

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.

PierPaolo Marchesini (Referee)

pmarchesini@lbl.gov

Received and published: 29 April 2020

The overall quality of the paper is excellent. I enjoyed the logical flow, how the material is presented, and how the methodology is explained. The integration of GPR and high-res seismic is properly justified and motivated on different levels (fracture density vs shear zones, etc.). I appreciated the exhaustive discussion of the seismic anisotropy and how it has been tackled.

I only have a few technical corrections that the authors might consider including in the final version. Although I do not consider those bounded to the acceptance of the paper for publication, I think that the corrections might improve the clarity of a couple

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



of details.

1) Figure 1 caption: why (a) is repeated twice into the first sentence? 2) Figure 3: In (a) and (b), why ~ 30 m? and not an exact scale? In (b) Why not showing the exact position of Receiver #45 instead of only pointing at it? In (b), I would flip "Receivers", seems easier to read. 3) In 3.2.1, what is 100-Hz referred to the geophones? Center frequency? Corner frequency? Damping frequency? Later in the section, it is pointed out that the dominant frequency observed is ~ 1.1 kHz. 4) In 4.1 and Figure 6 caption, GRP instead of GPR. 5) Figure 6, why not indicating N and S as in Figure 7? Just a stylistical detail, not crucial.

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

SED

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

