

## ***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: 3 May 2020

In Fig. 6+7 the first 25 ns in the sections are shielded with grey color. It is better to show this part too and explain the disturbances and influences on that signals. The sections in Fig. 6 and 7 show results from different profiles with different processing steps. For better comparability, both sections should be presented migrated and unmigrated as well. Are destructive migrated parts of the signal (Fig. 7) reflections received from installations inside the tunnel system? The shear zones are reflecting electromagnetic energy significantly. The shear zones S1 and S3 are representing different strike directions. The orientation of the antennae during the measurement affects the

C1

backscattering. In this case only one shear zone was detected. Maybe it would be possible to detect the other shear zone by rotating the antennae 90°. The distribution of the shear zones is shown in Fig. 10a and 11. It would be nice to show these lines in all the other pictures from seismic results too. Does it make sense to show GPR and seismic results in a common picture?

---

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

C2