

Interactive comment on “A geological model for the management of subsurface data in the urban environment of Barcelona city” by Enric Vázquez-Suñé et al.

Enric Vázquez-Suñé et al.

enric.vazquez@idaea.csic.es

Received and published: 29 July 2016

RESPONSE TO REFEREE #2 COMMENTS We respond below to the comments made by the Referee. To facilitate reading we have pasted the original comments (“REFEREE #2”) and our “RESPONSE”.

REFEREE #2: General Comments The article deals with an interesting issue as the geological knowledge in urban areas and its influence in groundwater resources management. Now a days, this is an important problems worldwide and novel approaches need to be found. The proposed methodology and the key point of including the administrative bodies highlight the advances proposed for this article.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



RESPONSE: We would like to begin by thanking the referee for his/her efforts, and we are very pleased for the overall positive assessment.

REFEREE #2: However, the article does not follow a clear structure and seeming some time that you are reading another article when you change the section. In order to improve its impact, there are some major and minor points that need to be discussed/improved before its publication. The most important issues are the following:

REFEREE #2: a) It is necessary an interrelation between the different sections of the article, being the most important linking properly the discussion with the previous sections. This is particularly relevant for the discussion.

RESPONSE: We agree with the referee's comment. For a better link between the previous sections and the discussion, we have rewritten some parts of the article (Introduction (chapter 1), Materials and methods (chapter 3), geological model (chapter 4) and the discussion (chapter 4). We believe that this revised version has substantially improved the original manuscript.

REFEREE #2: b) An improvement of the state of the art is needed as there many papers dealing with urban geology not mentioned in this article. It is necessary emphasize what is improving this study compared with many available.

RESPONSE: Thanks. As the referee suggests, there are additional works that are interesting and relevant to be included in the manuscript. We have considered and referenced them in the manuscript.

REFEREE #2: c) It is necessary to clarify the objectives and follow them along the text. From my point for view there are three clear key points: 1) integrate the information to construct a robust geological model in a urban area and 2) use this information to improve aquifer management and 3) show the importance of collaborating with the government/administration. However, along the text some sections refer more to point 1) and others to 2) and 3). The explanation should be clearer in this way.

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

RESPONSE: As explained before we have rewritten some sections of the paper. This includes a better statement of the objectives and their development along the text.

REFEREE #2: d) The proposed model is based in many reports of previous studies and the administration. It is necessary to explain in more detail what is the information contained in these reports and how it has been integrated into the geological model.

RESPONSE: We agree. We have included more information about the available surveys and data, and also about the methodology and the tools used to integrate that data into the geological model. (Item: 3.2. New data acquisition and methodology)

REFEREE #2: e) Other minor issues that should be addressed.

RESPONSE: We have addressed most of the specific comments and technical corrections in the manuscript following referee's suggestions.

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., doi:10.5194/se-2016-64, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

