Fig. 3, to make sure all of them can be identified in both graphic and text. A good way of achieving it could be by assigning letters or numbers to each part.

L. 93: I wonder if it would be more convenient to combine both tables 1 and 2 in a single one, due to their similar structure. In that case, each cell must be divided in two parts, for the pumped flow and wasted flow, respectively. Moreover, this can give the chance to include a third part: the pumped/wasted ratio; it can be eventually related to the pumping efficiency.

L. 100 and next ones: The discussion part must be enriched by comparing your study

C3

with other ones, perhaps using similar prototypes in sizes and conditions. Of course, the respective literature and references must be taken into account while doing so.

L. 134: The first conclusion might be too obvious, after so many years of continuous and ubiquitous use of the hydrams, to be considered as such after the present study.

Technical corrections:

Keywords: "Pump characteristic" is not a so accurate keyword for this study, since it does not suggest any possible topic.

L. 26: Farmlands are (missing plural).

L. 37: The name of the son of Joseph Michel de Montgolfier, who improved his father's model, is Pierre (or Pierre François).

L. 37: "Montgolfier designed the sniffer valve that reintroduce..." It must be "reintroduced".

L. 40: "The pump construction was simple and consisted of a pump chamber...". Do you refer to "chamber" perhaps?

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

C4