Reviewer 2

1. The authors have done a survey in a urban area in Sri Lanka which probably includes water use and household characteristics. However, the survey questions were not included, so the reader does not know this.

Survey questions were attached.

2. Also, doing a survey is an art, and it is not clear how skillfuly this art was performed in this study. The method section is only 5 sentences long, and states that a survey was done. How is unclear.

Methodology was elaborated

3. The results section shows superfluous tables, with a lot of excess data; this could be much more compact.

Removed excess data

4. There are no linear regression results, no graphs either.

Linear regression results were included.

5. There is no discussion on statistical significance of only 75 households being surveyed.

The method was explained.

6. There was no hypothesis on water use and its signifcant contributors (from e.g. literature on countries that are similar to Sri Lanka, how significant is USA data in this respect?)and then a statisitcal test to (dis)prove the hypothesis.

H0 = There is no relationship between the dependent variable percapita water consumption and the independent variables; household size, age, education level, number of taps and household income.

Ha= There is a relationship between the dependent variable percapita water consumption and the independent variables; household size, age, education level, number of taps and household income.

7.   Even if the data was approached in a scientific way, it still is no more than a case study. A nice set of data of water use in this specific area. There is no lesson to learn from this - there is no study on how water demand could be reduced, or something similar. The contribution of this study to the scientific community is not clear at all. The data was not even provided.