

Interactive comment on “Characterizing a decametre-scale granitic reservoir using GPR and seismic methods – A case study for preparing hydraulic stimulations” by Joseph Doetsch et al.

Volker Gundelach (Referee)

volker.gundelach@bgr.de

Received and published: 24 April 2020

Fig 1: use (); Change height axis; delete AU Gallery; two times b) Boreholes Fig 3: move text into white background line 360, 366, 376: GPR? line 363, 367: the use of (in the text? Fig 9: error bars instead dots? Fig 10c: exception of correlation at profile meter 20+45? line 521: "Ialso ed" ?

Scientific significance: The manuscript represents a substantial contribution in the description of a granitic reservoir using GPR and seismic methods. The comparison of measured GPR data with known geology leads to enhancement in site description. The seismic tomography between boreholes identifies anisotropy, shear zones and

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



fractures in the rock.

Scientific quality: The scientific approach and applied methods are adapted to the scientific problem. The results are discussed in an appropriate and balanced way. Related work was considered, including appropriate references.

Presentation quality: The scientific results and conclusions are presented in a clear, concise and well-structured way with appropriate use of the English language.

Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of SE? yes

Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? yes

Are substantial conclusions reached? yes

Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? yes

Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? yes

Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? yes

Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? yes

Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? yes

Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? yes

Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? yes

Is the language fluent and precise? yes

Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? yes

Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? some figures should be clarified

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

Are the number and quality of references appropriate? yes

Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? yes

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2020-40>, 2020.

SED

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

