

LETTER TO THE EDITOR**In Reply to Guozhong Huang, Peipei Zhang, Siheng Sun, Dingli****Zhang:**

Arulmozhi H

Department of Petrochemical Technology, Excel College of Engineering and Technology, Komarapalayam - 637 303, India

Email: Arulmozhi12@gmail.com

We appreciate the interest in our article. Here, we will attempt to clarify a few points.

Firstly, we did not assess the inter reliability. In the few instances when there were differences, discussions took place until consensus.

Secondly, as mentioned in the article, harmful substances in reclaimed water have an impact on human health. We encourage to reveal the impact of harmful substances in reclaimed water on human health and to conduct research from the perspective of risk assessment. However, due to the complexity of the reuse of reclaimed water, the water quality requirements and safety evaluation are difficult. Therefore, we advocate putting forward the way of reclaimed water reuse and the system framework of water safety evaluation index in the article. However, there are few examples of current water quality standards and reuse of reclaimed water in China, and the data are incomplete. These corresponding results could be potentially misleading where future decisions are to be made. Thus, many of the articles that have cited were excluded from the review because they did not meet inclusion criteria, which were carefully considered by the authorship team and appreciated during the peer review of our article.

Thirdly, it is urgently necessary to use safety assessment technology to assess potential hazards to public health, so as to ensure that the process of reclaimed water reuse will not harm human health. To evaluate the risk of reclaimed water can also guide the management, decision-making and ensure the smooth implementation of reusing.

Specifically, no quantitative data were in our article results section, and thus validity evidence could not be established.

Therefore, we need to select the related quantitative data which were provided for the review.

Finally, subsequent-use articles did not factor into the validity evidence that we generated. It is not unreasonable to suggest that subsequent publications may provide additional validation.

Another review could be conducted to investigate the entire body of validity evidence associated with each scale.