

Interactive comment on “Resolved stress analysis, failure mode, and fault-controlled fluid conduits in low-permeability strata” by David A. Ferrill et al.

David A. Ferrill et al.

dferrill@swri.org

Received and published: 2 April 2020

Comment – “Dear authors, I liked reading your paper, particularly after acknowledging that the analysis in this work is similar to that we have developed at Cardiff since we first contacted SWRI in 2013 - and collaborated with this latter institute. With this in mind, se-2020-17 is an excellent addition to what has been an attempt at characterizing fault-related fluid flow using high-quality seismic data. I was very pleased with having a field analogue of what we see on seismic.”

Author’s Response – Thank you for the positive feedback!

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Author's Change in Manuscript – Revised manuscript will enhance comparison to published examples and observations based on high-quality seismic data.

Comment – I think this paper needs a moderate revision, and I appended an annotated .pdf to this review.

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – Manuscript revision will address comments in annotated .pdf provided by reviewer.

Comment – Title - is the analysis in this work only valid for low-permeability data? I feel the analysis is broader than the title suggests.

Author's Response – Accept, good point.

Author's Change in Manuscript – Title is being shortened by removal of “in low-permeability strata” as suggested by reviewer.

Comment – 1-Very old references are used at the start of the paper. Why such broader references when the paper is very much about fault slip and associated tendency to leak?

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – Additional more recent relevant references are being added in the revision, as suggested by the reviewer.

Comment – 2 and 3-Seismic-based analyses have been undertaken by N. Ward et al. (2016). Tectonophysics and Roelofse et al. (2019) in basins posed for CO₂ capture and storage. I would suggest the authors to indicate that low-permeability intervals have been characterized in detail using high-quality seismic data and borehole information.

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – Additional relevant references for CO₂ sequestration

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

and examples characterized using seismic and borehole information are being included in the revision, as suggested by the reviewer.

Comment – 4-Case studies are missing at the end of Page 1.

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – Case studies from the literature are being added in support of this, as suggested by reviewer.

Comment – 5 & 6 - This part hints at the problem of scale in fault segment interaction. At what scale this interaction occurs? Could you kindly complete this introduction with the comments and ideas in Tao and Alves (2017) Reply letter and Tao and Alves (2019). Tectonophysics? These are important papers that review the importance of understanding fault segment length at several scales of analysis - without under-interpreting data - as fluid flow will be controlled by elusive roughness, pull aparts and local re-fracture features in faults. It is reassuring to see this paper (se-2020-17) confirm the aspects in Tao and Alves (2017; 2019).

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – Revised manuscript will expand on this and include the relevant suggested references.

Comment – 7-Once again, examples exist of similar approaches in Ward et al. (2016) and Roelofse et al. (2019). Mattos et al. (2016; 2018) are also interesting papers from Cardiff.

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – Revised manuscript will expand on this and include the relevant suggested references.

Comment – 8-low permeability, rather than 'impermeable' strata. There is no such thing as impermeable strata.

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – Revised text will use adjusted language as suggested.

Comment – 9-Total/maximum lengths of faults need to be stressed at the start of the paragraph. Which stratigraphic section? Detail needed.

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – Requested detail will be included in the revised manuscript.

Comment – 10 (page 8) - The 'scale problem' arises once again. Do the fault segments obey the rules in Tao and Alves (2019) that we need to collect T/Z data at a minimum spacing of 5% of a fault zone length to identify the presence of discrete segments; otherwise faults will resemble large constant-length structures? I am not asking for the inclusion of T/Z data in your paper, but it would be good to understand if the 5% rule is clearly recognized in the field - note: some longer faults require T/Z measurements at 3% of the length of a fault zone so that one can identify discrete segments. I think 2-3 paragraphs confirming how the segments are identified in se-2020-17 is very important in this page 8.

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – The revised manuscript will discuss the identification of discrete segments as suggested.

Comment – 11-Add examples with work undertaken by the Cardiff group using seismic data. The stress tensors are rather similar to some of our work.

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – Revised manuscript will make reference to this other published work as suggested and appropriate.

SED

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Comment – 12-Segment scale needs to be referred to once again. Do they obey the field observations, which are seemingly based on the recognition of linkage points and inflexion/trend changes in discrete fault segments? (see Tao and Alves, 2017 Reply).

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – Segment scale will be addressed in the revised manuscript

Comment – In essence, I overly enjoyed to read this work. The comments above will broaden the scope of this paper - particular those referring to the scale of fault and joint segments in the field and the way(s) they are recognized.

Author's Response – Accept – thank you!

Author's Change in Manuscript – Revisions to the manuscript will broaden the scope as recommended.

Comment – Please also note the supplement to this comment: <https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2020-17/se-2020-17-RC1-supplement.pdf>

Author's Response – Accept.

Author's Change in Manuscript – The marked up manuscript supplement is being consulted in addressing the review

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2020-17>, 2020.

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