Drinking Water Engineering and Science Discussions

Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC3
https://doi.org/10.5194/dwes-2020-34-RC3, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on dwes-2020-34

Anonymous Referee #3

Referee comment on "Hydraulic performance Analysis of water supply distribution network using water GEM v8i" by Dessalegn Geleta Ebsa and Fekadu Fufa, Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/dwes-2020-34-RC3, 2021

The paper presents a case study of a town in Ethiopia where the distribution network is modelled using well known software, WaterGEMS. My findings are:

- By the contents, the paper is more of a practitioner's paper rather than a scientific paper. The methodology is very basic and includes the pressure and velocity analysis without going much into the discussion of the results. As such, it does not add anything new about the modelling procedure than it is known for already a few decades.
- Interesting aspect is that it is a real case network with field data collection, which gives opportunity to put results of the simulation into a context of real problems. But then, I would for instance like to see the calibration results, learn whether there is a degree of intermittency in supply, which would in my assumption be the case, and how is this then handled in the model, are the roof tanks used, how the demand patterns look like, how about the leakages, etc. The papers is simply lacking some relevant details on the modelling process that could give me better idea while assessing the results. What is shown is just too basic.
- The structure of the paper is superficial and contains stories that are not so important for the modelling process, while it is lacking those that are important. The English is pretty substandard and needs significant improvements.

In summary, looking to the submission as a scientific paper, I see a very long road to make it approved and I am not convinced that this is the path to go; this is why I rejected it. In case the authors are willing to resubmit it, better chance is to profile it as a practitioner’s paper; still, in that case a major revision is inevitable.