

---

**From:** Ashantha Goonetilleke  
**Sent:** Friday, 2 January 2015 09:34  
**To:** isrimangangka@hotmail.com  
**Cc:** Prasanna Egodawatta  
**Subject:** FW: Your Submission ECOLENG-D-14-00854

Hi Isri

Another paper from your work has been accepted. This is also a very good journal with high impact factor.

Regards

Prof. Ashantha Goonetilleke | Science and Engineering Faculty | Queensland University of Technology | GPO Box 2434, Brisbane, Queensland 4001, Australia | Tel. [+61 7 3138 1539](tel:+61731381539) | CRICOS No. 00213J |  
Research profile | Research publications | Google Scholar citations | LinkedIn

-----Original Message-----

From: An Liu [<mailto:liu.an@sz.tsinghua.edu.cn>]  
Sent: Friday, 2 January 2015 11:15 AM  
To: Ashantha Goonetilleke  
Subject: FW: Your Submission ECOLENG-D-14-00854

Dear Sir,

The second paper from Isri's work is back. I will attend these comments asap.

Regards

An

-----Original Message-----

From: [ees.ecoleng.a.2e5419.b75e9981@eesmail.elsevier.com](mailto:ees.ecoleng.a.2e5419.b75e9981@eesmail.elsevier.com)  
[\[mailto:ees.ecoleng.a.2e5419.b75e9981@eesmail.elsevier.com\]](mailto:ees.ecoleng.a.2e5419.b75e9981@eesmail.elsevier.com) On Behalf Of William Mitsch  
Sent: Friday, January 02, 2015 8:50 AM  
To: [liu.an@sz.tsinghua.edu.cn](mailto:liu.an@sz.tsinghua.edu.cn)  
Subject: Your Submission ECOLENG-D-14-00854

Ms. Ref. No.: ECOLENG-D-14-00854

Title: Sectional analysis of stormwater treatment performance of a constructed wetland Ecological Engineering

Dear Dr. An Liu,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are appended below.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript.

To submit a revision, please go to <http://ees.elsevier.com/ecoleng/> and login as an Author.

Your username is: [liu.an@sz.tsinghua.edu.cn](mailto:liu.an@sz.tsinghua.edu.cn) If you need to retrieve password details, please go to: [http://ees.elsevier.com/ECOLENG/automail\\_query.asp](http://ees.elsevier.com/ECOLENG/automail_query.asp)

NOTE: Upon submitting your revised manuscript, please upload the source files for your article. For additional details regarding acceptable file formats, please refer to the Guide for Authors at: <http://www.elsevier.com/journals/ecological-engineering/0925-8574/guide-for-authors>

When submitting your revised paper, we ask that you include the following items:

#### Manuscript and Figure Source Files (mandatory)

We cannot accommodate PDF manuscript files for production purposes. We also ask that when submitting your revision you follow the journal formatting guidelines. Figures and tables may be embedded within the source file for the submission as long as they are of sufficient resolution for Production. For any figure that cannot be embedded within the source file (such as \*.PSD Photoshop files), the original figure needs to be uploaded separately. Refer to the Guide for Authors for additional information.

<http://www.elsevier.com/journals/ecological-engineering/0925-8574/guide-for-authors>

#### Highlights (optional)

Highlights consist of a short collection of bullet points that convey the core findings of the article and should be submitted in a separate file in the online submission system. Please use 'Highlights' in the file name and include 3 to 5 bullet points (maximum 85 characters, including spaces, per bullet point). See the following website for more information <http://www.elsevier.com/highlights>

#### Graphical Abstract (optional)

Graphical Abstracts should summarize the contents of the article in a concise, pictorial form designed to capture the attention of a wide readership online. Refer to the following website for more information: <http://www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts>

On your Main Menu page is a folder entitled "Submissions Needing Revision". You will find your submission record there.

PLEASE NOTE: The journal would like to enrich online articles by visualising and providing geographical details described in Ecological Engineering articles. For this purpose, corresponding KML (GoogleMaps) files can be uploaded in our online submission system. Submitted KML files will be published with your online article on ScienceDirect. Elsevier will generate maps from the KML files and include them in the online article.

Please note that this journal offers a new, free service called AudioSlides: brief, webcast-style presentations that are shown next to published articles on ScienceDirect (see also <http://www.elsevier.com/audioslides>). If your paper is accepted for publication, you will automatically receive an invitation to create an AudioSlides presentation.

Yours sincerely,

William J. Mitsch, PhD  
Editor-in-Chief  
Ecological Engineering

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1: General review comments

This is a very well written and interesting paper! It is generally good at it is but I suggest a few minor complementary "(Optional)" descriptions in 2.1 and 4 if space is available, if not it would be interesting to receive short comments from you regarding these. I also would like you to check or to further explain some text in 2.2, 2.4, 3.1 and 3.2, see below.

Specific comments

2.1 or 1.3 Water bypass (Optional). It would be interesting if you could mention the calculated design inflow (l/s) to the pond and at what flow (l/s) conditions bypass from the pond occurs and/or at what height (m) above the permanent pool level the bypass weir is. Do you have calculations for how large share (%) of the total yearly runoff volume (m<sup>3</sup>) is not bypassed?

2.2. You mention TN, TP and TSS as the "primary stormwater pollutants" and you have references for that statement, however this is not generally "Worldwide" true and the pollutants of greatest concern should be different for different specific receiving waters. You should mention something about this, e.g. that these pollutants are considered as primary in Australia. In e.g. Europe there is the Water Framework Directive and 33 substance of priority, and it is common there to also study other substances such as metals (e.g. Pb, Cu, Cd and ZN) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH, e.g. BaP). In many studies in Europe there are calculations for those pollutants that are of most concern for the receiving water and these pollutants differ for different case studies with different conditions of the receiving waters.

2.4. I suggest to further elaborate the text "were less than 1 year average recurrence interval" to be a more complete description, e.g. "were corresponding to design rainfall intensities of less than 1 year reoccurrence interval", or similar.

3.1. Maybe change the word "Preformed" to "Performed"?

3.2. Please explain more clearly if the load reduction values (%) in Fig. 2 are as low as 0-10% for the whole facility during the events or if the total load reduction of the facility during the studied period of events equals the sum of the events. If the latter, could you please give a number of the total load reduction (%), else could you explain why the reduction efficiency is so low? Furthermore, could you calculate or estimate the total pollutant load bypassed compared to the inflow pollutant load to the wetland; if the bypassed pollutant load is large this results in a relatively poor total removed pollutant load.

4. (Optional). It would be interesting if you could mention something about the influence on or importance of bypass to a pond or wetland in general, e.g. by recommendations based on your

results. Do you for instance recommend to always design for a bypass and should the bypass weir preferably be located before or within the first facility, as in this case in the wet pond? Do you recommend to design for a first flush and e.g. to treat the volume corresponding to the runoff depth 15 mm in the facility, thereby comprising the small and average runoff events and to bypass larger events? How large velocities could there be in a wet pond (design flow / cross sectional area) considering the risk for erosion and resuspension of sediments or do you have comments regarding this to add?

\*\*\*\*\*

For further assistance, please visit our customer support site at <http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/7923>. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions and learn more about EES via interactive tutorials. You will also find our 24/7 support contact details should you need any further assistance from one of our customer support representatives.