

Interactive comment on “Optimization analysis of active solar still using design of experiment method” by Mohammad Omar Abu Abbas et al.

Mohammad Omar Abu Abbas et al.

myalabedallah16@eng.just.edu.jo

Received and published: 14 November 2020

Dear Editor and Reviewer, The authors will like to appreciate the reviewers for taking the time to constructively critique the manuscript in order to enhance its quality suitable for the research community.

Comment 1: English should be checked by the native speaker Author Response: The article has gone through detailed and thorough proofreading by a native English-speaking person and has also been checked for any punctuation as well as grammatical error using an English correction checker (Grammarly). Action: It has been reviewed and modified.

Comment 2: Solar still should be introduced in the second paragraph of the introduc-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



tion Author Response: The authors welcome the suggestions from the reviewer. The updated manuscript has been prepared to reflect the suggestions by the reviewer accordingly. Action: It has been reviewed and modified

Comment 3: References to solar still performance should be added. What is the performance of the solar still and why should be improved? Action: It has been reviewed and modified

Comment 4: What happens with the solar still if you increase condenser cover temperature and increase saline water temperature? Action: Increasing different temperature between the salty water and condenser cover enhance the evaporation rate and condensation process which lead to increasing productivity (different temperature is driving force)

Comment 5: Line 90-91 - “Enhancing the productivity of solar still has received significant attention from many researchers.” – What researchers? References should be added Action: It has been reviewed and added

Comment 6: Same for line 92-95 Action: It has been reviewed and added

Comment 7: Line 105 typo “Manokar et al (2020). Analyzed. . .” Action: The correction has been made and highlighted in yellow, as suggested by the reviewer in the updated manuscript.

Comment 8: Line 155-157 - “It should be remarked that all of the researchers have studied the influence of utilizing one parameter at a time while keeping the other parameters fixed will not occur to understand the interaction.” This sentence is really not understandable. What is will not occur to understand the interaction? Author Response: The authors appreciate the reviewer for his critical comment on the manuscript. The updated manuscript has been prepared to reflect the suggestion by the reviewer accordingly Action: It has been reviewed and modified

Comment 9: Line 158 “we collected all the parameters that could affect the active solar

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

still” – My suggestion is to name all main parameters that you took into consideration. If not in the introduction then certainly in 2.3 Design of Experimental. Author Response: The authors are grateful to the reviewer for this observation, and in fact, we agree with the suggestion Action: It has been reviewed and added

Comment 10:) Line 320-322 – “The results found that the most important factors that enhance mass output are amount of external power, water depth, and basin area respectively.” It would be good to support that information with findings from the literature and an explanation of why is that so.

Author Response: The authors are grateful to the reviewer for such an in-depth review. The updated manuscript captures the suggestion by the reviewer Action: It has been reviewed and added

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://dwes.copernicus.org/preprints/dwes-2020-22/dwes-2020-22-AC4-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/dwes-2020-22, 2020>.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

